Supported by



CAPITALS COALITION INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR VALUING IMPACTS



Value Faciors

Version 1.0 September 2024

Disclaimer

The valuation factors and coefficients ("Information") are the proprietary content of GIST Advisory Switzerland SA ("GIST Impact") and Wifor Gmbh ("WifOR Institute"). All intellectual property rights are owned by GIST Impact and WifOR Institute. The Information is provided "as is," without any warranties, express or implied, including warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, or noninfringement. GIST Impact and WifOR Institute disclaim any liability for errors or omissions and in no event will GIST Impact, WifOR Institute, their affiliates, employees, agents, or licensors be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, punitive, or consequential damages arising from the use of the Information.

Restrictions on Use

Commercial Use: The Information may be used for commercial purposes to support business operations (e.g., applying the factors to enhance your services or products).

Commercial Redistribution: Redistribution, resale, or sublicensing of the Information or any part thereof for commercial purposes is strictly prohibited without prior written permission from GIST Impact and WifOR Institute.

Non-Commercial Use: The Information may be used for academic, research, or other non-commercial purposes.

Amendments and Modifications

GIST Impact and WifOR Institute reserve the right to modify or discontinue the Information at any time, with or without notice.

By accessing or using the Information, you agree to these terms. If you do not agree, do not use the Information.











Table of Contents

| About | i |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Background | ii |
| Purpose Statement | iii |
| Alignment Standards | iv |
| Definitions | V |
| Framework | 1 |
| Methodology and Approach | 6 |
| Methodology Summary | 7 |
| Value Factors | 15 |



INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR VALUING IMPACTS

balar

About

This document makes public, for the first time, a framework, methodology summary and collection of coefficients (so-called 'value factors') that together allow for the locationspecific valuation of business impacts across 25 countries.

The goal of this document, then, is to accelerate the transition towards an impact economy - where financial return is not the sole measure of economic performance. An impact economy values financial return as well as positive and negative changes in wellbeing (so-called 'impacts') across the environment and society. It is only by valuing the impacts of a business alongside its financial returns that it becomes possible to remedy the existing market failures that continue to contribute to the growing systemic environmental and social pressures threatening humankind.

This document is aimed above all at the private sector, without the support of which the transition to an impact economy can be neither complete nor timely. At the same time, we recognise the valuable roles played by the public sector (including governments, academia and ordinary citizens) as well as the 'third sector' (charities, NGOs, and so on). We therefore make this information available to all - for the greater good.











Background

İİ

In February this year, several providers of impact valuation methodology participated in a '<u>sprint</u>' to publish notes on their respective methodologies under the auspices of the Value Commission, supported and governed by the Capitals Coalition, the Value Balancing Alliance (VBA) and the International Foundational for Valuing Impacts (IFVI).

In response to a significant surge in interest after the above 'sprint' from companies large and small, some of the sprint participants now wish to take this initiative to its next logical step and publish alongside a set of value factors, for an agreed framework of impacts, applied to companies operating in 25 diverse countries. This will provide further encouragement and support to companies who are interested in learning more about their positive and negative impacts on the environment, on human health and on society at large.

Many of these companies are SMEs and would not have the budgets to explore their impacts without such additional support. Others may have staff and some budgets, but not quite enough to afford consulting advice and support to get their pilot study done. The value factor website conceived by some participants will enable all such interested companies to explore, understand, measure and economically size their impacts using these freely available numbers for 25 countries.

In summary, this initiative is a successor to the February sprint. Its purpose is to enable interested companies to measure and value their impacts through pilot projects appropriately, holistically, quickly, and at low or no cost.





Supported by





Purpose Statement

We inhabit a world of increasing volatility, risks and uncertainties. And we exacerbate these challenges by using macro- and micro-economic management models that neither account for the economic invisibility of nature's life sustaining and economy-generating benefits, nor adequately reflect changes in human or social capital.

Today is the time for the most significant institution of our globalised society – the private sector, which delivers the lion's share of employment, economic output and environmental impacts – to step forward proactively with effective solutions.

A necessary component for this is a fair and standardised institutional framework to measure and value corporate impacts (i.e. GHG-driven climate costs, air pollution-driven health costs, etc.) – collectively the largest drivers of today's unmanaged social and environmental costs. Valuing impacts across all capitals (natural, human, social and financial), in order to assess materiality and set priorities that look beyond shareholders' financial capital, is clearly the way forward.

Admirable corporate and investor leadership has already emerged in this space, and institutional initiatives such as those of the Capitals Coalition, the Value Commission, the EU Transparent Project, the Value Balancing Alliance and the International Foundation for Valuing Impacts are signalling the way forward. Now, the wider business community seeks guidance for accessible impact valuation and accounting, and they should be encouraged and enabled to do so in the public interest.

As leading providers of impact data and impact valuation, and in the interest of promoting and supporting all institutional initiatives towards impact transparency, GIST Impact and WifOR Institute are collaborating to provide you this this framework, summarised methodology and collection of value factors for 25 countries. This information, made public for the first time, enables corporate and financial services stakeholders to calculate the impacts of their companies and portfolios in a standardised and sciencebased way.











Alignment Statement

Value factors are indispensable to calculating impacts in a comprehensive, standardised and (above all) science-based way.

Governance is needed in this space.

To this end, the Capitals Coalition has brought the global community – including GIST Impact, WifOR Institute, the Value Balancing Alliance (VBA) and the International Foundation for Valuing Impacts (IFVI) – to form the Value Commission, which will be delivering a draft of the Value Accountability Framework this year. These efforts are also aligned with the progress and development of organizations like the International Foundation for Valuing Impacts (IFVI) and the Value Balancing Alliance (VBA), which are developing a comprehensive, independently governed, public good impact accounting methodology involving representatives from Capitals Coalition, GIST Impact, and WifOR on its Valuation and Technical Practitioner Committee.

Whilst there are a growing number of organisations developing their own value factors, we should be competing over delivery (transparency, confidence and accessibility) and not ownership or market share.

This is why it is so important that GIST Impact and WifOR Institute are showing leadership in making their value factors publicly available.

And this is why it is heartening to note that, as this first version of this document is made public, other organisations – such as the IFVI – have affirmed their support of these transparency efforts and interest in utilising them to inform the development of their official methodologies through its Due Process Protocol and independent oversight.



