



**SID 5** **Research Project Final Report**

● **Note**

In line with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, Defra aims to place the results of its completed research projects in the public domain wherever possible. The SID 5 (Research Project Final Report) is designed to capture the information on the results and outputs of Defra-funded research in a format that is easily publishable through the Defra website. A SID 5 must be completed for all projects.

- This form is in Word format and the boxes may be expanded or reduced, as appropriate.

● **ACCESS TO INFORMATION**

The information collected on this form will be stored electronically and may be sent to any part of Defra, or to individual researchers or organisations outside Defra for the purposes of reviewing the project. Defra may also disclose the information to any outside organisation acting as an agent authorised by Defra to process final research reports on its behalf. Defra intends to publish this form on its website, unless there are strong reasons not to, which fully comply with exemptions under the Environmental Information Regulations or the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Defra may be required to release information, including personal data and commercial information, on request under the Environmental Information Regulations or the Freedom of Information Act 2000. However, Defra will not permit any unwarranted breach of confidentiality or act in contravention of its obligations under the Data Protection Act 1998. Defra or its appointed agents may use the name, address or other details on your form to contact you in connection with occasional customer research aimed at improving the processes through which Defra works with its contractors.

**Project identification**

1. Defra Project code	<input type="text" value="NR0108"/>
2. Project title	<input type="text" value="Valuing England's Terrestrial Ecosystem Services"/>
3. Contractor organisation(s)	<input type="text" value="Jacobs"/>
4. Total Defra project costs (agreed fixed price)	<input type="text" value="£ 10,0697"/>
5. Project: start date .....	<input type="text" value="24/07/2006"/>
end date .....	<input type="text" value="30/11/2007"/>

6. It is Defra's intention to publish this form.  
Please confirm your agreement to do so..... YES  NO

(a) When preparing SID 5s contractors should bear in mind that Defra intends that they be made public. They should be written in a clear and concise manner and represent a full account of the research project which someone not closely associated with the project can follow.

Defra recognises that in a small minority of cases there may be information, such as intellectual property or commercially confidential data, used in or generated by the research project, which should not be disclosed. In these cases, such information should be detailed in a separate annex (not to be published) so that the SID 5 can be placed in the public domain. Where it is impossible to complete the Final Report without including references to any sensitive or confidential data, the information should be included and section (b) completed. NB: only in exceptional circumstances will Defra expect contractors to give a "No" answer.

In all cases, reasons for withholding information must be fully in line with exemptions under the Environmental Information Regulations or the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

(b) If you have answered NO, please explain why the Final report should not be released into public domain

## Executive Summary

7. The executive summary must not exceed 2 sides in total of A4 and should be understandable to the intelligent non-scientist. It should cover the main objectives, methods and findings of the research, together with any other significant events and options for new work.

### Key Messages

- This study aims to further develop the evidence base on the economic valuation of ecosystem services.
- There are many criticisms against the appropriateness of completing a total valuation of the benefits derived from ecosystems services. The approach outlined here highlights the issues faced in doing this and attempts to address them throughout the study.
- For policy decisions and an understanding of sustainability issues, an analysis of marginal changes which facilitates consideration of trade-offs and change over time is needed.
- The study adopted a service based approach. Whilst this has made it feasible to attempt to estimate the Total Economic Valuation (TEV) of England's terrestrial ecosystem services, the figures presented here are most likely to be lower bound estimates of the benefits received by society. This is due to the numerous difficulties with making such estimates and a number of gaps. The 'true' value, taking account of inter-linkages and thresholds and limits, is likely to be much higher.
- There are still significant gaps in understanding how benefits are derived from biophysical aspects of the ecosystem at different scales, as well as a lack of good, current data needed to value some of these benefits.
- It remains challenging to sum valuations for different benefits in different places and at different scales. More robust benefits transfer information may make this more practicable in future.

### Conclusions and recommendations

The following conclusions are drawn from this study:

1. This research has drawn together a significant body of information on a wide range of benefits provided by England's ecosystem services. It has been possible to categorise the final benefits received by society into a typology that can be used by decision makers to ensure the widest range of benefits are considered in policy making.

2. Due to a number of limitations, it is considered that the values presented are likely to significantly underestimate the full value received by society from many of the services, some of which may in fact be infinite in value. Therefore these values should be viewed as lower bound estimates. For instance, the estimated value of the benefits provided by regulating services does not include any value for water purification benefits and only partially covers the value of the benefits provided by other regulating services;
3. It is clear that a total valuation is not useful in considering the implications of policy related changes however given the gaps that remain in the overall framework and the fact that supporting services can not be included within the framework, the suitability of a total valuation for advocacy purposes may also be questioned by some.
4. Total System Value (TSV) does not equal Total Economic Value. The implication of this is that economic approaches can not solely be used to estimate TSV. The value of the additional benefits not currently captured within valuations needs to be considered in a qualitative manner in decision making. In order to facilitate this, the focus should be on generating a better understanding of the biophysical relationship along with limits and thresholds;
5. While the analysis provides a significant amount of information on how ecosystem service benefits are realised by society, as a result of the scope limitation of this assessment (i.e., a total valuation reflecting a snap-shot in time), it has not been possible to consider trade-offs, for instance between ecosystem services under different scenarios. The analysis can not show change over time, and therefore is of limited use in addressing sustainability issues;
6. A services based approach carries limitations as noted above, however it also provides the flexibility to use available data sources. Haines-Young and Potschin (2008) investigate how the habitats and services based approaches can be brought together so that their strengths can be combined and used most effectively to support decision making and in doing so they consider the suitability of a 'placed-based' approach. While this approach seems reasonable and worth further consideration, as it was not part of this research it is not clear at this stage what valuation issues (under either a total or marginal assessment) are likely to be encountered in making it operational, and to what extent it could overcome the limitations of the other approaches;
7. Many theoretical challenges have been encountered in completing this assessment. The most significant is that economic theory suggests change should be considered at the margin in order to inform decision-making. This leads on to issues with the identification of an appropriate baseline to facilitate consideration of the total benefits (e.g. this was a particular issue for the valuation of benefits from regulating services). While the baseline applied is suitable for use here, it is not necessarily very realistic in that there is no consideration of how alternative activities or behaviours would be used to replace lost welfare values under this baseline. Other major conceptual difficulties, specifically relating to the valuation of benefits from regulating services, relate to the attempt to identify the benefits over and above those provided under the baseline (e.g. as was the case with the assessment of benefits from both air quality and water regulation services). This data is necessary in order to complete a monetary valuation of these benefits;
8. As noted above, a significant limiting factor in this assessment was the lack of clear information on the benefits arising from some services. This hinged on a gap in our understanding of the biophysical relationships between aspects of the ecosystem and how final benefits are realised (e.g. benefits from regulation services, particularly water purification and waste treatment services);
9. In terms of how values can be aggregated the key conclusions are: it is inappropriate to use valuations that were estimated for a marginal change to estimate the total value at any scale of assessment (local, regional or national). At best these estimates can be used as an indication on the lower bound of the value for illustrative purposes (as per Section 4.4.5); and that care is required when summing the values for different benefits that have been estimated using different valuation approaches as this may cause double counting or may in fact result in an incorrect estimate of welfare values; and
10. While the best available monetary valuations were identified for application in many cases, it can not be assumed that these values are directly relevant to the question asked here and/or that there is no further need to improve on these estimates for use in the future. This is an obvious issue in recreation where in some cases only one data source was available and/or where benefits transfer was carried out using quite site specific WTP values. In other cases the valuations were based on relatively old data. Individuals' preferences might have changed since the time of the study which further impacts the accuracy of the valuation. These possible changes in preferences cannot simple be accounted for by

