









REGIONAL FLYWAY INITIATIVE TRAINING SERIES: From Wetland Ecosystem Services to Nature-based Solutions

ADB HQ on 27-30 June 2023

Introduction to the Preliminary Scoping Appraisal of the Toolkit for Ecosystem Service Site-based Assessment (TESSA)

Evelyn Piña-Covarrubias Postdoctoral Research Fellow

University of Southampton e.pina-covarrubias@soton.ac.uk

Preliminary Scoping Appraisal



Stakeholder engagement

Preliminary Scoping Appraisal (PSA)

- Initial understanding of the dynamics of a site.
- Scoping assessment.
- Helps us understand:
 - Ecosystem services provided by a site.
 - Changes on ecosystem services provision under plausible future changes.
- *This workshop*: we will use the PSA (with elements from other tools):
 - 1. Site boundaries.
 - 2. Habitat types.
 - 3. Provision of ecosystem services.
 - 4. Drivers of change.





PSA step 1. Site boundaries

- Key to documenting the ecosystem services provided by a site.
- Can define it manually, or by using available maps, reports, internet resources (e.g., Google Earth), etc.



PSA step 1. Site boundaries – this workshop

- We compiled site boundaries from different sources.
- Decision rules for boundary selection:
 - 1. Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR).
 - 2. Local government.
 - 3. World Database of Protected Areas
 - 4. Ramsar* (not yet designated).
 - 5. KBA database.
 - 6. IBA database.
 - 7. Estimated straw man boundary.



PSA step 2. Habitat types

- We need to classify the habitat types within each site.
- Resources: recent land cover/vegetation maps, etc.
- TESSA habitat classification is based on the Ramsar Classification System for Wetland Type.

Marine/coastal	Inland	Human-made
 Permanent shallow marine waters Marine subtidal aquatic beds Coral reefs Rocky marine shores Sand, shingle or pebble shores Estuarine waters Intertidal mud, sand or salt flats Intertidal marshes Intertidal forested wetlands Coastal brackish/saline lagoons 	 Permanent inland deltas Permanent rivers/streams/creeks Seasonal/intermittent/irregular rivers/ streams/creeks Permanent freshwater lakes Seasonal/intermittent freshwater lakes Permanent saline/brackish/alkaline lakes Seasonal/intermittent saline/brackish/alkaline lakes and flats 	 Aquaculture ponds Ponds Irrigated land Seasonally flooded agricultural land Salt exploitation sites Water storage areas Excavations Wastewater treatment areas Canals and drainage channels, ditches Karst and other subterranean

PSA step 2. Habitat types – this workshop

- Total area and % of each land cover type.
- Percentage of the site covered by each land cover type.
- We will follow: wetland habitat classification and framework of TESSA.



Habitat type	Estimated cover (%)	Area (ha)	
1 (W) - Shrub-domínated wetlands	25	62.5	
2 (N) - Seasonal/intermittent/ irregular rivers/streams/ creeks	5	12.5	
3 (Z.k(a)) - Karst and other subterranean hydrologícal systems, maríne/coastal	44	110.0	
4 (X-f) - Freshwater, tree- domínated wetlands	26	65.0	
TOTAL	100	250.0	
Brief explanation of what the caveats or problems are (if any)			

PSA step 3. Ecosystem services

- Need to document the ecosystem services provided by the site.
- TESSA framework: scoring of the top five services provided by the site.



PSA step 3. Ecosystem services – this workshop

- Stakeholder consultation survey Section 1.
- We will use provision, regulating, and cultural services.
- We will follow:
 - World Database of KBAs for ecosystem services: recommended fields.
 - RAWES toolkit: ecosystem services classification.

								KBAs
	Ecosystem services	Ecosystem service provided by the site	Service is essential or non- substitutable	Beneficia <u>that app</u> Within the site	ries of this ES li ly): Adjacent to	ve (<u>tick all</u> Distant to	A high proportion of people in the surrounding area benefit from this ES	Additional detail on the ES, beneficiaries and/or importance
Pro	ovisioning services: Comprise primarily mat	erials that can b	e harvested or co	ollected fro	om wetlands an	d energy taker	from ecosystems.	
1	Provision of fresh water E.g., Water used for domestic drinking supply, for irrigation, for livestock, etc.							
2	Provision of food E.g., Crops, fruit, livestock, capture fisheries, aquaculture, wild foods, etc.							
3	Provision of wood products / fibre E.g., Timber, and other wood products (for building, etc.) / fibres, resins, animal skins (for clothing, etc.)							
4	Provision of fuel E.g., Fuelwood, peat, etc.							
5	Provision of genetic resources E.g., Rare breeds used for crop/stock breeding, etc.							
6	Provision of natural medicines and oharr ceutical			D				$\land \land \land$

PSA step 4. Drivers of change

- How activities will impact the site's habitats and biodiversity?
- TESSA framework:

