

Presentation for the E3B Graduate Seminar

## **Ecological Foundations of Payment for Ecosystem Service Schemes**

Department of Ecology, Evolution & Environmental Biology (E3B)  
Columbia University • New York, NY USA

Instructors:

Prof. Shahid Naeem, E3B

Dr. Carter Ingram, Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)

Paige Olmsted, Earth Institute, Center for Environmental  
Research and Conservation (CERC)

Fall 2010



This seminar was generously supported by the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), under the terms of the TransLinks Cooperative Agreement No.EPP-A-00-06-00014-00 to the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS). TransLinks is a partnership of WCS, The Earth Institute, Enterprise Works/VITA, Forest Trends and the Land Tenure Center. The contents are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States government.

# Ecological Foundations of Payments for Ecosystem Services

November 10, 2010

# Last Week's Conclusions

1. It is important not to select only PES schemes by a filter that will preselect for those that are scientifically well informed.
2. If one uses a filter to reject a PES scheme for analysis, then there are two things that happen:
  - A biased representation that will create the impression that most PES schemes are scientifically robust and
  - We will not be able to say what needs to be improved. For example, if biodiversity PES founded on poverty alleviation benchmarks are the least well informed, then by filtering out those that cannot be analyzed, we will get a set of biodiversity PES schemes that do not reflect how poor the biodiversity PES schemes are. It is okay, in an analysis, if questions cannot be answered (the equivalent of a “0” or blank for the question), even if some PES schemes are predominantly 0s because they have so little information.

One complication is that a 0 may mean one of two very different things – a false negative (the scheme does include something but it was not listed in the material we had) or a genuine negative (the scheme genuinely does not include an item we were looking for, such as a definition of their ecosystem). The solution is to be clear about our awareness of this complication for negative results – something that is true for data collection in general, not just our research.

# Last Week's Conclusions Pt. 2

2. The use of an index represents a promising supplemental approach – but the development of an index is complex. We would use two indices
  - a) an index that applies to all PES schemes and
  - b) one that applies to the three “classes”

Thought from Shahid: In a way, we are assembling a template for the perfect PES scheme. In general, such a template would be derived by a conference if a body of experts, which I think we are comfortable with saying that we are not such a body. But our analytical tool, which effectively would represent a template for the scientifically ideal PES scheme, is derived from analyzing what's out there and the literature, so it might be said that we are uncovering what a body of experts might derive. It's important to be aware that by subjecting PES schemes to our analyses, we are effectively passing judgment on them.

# Outstanding Tasks

1. Assess the difficulty of analyzing PES schemes that do not pass through the filter – too many, should we chose a random set of those that did not pass the filter?
2. Settle on the filtering.
3. Finalize the instrument.
4. Subject a small number of studies to the analysis – three groups take the same small set and see if they come up with exactly the same conclusions – and if not, find out why and fix. We should be internally consistent.
5. Independent group to confirm? A few people at WCS?
6. Writing and compiling components of draft paper.

# Schedule Moving Forward

Nov. 10 - finalize instrument (?) - extent that this is possible

- assignment for week - each group test instrument for their market group

Nov. 17 - compare results, refine - add/take away measures, this would also assist refining of methods as well.

- sub-group begin lit review

- begin final analysis on cases

Nov. 24 - on-going case analysis, results compiled

- sub - group begin methods write up

Dec. 1 - on-going case analysis, results compiled

- sub-group write up results and conclusions

Dec. 8 - Draft components presented in class for peer comment (or could be done in the week leading up), and submitted (return to class with comments at some point in the following week, for a "final" submission during exam period).

Dec. 15\* - This is during two study days, no class

Dec. 22\* - This is during exams, but we could still have something due during the exam period (Dec 16-23)

# Discussion

- Any outstanding issues from last week
- Thoughts on priorities moving forward
- Based on last week, review google doc page for what to include in instrument – what stays universally, what applies to specific groups only
- To consider: what needs to be added based on idea that we don't want to filter out/test only cases that meet our scientific criteria