Proceeding Paper

The Value of Recreational Ecosystem Services in India [†]

Muniyandi Balasubramanian

Centre for Ecological Economics and Natural Resources, Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore 560 072, India; balasmku@gmail.com

† Presented at the 1st International Electronic Conference on Forests—Forests for a Better Future: Sustainability, Innovation, Interdisciplinarity, 15–30 November 2020; Available online: https://iecf2020.sciforum.net.

Abstract: Forest ecosystem services have played a vital role in human well-being. Particularly, recreational ecosystem services are creating physical and mental well-being for human beings. Therefore, the main objective of the paper is to estimate the economic value of recreational ecosystem services provides by recreational sites such as Nandi Hills and Nagarhole National Park based on the individual travel cost method in Karnataka, India. This study has used a random sampling method for 300 tourist visitors to recreational sites. The present study has also estimated the consumer surplus of the visitors. The results of the study have found that (i) economic value of two creational sites has been estimated at US $323.05 million, (ii) the consumer surplus has been estimated for Nandi Hills at US $7.45 and Nagarhole National Park at US $3.16. The main implication of the study is to design the entry fees for the recreational site and sustainable utilization of recreational ecosystem services for the present and future generations.

Keywords: forest; ecosystem services; travel cost method; India

1. Introduction

Forests provide a number of ecosystem services to human beings [1–4]. Forest ecosystem services are classified by four major types such as provisioning services (wild foods, raw materials, etc.), regulating services (climate regulation and weather, etc.), cultural services (spiritual and recreational services), and supporting services (habitat services) [3]. Forest ecosystem services have provided a vital benefit for, for instance, poverty reduction [5–7] and environmental benefits [8–11]. Forest ecosystem services have also contributed to household income for the forest depended communities [12–14]. Cultural ecosystem services have played a vital role in human well-being (see Table 1). However, the 28% income earned from forest in the developing countries. Further, forest ecosystem services have provided recreational ecosystem services [15]. Recreational ecosystem services have been described as the nonmaterial benefits people obtain from ecosystems through spiritual enrichment, cognitive development, reflection, recreation, and aesthetic experience [3]. Recreational ecosystem services have a strong association between human–nature interaction [16] However, there are a number of studies have been estimated the economic value of ecosystem services in India for example, the economic value and stock of six tiger reserves at US $128 million to US $271 million and US $344 million to US $10.08 billion, respectively [17]. The value of ecosystem services has provided US $13–148 million based on various economic valuation methods for the Nagarhole National Park in Karnataka [4]. The value of recreational ecosystem services at US $167,619 and the value of carbon sequestration at US $63.6 million for the Corbett Tiger Reserve [18]. The economic value of recreation services at Rs 4.4 million provided by Lalbagh botanical garden based on the travel cost method [19]. Moreover, considering that India accounts for a major global biological diversity, ecosystems like forests, wetlands etc., provide a larger number of benefits to human beings. However, the existing economic growth models being followed the world over have increasingly led to the degradation of ecosystems and

their valuable services. Therefore, there is a need for a larger number of economic valuation studies for a better understanding of the importance of ecosystem services, as well as sustainable use of ecological resources. Moreover, most of the studies focus mainly on the tangible benefits of very few ecosystem services.

Table 1. Cultural ecosystem services and related goods and services.

Cultural Ecosystem Services	Examples of Related Goods and Services
Opportunities for recreation and tourism	Hiking, camping, nature walks, jogging, winter sports, wild watching, horse riding, hunting, etc.
Aesthetic values	Enjoyment of rural, unique and colorful landscapes, individual habitats and species, and tranquility supporting mental well-being.
Inspiration for the art, science, and technology	Writing, painting, design, documentaries, movies, engineering materials, and architecture
Information for education and research	Education trips by schools and other groups; employee training; research related to ecosystem function, publications and patents.
Spiritual and religious experience	Natural and built sacred places, philosophy and faith; support to mental well-being.
Cultural identify and heritage	Landscape and habitats formed by human activities, species of spiritual importance, traditional and indigenous knowledge

Source: [3,20,21].

