



HAL
open science

Willingness to pay for mangrove preservation in Xuan Thuy National Park, Vietnam: do household knowledge and interest play a role?

Hung Trung Vo, Thanh Viet Nguyen, Michel Simioni

► To cite this version:

Hung Trung Vo, Thanh Viet Nguyen, Michel Simioni. Willingness to pay for mangrove preservation in Xuan Thuy National Park, Vietnam: do household knowledge and interest play a role?. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy*, 2020, 9 (4), pp.402-420. 10.1080/21606544.2020.1716854 . hal-02624828

HAL Id: hal-02624828

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02624828>

Submitted on 26 May 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Willingness to pay for mangrove preservation in Xuan Thuy National Park, Vietnam: Do household knowledge and interest play a role?

Journal:	<i>Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy</i>
Manuscript ID	TEEP-2019-0055.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Mangrove preservation, Double-bounded discrete choice, Contingent valuation, Xuan Thuy National Park

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Willingness to pay for mangrove preservation in Xuan Thuy National Park, Vietnam: Do household knowledge and interest play a role?

December 16, 2019

Abstract

Xuan Thuy National Park, a special nature reserve with mangrove swamps located in the Red River Delta in North Vietnam, plays an important role in combating coastal erosion and provides a habitat for many endangered bird species. Nevertheless, this wetland faces a dual threat from human development pressures and from natural hazards. This study applied double-bounded dichotomous choice contingent valuation method to directly estimate how much locals are willing to pay for mangrove conservation at Xuan Thuy National Park in the context of climate change. In particular, the technique was used to provide better assess to the non-use value of biodiversity and ecosystem support of mangroves. Survey respondents from 350 households in the buffer zone were presented with a hypothetical scenario describing a policy that quantifies the environmental change to be achieved by 2030, and specifying a lump sum payment. Non-parametric estimate of mean WTP was found at 511,090 VND per household (22.03 USD) whereas parametric estimate of mean WTP derived from the log-logistic specification was found at 619,908 VND (26.73 USD) per household. Awareness of mangrove benefit and interest in conservation activities have a positive impact on WTP responses, in addition to income. The findings will help policy-makers adopt sound environmental policies and advise locals on the importance of protecting

the mangroves which in turn protect their livelihoods.

Keywords: Mangrove preservation, Environmental services valuation, Contingent valuation, Double-bounded discrete choice, Xuan Thuy National Park, Vietnam.

JEL Classifications: Q51, Q57, 013

1 Introduction

While mangrove forests represent a small proportion of the world forests, researchers have placed them among the most important ecosystems on earth (Barbier and Sathirathai, 2004; Barbier, 2011). Mangroves typically grow in tidal coasts and act as a natural buffer zone against flooding, erosion (Prance and Tomlinson, 1987; Blanco et al., 2012). Mangroves serve as nurseries in a vital food source for marine life while providing critical habitat for endangered species (Polidoro et al., 2010). The leaf litter of mangroves accumulates in the root where it forms a carbon reserve fifty times larger than that captured by a tropical forest (Cummings and Shah, 2018). **Mangroves also support local livelihoods via provisioning services such as food, water, timber, fiber, or genetic resources (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005).** However, the world's mangroves are found disappearing at an alarming rate, three to four times faster than land-based forests during the past 30 years due to flawed developmental activities (McNally et al., 2011). Since the mid 1900s, between 20% and 35% mangrove forests have been lost worldwide (Polidoro et al., 2010).

Around 34-42% of the world mangrove forests are located in Southeast Asia, the world's largest area of mangroves (Giesen et al., 2007). Vietnam is a tropical country with a coastline of 3,260 kilometers (Quang Tuan et al., 2017). 78% of mangroves are located in the Mekong Delta, the southern end of Vietnam and 28% of mangroves remain in the Red River Delta, in northern Vietnam (Tuan, 2016). The mangrove forests of Vietnam were reported to decline dramatically from around 400,000 hectares in 1943 to 157,500 hectares in 2005 (McNally et al., 2011). The main cause of mangrove degradation in Vietnam included the use of herbicides during the Vietnam wars from 1945 to 1975 and shrimp aquaculture, which boomed since the mid 80s (Beresnev and Broadhead, 2016; Ha et al., 2012; Lan, 2013).

1
2
3
4
5 The removal of mangrove ecosystems has had far-reaching economic, social and environmen-
6 tal impacts. Vietnam faces annual monsoon and heavy inland flooding (Francisco, 2008). As
7 sea level rises due to climate change, the impact of the annual floods has increased over recent
8 decades. Many regions have also suffered severe soil erosion. In Kien Giang Province, as well as
9 the Mekong Delta, active and severe erosion was observed, with a coastal retreat of around 25
10 metres per year at the examined site (McNally et al., 2011). Therefore, Vietnamese authorities
11 with international assistance have implemented several major development projects to promote
12 investment in coastal ecosystems for sustainable development and build resilience in coastal com-
13 munities. These projects involved rehabilitating mangrove areas through the development of
14 nurseries and planting activities. Special nature reserves were designed to protect the mangroves
15 and wildlife. Furthermore, understanding the environmental and economic value of mangroves is
16 crucial to preserving them. Environmental valuation is a tool used to estimate a marketable price
17 for the quality of services natural ecosystems provided in the absence of a market (Champ et al.,
18 2017). The main purpose of environmental valuation is to find best alternatives that can put the
19 resources needed to maintain a good environment for human benefit.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Our study focuses on recognizing the values of ecosystem services in mangrove forests in Xuan
33 Thuy National Park (XTNP) at the Ba Lat estuary, Nam Dinh province. This typical wetland is
34 selected as the study site because of its international importance as habitat for several endangered
35 bird species. This wetland also brings great economic worth to local community **by supporting**
36 **local livelihoods via provisioning services such as fish and timber**, posing trade-offs between short-
37 term economic gains and long-term ecological, non-use benefits. Hence, a scientific assessment
38 of the economic value of mangrove forests is critical to systematic resource management. The
39 Contingent valuation Method (CVM) (Carson and Hanemann, 2005) is used to determine the
40 economic value of mangrove forests and examine factors influencing willingness-to-pay (WTP)
41 for the conservation of the mangroves and biodiversity in XTNP. CVM has been used in a number
42 of studies in Vietnam dealing with the water quality degradation in the Mekong Delta due to
43 pesticide (Phuong and Gopalakrishnan, 2003), flood prevention program (Navrud et al., 2012),
44 viral load testing among HIV-positive patients (Nguyen et al., 2017), conservation of the northern
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 yellow-cheeked gibbon in the Bach Ma National Park (An et al., 2018), etc. Only a few studies
6 were interested in the economic valuation of mangrove ecosystem in this country. For instance,
7 Tuan et al. (2014) used CVM with single bounded discrete choice (SBDC) question to show that
8 the mean WTP per household was estimated at 146,700 VND per year for mangrove restoration
9 of Thi Nai lagoon, Binh Dinh province. Factors significantly affecting household WTP were
10 housing condition and attitude of locals toward future climate scenarios. However, WTP was not
11 significantly affected by most socioeconomic or subjective characteristics of the respondents. The
12 lack of perception indicators of respondents regarding mangroves ecosystem could result in biased
13 estimation of their WTP because mangroves play an essential role for local livelihoods. The study
14 conducted by Pham et al. (2018) was the first one that explored the perceptions of respondents
15 towards mangroves as significant predictors of their WTP for mangrove conservation in the
16 Cat Ba Biosphere Reserve. Apart from socio-demographic indicators such as gender, education
17 level, occupation, other explanatory variables influencing the WTP include respondents' volunteer
18 experience in mangrove conservation activities and attitudes toward climate change impacts. The
19 estimation using the single bounded CVM yielded a mean WTP of 192,780 VND per household.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32 Our study aims to contribute first to the literature on economic valuation of mangrove ecosys-
33 tems in Vietnam by using double-bounded discrete choice (DBDC) question. Responses to a
34 SBDC question only reveal if each respondent's WTP value is less than ("no" response) or
35 greater than ("yes" response) the bid amount they received. In a DBDC question, respondents
36 randomly receive an initial bid. If they answer "yes" to the initial bid amount, they receive a higher
37 bid; if they answer "no," they receive a lower bid amount. The DBDC question is a repeated
38 dichotomous choice where a response is required for every bid amount, which is essentially a
39 payment card where respondents indicate their WTP each bid amount, not just the maximum
40 they would pay. This alternative specification of dichotomous-choice questions was proposed to
41 increase estimation efficiency by Hanemann et al. (1991). Compared to SBDC question, adding
42 additional bid amounts in DBDC question reduces the range into which the unobserved values
43 reside. To our knowledge, our study is the first one that relies on DBDC CVM to examine how
44 socio-economic, demographic and subjective characteristics of respondents influence their WTP
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 for mangrove restoration in Vietnam.

