



Ecosystem Service	Hydrological cycle and flood control
CICES class name	Hydrological cycle and water flow regulation (Including flood control, and coastal protection)
CICES Section	Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic)
CICES Class code	2.2.1.3

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
^[1] Water (in)filtration capacity	$m^3 * m^{-2} * yr^{-1}$, $mol * m^{-2}$	
^[7] Infiltration: unsaturated hydraulic conductivity	$mm * h^{-1}$	 , 
^[5] Water infiltration into the soil (using Beerkan test)	$mm * h^{-1}$	
^[7] Deep percolation	mm	 , 
^[4] Drainage below the bottom of the root zone (in the dryland context; low drainage is desirable to avoid salinization)	$mm * yr^{-1}$	
^[6] Water drainage	$mm * yr^{-1}$	 , 
^[10] Modelled drainage	$mm * yr^{-1}$	 , 
^[15] Water drainage	$mm * yr^{-1}$	
^[14] Water loss through drainage and runoff	$mm * yr^{-1}$	



[7] Hortonian runoff	mm during growing season	 , 
[18] Flood regulation: annual number of days with runoff > 10mm	#	
[17] Quantity: Share of rain water that evapotranspirates on site (without creating runoff) (urban agriculture)	%	
[2] Water movement and availability: -Soil porosity [%] -Water-filled pore space [%] -Electrical conductivity [$\mu\text{S cm}^{-1}$] -pH [-]		
[2] Accommodate water entry: -Stable aggregate index [not provided] -Bulk density [g * cm^{-3}] -Earthworms [not provided]		
[5] Soil macroporosity (0 - 10 cm)	Cm	
[3] Soil water holding capacity (0-20 cm), calculated by sample drying & rewetting	$\text{g H}_2\text{O * g soil}^{-1}$	
[11,12] WHC water holding capacity in topsoil (0-20cm)	%	
[16] Water holding capacity	%	
[13] Available Water Capacity (AWC); the amount of water held between conventional field capacity and wilting point, estimated according to texture and organic matter up to the rooting depth, excluding stones	%	
[6] Mean water content in different soil depths	$\text{g H}_2\text{O * 100 g dry soil}^{-1}$	 , 
[14] Soil moisture in topsoil (0-5 cm) and at rooting depth (5-60 cm)	cm * cm^{-3} , %	
[10] Soil water content on a specific date (July, the most water-limited part of the growing season)	$\text{g H}_2\text{O * g soil}^{-1}$	 , 
[15] Mean soil humidity in topsoil (0-30cm) during observation period	% dm	
[5] Plant-available soil water (0 - 10 cm)	cm	
[7] Water stress	prop. of days	 , 
[13] Soil Aridity Index (SAI); average number of days with dry soil in the upper soil layer where roots accumulate	d * yr^{-1}	







<p>[17] Water Quality: Weighted average concentration of TOC, TIC, NO⁻³, and NH⁺⁴ in leachate (Retention of elements and molecules, leaching, biodegradation)</p>	<p>mg * l⁻¹</p>	
<p>[8] Soil hydrological functions indicator based on a principal component analysis (PCA) of 12 variables assessed at 0-10 cm and 10-20 cm. Variables included: -Volumetric and gravimetric moisture content -Micro (<0.03 μm), meso (0.03–3 μm) and macro (>3 μm) porosity -Plant available water retained between water holding capacity and wilting point -Aggregate stability, bulk density, resistance to vertical penetration, shear strength resistance,</p> <p>Variables with significant contribution (>50 % of the maximum value) to either of the first two principal component axes were selected. Their contribution to PCA axes 1 and 2 multiplied by the overall variability explained by each PCA axis. These weighted factors were summed up and scaled to a range of 0.1 - 1.0.</p>	<p>-</p>	
<p>[9] Indicator value calculated as:</p> $I = \frac{\sum \log(\frac{i}{i_{max}}) }{n}$ <p>With: I – indicator value, i – variable i measured, i_{max} – maximum ecologic potential of variable i in benchmark reference, n – number of variables. Where performance is considered better than in the benchmark and deviation, therefore, has a positive effect, log($\frac{i}{i_{max}}$) is subtracted from the sum instead of added. For this ES, variables were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Soil organic matter [% dw] -Earthworm abundance [# * m⁻²] -Bacterial biomass [mg C * g dw⁻¹] -Number of earthworm taxa [-] 	<p>-</p>	 , 