adjustments for income growth or purchasing power.

### **The following recommendations are made:**

1. As concluded above, a total valuation exercise is not useful in considering policy implications and its usefulness for advocacy could also be questioned given the limitations encountered in this study. It is recommended that in future the focus should be on marginal assessments. These types of assessments can be used to inform both policy choices and for advocacy if appropriately defined. For instance, for advocacy it may be more appropriate to consider the implications of a national policy and the value of changes which might result from it (e.g. Jacobs (2005) assessment of the benefits of conservation policy in Scotland);
2. There is clearly a gap in our understanding of the biophysical relationships between some aspects of the ecosystem and how final benefits are realised. This has resulted in difficulty in identifying the extent of the benefits provided at a regional or national scale. Research into how services operate and interact at difference scales and how this interaction impacts on the extent of the benefits realised would help in the valuation of benefits at these scales. This is a priority and therefore should be used to inform future work in the biophysical assessments, modelling and monitoring arena in order to inform valuations;
3. There is a need to recognise the value of supporting services. It would be worth investigating the possibility of developing a biophysical model of supporting services to inform decisions regarding the other services accruing from them;
4. Further investigation should be carried out into how the 'place- based approach', as outlined in Haines-Young and Potschin (2008), could be made operational. The potential advantages and disadvantages it would offer in terms of valuation should be investigated with specific consideration given to what the implications of this approach are in terms of data requirements and availability for monetary valuation for marginal assessments; and
5. Prioritisation of how the valuation gaps should be filled will be dependant on how 'acceptable' the existing studies are considered to be. This will vary depending on the purpose of the valuation exercise. While these valuation data are considered acceptable and appropriate for use in BT in this case, given the reduced need for accuracy, they may not be considered adequately robust or appropriate where real policy choices are being made. For instance, while a gap has not been identified for a number of the recreational benefit assessments, the values available might not be considered acceptable for application where real policy choices are being made given their specific focus and/or their age. This issue may or may not represent a greater priority than, for instance, the gaps identified with regard to the valuation of wild produce therefore it is recommended that a benefits transfer strategy should be developed to prioritise how the evidence base should be developed.

This strategy should consider where efforts should be focused and what primary research is required. The following aspects are recommended for inclusion within this strategy:

- In order to provide for greater transferability of values it is recommended that primary assessments of benefits be undertaken with benefit transfer requirements in mind. There may be various ways of approaching this, for instance through a) undertaking a number of assessments at varying locations to get an understanding of the variability in the values. This might help in identifying appropriate adjustments for benefits transfer or b) the use of high level assessments which, for instance might consider all recreational opportunities available to respondents at a higher scale rather than valuing a specific recreational activity, say walking or cycling, at a specific site. Consideration should also be given to the appropriate scale at which the assessment should be carried out;
- This strategy could contain a requirement for all Government sponsored primary valuation data to:
  - i. Be uploaded to the EVRI valuations database. While a useful source of information, this database currently does not contain many of the new valuation studies which may prove useful in making an ecosystems approach operational; and.
  - ii. Present benefits functions in all final report or papers to enable adjusted benefits transfers to be undertaken.
- In order to facilitate consistent and comparable valuations, consideration should be given to how the collation and presentation of standard statistics on MV and GVA could be adjusted to fit in with an ecosystems approach to decision making.

8. As a guide this report should be no longer than 20 sides of A4. This report is to provide Defra with details of the outputs of the research project for internal purposes; to meet the terms of the contract; and to allow Defra to publish details of the outputs to meet Environmental Information Regulation or Freedom of Information obligations. This short report to Defra does not preclude contractors from also seeking to publish a full, formal scientific report/paper in an appropriate scientific or other journal/publication. Indeed, Defra actively encourages such publications as part of the contract terms. The report to Defra should include:
- the scientific objectives as set out in the contract;
  - the extent to which the objectives set out in the contract have been met;
  - details of methods used and the results obtained, including statistical analysis (if appropriate);
  - a discussion of the results and their reliability;
  - the main implications of the findings;
  - possible future work; and
  - any action resulting from the research (e.g. IP, Knowledge Transfer).

### Introduction

Defra's Ecosystems Approach project was undertaken to develop a more strategic approach to policy and decision making for the natural environment. This initiative has resulted in the publication of "Securing a healthy natural environment: an action plan for embedding an ecosystems approach", which details the steps necessary to embed an ecosystems approach in policy-making.

This research on the valuation of England's terrestrial ecosystem services (which excludes marine, but includes both inland freshwater systems and estuarine systems) aims to further develop the evidence base in terms of the economic valuation of ecosystem services. Alongside this work, Defra recently published an introductory guide to valuing ecosystem services (ES) to support the embedding of this approach (Defra, 2007b).

