
VALUING ECOSYSTEM SERVICES IN A GREEN ECONOMY

Thesis submitted by

Ian Arthur CURTIS BSc (Hons) *JCU*

In April 2003

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

In the School of Tropical Environmental Studies and Geography

James Cook University

*What is aught but as 'tis valued?
But value dwells not in particular will;
It holds its estimate and dignity
As well wherein 'tis precious of itself
As in the priser; 'tis mad idolatry
To make the service greater than the God;*

Troilus And Cressida, Act II., Sc. II.

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, author of this work, understand that James Cook University will make this thesis available for use within the University Library and, via the Australian Digital Thesis network, for use elsewhere.

I understand that, as an unpublished work, a thesis has significant protection under the Copyright Act and;

I do not wish to place any further restriction on access to this work.

Signature

Date

ELECTRONIC COPY

I, the undersigned, the author of this work, declare that the electronic copy of this thesis provided to the James Cook University Library, is an accurate copy of the print thesis submitted, within the limits of the technology available.

Signature

Date

FOREWORD: A GREEN ECONOMY

In a green economy corporations will behave differently. They will have a different philosophy. Sustainable principles will be paramount in their operational decisions, with minimal use of non-renewable resources and multiple recycling. A large part of their overall investment will be ethical. In a green economy, maintenance of ecosystem services such as clean air, unpolluted water and biodiversity, would be the responsibility of global business. The environment will be on the balance sheet of the multi-national corporations of the world.

Under such a scenario, a market for the formerly "free" goods and services provided by the environment could be readily envisaged, thus removing the last stumbling-block to our placing a value on these goods and services. Just as a carbon credit has a monetary value in an enhanced greenhouse context, perhaps equated to the ability of a hectare of forest to sequester carbon, so also biodiversity credits, for all the intrinsic reasons as well as a gene pool for medical research. Clean air and water can be evaluated on the basis of the cost to society to provide it otherwise.

So nature's storehouse becomes big business. The stability and growth of the corporate investment becomes a function of ecosystem condition. Inventories of ecosystem goods and services form part of the annual accounts for corporations as well as countries. However, the input for these inventories comes from zoologists, botanists, ecologists and environmental scientists, rather than from economists and accountants.

ABSTRACT

Scope

Ecosystems are being degraded and destroyed worldwide at a rate unprecedented in human history. Accordingly a great deal of interest is currently being focussed on ecosystems, the role they play in planetary life support, and the need for a market mechanism to conserve these formerly regarded 'free' goods and services. This research project is concerned with the various divisions or branches within economics dealing with environmental valuation, including applied economics in the form of valuation practice, environmental science, and ecology. It is thus both multi-disciplinary and interdisciplinary and has as its central theme the use of a surrogate market to establish shadow prices for ecosystem services.

Methodology

Twenty ecosystem attributes were identified as being common to all ecosystems depending on the level of integrity, and ranked in order of importance on the basis of a range of criteria. This was achieved by a systematic analysis, namely a multiple criteria analysis, and a social study, in the form of a Delphi philosophical inquiry. These two methods incorporated many different perspectives: namely anthropocentric, utilitarian (economic), ecological, aesthetics, equity, risk and uncertainty. The weightings provided by the panellists were non-pecuniary, and as such were not subject to any bias or odium that may have been associated with putting monetary values on nature's gifts. The non-pecuniary weightings assigned by the panellists were converted to dollar values by empirically linking them to the surrogate market, namely the property market in the region, and calculating the value of a flow of benefits emanating from them (the economic rent). A valuation table was devised to assess the ecosystem integrity of individual ecosystems on private or public land and a conceptual model devised for landscapes. The case study area was the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area of northeast Queensland.

