

# Limited substitutability, relative price changes and the uplifting of public natural capital values

Moritz A. Drupp<sup>a,b</sup>, Zachary M. Turk<sup>c</sup>,  
Ben Groom<sup>d,e</sup>, Jonas Heckenhahn<sup>f\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Economics, University of Hamburg, Germany

<sup>b</sup> CESifo Munich, Germany

<sup>c</sup> Landscape Policy and Governance Team,

Manaaki Whenua - Landcare Research (MWLR), New Zealand

<sup>d</sup> Department of Economics, University of Exeter Business School, United Kingdom

<sup>e</sup> Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment,

London School of Economics and Political Science, UK

<sup>f</sup> Faculty of Management and Economics, Ruhr-University Bochum, Germany

March 11, 2024

## Abstract

As the global economy continues to grow, ecosystem services tend to stagnate or degrow. Economic theory has shown how such shifts in relative scarcities can be reflected in the appraisal of public projects and environmental-economic accounting, but empirical evidence has been lacking to put the theory into practice. To estimate the relative price change in ecosystem services that can be used to make such adjustments, we perform a global meta-analysis of environmental valuation studies to derive income elasticities of willingness to pay (WTP) for ecosystem services as a proxy for the degree of limited substitutability. Based on 861 income-WTP pairs, we estimate an income elasticity of WTP of around 0.79 (95-CI: 0.60 to 0.97). Combining these results with a global data set on shifts in the relative scarcity of ecosystem services, we estimate relative price change of ecosystem services of around 2.2 percent per year. In an application to natural capital valuation of non-timber forest ecosystem services by the World Bank, we show that their natural capital value should be uplifted by more than 50 percent (95-CI: 32 to 78 percent), materially elevating the role of public natural capital. We discuss implications for relative price adjustments in policy appraisal and for improving estimates of comprehensive national accounts.

**Keywords:** Willingness to Pay; Ecosystem Services; Limited Substitutability; Growth; Relative Prices; Contingent Valuation; Forests

**JEL codes:** D61, H43, Q51, Q54, Q58

---

\*We thank Jasper Meya, Sjak Smulders, Daan van Soest and Martin Quaas as well as seminar audiences at BIOECON 2023, the World Bank, idiv Leipzig, MWLR and EAERE 2023 for helpful discussions, and are grateful to Johanna Darmstadt, Mark Lustig and Jasper Röder for excellent research assistance. We gratefully acknowledge funding by the World Bank. M.D. additionally acknowledges support from the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) under grant number 01UT2103B. B.G. acknowledges Dragon Capital for funding the Dragon Capital Chair and generous funding from the UKRI/NERC BIOADD project (ref: NE/X002292/1).

# 1 Introduction

Measuring economic progress towards sustainability requires addressing the limited substitutability among the various constituents of comprehensive wealth (Smulders and van Soest, 2023). Potential limits to substitutability imply that society must strike a balance between the two opposing paradigms of Weak and Strong Sustainability (e.g., Neumayer, 2003; Hanley et al., 2015; Dasgupta, 2021). Many contemporary measures of economic progress and wealth have explicitly or implicitly followed a Weak Sustainability approach. In doing so, they consider natural capital and ecosystem services as largely substitutable—sometimes even perfectly substitutable—with human-made capital stocks. In light of the continued growth of human-made capital and the stagnation or degradation of many natural capital stocks (IPBES, 2019), the Weak Sustainability approach is increasingly being called into question. From a theory perspective, we should consider some degree of imperfect substitutability when estimating shadow prices. This is relevant both for natural capital that serves as an intermediate input to various production processes as well as public natural capital as a direct source of utility (see, e.g. Smulders and van Soest, 2023; Zhu et al., 2019). A common constraint to implementation, however, has been a lack of sufficient empirical evidence on the limits of substitutability of ecosystem services and natural capital that can inform the computation of shadow prices (e.g., Cohen et al., 2019; Drupp, 2018; Rouhi Rad et al., 2021).

This paper makes a step towards closing this important empirical evidence gap to enable respecting a limited degree of substitutability and the change in the relative scarcity of ecosystem services in policy appraisal and environmental-economic accounting, by focussing on the limited sustainability of ecosystem services in utility. To this end, we present the largest global database to estimate the degree of limited substitutability of ecosystem services vis-a-vis human-made goods, via the income elasticities of WTP for ecosystem services, in order to compute relative price changes of ecosystem services. We use these estimates of relative price changes to derive adjustments to natural capital accounting, taking the assessment of forest ecosystem service values in the *Changing Wealth of Nations* (CWON) as a case study.

There are two general approaches to dealing with limited substitutability of ecosystem services in a dynamic context, for example in project appraisals with future costs and benefits or the assessment of comprehensive wealth. We can either apply differentiated discount rates – often a lower discount rate for non-market ecosystem services, or account for increasing relative scarcity by adjusting our valuation of ecosystem services over time (e.g. Baumgärtner et al., 2015; Drupp, 2018; Gollier, 2010; Hoel and Sterner, 2007; Traeger, 2011; Weikard and Zhu, 2005). Sterner and Persson (2008) have put a spotlight on the detrimental effects of climate change on non-market ecosystem services, such as the loss of biodiversity or environmental amenities. Sterner and Persson (2008) and subsequent work (Drupp and Hänsel, 2021; Bastien-Olvera and Moore, 2021) has studied how the increasing scarcity and limited substitutability of non-market ecosystem services vis-à-vis manufactured goods affects optimal climate policy via good-specific

discount rates or relative price changes. [Drupp and Hänsel \(2021\)](#), for instance, estimate that relative prices of non-market goods increase by around 2 to 4 percent per year. Incorporating this scale of adjustment leads to social cost of carbon estimates that are more than 50 percent higher compared to the case where goods are assumed perfectly substitutable. Accounting for relative price changes of non-market goods is thus crucial to the appraisal of climate change policy. It is likewise relevant for project appraisal and environmental-economic accounting such as in the System of Environmental Economic Accounting-Experimental Ecosystem Accounting (SEEA-EEA) and in CWON.

Previous empirical studies have estimated relative price changes of non-market goods by calculating the elasticity of substitution indirectly via the income elasticity of willingness to pay (WTP) from non-market valuation studies ([Baumgärtner et al., 2015](#); [Drupp, 2018](#); [Heckenhahn and Drupp, 2022](#)). The second key component are good-specific growth rates, estimated on historical time series ([Baumgärtner et al., 2015](#); [Heckenhahn and Drupp, 2022](#)) or as endogenous outcomes in global integrated climate-economy assessment models (e.g. [Drupp and Hänsel, 2021](#)). Relative price changes are then approximated by the income elasticity of WTP multiplied by the difference in good-specific growth rates. [Baumgärtner et al. \(2015\)](#) were the first to estimate relative price changes. They applied national growth rates to arrive at country-level results. However, they assumed that the elasticity of substitution is constant across all countries and ecosystem service types. Specifically, they derive the elasticity of substitution based on a single meta-analysis by [Jacobsen and Hanley \(2009\)](#), who estimate an income elasticity of WTP for global biodiversity conservation based on 46 contingent valuation (CV) studies. [Heckenhahn and Drupp \(2022\)](#) provide the first comprehensive country-specific evidence, estimating growth rates of 15 ecosystem services and the degree of limited substitutability based on a meta-analysis of 36 German WTP studies. They find that ecosystem services are complements to manufactured goods and that their relative price has, on aggregate, increased by around 4 percent per year.