There are two key objectives for this research as specified by Defra:

- to provide an economic valuation of the 'total' annual value of England's terrestrial and aquatic ecosystem services; and
- to move the field of ecosystem valuation forward through investigation of the existing evidence base, methodologies and limitations.

A total valuation is theoretically challenging to complete, and considered by some not to be a theoretically sound endeavour. Economic analysis to inform policy choices is typically concerned with marginal changes and the TEV framework is commonly applied in these analyses. Marginal valuation refers to a measure of the change (increase or decrease) in the provision of benefits under a given scenario.

The argument presented here is that where the purpose of the valuation is to compare contributions of capital stocks, as it is in this case, then the TEV framework as applied here is an appropriate (albeit imperfect) measure. So, while the valuation of the total benefits provided by England's ES may be considered by some to be meaningless, it is arguably appropriate given the project's objectives.

An overview of the total economic value estimates of the final benefits provided by England's Ecosystem Services is provided in Table A below. These values are considered to be lower bound estimates and given the significance of the gaps in the overall framework and a number of other issues discussed throughout the report it is not considered appropriate to present a summation of these benefits.

It is clear from Table A below that the benefits received from Provisioning Services appear to be the most significant in value, with benefits arising from the provision of recreational opportunities also providing significant values. However the results in Table A need to be interpreted with care.

The value of other benefits are very likely to be significantly underestimated due to issues encountered relating to the general approach being applied (a total valuation) and to data limitations.

For instance, it was not possible to estimate a value for the benefits received from water purification services due to issues in identifying the total extent of these benefits above the baseline. This should not be taken to suggest no benefits are gained but rather that it was not possible to estimate and value these benefits.

The benefits presented for carbon regulation services are in fact marginal values, albeit covering a very large margin (grasslands to woodlands). Furthermore, the flood defence benefits relate only to the value received from a subset of habitats; albeit the most significant habitats providing these services so it can be assumed this value represents a lower bound estimate.

Table A Welfare measure and/or contribution to the economy estimated for each ES benefit (£ million per annum)

		Welfare Measures (constituent of Total Economic Value)			Contributions to the economy	Notes
		Approach 1		Approach 2		
Benefit		Market Value/ Expenditure	Consumer Surplus	Estimate of total WTP (e.g. damage cost avoided)	GVA /Income	
Provisioning	Agricultural food produce	8,213	-	-	3,478	This estimate may change considerable from year to year as it is based on market prices which can fluctuate significantly.
	Agricultural non –food produce	1,119	-	-	474	
	Non-agricultural cultivated produce	832	-	-	259	Likely to be an underestimate as some of the estimates are based on single data sources and do not capture all of the benefits.
	Wild produce	31.3	-	-	-	Likely to be an underestimate as much of these benefits are carried out in an informal and ad hoc way and are therefore unrecorded.
Regulating	Carbon Regulation	-	-	1,007	-	This valuation covers the benefits provided by woodlands, wetlands and peatland.
	Clean air	-	-	0.018- 0.64	-	Only values the benefits provided by woodlands, so it likely to underestimate true benefit. At best this is a lower bound estimate
	Clean water	-	-	-	-	No valuation was possible due to geographical scale at which benefit provision was being considered.
	Flood control and storm buffering	-	-	1,243	-	Relates to a subset of habitats, however these may be the most significant so it can be assumed to represent a lower bound estimate.
Cultural	Recreation	5,389	266	-	1,951	This estimate can be considered to be a lower bound estimate.
	Knowledge Systems	-	-	-	-	No valuation was possible due to the conceptual issues associated with the total valuation approach and to the context specific nature of how these benefits are realised.
	Social use	-	-	-	-	
	Non-use	-	-	-	-	

## Approach and methods

The total benefits from terrestrial Ecosystem Services in this study represent the benefits at a snap shot in time – one year. No primary valuation has been carried out as part of this assessment. Valuations are built up using a variety of valuation approaches including using market data, damage cost avoided estimates and benefits transfer of value estimated through stated and revealed preference studies.

Other key aspects of the project scope are as follows:

- Under a total assessment, no consideration of alternatives or substitutes is considered. It is simply assumed that no alternative source of benefit is available;
- The assessment is limited to the benefits from England's ES to England;
- In order to complete the valuation exercise it is clearly necessary to investigate the links between habitats, the ES provided by these habitats and other processes and the resulting provision of benefits to society.

However a detailed or broad ranging review of these links was not considered to be within the scope of this project;

- This research attempts to present the value of 'actual' benefits received by society wherever possible. For example, the quantity of food actually produced in one year or the amount of carbon actually sequestered in one year;
- In addition to providing significant benefits, ecosystems can also have negative impacts on society's welfare. For example, some plants and animal species are (rightly or wrongly) regarded as pests (biting insects, rats etc.) and some carry disease (e.g. ticks) or are stinging or poisonous (nettles, some toadstools). These negative impacts from ES are considered to be outside the scope of this project; and
- This project includes the valuation of benefits received from ES that are not paid for within markets. Land management practices and production processes often create other external costs. For the purposes of this study, these could be considered to be second order externalities. These second order externalities are outside the scope of this project.

The starting point for this assessment is the definition of the baseline, against which the total benefits of the status quo can be measured. Conceptual difficulties arise in identifying a baseline that facilitates estimation of the total value of ES.

Strong sustainability proponents argue that it is impossible for man-made capital to serve as an adequate substitute for natural capital, such as the biosphere and ecological services. Guided by this principle, the baseline applied here contains an oxygen atmosphere, a hydrological cycle and fresh drinking water supplies, the human requirement for a complex diet based on plants/animals and a comfortable climate. These components are therefore not valued within the assessment presented. The baseline for each category of service is defined below.

The study adopts a 'services' based approach, under which the benefits arising from ecosystem services are assessed based more specifically on each ecosystem service at a spatial level that is appropriate to that service, rather than being based on a value per unit of habitat.

For instance, instead of considering the value of water regulation services based on the area of woodland providing these services, the value is based on the provision of water regulation services within a given area – such as a catchment – and provided by a variety of habitat types. Likewise for recreation benefits, instead of considering the recreational benefits based on the habitat that provides it, they are considered using more appropriate units such as participation rates. This approach allows for greater flexibility in the use of available valuation studies and data for benefits transfer however it also has limitations in terms of investigating the multifunctional aspects of ecosystem interactions. So while making the valuation task more manageable, this approach can miss the complex interdependencies of how benefits are realised.