The recent global studies on the value of recreational ecosystem services, for example, the value of Amazon forest ecosystem services at US $68.47 to US $822.76 million that includes the value of nuts, rubber, timber, livestock, energy, CO_2 sequestration, etc. [22]. The value of ecosystem services provided by the Andassa watershed of the Upper Blue Nile basin of Ethiopia has been estimated at US 22.58×10^6 in 2000 [23]. The economic value of 11 ecosystem services in China has been estimated at US $5.63 trillion for 2010. Among the 11 ecosystem services, regulating ecosystem services has contributed the highest value at 71% in the respect of China [24]. In the India context, a number of studies have estimated the value of recreational ecosystem services, based on the travel cost method and contingent valuation method. The economic value of recreational ecosystem services has been estimated at US $0.41 million, based on willingness to pay method for the Nagarhole National Park in Karnataka [4]. Further, the economic value of recreation ecosystem services provided by Little Rann Kachchh has been estimated at US $4.6 million, based on individual travel cost and contingent valuation method [25]. On the other side the value of recreational services, based on secondary data, has been estimated at US $6.5 million for the PeriyarTiger Reserve in Kerala [17]. The Corbett Tiger Reserve accounts for the economic value of recreational services at US $167,619, based on the individual travel cost method [26]. The recreational value of coastal and marine ecosystem services, based on the zonal travel cost method, has been estimated at US $531 billion for 2012-13 [27]. Furthermore, some studies have estimated the value of urban park recreational services. For example, the value of recreation services provided by Lal Bagh botanical garden based on the individual travel cost method has been estimated at Rs 4.4 million [19]. There are studies that have dealt with the valuation of recreational sites in Karnataka. The recreational value has estimated the protected areas of Western Ghats [28] based on the travel cost method the average consumer surplus per visit Rs. 290. A similar study carried out in the valley of a national park shows that the net recreational benefit was Rs. 588,332, and the average consumer surplus Rs. 194.68 [29]. The total recreation value of Dandeli wildlife sanctuary using the travel cost method for 2004-05has been estimated atRs. 37,142.86 per Sq. km, and the total value of Rs. 17,643,600 [30].

Most of the Indian studies has estimated consumer surplus for recreational sites, for instance, consumer surplus for the domestic visitors at Rs 227 and foreign visitors at Rs 1384 for Nagarhole National Park in Karnataka [4]. Jala and Nandagiri (2015) calculated consumer surplus at Rs 238 for Pilikula Lake in Karnataka. Further, the value of consumer surplus has been estiamted at the US $2.5 for Corbett Tiger Reserve in Uttarakhand [18]. The value consumer surplus for the four tiger reserves in India. Among the four tiger reserves, Kanha Tiger Reserve (KTR) has the highest consumer surplus value at approximately Rs 2558, while Kaziranga Tiger Reserve has the second highest consumer surplus

at about Rs 187. Third and fourth place were occupied by Periyar Tiger Reserve and Corbett Tiger Reserve with consumer surplus estimated at about Rs 147.38 to Rs 161.32 and Rs 150, respectively [31]. The economic value of consumer surplus for three protected areas such as BiligiriRangaswamy Temple Wildlife Sanctuary (Rs 38.24), Bannerghatta National Park (Rs 191.73), and Nagarhole National Park (Rs 557.33) per visit to the recreational site [32]

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Area

Karnataka has been a number of economic valuation studies conducted with respect to protected areas, but there is no economic value of recreational services study Nandi Hills. Nandi Hills are an old hill fortress or evergreen forest patch at the top ofthe Chikkaballapur district of Karnataka. It is 10 km away from Chikkaballapur town and approximately 60 km away from the city of Bangalore. Bangalore is home to a number of private companies with people from differentparts of the country, and working there exhausts them and so, on weekends, people like to visit different places in and around Bangalore, andNandi Hills is one suchnatural outdoor recreation place. Moreover, it is close to Bangalore, and hence many people visit it during weekends, as a quick getaway from their routine life. The Department of Horticulture is maintaining the hill top and climate with several plant species introduced across an experimental garden, a large-scale exotic botanical garden (140 acres), music stage (three-and-a-half-acre), food court, and temple. The hills are very rich in fauna, making this location popular for birdwatchers and bird photographers. The climate during winter is the best, with the hill top covered with dense attracting and people to visit, and also this place is home to many migrant bird species (ex. Warblers, flycatchers), such as Nilgiri woodpigeon and some species of Western Ghats (Uropeltid snakes, malbar whistling thrush). The hill slopes are home to endemic species of peninsular India (yellow-throated bulbul). Nandi Hills is one of the best places for hiking as well as trekking for beginners. Tourists come from various parts of Bangalore, the surrounding districts, and other states for viewing the unique nature of the hill. Second, Nagarhole National Park is located in the Kodagu and Mysore districts in Karnataka. There are more number of visitors has been visited to the park during the week days and weekend days.