Most government appraisal and environmental-economic accounting has yet to explicitly address the limited substitutability of non-market goods ([Groom et al., 2022](#)). Due to a lack of country-specific estimates of substitutability, global-level estimates of relative price changes have recently been integrated into governmental policy guidance ([Groom and Hepburn, 2017](#)). For instance, The Netherlands consider relative price changes of 1 percent per annum as part of their discounting guidance, and the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) consider relative price adjustments by ‘uplifting’ the damage costs of air pollution by 2 percent per year. Additionally, guidelines by the Asian Development Bank and Canada suggest the use of lower discount rates for environmental goods ([Groom et al., 2022](#)). The most recent CWON report by the World Bank captures a few select non-market goods and capital stocks. Most prominently, forest ecosystem service values are featured based on a meta-regression and benefit transfer analysis by [Siikamäki et al. \(2015\)](#). Even though [Siikamäki et al. \(2015\)](#) find positive and large GDP elasticities of WTP, CWON does not apply relative price adjustments in response to the increasing relative scarcity of forest

ecosystem service values. This occurs by assuming that per-hectare monetary values are constant over time, solely adjusting for inflation. Given that a constant social discount rate of 4 percent is also applied to forest ecosystem service values, such an approach implicitly assumes that non-market environmental values do not increase with incomes and thus follow a perfect substitutability assumption.

Against this background, we provide the first systematic global empirical evidence basis to inform relative price adjustments of ecosystem services for application to CWON and beyond. Our main focus is on improving the estimation of limited substitutability of ecosystem services vis-a-vis human-made goods. To this end, we perform a meta-analysis of environmental values derived by the contingent valuation (CV) approach to estimating the income elasticity of WTP—a key parameter also for benefit transfer across space (Baumgärtner et al., 2017; Smith, 2023). This builds on a large-scale keyword-based search strategy and an in-depth analysis of a large random sample of the known population of peer-reviewed CV studies. The subsequent inputs to our analysis are aggregate income and WTP estimates as well as recurring covariates from each study.

We find relative price changes of ecosystem services of around 2.2 percent per year on aggregate. Relative price changes are smaller (1.6 percent) for forest ecosystem services, due to a lower rate of de-growth of forest area offset by a larger income elasticity of WTP. These estimates can be employed to adjust WTP estimates for project appraisal or environmental-economic accounting. In an application on natural capital valuation, taking the Changing Wealth of Nations (CWON) 2021 report by the World Bank (2021) as a case study, we show that adjusting natural capital estimates for non-timber ecosystem services for relative price changes results in uplifting the present value over a 100 year time period by 52 percent (CI: 32 to 78 percent), materially elevating the role of public natural capital. This echoes work on the importance of limited substitutability in climate policy appraisal (Bastien-Olvera and Moore, 2021; Drupp and Hänsel, 2021; Sterner and Persson, 2008). We close by discussing the results of our empirical analysis in context and summarizing insights for environmental-economic appraisal and accounting.

## 2 Theoretical background

Well-being depends on the good and services that are derived in each period from human-made and natural capital stocks. To provide the theoretical background for our empirical analysis, we consider a simple model in which intertemporal well-being is derived from both human-made goods,  $C_t$  and non-market environmental goods or ecosystem services,  $E_t$ . In the general case of imperfect substitutability, ecosystem services feature explicitly in the instantaneous utility function representing preferences over market-traded human-made consumption goods and non-market goods,  $U(C_t, E_t)$ . A standard form of time-discounted Utilitarian social welfare function is given by:

$$W = \int_{t=0}^{\infty} U(C_t, E_t) e^{-\delta t} dt. \quad (1)$$

The theory of dual discounting or relative price changes has shown that there are two approaches to addressing the intertemporal appraisal of non-market goods (e.g., Baumgärtner et al., 2015; Gollier, 2010; Traeger, 2011; Weikard and Zhu, 2005):

1. Explicitly consider how the relative price of non-market goods vis-a-vis market-traded consumption goods changes over time. Then, compute comprehensive consumption equivalents at each point in time and use a single consumption discount rate to on future comprehensive consumption equivalents.
2. Use differentiated, good-specific consumption discount rates. In the most general application, one discount rate is used for manufactured consumption,  $r_C$ , and another for non-market goods,  $r_E$ .

In the first approach, we compute the value of non-market goods in terms of the market good numeraire. This is given by the marginal rate of substitution (MRS),  $U_{E_t}/U_{C_t}$ , which is the implicit price of non-market goods. The MRS tells us by how much the consumption of market goods would need to increase in reply to a marginal decrease in non-market goods to hold utility constant. The  $RPC_t$  measures the relative change in the valuation of non-market goods – the change in the MRS between non-market and market goods – and thus the change in their relative scarcity over time (Hoel and Sterner, 2007):

$$RPC_t = \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{U_{E_t}}{U_{C_t}} \right) / \left( \frac{U_{E_t}}{U_{C_t}} \right). \quad (2)$$

Future expected non-market values can then be adjusted using the  $RPC_t$  and a single SDR can be used to discount future flows of private and non-market consumption.

In the second approach, we compute good-specific (dual) discount rates as:

$$r_{C_t} = \delta + \eta_{CC_t} g_{C_t} + \eta_{CE_t} g_{E_t} \quad (3)$$

$$r_{E_t} = \delta + \eta_{EE_t} g_{E_t} + \eta_{EC_t} g_{C_t} \quad (4)$$

where  $g_E$  and  $g_C$  are the growth rates,  $\eta_{CC_t}$  ( $\eta_{EE_t}$ ) the elasticity of marginal utility of private-good (non-market good) consumption with respect to private-good (non-market good) consumption, and  $\eta_{CE_t}$  ( $\eta_{EC_t}$ ) denotes the cross-elasticity of marginal utility of private-good (non-market good) consumption with respect to non-market good (private-good) consumption (see, e.g., Baumgärtner et al., 2015). Expanding their applicability, these dual rates can also be used in cases where non-market goods are not evaluated in monetary units such as satellite accounts in national accounting and biophysical impact assessments. It is important to stress that this approach also implies that we have to adjust the ‘standard’ discount rate for private consumption with an addition to the Simple Ramsey Rule by a substitutability effect ( $\eta_{CE_t} g_{E_t}$ ).

