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1. Introduction

Human activity is increasing the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and in the ocean. In the atmosphere, carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas causing climate change. In the ocean, carbon dioxide dissolves to become an acid whose net effects on ocean chemistry are likely to cause ecosystems to shift away from calcifying species. While research on economic aspects of climate change has generated a large number of studies over the last few years, ocean acidification has only recently been recognised as a substantial problem. Impact studies are still rare and estimates of the economic impact are largely absent. We know of only three studies investigating economic consequences of ocean acidification on commercial fisheries, one focusing on the USA (Cooley and Doney, 2009) and two global studies (Cooley et al., 2011; Narita et al., 2012). Our study is the first to estimate the economic impact of ocean acidification on coral reefs, which are generally considered to be economically as well as ecologically important ecosystems.

Ocean acidification has a range of impacts on biological systems. It will likely change the competition between marine plankton species in favor of those that rely less on calcium (Orr et al., 2005; Riebesell et al., 2000), negatively affect shellfish (Gazeau et al., 2007; Spicer et al., 2007), impact on fish (Munday et al., 2009), may benefit highly invasive non-native algal species (Hall- Spencer et al., 2008), and reduce coral calcification (Hoegh-Goldberg et al., 2007; Veron et al., 2009; Veron, 2011). However, while the initial impact of ocean acidification is relatively clear, the eventual impact depends on the complex interaction of many species. The estimation of resulting changes in economic values, which generally derive from the higher trophic levels (e.g., top predator fish, marine mammals, sea birds), is therefore also pervaded by uncertainty. Coral reefs are an exception in that the impact of ocean acidification is relatively well understood and they have a range of direct and indirect use values for humans (e.g., coastal protection, fisheries, recreation, amenity). It is for these reasons that this paper is limited to assessing the economic impact of ocean acidification on coral reefs.

There are a large number of economic studies that assess the values of ecosystem services provided by coral reefs. A few of these studies specifically address the impact of climate change on the economic value of coral reefs. Most of these address specific regions such as Australia (Hoegh-Goldberg and Hoegh-Goldberg, 2004), Indian Ocean (Westmacott et al., 2002; Wilkinson et al., 1999), Pacific Ocean (World Bank, 2000); the Caribbean (Burke and Maidens, 2004; Vergara et al., 2009) and the United States (Gibson et al., 2008). Only Cesar et al. (2003a) estimates the global damage of climate change on coral reefs but does not specifically address the impact of ocean acidification. To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate the economic impact of ocean acidification on coral reefs worldwide.

The current paper is a first step towards filling an important gap in the literature on the valuation of the impact of climate change. The research tract on the economic impact of climate change, started by Nordhaus (1991), is still incomplete and lacks estimates of both negative and positive impacts (Tol, 2008b). Ocean acidification,
however, is more than just one of the unquantified impacts. For several reasons, the absence of this climate change impact also has serious implications for the type of policy interventions required. First, since ocean acidification is exclusively driven by carbon dioxide, as opposed to climate change which is also caused by other greenhouse gases, the additional cost associated with carbon dioxide emissions due to ocean acidification changes the trade-offs between the reduction of greenhouse gases (Schmalensee, 1993). Second, the absorption of carbon dioxide by the oceans and thus the impact of ocean acidification occur over a short time scale, whereas the warming of the atmosphere substantially lags behind the build-up of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. This changes the dynamics of optimal emission control, and makes the discount rate less important (d’Arge et al., 1982). Third, the consideration of ocean acidification also has implications for the instrument choice for the potential solution to climate change. Climate change may be countered by geoengineering (Schelling, 1996), but ocean acidification would continue unabated and may even accelerate in the case that sulphur particles are used to cool the planet (Royal Society, 2009). Therefore, valuing ocean acidification will not only increase the estimates of the Pigouvian tax required to achieve efficient greenhouse gas emissions abatement (Tol, 2005), but it will affect other trade-offs and policies too.

In this study, we construct and combine a series of models that describe each step in the impact pathway between carbon dioxide emissions and economic impact on coral reef ecosystem services. The structure of this combined model is represented in Fig. 1.
Subsequent sections of the paper describe the main elements of this model. Section 2 reviews the literature on ocean acidification and its impact on coral reefs, and constructs a simple model. Section 3 presents a meta-analysis of the economic value of coral reefs. Section 4 combines the two to produce a scenario and sensitivity analysis of the economic impact of ocean acidification on coral reefs. Section 5 concludes.

2. Ocean Acidification and Its Impact on Coral Reefs

Caldeira and Wickett (2005) show the results of 15 experiments with an ocean chemistry model to predict chemistry changes from carbon dioxide emissions to the atmosphere and the ocean. Although there are a number of mechanisms that lead to increased ocean acidity, the main mechanism is the higher concentration of dissolved CO$_2$ (Cao et al., 2007; McNeil and Matear, 2006, 2007; Morse et al., 2006; Ridgwell et al., 2007). This allows us to approximate surface ocean acidity as a simple function of the atmospheric concentration of CO$_2$:

$$A_t = \alpha(M_t - 280)$$

where $A$ is change in ocean acidity relative to pre-industrial times (in pH) at time $t$, $M$ is atmospheric carbon dioxide in parts per million by volume (ppmv). The pre-industrial level of carbon dioxide is the assumed value of 280 ppmv. The parameters $\alpha = 0.00569$ (0.04 $10^{-3}$) and $\beta = 0.67$ (0.53–0.86) are based on OLS regression using the results of (Caldeira and Wickett, 2005). Figure 2 shows that Eq. (1) is a rather good approximation; the $R^2$ is 99.9%.

A number of studies has estimated the impact of ocean acidification on the calcification rate of coral reefs (Gattuso et al., 1998; Kleypas et al., 1999; Langdon et al.,

![Figure 2. Ocean acidity as a function of the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide as modeled by Caldeira and Wickett (2005) and as approximated by Eq. (1) (thick line; the 67% confidence interval is given by the dashed lines).](image-url)
Table 1. The impact of ocean acidification on coral reef area according to five studies. The implied logistic parameter $\gamma$ (Eq. (2)) is also given.

| Coral area change (fraction)$^a$ | CO$_2$ (ppmv) | Acidity (pH)$^b$ | $\gamma$ | Source                      |
|----------------------------------|--------------|----------------|-------|-----------------------------|
| $-0.40$                          | 700          | $-0.33$        | 0.88  | Andersson et al. (2007)    |
| $-0.07$                          | 700          | $-0.33$        | 0.20  | Andersson et al. (2003)    |
| $-0.44$                          | 700          | $-0.33$        | 0.94  | Andersson et al. (2003)    |
| $-0.03$                          | 560          | $-0.25$        | 0.12  | Gattuso et al. (1998)      |
| $-0.16$                          | 1000         | $-0.47$        | 0.30  | Gattuso et al. (1998)      |
| $-0.08$                          | 560          | $-0.25$        | 0.30  | Kleypas et al. (1999)      |
| $-0.17$                          | 560          | $-0.25$        | 0.59  | Kleypas et al. (1999)      |
| $-0.40$                          | 560          | $-0.25$        | 1.15  | Langdon et al. (2000)      |

$^a$Numbers are reported as changes in the rate of calcification.