Table 2: Farm Scale













































Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<p>[20] Rate of water infiltration into the soil</p>	<p>mm * ha⁻¹</p>	
<p>[19] Four-level index based on the number of days streamflow is extended through seepage losses in channel irrigation systems (which recharge groundwater aquifers).</p>	<p>Index poor-fair-good-excellent</p>	
<p>[19] Flood protection: Four-level index based on share of water lost through seepage in open channel irrigation [%]. The higher the value, the better.</p>	<p>Index poor-fair-good-excellent</p>	



Table 3: Regional Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[21] Water holding capacity	m ³ * ha ⁻¹	 , 
^[22] Water retention capacity	m ³ * ha ⁻¹	
^[30] Soil water storage capacity. Values were normalized [0-1] using benchmark values where available and observed values otherwise.	mm	
^[22] Runoff coefficient	-	
^[23] Mitigated runoff: difference between total input precipitation by storm event and runoff	mm, m ³ * km ⁻²	
^[23] Mitigated runoff: percentage of mitigated flood water (intercepted, absorbed, or detained flood water, divided by total precipitation) multiplied by the number of beneficiaries at risk of flooding	-	
^[23] Mitigated runoff: runoff Curve Number (CN). The CN determines the approximate amount of direct runoff from a rainfall event in a particular area.	Range 30 - 100	
^[18] Inverse indicator. Flood regulation: annual number of days with runoff > 10mm	#	
^[24] Flood regulation: (runoff) curve number	-	
^[36] Number of extreme (runoff) events	# * yr ⁻¹	
^[22] Groundwater recharge	m ³ * ha ⁻¹	
^[35] Baseflow regulation, calculated using InVEST model	Not provided	
^[22] Evapotranspiration	mm	
^[22] Share of sealed soils	%	
^[30] Soil water infiltration capacity. Values were normalized [0-1] using benchmark values where available and observed values otherwise.	cm * h ⁻¹	
^[37] Water infiltration: annual subsurface water flow	mm * y ⁻¹	
^[31] Water yield: rainfall - actual annual evapotranspiration (using InVEST's Hydropower Water Yield model)	m ³ * yr ⁻¹ * grid cell ⁻¹	



[25] Moderation of extreme events: Percentage of the total area of the region that contains native vegetation	%	
[27] Water regulation index. The index is based on soil physical characteristics, including volumetric and gravimetric moisture content, porosity, plant available water (based on water retention curves), aggregate stability, bulk density, penetration resistance and shear strength resistance.	Index 0.1 - 1	
[32] Water flow management: expert based index for ES provision by land cover class [1-5], multiplied by the area of the land cover class	km ²	 ,  , 
[32] Water flow management value: expert based index for ES provision by land cover class [1-5], multiplied by the area of the land cover class and a literature-based monetary value of the ecosystem service	km ² , \$ * ha ⁻¹ * yr ⁻¹	 ,  , 
[27] Bio-indicator: Presence of specific ant species is used as an indicator for high, medium or low provision of this ecosystem service. Suitable indicator species must first be identified by correlation between presence of species and ecosystem service provision.	-	
[26] Flood regulation score: preventative and mitigation functions of vegetation and soils. Score calculated after Nedkov and Burkhard (2012), using the parameters: interception, infiltration, surface runoff and peak flow.	Score 0 - 100	 , 
[28] Flood protection: Values are assigned based on land cover classes. The matrix defined by Burkhard et al., 2012 (DOI:10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.06.019) was adapted and used in this study.	Index 0 - 5	
[29] Reduction of flash flood risk: total area of flooded buildings (relative to total catchment area) in a 100-year rainfall event.	%	 , 
[32] Flood control: expert based index for ES provision by land cover class [1-5] multiplied by the area of the land cover class	km ²	 ,  , 
[32] Flood control value: expert based index for ES provision by land cover class [1-5], multiplied by the area of the land cover class and a literature-based monetary value of the ecosystem service	km ² , \$ * ha ⁻¹ * yr ⁻¹	 ,  , 
[33] Flood regulation: Expert-/stakeholder rating of how much of this ES can be provided by a landscape (represented by a land use map), using a 6-point Lickert-scale	Scale none - highest capacity	
[33] Flood regulation: Expert-/stakeholder rating based on pairwise comparisons of landscapes (represented by land use maps) in an Analytical Hierarchical Process (AHP). Experts select the landscape with higher capacity for providing this ES and rate the difference between the two landscapes	Rating 1: equal capacity - 9: absolute preference of one landscape	
[34] Flood regulation, calculated as: maximum number of annual flood events in time series - average number of annual	#	