Supported by





Definitions

Impact

Impact is the change in one or more dimensions of people's individual or collective well-being arising from the activities of an enterprise and its value chain, either directly or through a change in the condition of the natural environment. An impact can be actual or potential, direct or indirect, intended or unintended, and positive or negative. Impacts are valued using monetary valuation techniques, by applying impact coefficients or 'value factors'. However, this anthropocentric approach has potential to be expanded to include other perspectives as well.

Input

The resources and business relationships that the entity draws upon for its activities.

Activities

Everything that an entity does, including operations, the procurement of inputs, the sale and provision of products and/or services, as well as any supporting activities. Activities span a large number of different actions that altogether contribute to outputs and ultimately, outcomes and impact.

Output

The direct result of an entity's activities, including an entity's products, services, and any by-products.

Outcomes

The changes in conditions or states (physical, biological, psychological, etc.) of systems caused by impact drivers, which may lead to material impacts on third parties or on the impact drivers and their transactional counterparts.

Impact Drivers

Activities and transactions of agents (governments, corporations, individuals, etc.) which result in significant outcomes leading to material impacts on human well-being.

Valuation Framework

A valuation framework is any description and classification of relevant capital stocks, flows, impact drivers, outcomes and impacts that enables assessment and underpins analysis of changes in human well-being. A framework establishes what should be valued - and why.

Value Factor

Any ratio of an impact or an outcome to its respective impact driver (be it an input or an output of business activity) for a location or country.





Note: the definitions of **impact**, **input**, **activities**, and **output** are taken and/or adapted from the IFVI-VBA *General Methodology* 1 – *The Conceptual Framework for Impact Accounting*, paragraphs 49-56 (pp.17-18). Accessible <u>here</u>.



1









| | | | Outcomes | | Impacts | | |
|-----------|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| Capital | Capital | Drivers | (Changes in bio-physical and | (Changes in bio-physical and socio-economic conditions) | | (Changes in human well-being due to Outcomes) | |
| | Definitions | (Input, Processes, Outputs) | GIST Impact | WifOR Institute | GIST Impact | WifOR Institute | |
| | | Air Pollution | Changes in concentration of pollutants | Changes in concentration of pollutants | Human health costs of company's air pollutions | Economic, ecological and health costs of company's air pollutions | |
| ital | Natural Capital consists of the limited stocks of physical and biological resources found on earth, and of the limited capacity of ecosystems to provide ecosystem services. Natural Capital impact values the positive and negative societal impacts associated with the physical and biological resources consumed as part of business activities. | Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services | Changes in ecosystems services stock and flows | Changes in ecosystems services stock & flows | Ecosystem and species impacts of company's business operations | Ecosystem and species impacts of company's business operations | |
| ap | | GHG Emissions | Changes in global GHG concentration | Changes in global GHG concentration | Attributable social cost of company's GHG emissions | Attributable social cost of company's GHG emissions | |
| | | Plastic Waste and Pollution | Changes in marine pollution | Changes in marine pollution | Ecosystem and animal health impacts of marine plastic particles | Ecosystem and animal health impacts of marine plastic particles | |
| tura | | Waste Generation | Changes in volume of waste material | Changes in volume of waste material | Air, water, land pollution costs of waste incineration/disposal | Air, water, land pollution costs of waste incineration/disposal | |
| Nat | | Water and Land Pollution | Changes in concentration of pollutants | Changes in concentration of pollutants | Eutrophication, health costs of company's land and water pollution | Eutrophication, health costs of company's water pollution | |
| | | Water Use | Changes in local water scarcity | Changes in local water scarcity | Costs to residence, farming, industry of water scarcity caused | Costs to residence, farming, industry of water scarcity caused | |



| Capital | Capital Definitions | Capital Drivers | | Outcomes (Changes in bio-physical and socio-economic conditions) | | Impacts (Changes in human well-being due to Outcomes) | |
|---------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Demittons | (Input, Processes, Outputs) | GIST Impact | WifOR Institute | GIST Impact | WifOR Institute | |
| apital | Human Capital includes the knowledge, skills, competencies and attributes embodied in individuals that facilitate the creation of | Fair Wages | Changes in level of wealth, comforts, necessities and material welfare | Changes in living standard | Health utility of income | Health utility of income | |
| an C | economic well-being. Human Capital impact values the contribution of a company towards human capital | Health and Safety | Enhanced / safer working environment | Enhanced working environment related to Injuries and illnesses | Negative impacts on employees' well-being of company EHS standards | Impacts on employees' well- being of company OHS standards | |
| n | development, and the physical and mental well-being of its employees. | | | | | | |
| Τ | | Training | Increase in employee skills and productivity | Increase in employee skills & productivity | Value of skills training / HRD to employees' future incomes | Impact of skills training / HRD on employees' future incomes | |



| Conitol | | Drivere | Outco | omes | Imp | acts |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Capital | Definitions | | (Changes in bio-physical and | socio-economic conditions) | (Changes in human well-being due to Outcomes) | |
| | | (input, Processes, Outputs) | GIST Impact | WifOR Institute | GIST Impact | WifOR Institute |
| | 7/ | Child Labour | Lower educational attainment | Changes in education | Lower income and well-being for children | Costs in forms of well-being and income |
| npita | Social Capital consists of the productive value of social connections, where 'productive' is understood in terms of | Community Investment / CSR | Direct and indirect contributions to CSR / local communities | Direct and indirect contributions to CSR / local communities | Attributable socio-economic value of impacts for material stakeholders | Attributable economic value of impacts for material stakeholders |
| the production of a broad range of well-being outcomes. Social Capital impact values the contribution of the company towards the positive impacts on stakeholder well-being. | Diversity, Equity and Inclusion | Unequal distribution of income to gender and ethnic groups | Unequal income distribution for women | Impact on household expenditure on Health, Education and Nutrition | Impact on life expectancy (measured in monetary units) | |
| | of the company towards the positive impacts on stakeholder well-being. | Forced Labour | Loss of rights at workplace, freedom to collective bargaining and well-being | Loss of freedom, work opportunities and well-being | Impact on health, quality of life, income and well-being | Costs in form of health, quality of life and income |
| 0) | | Inclusive Green Economy Business Model Features | Relative social value / cost of unique business model / supply chain features | Relative social value / cost of unique business model / supply chain features | Attributable socio-economic value of impacts for material stakeholders | Attributable economic value of impacts for material stakeholders |