$^b$Own calculations based on Eq. (1).

(2000; Andersson et al., 2003, 2007). Table 1 summarizes their results, expressed as a loss in reef area. We assume that reef area is a logistic function in ocean acidity:

$$R_t = \frac{\gamma A_t}{1 + \gamma A_t}$$

where $R$ is the change in reef area since pre-industrial times, and $\gamma = 0.56 (0.39)$ is a parameter; its value is the average of the parameters in Table 1.

Figure 3 gives reef area as a function of the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide, using Eq. (1) to compute ocean acidity. The uncertainty shown is the
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Figure 3. Coral reef area as a function of the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide as according to Eqs. (1) and (2). The dotted lines are the 67% confidence interval.

---

We assume, for want of an alternative, that the loss in reef area is equal to the change in calcification rate.
uncertainty about the coral reef response to acidification only; this uncertainty is substantial. Recently published research has shown the impact of ocean acidification on coral reefs to be highly complex and that at the local habitat/reef scale there are biological mechanisms that potentially improve conditions for calcification depending on benthic community structure, reef size, water residence time and circulation patterns (Anthony et al., 2011; Kleypas et al., 2011). According to the information we used, at around 1200 ppmv, there is a 16.5% chance that coral reefs are so degraded that they are not able to reproduce successfully. However, it is beyond the scope of this paper to predict when coral reefs may become extinct.

3. The Value of Coral Reefs

Coral reefs are highly productive ecosystems that provide a variety of valuable goods and services to humans. These goods and services include coral mining and recreational opportunities for diving, snorkelling and viewing (direct use values); amenity services reflected in real estate prices, coastal protection and habitat and nursery functions for commercial and recreational fisheries (indirect use values); and the welfare associated with the existence of diverse natural ecosystems (preservation values). The open-access nature and public good characteristics of coral reefs often result in reefs being undervalued in decision making related to their use and conservation. In response to this, there is now a substantial literature on the economic values of coral reefs. This section synthesises the results of the coral reef valuation literature through a meta-analysis. The data and analysis here are similar to those in Brander et al. (2007), but this study includes value estimates for all goods and services including e.g., commercial fishing and coastal protection while Brander et al. was limited to recreation values.

160 separate coral reef valuation studies were collected from a variety of publication outlets, including journal articles, book chapters, occasional papers, reports, and academic theses. The literature search attempted to be as comprehensive as possible by accessing online reference inventories (e.g., EVRI and ENVALUE), library catalogs, and relevant reference lists and bibliographies. Care was taken not to double count value estimates that are reported in more than one study, or to include estimates that were derived through value transfer. In order to compare value observations, information on a number of key variables is required, including coral reef value, goods and services being valued, number of visitors, area of coral cover, location, year of valuation, and valuation method used. 45 studies yielded sufficient information for a statistical meta-analysis i.e., contained information on all variables included in the meta-regression. From these 45 studies we were able to code 81 separate value observations, taking multiple observations from single studies (see Table A1 in the Appendix). On average, 1.8 observations per study were obtained, with a maximum of 12 observations from a single study (Cesar et al., 2003a,b).
Regarding the geographic representation of the sample, 30 observations are for US coral reefs, 21 from Southeast Asia, 9 from East Africa, 8 from Australia and 13 from the Caribbean. In terms of the ecosystem services valued, the sample contains 71 value observations for recreational opportunities, 5 for indirect use values (commercial fishing, coastal protection) and 5 for non-use (existence) values. This distribution of available information for coral reef services has implications for the specification of the meta-analytic value function and the values that are subsequently transferred.²

The value observations have been estimated using a variety of valuation methods. Around half (41) were obtained using the contingent valuation method,³ with the remainder derived from the travel cost (11), net factor income (7), production function (6), and gross revenue methods (17). It should be noted that these valuation methods differ significantly in terms of the welfare measures that they estimate (see Kopp and Smith, 1993; Carson et al., 1996; Freeman, 2003). This source of heterogeneity in the data may lead to problems of non-comparability between estimated values and we need to be wary of comparing inconsistent concepts of economic value (Brouwer, 2000; Smith and Pattanayak, 2002).

The diversity in welfare measures being estimated makes it necessary to clearly distinguish between the different valuation techniques in the meta-analysis. Although we may have a priori expectations as to the direction of any bias associated with each valuation method (Bateman and Jones, 2003), it is not possible to make sensible adjustments to the observed valuation estimates to correct for these biases. We therefore include dummy variables for each valuation method in the meta-regression to control for differences in values estimated through each method. To some extent there is a correspondence between the coral reef service valued and the valuation method employed, i.e., some methods are more suited to valuing certain services than others. There is not, however, perfect correlation between methods and services, and so we include sets of dummy variables in the meta-regression to represent both methods and services.

There is no standard reporting format for valuation results and so value observations are reported in a wide variety of units (e.g., total values, per unit of area, per visitor etc.), for different time periods (e.g., per day, per year, NPV over a given time horizon etc.), and in different currencies and years of value. Therefore, we standardized these values to a common metric, which is US$/km²/year in 2000 prices. The unit of area

²The limited number of value observations for non-tourism/recreation services means that it is only possible to estimate an aggregate value function for all coral reef services. Ideally it would be possible to estimate separate value functions for each ecosystem service (or a system of value functions) to allow for variation in the influence of explanatory variables across services. As the number of estimates on the value of coral reef ecosystem services increases, particularly for non-tourism related services, it will become possible to conduct new analyses that examine each service separately.
³The contingent valuation method is considered to be less reliable in cases where respondents are unfamiliar with the valued good or service. Our sample, however, is dominated by studies that investigate the direct use value of coral reefs (e.g., recreational services), for which the targeted respondents are highly familiar.
refers to the area of coral cover. Values from different years were converted to 2000 prices using GDP deflators from the World Bank World Development Indicators. PPP conversions were made to correct for differences in price levels between countries.

The selection of the units in which to standardise coral reef value estimates required careful assessment of the underlying data. Standardizing values to WTP per person as in Brouwer et al. (1999) or WTP per visit as in Brander et al. (2007) was not possible because several of the valuation methods used in the literature (e.g., net factor income, production function, and gross revenue methods) do not produce WTP estimates. WTP per person or per visit on the other hand could be converted to US$/km²/year given information on the area of coral cover and the relevant population size or number of visitors. We therefore followed Woodward and Wui (2001) and Brander et al. (2006) in defining the valuation effect size in terms of units of area. A further consideration in defining the units in which to standardize value estimates is that for the purposes of using the estimated meta-regression function for value transfer, it is preferable to define the dependent variable in per unit area rather than per person terms. This avoids the potentially difficult step in a value transfer exercise of identifying the number of beneficiaries that hold values for the policy site coral reef. Instead, the effect of beneficiary numbers on the value of coral reefs is controlled for by including population and visitor variables in the meta-regression.

