

Warsaw University
Warsaw Ecological Economics Center

FOREST NON-MARKET VALUATION STUDIES IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC, HUNGARY AND POLAND: A REVIEW

Anna Bartczak

bartczak@wne.uw.edu.pl

Presentation structure

- History of non-market valuation studies in the CE countries & some general information concerning forest and forestry in those countries
- An investigation of forest non-market valuation studies based on the report <u>"An instrument for</u> <u>assessing quality of environmental valuation</u> <u>studies"</u>, <u>Swedish Environmental Protection</u> <u>Agency</u>
 - TCM studies
 - CVM studies
- Conclusions



WARSAW UNIVERSITY Warsaw Ecological Economics Center

Non-market valuation studies in the Central European Countries

- <u>History</u> beginning of non-market valuation studies in the mid 1990s
- Research centres carrying out non-market valuation studies – one or a few depending on a country
- Number of non-market valuation studies up to 18 in any particular country
- <u>CE countries with the highest number of non-market</u> valuation studies: the Czech Republic, Poland & Hungary



Non-market valuation studies in the Czech, Hungary & Poland*

| Country | Studies | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|-----|--|--|--|--|
| Country | Research areas | Methods | No. | | | | |
| The Czech Repub. | air quality (2), forest (2) , flood protection (1), landscape (3), national park (1), waste management (1), drinking water quality (2), surface water quality (1); human health (2); VOSL (3) | BT(1); CE(1), ABM(1);CVM(13) TCM(2) | 18 | | | | |
| Hungary | air quality (1), forest (1), national park (1), nature conservation-caves (1), nature conservation-Danube (1), waste management (2), water quality (4); VOSL (1) | BT(3); CVM(9); HPM(1);TCM(2) | 12 | | | | |
| Poland | air quality (2), cultural heritage (1); forest (3) , national parks (2), drinking water quality (2), sea water quality (1), surface water quality (2), wetland (1), VOSL (2) | BT(1); CE(1) CVM(9); HPM(2) TCM (5) | 16 | | | | |

* without VOT studies

WARSAW UNIVERSITY Warsaw Ecological Economics Center

General information on forests and forestry in: the Czech Repub., Hungary & Poland

| | Country | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|------------|-------------|--|--|
| Characteristics | The Czech Repub. | Hungary | Poland | | |
| Share of forests area | 33% | 20% | 29% | | |
| Predominant forest type | mixed | coniferous | broadleaved | | |
| Average age | around 60 years | | | | |
| Share of public forests | 84% | 60% | 83% | | |
| Access to forests | unlimited and free of charge independently of the ownership structure | | | | |



Warsaw Ecological Economics Center

Non-market forest valuation studies in the Czech Repub., Hungary & Poland – background information (1)

- Number of surveys carried out : 6
 - Czech (2),
 - Hungarian (1),
 - Polish (3).
- Source of financing:
 - various ministries (Czech),
 - State Forest Enterprise (Poland),
 - WWF (Poland),
 - no funds (Hungary, Poland).



Warsaw University Warsaw Ecological Economics Center

Non-market forest valuation studies in the Czech Repub., Hungary & Poland – background information (2)

- Objects:
 - single-site (4):
 - ✤ Forest in the Jizerske hory Mountains (CR) (1)
 - ✤ Gemenc floodplain forest (Hungary) (1)
 - Białowieża primeval forest (Poland) (2)
 - multiple-site (2):
 - 10 selected forests covering various ecosystems and have different conservation regimes, ownership structures and geographical locations (Poland) – (1)
- Methods:
 - ✤ TCM (4),
 - ✤ CVM (3).



TCM studies: background information

| Country | THE CZECH REPUB. | POLAND | | | |
|---------------------------|--|------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| Author | Melichar, J. | Zięzio, J. | Giergiczny,M. | Bartczak, A. | |
| Timing of data collection | September – October 2005 | April – September 2003 | April – June 2003 | October November 2005 | |
| Estimated value | 1. recreational 2. Δ in a site quality (3 scenarios) | recreational | recreational | recreational | |
| Number of sites | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 | |
| Target population | ? | Poles and foreigners | all adult Poles | all adult Poles | |
| Frame population | forest visitors | forest visitors | forest visitors | forests visitors representative sample of adult Poles | |

Warsaw Ecological Economics Center

TCM studies: sampling & data collection

| l | | | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Country | THE CZECH REPUBL. | | POLAND | | | |
| Author | Melichar, J. | Zięzio, J. | Giergiczny M | Bartczak, A. | | |
| Data | primary | primary | secondary | primary | | |
| Data collection | on-site one-topic survey | on-site one-topic survey | | on-site one-topic survey respondents homes routine survey of the polling agency | | |
| Sampling | random sample of visitors | random sar | mple of visitors | random sample of visitors quota sample representative for a country | | |
| Sample size | 1. 312 2. 1248 | 1012 | 583 | 1.N=1002 2.N=1005 | | |
| Method of interviews | face-to-face | face-to-face | | face-to-face | | |
| Interviewers | trained students | trained students | | professional polling agency | | |
| 51114 - | | | | | | |