The valuation is based on the TEV framework, closely relating the list of services and benefits to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA). TEV is equal to market value plus the consumer surplus. Consumer surplus is the difference between what an individual is willing to pay for a good or services and what they actually pay. The concept of consumer surplus is particularly important when estimating the benefits of environmental goods and services that have a low, or no, market price; these are referred to as non-market benefits. Therefore, where a good has no market price, the consumer surplus effectively represents the TEV of the good. An estimate of TEV is often built up by considering the direct benefits, the indirect benefits and the non-use benefits provided by a good or service.

While the focus of this study is to provide estimates of the TEV, information on the economic impact of ecosystem services is also presented where possible, to provide important contextual data on the economic contribution of ecosystem services to the economy. The indicators of net economic contribution to society presented within this report range from Gross Value Added (GVA) figures, which net out producer costs from market values, estimates of income and more complete Economic Impact Assessment estimates which take into consideration multiplier effects and leakages.

The valuation of all the benefits arising from ES follows a consistent stepwise valuation process. Following the identification of the baseline to be applied for each MA category of services (discussed below), the process has four basic steps, each discussed briefly below.

### **Step 1 –Define the service**

Step 1 involves specifying the service and clearly delineating the components of the services that are of interest for the valuation exercise. This step is useful to assist conceptualising some of the more difficult



benefits resulting from these services, such as clean air or clean water, where there are a large number of interacting components (e.g. emissions to air or water) which impact on the final realisation of benefits.

**Step 2 – Describe and quantify the role that ecosystems play in the provision of the service and benefits. Understand and identify the extent of the service regionally and nationally.**

This step needs to be based on a scientific understanding of the ecosystems concerned and how different processes interact to produce the service and the resulting benefits. Here it is necessary to identify the difference in service provision between the status quo (as things currently are) and the baseline scenario. Where multiple processes interact it is also necessary to delineate the role that specific ecosystems play in the provision of the service. This is particularly difficult for benefits arising from regulating services.

**Step 3 – Quantify the benefits that stems from the provision of the given service.**

As discussed above, it is necessary to identify the final benefits to society that are provided by the relevant services. In order to quantify these benefits it is necessary to understand how the service provides the benefit and link this to the information on the extent of the service.

**Step 4 – Identify the appropriate monetary value of the benefits and complete the valuation assessment.**

Once the final benefits have been identified and quantified, it is necessary to identify appropriate valuation data to monetise these benefits.

The MA categorisation creates difficulties for valuation purposes, as categories can overlap. In addition, some services underpin others but still sit next to each other in the MA table, such as climate regulation and food, or climate regulation and disease regulation. For this reason it was necessary to develop a typology that, while building on the MA, facilitates the identification of final benefits and avoids issues associated with overlaps and double counting, amongst others.

The MS defines four categories of ecosystems services – provisioning, regulating, cultural and supporting. Each of these categories is discussed below.

## **Provisioning Services**

Provisioning services are those that result in products being provided by ecosystems. These products include food, fibre, fuel, genetic resources, bio-chemicals, natural medicines and pharmaceuticals.

The baseline assumption is that foods, fibres and fuels and other benefits from provisioning services are imported rather than available from England's natural resources. As the hydrological cycle remains in place under the baseline, the provision of water for abstraction, a benefit arising from the hydrological cycle, also remains within the baseline. Its value is therefore not captured within the total valuation exercise.

The Typology of benefits arising from these services is presented Table B.

Table B Typology of benefits for provisioning services

Service	Benefit	Sub-benefit	Constituent of TEV	Valuation Approach	Contribution to the economy
Agricultural food produce	Cereal Crops		MV	Market data	GVA
	Vegetables				
	Fruit (including orchards)				
	Livestock	meat and dairy			
	Game	pheasants/ grouse			
		waterfowl			
	Allotments			-	
Agricultural non-food produce	Fibre crops		MV	Market data	GVA
	Wool				
	Leather				
	Bio-fuels				
	Commercial cultivation of flowers and plants				
Non-agricultural cultivated produce	Aquaculture		MV	Market data	GVA
	Timber	wood and paper products			
		wood fuel			
		charcoal			
	Honey				Primary production†
Medical raw material: yew					
Wild produce	Commercial on-shore fisheries (net and trap)		MV	Market data	Primary production†
	Peat fuel			Market data and price estimate	
	Wild mushrooms			Market data and price estimate	
	Non-food plants (rushes, reeds, sedges and bracken)			Market data	
	Other wild products			Market data	

Notes: † - no information on the producer costs associated with the collection or production of these goods identified, however these costs are assumed to be low. Therefore the value of the primary production is assumed to be an appropriate proxy to represent the value of the contribution to the economy

Ecosystems support habitats and the diverse flora and fauna that exist there. Many goods are harvested from these habitats for human consumption, and the direct value of these goods to mankind is measured as an indicator of the value that ecosystem services provide, by supporting them.

While there is a lot of data available on some provisioning goods, there is very little on others. In addition the data are often presented at different geographical scales, are inconsistent between sources and it can be difficult to rationalise the details between sources. Values in these data sources are presented in both market and basis prices and this adds additional confusion when interpreting the MV and GVA data of these goods.

Table C presents the estimated benefits provided by provisioning services.

Benefit	MV	GVA
Agricultural food produce	8,213	3,478
Agricultural non-food produce	1,119	474
Non-agricultural cultivated produce	832	259
Wild produce	31.3	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,195</b>	<b>4,211</b>

Owing to the limited data for wild natural produce and the absence of consumer surplus values for all goods, these values under represent the value of England's natural produce and are considered to represent lower bound estimates of their total value.

These values represent the benefits provided by the production of these goods, however they take no account of the negative impacts that production might have on aspects of the environment or on other ecosystem services.

## **Regulating Services**

The MA defines regulating services as providing benefits obtained from the regulation of ecosystems processes. One reason why regulating services are important is that they provide 'infrastructure' and 'insurance' values. In many cases it is necessary to maintain at least a minimum set of these ecosystem services in order to ensure a reliable, sustainable, flow of the resulting benefits.

Natural systems are complex and dynamic with multiple roles and multiple stressors, which tend to behave in non-linear ways. This makes the regulating services from ecosystems particularly challenging to value due to the need to specify and quantify the role ecosystems play in regulating natural systems, such as air or water.