| Capital | Capital Drivers | | Outcomes (Changes in bio-physical and socio-economic conditions) | | Impacts (Changes in human well-being due to Outcomes) | |
|---------|--|---|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| | Definitions | Definitions (Input, Processes, Outputs) | GIST Impact | WifOR Institute | GIST Impact | WifOR Institute |
| tal | | Depreciation and Net Rent | Contribution to asset owners via current year depreciation charge and lease payments | Contribution to asset owners via current year depreciation charge and lease payments | Direct contribution to GDP | Direct contribution to GDP |
| Capit | Financial Capital is defined as the man- made goods as well as all financial assets (including embedded | Employee Compensation | Contribution to employees via current year salaries, benefits and bonuses | Contribution to employees via current year salaries, benefits and bonuses | Direct contribution to GDP | Direct contribution to GDP |
| ial (| intellectual capital) that are used to produce goods and services consumed by society. Financial value addition impact values the total contribution of a company to its direct non-shareholder stakeholders (i.e. GDP contribution). | Net Interest | Contribution to credit owners via current year net interest payable | Contribution to credit owners via current year net interest payable | Direct contribution to GDP | Direct contribution to GDP |
| nanc | | Profits | Contribution to shareholders via current year profits and loss | Contribution to shareholders via current year profits and loss | Direct contribution to GDP | Direct contribution to GDP |
| | | Тах | Contribution to government via current year tax charge minus subsidies receivable | Contribution to government via current year tax charge minus subsidies receivable | Direct contribution to GDP | Direct contribution to GDP |

Methodology and Approach

For a detailed analysis of the methodology and approach – including sources, assumptions, and valuation techniques used – please consult the *Impact Valuation Sprint 2024* report, published by the Value Balancing Alliance.





Impact Valuation Sprint 2024

balancing alliance

7









8

Overview

| Distributor | Outcomes and Impacts | Location specificity and error margins |
|-----------------|---|--|
| GIST Impact | Source: Value Balancing Alliance, Impact Valuation Sprint Report 2024 Link | This sample set of Value Factors for 25 Countries is part of a set of 190 country-level factors. Value Factors at a resolution of 50km ² and error margins (per impact driver) are also provided by GIST Impact to paid users. |
| WifOR Institute | Source: Value Balancing Alliance, Impact Valuation Sprint Report 2024 | This sample set of Value Factors for 25 Countries is part of a set of 190 country-level factors. https://www.wifor.com/en/impact-valuation-factors/ |



GHG Emissions

| Distributor | Outcomes | Impacts |
|-----------------|---|---|
| GIST Impact | GIST Impact looks into the future economic damages from the increased global temperatures and its associated impacts on the agricultural productivity, tourism, exposure to floods in coastal areas, human health impacts from increased incidences of diseases, etc. | Impacts are calculated in terms of 2% discount rates of the average damage cost from two Social Cost of Carbon models (2023 release) – the Data-driven Spatial Climate Model (DSCIM) and the Greenhouse Gas Impact Value Estimator model (GIVE). |
| WifOR Institute | WifOR Institute evaluates the costs of GHG emissions using the Social Cost of Carbon. The damages include lost benefits like the loss of agricultural yield, a reduction of recreational benefits or a reduction in the quality of life due to chronic health damages. | Impacts are calculated using the FUND model with a 2.5% social discount rate (where pure discount rate = 1%, 1.5% is growth rate of per capita consumption, and elasticity of marginal utility of consumption equals 1). |
| Key Differences | GIST Impact's estimates are derived from averaging the median estimat Model (DSCIM) and the Greenhouse Gas Impact Value Estimator model In contrast, WifOR Institute's value factors are based solely on the media value factors arises from their discounting rate: GIST Impact employs a whereas WifOR Institute utilises a 1% pure discount rate and interpolates result, WifOR Institute's value factors tend to be higher than those used b | es of two Social Cost of Carbon models: the Data-driven Spatial Climate (GIVE). In estimate of the FUND model. Another significant distinction in the 3% discount rate for calculating the net present value of future damages, is to estimate the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC) for specific years. As a by GIST Impact |



10

Air Pollution

| Distributor | Outcomes | Impacts |
|-----------------|---|---|
| GIST Impact | Outcomes are measured in terms of DALYs due to change in air pollution concentration associated with respiratory, COPD, cardiovascular diseases, lung cancer, stroke, and type II diabetes. | Impacts are measured using a hybrid Human Capital Approach (HCA). This method assesses lost economic productivity by valuing lost Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) using GDP per capita as a proxy. Additionally, it calculates the cost of illness per case by considering treatment costs. |
| WifOR Institute | Outcomes are measured in terms of health harms, economic losses in agriculture, man-made materials, as well as losses to other ecosystem services. The main impact is the health effect, which is measured in DALYs. | The valuation of DALYs is based on the Value of a Statistical Life Year (VSLY). WifOR Institute uses a VSLY value of \$200,000. |
| Key Differences | GIST Impact employs a hybrid Human Capital Approach (HCA) to gauge economically value lost Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) due to mo productivity measured by per capita income losses, and 2) the economic to medical care. In contrast, WifOR Institute adopts a Value of Statistical Life Years (VSLY approach uses a standardized value of \$200,000 across different geogra for the same lost DALYs depending on local and regional contexts. Econo impacts such as lost agricultural productivity, preservation costs related | the impact of air pollution, relying on two main indicators to rbidity and reduced life expectancy. These indicators are: 1) lost burden of diseases, estimated through the costs of ill ness and access () approach to assess the economic value of lost DALYs. The VSLY aphic regions, whereas GIST Impact considers varying economic values omic proxies are also employed in both methodologies to evaluate to biodiversity losses, and damage to building facades. |