flood events during time series. Only events where damages exceed a certain cost are counted.		
[38] Flood regulation supply Indicator: normalized total river discharge within five days after a modelled precipitation event. Calculated with the hydrological model STREAM	Index 0 - 1	
[40] Flood risk: expected cost of temporary disruption of transport infrastructure	\$ * ha ⁻¹ * yr ⁻¹	,
[40] Flood risk: expected cost damages to residential properties	\$ * ha ⁻¹ * yr ⁻¹	,
[39] Disturbance control, calculated as: $DC = I_w * O_w * 1.25$ With: DC – Disturbance control, I _w – water input to the system, calculated as rainfall * (1–runoff coefficient) and scaled to a range of [0 – 1000], O _w – water bodies occupancy percentage and flat floodplain area [0 – 1]	-	
[41] Flood regulation supply: continuous index, based on the variability of the peak discharge at the outlet of a catchment in dependence of land use and soil distribution	-	
[40] Floodplain capacity to store water: time to fill storage capacity (T) [days], calculated as: $T = \frac{S}{86400 * Q_{med}}$ With: T – Index of flood storage [d], S – Storage volume [m ³], Q _{med} – Median annual flood [m ³ * s ⁻¹]	d	,
[40] Space for water (in floodplains): theoretical proportion of floodplain area flooded annually, calculated by dividing the area of the indicative floodplain by the total area of the floodplain, and multiplying by the annual flood probability.	-	,
[42] Flood regulation supply index. The index represents the capacity of catchments to retain precipitation as a function of a catchments' topography and hydrology, water holding capacity of the soil, and land use.	0 - 1	

Table 4: National Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
[43] Water quantity: Expert assessment for each land use class, based on the indicator: above-ground runoff [not provided]	very negative (-3) to very positive (+3)	



Table 5: Multinational Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[43] Flood regulation supply: continuous index, based on the variability of the peak discharge at the outlet of a catchment in dependence of land use and soil distribution	0 - 1	
^[44] Flood protection: Values are assigned to Corine land cover classes, based on values published by Burkhard et al. (2009; DOI: 10.3097/LO.200915) and modified for the context of riparian zones.	Index 0 - 5	