The inter-linkages between the provision of many of these services (for instance erosion control and natural hazard regulation) and between components of these services (CO<sub>2</sub> functions and O<sub>2</sub> production) makes apportionment of the benefits to specific services and functions difficult, and in some cases inappropriate due to the assumptions required.

Therefore, the identification of a sensible baseline to facilitate the estimation of the total value (or something equating to the total value) of the benefits arising from these services is particularly difficult. The difficulties hinge on the presence of what is referred to above as an infrastructure value and in separating this out from the final benefits received. This has meant that any valuation presented on the benefits from regulating services represents a marginal assessment (albeit a very large margin), rather than a total. Each regulating service and its associated benefits are discussed individually below as each presents different issues for valuation.

The Typology of benefits arising from these services is presented Table D.

Table D Typology of benefits for regulating services

Service	Benefit	Sub-benefit	Constituent of TEV	Valuation Approach	Contribution to the economy
Climate regulation	Carbon sequestration	Reduced risks from Climate Change	Avoidance of a loss of welfare value (of various types)	Social Cost of Carbon	-
Air quality regulation	Dry deposition of pollutants	Physical health protection	Avoidance of a loss of welfare value (health)	Avoidance of cost in health services, additional WTP for avoiding damaged health. (incomplete data)	-
Water purification & waste treatment	Clean water	-	-	Conceptual difficulties limit valuation possibilities	-
Natural hazard regulation & Water regulation	Flood protection	Protection of people, property and land	Avoidance of a loss of welfare value (of various types)	WTP meta-analysis	-
	Erosion control /Landslide and subsidence prevention/ Retention of soil for use		-	-	

Table E presents a summary of the benefits arising from regulating services. Each ecosystem service is discussed individually below.

Benefit	TEV	Notes
Carbon sequestration	1,007	Applies to benefits from woodlands and associated soils, wetlands and peatlands.
Air quality regulation	0.018-0.64	Annual health related benefits provided by England's woodlands from reductions in PM <sub>10</sub> and SO <sub>2</sub> .
Water purification and waste treatment	-	Due to the number of variables involved in the provision of water quality it was not possible to complete a valuation.
Flood protection	1.2	Flood control and storm buffering benefits provided by a subset of England's habitats

### **Climate Regulation**

Climate regulation is provided by a series of interconnected processes and ecosystem services, such as water and air quality regulation or supporting services (discussed below) such as water cycling which all contribute to the provision of climate regulation services and resulting benefits. To avoid any overlap with other services and benefits only those benefits from carbon regulation have been considered.

It is necessary to differentiate the carbon regulation services provided by stored carbon from those provided by carbon sequestration. This effectively points to the need to delineate carbon stocks from carbon flows. Only carbon flows (or sequestration) benefits are included in the assessment.

Both carbon sequestration and carbon storage benefits are highly dependant on the characteristics and condition of the habitats in question. This creates difficulties in assuming average sequestration rates.

Using an avoided damage cost approach, the annual value of carbon sequestration benefits provided by England's woodlands and associated soils are estimated to be just under £1 billion. This value dwarfs that provided by England's wetland (~£5 million a year) and peatland (~£5 million a year) habitats.

While it has not been possible to value the carbon sequestration benefits provided by all England's habitats, the estimate presented above are likely to represent the majority of these benefits.

### ***Air Quality Regulation***

Ecosystems help to regulate air quality by assimilating the emissions to air of potentially polluting substances from human activities. However, ecosystem related effects are not the only natural processes at play in providing benefits related to air quality; oxidation, photochemical and wind dispersal processes in operation in the atmosphere may play a significantly bigger role. This makes it difficult to specify the role of ecosystems in the provision of clean air.

The annual health related benefits provided by England's woodlands from reductions in PM10 and SO<sub>2</sub> is estimated to be between £18,000 and £645,000 per year. This represents a lower bound estimate as other benefits such as the damage avoided to building and visual and aesthetic benefits are not included. Under a marginal assessment, the IGCB (Interdepartmental Group on Costs and Benefits, Defra) methodology for air quality damage avoided assessments would have been applied (Defra, 2007f). This methodology includes consideration of damage to buildings associated with air quality.

### ***Water purification and Waste Treatment***

In addition to the provision of water for drinking, water interacts with habitats and species in number of other roles within ecosystems. Ecosystems provide water purification and waste treatment services, which results in the provision of clean or clearer water which provides a series of important benefits, including health related benefits, visual and aesthetic benefits and non-use benefits.

Certain habitats play a role in helping to purify water (such as reed beds and salt marshes) and in providing long term storage for both nutrients and contaminants. The ability of ecosystems to contain, dilute and breakdown substances that can build up in water and cause pollution issues provides significant cost saving for society.

Due to the variables involved in the provision of water quality and waste treatment services across the country (e.g. pollution load, existing water quality, land management activities), and that the benefits realised from these services are very site specific, it has not been possible to estimate the extent of the benefits provided regionally or nationally. This would require site specific assessment data of marginal changes.

### ***Natural Hazard Regulation and Water Regulation***

Natural environments and ecosystems provide natural hazard protection services in the form of controlling and managing the environment's response to certain weather conditions and ultimately in buffering and mitigating impacts that may result from these and associated processes.

A number of conceptual issues arise when considering the benefits provided by these services. For instance, implicit in the consideration of these services is the fact that the benefits only occur following a natural hazard event or heavy rain fall and will often be dependent on land management practices. There is therefore a probabilistic element involved. Given the geographical scale considered here (i.e., national) and the associated variability in how benefits are realised, it is only feasible to consider the 'possible' benefits that might be provided by these services in a given year, rather than the 'actual' benefits that are realised by society, as is the case for some other services.

Using a benefits transfer of WTP values, it is estimated that the possible (as opposed to actual) flood control and storm buffering benefits provided by a subset of England's habitats (coastal & floodplain grazing marsh; coastal sand dunes; coastal vegetated shingle; mudflats; saline lagoons) are worth £1.2 billion a year.

This represents a partial valuation as it relates to the benefits provided by only a subset of the relevant habitat types, albeit the most significant habitat types to provide these benefits. It therefore is considered to represent a lower bound estimate of the full benefits provided nationally.