2.2. Data Collection

In order to estimate the economic value of recreational ecosystem services being provided by the Nandi Hills and Nagarhole National Park, we undertook a field survey in December 2019 for obtaining empirical data on the number of visits, travel expenditures, and other socio-economic variables. The field data collection was undertaken through in-person interviews (Nandi Hills, n = 150 and Nagarhole National Park, n = 150) of individuals who were randomly selected near the entrance or inside the Nandi Hills and Nagarhole National Park.However, this study did not cover any foreign tourists due to their unavailability in the recreation site during the study period.

2.3. Data Analysis

2.3.1. Travel Cost Method

The purpose of this study is to estimate the recreational benefit of Nandi Hills and Nagarhole National Park, using travel cost method (TCM). TCM is used to calculate the value of some goods or services that cannot be obtained through market prices such as forest parks, ecosystems, beaches, etc. The economic value is measured purely based on people's preferences. Thus, the theory of economic valuation is based on individual preferences and choices. People express their preferences through choices and trade-offs that they make, given certain constraints, such as those related to income or time availability (Ecosystem Valuation, 2013). Travel cost method was first introduced by Hotelling in 1947

for valuation of protected areas [33], and TCM is one of the best valuation methods for estimating the economic value of recreational ecosystem services [34]. Travel cost method is defined by a 'trip-generating function', and this study has used the following formula by [35]:

$$V = f(C, X) \tag{1}$$

V is the number of visits to the site, C is the visitor cost, and X is the other socio-economic indicators that are considerably described in V. Travel cost method has defined the independent variables (V) as the number of visits made by each visitor to a national park or wildlife sanctuary or any other recreational site over a specific period. The number of visits to the Nandi Hills has been estimated based on the time and cost incurred on travelling to the hill. The time and costs of travel vary from visitor to visitor depending on the point of origin. The value of a site also depends on how many people are willing to pay to visit that place. It is called revealed preference method, because the actual behavior and choices are used to account for the environmental values.

2.3.2. Econometric Model

The travel cost method makes the evaluation of individual preferences for expenditure on non-market goods possible. The travel cost method uses the cost of travelling to a non-priced entertaining location in order to presume the recreational benefits provided by the site [36]. The present study interviewed 300 visitors to the Nandi Hills and Nagarhole National Park. A basic econometric model used in this study shows the number of visitors is the independent variable to Nandi Hills and NagarholeNatioal Park as functional factors such as travel cost, age, residential location, household income, age, residential local, household income, household size, educational status, and quality of the park. Hence, the trip-generating functions for the entire datasets are described below.

$$r_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{ travel cost} + \beta_2 \text{ age} + \beta_3 \text{ residential location} \\ + \beta_4 \text{ household income} + \beta_5 \text{ household size} \\ + \beta_6 \text{educational status} + \beta_7 \text{ quality of the park} + e_i$$

where r_i is the dependent variable that stands for the number of visits by the ith individual to Nandi Hills and Nagarhole National Park per period of time; *travel cost* denotes the round trip total cost of an individual's residence to and from the site, and includes the opportunity cost of travel time and stay at the park.

2.3.3. Consumer Surplus

Consumer surplus has been described as "the difference between the total travel costs incurred by a visitor to a tourist site and the highest amount the visitor is willing to pay to make a visit to the site" [37]. The consumer surplus has been obtained [38].

$$Consumer\ Surplus = \frac{-1}{\beta_{TC}}$$

The total annual recreational value of the site can be estimated by multiplying the individual consumer surplus with the total number of visits during the year.