References

No.	Citation
1	Tang LL, Hayashi K, Kohyama K, Leon A (2018) Reconciling Life Cycle Environmental Impacts with Ecosystem Services: A Management Perspective on Agricultural Land Use. <i>Sustainability</i> 10(3): 630. DOI: 10.3390/su10030630
2*	Ferrarini A, Bini C, Amaducci S (2017) Soil and ecosystem services: Current knowledge and evidences from Italian case studies. <i>Applied Soil Ecology</i> 123: 693-698. DOI: 10.1016/j.apsoil.2017.06.031
3	Albizua A, Williams A, Hedlund K, Pascual U (2015) Crop rotations including ley and manure can promote ecosystem services in conventional farming systems. <i>Applied Soil Ecology</i> 95: 54-61. DOI: 10.1016/j.apsoil.2015.06.003
4	Kragt ME, Robertson MJ (2014) Quantifying ecosystem services trade-offs from agricultural practices. <i>Ecological Economics</i> 102: 147-157. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.04.001
5	Marichal R, Grimaldi M, Feijoo AM, Oszwald J, Praxedes C, Cobo DHR, Hurtado MD, Desjardins T, da Silva ML, Costag LGD, Miranda IS, Oliveira MND, Brown GG, Tselouiko S, Martins MB, Decaens T, Velasquez E, Lavelle P (2014) Soil macroinvertebrate communities and ecosystem services in deforested landscapes of Amazonia. <i>Applied Soil Ecology</i> 83: 177-185. DOI: 10.1016/j.apsoil.2014.05.006
6	Demestihis C, Plénet D, Génard M, Raynal C, Lescourret F (2017) Ecosystem services in orchards. A review. <i>Agronomy for Sustainable Development</i> 37(2): 12. DOI: 10.1007/s13593-017-0422-1
7	Kearney SP, Fonte SJ, García E, Siles P, Chan KMA, Smukler SM (2019) Evaluating ecosystem service trade-offs and synergies from slash-and-mulch agroforestry systems in El Salvador. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 105: 264-278. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.08.032
8	Lavelle P, Rodríguez N, Arguello O, Bernal J, Botero C, Chaparro P, Gómez Y, Gutiérrez A, Hurtado MDP, Loaiza S, Pullido SX, Rodríguez E, Sanabria C, Velásquez E, Fonte SJ (2014) Soil ecosystem services and land use in the rapidly changing orinoco river basin of colombia. <i>Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment</i> 185: 106-117. DOI: 10.1016/j.agee.2013.12.020
9	Rutgers M, van Wijnen HJ, Schouten AJ, Mulder C, Kuiten AMP, Brussaard L, Breure AM (2012) A method to assess ecosystem services developed from soil attributes with stakeholders and data of four arable farms. <i>Science of the Total Environment</i> 415: 39-48. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.04.041
10	Syswerda SP, Robertson GP (2014) Ecosystem services along a management gradient in Michigan (USA) cropping systems. <i>Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment</i> 189: 28-35. DOI: 10.1016/j.agee.2014.03.006
11	Williams A, Hedlund K (2013) Indicators of soil ecosystem services in conventional and organic arable fields along a gradient of landscape heterogeneity in southern Sweden. <i>Applied Soil Ecology</i> 65: 1-7. DOI: 10.1016/j.apsoil.2012.12.019
12	Williams A, Hedlund K (2014) Indicators and trade-offs of ecosystem services in agricultural soils along a landscape heterogeneity gradient. <i>Applied Soil Ecology</i> 77: 1-8. DOI: 10.1016/j.apsoil.2014.01.001
13	Costantini EAC, Castaldini M, Diago MP, Giffard B, Lagomarsino A, Schroers HJ, Priori S, Valboa G, Agnelli AE, Akça E, D'Avino L, Fulchin E, Gagnarli E, Kiraz ME, Knapič M, Pelengić R, Pellegrini S, Perria R, Puccioni S, Simoni S, Tangolar S, Tardaguila J, Vignozzi N, Zombardo A (2018) Effects of soil erosion on agro-ecosystem services and soil functions: A multidisciplinary study in nineteen organically farmed European and Turkish vineyards. <i>Journal of Environmental Management</i> 223: 614-624. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.06.065