Results

The Delphi panel reached consensus in all three rounds of questionnaires, and the weights provided for the twenty attributes for all three models in the multiple criteria analysis showed a significant level of agreement between the disciplines represented on the panel. The ten ecosystem services ranked most important were: biodiversity; refugia; erosion control/soil and sediment retention; genetic resources; gas regulation; climate regulation; biological control; purification (clean air, water); disturbance regulation; and aesthetics, in that order. The total value of ecosystem goods and services in all the tenure categories in the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area (8,944 km²) was determined to be in the range AUD\$188 to \$211 million year⁻¹, or AUD\$210 to \$236 ha⁻¹yr⁻¹ across tenure categories. The individual ecosystem services mentioned above ranged from AUD\$18.6 to \$20.9 million year⁻¹ for biodiversity down to AUD\$10.2 to \$11.4 million year⁻¹ for aesthetics. The value of individual ecosystem services constrained within a fully intact suite of ecosystem goods and services was found to be consistent with the value of all other uses to which land is put in a bioregion and with other avenues of investment in the economic system, and will increase proportionate to the human population density, and hence scarcity of ecosystem services.

Conclusion

The combination of revealed preferences in a surrogate market as the empirical baseline for the whole suite of ecosystem services in a bioregion or Local Government Area, along with the expressed preferences of a group of experts as to the importance of each individual good or service, provides the theoretical and practical justification for the acceptance of the technique as a means of establishing opening prices in a future trading market. Being linked to the value of real property and hence population density in a region, it provides a key insight into the status and thus value of ecosystems services provided by public and private land, including scarcity. The most critical recommendation to policy and decision-makers emanating from this research is the requirement that environmental impacts arising from development projects, policies or proposals be properly identified, the magnitude of the impact properly assessed, and mitigation of the impacts strictly enforced. The

Abstract

same applies for environmental pollution, damage and degradation with legal liability apparent. Legislation is required to be enacted which will lead to the need for rigorous environmental valuation procedures that have empirical verification and will stand scrutiny in a court of law. The technique expounded in this thesis is such a procedure.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of my supervisors, Associate Professor Steve Turton, Professor David Gillieson, and Professor Brian Roberts, most particularly my principal supervisor, Steve Turton, all from James Cook University. Contributions towards the funding for this project are gratefully acknowledged from the School of Tropical Environmental Studies and Geography in the Faculty of Science and Engineering, and the Rainforest CRC.

The contributions and perseverance of family and friends are paramount in extended self-funded research projects such as this, and the understanding and contributions from my mother, brothers and children were greatly appreciated, particularly from the youngest who had to suffer my late scholarship from the age of 10 to 17, and who may have been a little short-changed. However, like me, I hope she found the experience character building. I would also like to thank my colleagues at James Cook University for patient listening, even though they did not have a clue what I was talking about most of the time. Cheryl Roberts again took valuable 'time out' from her own PhD research to patiently and expeditiously proof read my thesis more than once, and I love her for it.

Most of all, I would like to express my appreciation and utmost admiration for those that took part in the Delphi Inquiry. This was no easy task. The Delphi technique depends to a large degree on the group understanding of their role in the inquiry. Most Delphi inquiries involve one, or at most two rounds where contribution of the panellists is required. The Delphi Inquiry conducted as an integral part of this research had four rounds where contribution was required, feedback from each round, and involved six components: three questionnaires with a total of 60 questions, and three matrices each of 120 cells to weight the ecosystem services. I repeat, this was no easy task. The names of those who took part in the Delphi inquiry appear in Appendix C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No
Statement of Access	i
Foreword: A Green Economy	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	vii
List of Figures	xii
List of Tables	xvi
List of Acronyms	xx
Statement of Sources	xxii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Need for the Study	3
1.3 Description of Ecosystem Goods and Services	7
1.4 The Wet Tropics of Queensland World Heritage Area	12
1.5 Aims, Expected Outcomes and Arrangement of the Thesis	17
1.5.1 Thesis Outline	18
SECTION 1 LITERATURE REVIEW	22
Chapter 2 Literature Review	23
2.1 Economic Approaches to Environmental Valuation	23
Chapter 3 Literature Review	41
3.1 The Emergence of Environmental and Ecological Economics	41