In standardizing coral reef values we face the problem of distinguishing between average and marginal values, both of which can be expressed as a monetary value per km². The majority of coral reef valuation studies have estimated total or average values but there are also a number of estimates of marginal values. Expressing coral reef values in per km² terms gives the impression that each km² of coral cover is equally productive, i.e., exhibit constant returns to scale or equivalently that the marginal value is equal to the average value. Without being able to convert marginal values to average values or vice versa, we assume exactly this. This assumption is examined by including the area of coral cover as an explanatory variable in the meta-regression. Information on the area of coral cover was obtained from the underlying valuation studies; gaps in this information were filled using a number of site-specific sources.

The methodological approach that we use to explain observed differences in coral reef values is a meta-regression. Meta-analysis is a statistical method for combining study results that allows the analyst to systematically explore variation in estimates across studies (Stanley, 2001). Our meta-analysis of coral reef values involves regressing the standardized coral values on a set of explanatory variables. These explanatory variables include geographic (location dummies for four different regions), ecological (area of coral cover and an index for biodiversity), socio-economic (GDP per capita, population density and number of visitors), services provided by the reef based on the valuation studies (e.g., dive tourism, snorkeling, commercial and recreational fishing and coastal protection), and methodological variables (valuation method used). The biodiversity index is defined as a composite measure of coral diversity and
reef fish diversity. Information on population density was derived from Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN) data. The process by which this data was converted to represent each coral reef valuation site is described in Wagendonk and Omtzigt (2003). Visitor numbers of each site were obtained either directly from each valuation study or from site specific sources. Table A2 in the Appendix provides definitions and descriptive statistics of the dependent and explanatory variables included in the meta-regression.

A number of alternative model specifications were investigated before defining the estimated meta-regression model given in Eq. (3). The dependent variable \( y \) in the meta-regression is a vector of values in US$/km²/year in 2000 prices. The explanatory variables are the socio-economic characteristics \( X_E \) (i.e., GDP per capita, population, and visitors), location \( X_L \), reef quality \( X_R \) (i.e., area of coral cover, biodiversity index), services values \( X_S \), and the valuation methods used \( X_V \). \( a \) is the constant term; \( b_E, b_L, b_R, b_S, \) and \( b_V \) contain the estimated coefficients on the respective explanatory variables; and \( \mu \) is a vector of residuals with assumed well behaved underlying errors.

The natural logarithms of the continuous variables (indicated in Table 2) are used in order to improve model fit and mitigate heteroskedasticity.

\[
\ln(y) = a + b_E X_E + b_L X_L + b_R X_R + b_S X_S + b_V X_V + \mu
\]  

(3)

The results of the meta-regression are presented in Table 2. A series of diagnostic tests were performed in order to test the robustness of the OLS estimation. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (K-S statistic = 0.072) does not reject the assumption of normally distributed residuals. Similarly, the null hypothesis of homogenous variance of the residuals cannot be rejected by White’s test for heteroskedasticity (White’s statistic = 12.841). Regarding model specification, the regression specification error test (RESET statistic = 0.253) does not reject the null hypothesis that the estimated linear form is the correct specification of the model. We test for potential multicollinearity in the model using pairwise correlations between the explanatory variables and find no correlation coefficients in excess of 0.8. The adjusted \( R^2 \) value of 0.60 is reasonably high, and indicates that almost two-thirds of the variation in coral reef value is explained by variation in the explanatory variables. In this log-log model, the coefficients measure the constant proportional or relative change in the dependent variable for a given relative change in the value of the explanatory variable. For example, the coefficient of 0.535 for the dummy variable indicating that the coral reef supports reef tourism means that, ceteris paribus, the value of the coral reef will be 71% (i.e., \( e^{0.535} - 1 \)) higher than the average when this service is provided, as compared to when this service is not present.

Regarding the results on the regional indicators, all else being equal, Caribbean reefs (the omitted dummy) have higher values than reefs in any other region, and Australian reefs are least valuable. This may reflect the relative travel time and cost to international reef visitors. As one would expect, income per capita, population density, and the number of visitors all have positive effects on coral reef value. More
biodiverse reefs are more valuable, and smaller reefs are more valuable (per square kilometer) than are bigger reefs, again as one would expect. The latter result indicates diminishing returns to scale of coral cover, i.e., that adding an additional km$^2$ to a large area of coral cover has a lower value than an additional km$^2$ to a small area. Vice versa, losing a km$^2$ from a small area is more serious than losing a km$^2$ from a large area. The services provided by coral reefs generate only a few significant coefficients on the dummy variables explaining economic value. Coral reefs that have been valued as providing snorkeling opportunities and coastal protection have lower values than the average, but this is significant only at the 10% level. The results on the dummy variables indicating the type of valuation method used are equally inconclusive. Only the contingent valuation method stands out, albeit at the 10% significance level only, yielding lower than average values. In the next section we use the estimated meta-analytic value function to conduct a value transfer to global coral reefs.

### Table 2. Meta-regression results; dependent variable is ln (coral reef value per square kilometer).

| Category          | Variable            | Coefficient | Standard deviation |
|-------------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Socio-economic    | Constant            | 0.216       | 5.298              |
|                   | GDP per capita (ln) | 1.125*      | 0.573              |
|                   | Population density (ln) | 0.516*     | 0.282              |
|                   | Visitors (ln)       | 0.675***    | 0.129              |
| Location          | USA                 | -3.604**    | 1.457              |
|                   | East Africa         | -0.200      | 1.706              |
|                   | Southeast Asia      | -4.606**    | 1.614              |
|                   | Australia           | -6.725**    | 2.779              |
| Reef quality       | Area coral cover (ln) | -0.524***   | 0.092              |
|                   | Biodiversity index (ln) | 2.475**   | 1.000              |
| Services          | Dive tourism        | 0.355       | 0.505              |
|                   | Snorkeling          | -0.605*     | 0.427              |
|                   | Other reef tourism  | 0.535*      | 0.466              |
|                   | Commercial fishing  | -0.390      | 0.758              |
|                   | Recreational fishing| -1.192      | 1.656              |
|                   | Coastal protection  | -3.061*     | 1.757              |
|                   | Biodiversity        | 0.638       | 1.656              |
|                   | Preservation        | 0.148       | 1.119              |
| Valuation method  | CVM                 | -1.701*     | 1.649              |
|                   | Travel cost method  | 0.405       | 1.708              |
|                   | Net factor income   | -1.377      | 1.797              |
|                   | Production function method | -0.512 | 1.928              |
|                   | Gross revenue       | -0.281      | 1.703              |
| Adj. $R^2$        |                     | 0.601       | $F$                |
|                   | Standard error      | 1.510       | 6.553              |

***$p < 0.01$, **$p < 0.05$, *$p < 0.1$. 

L. M. Brander et al.
4. Scenarios and Results

In this section we combine the results of the two previous sections to calculate the economic impact of ocean acidification on coral reefs and show results for the four marker scenarios of the IPCC Special Report on Emission Scenarios (Nakicenovic and Swart, 2001). Although controversial (Castles and Henderson, 2003; Pielke et al., 2008), the SRES scenarios are the standard in climate change impact analysis. Table A3 in the Appendix shows the scenario characteristics of the affected countries, that is, those with coral reefs.