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



No.	Citation
14	Daryanto S, Fu BJ, Wang LX, Jacinthe PA, Zhao WW (2018) Quantitative synthesis on the ecosystem services of cover crops. <i>Earth-Science Reviews</i> 185: 357-373. DOI: 10.1016/j.earscirev.2018.06.013
15	Demestilhas C, Plénet D, Génard M, Garcia de Cortazar-Atauri I, Launay M, Ripoche D, Beaudoin N, Simon S, Charreyron M, Raynal C, Lescourret F (2018) Analyzing ecosystem services in apple orchards using the STICS model. <i>European Journal of Agronomy</i> 94: 108-119. DOI: 10.1016/j.eja.2018.01.009
16*	Egerer MH, Philpott SM, Liere H, Jha S, Bichier P, Lin BB (2018) People or place? Neighborhood opportunity influences community garden soil properties and soil-based ecosystem services. <i>International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services and Management</i> 14(1): 32-44. DOI: 10.1080/21513732.2017.1412355
17	Grard BJP, Chenu C, Manouchehri N, Houot S, Frascaria-Lacoste N, Aubry C (2018) Rooftop farming on urban waste provides many ecosystem services. <i>Agronomy for Sustainable Development</i> 38(1): 2. DOI: 10.1007/s13593-017-0474-2
18	Qiu JX, Carpenter SR, Booth EG, Motew M, Zipper SC, Kucharik CJ, Loheide SP, Turner AG (2018) Understanding relationships among ecosystem services across spatial scales and over time. <i>Environmental Research Letters</i> 13(5): 054020. DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/aabb87
19	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
20*	Solen LC, Nicolas J, de Sartre Xavier A, Thibaud D, Simon D, Michel G, Johan O (2018) Impacts of Agricultural Practices and Individual Life Characteristics on Ecosystem Services: A Case Study on Family Farmers in the Context of an Amazonian Pioneer Front. <i>Environmental Management</i> 61(5): 772-785. DOI: 10.1007/s00267-018-1004-y
21	Forouzangohar M, Crossman ND, MacEwan RJ, Wallace DD, Bennett LT (2014) Ecosystem Services in Agricultural Landscapes: A Spatially Explicit Approach to Support Sustainable Soil Management. <i>Scientific World Journal</i> : 483298. DOI: 10.1155/2014/483298
22*	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: 96-116. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.09.020
23	Gret-Regamey A, Weibel B, Bagstad KJ, Ferrari M, Geneletti D, Klug H, Schirpke U, Tappeiner U (2014) On the Effects of Scale for Ecosystem Services Mapping. <i>Plos One</i> 9(12): e112601. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0112601
24	Koschke L, Furst C, Lorenz M, Witt A, Frank S, Makeschin F (2013) The integration of crop rotation and tillage practices in the assessment of ecosystem services provision at the regional scale. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 32: 157-171. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2013.03.008
25	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
26	Qiu J, Wardropper CB, Rissman AR, Turner MG (2017) Spatial fit between water quality policies and hydrologic ecosystem services in an urbanizing agricultural landscape. <i>Landscape Ecology</i> 32(1): 59-75. DOI: 10.1007/s10980-016-0428-0
27	Sanabria C, Lavelle P, Fonte SJ (2014) Ants as indicators of soil-based ecosystem services in agroecosystems of the Colombian Llanos. <i>Applied Soil Ecology</i> 84: 24-30. DOI: 10.1016/j.apsoil.2014.07.001

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



No.	Citation
28*	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
29	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
30	Rodríguez-Loinaz G, Alday JG, Onaindia M (2015) 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
31	Hashimoto S, DasGupta R, Kabaya K, Matsui T, Haga C, Saito O, Takeuchi K (2018) Scenario analysis of land-use and ecosystem services of social-ecological landscapes: implications of alternative development pathways under declining population in the Noto Peninsula, Japan. <i>Sustainability Science</i> 14: 53-75. DOI: 10.1007/s11625-018-0626-6
32	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
33	Inkoom JN, Frank S, Greve K, Furst C (2018) A framework to assess landscape structural capacity to provide regulating ecosystem services in West Africa. <i>Journal of Environmental Management</i> 209: 393-408. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.12.027
34	Jaligot R, Chenal J, Bosch M, Hasler S (2019) Historical dynamics of ecosystem services and land management policies in Switzerland. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 101: 81-90. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.01.007
35	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
36	Pham 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
37	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
38	Sturck J, Poortinga A, Verburg PH (2014) Mapping ecosystem services: The supply and demand of flood regulation services in Europe. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 38: 198-211. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2013.11.010
39	Barral MP, Oscar MN (2012) Land-use planning based on ecosystem service assessment: A case study in the Southeast Pampas of Argentina. <i>Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment</i> 154: 34-43. DOI: 10.1016/j.agee.2011.07.010
40	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
41	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

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



No.	Citation
42	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
43	Helfenstein J, Kienast F (2014) Ecosystem service state and trends at the regional to national level: A rapid assessment. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 36: 11-18. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2013.06.031
44	Clerici N, Paracchini ML, Maes J (2014) Land-cover change dynamics and insights into ecosystem services in European stream riparian zones. <i>Ecohydrology and Hydrobiology</i> 14(2): 107-120. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecohyd.2014.01.002