Chapter 4 Literature Review	56
4.1 Valuation Theory and Practice	56
Chapter 5 Literature Review	74
5.1 The Ecosystem Approach	74
Chapter 6 Literature Review	84
6.1 Section Summary	84
6.1.1 <i>Economic Approaches to Environmental Valuation</i>	84
6.1.2 <i>The Emergence of Environmental and Ecological Economics</i>	85
6.1.3 <i>Valuation Theory and Practice</i>	88
6.1.4 <i>The Ecosystem Approach</i>	91
SECTION 2 METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS	94
Chapter 7 Methodology	95
7.1 Introduction	95
7.2 The Surrogate Market	95
7.3 The Systematic Analysis	99
7.4 The Philosophical Inquiry	105
7.5 The Conceptual Model	110
7.5.1 <i>Landscape valuation</i>	114
7.6 Chapter Summary	118
Chapter 8 Results of the Philosophical Inquiry	120
8.1 Introduction	120
8.2 The Questionnaires	120
8.2.1 <i>Closed-ended questions/statements (ie. true/false)</i>	121
8.2.2 <i>Open-ended questions/statements (ie text responses)</i>	135

8.3	<i>Attrition</i>	142
Chapter 9 Results of the Multiple Criteria Analysis		144
9.1	<i>Introduction</i>	144
9.2	<i>The Multiple Criteria Models</i>	144
Chapter 10 Results of the Conceptual Modelling		152
10.1	<i>Introduction</i>	152
10.2	<i>The Conceptual Model and Valuation Tables for Ecosystems</i>	152
Chapter 11 The Aggregate and Individual Values of Ecosystem Services in the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area		162
11.1	<i>Introduction</i>	162
11.2	<i>The Surrogate Market</i>	163
11.3	<i>The Values</i>	163
Chapter 12 Section Summary		174
12.1	<i>Introduction</i>	174
	12.1.2 <i>The Surrogate Market and Shadow Prices</i>	174
	12.1.3 <i>The Delphi Questionnaires</i>	175
	12.1.4 <i>The Multiple Criteria Analysis</i>	176
	12.1.5 <i>The Conceptual Models and Valuation Table</i>	178
	12.1.6 <i>The Values</i>	180
SECTION 3 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION		182
Chapter 13 Discussion		183
13.1	<i>Introduction</i>	183
13.2	<i>Points of Agreement and Points of Difference: the Delphi inquiry</i>	184
13.3	<i>Past Deficiencies in Environmental Valuation</i>	186

13.4	<i>The Advantages of the Empirical Method of Valuation</i>	190
13.5	<i>What the Values Mean and What the Future Holds</i>	194
13.5.1	<i>What the Values Mean</i>	194
13.5.2	<i>What the Future Holds</i>	200
13.5.3	<i>Transferability and Limitations of the Method</i>	216
13.5.4	<i>The Global Context</i>	219
Chapter 14	<i>Conclusion</i>	226
14.1	<i>Introduction</i>	226
14.2	<i>General Conclusions</i>	228
14.3	<i>Specific Conclusions</i>	229
14.4	<i>Limitations of the Research</i>	230
14.5	<i>Recommendations</i>	231
14.6	<i>Avenues for Future Research</i>	232
	<i>List of References</i>	234
Appendix A	<i>Regional Ecosystems in the Wet Tropics Bioregion</i>	
Appendix B	<i>Spreadsheets for the three model multiple criteria analysis</i>	
Appendix C	<i>Introduction to the Delphi Inquiry. The Delphi Panel. First round preamble and questionnaire</i>	
Appendix D	<i>Conceptual Models for level of provision of ecosystem goods and services</i>	
Appendix E	<i>Preamble for round 2 and results of round 1 of the Delphi Inquiry</i>	
Appendix F	<i>Preamble for round 3 and results of round 2 of the Delphi Inquiry</i>	

Appendix G	<i>Preamble for round 4 and results of round 3 of the Delphi Inquiry. Results of round 4 and summary of the multiple criteria analysis</i>
Appendix H	<i>Text responses from the round 1 questionnaire of the Delphi Inquiry</i>
Appendix I	<i>Text responses from the round 3 questionnaire of the Delphi Inquiry</i>
Appendix J	<i>Valuation Tables for each of the tenure categories in the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area</i>