$CS = \frac{-1}{\beta_{TC}}$ × total number of visitors per year to the recreational site.

3. Results and Discussion

This section highlights the results and discussion. The result of the study is found that young age respondents more often visit the recreational site. In addition, the two study areas such as the National Park and Nandi Hills have received many young visitors. Further, this study has estimated that the university level educated respondents have a higher number of visits compared to other levels of education. Furthermore, 65 percent of

respondents are earning Rs 25,000 to Rs 50,000, and married respondents created a higher number of visits to the recreational site (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Socio-economic status of tourist respondents.

	Nagarhole National Park	Nandi Hills
Age		
18–40	78	66.66
41–60	20	29.33
Above 60	1.3	4
Education		
Illiterate	1.3	6
Primary	2	18
Secondary	24.7	70
University level	72	5.33
Household Income		
Rs 10,000–Rs 25,000	13.3	14.7
Rs 25,000–Rs 50,000	78.7	47.3
Rs 50,000–Rs 75,000	8	38
Rs 75,000 and above	0	0
Marital Status		
Single	8.1	44.67
Married	86.7	54
Widow	0	1.3
Household Size		
2 to 5	80	75.3
6 to 10	17.3	20
Above 10	2.7	5.7

Source: Author's estimates.

Figure 1 highlights that respondent's willingness to pay for visiting to the parks. The tourist visitors are ready to pay from Rs 10 to the above Rs 500 for visiting the recreational sites. Nagarohle National Park has received the highest willingness to pay compared to the Nandi Hills in Karnataka. Figure 1 shows that 80 percent of tourist visitors are ready to willing pay more than Rs 500 and above for visiting the Nagarhole National Park. Moreover, 25 percent of the visitors are ready to willing to pay between Rs 100 to Rs 150, and 48 percent of the visitors are willing to pay Rs 10 to Rs 50 for the Nandi Hills. This figure clearly shows that a few tourist respondents are ready to pay the range between Rs 250 to Rs 350 visiting to the recreational sites. Overall, this study has found the visitors' average willingness to pay in the range between Rs 150 to Rs 200 to both the Nagarhole National Park and Nandi Hills in Karnataka. Figure 2 highlights the frequency of visits to the recreational site, the minimum one visit, and maximum more than visits. Seventy-five percent and 65 percent of the respondents have visited the Nagarhole National Park and Nandi Hills once, respectively. Twenty-five percent of the tourist visitors are visiting at least two times to the recreational sites. Moreover, less than 10 percent of the tourist respondents are visiting three to four times to the tourist areas. Further, less than 5 percent of the respondents are visiting more than five times to the recreational sites.

Figure 1. Respondent's willingness to pay. Source: Author's estimates.

Figure 2. Frequency of visits to the site. Source: Author's estimate.

Table 3 highlights the regression results of the individual travel cost method for both the recreational sites in Karnataka. Travel cost is significant and negatively correlated. Table 3 indicates that one percent increase in the travel cost has impacts on 1.7 percent decrease in the number of trips for Nagarhole National Park and 3 percent decrease in the Nandi Hills trips, respectively. Age and number of trips are statistically significant and negatively correlated, old age people have less visits to the recreational site compared to the young age respondents. Residential locations and visiting to the recreational site are statistically significant, and a one percent increase in the distance impacts on 1.9 percent and 1.7 percent Nagarhole National Park and Nandi Hills. In addition, household income is statistically significant with the number of trips, for example, one percent increases in respondent's income impact on 2 percent increase number of visits to the Nagarhole National Park and Nandi Hills in Karnataka. In addition, household size, marital status, quality of the park, and educational status are not statistically significant, but positively correlated with the recreational site. Table 4 shows the consumer surplus and economic value of the two recreational sites for Nagarhole National Park and Nandi Hills. The consumer surplus has been estimated for Nagarhole National Park at Rs 247 and Nandi Hills at Rs 557, respectively. In addition, the economic value of NNP has been estimated at 55.8 million and 2.47 billion for the Nandi Hills.