11

Water Consumption

| Distributor | Outcomes | Impacts |
|-----------------|--|---|
| GIST Impact | Outcomes are measured as the location-specific energy required for provisioning amount of water consumed and increase in infectious diseases as well as malnutrition incidences due to rise in water scarcity. | The impacts are measured in following ways: 1. Water provisioning from a centralized facility related to energy externality costs; 2. Impact on human health in terms of DALYs lost due to infectious diseases resulting from limited availability of fresh water for human consumption; and 3. Impact on human health due to malnutrition in terms of DALYs lost due to lack of fresh water for agriculture. |
| WifOR Institute | Outcomes are measured in terms of water scarcity-related burden of disease, as well as economic costs, such as reduced agriculture output | The health costs of water deprivation are measured in DALYs and valued using VSLY. Economic damages are based on LCA studies linking water scarcity to agriculture output. |
| Key Differences | GIST Impact employs three distinct methods to assess the impacts of in related to reduced water access, including heightened incidences of mal externalities associated with water provisioning, such as increased energy nexus. Economic valuation of Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) con estimating the economic burden of diseases in terms of healthcare cost In contrast, WifOR Institute's approach to water consumption valuation p economic impacts. Human health damages, quantified in DALYs, utilize to of \$200,000. Economic damages are evaluated based on the foregone in regions using the Available Water Remaining (AWARE) metric, which refl | increased water scarcity. The first two methods focus on outcomes nutrition and waterborne diseases. The third approach examines gy demand and related impacts, thereby capturing the water-energy siders lost productivity measured by per capita income losses, alongside s and access. Drimarily involves two methods: assessing damage to human health and the Value of Statistical Life Years (VSLY) approach with a standard value mpacts from reduced agricultural productivity, adjusted across different ects water stress levels per region or country. |



Water Pollution

| Distributor | Outcomes | Impacts |
|-----------------|--|---|
| GIST Impact | Nutrient pollutants such as biodegradable organic matter, nitrogen, and phosphorus are conventional pollutants that, while not inherently carcinogenic or toxic, degrade water quality upon entering water bodies, necessitating treatment. In contrast, toxic pollutants pose significant environmental contamination risks, potentially leading to severe health impacts like death, diseases, or birth defects in organisms exposed to them. These outcomes are gauged by increased human exposure to these pollutants and the heightened demand for wastewater treatment, measured in terms of pollutant removal and the resulting burden of disease, encompassing both cancer-related and non-cancer health conditions. | The impacts are assessed through economic losses from human health conditions and the heightened external costs associated with wastewater treatment. For nutrient pollutants, the total removal costs are quantified by calculating the electricity expenditure required for pollutant extraction and assessing the impact of fugitive emissions in terms of equivalent CO2 emissions. To estimate the external costs of toxic pollutants (both organic and inorganic) discharged into water and land from various sources, characterization factors published in the USEtox model are used |
| WifOR Institute | Outcomes include both environmental and social impacts. The environmental impacts contain oxygen deficiency in water and its follow- up effects on fish production capacity and biodiversity. The social impacts are health diseases (measured in DALYs) due to exposure to polluted water. | Health impacts are valued using VSLY. Biodiversity impacts receive a share of global biodiversity costs, according to the share of threatened species attributable to each water pollutant. |
| Key Differences | Both GIST Impact and WifOR Institute distinguish between the impa pollutants such as Arsenic, Cad GIST Impact employs an abatement cost methodology to assess the in Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD), while valuing the economic impact o and the economic In contrast, WifOR Institute examines the effects on biodiversity and Institute estimates human health damage costs based on lost DALY distinction is that WifOR Institute focuses solely on water pollution and kilogram of po | acts of nutrient pollutants like Nitrogen and Phosphorus versus toxic Imium, Chromium, and Mercury. npacts of released nutrient pollutants such as Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and f lost Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) through productivity losses burden of diseases. fish production due to nutrient pollutants. For toxic pollutants, WifOR s using the Value of Statistical Life Years (VSLY) approach. A notable does not consider soil pollution, which results in higher value factors per llutant released. |



Waste Generation

| Distributor | Outcomes | Impacts | |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| GIST Impact | The outcomes are assessed individually for disposal methods such as recycling, incineration, and composting, where each offer avoided impacts through material or energy recovery. These impacts are evaluated in terms of GHG emissions, as well as air, water, and land pollutants, along with the resources consumed during waste treatment. When specific disposal methods are unknown, country-specific percentages for disposal methods are utilized to estimate these impacts accurately. | Impacts of waste generated by a company is calculated based on the type of disposal method used. Databases for the calculations are sourced from the LCA databases. The social cost of carbon is calculated for different gases, using the amount of carbon equivalent. | |
| WifOR Institute | Outcomes are measured for each waste type in terms of GHG emissions, other air emissions, leachate (for landfill), and experienced disamenity. | GHG emissions from different waste types are valued using the social cost of carbon. The social costs of leachate are estimated from the Hazard Rating System (HARAS) leachate risk model. Disamenities are valued using a hedonic pricing approach. | |
| Key Differences | Both GIST Impact and WifOR Institute's methodologies are based on the final treatment or disposal of waste. GIST Impact considers several end treatment methods including hazardous waste landfilling or incineration, non-hazardous waste landfilling or incineration, composting, hazardous waste recycling, and non-hazardous waste recycling. Economic proxies for waste disposal methods are determined based on the environmental impacts associated with each disposal approach, such as greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution, assessed through cause-effect pathways. In contrast, WifOR Institute focuses on two primary disposal methods: landfilling and incineration. The environmental impacts per unit of waste disposed are quantified and valued using specific methodologies for each impact driver. Additionally, WifOR Institute's methodology accounts f the disamenity value associated with landfilling and incineration infrastructure, using a hedonic pricing model to assess these impacts. | | |



Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

| Distributor | Outcomes | Impacts |
|-----------------|--|--|
| GIST Impact | The outcome is measured as the change in the original biome or natural vegetation type. The change in the net present value of any future losses is estimated based on the difference in yearly flows from the original state to the new state. | The impact pathway of land use change is assessed by evaluating changes in the original land parcel and the resulting ecosystem degradation. The loss of ecosystem is assessed through the conversion of land into arable land, permanent cropland, agricultural land, urban areas, industrial areas, mineral extraction sites, dump sites, construction sites, traffic areas and barren areas. |
| WifOR Institute | Outcomes of different types of land use include impacts on drinking water treatment costs, reduced crop harvest, biodiversity costs. Additionally, urban paved land use has a negative impact on working capacity due to the formation of urban heat islands. | Impacts are valued using the Environmental Priority Strategies (EPS) model. |
| Key Differences | GIST Impact's Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services metric evaluates imp services impacts are assessed based on transformations between differ service losses incorporates proxies like the social cost of carbon for redu water regeneration potential, considering net present value. In contrast, WifOR Institute employs three distinct methodologies to asse Urban Heat Island effect, valuing lost productivity based on GDP per hou impacts from biodiversity loss and reduced water production potential. L from changes in land use types and their effects on the flow of ecosystem costs. | bacts on two levels: ecosystem and species diversity. Ecosystem ent land use types. The economic valuation of differences in ecosystem uced carbon sequestration and water valuation methods for diminished ess land use impacts. Firstly, it addresses productivity losses due to the r worked, corrected for share of manual labor. Secondly, it evaluates .astly, WifOR Institute considers losses in ecosystem services resulting m services. Biodiversity impacts are quantified in terms of preservation |