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No	Figure Caption	Page no.
1.1	<i>Atmosphere; atmosphere land/water interface; biosphere; biosphere/regolith interface; regolith: stratification of ecosystem services</i>	11
1.2	<i>The Wet Tropics Bioregion</i>	13
1.3	<i>The Wet Tropics World Heritage Area</i>	15
3.1	<i>Links between the 'old' and the 'new' economics and measures of impact analysis</i>	48
7.1	<i>Triangulation model to assess the level of ecosystem services intact under a given level of protection or no protection (LOP Model)</i>	116
7.2	<i>Triangulation model to assess the level of ecosystem services intact under a given land use characteristic (LUC Model)</i>	117
8.1	<i>Bar chart of the responses to statement 1 "Anthropocentrism holds that only humans can have or ascribe intrinsic value, and as such all other features of the environment, whether living or non-living, can only have value through usefulness to humans"</i>	122
8.2	<i>Bar chart of the responses to statement 2 "It follows that a feature of the environment or an ecosystem service must provide some utility to at least one human entity, otherwise it has no economic value"</i>	123
8.3	<i>Bar chart of the true responses to the statement 5: "In the absence or failure of accepted markets, no direct mechanism exists to measure or reveal the prices of intangibles, so surrogate or shadow prices are used"</i>	123
8.4	<i>Bar chart of the true response to statement 9: "The contingency valuation method is fraught with risk where respondents have no knowledge of the resource, no experience in trading it and don't believe the market to be realistic"</i>	124

8.5	Bar chart of the true response to statement 12: “WTP is only useful in valuing a particular attribute of the environment eg. recreation, and is never areal, making it worthless to evaluate terrestrial ecosystems”	125
8.6	Bar chart of the true response to statement 16: “The many variables and feedback effects inherent in the natural world obfuscate proper modelling of environmental impacts on ecosystems”	125
8.7	Bar chart of the true response to question/ statement 17: “The problem becomes even more difficult when links between very complex phenomena and the economy are sought”	126
8.8	Bar chart of true responses to statement/ question 21: “It has been called ‘self-deception’ and ‘the deception’ of others, that to ‘measure the immeasurable’ is absurd”	126
8.9	Bar chart of true responses to statement/ question 26: “There is an instinctive conviction that what cannot be measured may not exist”	127
8.10	Bar chart of the true response to statement/ question 22: “Nothing else compares to the medium of money in the marketplace, which is the context in which millions of individuals express countless preferences daily”	127
8.11	Bar chart of the true response to statement/ question 24: “Money is regarded as the store of value (in terms of income and wealth), such that to express preferences or vote, it is assumed one must possess money”	128
8.12	Bar chart of the true response to statement/ question 34: “By developing a method to ascribe dollar values to ecosystem goods and services and thus finance conservation by way of establishing trading markets in them, natural resource utilisation can be made sustainable”	129
8.13	Bar chart of the true responses to question 45: ”Ecosystems are being lost because they do not have prices acting as negative feedback to keep use in equilibrium with availability”	130

8.14	Bar chart of true responses to question 47: “<u>Economists</u> argue that ecosystems are being lost because they don’t have prices acting as a negative feedback to keep use in equilibrium with availability”	1131
8.15	Bar chart for true responses to statement/question 49: “Biodiversity supports the natural ecosystems on which life depends, enriching the soil, purifying the water, and creating the very air we breathe. The greater the biodiversity of species in an ecosystem, the more productive and stable it is”	132
8.16	Bar chart of true responses to statement/question 50: “The single best opportunity to make sustainable development happen is to make investments in sustainable practices and technologies attractive to private business and private investment”	133
8.17	Bar chart of the true response to statement/question 51: “The Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 captured the spirit of a new idealism in which pragmatism was in full harmony with idealism”	133
10.1	Triangulation Model to assess extent of ecosystem services intact under a given level of protection or no protection; Example: National Park 99%	157
10.2	Triangulation Model to assess extent of ecosystem services intact under a given level of protection or no protection; Example: National Park 92%	158
10.3	Upper and lower limits of provision of ecosystem services in the tenure categories in the WTWHA derived from the conceptual models and increasing capitalisation rates reflecting risk and disturbance	160
13.1	Comparison of the values derived for various suites of ecosystem services by various researchers	197
13.2	Log scale chart of the exponential relationship between human population density and land value in the Wet Tropics Bioregion	200

