

PES and ecosystem service markets in the blue economy

Linus Hasselström, PhD plh@kth.se

KTH, Department of Sustainable development, environmental science and engineering (SEED)





My research questions

When are PES or ecosystem service markets

- Motivated
- Not motivated
- ...to support sustainable blue growth?

What types of designs may be suitable?

"Blue Growth is the long term strategy to support sustainable growth in the marine and maritime sectors as a whole."

European Commission / DG MARE

EC highlights sectors such as:

- a. Aquaculture
- b. Coastal tourism
- c. Marine biotechnology
- d. Ocean energy
- e. Seabed mining



What do I mean with PES and ES markets?

"voluntary transaction between service users and service providers that are conditional on agreed rules of natural resource management for generating offsite services" Wunder (2015)

A way of getting paid for providing ES indirectly or directly

...and a way of having to be accountable for a negative impact on ES

What creates and drives these "markets"

(Adapted from Cole et al., 2012)

<u>Taxpayer</u> <u>Regulatory compliance</u> Voluntariness/coasean financing/pigouvian Ex: Habitat banking Ex: Most of the PES Ex: Market for drinking schemes around the water in France /NGO (Similar to Co2 trade) world. funded PES/voluntary environmental (Similar to EU CAP) compensation, etc. Dependent on regulation by the Dependent on taxpayer Dependent on that an government funding ecosystem service provides a private profit Or "charity"

Types of maritime industries



Environmental /ES impact

Types of maritime industries



Environmental / ES impact

Aquaculture **Coastal tourism** Marine biotechnology



Ocean energy Seabed mining



Suitable locations for algae cultivation along the Swedish west coast (340 km2)

What are the positive and negative ES impacts?

Impacted ecosystem services from algae cultivation (Hasselström et al., in prep)

| | Ecosystem service | Affected? |
|--------------|--|---|
| Supporting | S1. Biogeochemical cycling S2. Primary production S3. Food web dynamics S4. Biodiversity S5. Habitat S6. Resilience | Attractive habitat for fish and small mobile species. Provides a surface for non-mobile species. Anchoring devices provide habitat for lobster and crabs. |
| egulating | R1. Climate and atmospheric regulation | Temporary C storage |
| | R2. Sediment retention | No. |
| | R3. Regulation of eutrophication | N&P uptake. |
| | R4. Biological regulation | No. |
| 2 | R5. Regulation of toxic substances | Maybe. |
| Provisioning | P1. Food | Production by cultivation. |
| | P2. Raw material | Production by cultivation. |
| | P3. Genetic resources | No. |
| | P4. Chemical resources | Production by cultivation. |
| | P5. Ornamental resources | No. |
| | P6. Energy (from biomass only) | Production by cultivation. |
| Cultural | C1. Recreation | Negatively. |
| | C2. Aesthetic values | Negatively. |
| | C3. Science & education | No. |
| | C4. Cultural heritage | No. |
| | C5. Inspiration | No. |
| | C6. Natural heritage | Negatively. |

Impacted ecosystem services from algae cultivation (Hasselström et al., in prep)

| | Ecosystem service | Affected? |
|--------------|--|---|
| Supporting | S1. Biogeochemical cycling S2. Primary production S3. Food web dynamics S4. Biodiversity S5. Habitat S6. Resilience | Attractive habitat for fish and small mobile species. Provides a surface for non-mobile species. Anchoring devices provide habitat for lobster and crabs. |
| egulating | R1. Climate and atmospheric regulation | Temporary C storage |
| | R2. Sediment retention | No |
| | R3. Regulation of eutrophication 🤇 | N&P uptake. Large benefits! |
| | R4. Biological regulation | No. |
| Ř | R5. Regulation of toxic substances | Maybe. |
| Provisioning | P1. Food | Production by cultivation. |
| | P2. Raw material | Production by cultivation. |
| | P3. Genetic resources | No. |
| | P4. Chemical resources | Production by cultivation. |
| | P5. Ornamental resources | No. |
| | P6. Energy (from biomass only) | Production by cultivation. |
| Cultural | C1. Recreation | Negatively. |
| | C2. Aesthetic values | Negatively. |
| | C3. Science & education | No. Largo costal |
| | C4. Cultural heritage | No. Large cosis! |
| | C5. Inspiration | No. |
| | C6. Natural heritage | Negatively. |

Algae cultivation and nutrient regulation... Some possible market designs.

Regulatory compliance

Establishing cap & trade system for nutrients? (as investigated by e.g. Swedish EPA, 2009 and Swedish EPA, 2012)

Challenging design Location matters Legal issues Tradition matters <u>Taxpayer</u> <u>financing/pigouvian</u>

Government pays seafarmers (ex. for mussels: Lindahl & Kollberg (2008); Zandersen et al. (2009))

Expensive for tax payers! Will payment be sufficient incentive? Voluntariness/coasean

e.g. voluntary offsetting s.a. "Nutritrade" project.

Or

Market signaling / eco labeling?

Too small potential?



Use of product vs. system boundaries

Many positive indirect effects

Product may replace e.g. fossil fuel, other food/fodder production, etc.

Should this indirect "positive impact" be priced on the algae market?

(Many economists would say no.)

Negative impacts

EU no net loss objective (of biodiversity and ecosystem services).

- Suggests use of the mitigation hierarchy (BBOP, 2012)
- And potentially compensation through habitat banking



Adapted from Enetjärn et al., 2015

Type of impacts to ES/environment and consequences for policy



Ocean energy

Seabed mining

Aquaculture
 Coastal tourism
 Marine biotechnology



Conclusions

- Industries pointed out by commission for Blue Growth are not inherently (environmentally) sustainable.
- Aquaculture is only industry with clear direct positive impacts to ES?
- All industries likely to have local negative impacts to ES.
 - Environmental compensation markets and trade between actors/sectors may be an option.
- Many industries and products are "more sustainable than substitutes". This suggests more overarching pricing policies, not ES markets. (?)