To make this more concrete, let us consider the constant-elasticity-of-substitution

(CES) utility function, capturing various degrees of substitutability or complementarity:

$$U(C_t, E_t) = \left( \alpha C_t^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} + (1-\alpha) E_t^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}}, \quad (5)$$

$0 < \sigma < +\infty$ , is the constant elasticity of substitution between the two goods, and  $0 < \alpha < 1$  is the utility share parameter for private consumption. The utility function given by equation 5 is strictly concave, represent homothetic preferences, and both the private good,  $C_t$ , and non-market good,  $E_t$ , are normal. It turns out that with CES preferences and imperfect complements, i.e.  $\sigma > 0$ , we get the following straightforward equivalence between both approaches (Weikard and Zhu, 2005):

$$RPC_t = \frac{1}{\sigma} [g_{C_t} - g_{E_t}] = r_{C_t} - r_{E_t}. \quad (6)$$

Accordingly, the choice of whether one adjusts the numerator via a relative price effect adjustment or the denominator via the use of dual discount rates is not of theoretical importance in intertemporal valuation exercises.

In the setting of CES preferences, Ebert (2003) has shown that the constant elasticity of substitution between a human-made consumption goods and a non-market good is directly and inversely related to the income elasticity of WTP,  $\xi$ , of the non-market good (cf. Baumgärtner et al., 2017). We can accordingly write Equation 6 as:

$$RPC_t = \xi [g_{C_t} - g_{E_t}]. \quad (7)$$

Our empirical approach is subsequently designed to estimate the income elasticity of WTP for a variety of applications. We estimate  $\xi$  at global and regional scales, for a few nations where sufficient data is available, and by specific types of non-market good.

### 3 Empirical strategy

We build on previous work by Jacobsen and Hanley (2009), Heckenhahn and Drupp (2022), Subroy et al. (2019), Richardson and Loomis (2009), and Barrio and Loureiro (2010) to estimate income elasticities of WTP for ecosystem services based non-market valuation studies in the academic literature. Our meta-analysis collects mean WTP and income estimates at the valuation exercise scale. The resulting dataset is then used to estimate income elasticities of WTP and subsequently the elasticity of substitution between ecosystem services and human-made goods (cf. Heckenhahn and Drupp, 2022). In this section, we first discuss the meta-analysis, then the empirical strategy we implement to arrive at estimates of  $\xi$ .

### 3.1 Meta-analysis of mean WTP-income value pairs

The data basis for this study is a meta-analysis of existing WTP studies. In the first phase, we identify potentially relevant non-market valuation studies through a keyword-based search string provided in Appendix A.1 based on the authors' experience and beta testing. To ensure better comparability of ecosystem service valuation estimates, we focus our search on contingent valuation (CV) studies that were published in peer-reviewed, English-language literature since the year 2000. The keyword-based search results in a preliminary data set where each row is a peer-reviewed journal article in which we expect to find relevant contingent valuation-based mean WTP estimates and respondent income data.

The search string employed is intended to cast a wide net. That is, we expect to drop several studies due to irrelevance and informational shortcomings. The data is then evaluated using the exclusion criteria reported in Appendix A.2. After application of the first exclusion criteria—including whether each article has been cited at least once in SCOPUS—2,174 articles remain. The next exclusion criteria step is an abstract screening to check whether the articles potentially report new, contingent valuation-based WTP estimates at all. Strictly theoretical papers as well as reviews, secondary source estimates, and benefits transfer approach (BTA)-focused papers are excluded to avoid double-counting estimates. Naturally, whether we can access the articles is important and rarely proved to be an issue. At this stage, 1,165 studies remain on which to conduct a detailed screening and subsequently data harvesting.

From the data set of 1,165 candidate WTP studies, we selected a random sample of 100 studies as the basis to fine tune key steps in the screening and coding processes and improve consistency between our two independent coders. Each paper is carefully scrutinized for appropriate WTP and income data. A recurring issue is that several papers do not report whether income data is net of taxes or gross income. We have subsequently contacted each paper's corresponding author in search of clarification. The review of each paper and harvesting of relevant data was found to be a particularly time-intensive process. However, we found it easier to first screen for the inclusion of both mean WTP and mean income estimates—or the information necessary to derive such estimates—before harvesting relevant data. We also found that there is an important distinction between contingent valuation estimates presented on a timescale basis versus per-use estimates. Namely, without data on frequency of use at the respondent scale, per-use estimates are not comparable to estimates based on timescales, which is why we chose to set them aside. We then further constrain our data set to peer-reviewed, contingent valuation studies that survey respondents on values based on timescales such as annually, monthly, etc. and convert estimates to an annual scale.

Our main analysis subsequently builds on a random sample of studies surviving our exclusion criteria and containing at least the minimum necessary information—at least one mean WTP estimate and mean respondent income estimate. An unfortunate but necessary result of our focus on comparability is a substantially reduced number of

studies contributing to the end result. Of the 1,165 studies passing the first two rounds of screening, 402 studies containing 861 distinct WTP-income pairs are of use. Table 1 provides summary statistics of our sample.

Table 1: Prepared data set description

Variable	Context	Value
Countries represented	Count	74
Continent	Observations	
North America		101
South America		45
Africa		37
Europe		290
Asia		380
Australia		8
Study year	Mean (s.d.)	2010 (6.7)
Income	Mean annual, 2020 USD (s.d.)	37,793 (38,508)
WTP	Mean annual, 2020 USD (s.d.)	155 (496)
Survey sample size	Mean (s.d.)	608 (810)
Respondent age	Mean (s.d.)	43 (6.5)
Respondent household size	Mean (s.d.)	4.1 (1.5)
Forest-relevant estimates	Share of observations	0.29

*Notes:* s.d. is the standard deviation of the data referenced. Based on N=861 WTP-income pairs contained in 402 unique studies.

### 3.2 Estimation strategy

Our main result is based on a log-log specification of WTP and income values while accounting for the structure of our data, and clustering standard errors at the study level. The basic univariate version of estimation equation is thus given by

$$\ln(WTP_{ij}) = \alpha + \xi \ln(INC_{ij}) + \epsilon_i \quad (8)$$

We suspect a number of covariates might bias the estimated coefficient on income if omitted. These variables would have a direct effect on WTP and as such should be included in the model. For example, populations of different ages may have different preferences impacting their WTP as their lifestyles—and interaction with nature—may differ systematically. We might also expect that people value different types of ecosystem services differently and that different nations—with individual and unique histories—may



systematically differ in their resulting levels of WTP. Importantly, the income (and WTP) is not always consistent on a household level, but sometimes elicited at an individual level. We, therefore, rely as a default on the multivariate estimate that contains controls for these differences across estimates. The model specification then becomes:

$$\ln(WTP_{ij}) = \alpha + \xi \ln(INC_{ij}) + \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k x_{ij} + \epsilon_i \quad (9)$$

where  $\sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k x_{ij}$  is our list of  $n$  covariates. These include potentially relevant factors about the survey environment (survey year, nation or continent), respondent incomes (income and WTP per-person or household, gross or net income), WTP terms (annual, monthly, repeated), and survey methods (elicitation format, data collection method). We also test for different time periods (for example, pre- and post-2010) and for differences between regulating and cultural services as well as differences when estimates are relevant to forests through the use of indicator variables. Interactions, for example, between income and country indicators can also be tested. We also prepared a set of indicator variables for ecosystem service types based on the ecosystem services listed in the Millenium Ecosystem Assessment [MEA \(2005\)](#) framework. These indicators are at the WTP estimate-level as some papers report estimates specific to certain ecosystem service types.

