

<b>Ecosystem Service</b>	<b>Recreation through observation of nature</b>
<b>CICES class name</b>	Characteristics of living systems that enable activities promoting health, recuperation or enjoyment through passive or observational interactions
<b>CICES Section</b>	Cultural (Biotic)
<b>CICES Class code</b>	3.1.1.2

### Sample Indicators









Indicator values from			
Experiment or direct measurement		Survey	
Expert assessment		Statistical- or census data	
Model or GIS		Literature values	
Stakeholder participation		Not provided	

Table 1: Field Scale








Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<sup>[17]</sup> Capacity for nature-based recreation indicator. The indicator is based on the vicinity of water, land relief, accessibility from urban areas, presence of HNV farmland and variation in land cover.	[-]	
<sup>[3]</sup> Hedges between agriculture and other use	Not provided	
<sup>[3]</sup> Number of elements and land cover types in a viewshed	#	
<sup>[3]</sup> Diversity of land cover/ land use types (calculated by adapting Shannon Index 'H', Gini index, or Simpson's Diversity Index' D')	[-]	
<sup>[28]</sup> Abundance of large butterflies (species with median wingspan>5.4 cm)	Not provided	
<sup>[28]</sup> Abundance of birds that are either: colourful species, species that people attract to their homes with feeders or species with hunting value	Not provided	
<sup>[28]</sup> Ant species richness as a predictor of the abundance of birds, including those described above	Not provided	

Table 2: Farm Scale























Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<sup>[3]</sup> Hedges between agriculture and other use	Not provided	
<sup>[3]</sup> Number of elements and land cover types in the viewshed	#	
<sup>[3]</sup> Diversity of land cover/ land use types (calculated by adapting Shannon Index 'H', Gini index, or Simpson's Diversity Index 'D')	-	
<sup>[23]</sup> Four-level index based on the provision of walking trails/ecotourism/environmental education	poor-fair-good-excellent	
<sup>[33]</sup> Recreation opportunities: Indicator calculated by a formula derived from survey and expert assessment. Up to five attributes were considered: singular natural resources, scenic beauty, accessibility, tourism attraction capacity, and tourism use aptitude. Results were corrected by carrying capacity of land use types, considering factors such as flora and fauna factor, perimeter area ratio and slope factor.	persons * ha <sup>-1</sup>	 ,  , 






















Table 3: Regional Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<sup>[7]</sup> Tourism: Ratio of tourism income to GDP	%	
<sup>[18]</sup> Average travel cost of tourists	\$ * yr <sup>-1</sup>	
<sup>[11]</sup> Potential number of visitors calculated from population statistics and assuming travel distance of 80 km for daily trips and 8 km for short trips	#	 ,  , 
<sup>[11]</sup> Actual number of visits from surveys or statistics	#	 ,  , 
<sup>[29]</sup> Density of rural tourism establishments. Values were normalized [0-1] using benchmark values where available and observed values otherwise.	# * km <sup>-2</sup>	
<sup>[30]</sup> Number of visitors	# * yr <sup>-1</sup>	 ,  , 
<sup>[32]</sup> Forest recreation: share of land that is forested	%	
<sup>[9]</sup> Area of natural or semi-natural habitats not affected by roadside noise louder than 55dB(A)	m <sup>2</sup>	
<sup>[9]</sup> Area of natural or semi-natural habitats not affected by roadside noise louder than 55dB(A) and accessible from the nearest city within a given time constraint	m <sup>2</sup>	