GIST Impact – GHG Emissions, Air Pollution and Water Consumption

| | | GHG Emissions | | | Water Consumption | | | | |
|-------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Country | CO₂e Emissions (USD/Ton ne) | CH4 Emissions (USD/Tonne) | N₂O Emissions (USD/Tonne) | Particulate Matter (USD/Tonne) | Oxides of Nitrogen (USD/Tonne) | Oxides of Sulphur (USD/Tonne) | Non-Methane Volatile Organic Compounds (USD/Tonne) | Ammonia (USD/Tonne) | Water Consumption (USD/m³) |
| Australia | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -22.99 | -925 | -11.99 | | | -0.10 |
| Belgium | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -5,264.96 | -1,16127 | -1,711.09 | | | -0.03 |
| Botswana | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -8.88 | -3.58 | -4.49 | | | -0.41 |
| Canada | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -11.96 | -4.72 | -6.07 | | | -0.04 |
| Chile | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -49.08 | -19.51 | -2.5.09 | | | -0.36 |
| China | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -198.03 | -866.47 | -441.14 | | | -0.48 |
| Colombia | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -37.64 | -14.76 | -18.68 | | | -0.05 |
| Costa Rica | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -61.91 | -23.68 | -30.18 | | | -0.08 |
| Denmark | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -1,475.55 | -325.44 | -479.74 | | | -0.17 |
| Ecuador | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -54.13 | -21.27 | -27.16 | | | -0.12 |
| Finland | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -68.12 | -15.03 | -22.16 | | | -0.01 |
| France | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -1,131.60 | -249.65 | -367.78 | | | -0.02 |
| Germany | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -1,629.66 | -359.54 | -529.87 | | | -0.04 |
| Guyana | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -4.44 | -1.74 | -2.21 | VO | | -0.07 |
| India | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -1 50.60 | -62.89 | -77.37 | | | -0.31 |
| Indonesia | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -22.79 | -93.93 | -47.31 | | | -0.18 |
| Ireland | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -989.79 | -218.39 | -322.15 | | | -0.05 |
| Italy | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -1,125.79 | -248.31 | -365.58 | | | -0.32 |
| Japan | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -478.95 | -2,110.69 | -1,075.65 | | | -0.04 |
| Kenya | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -24.28 | -9.49 | -9.52 | | | -0.08 |
| Mexico | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -91.27 | -34.21 | -42.62 | | | -0.47 |
| New Zealand | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -41.58 | -183.29 | -93.42 | | | -0.01 |
| Norway | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -129.91 | -28.65 | -42.26 | | | -0.00 |
| Peru | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -34.23 | -13.45 | -17.06 | | | -0.25 |
| Philippines | -236.69 | -2,021.11 | -66,396.00 | -46.86 | -19121 | -96.08 | | | -0.27 |



WifOR Institute – GHG Emissions, Air Pollution and Water Consumption

| | | GHG Emissions | | | Water Consumption | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Country | CO₂e Emissions (USD/Tonne) | CH4 Emissions (USD/Tonne) | N₂O Emissions (USD/Tonne) | Particulate Matter (USD/Tonne) | Oxides of Nitrogen (USD/Tonne) | Oxides of Sulphur (USD/Tonne) | Non-Methane Volatile Organic Compounds (USD/Tonne) | Ammonia (USD/Tonne) | Water Consumption (USD/m³) |
| Australia | -224.71 | | | -58,828.70 | -1 5,838.00 | -13,422.70 | -2,185.16 | -25,820.00 | -9.38 |
| Belgium | -224.71 | | | -87,878.10 | -22,940.10 | -20,078.00 | -2,647.43 | -37,837.40 | -0.28 |
| Botswana | -224.71 | | | -58,890.90 | -16,109.00 | -13,539.70 | -2,177.23 | -26,899.60 | -3.73 |
| Canada | -224.71 | | | -58,898.10 | -17,246.00 | -13,988.80 | -2,155.52 | -31,519.80 | -1.08 |
| Chile | -224.71 | | | -60,548.30 | -18,419.70 | -14,636.70 | -2,235.33 | -35,097.30 | -10.72 |
| China | -224.71 | | | -70,079.60 | -18,461.30 | -1 5,90 0.70 | -2,467.07 | -29,607.60 | -8.94 |
| Colombia | -224.71 | | | -62,097.30 | -16,639.30 | -14,133.90 | -2,315.34 | -26,909.40 | -0.78 |
| Costa Rica | -224.71 | | | -66,240.90 | -21,653.40 | -16,636.10 | -2,352.78 | -44,726.80 | -0.37 |
| Denmark | -224.71 | | | -69,778.30 | -18,937.20 | -16,100.40 | -2,345.71 | -32,086.20 | -0.26 |
| Ecuador | -224.71 | | | -64,032.60 | -17,130.60 | -14,557.70 | -2,400.10 | -27,595.10 | -1.28 |
| Finland | -224.71 | | | -59,970.50 | -16,575.10 | -13,860.40 | -2,203.36 | -28,124.00 | -0.20 |
| France | -224.71 | | | -68,031.10 | -20,938.10 | -16,629.20 | -2,327.58 | -41,042.10 | -1.22 |
| Germany | -224.71 | | | -76,868.60 | -21,518.40 | -18,050.00 | -2,460.27 | -38,404.30 | -0.23 |
| Guyana | -224.71 | | | -58,879.10 | -17,323.10 | -13,838.00 | -2,516.40 | -30,584.10 | -0.24 |
| India | -224.71 | | | -94,250.50 | -24,079.90 | -21,231.80 | -3,043.99 | -37,776.00 | -20.60 |
| Indonesia | -224.71 | | | -69,770.50 | -18,490.50 | -1 5,81 5.40 | -2,573.33 | -29,512.80 | -6.30 |
| Ireland | | | | | | | | | -0.21 |
| Italy | -224.71 | | | -73,920.80 | -23,178.20 | -18,279.90 | -2,434.41 | -46,633.80 | -5.98 |
| Japan | -224.71 | | | -85,109.20 | -26,238.00 | -20,967.70 | -2,612.92 | -52,558.40 | -0.08 |
| Kenya | -224.71 | | | -65,834.40 | -22,822.50 | -16,749.60 | -2,917.57 | -47,648.30 | -8.69 |
| Mexico | -224.71 | | | -63,670.30 | -16,953.70 | -14,494.00 | -2,286.02 | -27,468.10 | -51.24 |
| New Zealand | -224.71 | | | -60,056.20 | -18,348.80 | -14,473.00 | -2,369.67 | -34,597.30 | -1.07 |
| Norway | -224.71 | | | -59,704.60 | -16,952.20 | -13,974.50 | -2,189.07 | -29,817.40 | -0.09 |
| Peru | -224.71 | | | -60,552.10 | -23,600.10 | -16,597.60 | -2,300.52 | -55,590.40 | -9.87 |
| Philippines | -224.71 | | | -86,822.10 | -22,302.10 | -19,604.10 | -2,805.05 | -35,275.30 | -2.35 |