We are interested in arriving at defensible estimates of  $\xi$ , including whether it differs by region and ecosystem service type. Inclusion of covariates supports that effort. As is common practice, we conduct a sensitivity analysis on our coefficient of interest by estimating a large set of models with different variations of covariates included in our main model in Equation 9. So, we estimate an  $2^{13} = 8,192$  versions of our main log-log specification.

As noted, we also estimate the income elasticity of the WTP based on important sub-samples. These include regional, by broad categories of regulating and cultural services, and pre- and post-2010. As study sample size also varies substantially—note a mean sample size of 608 with a standard deviation of 810—the result of alternative observation weights are compared. However, our preferred weighting approach is to apply the square-root of the samples size used at the WTP estimate scale. This implies that we put some weight on sample size but avoid the risk that a few studies with particularly large sample sizes drive our result entirely. In an additional analysis, we investigate numerous specifications that have been used in the literature so far to estimate income elasticity of WTP: From simple OLS, to random effects, (e.g. [Jacobsen and Hanley, 2009](#); [Heckenhahn and Drupp, 2022](#)) fixed effects, to clustered random regression as used here with sample size, inverse of square root of sample size (cf. [Subroy et al., 2019](#)) to our preferred main specification that uses the square root of sample size to weigh estimates.

### 3.3 Growth rates

We next assemble growth rates of ecosystem services to obtain a proxy for a global measure of the shift in the relative scarcity of ecosystem services vis-a-vis human-made goods. These estimates extend and update prior work by (Baumgärtner et al., 2015), who found that ecosystem services have overall declined by half a percent in the last decades. We focus on non-market (and non-rivalrous) ecosystem services, i.e. we do not consider provisioning services but capture regulating and cultural services. In a first step, we update the data sources employed by (Baumgärtner et al., 2015), notably: Forest cover, Living Planet Index (LPI), and IUCN’s Red List Index (RLI). We complement this with two additional measures for regulating services that capture highly salient aspects of environmental quality: air quality regulation and climate regulation. We proxy the former by the negative of changes in PM2.5 emissions, i.e. counting reductions in emission as an improvement in air quality. We proxy for the latter with the change in the 2C global mean temperature budget – the upper target of the UN Paris Agreement. Table 2 shows the individual components, units of measurement, and data sources.

Table 2: Components and data sources for estimates of growth rates

Component	Unit of measurement	Data source
Forest area	Hectare	WorldBank (2023)
Living Planet Index (LPI)	Dimensionless	Zoological Society of London, and WWF 2022
Red List Index (RLI)	Various	IUCN RedList (2023), based on Butchart et al. (2010)
Air quality (mean annual PM2.5)	Micrograms per m <sup>3</sup>	WorldBank (2023)
Climate regulation	Degrees Celsius	NOAA (2023)
GDP per capita	US dollars	WorldBank (2023)

Within regulating (forest, LPI, RLI, PM2.5, temperature) and cultural services (forest, LPI, RLI) as well as aggregate ecosystem services we take the arithmetic mean of relevant individual components. To calculate growth rates, we use the time span with the longest comparable data across all indicators (1993 to 2016) and estimate exponential growth rates, including standard errors. We use the largest standard error of the individual growth rate components – climate for regulating and aggregate services, and the living planet index for cultural services – when aggregating standard errors. Akin to estimating growth rates of ecosystem services, we also estimate the growth rate of global GDP per capita. In contrast to (Baumgärtner et al., 2015), we do not subtract provisioning services, and measure economic growth including its standard error.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>All time series show a clear trend over the time period, except for air quality, which deteriorates from

## 4 Results

We present here estimates of income elasticities of WTP,  $\xi$ , for ecosystem services globally as well as select regions. We also estimate  $\xi$  based on subcategories of ecosystem services as well as different time frames. We subsequently couple the estimates of income elasticities with estimates of good-specific growth rates to compute relative price changes of ecosystem services.

### 4.1 Income elasticity of WTP for ecosystem services

We first estimate the income elasticity of WTP for aggregate ecosystem services on our full sample via univariate regression (Equation 8) and by adding key controls (different permutations of Equation 9). Our univariate result is an estimate of the income elasticity of WTP for ecosystem services of 0.62 (95-CI: 0.41 to 0.84), see Table 3. Adding controls changes the estimate of the income elasticity of WTP to 0.79 (95-CI: 0.60 to 0.97). This change is almost entirely attributable to the inclusion of an indicator of whether the income measure is at the household or individual level. Respondent measures of income potentially overlook the dynamics around household size or multiple streams of income resulting in seemingly more elastic estimates of the income elasticity of willingness to pay for ecosystem services. As such, we select our coefficient from multivariate estimation as our main result. We develop a specification graph to investigate the sensitivity of our estimate to various combinations of control variables. The result of **8,192** alternative specifications represented in Figure 5 of Appendix A.4 and shows that our main univariate estimate falls at the lower end of these alternative specifications.

Our main estimate maps into a mean value for the elasticity of substitutability between ecosystem services and human-made goods of 1.27 (95-CI: 1.03 to 1.66).

Table 3: Income elasticity of WTP for aggregate ecosystem services

Sample	ln(INCOME)	S.E.	N	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>
Univariate	0.62***	0.11	861	0.88
With controls	0.79***	0.09	861	0.89

*Notes:* Choice set of controls including the study year, sample size, income information (gross/net, individual/household), payment type and elicitation method. Significance levels: \* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

Estimates on subsets of aggregate ecosystem services allow us to investigate the extent of heterogeneity. We consider different sub-types of ecosystem services, and potential differences across continents and time frames. Table 4 reports income elasticities of WTP across different sub-types of ecosystem services: regulating and cultural services as well as key sub-categories. Overall, we find little variation in income elasticities,

1990 to 2010 and improves again thereafter. We thus also redo the analysis of growth rates for the time frame from 2010 to 2016.

noting that oftentimes projects valued in CV studies encompass contributions to multiple services. Only the estimate of the income elasticity for recreation and ecotourism is slightly lower—the category closest to being rivalrous. We also split the sample into forest and non-forest ecosystem services as this serves as a key input to our application on natural capital accounting in the CWON framework in Section 5. We find that the income elasticity of forest ecosystem services is slightly higher than the aggregate estimate. We present the univariate and choice set of control estimates alongside key subgroups to be discussed in Figure 1.

