

Utility of ecosystem services to inform regional livestock management: beyond a choice experiment

Leyre Goti¹, Alberto Bernués² and Roberto Ruiz³ ¹Thünen Institute, UPV-EHU; ²CITA; ³Neiker tecnalia Universidad Eu del País Vasco Un

Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea







EAAP- Belfast 2016 S19 - 24516



Ecosystem services of a mountain livestock system

Quantification through a choice experiment

Additional insights from qualitative methods

Ecosystem services of mountain livestock system - Context

Research project OVIPRINT aims at evaluation carbon footprint and ES for management of sheep production systems.

Low input production systems produce a higher carbon footprint per litre of milk, positive externalities (ES) may give a more integral view for management.

Carbon footprint was calculated (see *Batalla et al. 2015*) and management strategies were simulated using a genetic algorithm (*Villalba et al 2015*).

ES quantification was performed through a choice experiment (other case study in Spain see *Bernués et al. 2014*; in Norway *Bernués et al. 2015*).

Quantification through a choice experiment I

The process of setting up a choice experiment to quantify the ecosystem services included also **qualitative processes**.

A *literature review* (>50 refs.) was performed to identify the ES that were present in the area and similar ecosystms. Some additional ES that were discarded included water purification systems, soil and other types of biodiversity (e.g. wolf, birds...).

A review of grey literature and internet sources together with *personal interviews* to identify e.g. number of forest fires, subsidies etc..

A set of *focus groups* including different types of stakeholders, to check the previously identified ES, their knowledge and additional issues.

	FG1	FG2	FG3	FG4
	(Technical)	(Shepards)	(Consumers)	(Ramblers)
Number of participants	12	8	6	6

Quantification through a choice experiment II - ES













Quantification through a choice experiment III



Quantification through a choice experiment IV – Preliminary results

ES	WTP*	%
Landscape	6,6	9,4
Biodiversity	12,4	17,6
Product quality	21,4	30,3
Fire prevention	30,1	42,7
TEV	70,5	100

*Partial WTP in €/ per capita/ year

Additional insights from qualitative methods II

The qualitative methods employed to set up the choice experiment, as the initial literature review provided a list of ES and pointed at issues that affect ES provision.

Focus group of shepards revealed that for the delivery of ES *zonification* may be a key issue. This was also identified in the literature review (e.g. Dubois et al 2015)

Asymmety in the provision and use of ES was also a concern in various focus groups (ramblers, shepards) and also turned up in the previous literature review (see e.g. Jacuet et al 2013)

Additional insights from qualitative methods - Conclusions

A choice experiment brings useful information for management on priorities of stakeholders (e.g. fire prevention) as well as willingness to pay for positive externalities of livestock systems, which should be taken into account when accounting for the negative externalities.

Further exploring the outputs of the choice experiment set up process (literature review, focus groups...) allows to identify issues that are influencing the availability of ES, as zonification, coordination and symmetry .

Thank you for your attention

The research was funded by: Marie Curie FP7-PEOPLE-2011 IEF, Contract no. 299794 (European Commission) and INIA-RTA2011-00133-C02-02 (Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness, Government of Aragón and FEDER)