GIST Impact – Water Pollution

| | Water Pollution | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|--|---|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Country | Total Nitrogen Emissions (USD/Tonne) | Total Phosphorous Emissions (USD/Tonne) | Chemical Oxygen Dem and (USD/Tonne) | Antimony (USD/Tonne) | Arsenic (USD/Tonne) | Cadmium (USD/Tonne) | Chromium (USD/Tonne) | Copper (USD/Tonne) | Lead (USD/Tonne) | Mercury (USD/Tonne) | Nickel (USD/Tonne) | Zinc (USD/Tonne) |
| Australia | -1,941.96 | -2,470.74 | -142.72 | -1,096.99 | -72,450.58 | -201,690.60 | -0.06 | -86.37 | -42,260.99 | -2,759,533.00 | -1,975.55 | -15,387.32 |
| Belgium | -765.42 | -94320 | -61.45 | -1,052.72 | -83,348.63 | -351,854.80 | -0.05 | -132.49 | -72,608.54 | -5,429,098.00 | -2,151.33 | -26,753.76 |
| Botswana | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -148.54 | -7,720.28 | -4,396.20 | -0.01 | -3.45 | -1,551.32 | -52,508.69 | -206.61 | -240.04 |
| Canada | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -857.28 | -50,348.38 | -103,036.30 | -0.05 | -27.99 | -23,770.70 | -1,823,834.00 | -1,213.36 | -7,209.61 |
| Chile | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -313.70 | -17,938.42 | -26,864.89 | -0.02 | -9.37 | -6,563.20 | -432,533.90 | -464.12 | -1,761.67 |
| China | -2,555.46 | -3,267.27 | -185.10 | -370.74 | -28,825.43 | -66,409.86 | -0.01 | -24.31 | -15,720.65 | -1,365,644.00 | -564.99 | -5,107.23 |
| Colombia | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -138.12 | -7,149.99 | -4,308.80 | -0.01 | -4.08 | -1,650.35 | -67,843.57 | -190.54 | -281.16 |
| Costa Rica | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -243.15 | -12,325.48 | -6,953.04 | -0.01 | -6.01 | -2,643.33 | -103,258.10 | -324.91 | -420.01 |
| Denmark | -254.91 | -280.39 | -26.18 | -1,097.04 | -52,486.88 | -21,193.43 | -0.06 | -9.43 | -7,887.59 | -140,640.80 | -1,272.44 | -620.43 |
| Ecuador | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -132.45 | -6,780.30 | -4,099.42 | -0.01 | -3.91 | -1,582.09 | -64,999.34 | -177.86 | -269.61 |
| Finland | -274.91 | -306.36 | -27.56 | -914.18 | -43,672.76 | -17,633.25 | -0.05 | -7.86 | -6,572.65 | -117,185.30 | -1,056.58 | -517.02 |
| France | -424.95 | -501.16 | -37.93 | -937.15 | -74,082.18 | -313,154.70 | -0.04 | -117.94 | -64,632.52 | -4,832,038.00 | -1,902.21 | -23,816.61 |
| Germany | -1,652.45 | -2,094.87 | -122.72 | -1,090.23 | -86,445.69 | -364,469.20 | -0.05 | -13721 | -75,200.51 | -5,623,649.00 | -2,242.20 | -27,706.89 |
| Guyana | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -110.68 | -5,599.91 | -3,160.47 | -0.01 | -2.74 | -1,203.15 | -46,994.85 | -147.23 | -191.18 |
| India | -828.74 | -1,025.42 | -65.82 | -50.41 | -3,660.86 | -8,285.67 | -0.00 | -4.46 | -2,105.72 | -174,489.50 | -108.32 | -624.24 |
| Indonesia | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -73.38 | -4,558.31 | -5,818.86 | -0.00 | -2.60 | -1,585.98 | -120,032.30 | -132.41 | -379.94 |
| Ireland | -1,668.87 | -2,116.19 | -123.85 | -1,765.33 | -144,374.00 | -592,886.20 | -0.08 | -222.17 | -121,946.10 | -9,144,982.00 | -4,120.79 | -44,863.71 |
| Italy | -841.97 | -1,042.59 | -66.73 | -774.57 | -60,929.56 | -258,641.70 | -0.04 | -97.48 | -53,407.71 | -3,991,102.00 | -1,538.70 | -19,684.88 |
| Japan | -762.38 | -939.25 | -61.24 | -908.54 | -61,225.84 | -88,353.18 | -0.04 | -31.48 | -22,505.85 | -2,009,638.00 | -1,253.83 | -6,702.98 |
| Kenya | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -30.50 | -1,532.72 | -880.39 | -0.00 | -0.71 | -318.27 | -10,753.23 | -39.10 | -49.29 |
| Mexico | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -200.70 | -9,913.31 | -5,628.48 | -0.01 | -4.96 | -2,180.38 | -85,060.14 | -251.81 | -346.68 |
| New Zealand | -198.82 | -207.57 | -22.31 | -802.85 | -53,082.04 | -147,640.40 | -0.04 | -63.21 | -30,930.59 | -2,019,836.00 | -1,450.74 | -11,261.46 |
| Norway | -65.07 | -33.92 | -13.07 | -1,463.35 | -70,715.64 | -28,566.43 | -0.09 | -12.57 | -10,523.92 | -187,747.90 | -1,737.65 | -827.60 |
| Peru | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -143.79 | -7,592.75 | -4,549.27 | -0.01 | -425 | -1,719.02 | -70,741.04 | -207.90 | -292.70 |
| Philippines | -834.84 | -1,033.33 | -66.24 | -58.32 | -3,666.64 | -4,644.58 | -0.00 | -2.07 | -1,261.06 | -95,514.48 | -108.23 | -301.98 |