[19] (Designated) recreational trails	km	
[30] Area covered by recreational landscape	ha	
[10] Total number of recreational areas	#	
[4] Number of areas used for social amenity (e.g., picnic areas) in the area	#	
[13] Recreation & ecotourism potential, calculated based on: *Distance to singular natural resources (e.g., diverse forests, presence of water bodies) [0 -100] *Scenic beauty (viewsheds) [0-100] *Accessibility (gaussian distance to roads) [km] *Tourism attraction capacity (distance to natural attractions concentration [1-100], variety of natural attractions [1-100], distance to tourism services [km]) *Tourism use aptitude [1-100] (based on land cover) Selection and weighing of factors based on expert assessment	Index 0 - 100	
[13] Recreation & ecotourism opportunities, calculated as: (Recreation & ecotourism potential /100) * ((physical carrying capacity of an area) * (erodibility of the area) * (correction factor for account for fauna) * (perimeter/area ratio))	persons * ha <sup>-1</sup>	
[1] Recreational potential calculated by a composite model that considers the degree of naturalness, nature protection, and presence of water. Dimensionless index	Index 0-1	
[12] Recreation potential: continuous index, based on presence of certain ecosystems (i.e., forest, coastline), certain ecosystem characteristics (i.e., naturalness) and their accessibility	-	
[16] Recreational potential, calculated as the sum of scores for density of public rights of way (footpaths, bridleways), the cultural heritage value of land use and proximity of similar alternative sites, each (1-5), multiplied by the score for the population living within 3 km travel distance of any part of the site (1-5)	-	
[21] Recreation & aesthetic values: values are assigned to different land cover classes. The matrix by Burkhard et al., 2012 (DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.06.019) was adapted the and used in this study.	Index 0-5	
[20] Recreational surface per capita, calculated as recreational areas (forests, abandoned land, water courses and grassland areas) within a distance of 5 km to settlements divided by the number of residents	ha * capita <sup>-1</sup>	
[24] Recreational potential: the following indicators were normalized, and the average was calculated: - Degree of naturalness: hemeroby index based on the land cover type [1 (natural/ without actual human impact) - 7 (artificial)] - Protected areas: occurrence of protected areas [not provided]	Not provided	



- Attractiveness of water bodies: Distance to the nearest stagnant surface water body or water courses of the first or second order		
<sup>[27]</sup> Recreation potential: (1- (modelled utility value of recreational nature areas (considering both qualities of the area and distance to a person) divided by population density))	0-1	 , 
<sup>[31]</sup> Recreation: expert based index for ES provision by land cover class [1-5] multiplied by the area of land cover class [km <sup>2</sup> ]	Index 1-5 * km <sup>-2</sup>	 ,  , 
<sup>[31]</sup> Recreation value: expert based index for ecosystem service supply by land cover class [1-5] multiplied by the area of the land cover class [km <sup>2</sup> ] and a literature-based monetary value of the ecosystem service	\$ * ha <sup>-1</sup> * yr <sup>-1</sup>	 ,  , 
<sup>[15]</sup> Spatial mapping by stakeholders: stakeholders could place green stickers on a map to mark the supply hotspots of this ecosystem service. Red stickers were used to mark locations where the supply of this service is declining. Two different sizes of stickers were used to represent a radius of 0.75 km or 1 km, respectively.	Index 0-5	
<sup>[35]</sup> Index based on naturalness (based on Corine Landcover Class), level of conservation (based on presence of protected areas) and accessibility to the human population (based on distance from areas with high population density)	-	 , 
<sup>[22]</sup> Roadside variation: number of “land use patches” intersected by or adjacent to all roads and paths, except motorways and railways, divided by total road length. Values were scaled [0-1]	km <sup>-1</sup>	
<sup>[22]</sup> Accessibility: Share of the land surface within 100 meters from the road. Values were scaled [0-1]	%	
<sup>[34]</sup> (Water activities): Numer of river watching sites	#	
<sup>[34]</sup> (Water activities): Number of visitors or facilities (e.g. hotels or restaurants)	#	
<sup>[34]</sup> (Water activities): Length of walkway or cycleway	km	
<sup>[34]</sup> (Water activities): Turnover from tourism	\$ * ha <sup>-1</sup>	
<sup>[8]</sup> Open landscapes: Share of land under agricultural cultivation (keeping landscapes open through agriculture is seen as increasing aesthetic value)	%	
<sup>[3]</sup> Hedges between agriculture and other use	Not provided	
<sup>[3]</sup> Diversity of land cover/ land use types (calculated by adapting Shannon Index ‘H’, Gini index, or Simpson’s Diversity Index’ D’)	[-]	
<sup>[8]</sup> Diversity of landscapes: Shannon index of land use	[-]	



[3] Number of elements and land cover types in a viewshed	#	
[34] Proximity to urban areas of scenic rivers or lakes	km	
[18] WTP - willingness to pay for landscape preservation considering likely landscape changes	\$	