Timing	Scope (% of site affected)	Impact (degree of change in next 10 years)
1. Likely in long term (beyond 10 years)	0. Little of area (<10%)	1. Low (<10%)
2. Likely in short term (within 10 years)	1. Some of area (10- 49%)	2. Moderate (10- 30%)
3. Happening now	2. Most of area (50- 90%)	3. High (>30%)
	3. Whole area (>90%)	

Score = Timing + Scope + Severity

Table B. Activities impacting the site

Activities	Timing	Scope	Impact	Score
(Score al	that apply)			
Residential and commercial development	1	3	2	6
Agriculture and aquaculture	3	1	1	5
Energy production and mining	1	3	2	6
Transportation and access corridors	3	1	3	F

PSA step 5. Drivers of change – this workshop

- Stakeholder consultation survey Section 2.
- We will follow: Ramsar R-METT 'Data sheet 3: Ramsar site threats'.
- Impact:
 - High: Serious impact.
 - Medium: Moderate impact.
 - Low: Driver is present, but with minimal impact.
 - **N/A**: Driver is not present.

		_		_				
	Driver of change	High	Medium	Low	N/A	Notes		
	Residential and commercial development within the wetland site: Drivers of change from human settlements or other non-agricultural							
	land uses with a substantial footprint.							
1	Housing and settlement							
2	Commercial and industrial areas	\mathbf{V}						
3	Tourism and recreation infrastructure		K					
	Agriculture and aquaculture within the w intensification, including silviculture, mario	etland culture	site: Drivers and aquacul	of change ture.	e from far	ming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and		
4	Annual and perennial non-timber crop production			$\mathbf{\nabla}$				
5	Drug cultivation			$\mathbf{\nabla}$				
6	Wood pulp and plantations	$\mathbf{\nabla}$						
7	Livestock farming and grazing							
3	in ndf 'nwa sqr Itur							

Ramsar Site Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool



A Guide for Managers and Stakeholders



The alternative state - TESSA



The alternative state – TESSA rationale

- Most plausible change (e.g., management, land cover, habitat quality).
- Makes impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services explicit.
- Difference from changes in land use useful to decision-makers.
- Need to consider who will be affected.
- TESSA compares the current state to an alternative state.



The alternative state – selection of sites

- Measurements can be taken from a real place.



The alternative state – this workshop

- Area of each land use type that would occur in the alternative state.
- We will follow the TESSA framework:

Habitat type	Current state area (ha)	Alternative state area (ha)
 Shrub-domínated wetlands 	62.5	20.0
2. Seasonal/íntermíttent/ írregular rívers/streams/ creeks	12.5	6.5
3. Karst and other subterranean hydrologícal systems	110.0	50.0
 Freshwater, tree- dominated wetlands 	65.0	78.5
5. urban areas	0.0	75.0
6. Bare ground	0.0	20.0
TOTAL	250.0	250.0

Documentation of ES in RFI wetland sites of the Philippines

- 1. Site boundaries.
- 2. Habitat types.
- 3. Ecosystem services.
- 4. Drivers of change.
- 5. Alternative state.





Visayas, Palawan & Mindanao

Luzon

Documentation of ES in RFI wetland sites of the Philippines

- \rightarrow Combination of toolkits and resources:
 - **TESSA** \Rightarrow The framework we will follow.
 - Site-tailored vs. InVEST, Co\$tingNature, etc.
 - Valuations of ecosystem services (alternative state) vs. RAWES, PA-BAT +
 - **RAWES** ⇒ Ecosystem services classification (tailored for wetlands).
 - World Database of KBAs for ecosystem services ⇒ Recommended fields.
 - Ramsar R-METT tool ⇒ Classification of drivers of change (tailored for wetlands).
- \rightarrow We will facilitate:
 - Site maps with boundaries for current and alternative states.
 - Tables of habitat types for current and alternative states.
 - Ecosystem services and drivers of change (stakeholder consultation surveys per site).
 - Additional supporting material.



REGIONAL FLYWAY INITIATIVE TRAINING SERIES: From Wetland Ecosystem Services to Nature-based Solutions ADB HQ on 27-30 June 2023

Assessment of Cultivated Goods, Harvested Wild Goods, and Nature-based Recreation and Tourism

Evelyn Piña-Covarrubias Postdoctoral Research Fellow University of Southampton <u>e.pina-covarrubias@soton.ac.uk</u>













Cultivated goods

- Quantifies amounts, and economic value of cultivated goods:
 - Include: e.g., aquaculture or plantation products, food and biofuel crops, livestock.
 - *Do not include*: e.g., timber from non-cultivated species.
- Identifies groups that would gain / lose benefits resulting from changes.
- Data collection: workshop / existing data / questionnaires for cultivators.
- Current and alternative states.