Table 4: Heterogeneity of income elasticities of WTP across ecosystem service sub-types


	ln(INCOME)	S.E.	N	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>
Climate regulation	0.80***	0.18	189	0.93
Air quality regulation	0.79***	0.14	258	0.92
Water regulation	0.85***	0.14	287	0.89
Erosion regulation	0.84***	0.12	196	0.86
Regulating Services	0.79***	0.12	542	0.93
Spiritual and religious values	0.84***	0.12	121	0.63
Aesthetic values	0.72***	0.10	424	0.89
Recreation and ecotourism	0.69***	0.16	361	0.85
Biodiversity preservation	0.81***	0.10	392	0.89
Cultural Services	0.73***	0.11	524	0.86
Forest ecosystem services	0.81***	0.13	246	0.87
Non-forest ecosystem services	0.78***	0.12	615	0.89

Notes: Multivariate regressions. Significance levels: \* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

We next divide our sample by the continent in which the hypothetical environmental project to be undertaken was located, and report the results in Table 5. We note that the estimates are mostly concentrated in Asia, followed by Europe, and relatively few estimates from the rest of the world. We note that several studies located in Africa involve day trips and other per-use scenarios and subsequently are excluded from our analysis. In terms of income elasticities, we find lower estimates for North America—as well as less consistency—versus the rest of the world.

We note that the broadest comparable meta-analysis on the income elasticity of WTP (for biodiversity conservation only) was conducted by [Jacobsen and Hanley \(2009\)](#). Their main result was an income elasticity of WTP estimate of 0.38, but published more than a decade ago. It is therefore interesting to investigate how our estimate of the income elasticity of WTP relates in a comparable time frame, as well as in comparison to the most recent decade. In Table 5 we break down the sample by sampling year. We conduct this analysis based on our univariate estimation strategy such that year and other covariates potentially correlated with the two periods are not included. First, we consider estimates from publications based on samples collected up to and including in

Figure 1: Point estimates of the elasticity of WTP from select models.



Notes: Estimates are the coefficients on  $\ln(INCOME)$  from the main and univariate specifications in Table 3 as well as estimates based on subsets of observations on regulating services, and cultural services, and forests using the main model. 95 percent confidence interval estimates are included around the point estimates.

Table 5: Heterogeneity of income elasticities of WTP across continents

	$\ln(INCOME)$	S.E.	N	Adj. $R^2$
North America	0.57*	0.29	101	0.96
South America	-0.34	0.63	45	0.90
Africa	0.78***	0.15	37	0.98
Europe	0.85***	0.15	290	0.81
Asia	0.71***	0.13	380	0.92

Notes: Multivariate regressions. Significance levels: \*  $p < 0.1$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

year 2010, and find a larger income elasticity of 0.89 in our full model with controls. In contrast, the income elasticity based on articles data collected from 2011 onwards is somewhat lower, at 0.74. See Table 6.

## 4.2 Growth rates

Table 7 reports estimates on the growth rates of ecosystem service categories and their standard errors. We present these alongside the growth rate of GDP per capita. Each growth metric is estimated based on data for the years 1993 to 2016. We find substantial heterogeneity in growth rates. The Living Planet Index and climate regulation metrics

Table 6: Heterogeneity of income elasticities of WTP across decades

	ln(INCOME)	S.E.	N	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>
pre-2010	0.89***	0.16	429	0.85
2011-2021	0.74***	0.11	432	0.91

Notes: Multivariate regressions. Significance levels: \* p<0.1, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01

show the largest rates of de-growth, while the change in forest area and air quality metrics show the lowest rates of change.<sup>2</sup> Our estimate of aggregate ecosystem service change is -1.01 percent (CI: -1.34 to -0.68), while GDP per capita has increased by 1.82 percent (CI: 1.78 to 1.86) over the same period. This amounts to a sizable shift in the relative scarcity of ecosystem services vis-a-vis human-made goods. Ecosystem services have become relatively scarcer by 2.83 percent per year (best to worst case scenarios of 2.46 to 3.20 percent).

Table 7: Good-Specific Growth Rates

Indicator	Growth rate (S.E.)
Forest area	-0.11% (0.00%)
Living planet index	-2.84% (0.06%)
Red list index	-0.42% (0.01%)
Air quality (PM2.5)	-0.16% (0.17%)
Climate regulation	-1.50% (0.14%)
Aggregate Ecosystem Services	-1.01% (0.17%)
GDP per capita	1.82% (0.02%)

### 4.3 Relative price changes of ecosystem services

We can now combine the two critical pieces of information – income elasticity and growth rate estimates – to compute relative price changes (RPC) of ecosystem services. Table 8 reports our estimates of relative price changes both in the aggregate and for different ecosystem service categories. Our central estimate for the relative price change of aggregate ecosystem services is 2.23 percent (CI: 1.84 to 2.45). That is, the value of ecosystem services is increasing by around 2.2 percent per year relative to human-made goods. This is 2.4 times (and potentially over 4.2 times) the estimate of  $0.91 \pm 0.35$  percent in Baumgärtner et al. (2015). The RPC estimate for regulating services is only slightly higher than that for cultural ecosystem services, which is qualitatively similar

<sup>2</sup>Results are qualitatively similar when constraining the analysis to the most recent trend data, except for air quality regulation which shows a positive development in the current trend data (2010 to 2016), improving by 1.78% per year. In contrast, the decline rate for climate regulation is more strongly negative. Overall, we find a somewhat smaller rate of de-growth of -0.73 percent for the time period 2010 to 2016.

to what [Heckenhahn and Drupp \(2022\)](#) find for a German case study. While the income elasticity for forest ecosystem services is higher than for ecosystem services on aggregate, the rate of decline of forest area is considerably smaller; in combination, the relative price change of forest ecosystem services (1.57 percent) is smaller than that of aggregate ecosystem services (2.23 percent).

Table 8: Relative Price Changes (RPC) of Ecosystem Services

Sample	$\xi = 1/\sigma$ (S.E.)	$g_C - g_E$ (S.E.)	RPC (C.I.)
Regulating Services	0.79 (0.12)	2.83% (0.17%)	2.24% (1.93% to 2.55%)
Cultural Services	0.73 (0.11)	2.95% (0.09%)	2.15% (1.84% to 2.45%)
Aggregate E.S.	0.79 (0.09)	2.83% (0.17%)	2.23% (1.97% to 2.49%)
Forest E.S.	0.81 (0.13)	1.94% (0.07%)	1.57% (1.25% to 1.88%)

Notes: RPC 95% confidence interval estimates based on  $\xi(g_C - g_E) \pm 1.96 \times \sqrt{\left(\frac{S.E.(\xi)}{\xi}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{S.E.(g_C - g_E)}{g_C - g_E}\right)^2}$ .

## 5 Application to Environmental-Economic Accounting

Relative price adjustments of ecosystem services are relevant for both environmental-economic appraisal and accounting. Here, we explore implications for environmental-economic accounting, considering the Changing Wealth of Nations (CWON) 2021 report by the [World Bank \(2021\)](#) as a prominent case study.