6
7 The second contribution of our study is to introduce questions about how respondents eval-
8 uate the causes of mangrove degradation and perceive the potential benefits occurring from its
9 restoration. **Our study provide more detail information on perceptions of respondents compared to**
10 the recent paper of Pham et al. (2018) which showed the importance of introducing perceptions
11 of respondents towards mangroves when assessing significant predictors of WTP for mangrove
12 restoration. Therefore, by proposing a more accurate assessment of WTP using DBDC question-
13 naire and introducing household knowledge and interest as potential determinants of WTP, our
14 paper aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of WTP for mangrove restoration
15 not only in XTNP, but also in Vietnam.

16
17 The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the background of the mangrove
18 ecosystem of XTNP. Section 3 presents the methodology used in the paper. Section 4 summarizes
19 the main features of data. Results are presented and discussed in section 5. Section 6 draws
20 some conclusion.

2 The mangrove ecosystem of Xuan Thuy National Park

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
XTNP, the first Ramsar site in South-East Asia approved by the Bureau of the Convention on
Wetlands of International Importance, is located in Nam Dinh province, in Red River Delta,
Northern Vietnam (Thanh and Yabar, 2015).¹ The park occupies 7,100 hectares of core zone
which is strictly protected and 8,000 hectares of buffer zone where human activities are regulated
to reduce adverse impacts on the core area (Pham Hong and Mai Sy, 2015). This study was
conducted in 5 communes in the buffer zone: Giao Hai, Giao Xuan, Giao Lac, Giao An and Giao
Thien (see Figure 1).


Today, XTNP is internationally-recognized as a migratory bird habitat, many of them are
named in the Red List of Endangered species such as the Black-faced Spoonbill, Spotted Green-

¹The Convention on Wetlands, called the Ramsar Convention, is an intergovernmental treaty that provides the
framework for national action and international cooperation for the conservation and wise use of wetlands and
their resources.

Figure 1

Map of Xuan Thuy National Park and survey sites in 2008

Source: Management Board of Xuan Thuy National Park (2014)



shank and Spoon-billed Sandpiper. Besides, the coastal wetland is protected by over 3000 hectares of mangroves and has over 500 aquatic species, 120 species of plant, and 10 mammal species (Leslie et al., 2018). This Ramsar site provides invaluable green economy services including food, eco-tourism, protection from floods and storms for 48,000 local inhabitants in the buffer zone (Thanh and Yabar, 2015).

Despite a high biodiversity, XTNP is under serious threat from the degradation of its mangrove forests. According to a report by Vietnam Netherlands Water Partnership On Water for Food and Ecosystem (2008), the period 1986- 1998 indicated a dramatic reduction in the area of the mangroves by nearly 70%, mainly due to intensive shrimp farming. The park officers face challenges to prevent illegal human activities such as bird trapping, fishing, cutting mangroves for wood in the core zone because the wetlands still play a major part in local livelihoods and income.

Moreover, the low-lying island has a highest elevation of about 0.5 and 0.9 m above sea level making thousands of locals extremely vulnerable to any storm that hits the coast, particularly in monsoon season (Nhuan et al., 2009). In addition, erosion is happening very rapidly here in which land is being lost up to 14.5m per year. There is the connection between mangrove forest degradation, climate change impacts and the values of mangrove biodiversity of XTNP. It is important to understand clearly that the serious degradation of mangrove forests in XTNP has been mainly caused by human activities, rather than the climate change impacts. However, the severe impacts of climate change are potential on the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem functional provided by mangroves, rather than the degradation of mangrove area itself. The restoration of mangrove forests is to mitigate the impacts of the increased natural disasters due to climate changes, protect biodiversity, and support local livelihoods sustainability. Therefore, the implementation of economic instrument is necessary to value mangrove restoration of XTNP for effective management of this wetland ².

3 Methodology

This section introduces the main features of the methodology used in this paper. The focus is first to put on questionnaire design and survey methodology. Then, we describe the estimation techniques used to assess the mean WTP and study its determinants.

3.1 Questionnaire design and survey methodology

Questionnaire design From a theoretical point of view, total economic value of an ecosystem service has two major components: use values and non-use values (Albani and Romano, 1998; Barbier, 1994). There are consumptive uses from natural resources that humans can directly benefit from such as fish or water. There are also non-consumptive uses from these natural resources, for instance, recreation such as birdwatching or sightseeing, arise whenever an individual comes in contact with the natural resources, but no part of the resources is used for consumption

²We would like to thank one of the reviewers for these suggestions

(Albani and Romano, 1998). Non-use values emerge from knowing these resources are existing for ecosystem functioning (existence value), or available for future generations (bequest value) (Barbier, 1994). These non-use values cannot be transacted in marketplaces. Environmental economists find ways to measure the values that humans derive from these ecosystem services for project implementation purposes and policy development. The CVM is a widely used survey-based approach to place monetary values on environment goods and services not bought or sold in the marketplace (Carson, 2000). The goal of the CVM is to improve the the reliability of the estimate results of non-use values. The CVM builds a hypothetical market using a survey questionnaire to form a scenario that allows respondents to state their WTP in return for improved environmental quality (Aizaki et al., 2015).

To guarantee the applicability of the questionnaire in our study, focus group discussions were held with village heads of the five studied communes, and with XTNP's management board. The scenarios for the mangrove biodiversity protection project was also informed by baseline studies and expert's opinions about how we can improve the current situation. The questionnaire was designed so that respondents' information on willingness to pay contributed directly to the protection of fauna and flora diversity of the mangroves. It implies that the willingness to pay in our survey data only focus on non-use values.

This survey has three main sections. The first section of the questionnaire was designed to understand respondents' perception about mangrove ecosystem services, their perception of global climate change, and biodiversity protection. A major part of this section was to explain the biodiversity of XTNP and the threats to biodiversity. In doing so, respondents were provided with adequate information to decide their valuation on the basis of direct benefits and other non-use benefits that can be gained from the mangroves. Our enumerators therefore proposed the following scenario to survey residents. According to the Tran et al. (2016), a climate change scenario is forecast that by 2030, XTNP would experience a sea level rise of 20 cm and the mangroves would be severely affected. Our enumerators clearly stated the vulnerability of XTNP that were informed by research studies. Pictures of coastal erosion and biodiversity degradation were shown as an visual aid to help respondents understand how vulnerable XTNP would be to sea

level rise in the coming decades. The scenario supposed a local project would be carried out from now to 2030 and require all locals to donate money for protecting mangroves and biodiversity in XTNP. Respondents were then asked the amount of cash they would be willing to contribute in a lump sum payment for the project.

In the second section, respondents were asked the elicitation questions, that were the WTP questions. Based on the existing literature review, there are two formats to elicit individual preferences: (1) *open-ended* format : respondents are asked directly what their WTP is, no bid value being suggested ; (2) *close-ended* format: a bid value is proposed to respondents and they can choose whether or not to accept it. In order to determine optimal bid design, a pre-test survey with an open-ended format had been conducted with 20 households in the buffer zone prior to the main survey. In the pre-test survey, household members were invited by the management board of XTNP to take interview with our enumerators at the park office. This pre-test survey ensured that the lowest bid rate and the highest bid value used in the close-ended format of the formal survey were applicable and made economic sense. The results showed that the lowest bid value is 50,000 VND and the highest bid value is 2,000,000 VND.

Our study relied on Double bounded dichotomous choice (DBDC) contingent valuation methodology (Hanemann et al., 1991). Each respondent was required to answer "yes" or "no" to two sequential bid rates. A respondent accepted the initial bid rate would be proposed a corresponding higher bid rate. If the initial bid rate was refused, a lower bid rate would be proposed subsequently. Therefore, there are four possible responses: (Yes, Yes), (Yes, No), (No, Yes), (No, No) (Hadker et al., 1997; Tseng and Chen, 2008). **DBDC is considered as lack of incentive compatibility if respondents' uncertainty regarding how survey responses will be converted into final actions (Christian A. Vossler, 2013; Ewa Zawojka, 2017; Richard T. Carson, 2007). However, DBDC increases efficiency over single dichotomous choice models in three ways (Hanemann et al., 1991; Haab and McConnell, 2002). First, it is clear bounds on WTP for the answer sequences "yes-no" or "no-yes". Second, in case of the "no-no" pairs and the "yes-yes" pairs, there are also efficiency gains. These come because additional questions, even when they do not bound WTP completely, further constrain the part of the distribution where the respondent's WTP can**

lie. Finally, the number of responses is increased, so that a given function is fitted with more observations (Haab and McConnell, 2002).