Table 3. Regression results of recreational values of Nagarhole National Park (NNP) and Nandi Hills.

Variables	Coefficient t-Statistics) NNP	Coefficient (t-Statistics) Nandi Hills
Intercept	0.980	1.823
	(2.761)	(4.037)
Travel Cost	-1.014×10^{-5}	−0.247
	(−1.716) **	(−3.074) ***
Age	−0.009	−0.175
	(−2.136) **	(−2.212) **
Marital Status	0.113	0.431
	(1.110)	(2.301)
Household size	0.060	0.049
	(1.264)	(2.386)
Educational status	−0.017	0.983
	(−1.285)	(2.487)
Residential location	0.139	0.140
	(1.969) **	(1.750) *
Household Income	3.880×10^{-6}	0.149
	(2.108) **	(1.846) *
Quality of the park	−0.47	−0.32
	(−1.258)	(−1.130)
R^2	14.0	12.9
F-Statistics	2.837	2.273

Note: ***, **, * denote significance at 1%, 5%, 10% levels, respectively.

Table 4. Economic value of recreational ecosystem services in Nandi Hills and Nagarhole National Park.

Components	Nandi Hills Value in (Rs)	Nagarhole National Park
Individual Average Consumer Surplus	Rs 247	Rs 557.33
Total Economic Benefits	Rs. 2.47 billion	Rs 55.8 million

Source: Author's estimate based on primary survey.

The result of the study has found that (i) economic value of two creational sites has been estimated at US $323.05 million, (ii) the consumer surplus has been estimated for Nandi Hills at US $7.45 and Nagarhole National Park at US $3.16. Similar results have found that the various recreational sites, for example, the value of tourism 525 million euros in the six German national parks based on travel cost method [39]. An economic value of recreational ecosystem services has been estimated at $AUD 3.3 billion per year provided by New South Wales in south-eastern Australia [33]. Further, the value of recreational ecosystem services has been estimated at US $31.8 million for McKenzie Lake, Fraser Island based on travel cost method [40]. Economic value of Gold Cost beaches has been estimated at US $500 million per year based on travel cost method for Australia [41]. The value of recreational ecosystem services provided by Coorong, Australia has been estimated at US $30.5 per year [42]. The value of recreational benefits has been estimated at 359 to 574 euro per visit to the Marine Nature Reserve (MNR) in the United Kingdom [43]. Economic value of the Poseidon temple in Sounio, Greece has been estimated at 1.5–24.5 million per year based on travel cost method [44].

In India, there are a number of studies that have investigated the value of recreational ecosystem services for national parks and wildlife sanctuaries. For instance, the value of recreational ecosystem services at Rs 773.45 million for the Kaziranga National Park based on travel cost method [45]. The economic value of Nagarhole National Park, especially recreational ecosystem services, has been estimated at US $0.41 million, based on willingness to pay method [4]. The economic value of recreation ecosystem services provided by Little Rann Kachchh has been estimated at US $4.6 million, based on individual travel cost

and contingent valuation method [25]. On the other side, the value of recreational services, based on secondary data, has been estimated at US $6.5 million for PeriyarTiger Reserve in Kerala [17]. The Corbett Tiger Reserve accounts for the economic value of recreational services at US $167,619, based on the individual travel cost method [46]. The recreational value of coastal and marine ecosystem services, based on the zonal travel cost method, has been estimated at US $531 billion for 2012–2013 [27]. Whereas, the economic value of Dachigam National Park in Jammu and Kashmir, based on the travel cost method, has been estimated at US $4.5 million. Furthermore, some studies have estimated the value of urban park recreational services. For example, the value of recreation services provided by Lal Bagh botanical garden based on the individual travel cost method has been estimated at Rs 4.4 million [19]. There are studies that have dealt with the valuation of recreational sites in Karnataka. The recreational value in respect of the protected site of Western Ghats [28] based on the relationship between travel cost and visitation rate and willingness to pay, has been estimated at Rs. 26.7 per visitor, and the average consumer surplus per visit Rs. 290. A similar study carried out in the valley of a national park shows the net recreational benefit at Rs. 588,332, and the average consumer surplus at Rs. 194.68 [29]. The total recreation value of Dandeli wildlife sanctuary using the travel cost method for 2004-2005 has been estimated at Rs. 37,142.86 per Sq. km, and a total value of Rs. 17,643,600 [30]. Similarly, a study based on the willingness to pay for the preservation of watershed in Karnataka indicates a value of Rs.125.45 per hectare, and a total value of Rs. 480 million (for 2004–2005). Further, [32] estimated the value of recreational ecosystem services based on individual travel cost method for BilgiriRangaswamy Temple Wildlife Sanctuary (Rs 3.8 million), Nagarhole National Park (Rs 55.8 million), and Bannerghatta National Park (Rs 19 million) for Karnataka.

