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We manage and protect Finland’s most valuable natural treasures in a responsible manner

- For the benefit of people and nature
The NHS Manages All State-owned PAs

- 38 national parks
- 19 strict nature reserves
- 7 national hiking areas
- 12 wilderness areas
- almost 500 other PAs
- public water areas

Altogether over 7 million hectares, 18% of Finland’s surface area
Finland’s National Parks

- 38 national parks
- 9,789 km²
- 2.3 million visits in 2013
Ecosystem Services

- Provisioning Services
- Regulating Services
- Supporting Services
- Cultural Services
Flood Control, Clean Air...
Clean Water, Landscapes
Conservation of Species
Berries and Mushrooms
Education
Recreation and Tourism
The Total Economic and System Values

Full range of ecosystem services underpinned by biodiversity

Monetary

Quantitative

Qualitative

Non-specified

TEV

TSV

Monetary: e.g. avoided water purification costs, value of food provisioning, value of carbon storage.

Quantitative: e.g. cubic meters of water purified, tonnes of carbon stored, share of population affected by loss of food provisioning.

Qualitative: range and materiality of various benefits provided by the ecosystem instance being evaluated.

Source: Gantioler et al. 2010, adapted from TEEB 2009.
The Total Value of a National Park

Visitor spending increases income and employment in the area. Income effects are part of the direct use values.
What Did We Do?

An application producing annually
- direct and total income effects (€)
- employment effects (Jobs)

Easy-to use, practical tool

Estimate for each national park

Cumulative, state-level effects

Local Economic Impacts of Visitor Spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total value</th>
<th>Minimum value*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Million €</td>
<td>Jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National parks</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>1 484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National hiking areas</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Minimum value* indicates the economic impacts created by the visitors to whom the national park was the only or the most important reason for visit.
Big Differences between the Parks

- The impacts are biggest in Northern Finland in parks located nearby a tourist center
  - **Pallas-Yllästunturi**
    - 34.3 million €, 450 jobs
  - **Urho Kekkonen NP**
    - 21.6 million €, 284 jobs
  - **Oulanka**
    - 15.5 million €, 200 jobs
HOW?
Basic requirement: Standardized visitor monitoring data across the PA system
Visitor Monitoring

Visitor Surveys

Visitor Counting

Visitor Information
ASTA Visitor Information Forms the Base of Regular Economic Impact Estimates

- Annual numbers of visits
- Visitor spending in the parks and their surroundings
- Other visitor information
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How the Information Has Been Useful for Nature Conservation in Finland?

In making the benefits visible and tangible

- Benefits are not obvious
- Decision-makers prefer numbers
How the Information Has Been Useful for Nature Conservation in Finland?

In demonstrating that national park visitation supports local livelihoods thereby increasing the general acceptability of national parks.
How the Information Has Been Useful for Nature Conservation in Finland?

- In making the case for continued public investment by showing that money spent on management and services of national parks and other PAs comes back many-fold to local economies through private businesses and jobs.
How the Information Has Been Useful for Nature Conservation in Finland?

In clarifying the role of actors:

- State provides facilities
- The private sector creates business services
  → Both are needed
  → Cooperation
How the Information Has Been Useful for Nature Conservation in Finland?

In creating new sustainable businesses around protected areas
How the Information Has Been Useful for Nature Conservation Finland?

In measuring economic effectiveness
The VSE model of the U.S. National Park Service

Economics

Visitor Spending Effects

The National Park Service (NPS) manages the nation’s most iconic destinations that attract millions of visitors from across the nation and around the world. Trip-related spending by NPS visitors generates and supports a considerable amount of economic activity within park gateway communities. This economic effects analysis measures how NPS visitor spending cycles through local economies, generating business sales and supporting jobs and income.

- Now Available - 2013 National Park Visitor Spending Effects Report (PDF 1471 KB)
- Archived - 2012 National Park Visitor Spending Effects Report (PDF 848 KB)

Hikers enjoying the Taggart Lake trail at Grand Teton National Park. NPS Photo/
Danielle Lehle
National Parks Move People!

On average 15 km of walking per visit

- 34 million km a year in Finland’s all national parks
- 850 times around the globe
Health and Well-Being Benefits in Euros?

Health and well-being benefits perceived by visitors:
- On average 208 € per visit, median 100 € per visit
- Finland’s all national parks year 2013, 226 million €
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Number of Visits to National Parks and Visitor Centers

- **National Parks**
- **Visitor Centres and Customer Service Points**

The graph shows the number of visits to National Parks and Visitor Centers from 2000 to 2013. The visits to National Parks have gradually increased, while visits to Visitor Centres and Customer Service Points have shown more variability over the years.
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