CWON, like most measures of comprehensive wealth, only features natural capital to a limited degree, with the bulk of natural capital components relating to fossil energy resources and other provisioning services that are traded on markets. CWON, however, also considers non-timber forest benefits as part of its natural capital accounting. Non-timber forest benefits are currently estimated to be around 12 percent of the total value of natural capital [World Bank \(2021\)](#). Non-timber ecosystem service values in the year 2018, in WTP per hectare, are based on a meta-regression analysis based on 270 estimates from non-market valuation studies of non-timber forest benefits by ([Siikamäki et al., 2021](#)). Per-hectare values are assumed to be constant over time and only adjusted for inflation by using country-specific GDP deflators ([World Bank, 2021](#)). The capitalized value of non-timber ecosystem services is calculated as the present value of annual services, discounted over a 100 year time horizon at a constant discount rate of 4 percent. This implies that no adjustment for relative price changes is factored in despite forest de-growth, particularly in comparison to GDP per capita. Implicitly, this carries the

assumption that WTP does not increase with income and—in the setting of our model—that ecosystem services are considered perfect substitutes to human-made goods.<sup>3</sup>

We perform relative price change adjustments to the yearly WTP estimates for non-timber forest ecosystem services based on our estimates and compare the adjusted natural capital value to the current CWON approach. We show the results in Figure 2, which depicts the estimated increase in CWON's non-timber forest natural capital value (in %), relative the CWON's current estimate, as a function of the degree of complementarity between forest ecosystem services and human-made goods, measured by the income elasticity of WTP for forest ecosystem services. For instance, Cobb-Douglas substitutability, as the knife-edge case between substitutability and complementarity ( $\sigma = \xi = 1$ ), would imply uplifting the public natural capital value of non-timber forest ecosystem services by 72 percent. In comparison, a prominent assumption in the integrated assessment modelling literature by [Sternier and Persson \(2008\)](#) of an elasticity of substitution of 0.5, and thus a degree of complementarity of 2, would translate into uplifting the public natural capital value by 270 percent.

For our central estimate of relative price changes of forest ecosystem services, we find that the value of non-timber forest natural capital should be uplifted by 52 percent, with a 95 percentile confidence interval around the central estimate of the income elasticity resulting in a range of uplift-factors of 32 to 78 percent (see Figure 2). For comparison, using the relative price change of aggregate ecosystem services, which builds on a slightly lower income elasticity but a much larger difference in growth rates, yields a central uplift-factor for public natural capital of 88 percent.


Considering the limited degree of substitutability and the shifts in relative scarcity by performing relative price adjustment of the annual WTP values in computing the natural capital value of non-timber forest services makes a material difference to natural capital accounting in CWON. The 52 percent increase in non-timber forest value would lead to an increase of the overall natural capital value in CWON of around 6 percent (CI: 3.8 to 8.8 percent). In such a revised natural capital value, the adjusted non-timber forest value would have an elevated contribution of around 17 percent (CI: 15 to 19 percent) instead of the current 12 percent.

---

<sup>3</sup>[Siikamäki et al. \(2021\)](#) report positive and significant GDP elasticities of WTP for recreation and habitat/species conservation, for instance, but these are not considered in the CWON natural capital valuation.



Figure 2: Increase in public natural capital value along the degree of complementarity.



Notes: The red line in this figure shows the estimated increase in The Changin Wealth of Nations' (CWON) non-timber forest natural capital value (in %), relative the CWON's current estimate, as a function of the degree of complementarity between forest ecosystem services and human-made goods, measured by the income elasticity of WTP for forest ecosystem services. The vertical black line indicates the central estimate of the income elasticity of WTP for forest ecosystem services while the grey-shaded area indicates its 95 percentile confidence interval. Horizontal, dashed helplines indicate the corresponding increase in the public natural capital value (in percent).

## 6 Discussion

We discuss our empirical approaches and assumptions in turn, focusing on the estimation of the income elasticity of WTP, as a proxy for the degree of limited substitutability, and the aggregation of ecosystem services and the computation of growth rates.

We identify the degree of complementarity via the income elasticity of WTP for ecosystem services based on a meta-analysis of the peer-reviewed literature. For this, we consider 861 unique (mean) income-WTP pairs across studies and geographical contexts as well as across a 20 year time frame. A number of remarks are in order.

First, our analysis is subject to concerns on the underlying data quality of contingent valuation studies, including hypothetical bias etc., which has been discussed at length in the literature (e.g., [Kling et al., 2012](#)). [Schläpfer \(2008\)](#), for instance, argues that (too) small income effects in contingent valuation studies may be an artefact of anchoring biases, but we are not aware of a clear empirical test of this hypothesis. If this were

the case, we might capture too small income elasticities and thus underestimate the degree of complementarity. This implies that our estimates of the appropriate upward-adjustment of natural capital values may represent a conservative estimate.

Second, besides contingent valuation specific concerns, our approach to identifying the (aggregate) income elasticity of WTP—while building on the state of the art in the literature—is very coarse, and rests on a very heterogeneous, imbalanced panel. Broadly speaking, our new sample contains studies that reflect both methodological refinements that have been introduced over time that have arguably deflated WTP estimates [Barrio and Loureiro \(2010\)](#), and an increasing share of studies from Asia and lower-income countries over time. Ideally, we’d like to identify the income elasticity of WTP based on a sample that is not subject to methodological revisions or major changes in its geographical composition. While a few test-retest investigations exist that draw repeatedly from the same sample (see [Skourtos et al., 2010](#), for an overview), these typically concern shorter time frames and have not been designed to investigate income effects. Evidence to date suggests that mean WTP estimates are relatively constant over time frames of up to 5 years, but that this is not the case for longer time frames ([Skourtos et al., 2010](#)).

Third, our approach of relying on a direct relationship between the income elasticity of WTP and the elasticity of substitution holds under a very common but still very specific assumption on preferences, specifically that preferences are represented by a constant-elasticity-of-substitution (CES) utility function (e.g., [Ebert, 2003](#); [Baumgärtner et al., 2017](#)). We are not aware of systematic studies trying to test the relative goodness-of-fit of CES versus other utility specifications, but note that extensions exist in the applied theoretical literature. One interesting case is an extension of preferences that consider critical thresholds in the form of subsistence needs ([Baumgärtner et al., 2017](#); [Drupp, 2018](#); [Heal, 2009](#)). If there exists some critical level of ecosystem services,  $\bar{E} > 0$ , then the degree of substitutability becomes endogenous to the level of the ecosystem service over and above the critical level, and the equation for the relative price change of ecosystem services is adjusted to (cf. [Drupp, 2018](#)):<sup>4</sup>

$$RPC_t = \xi \left[ g_{C_t} - g_{E_t} \frac{E_t}{E_t - \bar{E}} \right]. \quad (10)$$

Such an extension implies slightly higher relative price changes that increase substantially as one gets close to the critical basic need threshold ([Drupp, 2018](#)). It would lead to an upward revision of the natural capital values adjustment discussed in Section 5.

