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**Background**

The rationale for developing the database of value estimates was to provide an input to policy appraisal. Specifically, the database was set up so as to provide where possible not only a range of *total* values for a biome on a per hectare basis but also, where data are available, values *disaggregated on the basis of ecosystem services* [ESSs]. This set-up was applied so as to facilitate the application of the Ecosystem Approach. A further benefit of this disaggregation is that it allows policy-makers to determine which of the ESSs are pertinent to their particular policy perspective.

We pre-suppose that the objective of the policy-maker using this database is to find a monetary value for the benefits of conserving a particular habitat. However the decision as to whether to choose conservation versus the extractive alternative depends on a number of factors, some of which are linked to the nature of individual ESSs. The database-user may thus decide to *filter* the values outputted.

**Filtering for appropriate data points**

Some of the filters that might be considered are set out below and the database-interface has been set up to facilitate filtering. Once a biome is selected, the total number of available data points/value estimates will be presented. This is important in that filtering only really works if there are sufficient data points for the biome in question. At each stage below the number of studies pertaining to each choice are presented to the user.

The TEEB Valuation Database can be found on website of the Ecosystem Service Partnership (URL: http://www.es-partnership.org/esp/80763/5/0/50). At this moment a simple version of the database is available for users to select relevant values and case studies. All values in the TEEB Valuation Database are made available and all variables can be used to filter the values. Because the present version of the database is not suitable for an online and interactive filter not all features described below are available at this moment. For example the step-wise and multiple selection procedure is not possible, even though the data is well structured.

*Locally-derived ESSs versus globally derived ESSs*

After the user has determined the biome to be considered, a choice presented is between (i) ESSs for which benefits are in the main locally-derived benefits, (ii) ESSs that are in the main globally-derived and finally (iii) ESSs that are local and global in nature, i.e. all ESSs. Links are provided to provide definitions and explanations for the different ESSs to allow the user to select./de-select options.

The reason for allowing this first stage of filtering is that policy-makers might want to focus on ESSs that benefit local people *and local people alone*. This does not imply that these policy-makers do not care about global benefits, only that they might look to global donor agencies to fund the positive global externality.

 *Tourism*

There is enormous variability in the value estimates per hectare and one of the reasons for this is that some sites are valued based in part on tourism revenues. Thus the choice presented pertains to whether values that either (i) include leisure and tourism as an ESS or (ii) exclude it are a better match for the choice the policy-maker is seeking valuation estimates for. It would be appropriate to pick (i) if there is the *potential* for tourism activity.

 *Protected Area designation*

Many of the data points in the valuation database pertain to protected areas (PAs). Although values derived outside PAs might be useful for analysis within PAs, the filtering allows the user to select only these PA data points. Again, it would be appropriate to pick PA if a policy-maker is considering the establishment of a PA.

 *High income/low income*

There is evidence from meta-analyses carried out in the environmental economics literature that studies carried out in higher income countries realise a higher value estimate on average. Thus a broad high-income/low-income choice is offered.

The user can define which of these filters (if any) to apply. The output at the end of this process is presented in one of two ways: (i) a global map showing the location of the study sites which provide values, given the choices made; (ii) a value range. The value range is likely to be more reliable but the end-user may decide to choose one or two individual values from specific geographical regions.

**Appropriate use of the findings**

The database of environmental values for biomes and ESSs within these biomes is one of the most extensive database of its kind. All values within the database have been screened with respect to the methodological integrity applied in the primary literature sources. Notwithstanding this, caution must be applied in using the values revealed in searches owing to the inherent limitations of benefits transfer (see Chapter 5). The results are intended to provide an *indicative* value, not *the* value. Even a primary valuation study cannot offer a precise value for a non-traded ESS, and benefits transfer adds an additional layer of abstraction.

Where the outputs may be particularly useful in the policy debate is in considering the relative value of different ESSs. So even if (say) we do not have a reliable, precise value for ‘water purification’ we can assess broadly how valuable it is as an ESS relative to others.