TCM studies: pre-testing & methodology

| Country | THE CZECH REPUB. | POLAND | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Author | Melichar, J. | Zięzio, J. | Giergiczny,M. | Bartczak, A. | |
| Pre-testing | focus groups in-depth interviews pilot studies | | | _ | |
| Cost components | transport, accommodation | transport, accommodation, travel time | transport, travel time* | transport, travel time*, time on site* | |
| Multidesti- nation trips | assumption: all trips are a one destination trips | assumption: all trips are a one destination trip | assumption: all trips are a one destination trip | stated weights to a visit in a forest | |
| Substitutes | travel costs to substitutes counted but not included in the v.f. | - | | existence of substitutes included in the v.f (dummy variable) | |

*VOT estimated in CE or CV survay



TCM studies: models & estimations (1)

| Country | THE CZECH REPUBL. | | POLAND | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Author | Melichar, J. | Zięzio, J. | Giergiczny,M. | Bartczak, A. | | |
| Wealfare's measure | NCS | travel expenses | NCS | NCS | | |
| Model | Single site count model. 1-truncated Poisson regression. | - | ZTCM Countinous model | Multiple Site count model. 1-truncated Poisson regression | | |
| Valuation function (v.f.) | $\lambda_{ij} = \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij} + \beta_2 p_{ij} + \beta_3 q_j)$ $\Pr(y_n y_n > 0) = \frac{e^{-\lambda_n \lambda^y n - 1}}{(y_n - 1)!}$ | $V = N \cdot AC$ | $\lambda_{ij} = \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij} + \beta_2 p_{ij})$ | $\lambda_{ij} = \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij} + \beta_2 p_{ij})$ $\Pr(y_n y_n > 0) = \frac{e^{-\lambda_n \lambda^y n - 1}}{(y_n - 1)!}$ | | |
| Explanatory power of v.f. | 1.log-likelihood 17 763 2. log-likelihood 64 386 | - | adjusted R ² =0.81 | log-likelihood 39 584 | | |
| % of excluded observation | | 0 | 9% (foreign visitors) | 6% (visitors with no recreational purpose of a trip and visits longer than 1 day) | | |

Warsaw Ecological Economics Center

TCM studies: models & estimations (2)

| Country | THE CZECH REPUB. | POLAND | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Author | Melichar, J. | Zięzio, J. | Giergiczny,M. | Bartczak, A. | |
| Non-visitors | - | - | Taken into account | Taken into account | |
| Results | 1)11.58 Euro per visit per visitor 2)∆ in quality =35.25 Euro per visitor per year | Total annual recreational value = 4.1 mIn Euro | Total annual recreational value = 2.9 mln Euro Total recreational value = 73.6 mln Euro (r=2%) | <u>Visitors</u> : 22.84 Euro per vist per person <u>All</u> : 2118 Euro/ha per year | |
| Confidence interval (c.i.) for the coefficient of the travel cost variable | 1) β_2 =-0.0029 95% C.I.= [-0.0031; -0.0028] 2) β_2 =-0.0028 95% C.I.= [-0.0029; -0.0027] | _ | β ₂ =-0.00896 95% C.I.= [-0.0115; -0.0065] | β ₂ =-0.01102 95% C.I.= [-0.0115; -0.0105] | |



WARSAW UNIVERSITY Warsaw Ecological Economics Center

TCM studies: veryfication

| Country | THE CZECH REPUB. | POLAND | | | |
|-------------------------|--|------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Author | Melichar, J. | Zięzio, J. | Giergiczny,M. | Bartczak, A. | |
| Sensitivity analysis | NB vs. Poisson model | _ | - | NB vs. Poisson model | |
| Validity tests | debriefing questions for respondents and interviewees | _ | - | comparison with CVM results | |
| Non- responses | - | - | | 07 | |



Warsaw University Warsaw Ecological Economics Center

CVM studies: backgroung information

| Country | THE CZECH REPUB. | | | HUNGARY | POLAND |
|---------------------------------|--|------|------|---|---|
| Author | Šišak L., Pulkráb K., Kalivoda V. | | | Nagypál N., Szlávik J. | Bartczak, A. |
| Timing of data collection | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | January-April 2002 | 1.October 2.November 2005 |
| Estimated value | recreational | | | the total economic value | recreational |
| Number of sites | national level | | | 1 | 10 |
| Target population | all adult Czechs | | | ? | all adult Poles |
| Frame population | representative sample of adult Czechs | | | representative sample of local population | forest visitors representative sample of adult Poles |



