

The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity




Zoological Society London
Symposium April 28th 2010

Poverty Reduction and Biodiversity Conservation: An Economic Perspective

Pavan Sukhdev, UNEP
Study Leader, TEEB



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety



Rijksoverheid




MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS





TEEB Phase 2 – Reports for different audiences



TEEB Ecological and
Economic Foundations
www.teebweb.org



TEEB for Policy-Makers
www.teebweb.org



TEEB for Local Policy
Launch in September 2010



TEEB for Business
Launch in summer 2010




TEEB for Citizens
Launch in late 2010

The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity



Ecosystem Losses & Links to MDG's
Haiti Example : MDG # 1, 4, 5, 8...



The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity



Haiti : Ecosystem Losses and Links to MDG's 1, 4, 5, 8...

- Haiti was originally fully forested, less than 3% cover still remains. Poorest country in the Western Hemisphere 65% of its people must survive on less than 1 \$ a day.
- Deforestation has diminished evaporation back to the atmosphere over Haiti ; rainfall in many locations has declined by as much as 40%, reducing stream flow and irrigation capacity
- 1950-1990, the amount of *arable land* almost halved due to soil erosion.
- Avezac Irrigation System only supports half of the initially 9,500 acres it planned to cover.
- When it rains , hillsides no longer efficiently retain or filter water and even moderate rains cause devastating floods.
- Ground and stream waters are laden with sediment and pollution which has degraded estuarine and coastal ecosystems.
- about 90% of Haitian children are chronically infected with intestinal parasites that they acquire from the water they drink

MDG 1: Eradicate
extreme poverty
and hunger

MDG 8: Develop a
Global Partnership
for Development

MDG 5: Improve
maternal health

MDG 4: Reduce
child mortality



MDG-3

MDG 3 : Example from India

MDG 3:
Promote gender
equality and
empower women

Box 2.3: Gender, poverty and biodiversity in Orissa, India

The impact of the loss of biodiversity, often not very visible, has serious implications for poverty reduction and well-being for women as it severely affects the role of women as forest gatherers. Studies in the tribal regions of Orissa and Chattisgarh, states in India which were once heavily forested, have recorded how deforestation has resulted in loss of livelihoods, in women having to walk four times the

distance to collect forest produce and in their inability to access medicinal herbs which have been depleted. This loss reduces income, increases drudgery and affects physical health. There is also evidence to show that the relative status of women within the family is higher in well-forested villages, where their contribution to the household income is greater than in villages that lack natural resources.

Sarojini Thakur, Head of Gender Section,
Commonwealth Secretariat, personal communication, May 15th 2008.


The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity



(a key message from TEEB's Interim Report)
Ecosystem Losses & Poverty


India Example: 480 Million people earn their livelihood mainly in small farming, animal husbandry, informal forestry, fisheries ...

**Ecosystem services /
classical GDP**



7.3 %

**Ecosystem services/
“GDP of the Poor”**



57 %

Source: GIST's Green Accounting for Indian States Project, 2002-03 data

The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity



How do we identify who are the rural poor ?

- **Agriculture - Main workers**
- **Cultivators - 103 million - of which less than 1 ha holdings 60%**
- **Agricultural labourers- 63 million - all considered poor**
- **Agriculture - Marginal workers - all considered poor**
- **Cultivators - 24 million**
- **Agricultural labourers - 43 million**
- **Fishing, hunting, plantation and other activities - 10.3 million (as per census 2001) but studies vary in their estimates**
- **Forest dependent population (from FAO study) - 275 million**
- **Total - 477 million (approx)**

The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity



Rethinking Agricultural Modernization : Looking at the full suite of ecosystem services for informed choices

(S. Vidanage, S. Perera and M. Kallesoe, 2005. In: Emerton 2005)

Analysis of local wetland benefits to justify traditional tank management in Sri Lankan river basin: value of rice is but a fraction of all benefits

The Value of Tank Water and Biological Resources in Rajangana and Angamauwa Sub-Catchments of the Kala Oya Basin (per tank)

Resource	% of households	Value per Household (US\$/hh/yr)	Value per Unit Area* (US\$/ha/yr)
Paddy cultivation	13%	177	161
Vegetable cultivation	7%	86	39
Banana cultivation	3%	1150	209
Coconut cultivation	13%	238	216
Domestic water	93%	226	1,469
Livestock water	13%	369	335
Commercial water	2%	132	12
Fishery	16%	309	351
Lotus flowers	10%	106	72
Lotus roots	7%	235	107
Total			2,972

* Total inundated area

The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity



Leuser Ecosystem, Indonesia

Distribution of benefits to the different sectors (in million US\$)

	Deforestation		Conservation	
	Value	Proportion (%)	Value	Proportion (%)
Biodiversity (WTP)	56	1	492	5
Provisioning Services				
Agriculture	2499	36	1642	17
Fisheries	557	8	659	7
NTEP	235	3	94	1
Timber	1184	17	0	0
Water supply	699	10	2419	25
Regulating Services				
Flood prevention	1223	18	1591	17
Fire prevention	30	0	715	7
Carbon sequestration	53	1	200	2
Cultural Services				
Tourism	171	2	828	9
Total	6958	100	9538	100


Note: for the period 2000–2030, at a discount rate of 4%.

(Beukering et al. 2003)

The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity



Making the case: Unequal distribution of ecosystem benefits



Source: adapted from van Beukering et al. 2003

The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity



Who benefits from Panda tourism in Wolong BR? (He et al 2008)

Wolong BR

- conserves global public goods (e.g. giant panda),
- ensures collective goods at national/local level (e.g. panda tourism)
- restricts access to other local collective and private goods (NTFPs, farmland inside the PA).

But check benefit distribution:

Those living close to the roads had a larger share in tourism related income, whereas those living in the forest – in panda habitat – continued to largely rely on agriculture for their living.

ES perspective allows to target/fine tune conservation measures!



Way forward

Ecologically effective versus socially just conservation :
Trade-Off ? Not necessarily.

We need to diversify conservation action in two ways:

- towards a mosaic of areas with different land use rules inside and outside protected areas
- towards recognised and strengthened in situ management capacities and institutional arrangements

The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity



- towards a mosaic of areas with different land use rules inside and outside protected areas:

Land use modelling by Polasky et al (2005):


“ We combine the biological and economic models with optimization methods to find efficient land-use patterns

..... we find that a large fraction of conservation objectives can be achieved at little cost to the economic bottom line with thoughtful land-use planning....”

The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity



- towards recognized and strengthened in situ management capacities and institutional arrangements



Forest Vegetation Density

Hayes and Ostrom 2005, comparing state run PAs with other forest management regimes (p 607)

Hayes (2006):

“.... rather than a legal definition of protection, it is the rules acknowledged and made by forest users that influence forest condition.”

The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity




Thank You!

www.teebweb.org



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety



Rijksoverheid



MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