Finally, we assume that preferences elicited primarily on small scale projects aimed at improving ecosystem service conditions scale up to the global level. However, services may be perceived as complements (substitutes) at the local level, but as substitutes (complements) at a global scale. This issue may be more pronounced when the focus is

---

<sup>4</sup>WTP estimates are typically assumed to be a function of the ecosystem service level themselves ([Baumgärtner et al., 2017](#)). Empirical evidence, however, is mixed—[Barrio and Loureiro \(2010\)](#) and others find, for instance, that WTPs decrease with forest cover, while [Taye et al. \(2021\)](#) find that WTPs increase with forest cover—as it’s often challenging to isolate the pure effect of the level of the ecosystem service.

relatively more on local public goods as compared to global public goods. We cannot directly test for this, but a comparison of the income elasticity of WTP for recreational services versus other services may serve as a proxy for this idea. Indeed, we find that the income elasticity for recreational services is smaller than the estimate for the other ecosystem services, but also that there is more variation around the income elasticity of WTP for recreational services.

We have updated and extended the “*Herculean task*” (Baumgärtner et al., 2015, p. 278) of assembling a proxy for the aggregate growth rates of ecosystem services. There exists no accepted standard for how to aggregate various measures of environmental quality, and also the data sources we draw on have to be considered imperfect proxies themselves. We have followed Baumgärtner et al. (2015) in using the unweighted arithmetic mean of the growth rates for the different types of ecosystem services. This assumes that the elasticity of substitution between different ecosystem services is equal to one (Cobb-Douglas), which implies that WTPs would be the same for all types of ecosystem services if their quantities were similar, an assumption we cannot properly test. We note that there are other conceivable means of aggregation, using different weightings to different degrees of substitutability. We leave a systematic exploration of this issue to future work; the same holds for exploring the role of uncertainty around projecting past growth estimates into the future (Gollier, 2010) as well as the potential convergence of ecosystem service and human-made goods growth rates, as the scarcity and limited substitutability of ecosystem services as intermediate inputs to production may manifest itself as a drag on growth (Zhu et al., 2019).

## 7 Conclusion

We present the largest global database to estimate the degree of complementarity of ecosystem services vis-a-vis human-made goods, via the income elasticities of WTP for ecosystem services, in order to compute relative price changes of ecosystem services. We find relative price changes of ecosystem services of around 2.2 percent per year on aggregate. Relative price changes are smaller (1.57 percent) for forest ecosystem services as these show a slower rate of de-growth as compared to other ecosystem service components. These estimates can be employed to adjust WTP estimates for project appraisal or environmental-economic accounting. In an application on natural capital valuation, taking the Changing Wealth of Nations (CWON) 2021 report by the World Bank (2021) as a case study, we show that adjusting natural capital estimates for non-timber ecosystem services for relative price changes results in uplifting the present value over a 100 year time period by around 50 percent (CI: 32 to 78 percent), materially elevating the role of public natural capital. This echoes work on the importance of limited substitutability in climate policy appraisal (Bastien-Olvera and Moore, 2021; Drupp and Hänsel, 2021; Sterner and Persson, 2008).

The adjustment techniques we present are generally applicable for environmental-economic appraisal and accounting, while the specific numerical inputs, such as on

growth rates, need to be adjusted on a case-by-case basis. Our results suggest that the case for making relative price adjustments is reasonably robust and that more countries and institutions than present ([Groom et al., 2022](#)) may consider making such adjustments to correct the current mis-valuation of non-market goods in appraisal and of public natural capital values in (comprehensive) wealth accounting.

## References

- Barrio, M. and M. L. Loureiro (2010). A meta-analysis of contingent valuation forest studies. *Ecological Economics* 69(5), 1023–1030.
- Bastien-Olvera, B. A. and F. C. Moore (2021). Use and non-use value of nature and the social cost of carbon. *Nature Sustainability* 4(2), 101–108.
- Baumgärtner, S., M. A. Drupp, J. N. Meya, J. M. Munz, and M. F. Quaas (2017). Income inequality and willingness to pay for environmental public goods. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 85, 35–61.
- Baumgärtner, S., M. A. Drupp, and M. F. Quaas (2017). Subsistence, substitutability and sustainability in consumption. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 67(1), 47–66.
- Baumgärtner, S., A. M. Klein, D. Thiel, and K. Winkler (2015). Ramsey discounting of ecosystem services. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 61(2), 273–296.
- Butchart, S. H., M. Walpole, B. Collen, A. Van Strien, J. P. Scharlemann, R. E. Almond, J. E. Baillie, B. Bomhard, C. Brown, J. Bruno, et al. (2010). Global biodiversity: indicators of recent declines. *Science* 328(5982), 1164–1168.
- Cohen, F., C. J. Hepburn, and A. Teytelboym (2019). Is natural capital really substitutable? *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 44, 425–448.
- Dasgupta, P. (2021). The economics of biodiversity and ecosystem services: The dasgupta review.
- Drupp, M. A. (2018). Limits to substitution between ecosystem services and manufactured goods and implications for social discounting. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 69(1), 135–158.
- Drupp, M. A. and M. C. Hänsel (2021). Relative prices and climate policy: How the scarcity of nonmarket goods drives policy evaluation. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 13(1), 168–201.
- Ebert, U. (2003). Environmental goods and the distribution of income. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 25(4), 435–459.
- Gollier, C. (2010). Ecological discounting. *Journal of economic theory* 145(2), 812–829.
- Groom, B., M. Drupp, M. C. Freeman, and F. Nesje (2022). The future, now: A review of social discounting. *Annual Review of Resource Economics*.
- Groom, B. and C. Hepburn (2017). Reflections—looking back at social discounting policy: the influence of papers, presentations, political preconditions, and personalities. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 11(2), 336–356.

- Hanley, N., L. Dupuy, and E. McLaughlin (2015). Genuine savings and sustainability. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 29(4), 779–806.
- Heal, G. (2009). Climate economics: a meta-review and some suggestions for future research. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*.
- Heckenhahn, J. and M. A. Drupp (2022). Relative price changes of ecosystem services: Evidence from Germany. *CESifo Working Paper* (No. 9656).
- Hoel, M. and T. Sterner (2007). Discounting and relative prices. *Climatic Change* 84(3), 265–280.
- IPBES (2019). Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Technical report, Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.
- Jacobsen, J. B. and N. Hanley (2009). Are there income effects on global willingness to pay for biodiversity conservation? *Environmental and Resource Economics* 43(2), 137–160.
- Kling, C. L., D. J. Phaneuf, and J. Zhao (2012). From Exxon to BP: Has some number become better than no number? *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 26(4), 3–26.
- MEA (2005). *Millennium ecosystem assessment*. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.
- Neumayer, E. (2003). *Weak versus strong sustainability: exploring the limits of two opposing paradigms*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Richardson, L. and J. Loomis (2009). The total economic value of threatened, endangered and rare species: an updated meta-analysis. *Ecological Economics* 68(5), 1535–1548.
- Rouhi Rad, M., W. Adamowicz, A. Entem, E. P. Fenichel, and P. Lloyd-Smith (2021). Complementarity (not substitution) between natural and produced capital: Evidence from the Panama Canal expansion. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 8(6), 1115–1146.
- Schläpfer, F. (2008). Contingent valuation: a new perspective. *Ecological Economics* 64(4), 729–740.
- Siikamäki, J., M. Piaggio, N. da Silva, I. Álvarez, and Z. Chu (2021). Global assessment of non-wood forest ecosystem services: A revision of a spatially explicit meta-analysis and benefit transfer.
- Siikamäki, J., F. J. Santiago-Ávila, and P. Vail (2015). Global assessment of non-wood forest ecosystem services. *Spatially Explicit Meta-Analysis and Benefit Transfer to Improve the World Bank's Forest Wealth Database*, 1–97.