Table 4: National Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
[2] Number of visits per year	# * area <sup>-1</sup> * yr <sup>-1</sup>	
[2] Valuation: Number of visits per year multiplied by value indicator. The value indicator depends on the habitat mix for that location	\$ * area <sup>-1</sup> * yr <sup>-1</sup>	
[6] Number of "day leisure visits" (any round trip of less than one day in duration made from home or a holiday destination for leisure purposes)	# * grid cell <sup>-1</sup>	
[11] Potential number of visitors calculated from population statistics and assuming travel distance of 80 km for daily trips and 8 km for short trips	#	
[11] Actual number of visits from surveys or statistics	#	
[14] Number of visitors per year	#	
[26] Number of visitors in agricultural areas	Not specified	
[26] Number of rural enterprises offering tourism-related services	Not specified	
[26] Number of birdwatchers	Not specified	
[26] Farm tourism	Not specified	
[25] Modelled probability of visitation by recreationists/tourists, based on land cover class, mean elevation, distance from a nearest major road, path density, county and population.	0-1	
[26] Walking and biking trails	Not specified	
[3] Number of elements and land cover types in a viewshed	#	
[3] Hedges between agriculture and other use	Not provided	
[3] Diversity of land cover/ land use types (calculated by adapting Shannon Index 'H', Gini index, or Simpson's Diversity Index 'D')	[-]	



Table 5: Multinational Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<sup>[3]</sup> Hedges between agriculture and other use	Not provided	
<sup>[3]</sup> Number of elements and land cover types in a viewshed	#	
<sup>[3]</sup> Diversity of land cover/ land use types (calculated by adapting Shannon Index 'H', Gini index, or Simpson's Diversity Index 'D')	-	
<sup>[12]</sup> Recreation potential: continuous index, based on presence of certain ecosystems (i.e., forest, coastline), certain ecosystem characteristics (i.e., naturalness) and their accessibility	-	



## References

No.	Citation
1	Baro F, Gomez-Baggethun E, Haase D (2017) Ecosystem service bundles along the urban-rural gradient: Insights for landscape planning and management. <i>Ecosystem Services</i> 24: 147-159. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecoser.2017.02.021
2	Bateman IJ, Harwood AR, Abson DJ, Andrews B, Crowe A, Dugdale S, Fezzi C, Foden J, Hadley D, Haines-Young R, Hulme M, Kontoleon A, Munday P, Pascual U, Paterson J, Perino G, Sen A, Siriwardena G, Termansen M (2014) Economic Analysis for the UK National Ecosystem Assessment: Synthesis and Scenario Valuation of Changes in Ecosystem Services. <i>Environmental &amp; Resource Economics</i> 57(2): 273-297. DOI: 10.1007/s10640-013-9662-y
3	Carvalho-Ribeiro S, Correia TP, Paracchini ML, Schupbach B, Sang AO, Vanderheyden V, Southern A, Jones P, Contreras B, O'Riordan T (2016) Assessing the ability of rural agrarian areas to provide cultural ecosystem services (CES): A multi scale social indicator framework (MSIF). <i>Land Use Policy</i> 53: 8-19. DOI: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.04.024
4	Felipe-Lucia MR, Comin FA (2015) Ecosystem services-biodiversity relationships depend on land use type in floodplain agroecosystems. <i>Land Use Policy</i> 46: 201-210. DOI: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.02.003
5*	Fürst C, Frank S, Witt A, Koschke L, Makeschin F (2013) Assessment of the effects of forest land use strategies on the provision of ecosystem services at regional scale. <i>Journal of Environmental Management</i> 127: S96-S116. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.09.020
6	Holland RA, Eigenbrod F, Armsworth PR, Anderson BJ, Thomas CD, Heinemeyer A, Gillings S, Roy DB, Gaston KJ (2011) Spatial covariation between freshwater and terrestrial ecosystem services. <i>Ecological Applications</i> 21(6): 2034-2048. DOI: 10.1890/09-2195.1
7	Hou Y, Zhou SD, Burkharda B, Muller F (2014) Socioeconomic influences on biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being: A quantitative application of the DPSIR model in Jiangsu, China. <i>Science of the Total Environment</i> 490: 1012-1028. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.05.071
8	Huber R, Lehmann B (2010) Economies of Scope in the Agricultural Provision of Ecosystem Services: An Application to a High Cost Production Region. <i>German Journal of Agricultural Economics</i> 59(2): 91-105.
9	Lautenbach S, Kugel C, Lausch A, Seppelt R (2011) Analysis of historic changes in regional ecosystem service provisioning using land use data. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 11(2): 676-687. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2010.09.007
10	Liu S, Crossman ND, Nolan M, Ghirmay H (2013) Bringing ecosystem services into integrated water resources management. <i>Journal of Environmental Management</i> 129: 92-102. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.06.047
11	Maes J, Hauck J, Paracchini ML, Rataamaki O, Hutchins M, Termansen M, Furman E, Perez-Soba M, Braat L, Bidoglio G (2013) Mainstreaming ecosystem services into EU policy. <i>Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability</i> 5(1): 128-134. DOI: 10.1016/j.cosust.2013.01.002
12	Mouchet MA, Paracchini ML, Schulp CJE, Sturck J, Verkerk PJ, Verburg PH, Lavorel S (2017) Bundles of ecosystem (dis)services and multifunctionality across European landscapes. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 73: 23-28. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.00.026
13	Nahuelhual L, Carmona A, Aguayo M, Echeverria C (2014) Land use change and ecosystem services provision: a case study of recreation and ecotourism opportunities in southern Chile. <i>Landscape Ecology</i> 29(2): 329-344. DOI: 10.1007/s10980-013-9958-x
14	Neugarten RA, Honzak M, Carret P, Koenig K, Andriamaro L, Cano CA, Grantham HS, Hole D, Juhn D, McKinnon M, Rasolohery A, Steininger M, Wright TM, Turner WR (2016) Rapid Assessment of Ecosystem Service Co-Benefits of Biodiversity Priority Areas in Madagascar. <i>PLoS One</i> 11(12): e0168575. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0168575