4. Conclusions

Recreational ecosystem services play vital roles towards human well-being. Most of the developing and developed people are more interested in tourism and recreation. Recreational ecosystem services have an important role in the mental and physical well-being of people. However, recreational ecosystem services have created a larger number of economic and employment opportunities for local people. The present study has estimated the value of recreational ecosystem services for two recreational sites such as Nagarhole National Park and Nandi Hills in Karnataka based on the Individual Travel Cost Method (ITCM). In addition, this study has also estimated the consumer surplus for the two recreational sites. This study has estimated that (i) the economic value of two creational sites at US $323.05 million, and (ii) the consumer surplus for Nandi Hills at US $7.45 and Nagarhole National Park at US $3.16. The main policy implication of the study is to design (1) land use and land cover policy, (2) designing entry fees for the various protected areas for sustainable tourism, and (3) achieving sustainable development goals (SDGs) at the local level.

References

1. Costanza, R.; d'Arge, R.; De Groot, R.; Farber, S.; Grasso, M.; Hannon, B.; Limburg, K.; Naeem, S.; O'neill, R.V.; Paruelo, J.; et al. The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature* **1997**, *387*, 253–260.
2. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Board. *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Wetlands and Water Synthesis*; Island Press: Washington, DC, USA, 2005.
3. Pascual, U.; Muradian, R.; Brander, L.; Gómez-Baggethun, E.; Martín-López, B.; Verma, M.; Armsworth, P.; Christie, M.; Cornelissen, H.; Eppink, F.; et al. The economics of valuing ecosystem services and biodiversity. In *Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Ecological and Economic Foundations*; Routledge: Oxfordshire, UK, 2010; pp. 183–256.
4. Ninan, K.N.; Kontoleon, A. Valuing forest ecosystem services and disservices—Case study of a protected area in India. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **2016**, *20*, 1–14.
5. Masiero, M.; Pettenella, D.; Boscolo, M.; Kanti Barua, S.; Animon, I.; Matta, R. *Valuing Forest Ecosystem Services: A Training Manual for Planners and Project Developers*; Food and Agriculture Organization of The United Nations: Rome, Italy, 2019.
6. Cheng, B.; Li, H.; Yue, S.; Huang, K. A conceptual decision-making for the ecological base flow of rivers considering the economic value of ecosystem services of rivers in water shortage area of Northwest China. *J. Hydrol.* **2019**, *578*, 124126.

7.   Wunder, S.; Börner, J.; Shively, G.; Wyman, M. Safety nets, gap filling and forests: A global-comparative perspective. *World Dev.* **2014**, *64*, S29–S42.

8.   Jenkins, M.; Schaap, B. Forest Ecosystem Services. In Proceedings of the United Nations Forum on Forests, New York, NY, USA, 26–30 April 2021.

9.   Di Girolami, E.; Arts, B. *Environmental Impacts of Forest Certifications*; Forest and Nature Conservation Policy Group, Wageningen University and Research: Wageningen, The Netherlands, 2018.

10.   Pearce, D.W. The Economic Value of Forest Ecosystems. *Ecosyst. Health* **2001**, *7*, 284–296.

11.   Mori, A.S.; Lertzman, K.P.; Gustafsson, L. Biodiversity and ecosystem services in forest ecosystems: A research agenda for applied forest ecology. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **2017**, *54*, 12–27.