List of Figures

- | | | |
|-------------|--|------------|
| 13.3 | <i>Log scale chart showing the exponential relationship between human population density and land values and the multiplier for mitigation of an impact in Cairns City Council (CCC) in other shires in the bioregion</i> | 217 |
| 13.4 | <i>Log scale chart showing lowest land values for the shires with the largest overall land area and component of alienated (rateable) land</i> | 218 |

LIST OF TABLES

Table No	Table Caption	Page no
1.1	<i>Role, function, interdependencies, threats ownership and beneficiaries of ecosystem goods and services</i>	9-10
1.2	<i>Areal extent of the various land tenures in the Wet Tropics of Queensland World Heritage Area</i>	14
2.1	<i>Disparities between ‘willingness to pay’ and ‘willingness to accept’</i>	26
2.2	<i>Examples of recent HP studies of countryside characteristics on house/property prices</i>	39
3.1	<i>Examples of various approaches to environmental valuation published in the June 2002 issue of the journal of Ecological Economics</i>	47
7.1	<i>Ecosystem attributes used in the multi-model multiple criteria analysis</i>	101
7.2	<i>Multiple Criteria Analysis (MCA) model 1 ‘Anthropocentric’ with selected criteria and maximum weightings allocated</i>	102
7.3	<i>Multiple Criteria Analysis (MCA) model 2 ‘Utilitarian’ with selected criteria and maximum weightings allocated</i>	103
7.4	<i>Multiple Criteria Analysis (MCA) model 3 ‘Balanced Sensitivity’ with selected criteria and maximum weightings allocated</i>	103
7.5	<i>Sample calculation to normalise the weightings to a nominal value of +5</i>	104
7.6	<i>Situations where a Delphi Inquiry is useful, features and phases of Delphi</i>	106
7.7	<i>Characteristics and applications of the most significant modes of Philosophical Inquiry Systems</i>	107
7.8	<i>Valuation table for individual landholdings and landscapes</i>	113

List of Tables

9.1	Results of Kendall's W for Model 1 (Anthropocentric Perspective)	144
9.2	Results of Kendall's W for Model 2 (Utilitarian Perspective)	145
9.3	Results of Kendall's W for Model 3 (Balanced Sensitivity)	146
9.4	Relative rankings of the attributes for each of the models	147
9.5	The ten ecosystem services ranked most important	148
9.6	Final weights for the ecosystem attributes (goods and services)	149
9.7	Results of Kendall's coefficient of concordance for the mean of each discipline's weightings for the attributes/criteria in each model	150
10.1	The upper and lower limit of provision of ecosystem services in the tenure categories	153
11.1	Total rateable value of land in the eleven LGAs represented in the Wet Tropics Bioregion	163
11.2	The total value of ecosystem goods and services in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002	164
11.3	The total value of stabilisation services in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002	165
11.4	The total value of regeneration services in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002	165
11.5	The total value of production of goods in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002	165
11.6	The total value of life fulfilling services in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002	166
11.7	The total value of gas regulation in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002	166

List of Tables

11.8	<i>The total value of climate regulation in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	167
11.9	<i>The total value of disturbance regulation in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	167
11.10	<i>The total value of water regulation in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	167
11.11	<i>The total value of erosion control and soil/sediment retention in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	168
11.12	<i>The total value of biological control in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	168
11.13	<i>The total value of refugia in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	168
11.14	<i>The total value of soil formation in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	169
11.15	<i>The total value of nutrient cycling and storage in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	169
11.16	<i>The total value of assimilation of waste, attenuation, and detoxification in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	169
11.17	<i>The total value of purification (clean air, water) in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	170
11.18	<i>The total value of pollination in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	170
11.19	<i>The total value of biodiversity in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002.</i>	170
11.20	<i>The total value of water supply in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	171
11.21	<i>The total value of food production in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	171
11.22	<i>The total value of raw materials in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	171