\* The ecosystem service discussed on this factsheet is not a focus of the cited paper





No.	Citation
15	Palomo I, Martin-Lopez B, Zorrilla-Miras P, Del Amo DG, Montes C (2014) Deliberative mapping of ecosystem services within and around Donana National Park (SW Spain) in relation to land use change. <i>Regional Environmental Change</i> 14(1): 237-251. DOI: 10.1007/s10113-013-0488-5
16	Posthumus H, Rouquette JR, Morris J, Cowing DJG, Hess TM (2010) A framework for the assessment of ecosystem goods and services; a case study on lowland floodplains in England. <i>Ecological Economics</i> 69(7): 1510-1523. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2010.02.011
17	Schulp CJE, Van Teeffelen AJA, Tucker G, Verburg PH (2016) A quantitative assessment of policy options for no net loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the European Union. <i>Land Use Policy</i> 57: 151-163. DOI: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.05.018
18	van Berkel DB, Verburg PH (2014) Spatial quantification and valuation of cultural ecosystem services in an agricultural landscape. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 37: 163-174. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.06.025
19*	Vejre H, Vesterager JP, Andersen PS, Olafsson AS, Brandt J, Dalgaard T (2015) Does cadastral division of area-based ecosystem services obstruct comprehensive management? <i>Ecological Modelling</i> 295: 176-187. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.09.027
20	Vigl LE, Tasser E, Schirpke U, Tappeiner U (2017) Using land use/land cover trajectories to uncover ecosystem service patterns across the Alps. <i>Regional Environmental Change</i> 17(8): 2237-2250. DOI: 10.1007/s10113-017-1132-6
21*	Zhang ZM, Gao JF, Fan XY, Lan Y, Zhao MS (2017) Response of ecosystem services to socioeconomic development in the Yangtze River Basin, China. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 72: 481-493. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.08.035
22	Andersson E, Nykvist B, Malinga R, Jaramillo F, Lindborg R (2015) A social–ecological analysis of ecosystem services in two different farming systems. <i>Ambio</i> 44(1): 102-112. DOI: 10.1007/s13280-014-0603-y
23	Fleming WM, Rivera JA, Miller A, Piccarello M (2014) Ecosystem services of traditional irrigation systems in northern New Mexico, USA. <i>International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services and Management</i> 10(4): 343-350. DOI: 10.1080/21513732.2014.977953
24	Früh-Müller A, Hotes S, Breuer L, Wolters V, Koellner T (2016) Regional patterns of ecosystem services in cultural landscapes. <i>Land</i> 5(2): 17. DOI: 10.3390/land5020017
25	Hornigold K, Lake I, Dolman P (2016) Recreational use of the countryside: No evidence that high nature value enhances a key ecosystem service. <i>PLoS ONE</i> 11(11): e0165043. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0165043