Given the large number of variables which interact to result in the provision of actual benefits (e.g., rain fall, land use, proximity to population centres etc) it was not feasible to estimate the actual benefits received in a given year, either regionally or nationally.

## Cultural Services

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment defines cultural services as those that provide the non-material benefits people obtain from ecosystems through spiritual enrichment, cognitive development, reflection, recreation and aesthetic experiences. This category therefore includes both direct non-consumptive uses (e.g. recreation) and non-use values (NUVs) (e.g. some aesthetic and cultural heritage aspects).

The baseline for considering the benefits from cultural services effectively assumes that the natural environment which remains under the baseline provides little to no cultural service benefits.

The Typology of benefits arising from these services is presented Table F.

Table F Typology of benefits for cultural services

Service	Benefit	Sub-benefit	Constituent of TEV	Valuation Approach	Contribution to the economy	
Recreation Opportunities	Welfare benefits of participants Economic + benefits of expenditure	Hill walking	CS & MV	Market data and stated preference WTP above cost	Income	
		Casual walking/Rambling				
		Freshwater Angling				
		Game shooting				
		Bird / wildlife watching	CS & MV (bird-watching only)	Stated preference WTP above cost		
		Cycling	CS			
		Horse riding				
		Golf	-			Valuation not possible due to data limitations
		Gardening				
		Watersports (includes canoeing, rowing, sailing, windsurfing)				
Knowledge Systems	Education	-	-		Valuation not possible due to conceptual problems	-
	Research					
Social Use Values	Local people gaining social use values	Social services, sense of place, spiritual, religious, continued traditional way of life etc.	-		Valuation not possible due to conceptual problems	-
Non-Use Values	Social/cultural heritage	Continue traditional ways of life; sense of place; spiritual; religious etc.	Non use		Marginal stated preference WTP	-
	Physical/landscape/ built heritage	Landscape/aesthetics/built heritage etc				
	Biodiversity (habitats & species)	People orientated intrinsic value				

A number of recreational activities are made possible by the presence of high quality natural environments and by the presence of wildlife (flora and fauna) within them. This assessment considers the ways in which ecosystems (through a variety of ecological processes) act to provide opportunities for people to undertake recreation e.g. the provision of a pleasant natural environment to go walking in; or the provision of game for shooting.

Given the diversity in the benefits provided, valuation approaches applied varied by benefit. Benefits transfer has been applied to estimate recreational consumer surplus values, while market data has been used to estimate related expenditures. Income has been estimated from expenditure using a variety of multipliers.

The recreational consumer surplus generated from ecosystem services is at a minimum around £266 million per annum. Due to a lack of data, not all recreational activities have been valued; therefore this estimate represents a lower bound value. Expenditure values are estimated at £5,389 million per annum. The Total Economic Value estimate from recreation is therefore £5,655 million per annum. Income generated from recreational activities undertaken in England is estimated to be £1,1951 million per annum. See Table G for a breakdown of these values.

Table G CS for recreational activities (£ million per annum)

Activity	CS	Expenditure	TEV	Income
Walking	£65	£3,093	£3,158	£742
Freshwater angling	£93	£1,164	£1,257	£997
Bird watching	£16	£34	£50	£8
Game shooting	-	£1,098	1,098	£204
Cycling	£19	-*	19	-*
Horse riding	£73	-*	73	-*
Golf	-*	-*	-	-*
Gardening	-*	-*	-	-*
Watersports	-*	-*	-	-*
Total	£266	5,389	5,655	1,951

Note: \*gaps in available data limit valuation of benefits

The valuation presented here can be considered to underestimate the total value of these activities in England due to a number of gaps in the valuations. The key limitation was in identifying appropriate willingness-to-pay and /or expenditure values. It is also important to note that each recreational activity has a different degree of reliance upon healthy natural ecosystems which should be considered when assessing the role of ecosystems in the provision of the benefits.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment identifies knowledge systems as a service within the cultural services category. This service can be seen to provide both education and research benefits that are obtained from working with and learning from natural ecosystems.

Social use values are obtained from the benefits people get by living around and working with ecosystem services (e.g. traditional reed cutters and salmon netmen). These people are likely to gain an additional benefit not associated with recreation or the products they obtain. The benefits will be more akin to the people having a sense of place; some spiritual or religious benefit, social services and a continuation of a traditional way of life.

It was not possible to quantify and therefore value the benefits arising from knowledge systems and social use values. While it is clear that these services provide significant benefits to society, it is the conceptual difficulties in identifying the nature of the final benefits realised that limits valuation.

Non use values are benefits perceived by individuals that are not associated with the actual use of, or even an option to use, the ecosystem or its services. Non use values are therefore a 'special case' in that they are not dependent upon any particular ecosystem service as such, but simply upon the existence of species, habitats, landscapes, or social and cultural heritage. Therefore identifying the role the ecosystems play in the provision of these values is not straightforward.

When it comes to benefits arising from non-use values conceptual difficulties in identifying the extent of the benefits abound, given the objective of estimating the value of the total benefits. Presented by way of illustration, is a rough minimum estimate of £399 million per annum. This value is based on a marginal assessment and therefore should not be considered comparable with some of the other benefit values presented here. Care is required when interpreting this figure.

## Supporting Services

Supporting services can be defined as the services that are necessary for the production of all other ecosystem services. They include services such as: microclimate regulation; nutrient cycling; photosynthesis; pollination; primary production; soil formation and functioning; and water cycling. It can therefore be argued that the value of supporting services is infinite as without them there would be no other services or final benefits. These services provide an 'infrastructure' service that is necessary in some way to realise all of the final benefits.

For these reasons supporting services are not included within the overall typology presented. This does not mean that supporting services should not be considered as part of an overall Ecosystems Approach nor should it be taken to suggest that the benefits accrued by these services have no value to society. A case study presents

specific consideration to the benefits provided by pollination which is considered here to be a supporting service. This is discussed further under the Case Studies section below.

## **Aggregation and disaggregation of benefit estimates**

The study explored the issues around three different types of aggregation – aggregation across different geographical scales, aggregation of benefits derived from different valuation approaches and aggregation of marginal to total value estimates. These are discussed below.

