# Session 3: Valuing ecosystem wealth, degradation and enhancement

# Challenges and Solutions to Measuring the Present Value of Ecosystem Assets

Parallel sessions, Thursday 10 - 11 am

Expert meeting on Ecosystem Valuation in the context of Natural Capital Accounting, 24-26 April 2018, Bonn













- 1. What are the main considerations in estimating **future flows** of benefits and associated asset lives?
- changes in demand (population, income, policy measures & decisions / institutions, and preferences), physical changes in supply (political decisions in e.g. fisheries, soil protection, condition changes through natural changes such as climate change) and price changes (development of scarcity)
- Uncertainty in projections / forecasting (e.g. IPCC / IPBES scenarios)
- Scenarios (BAU, alternative pathways), if so under clear rules such as ...
- Reduce scope of assumptions as far as possible

- 1. What discount rates are appropriate for ecosystem assets and what is the relationship to market rates of interest?
- Chosen rates highly influence the results and thus a high degree of transparency on the choice is required (and sensitivity analysis may provide further insights)
- Discount rate for benefits needs to be the same for costs (just one discount rate) but they may vary over time
- Do all countries need to choose the same discount rates or do we rather need a standard for how countries choose a discount rate?
- ► The rates of change in condition (and ecological thresholds) may influence the choice of discount rate ...
- A zero discount rate implies that policy measures for ecosystem improvement have the same value irrespective when they are taken
- At the end, we need principles how to set a discount rate

- 1. Do ecosystem assets that supply no final ecosystem services have a zero value in monetary terms?
- Yes, but there will be very few ecosystem assets that this applies to.
- Yes, but it needs a lot of efforts to define the linkages, assess them and value the contributions to improvements. E.g. if there is a intermediary contribution to a final ES that should not be left out.
- However, in bio-physical terms their contribution to other assets needs to be taken into account / be mapped
- There is a biophysical and a monetary part of ES accounting and both provide information that is relevant for different purposes
- Yet, this needs to be clarified further.

- 1. How should differences between observed market values for land and the present value of ecosystem services from a given area of land be interpreted?
- We would not expect them to be the same.
- Land has (expected) rents and that determines the value at which it is traded.
- ► ES accounting covers non-traded / non-SNA benefits and thus the two values are likely different.
- Our interpretation of the difference in values is: the non-traded benefits of land.

- 1. Given that these issues have been unresolved for quite some time, what are needed and realistic next steps to advance them further?
- Principles need to be set / be advanced for e.g. discounting rates (but differentiated between e.g. ecosystem services)
- Historical discount rate can provide a test case for validation
- ► IPCC / IPBES scenarios can provide starting points for SEEA-EEA projections
  - ▶ Time frames need to discussed in relation to ecological processes
- ► For informing policy, complexity needs to be reduced as far as possible
- Move on from case studies and applied experimentation