12.   Angelsen, A.; Wunder, S. *Exploring the Forest—Poverty Link*; CIFOR Occasional Paper No. 40; Center for International Forestry Research: Bogor, Indonesia, 2003; pp. 1–20.

13.   Shackleton, C.; Shackleton, S. The importance of non-timber forest products in rural livelihood security and as safety nets: A review of evidence from South Africa. *S. Afr. J. Sci.* **2004**, *100*, 658–664.

14.   Paumgarten, F. The role of non-timber forest products as safety-nets: A review of evidence with a focus on South Africa. *Geo-Journal* **2005**, *64*, 189–197.

15.   Angelsen, A.; Jagger, P.; Babigumira, R.; Belcher, B.; Hogarth, N.J.; Bauch, S.; Börner, J.; Smith-Hall, C.; Wunder, S. Environmental income and rural livelihoods: A global-comparative analysis. *World Dev.* **2014**, *64*, S12–S28.

16.   Moon, K.; Blackman, D. A guide to understanding social science research for natural scientists. *Conserv. Biol.* **2014**, *28*, 1167–1177.

17.   Verma, M.; Negandhi, D.; Khanna, C.; Edgaonkar, A.; David, A.; Kadekodi, G.; Costanza, R.; Gopal, R.; Bonal, B.S.; Yadav, S.P.; et al. Making the hidden visible: Economic valuation of tiger reserves in India. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **2017**, *26*, 236–244.

18.   Badola, R.; Hussain, S.A.; Mishra, B.K.; Konthoujam, B.; Thapliyal, S.; Dhakate, P.M. An assessment of ecosystem services of Corbett Tiger Reserve, India. *Environment* **2010**, *30*, 320–329.

19.   Balasubramanian, M. *Economics of Urban Ecosystem Services: A Case Study of Bangalore, Monograph*; Institute for Social and Economic Change: Bangalore, India, 2017.

20.   Gantioler, S.; D'Amato, D. Cultural services and related goods. In *Social and Economic Benefits of Protected Areas: An Assessment Guide*; Earthscan Publishers: London, UK, 2013.

21.   De Groot, R.S.; Alkemade, R.; Braat, L.; Hein, L.; Willemen, L. Challenges in integrating the concept of ecosystem services and values in landscape planning, management and decision making. *Ecol. Complex.* **2010**, *7*, 260–272.

22.   Strand, J.; Soares-Filho, B.; Costa, M.H.; Oliveira, U.; Ribeiro, S.C.; Pires, G.F.; Olieria, A.; Rajao, R.; May, P.; Van de Hoff, R.; et al. Spatially explicit valuation of the Brazilian Amazon Forest's Ecosystem Services. *Nat. Sustain.* **2018**, *1*, 657–664.

23.   Gashaw, T.; Tulu, T.; Argaw, M.; Worqlul, A.W.; Tolessa, T.; Kindu, M. Estimating the impacts of land use/land cover changes on Ecosystem Service Values: The case of the Andassa watershed in the Upper Blue Nile basin of Ethiopia. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **2018**, *31*, 219–228.

24.   Xie, G.; Zhang, C.; Zhen, L.; Zhang, L. Dynamic changes in the value of China's ecosystem services. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **2017**, *26*, 146–154.

25.   Dixit, A.M.; Bandyopadhyaya, S.; Kumar, L.; Bedamatta, S. *Economic Valuation of Landscape Level Wetland Ecosystem and Its Services in Little Rann of Kachchh, Gujarat*; The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity India Initiative, GIZ India; Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH: Bonn/Eschborn, Germany, 2016; p. 160.

26.   Badola, R. People and protected areas in India. *Unsalvya* **1999**, *199*, 12–15.

27.   Mukhopadhyay, P.; Da Costa, V. *Recreational Value of Coastal and Marine Ecosystems in India: A Partial Estimate*; Working Paper 124; Madras School of Economics: Tamil Nadu, India, 2015.

28.   Mohandas, T.V.; Remadevi, O.K. A study on tourist visitations in protected areas of Central Western Ghats in Karnataka. *Indian For.* **2011**, *137*, 403–410.