WifOR Institute – Water Pollution

| | | Water Pollution | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Country | Total Nitrogen Emissions (USD/Tonne) | Total Phosphorous Emissions (USD/Tonne) | Chemical Oxygen Demand (USD/Tonne) | Antimony (USD/Tonne) | Arsenic (USD/Tonne) | Cadmium (USD/Tonne) | Chromium (USD/Tonne) | Copper (USD/Tonne) | Lead (USD/Tonne) | Mercury (USD/Tonne) | Nickel (USD/Tonne) | Zinc (USD/Tonne) |
| Australia | -1.98 | -37.50 | 1. | -63,325.60 | -6,618,410.00 | -22,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -21.72 | -8,099.19 | -358,532.00 | -116,564.00 | -54,172.40 |
| Belgium | -2.31 | -43.86 | | -74,066.70 | -7,741,010.00 | -25,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -25.41 | -9,472.95 | -419,345.00 | -136,335.00 | -63,361.00 |
| Botswana | -1.97 | -37.27 | | -62,935.40 | -6,577,630.00 | -21,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -21.59 | -8,049.28 | -356,322.00 | -115,846.00 | -53,838.60 |
| Canada | -1.98 | -37.48 | | -63,282.70 | -6,613,930.00 | -22,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -21.71 | -8,093.71 | -358,289.00 | -116,485.00 | -54,135.80 |
| Chile | -2.10 | -39.75 | | -67,114.90 | -7,014,440.00 | -23,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -23.02 | -8,583.83 | -379,985.00 | -123,539.00 | -57,414.00 |
| China | -2.24 | -42.49 | | -71,743.30 | -7,498,180.00 | -24,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -24.61 | -9,175.79 | -406,190.00 | -132,058.00 | -61,373.40 |
| Colombia | -1.98 | -37.53 | | -63,380.30 | -6,624,140.00 | -22,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -21.74 | -8,106.19 | -358,842.00 | -116,665.00 | -54,219.20 |
| Costa Rica | -1.98 | -37.53 | | -63,371.30 | -6,623,190.00 | -22,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -21.74 | -8,105.03 | -358,790.00 | -116,648.00 | -54,211.50 |
| Denmark | -2.12 | -40.17 | | -67,826.60 | -7,088,830.00 | -23,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -23.27 | -8,674.85 | -384,015.00 | -124,849.00 | -58,022.80 |
| Ecuador | -2.00 | -37.86 | | -63,936.00 | -6,682,210.00 | -22,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -21.93 | -8,177.25 | -361,987.00 | -117,687.00 | -54,694.60 |
| Finland | -2.00 | -37.91 | | -64,007.00 | -6,689,630.00 | -22,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -21.96 | -8,186.34 | -362,390.00 | -117,818.00 | -54,755.40 |
| France | -2.11 | -39.98 | | -67,518.90 | -7,056,680.00 | -23,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -23.16 | -8,635.51 | -382,273.00 | -124,283.00 | -57,759.60 |
| Germany | -2.18 | -41.25 | | -69,660.80 | -7,280,530.00 | -24,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -23.90 | -8,909.44 | -394,400.00 | -128,225.00 | -59,591.90 |
| Guyana | -1.97 | -37.42 | | -63,189.50 | -6,604,190.00 | -22,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -21.68 | -8,081.78 | -357,761.00 | -116,313.00 | -54,056.00 |
| India | -2.40 | -45.44 | | -76,729.10 | -8,019,270.00 | -26,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -26.32 | -9,813.47 | -434,419.00 | -141,236.00 | -65,638.60 |
| Indonesia | -2.15 | -40.77 | | -68,845.50 | -7,195,320.00 | -23,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -23.62 | -8,805.17 | -389,784.00 | -126,724.00 | -58,894.40 |
| Ireland | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italy | -2.15 | -40.81 | | -68,910.20 | -7,202,090.00 | -23,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -23.64 | -8,813.45 | -390,150.00 | -126,843.00 | -58,949.80 |
| Japan | -2.20 | -41.62 | | -70,274.80 | -7,344,710.00 | -24,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -24.11 | -8,987.98 | -397,876.00 | -129,355.00 | -60,117.20 |
| Kenya | -2.17 | -41.22 | | -69,604.60 | -7,274,660.00 | -24,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -2.3.88 | -8,902.26 | -394,082.00 | -128,122.00 | -59,543.90 |
| Mexico | -2.25 | -42.68 | | -72,064.00 | -7,531,700.00 | -25,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -24.72 | -9,216.81 | -408,006.00 | -132,649.00 | -61,647.70 |
| New Zealand | -2.01 | -38.02 | | -64,207.10 | -6,710,550.00 | -22,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -22.03 | -8,211.94 | -363,523.00 | -118,186.00 | -54,926.50 |
| Norway | -1.97 | -37.26 | | -62,921.30 | -6,576,160.00 | -21,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -21.58 | -8,047.48 | -356,243.00 | -115,820.00 | -53,826.50 |
| Peru | -2.00 | -37.91 | | -64,021.50 | -6,691,140.00 | -22,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -21.96 | -8,188.19 | -362,472.00 | -117,845.00 | -54,767.70 |
| Philippines | -2.13 | -40.33 | | -68,107.20 | -7,118,160.00 | -23,000,000.00 | -0.00 | -23.36 | -8,710.75 | -385,604.00 | -125,365.00 | -58,262.90 |