Figure 4 shows the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide according to the four SRES scenarios and a standard (Maier-Reimer and Hasselmann, 1987) carbon cycle model as embedded in the integrated assessment model FUND (Tol, 2008a). The CO₂ concentration in 2100 shows a wide range, from 570 ppmv (and falling) in the B1 scenario to 812 ppmv (and accelerating) in A2.

Figure 5 shows the resulting change in surface ocean pH. Equation (1) has that ocean pH is proportional to the excess atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide, raised to the power 2/3. In pre-industrial time, ocean pH was 8.2 (Key et al., 2004). There is a wide range for future pH values. The change in pH in 2100 varies from −0.25 (but rising) in B1 to −0.38 (and accelerating) in A2. This pattern follows immediately from the CO₂ concentrations in Fig. 3.

Figure 6 shows the percentage loss of coral reef area (since pre-industrial times) due to the increased acidity of the surface ocean. Equation (2) has a logistic relationship between ocean pH and coral reef area, so the response is monotone but non-linear. In 2000, the total area was some 307,000 km², but already 7% was lost due to
ocean acidification. The loss in 2100 ranges from 16% or 30,000 km² (but falling\(^4\)) in B1 to 27% or 65,000 km² (and accelerating) in A2. Again, this pattern follows straightforwardly from the pH values in Fig. 4. It should be noted that the estimated loss in coral area is only due to projected ocean acidification and not to other

\(^4\)Note that we assume that coral reefs respond as fast to falling acidity as to rising acidity. This assumption may be optimistic, although one would expect an eventual positive effect from falling ocean acidity.
factors that may result in coral degradation (e.g., warming, sea level rise, pollution, mining etc.).

Figure 7 shows the global average value per km² of coral reef area. The average is a weighted average, using national coral reef area as weights. Several variables feed into the meta-regression (cf. Sec. 3). Population density and per capita income are part of the SRES scenarios. We assumed that the growth rates for population and income are uniform across the countries in the FUND regions, and used these growth rates to extrapolate the national coral reef value. The number of visitors is also important (Table 2). We used the number of international arrivals according to the Hamburg Tourism Model (Hamilton et al., 2005). See Fig. A1 in the Appendix. Coral reef area also affects coral reef value. We used the areal change of Fig. 6. The meta-analysis is about the annual value per area of coral reef. We calculate the net present value by assuming that the annual value is constant; we use a Ramsey rate of discount, with a pure rate of time preference of 3% per year and an income elasticity of marginal utility of one.

All scenarios display a rapid rise in per unit area values. We assumed that the meta-regression results are representative for 2000. The average value then was $177 thousand per square km², with a range of $39 to $804 thousand per km². This value rises by a factor 67 in the A2 scenario, and a factor 681 in the A1 scenario. Four developments contribute to this. Firstly, population grows substantially, so that there are more people to appreciate coral reefs. Secondly, coral reef area falls substantially,
so that the scarcity value of the remaining area increases. These two factors contribute relatively little, because the elasticities are relatively small (around 0.5). The third development is more important. Visitor numbers rapidly rise as people become more affluent and take more holidays. In the SRES scenarios, economic growth is concentrated in the poor countries in the tropics—exactly where coral reefs tend to be as well. The HTM model assumes that mass tourism will remain at destinations that are not too far from the home country, so that tourism growth is also concentrated in the tropics. However, the elasticity is only 0.68. The fourth development dominates. The SRES scenarios have rapid growth in poor countries, and the income elasticity of the coral reef value is 1.2. This explains the explosive growth in value: As people grow richer, the money value they attach to coral reefs grows fast.

Figure 8 shows the annual economic damage of ocean-acidification-induced coral reef area loss. Figure 8 multiplies Fig. 6 (area loss) and Fig. 7 (net present value per area), and expresses the result as a fraction of GDP. Damages are higher in the A1 and B2 scenarios than in the A2 scenario because coral values are higher in A1 and B2 than in A2. The B2 scenario has both lower values and lower losses than the A1 scenario. In the long run, the B1 scenario has the lowest damages, because it has the lowest loss of coral reefs. Following the coral loss scenarios, there are even benefits towards the end of the century. The annual damage goes up to US$870 billion in the A1 scenario in 2100. Although this may seem a substantial economic loss, this damage figure is only 0.14% of global GDP. The proportional loss in the B2 scenario is in fact higher (0.18% of GDP), while the A2 scenario is again lower (0.14% of GDP).

Multiplying the annual value per area of coral reef with the total coral reef loss until a particular year assumes perpetual regret—that is, people in 2100 still suffer a loss of welfare because of coral reef loss in 2000, and the 2100 loss is in fact greater than the 2000 loss because of economic growth etc.
Figure 9 shows a sensitivity analysis of the annual damage in 2100. The B2 scenario is central in most cases, so we varied parameters in that scenario. For comparison, the results of the other three scenarios are also shown. Parameters were varied by one standard deviation including the parameters describing the relationship between ocean surface acidity and atmospheric concentration (low and high pH), area of coral cover (low and high scarcity), reef area lost (low and high loss), and value of reef area (low and high value).

The response of ocean acidity to ambient carbon dioxide concentrations is not particularly uncertain, and damages are hardly affected. In the base case, the damage in 2100 is $528 billion. The error around this relationship increases or decreases damages by $2 billion. The area elasticity of value is not that important either: Damages go up or down by $5 billion. The choice of scenario make a substantial difference: Under the B1 scenario, there is a positive impact of $69 billion; this is $228 billion for A2, $528 billion for B2 and $870 for A1b. The extent of coral area loss per unit change in ocean pH is very uncertain, however, and this uncertainty is about as large as the uncertainty about the scenarios. The damage ranges from $112 to $1,417 billion. The largest uncertainty, more than a factor four, is the value per unit area. The range of damages is from $117 to $2,293 billion.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This paper gives one of the first partial estimates of the economic value of ocean acidification. This estimate is limited to the impact on coral reefs, perhaps the most tractable of the many impacts of ocean acidification. We construct and calibrate simple models of ocean acidification and coral reef area loss, driven by the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide. We extend an earlier meta-analysis of coral reef
values to estimate a value transfer function for coral reefs, and apply an existing model of tourist numbers. We drive this by CO\textsubscript{2} emissions, population, and income for the four SRES scenarios. Combining these models, we derive a number of scenarios of the annual impact of ocean-acidification-induced coral reef loss, and conduct a sensitivity analysis.