- Skourtos, M., A. Kontogianni, and P. Harrison (2010). Reviewing the dynamics of economic values and preferences for ecosystem goods and services. *Biodiversity and conservation* 19(10), 2855–2872.
- Smith, V. K. (2023). Accounting for income inequality in benefit transfers: The importance of the income elasticity of wtp. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 102781.
- Smulders, S. and D. van Soest (2023). Natural capital substitution: Implications for growth, shadow prices, and natural capital accounting. *Mimeo, Tilburg University*.
- Sterner, T. and U. M. Persson (2008). An even sterner review: Introducing relative prices into the discounting debate. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*.
- Subroy, V., A. Gunawardena, M. Polyakov, R. Pandit, and D. J. Pannell (2019). The worth of wildlife: A meta-analysis of global non-market values of threatened species. *Ecological Economics* 164, 106374.
- Taye, F. A., M. V. Folkersen, C. M. Fleming, A. Buckwell, B. Mackey, K. Diwakar, D. Le, S. Hasan, and C. Saint Ange (2021). The economic values of global forest ecosystem services: A meta-analysis. *Ecological Economics* 189, 107145.
- Traeger, C. P. (2011). Sustainability, limited substitutability, and non-constant social discount rates. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 62(2), 215–228.
- Weikard, H.-P. and X. Zhu (2005). Discounting and environmental quality: When should dual rates be used? *Economic Modelling* 22(5), 868–878.
- World Bank, T. (2021). *The Changing Wealth of Nations 2021: Managing Assets for the Future*. The World Bank.
- Zhu, X., S. Smulders, and A. de Zeeuw (2019). Discounting in the presence of scarce ecosystem services. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 98, 102–272.

## Appendix A Selection of relevant valuation studies

### A.1 Search string

Our focus is on values for regulating ecosystem services and cultural ecosystem services (not provisioning services) that have been elicited using the contingent valuation method. The search string has three components (1) focus on ecosystem services, (2) focus on WTP estimates, (3) focus on the contingent valuation method.

( TITLE-ABS-KEY ( environment\* OR natur\* OR ecosystem OR biodiversity OR biologic\* OR ecologic\* OR habitat\* OR forest\* OR species OR protected OR conserv\* OR endangered OR "national park\*" OR landscape\* OR terrestrial OR pollination OR tree\* OR tropic\* OR vegetation OR peatland\* OR grassland\* OR dryland\* OR pastoral OR soil OR animal\* OR bird\* OR wild\* OR air OR water OR aquatic OR marine OR coast\* OR water\* OR fish\* OR wetland\* OR mangrove\* OR reef\* OR marsh\* OR floodplain\* OR river\* OR climate OR storm\* OR erosion OR pest\* OR hazard\* OR recreat\* OR touris\* OR "urban green" OR sacred OR spirit\* OR sanctuary OR "natural heritage" OR aesthetic\* )

AND TITLE-ABS-KEY ( wtp OR willingness-to-pay OR "willingness to pay\*" OR "willing to pay\*" OR "shadow price\*" OR "shadow value\*" OR "implicit price\*" OR "implicit value\*" )

AND TITLE-ABS-KEY ( "contingent valuation\*" OR cvm OR "contingent choice\*" )  
AND ( LIMIT-TO ( SRCTYPE , "j" ) ) AND ( LIMIT-TO ( DOCTYPE , "ar" ) ) AND  
( LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2021 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2020 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2019 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2018 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2017 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2016 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2015 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2014 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2013 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2012 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2011 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2010 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2009 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2008 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2007 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2006 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2005 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2004 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2003 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2002 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2001 ) OR LIMIT-TO ( PUBYEAR , 2000 ) ) AND ( LIMIT-TO ( LANGUAGE , "English" ) )

### A.2 Exclusion criteria

1. Citations: We excluded all studies that had not been cited (in SCOPUS).
2. Abstract screening: We excluded non-topical publications based on abstract-screening that do not report new primary WTP estimates. Specifically, we excluded: Theory, reviews, comments, non-primary valuation (such as benefit transfer), as well as WTPs for non-environmental goods, WTPs for provisioning services, WTPs derived from valuation approaches other than CV
3. PDFs obtainable: We excluded studies where we could not access the PDFs.



4. Paper screening: We excluded non-topical publications based on abstract-screening that do not report new primary WTP estimates. Specifically, we excluded: Theory, reviews, comments, non-primary valuation (such as benefit transfer), as well as WTPs for non-environmental goods, WTPs for provisioning services, WTPs derived from valuation approaches other than CV PLUS XYZ
5. WTP data screening: We excluded papers that reported a median WTP instead of mean WTP.


### **A.3 Inflation and currency conversion**

All monetary values were converted to 2020 US Dollar by first inflating the respective national consumer price index and then applying purchasing-power-parity (PPP) conversion. The relevant year for the inflation of the values was the year of study data collection. When the authors did not provide the study year, we estimate the average lag between study and publication years based on the studies where both pieces of information is available. The difference is approximately 4.0 years on average. We use this to estimate the study year when missing.

### **A.4 Alternative specification results**


This section presents a specification graph that suggests the robustness of our results to the inclusion or exclusion of covariates. We also present results based on alternative statistical models to suggest the robust of our results to model selection.

Figure 3: Income elasticity of WTP estimates based on alternative model specifications.




Notes: Estimates are the result of  $2^{13} = 8,192$  alternative specifications of Equation 9. The main specification is based on Equation 9 which is at the 44th percentile ranking of our income elasticity coefficient estimates from smallest to largest. The 95 percent confidence interval estimates are included and results are plotted from smallest (0.53) to largest (0.87) coefficient estimate on  $\ln(INCOME)$ .

Figure 4: Income elasticity of WTP estimates based on alternative statistical models.



*Notes:* The main result is based on a fixed-effects (FE) model at the study level and weighted by the square root of the sample size. Some frequent alternatives to this approach include unweighted fixed effects and random effects models and weighted and unweighted OLS estimates. While a Hausman test suggests FE model is most appropriate, we provide these alternative estimates.

Figure 5: Income elasticity of WTP estimates by weight selection.



*Notes:* The main result is derived with weights based on the square root of the sample size. Some alternatives that are more or less reasonable are to use the sample size, inverse of the sample size, and inverse of the square root of the sample size. Inverse sample sizes will tend to place more weight on studies with smaller sample sizes and squared sample size weights will tend to bias estimates toward studies with substantially larger samples.