### **1. Aggregation across different geographic scales e.g. aggregating regional results to a national level, or conversely disaggregating national data to a regional scale;**

The overriding consideration for aggregation, especially in cases of marginal change assessments, is whether it is appropriate to assume that the value estimated for one location is applicable to the preferences of people in another, and whether it is legitimate to apply a site specific value more generally without taking into consideration the characteristics of individual sites and substitute sites.

The method of valuation will obviously impact on the significance of this consideration. If stated preference or revealed preference methods are used to estimate willingness-to-pay then individuals' preferences will play a significant role in overall value, however if market price approaches are applied to value the benefits then variation in regional preferences are less likely to be of concern.

### **2. Aggregating the value of different types of benefits measured by a variety of valuation approaches;**

Aggregation in this context refers to the summing together of benefit estimates derived by different valuation approaches. The valuation approaches used have generated a range of monetary indicators and care is required in how these are summed together to generate an overall value estimate. It is necessary to ensure that the indicators represent similar components of welfare and that double counting does not occur. As noted above, the Total Economic Value is equal to the market value (or expenditure) plus the consumer surplus value. Therefore the value of these benefits can be summed together to estimate an aggregated Total Economic Value. Where the valuation estimates a total WTP based on a proxy value, for instance damage cost avoided, this is taken to represent the total willingness-to-pay value of this benefit and therefore is equal to Total Economic Value. This value can not be summed to the market value or consumer surplus estimates for a given benefit, as this would represent double counting.

GVA and income estimates have been presented to reflect the contribution to the economy made by ecosystems, they can not be added to the market value or the consumer surplus values as they do not form part of the Total Economic Value.

### **3. Aggregation from marginal to total value estimates.**

A review of the literature demonstrates that existing values of ecosystems are typically based on marginal analysis of changes, under the assumption that all other things are equal. Diminishing marginal utility for the scale of an ecosystem implies that as the scale of an ecosystem diminishes then the value of the remaining ecosystem will increase. The same is assumed for the flow of benefits from that ecosystem. However, this may not apply all in cases.

Economic theory also states that the value of any set of goods depends on the path or sequence by which they are valued and aggregated. This is the path dependency problem which arises because of substitution and also income effects between goods.

Therefore the WTP for 'all ecosystems' is likely to be significantly higher than the sum of the WTP estimates for each individual benefits from ES separately.

It therefore cannot simply be assumed that values which have estimated 'small' changes in ecosystem services can be used for valuing (in effect) far larger 'changes'.

## **Gap Analysis**

The study uses a mix of valuation approaches to estimate the TEV and the economic impact of the benefits provided by England's ecosystem services. However, it has not been possible to value all benefits identified. This is for a number of reasons and not solely as a result of missing valuation data.

It should be noted that the significance of the gaps identified for further valuation work will vary depending on the specific nature of the valuation tasks and the key policy areas Defra feel are important in this context.



That said however, without a clear understanding of the biophysical relationships at play within ecosystems, valuations that can be completed will always contain unknown margins of error. The implications of these errors will vary depending on the type of decisions they are being used to inform.

Details are provided in the main report on the nature of the gaps and how these have affected the completion of a valuation for each specific benefit. However, it can be seen that these gaps can be classified as follows:

1. A gap in our understanding of the biophysical relationships between aspects of the ecosystem and how final benefits are realised

For this study, this hinges mainly on the difficulties in defining a clear baseline from which benefits can be identified. It also relates to the geographical scale at which the assessment is being completed, as the ability to specify the benefits reduces as the geographical scale and the number of variables involved increases. This gap relates to how to describe and quantify the role ecosystems play in the provision of the service and benefits. Valuation of the benefits received from water purification services was limited by this type of gap as it was not possible to identify the extent of the benefits over the baseline.

2. A gap in the data available to quantify the benefit

In some cases, where it has been possible to identify how a benefit is generated, it has not been possible to locate data on the extent of that benefit at a regional or national scale. This data is necessary to attempt to quantify the ecosystem service benefits and was encountered for instance with the valuation of some recreation benefits and benefits received from the provision of wild produce.

3. A gap in the data available on the monetary value of a given benefit

This may relate to market value, consumer surplus values or total willingness-to-pay estimated via a variety of approaches. This relates to the ability to identify the appropriate monetary value for the benefit. This type of gap was only encountered in a few cases, however as noted in the conclusions, the appropriateness of some of the valuation data for use in policy decisions may be questionable.

## Case Studies

A number of case studies were completed in order to investigate specific issues.

A growing body of evidence highlights that ecosystems play an important and valuable role in sustaining and promoting physical and psychological health in people and communities. These benefits are 'cross cutting' in that they are provided by a suite of ES, either individually or in combination. This case study presents an overview of the direct and indirect health benefits provided by Ecosystems in order to clearly identify the range of health benefits which might be provided by a given policy.

The key points coming from this case study are:

- Physical and mental health benefits derived from ES are not identified within the Services and Benefits Typology (see Section 3.6) because they are considered to be cross-cutting and thereby provided by a range of ES. They are typically realised through the complex interaction of a number of ES.
- Ecosystems provide direct health benefits through the provision of food, medicines and materials. It is estimated that 50% of prescription drugs are derived from natural compounds. Benefits in relation to the provision of fuel for heating are also provided.
- Indirect benefits are provided by key ecosystem services, such as the absorption of atmospheric pollutants and the provision of opportunities for physical activity which promotes health and well-being, both physical and mental. Renewable energy in the form of biomass has the potential to provide considerable amounts of energy, potentially replacing non-renewable sources which provides health benefits associated with reduced air emissions.
- The valuation of ecosystem related health benefits is a complex task, intensified by the presence of multiple benefits from a single service (creating a risk of double-counting) and in some cases the subjective nature of the benefits.

Pollination is categorised here as a supporting service. The objective of this case study is to present a discussion on the nature of the benefits provided by this ES and on the valuation literature, and to note some of the issues around valuing these benefits.