We find that the annual economic impact rapidly escalates over time, essentially because the scenarios have rapid economic growth in the relevant countries and recreational activities related to coral reefs are a luxury good. Nonetheless, the annual value in 2100 in still only a small fraction of total income, and one order of magnitude smaller than the impact of climate change (Tol, 2008b). This is not surprising since we estimated only the economic impact of ocean acidification on coral reefs where recreation has a dominant role and did not look at any other impacts. The estimated impact is uncertain, of course, but the estimated confidence interval spans one order of magnitude only.

Despite the relatively small numbers, future research should investigate the implications of our findings for climate policy — the Pigouvian tax on carbon dioxide emissions, the trade-offs between greenhouse gases, the optimal trajectory over time and its sensitivity to the discount rate, and the attractiveness of geoengineering. If indeed ocean acidification adds some 10\% to the total impact of climate change, then the Pigouvian tax on carbon dioxide (but not on other greenhouse gases) should go up by at least 10\% too. However, as ocean acidification is a more direct and more immediate impact, the marginal cost estimate should be more sensitive than the total cost estimate — but how much remains to be studied. To test the robustness of our conclusions, other researchers should derive their own estimates of the economic value of ocean acidification. Future research should seek to extend the estimates presented here to other impacts of ocean acidification, notably on shellfish, fish, marine mammals, and birds; to explore the distribution of impacts and vulnerability of impacted populations; and to investigate the interactions between ocean acidification, climate change, and sea level rise.
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### Appendix

Table A1. Economic valuation studies used in the meta-analysis.

| Author(s)          | Date | Title                                                                                           | Publication                                                                 |
|--------------------|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Andersson         | 2003 | The recreational cost of coral bleaching: A stated preference study of international tourists     | Paper presented at the 2003 EAERE conference in Bilbao                     |
| Arin               | 1998 | Estimating the tourist demand for international dive vacations: A pretest                       | Master of Science Thesis, Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University |
| Ayob et al.        | 2000 | Preferences for outdoor recreation: The case of Pulau Payar visitors                            | Paper presented at the First Conference of the Malaysian Association for Resource and Environmental Economics |
| Brown et al.       | 2000 | Trade-off analysis for marine protected area management                                          | CSERGE Working Paper, University of East Anglia, UK                        |
| Bappenas          | 1996 | Recreation values of tourists for Bunaken National Marine Park, North Sulawesi                    | Indonesian Ministry of Forestry Report No. 66                              |
| Berg et al.        | 1998 | Environmental economics of coral reef destruction in Sri Lanka                                   | Ambio                                                                      |
| Bowker and Leeworthy | 1998 | Accounting for ethnicity in recreation demand: A flexible count data approach                    | Journal of Leisure Research                                                |
| Brock              | 1994 | Beyond fisheries enhancement: Artificial reefs and ecotourism                                     | Bulletin of Marine Science                                                |
| Carr and Mendelsohn | 2001 | Valuing coral reefs: A travel cost analysis of the Great Barrier Reef                             | Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies                          |
| Cesar and van Beukering | 2004 | Economic valuation of the coral reefs of Hawaii                                                 | Pacific Science                                                           |
| Cesar et al.       | 2003 | Mainstreaming economic valuation in decision making: Coral reef examples in selected CARIDOM countries | ARCADIS-Euroconsult                                                      |
| Cesar and van Beukering | 2002 | Economic valuation of the coral reefs of Hawaii                                                 | Hawaii Coral Reef Initiative Research Program                              |
| Cesar              | 1996 | Economic analysis of Indonesian coral reefs                                                     | World Bank                                                                |
| Driml              | 1999 | Dollar values and trends of major direct uses of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park              | Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority                                  |
| Driml              | 1994 | Protection for profit: Economic and financial values of the great barrier reef world heritage area and other protected areas | Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority                                  |
Table A1. (Continued)

| Author(s)         | Date  | Title                                                                 | Publication                                      |
|-------------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Davis and Tisdell | 1996  | Economic management of recreational scuba diving and the environment | *Journal of Environmental Management*            |
| Dixon             | 1993  | Economic benefits of marine protected areas                          | *Oceanus*                                       |
| Dixon et al.      | 1993  | Meeting ecological and economic goals: The case of marine parks in the caribbean | *World Bank*                                    |
| Edwards           | 1991  | The demand for Galapagos vacations: Estimation and application to wilderness preservation | *Coastal Management*                            |
| English et al.    | 1996  | Economic contribution of recreation visitors to the Florida Keys/Key West | National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Adminstration |
| GEF/UNDP/IMO      | 1999  | Total economic valuation: Coastal and marine resources in the Straits of Malacca | *Global Environment Facility*                   |
| Hodgson and Dixon | 1988  | Logging versus fisheries and tourism in Palawan                      | *East-West Center*                              |
| Johns et al.      | 2001  | Socioeconomic study of reefs in Southeast Florida (executive summary) | National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Adminstration |
| KPMG Consulting   | 2000  | Economic and financial values of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park | *Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority*       |
| Kragt et al.      | 2006  | Recreational demand under Great Barrier Reef degradation: A contingent behaviour approach | *FEEM Working Paper No. 45.2006*                |
| Leeworthy and Wiley | 1996 | Importance and satisfaction ratings by recreating visitors to the Florida Keys/Key West | National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Adminstration |
| Leeworthy et al.  | 1997  | Nonmarket economic user values of the Florida Keys/Key West          | National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Adminstration |
| Lindberg          | 1993  | An analysis of ecotourism's economic contribution to conservation and development in Belize | Griffith University, Australia                  |
| Mak and Moncur    | 1998  | Political Economy of protecting unique recreational resources: Hanauma Bay, Hawaii | *Ambio*                                         |
| Ngazy             | 2004  | Recreational coral bleaching and the demand for coral reefs: A case study | International Centre for Living Aquatic Resources Management |
| Author(s)            | Date | Title                                                                 | Publication                                           |
|---------------------|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Peachy              | 1998 | An economic analysis of water based recreation in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park | Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority              |
| Pendleton           | 1995 | Valuing coral reef protection                                         | Ocean and Coastal Management                         |
| Pham and Tran       | 2001 | Analysis of the recreational value of the coral-surrounded Hon Mun Islands in Vietnam | EEPSEA report                                       |
| Riopelle            | 1995 | The economic valuation of coral reefs: A case study of West Lombok, Indonesia | Dalhousie University, Canada                         |
| Ruitenbeek et al.   | 1999 | Optimization of economic policies and investment projects using a fuzzy logic based cost-effectiveness model of coral reef quality: Empirical results for Montego Bay, Jamaica | Coral Reefs                                           |
| Sudara et al.       | 1991 | Tourism for economic gain in the vicinity of Samui and Pha-ngan Islands | Proceedings of the Regional Symposium on Living Resources in Coastal Areas. Marine Science Institute, University of the Philippines |
| Seenprachawong      | 2003 | Economic valuation of coral reefs at Phi Phi Islands, Thailand         | Proceedings of the Regional Symposium on Living Resources in Coastal Areas. Marine Science Institute, University of the Philippines |
| Setiasih            | 2000 | Recreational valuation using contingent and conjoint analysis: A study from Menjangan Island, Bali Barat National Park | University of East Anglia, UK                        |
| Tabata and Reynolds | 1995 | Hawaii’s recreational dive industry: Results and recommendations of a 1990 study | Proceedings of the 8th International Coral Reef Symposium, Panama |
| Vogt                | 1997 | The economic benefits of tourism in the marine reserve of Apo Island, Philippines | Proceedings of the 8th International Coral Reef Symposium, Panama |
| Weber et al.        | 1996 | Managing a coral reef ecosystem in Indonesia                           | Paper presented to the 4th Biennial Meeting of the International Society for Ecological Economics, Boston, Massachusetts, USA |
| Author(s)  | Date  | Title                                                                 | Publication                                                        |
|-----------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Wiley     | 1999  | A cost-benefit analysis for a proposed wastewater treatment plant in the Florida Keys | National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration               |
| White et al. | 1997 | Using integrated coastal management and economics to conserve coastal tourism resources in Sri Lanka | Ambio                                                             |
| White et al. | 2000 | Benefits and costs of coral reef and wetland management, Olango Island, Philippines | Cordio                                                            |
| Yeo       | 2004  | The recreational benefits of coral reefs: A case study of Pulau Payar Marine Park | International Centre for Living Aquatic Resources Management       |
Table A2. Descriptive statistics for the variables in the meta-regression (cf. Table 2).