26	Maes J, Liqueste C, Teller A, Erhard M, Paracchini ML, Barredo JI, Grizzetti B, Cardoso A, Somma F, Petersen JE, Meiner A, Gelabert ER, Zal N, Kristensen P, Bastrup-Birk A, Biala K, Piroddi C, Egoh B, Degeorges P, Fiorina C, Santos-Martín F, Naruševičius V, Verboven J, Pereira HM, Bengtsson J, Gocheva K, Marta-Pedroso C, Snäll T, Estreguil C, San-Miguel-Ayanz J, Pérez-Soba M, Grêt-Regamey A, Lillebø AI, Malak DA, Condé S, Moen J, Czucz B, Drakou EG, Zulian G, Lavalle C (2016) An indicator framework for assessing ecosystem services in support of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020. <i>Ecosystem Services</i> 17: 14-23. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecoser.2015.10.023
27	Odgaard MV, Turner KG, Bøcher PK, Svenning JC, Dalgaard T (2017) A multi-criteria, ecosystem-service value method used to assess catchment suitability for potential wetland reconstruction in Denmark. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 77: 151-165. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.12.001
28*	Peters VE, Campbell KU, Dienno G, García M, Leak E, Loyke C, Ogle M, Steinly B, Crist TO (2016) Ants and plants as indicators of biodiversity, ecosystem services, and conservation value in constructed grasslands. <i>Biodiversity and Conservation</i> 25(8): 1481-1501. DOI: 10.1007/s10531-016-1120-z

\* The ecosystem service discussed on this factsheet is not a focus of the cited paper





No.	Citation
29	Rodríguez-Loinaz G, Alday JG, Onaindia M (2014) Multiple ecosystem services landscape index: A tool for multifunctional landscapes conservation. <i>Journal of Environmental Management</i> 147: 152-163. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.09.001
30	Adhikari S, Baral H, Nitschke CR (2018) Identification, Prioritization and Mapping of Ecosystem Services in the Panchase Mountain Ecological Region of Western Nepal. <i>Forests</i> 9(9): 554. DOI: 10.3390/f9090554
31	Huq N, Bruns A, Ribbe L (2019) Interactions between freshwater ecosystem services and land cover changes in southern Bangladesh: A perspective from short-term (seasonal) and long-term (1973-2014) scale. <i>Science of the Total Environment</i> 650: 132-143. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.08.430
32	Li T, Lü Y, Fu B, Hu W, Comber AJ (2019) Bundling ecosystem services for detecting their interactions driven by large-scale vegetation restoration: enhanced services while depressed synergies. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 99: 332-342. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.12.041
33	Nahuelhual L, Benra F, Laterra P, Marin S, Arriagada R, Jullian C (2018) Patterns of ecosystem services supply across farm properties: Implications for ecosystem services-based policy incentives. <i>Science of the Total Environment</i> 634: 941-950. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.042
34*	Phama HV, Torresan S, Critto A, Marcomini A (2019) Alteration of freshwater ecosystem services under global change - A review focusing on the Po River basin (Italy) and the Red River basin (Vietnam). <i>Science of the Total Environment</i> 652: 1347-1365. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.10.303
35	Santos-Martín F, Zorrilla-Miras P, Palomo-Ruiz I, Montes C, Benayas J, Maes J (2019) Protecting nature is necessary but not sufficient for conserving ecosystem services: A comprehensive assessment along a gradient of land-use intensity in Spain. <i>Ecosystem Services</i> 35: 43-51. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecoser.2018.11.006