The questionnaire was designed so that the information respondents presented on willingness or unwillingness to pay was true and accurate as far as their knowledge was concerned. If people replied that they were willing to pay, then our enumerators recorded that. If this was no, there were follow-up questions to ask why respondents were unwilling to pay. This procedure made sure respondents understood the scenario presented to them and avoided the hypothetical bias that would affect the validity of the results. Reasons for refusing any payment for mangrove conservation included : a) the government should be responsible for conservation, b) the project cannot succeed in preserving biodiversity, c) the funds contributed by respondents might not be used for the right purpose, d) respondents have not made up their mind yet. It is worth noting that respondents with these answers would be removed from the valuation analysis (the protest bid).

Finally, information on demographic and social economic conditions of the survey site was collected for statistical purposes and used as explanatory variables in the regression analysis, in a third section. Enumerators asked respondents questions about their employment status, age, marital status, educational level, etc.

Survey method The survey was conducted in the five communes constituting the buffer zone, i.e. Giao Thien, Giao An, Giao Xuan, Giao Hai and Giao Lac in March and April 2017. In doing so, our study aims to provide an initiative for local engagement in biodiversity protection. According to Giao Thuy District's Statistical Yearbook in 2015, there are total 12,972 households in the five surveyed communes. To determine a statistically visible sample size for the CVM in this study, the following formula was used to select the total number of surveyed households, or n :

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N * \varepsilon^2} \quad (1)$$

where N is a total number of households in the area, and ε is desired margin of error (Tuan et al., 2014). In this study, the error was fixed at 5%, and, consequently, the survey sample size at 350

households.

Multi-stage sampling was used to select villages and households. At the first stage, two villages were selected by random sampling from the list of villages in each commune. At the second stage, 350 households were surveyed by convenience sampling, i.e. surveying any household in each village without any prior notice given their proximity to enumerators. In the main survey, enumerators were sent to conduct face-to face interviews instead of phone or email survey.

3.2 Econometric modelling

Nonparametric estimation Non-parametric and parametric estimation methods were used to measure mean WTP for surveyed households. As WTP is not observable, non-parametric method allows the researcher to consider WTP as a random variable with a particular cumulative distribution function that defines the probability of the WTP being less than a certain threshold. This distribution can be estimated using Kaplan-Meier survival estimator as shown by Turnbull (1976). Then, the mean WTP for mangrove conservation can be seen as the probability of total number of households accepting bid values. The general formula is:

$$\text{Mean WTP} = \sum(t_j * f_j)$$

where t_j shows the different bid values and f_j is the change in density (Carson and Hanemann, 2005). In this method, the estimation results completely depend on the statistical characteristics of the observations.

The Kaplan-Meier-Turnbull estimator can be used to compare survival curves across values of a given covariate when this latter is discrete. Testing a difference between the estimated survival functions is then possible using statistical test. However, this test does not provide strong evidence that the considered covariate influences survival because other factors may be correlated with both this covariate and with survival. Thus, the effects of the covariates cannot be modelled explicitly using this estimator.

Parametric estimation There are four potential outcomes per respondent in a DBDC questionnaire, as mentioned before: (Yes, Yes), (Yes, No), (No, Yes) and (Non, No). For each outcome, there is an interval at which WTP belongs. So,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(Yes, Yes) indicates that } WTP \geq b^U \\ \text{(Yes, No) indicates that } b \leq WTP < b^U \\ \text{(No, Yes) indicates that } b^L \leq WTP < b \\ \text{(No, No) indicates that } WTP < b^L \end{array} \right. \quad (2)$$

where b , b^L , and b^U are known values. In contrast to the SBDC model, which results in only one minimum or maximum value for each respondent's WTP, the DBDC methodology allows the construction of a bounded interval, or minimum or maximum bound, of each respondent's WTP, and is shown to improve the asymptotic efficiency of parameter estimates (Hanemann et al., 1991; Nayga et al., 2006).

From the knowledge of the b , b^L , and b^U values and the answer, it is then possible to build the following probabilities:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} P^{YY} \equiv \text{Prob}[(Yes, Yes)] = \text{Prob}[WTP \geq b^U] = 1 - G(b^U) \\ P^{YN} \equiv \text{Prob}[(Yes, No)] = \text{Prob}[b \leq WTP < b^U] = G(b^U) - G(b) \\ P^{NY} \equiv \text{Prob}[(No, Yes)] = \text{Prob}[b^L \leq WTP < b] = G(b) - G(b^L) \\ P^{NN} \equiv \text{Prob}[(No, No)] = \text{Prob}[WTP \leq b^L] = G(b^L) \end{array} \right. \quad (3)$$

where $G(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of a known statistical distribution such as logistic, normal, or Weibull.

The format of Eq. (4) is used to display the WTP function:

$$\log WTP = X\beta + \varepsilon \quad (4)$$

where X is a vector of explanatory variables, including initial bid (in logarithm), β , a vector of parameters to be estimated, and ε , the error term.

For a sample of n independent observations, the log-likelihood can be expressed as follows

$$\ln L = \sum_{i=1}^n [d_i^{YY} P_i^{YY} + d_i^{YN} P_i^{YN} + d_i^{NY} P_i^{NY} + d_i^{NN} P_i^{NN}] \quad (5)$$

where d_i^{AA} indicates whether respondent i answered (A, A) with $A = Y, N$ (dichotomous variable). Estimates of parameters β can be recovered by maximizing the log-likelihood given in Eq. (5).

4 Data

4.1 Individual characteristics

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. In this study size, the number of female participants (52.3% of the 350 respondents) is slightly greater than the number of males, reflecting gender balance in the survey.

The respondents aged over 45 account for almost 60% of the total sample, dominating the age distribution of respondents in the sample. This indicates that while younger generations are leaving villages for work, the middle-aged and elderly (over 45) tend to work in the villages. Married individuals make up 92.8 percent of the sample. Most respondents in the survey (94.5%) reported that they were born in Giao Thuy District. The survey indicates a sample with a low education level, given that 92% of the respondents could complete high school. In this study, there are four main categories of jobs: farmers working in the aquaculture or agriculture sector, business owners, and hired employees at public or private sectors. These main labor force groups account for 89.5% of the total sample. The remaining sample consists of students, retirees, housewife, and unemployed. Over one-third of the respondents (38%) has a monthly household income of lower than 3 million VND (about 129 USD), followed by 28.8% receiving between 3 and 6 million VND (about 129-258 USD), and 22.7% in the range between 6 and 10 million VND (about 258–430 US\$). And only 10.5 % of respondents has a monthly income of over 10 million VND (about 430 USD). Furthermore, the majority of respondents (81.3%) said that their

Table 1
Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents

	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Female	183	52.3
	Male	167	47.7
Age	18-25	29	8.382
	26-35	54	15.6
	36-45	57	16.5
	46-55	76	22
	>= 56	130	37.6
Marital Status	Married	324	92.8
	Single	25	7.2
Born in Giao Thuy district	Yes	328	94.5
	No	19	5.4
Education	Below high-school	320	91.9
	High-school or above	28	8.1
Career	Farmer/Fisherman	224	64.5
	Business owner/Self-employed	27	7.7
	Public sector employee	16	4.6
	Private sector employee	44	12.6
	Students	7	2
	Retired/Housewife	27	7.8
	Unemployed	2	0.6
Household Size	1	21	6.1
	2	63	18.3
	3	65	18.8
	4	90	26.1
	5	73	21.1
	6	26	7.6
	7	4	1.2
	9	2	0.6
	10	1	0.3
	Monthly Income of household (million VND)	Low income (Up to 3)	132
Lower middle (Between 3 and 6)		100	28.8
Upper middle (Between 6 and 10)		79	22.7
High income (Over 10)		34	10.5
Environmental work	Not at all	181	52.1
	Slightly related	67	19.3
	Very related	99	28.5
Passion for environmental protection	No	30	8.6
	Like a little	133	38.3
	Like a lot	184	53
Mangrove dependency	Yes	65	18.7
	No	282	81.3

household's income partially or totally depend on the mangrove ecosystem. Average household size in the sample is about 3.71 and can represent normal family size in Nam Dinh Province. The largest household has 10 people and the smallest household has 1 person. Finally, less than one-third (28.5%) had their field of career or study very related to environment and biology and more than one-half (53%) showed strong interest in environmental conservation activities.

4.2 Local awareness about mangrove restoration in XTNP

Table 2 shows respondents' perceived benefits for local communities from mangrove ecosystems.