| Variable                | Definition                          | Mean   | Standard Deviation |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------------------|
| **Dependent variable**  |                                     |        |                    |
| Coral reef value        | US$ per km² per year (ln)           | 10.946 | 2.392              |
| **Socio-economic**      |                                     |        |                    |
| GDP per capita          | GDP per capita (ln)                 | 9.141  | 1.275              |
| Population density      | Population density 50 km radius (ln)| 3.924  | 1.374              |
| Visitors                | Number of visitors (ln)             | 11.514 | 2.312              |
| **Location**            |                                     |        |                    |
| USA                     | 1 = USA; 0 = other                  | 0.366  | 0.485              |
| East Africa             | 1 = East Africa; 0 = other          | 0.110  | 0.315              |
| Southeast Asia          | 1 = Southeast Asia; 0 = other       | 0.256  | 0.439              |
| Australia               | 1 = Australia; 0 = other             | 0.098  | 0.299              |
| Caribbean               | 1 = Caribbean; 0 = other             | 0.169  | 0.376              |
| **Reef quality**        |                                     |        |                    |
| Area coral cover        | Area coral cover km² (ln)           | 3.902  | 2.703              |
| Biodiversity index      | Biodiversity index (ln)             | −1.290 | 0.773              |
| **Services**            |                                     |        |                    |
| Dive tourism            | 1 = Diving; 0 = other               | 0.720  | 0.452              |
| Snorkeling              | 1 = Snorkeling; 0 = other           | 0.561  | 0.499              |
| Other reef tourism      | 1 = Tourism; 0 = other              | 0.451  | 0.501              |
| Commercial fishing      | 1 = Commercial fishing; 0 = other   | 0.073  | 0.262              |
| Recreational fishing    | 1 = Recreational fishing; 0 = other | 0.012  | 0.110              |
| Coastal protection      | 1 = Coastal protection; 0 = other   | 0.024  | 0.155              |
| Biodiversity            | 1 = Biodiversity; 0 = other         | 0.012  | 0.110              |
| Preservation            | 1 = Preservation; 0 = other         | 0.061  | 0.241              |
| **Valuation method**    |                                     |        |                    |
| CVM                     | 1 = CVM; 0 = other                  | 0.488  | 0.503              |
| Travel cost method      | 1 = Travel cost; 0 = other          | 0.134  | 0.343              |
| Net factor income       | 1 = NFI; 0 = other                  | 0.085  | 0.281              |
| Production function     | 1 = Production function; 0 = other  | 0.073  | 0.262              |
| Gross revenue           | 1 = Gross revenue; 0 = other        | 0.207  | 0.408              |
Table A3. Selected characteristics of affected countries: Reef area in 2000; population, per capita income, international tourist arrivals in 2000 and assumed growth rates for the 21st century.