11.23	<i>The total value of genetic resources in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	172
11.24	<i>The total value of recreation opportunities (nature based) in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	172
11.25	<i>The total value of the aesthetic, cultural and spiritual (existence values) in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	172
11.26	<i>The total value of Other Non-Use Values (Bequest, Option and Quasi Option Values) in the tenure categories in the WTWHA as at June 30, 2002</i>	173
11.27	<i>The Usus Fructus per annum for the tenure categories adjusted for the decreasing level of protection and increasing disturbance (increasing capitalisation rate) and by the mean of the upper and lower limit of provision of services</i>	173
12.1	<i>Final weights of the ecosystem goods and services</i>	178
12.2	<i>Capitalisation rates and conceptual models used to determine upper and lower limits of provision of ecosystem services</i>	179
12.3	<i>Annual values or shadow prices of the individual ecosystem goods and services (attributes) totalled for all the tenure categories in the WTWHA.</i>	182
13.1	<i>Extrapolated values for the tenure categories for the whole of Australia using tenure categories and areas from Year Book Australia 2002</i>	194
13.2	<i>Comparison of the subject (what) of a selection of studies of valuations of ecosystem services</i>	196
13.3	<i>Valuation table for Wyalla Plains</i>	221
13.4	<i>Payment schedule to landholders for conservation contracts in Costa Rica</i>	224

LIST OF ACRONYMS

A	Area
AAV	Assessed Annual Value
AHP	Analytical Heirarchy Process
ATSI	Aboriginal and Torres Straight Islanders
B	Benefit
BBI	Biodiversity Benefits Index
BBS	Biodiversity Significance Score
CBA	Cost Benefit Analysis
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCC	Cairns City Council
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism (Kyoto Protocol)
CERCLA	<i>The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act 1980 (USA)</i>
CM	Choice Modelling
CPI	Consumer Price Index
<i>cr</i>	capitalisation rate
CSIRO	Commonwealth Scientific Industrial and Research Organisation
CVM	Contingency Valuation Method
CWGMBI	Commonwealth Working Group on Market Based Instruments
DPI	Department of Primary Industries
Ecol	Ecologist
EcolEcon	Ecological Economist
EDP	Environmentally adjusted net Domestic Product
EnvEcon	Environmental Economist
EnvSci	Environmental Scientist
EPA	Environment Protection Authority
ESD	Ecologically Sustainable Development
<i>esi</i>	extent of provision of ecosystem services
GBR	Great Barrier Reef
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
Geog	Geographer
GNP	Gross National Product
GPP	Gross Primary Production
ha	hectare
HP	Hedonic Pricing
HSS	Habitat Services Score
IBRA	Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia
IS	Inquiry System
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
JI	Joint Implementation (Kyoto Protocol)
LGA	Local Government Authority
LGs	Local Governments
LOP	Level of Protection (model)
LUC	Land Use Characteristic (model)
MA	Millenium Ecosystem Assessment
MADM	Multiple Attribute Decision Method
MBIs	Market Based Instruments
MCA	Multiple Criteria Analysis
<i>MUV</i>	Median Unimproved Value
N	Number
NAPSWQ	National Action Plan for Water Qualityand Salinity
NatRM	Natural Resource Manager

List of Acronyms

NIEIR	National Institute of Economics and Industry Research
NRDA	National Resources Damage Assessment
NRDA	Natural Resources Damage Assessment
NSB	Net Social Benefit
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PAGE	Pilot Analysis of Global Ecosystems
PAs	Protected Areas
PC	Productivity Commission
REs	Regional Ecosystems
S	Species Richness
SCEP	Study of Critical Environmental Problems
TCM	Travel Cost Method
TEV	Total Economic Value
TV	Total Value
<i>TV_i</i>	Total value individual attribute
<i>TV_w</i>	Total value whole ecosystem
<i>UF_{pa}</i>	<i>Usus Fructus per annum</i>
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UV	Unimproved Value
<i>W</i>	Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance
WCED	World Commission on Economic Development
WHA	World Heritage Area
WRI	World Resources Institute
<i>wt</i>	weight of ecosystem attribute
WTA	Willingness to Accept
WTMA	Wet Tropics Management Authority
WTP	Willingness to Pay
WTWHA	Wet Tropics World Heritage Area
WWF	World Wide Fund (for nature)

STATEMENT OF SOURCES

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given

Signature

Date