The key points from this assessment are:

- Pollination is an extremely valuable yet often under appreciated ecosystem service. Pollination generates value to society by supporting other ecosystems (agricultural and non-agricultural), that in turn generate benefits through enhanced productivity. As a supporting service, the benefits of pollination services must be considered within the context of other ecosystem benefits (e.g. food production, recreation, non-use value).
- A relatively large number of studies have attempted to put a monetary value on the benefits arising from pollination in terms of crop productivity, including some from the UK. For instance, estimates show that the value of pollination services is far higher than the value of honey production.
- In contrast, there appears to be little evidence of research into non-market benefits provided by pollination, yet these are likely to be major components of the total value of this service.
- Wildflowers are a vital component of many of the UK's most valued landscapes and some 90% of species are thought to be critically dependent on pollinators. To protect landscape and biological diversity, it is therefore essential to protect pollinators.
- Importantly, pollinators are themselves critically dependent on the integrity of ecosystems (e.g. to provide opportunities for foraging, nesting and reproduction). Pollinator populations are declining; there has been a nearly 50% decrease in bee colonies since the 1950's. Therefore evidence is growing in support of improved policies to encourage landscape/habitat diversity in support of pollinators.

The third and fourth case studies present actual valuation examples.

Many ecosystems are made up of numerous habitats, each providing a number of different services. Policy changes can incentivise change from one habitat to another, for example one which results in a grassland or intensively grazed land being planted with trees to restore woodland or to address a flooding issue.

In the UK, flooding is common and often results in significant damage to land, people and properties, resulting in both financial and economic costs. The nature of the habitats in a floodplain can have a considerable impact on the extent and timing of the damage due to flooding.

A marginal valuation of a range of benefits that might be generated as a result of a land use change (arable to wet woodland) is presented. The objective here is to illustrate to decision makers the full range of benefits which might be provided from a particular policy driver, in this case flood protection. While the assessment presented is marginal, it is not a net assessment.

The key points from this case study were:

- Policy driven land use changes can have broad impacts. Flooding in the England is an increasingly important issue following the floods of Summer 2007, and research is exploring alternative protection options to hard defences.
- Creating floodplain woodlands is one of the land use changes under investigation. Research is showing that the flood protection and prevention benefits of floodplain woodlands can be large and are likely to outweigh the opportunity costs of losing alternative land uses.
- It is clear that while the driver for land use change in this case is flood protection, additional benefits can be realised. In order to maximise these additional benefits, they need to be recognised at the policy development stage and incorporated into the decision making process.
- In the case study provided, the benefits include biodiversity, carbon sequestration, nutrient cycling, recreation and non-use. While the net benefits of a land use change from grass land to floodplain woodland are large and in some cases easy to qualitatively describe, they can be difficult to quantify and thus value.
- An increase of 50 hectares of floodplain woodland is estimated here (using hypothetical data) to bring benefits worth around £126K to £266K per annum. This is considered to be a lower bound estimate.

The benefits of ES are by no means restricted to natural or semi-natural settings. The advantages of green spaces in the urban environment are well documented (e.g. in terms of physical and mental health), carbon sequestration, noise reduction, assimilation of soil contamination). Another important consideration is the benefits urban trees provide in terms of air quality.

The final case study examines how health related benefits are provided by urban trees in two London Boroughs and values these benefits based on a damage costs avoided approach. A discussion of other benefits provided by urban trees is also provided here.

This assessment represents a total valuation (i.e. a valuation of the benefits currently provided by these urban trees). However the damage costs values can also be applied in marginal assessment.

The key points coming from this are:

- Ecosystem services are not restricted to natural or semi-natural locations; green spaces, specifically trees, in an urban environment provide numerous benefits. Direct and indirect benefits arise from the effect on air quality (gaseous and particulate), temperature, and the aesthetics of an area.
- Using complex air quality, emission and transpiration modelling, it is possible to infer the following:
- Mature, mixed woodland sequesters airborne particulates at three times the rate of grassland;
- Trees at the edge of woodland are more efficient at sequestering particulates than those in the centre; and
- Evergreens are more efficient than deciduous trees at providing pollution removal benefits.
- To value the benefits provided by urban trees, the damage cost values are applied. These are estimated for each pollutant based on avoided deaths brought forward and avoided hospital admissions. PM10 has the greatest damage cost per tonne per annum therefore the greatest benefit arises from its removal.
- A conservative central estimation of the health benefits of pollutant removal by urban trees in two London Boroughs is approximately £22K and £67K.

## Acronyms

ABI	Annual Business Inquiry
AC	Assimilative capacity
C	Carbon
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CBA	Cost Benefit Analysis
CS	Consumer Surplus
Defra	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DMA	Diminishing marginal utility
DoH	Department of Health
EA	Environment Agency
EAF	Economic Accounts for Forestry
EclA	Economic Impact Assessment
ES	Ecosystems Services
ETS	Emissions Trading Scheme
FBS	Farm Business Survey
FCDPAG	Flood and Coastal Defence Project Appraisal Guidance
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
GOR	Government Office Region
GVA	Gross Value Added
IGCB	Interdepartmental Group and Costs and Benefits
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
JNCC	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
MA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
MV	Market Value
NEP	Natural Environment Programme
NERC	Natural Environment Research Council
NPV	Net Present Value
NUV	Non-use value
Ofwat	Office of Water Services
ONS	Office for National Statistics
PAH	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons
PC	Producer Cost
PC	Producer Surplus
pCEA	preliminary Cost Effectiveness Analysis
PSG	Project Steering Group
RP	Revealed Preferences
RPI	Retail Price Index
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SCC	Social Cost of Carbon
SIC	Standard Industrial Classification
SP	Stated Preferences
SPC	Shadow Price of Carbon
TEV	Total Economic Value
TSV	Total System Value
UFORE	Urban Forest Environment model
US EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds
VPF	Value of Prevention of a statistical Fatality
WFD	Water Framework Directive
WTA	Willingness-to-avoid
WTP	Willingness to Pay

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the following groups or individuals for their guidance and assistance throughout this project:

- The Project Steering Group lead by Defra;
- The Advisory Panel made up of Professor Kerry Turner, Professor Rave Raffaelli and Professor Ken Willis;
- James Spurgeon for his involvement in the early stages of the project;
- David Nowak and Robert Hoehn from the USDA Forest Service who very kindly modeled the pollution removal capabilities of urban trees used in one of the case studies; and
- The other NEP project teams, specifically Roy Haines-Young and Carol Somper for attending workshops held by the project team.

## References to published material

---

9. This section should be used to record links (hypertext links where possible) or references to other published material generated by, or relating to this project.