GIST Impact – Waste Generation and Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

| | Waste Generation | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Country | Hazardous (Incinerated) (USD/kg) | Hazardous (Landfill) (USD/kg) | Hazardous (Recycling/Recovered) (USD/kg) | Non-Hazardous (Recycling/Recovered) (USD/kg) | Non-Hazardous (Incine ra ted) (USD/kg) | Non-Hazardous (Dumping) (USD/kg) | Non-Hazardous (Landfill) (USD/kg) | Land Use Change (USD/m²) | | |
| Australia | -1.34 | | | -0.06 | -21.43 | -0.00 | -0.13 | -3.3.89 | | |
| Belgium | -1.66 | | | -0.06 | -36.56 | -0.00 | -0.21 | -43.61 | | |
| Botswana | -0.19 | | | -0.06 | -0.69 | -0.00 | -0.03 | -23.15 | | |
| Canada | -0.89 | | | -0.06 | -11.37 | -0.00 | -0.09 | -7.44 | | |
| Chile | -0.35 | | ~ 1 | -0.06 | -3.08 | -0.00 | -0.03 | -31.31 | | |
| China | -0.51 | | | -0.06 | -7.64 | -0.00 | -0.04 | -59.07 | | |
| Colombia | -0.18 | | | -0.06 | -0.73 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -13.33 | | |
| Costa Rica | -0.25 | | | -0.06 | -1.14 | -0.00 | -0.02 | -16.63 | | |
| Denmark | -0.79 | | | -0.06 | -3.17 | -0.00 | -0.05 | -20.61 | | |
| Ecuador | -0.17 | | | -0.06 | -0.70 | -0.00 | -0.02 | -21.70 | | |
| Finland | -0.67 | | | -0.06 | -2.64 | -0.00 | -0.04 | -21.00 | | |
| France | -1.48 | | | -0.06 | -32.55 | -0.00 | -0.19 | -36.73 | | |
| Germany | -1.71 | | | -0.06 | -37.87 | -0.00 | -0.22 | -43.19 | | |
| Guyana | -0.15 | | | -0.06 | -0.53 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -12.44 | | |
| India | -0.14 | | | -0.06 | -1.02 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -22.41 | | |
| Indonesia | -0.15 | | | -0.06 | -0.74 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -29.86 | | |
| Ireland | -2.85 | | | -0.06 | -61.43 | -0.00 | -0.36 | -110.41 | | |
| Italy | -1.23 | | | -0.06 | -26.90 | -0.00 | -0.17 | -51.50 | | |
| Japan | -0.96 | | | -0.06 | -10.80 | -0.00 | -0.05 | -37.92 | | |
| Kenya | -0.09 | | | -0.06 | -0.16 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -9.96 | | |
| Mexico | -0.21 | | | -0.06 | -0.94 | -0.00 | -0.02 | -38.23 | | |
| New Zealand | -1.00 | | | -0.06 | -1 5.69 | -0.00 | -0.10 | -23.95 | | |
| Norway | -1.05 | | | -0.06 | -4.23 | -0.00 | -0.05 | -9.35 | | |
| Peru | -0.19 | | | -0.06 | -0.76 | -0.00 | -0.02 | -28.27 | | |
| Philippines | -0.13 | | | -0.06 | -0.59 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -33.17 | | |



WifOR Institute – Waste Generation and Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

| | Waste Generation | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Country | Hazardous (Incinerated) (USD/kg) | Hazardous (Landfill) (USD/kg) | Hazardous (Recycling/Recovered) (USD/kg) | Non-Hazardous (Recycling/Recovered) (USD/kg) | Non-Hazardous (Incine ra ted) (USD/kg) | Non-Hazardous (Dumping) (USD/kg) | Non-Hazardous (Landfill) (USD/kg) | Land Use Change (USD/m²) | | |
| Australia | -0.52 | -0.20 | | | -0.28 | | -0.13 | -0.28 | | |
| Belgium | -0.58 | -0.23 | | | -0.33 | | -0.13 | -0.96 | | |
| Botswana | -0.52 | -0.20 | | | -0.28 | | -0.13 | -0.54 | | |
| Canada | -0.52 | -020 | | | -0.28 | | -0.13 | -0.34 | | |
| Chile | -0.53 | -0.20 | ~ 1 | | -0.28 | | -0.13 | -0.63 | | |
| China | -0.55 | -0.21 | | | -0.30 | | -0.13 | -0.68 | | |
| Colombia | -0.53 | -0.20 | | | -0.28 | | -0.13 | -0.98 | | |
| Costa Rica | -0.54 | -0.21 | | | -0.29 | | -0.13 | -1.02 | | |
| Denmark | -0.55 | -0.21 | | | -0.30 | | -0.13 | -0.97 | | |
| Ecuador | -0.53 | -0.21 | | | -0.29 | | -0.13 | -0.83 | | |
| Finland | -0.53 | -0.20 | | | -0.28 | | -0.13 | -0.54 | | |
| France | -0.54 | -0.21 | | | -0.30 | b . | -0.13 | -0.96 | | |
| Germany | -0.56 | -0.22 | | | -0.31 | | -0.13 | -0.96 | | |
| Guyana | -0.52 | -0.20 | | | -0.28 | | -0.13 | -1.09 | | |
| India | -0.60 | -0.24 | | | -0.35 | | -0.13 | -0.65 | | |
| Indonesia | -0.54 | -0.21 | | | -0.30 | | -0.13 | -1.10 | | |
| Ireland | -0.53 | -0.20 | | | -0.29 | | -0.13 | | | |
| Italy | -0.55 | -0.21 | | | -0.31 | | -0.13 | -0.90 | | |
| Japan | -0.58 | -0.23 | | | -0.33 | | -0.13 | -0.88 | | |
| Kenya | -0.54 | -0.21 | | | -0.29 | | -0.13 | -0.41 | | |
| Mexico | -0.53 | -0.2.1 | | | -0.29 | | -0.13 | -0.47 | | |
| New Zealand | -0.53 | -0.20 | | | -0.28 | | -0.13 | -0.95 | | |
| Norway | -0.52 | -0.20 | | | -0.28 | | -0.13 | -0.46 | | |
| Peru | -0.53 | -0.20 | | | -0.28 | | -0.13 | -0.76 | | |
| Philippines | -0.59 | -0.24 | | | -0.34 | | -0.13 | -1.07 | | |