| Reef km² | Population | Population growth rate (%) | Income billion US$ | Income growth rate (%) | Arrivals | Arrivals growth rate (%) |
|----------|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
|          | km²        | A1  | A2  | B1   | B2   | A1        | A2        | B1        | B2        | A1 | A2 | B1 | B2 |
| Indonesia| 51020      | 228438 | 0.20 | 0.68 | 0.20 | 0.68 | 1024 | 5.07 | 2.61 | 4.56 | 3.53 | 4324 | 5.00 | 3.79 | 4.83 | 4.39 |
| Australia| 48960      | 19358 | 0.31 | 0.09 | 0.31 | 0.09 | 20327 | 3.66 | 2.19 | 3.09 | 2.60 | 3726 | 3.58 | 3.00 | 3.33 | 3.29 |
| New Caledonia| 40000   | 205 | 0.76 | 0.97 | 0.76 | 0.97 | 7367 | 3.96 | 2.57 | 3.43 | 2.97 | 86 | 3.82 | 3.22 | 3.56 | 3.50 |
| Paraguay| 25060      | 5734 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 1860 | 1.87 | 0.86 | 1.34 | 1.11 | 438 | 2.09 | 1.79 | 1.82 | 1.94 |
| Papua New Guinea| 13840 | 5049 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 1172 | 3.67 | 1.88 | 3.71 | 2.20 | 42 | 4.51 | 3.55 | 4.66 | 3.80 |
| Fiji| 10020      | 844 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 2544 | 3.48 | 2.21 | 3.00 | 2.60 | 318 | 3.66 | 3.16 | 3.43 | 3.42 |
| Maldives| 8920       | 311 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 1088 | 3.11 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.30 | 315 | 3.09 | 2.64 | 2.85 | 2.91 |
| Saudi Arabia| 6660   | 22757 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 6886 | 4.11 | 2.52 | 3.61 | 3.27 | 3325 | 4.86 | 4.21 | 4.66 | 4.77 |
| Marshall Islands| 6110 | 71 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 1923 | 2.94 | 1.76 | 2.47 | 2.12 | 5 | 3.27 | 2.84 | 3.04 | 3.08 |
| French Polynesia| 6000  | 254 | 0.01 | 0.23 | 0.01 | 0.23 | 5095 | 1.95 | 0.85 | 1.48 | 1.16 | 172 | 3.01 | 2.58 | 2.75 | 2.87 |
| India| 5790       | 1029991 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 358 | 1.87 | 0.86 | 1.34 | 1.11 | 2124 | 1.95 | 1.68 | 1.69 | 1.83 |
| Solomon Islands| 5750  | 480 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 863 | 4.11 | 2.52 | 3.61 | 3.27 | 12 | 4.85 | 4.21 | 4.65 | 4.77 |
| Vanuatu| 4110       | 193 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 1402 | 3.48 | 2.21 | 3.00 | 2.60 | 44 | 3.57 | 3.09 | 3.36 | 3.33 |
| Egypt| 3800       | 69537 | 0.85 | 0.97 | 0.85 | 0.97 | 949 | 3.17 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.31 | 2872 | 3.72 | 3.28 | 3.47 | 3.56 |
| Malaysia| 3600   | 22229 | 0.20 | 0.68 | 0.20 | 0.68 | 4343 | 5.07 | 2.61 | 4.56 | 3.53 | 7469 | 5.33 | 4.12 | 5.16 | 4.75 |
| Bahamas| 3580       | 298 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 12338 | 3.48 | 2.21 | 3.00 | 2.60 | 1598 | 3.74 | 3.24 | 3.51 | 3.50 |
| Tanzania, United Rep.| 3580  | 36232 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 155 | 4.11 | 2.52 | 3.61 | 3.27 | 285 | 4.21 | 3.56 | 4.02 | 4.11 |
| Cuba| 3290       | 11184 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 640 | 1.87 | 0.86 | 1.34 | 1.11 | 738 | 1.90 | 1.61 | 1.63 | 1.76 |
| Eritrea| 3260      | 4298 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 180 | 3.48 | 2.21 | 3.00 | 2.60 | 315 | 3.63 | 3.14 | 3.40 | 3.40 |
| Kiribati| 2940      | 94 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 616 | 4.67 | 2.67 | 4.71 | 2.99 | 4 | 4.89 | 3.78 | 5.05 | 4.02 |
| Japan| 2900       | 126772 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 40944 | 2.94 | 1.76 | 2.47 | 2.12 | 1731 | 3.16 | 2.73 | 2.95 | 2.96 |
| Sudan| 2720       | 36080 | 0.20 | 0.68 | 0.20 | 0.68 | 279 | 5.07 | 2.61 | 4.56 | 3.53 | 63 | 5.45 | 4.25 | 5.28 | 4.87 |
| Madagascar| 2230  | 15983 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 230 | 3.11 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.30 | 75 | 3.50 | 3.06 | 3.26 | 3.32 |
| Thailand| 2130      | 61798 | 0.31 | 0.09 | 0.31 | 0.09 | 2869 | 3.66 | 2.19 | 3.09 | 2.60 | 6952 | 3.66 | 3.07 | 3.41 | 3.36 |
| Colombia| 2060      | 40349 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 2090 | 3.67 | 1.88 | 3.71 | 2.20 | 1399 | 4.31 | 3.38 | 4.48 | 3.62 |
| Reef | Population | Population growth rate (%) | Income | Income growth rate (%) | Arrivals | Arrivals growth rate (%) |
|-----|------------|---------------------------|--------|------------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| km² | A1         | A2 | B1 | B2 | A1 | A2 | B1 | B2 | A1 | A2 | B1 | B2 |
| Myanmar | 1870 | 41995 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 556 | 3.11 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.30 | 110 | 3.41 | 2.87 | 3.16 | 3.17 |
| Mozambique | 1860 | 19371 | 0.01 | 0.39 | 111 | 3.31 | 1.67 | 2.67 | 2.60 | 51 | 3.85 | 3.18 | 3.53 | 3.90 |
| Seychelles | 1690 | 19371 | 0.31 | 0.09 | 4620 | 3.76 | 2.19 | 3.09 | 3.60 | 121 | 3.57 | 2.99 | 3.32 | 3.28 |
| Puerto Rico | 1610 | 3937 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 312 | 3.48 | 2.21 | 2.79 | 2.99 | 313 | 4.82 | 3.20 | 4.97 | 3.94 |
| Panama | 1600 | 2846 | 0.39 | 0.24 | 300 | 4.96 | 2.01 | 4.09 | 2.24 | 345 | 5.02 | 3.90 | 5.08 | 4.06 |
| China | 1510 | 12311 | 0.39 | 0.24 | 574 | 3.93 | 2.17 | 3.27 | 2.38 | 200 | 4.19 | 3.51 | 3.91 | 4.24 |
| Tonga | 1510 | 12311 | 0.81 | 0.24 | 1692 | 4.77 | 2.67 | 4.71 | 2.99 | 29 | 4.92 | 3.81 | 5.17 | 4.06 |
| Haiti | 1420 | 256 | 0.81 | 0.24 | 186 | 4.77 | 2.67 | 4.71 | 2.99 | 29 | 4.92 | 3.81 | 5.17 | 4.06 |
| Dominican Republic | 1350 | 8828 | 0.69 | 0.24 | 1525 | 4.67 | 2.67 | 4.71 | 2.99 | 1776 | 4.91 | 3.79 | 3.91 | 4.03 |
| Dominican Republic | 1270 | 7939 | 0.81 | 0.39 | 271 | 4.67 | 2.67 | 4.71 | 2.99 | 151 | 4.92 | 3.82 | 3.91 | 4.03 |
| Haiti | 1220 | 6965 | 0.81 | 0.39 | 254 | 4.67 | 2.67 | 4.71 | 2.99 | 145 | 5.01 | 3.90 | 5.17 | 4.06 |
| Mexico | 1220 | 101879 | 0.81 | 0.39 | 319 | 3.11 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.30 | 202 | 4.15 | 3.54 | 3.91 | 4.24 |
| Brazil | 1200 | 174469 | 0.81 | 0.39 | 319 | 3.11 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.30 | 202 | 4.15 | 3.54 | 3.91 | 4.24 |
| El Salvador | 1190 | 2458 | 0.81 | 0.39 | 319 | 3.11 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.30 | 202 | 4.15 | 3.54 | 3.91 | 4.24 |
| United Arab Emirates | 1190 | 2408 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 11786 | 4.41 | 3.18 | 4.38 | 3.05 | 140 | 4.16 | 3.05 | 4.24 | 3.13 |
| Taiwan, Province of China | 940 | 79939 | 0.81 | 0.39 | 319 | 3.11 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.30 | 202 | 4.15 | 3.54 | 3.91 | 4.24 |
| Iran, Islamic Republic | 700 | 66129 | 0.81 | 0.39 | 319 | 3.11 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.30 | 202 | 4.15 | 3.54 | 3.91 | 4.24 |
| Qatar | 700 | 769 | 0.81 | 0.39 | 319 | 3.11 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.30 | 202 | 4.15 | 3.54 | 3.91 | 4.24 |

