

Erratum

Valuing ecosystem benefits in a dynamic world

Sarah Cornell*

Clim Res 45: 261–272, 2010

*Email: sarah.cornell@bristol.ac.uk

The article indicated that peatland restoration across a catchment could avoid costs amounting to £1 to 2 million per year, citing the website of the Sustainable Catchment Management Programme (SCaMP), a joint initiative of United Utilities and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. SCaMP did indeed demonstrate clear multiple benefits of peatland restoration, but the monetized value is not an estimate made by United Utilities, and it does not appear in the project reports for SCaMP.

The accuracy of the avoided costs estimate cannot be confirmed. Reports that mention the SCaMP initiative and give this range of value estimates (e.g. IEEP 2006, Defra 2007) are ambiguous about the relevant geographical scale to which they refer and the source of the monetary information. In addition, there is no documentation of the methodology of the estimate.

The key arguments made in the study about the economic knowledge base for ecosystem services remain

valid: (1) valuation studies of ecosystem services are very sparse; (2) available valuation data are prone to problems with validity and reliability; (3) the economic estimates of the value of supporting and regulating ecosystem services are often very much smaller than use and amenity values.

LITERATURE CITED

- Defra (2007) An introductory guide to valuing ecosystems. PB12852, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, London. www.defra.gov.uk/environment/policy/natural-enviro/ documents/eco-valuing.pdf
- IEEP (2006) Value of biodiversity: documenting EU examples where biodiversity loss has led to the loss of ecosystem services. Project Final Report ENV.G.1/FRA/2004/0081, Institute for European Environmental Policy, Brussels. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/enveco/pdf/value_biodiversity.pdf