Table 2
Perceived benefits from mangrove forests

Benefits from mangrove forest	Percentage
Aquatic products, raw material for production and consumption	42.6
Recreation, tourism	7.1
Prevention of storms, floods, tides, and coastal erosion	61.1
Underground water protection, preventing salinization	7.4
Climate regulation, carbon dioxide absorption	17.7
Preserving silt, sea encroachment	11.7
Habitat for fish and animals	22.6
Biodiversity	10
Cultural values	0.9
Other	10
Do not know	16

Over 60% of respondents believed that the mangroves in XT help mitigating flooding, storms and soil erosion. The results also indicate that a major number of the respondents have realized the vital roles of mangrove ecosystems in their livelihood, including a necessary supply of aquatic products, raw material for production and consumption.

Table 3 displays the local perception of mangrove degradation. Human activities such as aquaculture, fishery, etc. (40%) were perceived to be the major threat to mangrove forests.

Table 4 shows reasons for protection in Ba Lat estuary. First, respondents were given clear demonstration of how the mangroves in Ba Lat estuary has changed from time to time and were

Table 3

Perceived causes of mangrove degradation

Reasons	Percentage
Human activities: aquaculture, fishery, etc.	40.9
Pollution	13.40
Climate change	18.60
Other	5.70
Do not know	2.00

Table 4

Perceived motives for mangrove conservation

Reasons	Not at all important	Not so important	Neutral	Important	Very important	Can not evaluate
Providing wood, fish and raw materials	8.3	11.1	20.6	46.9	10	3.1
Providing recreation	4	12.3	20.3	52	10	1.4
Preventing floods, erosion, salinization	0	0	2.6	15.4	81.4	0.6
Conserving biodiversity	3.1	10.3	14.6	58.6	11.4	2
Benefits for future uses	2.3	6.6	9.7	52.4	28.4	0.6

provided with various scenarios of the mangroves in the context of climate change . Respondents were asked to rate the importance of reasons to protect the mangroves, on a scale from 1 to 5, with "1 = Not at all important", "2 = Not so important", "3= Neutral" , 4= important", and "5= very important". Respondents were also left with the choice of not being able to evaluate. These results suggest the two most important reasons are preventing the coastlines against floods, erosion, salinization and providing benefits for future uses. Conserving biodiversity is the third most important reason for mangrove rehabilitation.

4.3 Bid responses

The interviewers randomly selected 350 respondents. Answers from 226 respondents were used in estimating WTP after excluding protested zero-bids: 70 respondents who were not willing to

pay to protect mangroves, and 54 who answered they were not sure. Discarding observations will reduce the degrees of freedom and the efficiency of the estimates (Brox et al., 2003). However, the protested zero-bids have been removed since these data might fail to determine the correct economic value of the good in question (Jürgen Meyerhoff, 2007).

Figure 2
WTP responses




Table 5 gives the main reasons for respondents' being willing or unwilling to pay. The most important reason for WTP for mangrove restoration is that mangrove restoration is a good program for their own benefit (70.4%). About 57.5% of the respondents believed that their contributions now would bring benefit for future generation. On the other hand, the main reason for not being willing to pay for the restoration of mangroves was household income constraints, accounting for 37.9% of the negative responses; followed by the statement that the project is likely to fail (11.3%). 9.7 % of the respondents did not agree to pay because they thought that only those who had direct benefit from the program should finance. About 29.8% of respondents provided other answers not listed in the questionnaire such as the need for more information, depending on other people's contributions, etc.

Table 6 shows how bid rates were presented to respondents. For each respondent, the interviewer made a random selection of A, B, C or D options. If the respondent did not accept

Table 5

Reasons for being willing to pay and for not being willing to pay.

Reasons	Percent
Respondent's reasons for being willing to pay	
The program is good for my own sake	70.4
The program is good for the next generation	57.5
The program is necessary for preserving culture, beliefs	5.8
The program is good for the whole society	34.1
Others	9.7
Respondent's reasons for not being willing to pay	
My family has no money to contribute	37.9
The biodiversity in this area does not mean much to my family	4.8
I am afraid my family contribution shall not be used properly	6.5
I do not believe in the success of the project	11.3
Biodiversity protection is the sole responsibility of the local authority	0.8
It is the beneficiary who should finance	9.7
Others	29.8

the first bid rate in column 2, the interview was followed up with a proposal of smaller bid rate (initial bid divided by two) as shown in column 3. If the first bid rate was accepted, the second bid rate was doubled, as shown in column 4.

Table 6

Bid options proposed to respondents.

Options	Initial bid or b	Lower bid or b^L	Upper bid or b^U
A	100,000	50,000	200,000
B	300,000	150,000	600,000
C	500,000	250,000	1,000,000
D	1,000,000	500,000	2,000,000

Table 7 displays the distribution of the answers of respondents in (Yes, Yes), (Yes, No), (No, Yes), and (No, No) for each bid option, and for all options without distinction between them. No clear pattern appears when reading this table except that, when the initial bid rate increases,

the percentage of respondents accepting both the first and second bid rates decline from 44.3% to 11.1% , and, conversely, the percentage of respondents refusing both the first and second bid rates increase from 18% to 44.4%.

Table 7
Distribution of responses by bid option

Bid options	Yes-Yes	Yes- No	No- Yes	No- No
A: (100.000; 50.000 ; 200.000)	44.3% (27)	29.5% (18)	8.2% (5)	18.0% (11)
B: (300.000; 150.000 ; 600.000)	26.9% (14)	36.5% (19)	13.5% (7)	23.1% (12)
C: (500.000; 250.000 ; 1.000.000)	19.0% (12)	30.2% (19)	15.9% (10)	34.9% (22)
D: (1.000.000; 500.000 ; 2.000.000)	11.1% (7)	28.6% (18)	15.9% (10)	44.4% (28)
All options combined	25.1% (60)	31.0% (74)	13.4% (32)	30.5% (73)

[Note: Frequency counts are in parentheses.]

5 Results

5.1 Non-parametric estimation

The Kaplan-Meier Turnbull nonparametric approach was used to estimate the proportion of respondents willing to pay falling into the intervals defined by the different monetary thresholds (Turnbull, 1976). The change in density occurring in each interval was used to determine the lower bound estimate for the mean of WTP by multiplying the density estimated to be in each interval and the lower endpoint of the interval. Table 8 shows then that about 13.1 % of the respondents fall into the interval 0 to 50,000 VND, and about 7.4 % were willing to pay over 2,000,000 VND, and that the median falls into the interval 300,000-500,000 VND. The nonparametric estimate of mean WTP is 511,090 VND (22 USD) per household. As emphasized by Carson and Hanemann (2005), this value provides a lower-bound to mean WTP for mangrove preservation in XTNP.

Table 8
Turnbull estimation results

Lower bound (t_j)	Upper bound	Probability of being greater than upper bound	Change in density (f_j)	Mean WTP
0	50,000	0.869	0.131	0
50,000	100,000	0.81	0.059	2950
100,000	150,000	0.745	0.065	6500
150,000	200,000	0.596	0.149	22350
200,000	250,000	0.596	0	0
250,000	300,000	0.596	0	0
300,000	500,000	0.476	0.12	36000
500,000	600,000	0.263	0.213	106500
600,000	1,000,000	0.263	0	0
1,000,000	2,000,000	0.074	0.189	189000
2,000,000	∞	0	0.074	148000

5.2 Parametric estimation

We assume that the choice of suggested WTP is a function of gender, age, household size, education, income, knowledge about benefits of mangroves and passion for environmental conservation.

The empirical interval regression model based on Eq. (4) is as follows:

$$\ln WTP = f(\text{Initial Bid, Gender, Age, Household size, Education, Income, Knowledge, Passion}) + \varepsilon \quad (6)$$

where $\ln WTP$ is the WTP for mangrove preservation (in logarithm). The definitions for all explanatory variables used in Eq. (6) are presented in Table 9. Results of estimation by maximum likelihood of the corresponding model with different assumptions about the cumulative distribution function $G(\cdot)$ are reported in Table 10.

We first tested if the introduction of the individual characteristics in addition to initial bid, was statistically meaningful. We performed a likelihood ratio test comparing the estimated model with a model where the values of the parameters associated to individual characteristics were all

Table 9
Description of variables.

Variable	Description	Value
1 Probability	The probability of a respondent being willing to pay for mangrove forest restoration	1 = Yes WTP 0 = No WTP
2 Bid	Bid levels (thousand VND) ^a	Option A (100; 200; 50) Option B (300; 600; 150) Option C (500; 1,000; 250) Option D (1,000; 2,000; 500)
3 Age	Age of respondent	Numeric variables
4 Gender	Gender of respondent	1 = Male 0 = Female
5 Education	If respondent was educated to high-school level or above	1 = High-school or above 0 = Otherwise
6 Hhsize	Number of members of each households	Numeric variables
7 Knowledge	Respondent has knowledge about benefits of mangroves	1 = Yes 0 = No
8 Passion	Respondent is interested in activities for environmental conservation	1 = Yes 0 = No
9 Income	Total household income per month (million VND)	1 = Up to 3 2 = Between 3 and 6 3 = Between 6 and 10 4 = Between 10 and 15 5 = Over 15

^a 1 USD is equivalent to 22,300 VND.