Cultivated goods - methods

Cultivated M1	Cultivated M2	Cultivated M3
 Workshop Used at first, to establish: Total <u>area</u> under cultivation <u>Who</u> is involved? <u>Existing data</u>? ⇒ no = M2 / yes = M3 For each selected good: How many <u>households</u> cultivate it? Which <u>social groups</u> cultivate it? How is it <u>cultivated/used</u>? Temporal <u>changes</u> in patterns of cultivation 5. Contribution of the <u>ecosystem</u> to production of each selected good 	 Individual questionnaires with cultivators Can be adapted to local circumstances For less developed contexts (rural areas) 	 Existing data Developed countries

Harvested wild goods

- Volume, economic net value, and relative importance to people.
- From uncultivated areas:
 - *Include*: e.g., plants for food and medicine, animals hunted for food (fish) or decoration (feathers), fibres (timber, bamboo, rattan), livestock feed.
 - *Do not include*: e.g., crops, products from aquaculture or plantations.
- Data collection: workshop / existing data / questionnaires for harvesters.
- Current and alternative states.



Harvested wild goods - methods

Harvested wild goods M1	Harvested wild goods M2	Harvested wild goods M3	Harvested wild goods M4
 Workshop First step: collect general information on wild goods harvesting (assessment site) Focus on the most important <u>3-5 products</u> Importance for stakeholder groups Then ⇒ M2 / M3 / M4 For each selected good: <u>Households</u> that harvest it Which particular groups? <u>When/from where</u> it is harvested? <u>How</u> it is used? Are the <u>harvest patterns</u> changing? 	 Questionnaire survey Valuation of <u>harvested</u> wild goods To individual harvesters Needs to be adapted to local settings 	 Participatory approach Valuation of <u>non-</u><u>marketed</u> goods (subsistence) Uses numeraires to estimate values (e.g., livestock) 	 Field surveys / secondary data For estimating the value of harvested wild timber <u>One-off benefit</u> of timber

Nature-based recreation and tourism

- Annual number of visits for tourism/recreation purposes.
- Annual total income from tourism/recreation.
- Data collection: existing data, expert interviews, field surveys/ questionnaires.
- Current and alternative states.



Nature-based recreation and tourism - methods

- Annual economic value of nature-based recreation and tourism:
 - a) Existing secondary data.
 - b) Recreation methods:

Recreation M1	Recreation M2	Recreation M3
- Census	- Questionnaire	- Questionnaire
- First step	- Indirect estimates	- Travel Costs Method (TCM):
- Number of annual visits to a site	 Needs to be adapted to local context 	 Zonal TCM (origin of visitors, 1 visit)
 Not recommended for <100 visits per year / <\$1,000 USD gross annual revenue 		 Individual TCM (many visits) More complex: statistical analysis
 Knowledge of statistics? ⇒ no = M2 / yes = M3 		

Example (Aung et al. 2021)

- *The site*: Moeyungyi Wetland Wildlife Sanctuary, Myanmar.
- Its value: Important reservoir for resident and migratory birds
- The issue: Water used for rice cultivation, and risk of increase.
- The context: Surrounded by 17 villages (12,000 households; 65,000 people).
- *The tool*: TESSA.
 - Assessment of ecosystem services.
 - Current state, and future plausible alternative state...
 - If water level of its permanent lake drops significantly.
 - Alternative state: nearby site with plausible land use change.
 - PSA identified six important ecosystem services.
 - Will focus on...
 - ✓ Harvested wild goods: fish, molluscs, plants.
 - ✓ Cultivated goods: rice.
 - ✓ Nature-based recreation: bird watching.



Example - results

1. <u>Harvested wild goods</u>

- Mean annual net value of fish/household = \$3,360.
- 4,577 households.
- Total annual net economic benefit from fishing = \$15.4 million.

2. <u>Cultivated goods</u>

- Total annual net value of rice cultivation = \$438,000.
- Alternative state = \$603,000.

3. Nature-based recreation

- Total annual recreation revenue = \$73,500.
 - International tourists = \$54,200 (>70% of all revenue).
 - National tourists = \$19,300.

Nature-based recreation and tourism – example

- Middleton Lakes, UK
- Zonal TCM to estimate consumer surplus
- Visitors/yr = 31,167
- 73 survey questionnaires
- Round-trip travel cost per visitor (TC):

$$TC = \frac{(2D \ x \ F) + P}{n} + A$$

- Total consumer surplus:
- Current state (nature conservation site) = £104,655
- Alternative state (public amenity park) = £53,374

Conservation and Society 14(1): 48-56, 2016

<u>Article</u>

Ecosystem Services Provided by a Former Gravel Extraction Site in the UK Under Two Contrasting Restoration States

Phillip J. Blaen^{a,b,#}, Michael A. MacDonald^a, and Richard B. Bradbury^a

*RSPB Centre for Conservation Science, RSPB, The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire, UK

^bSchool of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK





Annual visitation rates per capita as a function of travel cost Predicted number of visits under different additional costs

ANY QUESTIONS?





University of

Southampton

Disclaimer: The views expressed on this document are those of the author/s and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) or its Board of Governors or the governments they represent. ADB does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this publication and accepts no responsibility for any consequence of their use. By making any designation of or reference to a particular territory or geographic area, or by using the term "country" in this document, ADB does not intend to make any judgments as to the legal or other status of any territory or area.