

Monetary valuation of human impacts on the natural capital

Bengt Steen, Environmental System Analysis, Chalmers University of Technology

A shift towards sustainable and just economies can hardly be managed without quantified monetary values of environmental impacts. A logical consequence of the Brundtland definition of sustainable development, is that the natural capital that we leave to the next generation must not decrease. A good indicator for the environmental aspect of sustainable development is therefore **the cost to preserve the natural capital, or a compensation to people who carry the consequences of the decreased capital**. The EPS methodology for valuing impacts was developed during the 1990ies and are based on these principles. It has been updated several times to account for new knowledge. The last update was published 2020. That update also included an adaption to the new ISO standard on monetary valuation of environmental impacts, ISO 14008.



The value of damage to the natural capital is equal to the costs to restore or preserve environmental goods or to compensate for loss and disability



Methodology

The EPS methodology, used for assessing monetary values of environmental impacts from economic activity includes five steps.

1. Define what is to be sustained. In this case it is human welfare, and thus the present satisfiers for human basic needs, i.e. air, food, water, wood, climate, fossil and mineral resources. These are called environmental goods.
2. Define indicators of human impacts on the environmental goods, e.g. crop loss
3. Chose a valuation methodology and use it for assessing monetary values of indicator units. We have chosen to use costs to prevent or restore environmental change or market values if the change is temporary.
4. Determine the monetary values of impacts caused by each emission and resource use. This is done by quantifying impact factors for all significant mechanisms for impacts on environmental goods. Adding them up results in monetary values for all environmental impacts from an emission or resource use.
5. Determine the monetary value of impacts from a product or service. This is done by using LCA methodology to determine how much of different emissions and resource flows there are and multiplying with their monetary values.

Results

Examples of damage cost from impacts on environmental goods

| Environmental good | Impact indicator | Unit | Monetary impact value (€) | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| | | | Best estimate | Uncertainty |
| Production capacity of crops | Decreased productioncapacity | kg | 0.263 | 1.24 |
| Production capacity for meat | Decreased productioncapacity | kg | 2.35 | 1.32 |
| Production capacity for fish | Decreased productioncapacity | kg | 2.2 | 1.3 |
| Production capacity for wood | Decreased productioncapacity | m3 | 65.5 | 1.2 |
| Biodiversity, global | Share of threat to redlisted species | dimensionless | 6.92E+10 | 1.5 |
| Production capacity for drinking water | Decreased productioncapacity | m3 | 1.7 | 2.26 |
| Clean air, clean water, uncontaminated food, and good climate | Years of lost life expectancy, YLL | personyear | 9.73E+04 | 1.3 |
| Clean air, clean water, uncontaminated food, and good climate | Working capacity | personhour | 27.3 | 1.25 |
| Clean air, clean water, uncontaminated food, and good climate | Undernutrition | personyear | 5840 | 1.1 |
| Clean air, clean water, uncontaminated food, and good climate | Diarrhea | personyear | 10220 | 1.5 |
| Clean air, clean water, uncontaminated food, and good climate | Malaria episodes | personyear | 18590 | 1.1 |
| Clean air, clean water, uncontaminated food, and good climate | Gravation of angina pectoris | personyear | 5840 | 1.5 |
| Clean air, clean water, uncontaminated food, and good climate | Cardiovascular disease personyear | personyear | 9734 | 2.4 |
| Clean air, clean water, uncontaminated food, and good climate | Infarcts personyear | personyear | 7995 | 1.3 |
| Clean air, clean water, uncontaminated food, and good climate | Asthma cases | personyear | 4185 | 2 |

Examples of damage cost from emissions

| Emission | Receiving media | Unit | Monetary impact value, € |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------|--------------------------|
| Carbon dioxide, CO2 | air | kg | 2.88E-01 |
| Carbon monoxide, CO | air | kg | 1.08E+00 |
| Nitrogen oxides, NOx | air | kg, as NO2 | -2.37E+01 |
| Nitrous oxide, N2O | air | kg | 7.67E+01 |
| Ammonia, NH3 | air | kg | -4.34E+01 |
| Sulphur oxides, SOx | air | kg | -8.45E+00 |
| Hydrogen Fluoride | air | kg | -6.64E+00 |
| Hydrogen Chloride | air | kg | -6.80E+00 |
| Hydrogen Sulphide | air | kg | -1.97E+01 |
| PM2.5 | air | kg | 2.32E+02 |

Examples of damage costs from processing materials

| Material or process | Unit | Monetary impact cost, €/unit | | | | | Landfill, municipal | Landfill, (C&D) |
|-------------------------|--------|------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| | | Production | Incineration | Energy recovery | Material recycling | Composting | | |
| Cement | kg | 0.276 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Glass | kg | 0.418 | 0 | 0 | -0.335 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steel coil | kg | 2.16 | 0 | 0 | -0.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stainless steel | kg | 14.1 | 0 | 0 | -11.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Aluminium | kg | 3.27 | 0 | 0 | -2.62 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Corrugated board | kg | 0.352 | 0.0003 | -0.412 | -0.106 | 0.0047 | 1.33 | 1.33 |
| Polypropylene, PP | kg | 1.37 | 0.905 | -0.373 | -1.05 | 0.00905 | 0.0726 | 0.0726 |
| Polyurethane foam, PU | kg | 3.47 | -0.00808 | -0.691 | 0 | 0.00693 | -0.0076 | -0.0076 |
| Cotton&Polyester, 50/50 | kg | 2.96 | 0.565 | 0.0692 | -0.888 | 0.155 | 1.76 | 1.76 |
| Heavy truck transport | ton km | 0.0579 | | | | | | |
| Ship | ton km | -0.000716 | | | | | | |
| Light duty vehicle | ton km | 0.271 | | | | | | |

Further reading

Bengt Steen, Monetary valuation of environmental impacts – Models and data. CRC press, 2019

<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9780429430237>

Steen, B and Rydberg T, EPS weighting factors, version 2020d, Report nr 2020:6 From the Swedish Lifecycle Center, Chalmers University of technology, 2020.