



Ecosystem Services from a UK Conservation Perspective

Paul Morling

May 2011

The RSPB

We passionately believe that conservation of biodiversity is both a practical necessity and a moral imperative

- Voice for nature
- 200 nature reserves for the benefit of wildlife and people
- Over one million members
- Share our enthusiasm and knowledge to help as many people as possible enjoy the natural world
- Base our work on sound science and rational analysis
- Work internationally through BirdLife International

Some Issues

- Commitments are nice but without clear mechanisms to fulfil them they will not be met
- We already face a conservation financing gap as indicated by the shortfall in UKBAP funding of £273 million (2010-2015). Total funding required for biodiversity targets in the UK = £1.1 billion
- Nature provides benefits which are, to varying degrees 'public goods'. Government will always have a role to play in guaranteeing they are provided.
- Fiscal austerity means alternative mechanisms will need to be considered – PES, Offsets etc.
- What more could the private sector, businesses and civil society be doing to expand their role in financing conservation.

RSPB Nature Reserves (2002)

- 182 reserves
- Over 1 million visitors
- Average spending £11 per person
- £11.7 million of visitor spending
- Total reserve impact: 1000 FTE jobs



Valuing North Norfolk's Coast (2000)

- Visitors to the six sites support an estimated 440 FTE jobs
- Visitors attracted by birds and wildlife spend £6.2 million per year
- 34% of respondents identified birds & wildlife as their main reason to visit the survey area





Sea Eagles on Mull – 2010

£5-8 Million visitor spend

110-175 jobs on Mull

£2.4-£2.8 million local income

Valuing Wild Nature Phase 1 (2002)

- RSPB, convened a workshop of international biodiversity and environmental economics experts
- Key findings:
 - We are currently experiencing a 1% nature loss p.a. resulting in a loss of ES worth \$250 billion p.a.
 - If we had an effective network of Protected Areas this would cost \$45 billion p.a.
 - but it could deliver benefits of \$5 trillion!

Valuing Wild Nature Phase 2 (2006)

The ES approach:

Must compliment, not replace, ethical and scientific reasons for conservation

Changes the scale and timeframe over which we should consider conservation

Makes us think more about the winners and losers of land use changes

Some knowledge about biophysical processes underpinning ES although very limited ability to measure

ES are not necessarily correlated with biodiversity delivery



What's the Value of Biodiversity *per se* ?

Conservation economics (Krutilla etc)

Primary/infrastructure value (Turner etc)

Insurance/resilience values (Maler, etc)


Agrobiodiversity (crop yield, pollination)

Bioprospecting (UK marine examples ?)


Non use values ('soft values')



Do Ecosystem Service hotspots overlap with biodiversity hotspots ?



Changing the Scale of Conservation ?



Suggests integrated spatial planning for multiple service delivery and policies that reflect the interconnectedness and interdependence of nature and the economy

An aerial photograph of a landscape featuring a large, irregularly shaped lake in the center. The surrounding terrain is a mix of brown and tan colors, suggesting a semi-arid or high-altitude environment. In the background, there are several mountain peaks, with the most prominent one being a sharp, conical peak. The sky is a pale, clear blue.

Land-use / management

- Affects services including, but not exclusive to;
 - Climate Change mitigation
 - Water quality
 - Flood risk management

Potential synergies, potential trade-offs.