1
2
3
4
5 fixed to zero. The p-value for log-logistic (0.014), log-normal (0.009), and Weibull (0.003) clearly
6 indicate the rejection of the null hypothesis that all the latter parameters are equal to zero.
7

8
9 Although the estimated coefficient of an independent variable does not directly measure the
10 marginal effect of that variable on WTP, the sign of the estimated coefficient does indicate the
11 direction of the effect, as emphasized by Knapp et al. (2018). The estimation results were found
12 to be highly consistent in three model specifications. Table 10 indicates that the signs and signif-
13 icance of the parameters in the three specifications are relatively similar. As expected, we found
14 a significant negative impact of the initial bid on WTP. This result corroborates the observation
15 made when reading Table 7. Characteristics of respondents such as gender, age, household size
16 and education did not appear to have an impact on WTP. Only respondents belonging to upper
17 middle and higher income classes seemed ready to pay for mangrove restoration. It is noted that
18 there are five levels of income in Table 10 as the description of the survey data. However, we
19 have divided into three levels of income in order to have enough observations for our model in
20 Table 5. We have also reduced the passion variable from three levels in the questionnaire to two
21 levels in our model for the same purpose³.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 The results reveal two additional important facts. First, the passion of respondents for en-
33 vironmental protection activities was found to have a positive impact on respondent WTP for
34 mangrove restoration, implying that the interest in improving climate scenarios led to a respon-
35 dent being willing to pay more. This finding is consistent with Pham et al. (2018) that volunteer
36 experience in conservation activities has a positive influence in explaining WTP for mangrove
37 rehabilitation project. Second, the respondent's knowledge about the benefits of mangroves al-
38 lowed respondents to better appreciate mangroves, modifying Pham et al. (2018) the perceptual
39 determinants of WTP for mangrove restoration.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The results of the interval regression estimation provide estimates of the mean and median
47 values of WTP as by-products. Table 11 reports the estimated values of truncated mean, adjusted
48 truncated mean, and median WTP for the three specifications.⁴ Confidence intervals can then
49
50
51

52 ³Thanks one of the reviewers for comments on variable explanations

53 ⁴Details about the computation of these estimates are given in Aizaki et al. (2015). Truncated (at maximum
54 bid) mean estimates are computed to avoid (i) having infinite value when the estimated value of initial bid
55 parameter is lower than one, or (ii) getting some portion of the respondents who have an estimated WTP greater
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 be computed using nonparametric bootstrap technique.⁵ For instance, maximizing the likelihood
6 function under the assumption of a log-logistic distribution results in estimates of 619,908 VND
7 (26.63 USD) for the truncated mean WTP, 639,967 VND (27.49 USD) for the adjusted truncated
8 mean, and 358,559 VND (15.41 USD) or the median WTP. Here, the estimation results were
9 also found to be highly consistent for the three specifications. Estimated confidence intervals
10 for each of the three measures: truncated mean, adjusted truncated mean, and median, overlap.
11 The total non-use value from the restoration of the mangrove ecosystem in **Ba Lat estuary** can
12 then be calculated by multiplying mean WTP per household (619,908 VND) by the total number
13 of households (10,465) living in the in **Ba Lat estuary** in 2015. Table 11 displays the computed
14 results for mean WTP, their confidence intervals and total non-use value of mangroves across
15 the three models. In the log-logistic specification, the total non-use value was estimated at
16 approximately 6.487 billion VND which is equivalent to about 277,100 USD per year.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Compared with other mangrove valuation studies in Vietnam, our non-parametric and para-
metric estimates of mean WTP per household (511,090 VND and 619,908 VND, respectively)
are much higher than those of Tuan et al. (2014) (131,670 VND and 146,700 VND, respec-
tively) and Pham et al. (2018) (only parametric mean WTP was reported at 192,780 VND).
The discrepancy could be mainly attributed to the lump sum payment for each household in our
hypothetical scenario whereas the annual payment per household was requested in other studies.
The DBDC format in our CVM survey is also noteworthy, producing a better data set and more
precise results of WTP estimates. Furthermore, the environmental context of XTNP with more
endangered bird species, higher biodiversity values and greater threats of climate change possibly
resulted in an increase in yes responses, raising the demand for mangroves forest rehabilitation.

than their income. The adjusted truncated mean makes use of the normalization proposed by Boyle et al. (1988).
This normalization allows to set the value of the cumulative distribution function of WTP as soon as WTP is
greater than the maximum bid, to one.

⁵The bootstrap method resamples the data at our hands and repeatedly estimates the model with the boot-
strapped data to formulate an empirical distribution of the associated WTP. See Hole (2007) for more details.
The number of bootstrap replications can be chosen following Davidson and MacKinnon (2000).

Table 10
Maximum likelihood results

Variable	Log logit	Log normal	Weibull
Constant	14.913(1.489)***	8.919(0.835)***	10.867(1.005)***
Log(bid)	-1.237(0.101)***	-0.74(0.056)***	-0.868(0.069)***
Gender	-0.103(0.279)	-0.114(0.163)	-0.048(0.169)
Age	-0.005(0.01)	-0.003(0.006)	-0.003(0.006)
Household size	-0.053(0.096)	-0.032(0.057)	-0.02(0.056)
Education	0.279(0.433)	0.134(0.256)	0.145(0.288)
Income: Lower middle	0.205(0.348)	0.139(0.204)	0.191(0.218)
Income: Upper middle	0.528(0.375)	0.365(0.221)*	0.333(0.228)
Income: High	0.794(0.476)*	0.481(0.276)*	0.568(0.305)*
Knowledge	0.677(0.383)*	0.385(0.227)*	0.44(0.229)*
Passion	0.812(0.277)***	0.508(0.163)***	0.555(0.17)***
Observations	227	227	227
Log likelihood	-306.067	-305.199	-300.864
LR test statistics (p-value)	0.014	0.009	0.003

[Note: Standard errors are in parentheses, and *: $p < 0.1$; **: $p < 0.05$; ***: $p < 0.01$.]

6 Conclusion

This research is motivated by the idea that mangrove ecosystem restoration can generate a variety of benefits to human such as carbon sequestration, erosion control, water purification, flood prevention, wildlife habitat, etc. However, many of these benefits are not valued by markets. In addition, mangroves are one of the most threatened ecosystems in Vietnam, and yet there exists few quantitative information on the value of mangroves in Vietnam. This paper used CVM with DBDC questionnaire, to assess the economic value of mangroves at XTNP in the context of climate change. Specifically, it explored the determinants of WTP for improved management of mangroves. Mean WTP was first estimated using either nonparametric or parametric methods.

Table 11
Mean WTP

	Log logit	Log normal	Weibull
Truncated Mean WTP	619,908.457 ^a	607,333.742	592,294.639
	[506,422; 701,113] ^b	[515,877; 689,005]	[497,088; 675,590]
	6,487,342,003 ^c	6,355,747,610	6,198,363,397
Adjusted truncated Mean WTP	693,966.997	672,705.172	628,172.846
	[547,087; 803,778]	[553,183; 794,871]	[517,606; 741,085]
	7,262,364,624	7,039,859,625	6,573,828,833
Median WTP	358,559.672	346,233.245	391,307.789
	[274,635; 444,357]	[274,715; 429,994]	[308,592; 476,886]
	3,752,326,967	3,623,330,909	4,095,036,012

^a Computed mean WTP in VND.

^b 95% confidence intervals are computed with 299 bootstrap replications.

^c Computed total non-use value of mangroves in VND

The parametric model gave an estimate of 619,908 VND per household, while the non-parametric model produced a lower bound for mean WTP of 511,090 VND per household. These results suggest that the total non-use value of mangrove in XTNP is estimated at 6.5 billion VND, with a lower bound of 5.3 billion VND. Second, factors affecting people's WTP were found to be income, **knowledge about mangrove's benefits and their interest in activities for environmental conservation**. People with high income, having good understanding of the mangrove benefits or showing strong interest in environmental conservation activities would likely to pay more. The findings provide decision-makers with the true cost of converting mangroves to short-term profitable alternatives, while taking into account indirect economic, ecological and social benefits of mangroves. The study also sets out important policy guidelines including strengthening the role of the mangroves via mass media, especially newspapers and television to raise public awareness of mangrove value. In addition, locals should be given environmental training programs that encourage them to adopt sustainable behaviors and engage their interests in conservation

activities.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank anonymous reviewers for helpful comments. Vietnam National Foundation for Science and Technology Development (NAFOSTED) funds this research under grant number 502.01-2018.20.