CVM studies: sampling & data collection

| Country | THE C | ZECH RE | PUB. | HUNGARY | POL | AND | |
|-------------------------|---|--------------|--------|---|--|--|--|
| Author | Šišak L, Pulkráb K., Kalivoda V | | | Nagypál N., Szlávik J. | Bartcz | Bartczak, A. | |
| Data | | primary | | primary | prin | nary | |
| Data collection | routine survey of the polling agency Multi-topic survey | | | respondents homes, public places one-topic survey | 2. responde routine su | on-site one-topic survey respondents homes routine survey of the polling agency | |
| Sampling | quota sample representative for a country | | | quota sample representative for a local population | random s visitors quota sar represent country | 100 | |
| Sample size | 856 | 991 | 1461 | 300 | 1.N=501 2. 1005 | 1.N=501 2. 1005 | |
| Method of interviews | face-to-face | | | face-to-face | face-to-face | | |
| Interviewers | professio | onal polling | agency | one of the authors and her friends and relatives | | sional agency | |



CVM studies: pre-testing & scenario

| Country | THE (| CZECH REPUB. | HUNGARY | POL | AND |
|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| Author | Šišak L, Pi | ulkráb K., Kalivoda V | Nagypál N., Szlávik J. | Bartcz | zak, A. |
| Pre-testing | | - | - | consultation forestry exp | |
| Scenario | | _ | description of current quality of the forest | presenting costs connected with keeping forests as a recreational place | |
| Payment vehicle | entrance fee to a private forest | entrance fee | annual payment not specified a form nor a recipient | to a loca | e fee paid al forest nent body |
| % of non- responses for valuation quest. | 19% | 0% | no information | 0% | 0% |
| % of protesters | not defined | | 9% | 50% | 38% |



CVM studies: WTP

| Country | THE CZECH REPUB. | | | HUNGARY | POLAND | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-----|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Author | Šišak L, Pulkráb K., Kalivoda V | | | Nagypál N., Szlávik J. | Bartcz | zak, A. | |
| WTP/WTA | WTP | | | WTP | W | WTP | |
| Question format | С | pen-ended | d | open-ended | payment card | single bounded DC | |
| Protesters | - | | | excluded from an estimation | excluded from an estimation | | |
| % zero WTP | 68% | 68% | 65% | 44% | 20% | 8% | |



CVM studies: models

| Country | THE CZECH REPUB. | HUNGARY | POLAND |
|---------|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| Author | Šišak L, Pulkráb K., Kalivoda V | Nagypál N., Szlávik J. | Bartczak, A. |
| Method | non-parametric | non-parametric | parametric |
| Model | _ | _ | a Spike model |



Warsaw University Warsaw Ecological Economics Center

CVM studies: results

| Country | THE CZECH REPB. | | | HUNGARY | POLAND | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Author | Šišak L, Pulkráb K., Kalivoda V | | | Nagypál N., Szlávik J. | Bartczak, A. | |
| Results | 0.09 Euro per person per visit | 0.23 Euro per person per visit | 0.95 Euro per person per visit | 12 Euro per person per year | <u>Visitors</u> : 0.72 Euro per person per visit (st.error 0.05) <u>All</u> : 64 Euro/ha per year | Visitors: 4.68 Euro per person per visit (st. error 0.32) <u>All</u> : 334 Euro/ha per year |
| % of WTP in net income | - | - | - | - | <u>Visitors</u> : 0.1% | <u>Visitors</u> : 0.7% |



CVM studies: veryfication

| Country | CZECH | HUNGARY | POLAND | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| Author | Šišak L, Pulkráb K., Kalivoda V | Nagypál N., Szlávik J. | Bartczak, A. | | |
| Sensitivity analysis | | _ | minimum legal WTP: 0.64 Euro per visitor per visit | non-parametric estimation (Kaplan- Meier estimator): 3.56 Euro per visit -an anchoring effect: acceptance of lowest bid 98% acceptance of highest bid 33% | |
| Validity tests | - | - | comparison with results achieved by TCM | | |
| Non- <mark>responses</mark> | - | - | | | |



Conclusions (1)

- Short history of non-market valuation studies in transition economies, a small number of such studies, decision makers are not aware or not interested in carrying them out
- Most of forest non-market valuation studies did not involve the stage of testing the scenarios and questionnaires, payment vehicle or bids in CV surveys (mostly due to financial constrains).
- In some surveys a target sample has not been defined
- In the majority of TCM studies non homogeneous visits were taken into account (mixing one day visits with multi-day visits).
- Only in one case the value of time spent on the recreation site was included in the cost component.
- In the majority of TCM studies it was assumed that the trips have a single goal
- In some surveys some elementary methodological mistakes appeared such as assuming that the value of recreation equals travel expenses



Warsaw Ecological Economics Center

Conclusions (2)

- The scenarios in CVM studies (if any) were not convincing or realistic. In most of those studies a payment vehicle was not precisely defined. Both of these factors caused a high number of protest answers. In one out of 3 CVM studies the share of protesters was not investigated.
- The size of the sample in two CVM studies after excluding protesters was below 500, which could influence the reliability of their findings
- In almost all studies authors avoided estimation of the total value and the problem of discounting connected with it
- All surveys suffer from lack of sufficient sensitivity and validity analysis.