29.   Gera, M.; Yadav, A.K.; Bisht, N.S.; Giresh, M. Valuation of recreational benefits from Valley of Flowers National Park. *Indian For.* **2008**, *134*, 26–35.

30.   Panchamukhi, P.R.; Trivedi, P.; SKumar, A.; Sharma, P. *National Resource Accounting in Karnataka: A Case Study of the Land & Forestry Sector (Excluding Mining)*; Central Statistical Organisation, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India: New Delhi, India, 2008.

31.   Khanna, C.; Singh, R.; David, A.; Edgaonkar, A.; Negandhi, D.; Verma, M.; Costanza, R.; Kadekodi, G. *Economic Valuation of Tiger Reserves in India a Value + Approach*; Indian Institute of Forest Management: Madhya Pradesh, India, 2015.

32.   Balasubramanian, M. Valuation of Ecosystem Services and their implications for accounting for natural capital in Karnataka. *Aarthika Charche FPI J. Econ. Gov.* **2020**, *5*, 59–72.

33.   Heagney, E.C.; Rose, J.M.; Ardeshiri, A.; Kovac, M. The economic value of tourism and recreation acrossa large protected area network. *Land Use Policy* **2019**, *88*, 104084.

34.   Anderson, D.M. Estimating the economic value of ice climbing in Hyalite Canyon: An application of travel cost count data models that account for excess zeors. *J. Environ. Manag.* **2010**, *91*, 1012–1020.

35.   Bateman, I.J.; Binner, A.; Day, B.; Fezzi, C.; Rusby, A.; Smith, G.; Welters, R. *United Kingdom: Paying for Ecosystem Services in the Public and Private Sectors*; Island Press: Washington, DC, USA, 2019.

36.   Khan, H. *Demand for Eco-Tourism: Estimating Recreational Benefits from the Margalla Hills National Park in Northern Pakistan*; Working Paper No 5-04; SANDEE: Kathmandu, Nepal, 2004.
37.   Timah, P.N. *Non-Market Valuation of Beach Recreation Using the Travel Cost Method (TCM) in the Context of the Developing World*; Department of Economics, Saint Louis University: Uppsala, Sweden, 2011.
38.   Gillespie, M.A.; Wratten, S.D. The role of ecosystem disservices in pest management. In *Environmental Pest Management: Challenges for Agronomists, Ecologists, Economists and Policymakers*; John Weily and Sons Ltd.: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2017; pp. 175–194.
39.   Mayer, M.; Woltering, M. Assessing and valuing the recreational ecosystem services of Germany's national parks using travel cost models. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **2018**, *31*, 371–386.
40.   Fleming, C.M.; Cook, A. The recreational value of Lake McKenzie, Fraser Island: An application of the travel cost method. *Tour. Manag.* **2008**, *29*, 1197–1205.
41.   Zhang, W.; Ricketts, T.H.; Kremen, C.; Carney, K.; Swinton, S.M. Ecosystem services and dis-services to agriculture. *Ecol. Econ.* **2007**, *64*, 253–260.
42.   Rolfe, J.; Dyack, B. Valuing recreation in the Coorong, Australia, with travel cost and contingent behaviour models. *Econ. Rec.* **2011**, *87*, 282–293.
43.   Chae, D.R.; Wattage, P.; Pascoe, S. Recreational benefits from a marine protected area: A travel cost analysis of Lundy. *Tour. Manag.* **2012**, *33*, 971–977.
44.   Tourkolias, C.; Skiada, T.; Mirasgedis, S.; Diakoulaki, D. Application of the travel cost method for the valuation of the Poseidon temple in Sounio, Greece. *J. Cult. Herit.* **2015**, *16*, 567–574.
45.   Bharali, A.; Mazumder, R. Application of travel cost method to assess the pricing policy of public parks: The case of Kaziranga National Park. *J. Reg. Dev. Plan.* **2012**, *1*, 44–52.
46.   Balasubramanian, M. Economic Value of Regulating Ecosystem Services: A Comprehensive at the Global Review. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* **2019**, *191*, 616.