References

- Aizaki, H., T. Nakatani, and K. Sato (2015). *Stated preference methods using R*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Albani, M. and D. Romano (1998). *Total Economic Value and Evaluation Techniques*, pp. 47–71. Boston, MA: Springer US.
- An, L. T., J. Markowski, M. Bartos, T. Q. Thoai, T. H. Tuan, and A. Rzenca (2018). Tourist and Local Resident Preferences for the Northern Yellow-Cheeked Gibbon (*Nomascus annamensis*) Conservation Program in the Bach Ma National Park, Central Vietnam. *Tropical Conservation Science* 11, 1–16.
- Barbier, E. B. (1994). Valuing environmental functions: Tropical wetlands. *Land Economics* 70(2), 155–173.
- Barbier, E. B. (2011). Wetlands as natural assets. *Hydrological Sciences Journal* 56(8), 1360–1373.
- Barbier, E. B. and S. Sathirathai (2004). *Shrimp Farming and Mangrove Loss in Thailand*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Beresnev, N. N. and J. Broadhead (2016). Mangrove - related policy and institutional frameworks

in Pakistan , Thailand and Viet Nam. Technical report, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Blanco, J. F., E. A. Estrada, L. F. Ortiz, and L. E. Urrego (2012). Ecosystem-Wide Impacts of Deforestation in Mangroves: The Urabá Gulf (Colombian Caribbean) Case Study. *ISRN Ecology 2012*, article ID 958709.

Boyle, K. J., M. P. Welsh, and R. C. . Bishop (1988). Validation of empirical measures of welfare change: Comment. *Land Economics 64*(1), 94–98.

Brox, J. A., R. C. Kumar, and K. R. Stollery (2003). Estimating willingness to pay for improved water quality in the presence of item nonresponse bias. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics 85*, 414–428.

Carson, R. T. (2000). Contingent valuation: A user's guide. *Environmental Science and Technology*.

Carson, R. T. and W. Hanemann (2005). Contingent valuation. In K.-G. Mäler and J. Vincent (Eds.), *Handbook of Environmental Economics*, Chapter 17, pp. 821–936. Amsterdam, NL: Elsevier B.V.

Champ, P. A., K. J. Boyle, and T. C. Brown (2017). *A Primer on Nonmarket Valuation*. Dordrecht, NL: Springer.

Christian A. Vossler, S. B. W. (2013). Statistical efficiency of double-bounded dichotomous choice contingent valuation. *Journal of Economic Behavior Organization 86*, 137–147.

Cummings, A. R. and M. Shah (2018). Mangroves in the global climate and environmental mix. *Geography Compass 12*, e12353.

Davidson, R. and J. G. MacKinnon (2000). Bootstrap tests: how many bootstraps? *Econometric Reviews 19*(1), 55–68.

- 1
2
3
4
5 Ewa Zawojka, M. C. (2017). Re-examining empirical evidence on stated preferences: importance
6 of incentive compatibility. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* 6, 374–403.
7
8
9 Francisco, H. A. (2008). Adaptation to climate change: Needs and opportunities in southeast
10 asia. *ASEAN Economic Bulletin* 25(1), 7–19.
11
12
13 Giesen, W., S. Wulffraat, M. Zieren, and L. Scholten (2007). Mangrove Guidebook for Southeast
14 Asia. Technical report, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
15
16
17
18 Ha, T. T. T., H. van Dijk, and S. R. Bush (2012). Mangrove conservation or shrimp farmer's
19 livelihood? The devolution of forest management and benefit sharing in the Mekong Delta,
20 Vietnam. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 69, 185–193.
21
22
23
24 Haab, T. C. and K. E. McConnell (2002, November). *Valuing Environmental and Natural Re-*
25 *sources*. Number 2427 in Books. Edward Elgar Publishing.
26
27
28
29 Hadker, N., S. Sharma, A. David, and T. R. Muraleedharan (1997). Willingness-to-pay for borivli
30 national park: Evidence from a contingent valuation. *Ecological Economics* 21(2), 105–122.
31
32
33
34 Hanemann, M., J. Loomis, and B. Kanninen (1991). Statistical efficiency of double-bounded
35 dichotomous choice contingent valuation. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 73(4),
36 1255–1263.
37
38
39
40 Hole, A. R. (2007). A comparison of approaches to estimating confidence intervals for willingness
41 to pay measure. *Health Economics* 16, 827–840.
42
43
44
45 Jürgen Meyerhoff, U. L. (2007). Do protest responses to a contingent valuation question and a
46 choice experiment differ? *Environmental and Resource Economics* 39, 433–446.
47
48
49
50 Knapp, T., K. Kovacs, Q. Huang, C. Henry, R. Nayga, J. Popp, and B. Dixon (2018). Willingness
51 to pay for irrigation water when groundwater is scarce. *Agricultural Water Management* 195,
52 133–141.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Lan, N. T. P. (2013). Social and ecological challenges of market-oriented shrimp farming in
6 Vietnam. *SpringerPlus* 2, 675.
7
8
9 Leslie, M., S. T. Nguyen, T. K. D. Nguyen, T. T. Pham, T. T. N. Cao, T. Q. Le, T. T. Dang,
10 T. H. T. Nguyen, T. B. N. Nguyen, H. N. Le, T. T. Tran, T. C. T. Bui, N. A. Tran, M. H.
11 Natascha, and Y. Chris (2018). Bringing social and cultural considerations into environmental
12 management for vulnerable coastal communities: Responses to environmental change in Xuan
13 Thuy National Park, Nam Dinh Province, Vietnam. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 158,
14 32–44.
15
16 Management Board of Xuan Thuy National Park (2014). The current state of biodiversity at
17 xuan thuy national park. Technical report, Management Board of Xuan Thuy National Park.
18
19 McNally, R., A. McEwin, and T. Holland (2011). The Potential for Mangrove Carbon Projects
20 in Vietnam. Technical report, Smart Development Works.
21
22 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005). Ecosystems and human well-being: Synthesis. Tech-
23 nical report, Island Press, Washington, DC.
24
25 Navrud, S., T. Huu Tuan, and B. Duc Tinh (2012). Estimating the welfare loss to households
26 from natural disasters in developing countries: a contingent valuation study of flooding in
27 Vietnam. *Global Health Action* 5(1), 17609.
28
29 Nayga, R. M., R. Woodward, and W. Aiew (2006). Willingness to pay for reduced risk of foodborne
30 illness: A nonhypothetical field experiment. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics/Revue*
31 *canadienne d'agroeconomie* 54(4), 461–475.
32
33
34 Nguyen, Q. L. T., L. H. Nguyen, B. X. Tran, H. T. T. Phan, H. T. Le, H. D. Nguyen, T. D.
35 Tran, C. D. Do, C. M. Nguyen, V. T. M. Thuc, C. Latkin, M. W. B. Zhang, and R. C. M.
36 Ho (2017). Co-financing for viral load monitoring during the course of antiretroviral therapy
37 among patients with hiv/aids in vietnam: A contingent valuation survey. *PLOS ONE* 12(2),
38 0172050.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Nhuan, M. T., N. T. M. Ngoc, N. Q. Huong, N. T. H. Hue, N. T. Tue, and P. B. Ngoc (2009).
6 Assessment of Vietnam Coastal Wetland Vulnerability for Sustainable Use (Case Study in
7 Xuanthuy Ramsar Site, Vietnam). *Journal of Wetlands Ecology* 2(1), 1–16.
8
9
10
11 Pham, T. D., N. Kaida, K. Yoshino, X. H. Nguyen, H. T. Nguyen, and D. T. Bui (2018).
12 Willingness to pay for mangrove restoration in the context of climate change in the Cat Ba
13 biosphere reserve, Vietnam. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 163, 269–277.
14
15
16
17 Pham Hong, T. and T. Mai Sy (2015). Vulnerability to climate change of mangroves in Xuan
18 Thuy National Park, Vietnam. *Journal of Agricultural and Biological Science* 10(2), 55–60.
19
20
21
22 Phuong, D. M. and C. Gopalakrishnan (2003). An application of the contingent valuation method
23 to estimate the loss of value of water resources due to pesticide contamination: the case of
24 the Mekong Delta, Vietnam. *International Journal of Water Resources Development* 19(4),
25 617–633.
26
27
28
29
30 Polidoro, B. A., K. E. Carpenter, L. Collins, N. C. Duke, A. M. Ellison, J. C. Ellison, E. J.
31 Farnsworth, E. S. Fernando, K. Kathiresan, N. E. Koedam, S. R. Livingstone, T. Miyagi, G. E.
32 Moore, V. N. Nam, J. E. Ong, J. H. Primavera, S. G. Salmo, J. C. Sanciangco, S. Sukardjo,
33 Y. Wang, and J. W. H. Yong (2010). The loss of species: Mangrove extinction risk and
34 geographic areas of global concern. *PLoS ONE* 5, e10095.
35
36
37
38
39
40 Prance, G. T. and P. B. Tomlinson (1987). The Botany of Mangroves. *Brittonia*.
41
42
43 Quang Tuan, N., H. Cong Tin, L. Quang Doc, and T. Anh Tuan (2017). Historical Monitoring
44 of Shoreline Changes in the Cua Dai Estuary, Central Vietnam Using Multi-Temporal Remote
45 Sensing Data. *Geosciences* 7(3), 72.
46
47
48
49 Richard T. Carson, T. G. (2007). Incentive and informational properties of preference questions.
50 *Environmental and Resource Economics* 37(1), 181–210.
51
52
53
54 Thanh, H. T. and H. Yabar (2015). Climate Change Challenges for Sustainable Coastal Wetland
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Management in Xuan Thuy Ramsar Site, Vietnam. *British Journal of Environment & Climate*
6 *Change* 5(53), 214–230.
7