The Economic Impact of Ocean Acidification on Coral Reefs
| Reef | Population | Population growth rate (%) | Income | Income growth rate (%) | Arrivals | Arrivals growth rate (%) |
|-----|------------|---------------------------|--------|------------------------|----------|-------------------------|
|     | km²        | A1       | A2       | B1       | B2       | billion US$ | A1       | A2       | B1       | B2       |        |                |
| Sri Lanka | 680 | 19409 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 726 | 3.48 | 2.21 | 3.00 | 2.60 | 403 | 3.77 | 3.27 | 3.54 | 3.53 |
| Kenya  | 630 | 30766 | 0.01 | 0.39 | 0.01 | 0.39 | 333 | 3.93 | 2.17 | 3.27 | 3.18 | 691 | 4.30 | 3.52 | 3.99 | 4.28 |
| Virgin Islands, U.S. | 590 | 122 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 7367 | 3.11 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.30 | 454 | 3.41 | 2.96 | 3.17 | 3.22 |
| Bahrain | 570 | 645 | 0.76 | 0.97 | 0.76 | 0.97 | 9839 | 3.96 | 2.57 | 3.43 | 2.97 | 2043 | 4.06 | 3.48 | 3.80 | 3.77 |
| Oman   | 530 | 2622 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 5615 | 3.48 | 2.21 | 3.00 | 2.60 | 352 | 3.57 | 3.07 | 3.34 | 3.33 |
| Samoa  | 490 | 179 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 924 | 4.67 | 2.67 | 4.71 | 2.99 | 68 | 5.56 | 4.44 | 5.71 | 4.69 |
| Djibouti | 450 | 461 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 817 | 4.96 | 2.91 | 4.99 | 3.24 | 21 | 5.10 | 4.00 | 5.26 | 4.24 |
| Cameroon | 430 | 15803 | -0.15 | -0.08 | -0.15 | -0.08 | 604 | 4.11 | 2.52 | 3.61 | 3.27 | 100 | 4.26 | 3.60 | 4.06 | 4.16 |
| Comoros | 430 | 596 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 354 | 4.96 | 2.91 | 4.99 | 3.24 | 23 | 5.19 | 4.08 | 5.35 | 4.32 |
| Guadeloupe | 400 | 431 | -0.01 | -0.23 | -0.01 | -0.23 | 4152 | 1.95 | 0.85 | 1.48 | 1.16 | 640 | 2.90 | 2.46 | 2.64 | 2.74 |
| Martinique | 260 | 419 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 5201 | 1.87 | 0.86 | 1.34 | 1.11 | 457 | 2.21 | 1.94 | 1.95 | 2.10 |
| Netherlands Antilles | 250 | 212 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 5414 | 1.87 | 0.86 | 1.34 | 1.11 | 681 | 1.96 | 1.68 | 1.70 | 1.83 |
| St. Kitts and Nevis | 160 | 39 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 3132 | 1.87 | 0.86 | 1.34 | 1.11 | 232 | 2.07 | 1.80 | 1.81 | 1.96 |
| St. Vincent and Grenadines | 140 | 116 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 1120 | 4.11 | 2.52 | 3.61 | 3.27 | 108 | 4.56 | 3.92 | 4.36 | 4.48 |
| Kuwait | 110 | 2042 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 15719 | 1.87 | 0.86 | 1.34 | 1.11 | 295 | 2.34 | 2.06 | 2.07 | 2.20 |
| Singapore | 100 | 4300 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 25645 | 3.48 | 2.21 | 3.00 | 2.60 | 6422 | 3.79 | 3.29 | 3.56 | 3.55 |
| Barbados | 90 | 275 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 6594 | 3.48 | 2.21 | 3.00 | 2.60 | 442 | 3.72 | 3.22 | 3.49 | 3.47 |
| St. Lucia | 90 | 158 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 1825 | 3.48 | 2.21 | 3.00 | 2.60 | 256 | 3.50 | 3.01 | 3.27 | 3.27 |
| Dominica | 70 | 71 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 3140 | 4.67 | 2.67 | 4.71 | 2.99 | 60 | 4.87 | 3.75 | 5.01 | 3.99 |
| Bangladesh | 50 | 131270 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 0.81 | 1.34 | 317 | 4.67 | 2.67 | 4.71 | 2.99 | 156 | 4.24 | 3.13 | 4.39 | 3.37 |
| Cambodia | 50 | 12492 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.59 | 294 | 3.11 | 1.91 | 2.64 | 2.30 | 220 | 3.40 | 2.96 | 3.17 | 3.21 |
| Reef km² | Population | Population growth rate (%) | Income billion US$ | Income growth rate (%) | Arrivals | Arrivals growth rate (%) |
|---------|------------|---------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|----------|-------------------------|
|         | A1 A2 B1 B2 | A1 A2 B1 B2              | A1 A2 B1 B2       | A1 A2 B1 B2            | A1 A2 B1 B2 |
| Ecuador | 50 13184   | 0.24 0.59 0.24 0.59      | 1565              | 3.48 2.21 3.00 2.60    | 440      | 3.43 2.94 3.21 3.19     |
| Jordan  | 50 5153    | 0.24 0.59 0.24 0.59      | 1150              | 3.48 2.21 3.00 2.60    | 1074     | 3.48 2.99 3.25 3.25     |
| Nauru   | 50 12      | -0.41 0.24 -0.41 0.24    | 2147              | 3.60 1.46 3.00 2.45    | 190      | 3.89 2.90 3.63 3.62     |
| Pakistan| 50 144617  | -0.31 -0.09 -0.31 -0.09 | 449               | 3.66 2.19 3.09 2.60    | 378      | 3.50 2.92 3.26 3.21     |
| Reunion | 50 733     | 0.03 0.02 0.03 0.02      | 2050              | 1.87 0.86 1.34 1.11    | 304      | 2.28 1.97 2.01 2.14     |
| South Africa | 50 43586 | 0.20 0.68 0.20 0.68      | 3566              | 5.07 2.61 4.56 3.53    | 4488     | 4.67 3.46 4.49 4.11     |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 40 1170 | 0.01 0.39 0.01 0.39      | 4202              | 3.93 2.17 3.27 3.18    | 260      | 4.04 3.29 3.74 4.01     |
| Costa Rica | 30 3773   | 0.85 0.97 0.85 0.97      | 2540              | 3.17 1.91 2.64 2.31    | 785      | 3.74 3.31 3.49 3.59     |
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