8
9 Tran, T., V. T. Nguyen, T. L. H. Huynh, V. K. Mai, X. H. Nguyen, and H. P. Doan (2016).
10 Climate Change and Sea Level Rise Scenarios for Vietnam. Technical report, Ministry of Natural
11 Resources and Environment of Vietnam.
12
13

14
15 Tseng, W. C. and C. C. Chen (2008). Valuing the potential economic impact of climate change
16 on the Taiwan trout. *Ecological Economics* 65(2), 282–291.
17
18

19
20 Tuan, M. S. (2016). Mangrove-related policy and institutional framework in Vietnam. Technical
21 report, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
22
23

24
25 Tuan, T. H., N. H. D. My, L. T. Q. Anh, and N. V. Toan (2014). Using contingent valuation
26 method to estimate the WTP for mangrove restoration under the context of climate change:
27 A case study of Thi Nai lagoon, Quy Nhon city, Vietnam. *Ocean and Coastal Management* 95,
28 198–212.
29
30

31
32 Turnbull, B. W. (1976). The Empirical Distribution Function with Arbitrarily Grouped, Censored
33 and Truncated Data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 38(3), 290–295.
34
35

36
37 Vietnam Netherlands Water Partnership On Water for Food and Ecosystem (2008, November).
38 Integrated and Sustainable Use of Water Resources for Maintaining Ecosystem of Xuan Thuy
39 National Park. Technical report, Vietnam Institute for Water Resources Research.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix

This session provides a sample of questions on WTP developed as part of the household questionnaire survey.

Future climate scenario

Climate change is a major challenge for coastal areas in Vietnam. According to the future climate change scenario that the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment released in 2016, the average temperature in Ba Lat estuary would increase by about 0.6°C by 2030 compared to the period of 1986-2005. Meanwhile, maximum rainfall per day would increase from 20 to 30 ml and sea level would likely rise by an additional 20 cm in Ba Lat estuary. Climate change and sea rise could result in a large area of the mangrove degraded, which in turn lead to severe losses of biodiversity. According to the board of directors at XTNP, if appropriate preservation measures are not taken, biodiversity value of the park would be declined by about 5% each year in comparison to the present.

Supposed a project is conducted from now to 2030 to implement new measures for planting, protection of the mangroves, protecting birds and biodiversity in the mangrove forest. This project would raise awareness and capacity of the locals on planting, mangrove rehabilitation as well as provide training courses, seminars on the mangroves. It is noted that the project would help develop alternative livelihoods for the locals and encourage communities to actively participate in the conservation. The exploitation of natural resources for fisheries would be reduced and replaced by eco-tourism services, hence offering new opportunities for economic development as well as protection of natural biodiversity resources. Local authorities would play a role in mobilizing financial resources necessary to fund the project. If this project is supported by the majority of the locals, all households living in 5 communes including Giao Thien, Giao An, Giao Lac, Giao Xuan and Giao Hai would make a lump sum payment to the Fund for Biodiversity protection (Fauna and Flora) of the Mangroves in Ba Lat estuary.

1. Please tell us, are you ready to make a financial contribution to the Fund for the protection

of Fauna and Flora Diversity of the mangroves in Ba Lat estuary?

Yes No Not sure

2. (If YES) Please tell us the reason

For my own sake

For the next generation

Preservation of culture, religion

For the benefit of society

Other (please specify)

→ Go to question 4

3. (If NO or NOT SURE) Please tell us the reason

My family has no money to contribute

The diversity of species in this area does not mean much to my family

I am afraid my household contribution shall not be used properly

I do not believe in the success of the project

Biodiversity protection is the sole responsibility of the local government

The person who is beneficiary should finance

Other (Please specify)

→ Go to question 7

Applicability of the WTP

We know that this is just a survey for research purposes, so your WTP answers may not reflect the real payment. In surveys, people sometimes response that they are willing to pay a larger amount than they will actually do. For example, 70% of respondents say they are willing to pay the money. Nevertheless, when the project is actually implemented, only 50% of the households contribute to the fund. Therefore, we would

like you to answer as if this is a real payment, i.e. imagine that you are required to contribute to the funds for implementing the project on request of local authorities and most people agree to make financial contributions.

4. Are you willing to pay <first bid> to implement the project?
- Yes No → go to question 6 Not sure → go to question 6
5. (If YES) If your contribution is <second higher bid>, would you be willing to pay the amount for the implementation of the project?
- Yes → go to question 9 No → go to question 7 Not sure → go to question 8
6. (If NO or NOT SURE) If the contribution is <second lower bid>, would you be willing to pay the amount for the implementation of the project?
- Yes → go to question 9 No → go to question 7 Not sure → go to question 8
7. Please tell me the reason you are not willing to contribute this sum
- It is not necessary to contribute so much money
- The biodiversity in this area does not mean much to my family
- I do not believe in the success of the project
- I must spend money on more important things
- My household does not have enough money to contribute this much
- Other (please specify)
8. Could you please show the reason that you are not willing to contribute this sum? (*the interviewer should not give a clue*)
- I must discuss with other family members / I have no right to decide
- I wait to see whether others contribute or not

1
2
3
4
5 Other (please specify)

6
7
8 9. Assuming that the project is not implemented, how will biodiversity be affected in the
9 mangroves in Ba Lat estuary by 2030?

10
11 Very much

12
13 Much

14
15 Average

16
17 Little

18
19 Not affected

20
21 Do not know

22
23
24
25 10. When the project is implemented, how better will the biodiversity of the mangroves in Ba
26 Lat estuary than that when the project is absent?

27
28 Very much

29
30 Much

31
32 Average

33
34 Little

35
36 Not different

37
38 Do not know

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Report on how we have revised the manuscript “**Willingness to pay for mangrove preservation in Xuan Thuy National Park, Vietnam: Do household knowledge and interest play a role?**”

December 2019

We are very grateful for the extraordinarily insightful and constructive comments by the two reviewers and the guidance by the editor. They were of great help for us in substantially improving the manuscript.

We describe the revisions to the manuscript in the following by replying to each issue raised in the review reports separately. For this sake, we reproduce the reports and mark our respective replies in *italics* and **red**.

Journal: Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy

Reviewer #1

Total economic value:

The authors mention provisioning services, such as fish and water, and define them as consumptive services. Next, they mention as non-consumptive services recreation, tourism, existence and bequest values. These non-consumptive services includes both direct use-values such as recreation and tourism, and non-use values such as existence and bequest values. It does not seem that the authors are aware of this distinction between use and non-use values. This becomes even more obvious when they later in the paper claim that they are eliciting the population’s non-use value for the mangroves. Reading the scenario used during the interviews it is obvious that what is measured in this survey is both use and non-use values. The use values aspect of the survey is further emphasized by the fact that the respondents all are inhabitants of the mangrove area. The authors need to clarify the distinction between use and non-use values, as formulated in the TEV. Furthermore, they need to clarify which values are included in the WTP they derive from their data.

We have clarified the distinction between use and non-use values on page 7. We have also clarified on page 8 that our data for WTP only include non-use value.

Double bounded dichotomous choice contingent valuation

While the standard elicitation instrument is the single bounded CV, the authors applies the double bounded DC CVM. There are good reasons for why this method is seldom applied. The most important is the lack of incentive compatibility. If a person is first asked to pay an amount to enable the implementation of the project and accept the amount, why should the same person accept an even higher amount? Being asked the first amount, the person must assume that there is some connection between this amount and the costs of the project. Why is he/she then asked to pay another amount? There is a large literature on consequentiality, showing that finding the survey consequential is a condition for the survey to be incentive compatible (see e.g. Vossler et al, 2013).

The authors need to clarify why they have chosen the DBCV, and discuss pros and cons with this elicitation technique, especially regarding incentive compatibility.

We have justified on choosing DBDC and discussed pros and cons of DBDC on pages 4 and 9 as the reviewer's suggestions.

Dataset

Before estimating WTP 129 observations are removed from the dataset. The reasons are; 1) they are for various reasons not willing to pay any amount for the suggested mangrove protection, or 2) they don't know whether they are willing to pay. While the latter type of answer for obvious reasons is difficult to handle, it is far from obvious that the former is a good reason for removing a respondent. Removing 0-pay respondents significantly inflates the elicited WTP, and there have to be very good reasons for removing such responses (Meyerhof et al, 2014). The authors don't provide any convincing reasons for removing almost 30% of the responses.

We have justified on removing the protests on page 17 as the reviewer's suggestions.

Data processing/statistical analysis

While the non-parametric processing of the data seems correct and sufficiently explained, there are many problems with the parametric model.

First, it is unclear how the model in (4) is transferred into the model in (6). The authors say they use (4) to estimate (6). This must be better explained. It must also be explained what distinguishes the three parametric models (I assume it is the distribution of the random (error) term).

The author mention that the estimated parameters in the parametric model can not be interpreted as marginal sensitivities of WTP, which is correct as long as the dependent variable is logWTP. This need to be explained. Furthermore, it need to be explained what the estimated parameters express, and how it may be possible to convert them into interpretable parameters.

We have explained more detail on page 12 and 20 as the reviewer's suggestions.

Results

The authors estimates a total WTP for the protection project by multiplying the mean WTP as derived from the two models. However, what do we know about the representativeness of the sample? The sample is a random sample from 2 communes, and there is very little indication of the representativeness of the sample for; 1) the two communes, and 2) for the region. For example, it could be interesting to have data on gender, age, education and income distribution for the whole region (or the two communes) presented in table 6. As long as we don't know anything about representativeness it is not obvious that total WTP can be estimated by multiplying means WTP by number of households/persons.

Both the very high WTP (compared to previous comparable surveys) and the fact that the attitudinal variables are all significant probably are consequences of the removal of all "protesters". Hence, the authors should run the models on a dataset encompassing also protest respondents.

1
2
3 *We have described our survey on page 11: “Multi-stage sampling was used to*
4 *select villages and households. At the first stage, two villages were selected by*
5 *random sampling from the list of villages in each commune. At the second stage,*
6 *350 households were surveyed by convenience sampling”. We have also justified*
7 *on removing the protests and discussed the high WTP on page 17 and 23,*
8 *respectively, as the reviewer's suggestions.*
9

10 11 12 13 Discussion

14 Both choice of elicitation technique (DBCV) and the choice of removing all protesters are
15 quite controversial and need therefore to be dealt with in the discussion. Also the “extent
16 of the market”, i.e. how many households can reasonably be assumed to hold this WTP,
17 and is the model result representative for all these households, must be discussed.
18

19
20 *We have justified on pages 9, 17, and 25 as the reviewer's suggestions.*
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Report on how we have revised the manuscript “Willingness to pay for mangrove preservation in Xuan Thuy National Park, Vietnam: Do household knowledge and interest play a role?”

December 2019

We are very grateful for the extraordinarily insightful and constructive comments by the two reviewers and the guidance by the editor. They were of great help for us in substantially improving the manuscript.

We describe the revisions to the manuscript in the following by replying to each issue raised in the review reports separately. For this sake, we reproduce the reports and mark our respective replies in *italics* and **red**.

Journal: Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy

Reviewer #2

This paper estimate the local citizen’s willingness to pay (WTP) for mangrove conservation at Xuan Thuy National Park in Vietnam under the context of climate change, applying contingent valuation method. The paper also examined the determinants influencing the WTP for wetland conservation, and indicated that together with household income, respondent’s awareness of mangrove benefits and the interest in conservation activities play an important role in explaining local citizen’s preferences for the wetland conservation.

Comments:

1. Mangroves function in both mitigating the disasters impacts which is increasing due to climate changes, as well as supporting local livelihoods via provisioning services. The authors discussed the former but missed to present the later. Though the later was mentioned in line 36 page 3, but it is worth to address more.

We have revised the text on pages 2-3 as the reviewer's suggestions.

2. Line 41-47 page 3, the authors wrote “The CVM method is used to ... in the context of climate change”. How climate changes context is considered in the analysis should be explained.

We have explained on pages 7 & 32 as the reviewer's suggestions.

3. Though DBDC has some advantages compared to SBDC as indicated in page 4 by the authors, it may induce some biases and inconsistencies. The authors should mention these potential problems and show how these can be controlled in their study.

We have revised the text on pages 9-10 as the reviewer's suggestions.

4. Line 5-12 page 5, the author mentioned the second contribution of the paper is to include the perception variables in mangrove valuation and this is in line with the study by Pham et al. (2018). However, how it can be a contribution when it was introduced in the literature. Moreover, these two perceptions were not included as the determinants of WTP. The author rather introduced the variables of knowledge and interest. Hence, this paragraph should be rewritten.

1
2
3 *We have revised the text on page 5 as the reviewer's suggestions.*
4
5

6 5. What is the connection between the values of mangrove biodiversity of XTNP,
7 mangrove forest degradation and climate change impacts in the section 2 “The mangrove
8 ecosystem of Xuan Thuy National Park”? It is also important to understand clearly that the
9 serious degradation of mangrove forests has been mainly caused by human activities, rather
10 than the climate change impacts. The severe impacts of climate change are potential on the
11 loss of biodiversity and ecosystem functional provided by mangroves, rather than the
12 degradation of mangrove area itself. The restoration of mangrove forests is to mitigate the
13 impacts of the increased natural disasters due to climate changes, protect biodiversity, and
14 support local livelihoods sustainability. Hence, the sentence “Therefore, the implementation
15 of ... to value mangrove biodiversity ... this wetland” in line 7-8, page 7 should be corrected
16 as “... to value mangrove restoration...”. There were many places in the text indicating
17 “biodiversity conservation” which should be taken into the consideration.
18
19

20
21 *We have corrected the text as the reviewer's comments and suggestions on pages 7,*
22 *10, 18, 31 and 32.*
23

24 6. In part 3.2 “Econometric modelling”, authors introduced two methods using for data
25 analysis, they however should explain more for the reasons of using both methods.
26

27 *We have included descriptions of two methods on pages 11-12 as the reviewer's*
28 *suggestions.*
29

30
31
32 7. The identified sample size was 350 households (line 7 page 10), but it remained 226
33 after excluding the protests (line 40 page 15). How does this impact the estimated results?
34

35 *We have justified on removing the protests on page 17 as the reviewer's suggestions.*
36
37

38
39 8. Line 55 page 15, 9.3% should be replaced by 9.7% as indicated in Table 5.
40

41 *We have corrected the mistake as the reviewer's comment.*
42

43 9. Table 4 should be moved right after table 3.
44

45 *We have changed the table positions as the reviewer's suggestion.*
46
47

48
49 10. Line 18 page 20, “The definition for all explanatory variable ... in Table 1” should be
50 replaced as “The in Table 9”.
51

52 *We have corrected the mistake as the reviewer's comment.*
53

54
55 11. Why income categories in Table 9 were 5 levels, but they were three levels in Table
56 10? It should be given more explanation of recoding this variable in the text, somewhere in
57 lines 45-47 page 20. Similarly to the passion variable shown in Table 1 with 3 levels but it
58 was 2 levels in Table 9.
59

60 *We have given more explanation as the reviewer's suggestion on page 22.*

1
2
3 12. Line 28 page 22, why is Ba Ria estuary? Should it be corrected to Ba Lat estuary
4 instead?
5

6 *We have corrected the mistakes as the reviewer's comments on page 22.*
7
8

9
10 13. In the conclusion section, authors indicated the factors of income, perception of
11 mangrove benefits and concern for the environment are determinants influencing the WTP.
12 However, the two later factors were not explanation variables in the model estimation, the
13 authors rather considered on the respondents' knowledge about mangrove's benefits and their
14 interest in activities for environmental conservation. The sentence "Second, factors affecting
15 ...for the environment" in line 55 page 24 and line 5 page 25 should be corrected.
16

17 *We have corrected the sentence as the reviewer's suggestion on page 25.*
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only