





Table 2: Farm Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
[3] Share of nitrogen retained during water passage between agricultural sub-catchment and sea. Values were scaled [0-1]	%	
[3] Share of farmers that express clearly a value and care for the health of the land. Values were scaled [0-1]	%	

Table 3: Regional Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
[6] Nitrate leaching	kg * ha <sup>-1</sup> * yr <sup>-1</sup>	
[5] Risk of nitrate leaching: exchange frequency of the soil water in the root layer. Infiltration rate divided by field capacity	%	
[3] Share of nitrogen retained during water passage between agricultural sub-catchment and sea. Values were scaled [0-1]	%	
[3] Share of farmers that express clearly a value and care for the health of the land. Values were scaled to [0-1]	%	
[4] Nutrient regulation: assigned values depend on the land cover class. 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	
[7] Share of riparian forest cover in 25 m buffer along rivers. Values were normalized [0-1] using benchmark values where available and observed values otherwise.	%	
[7] Share of natural forest cover in municipality's surface. Values were normalized [0-1] using benchmark values where available and observed values otherwise.	%	
[8] Water purification and provision, calculated as: $W = NPP * (1 - VCNPP) * IC_s * S_{cf}$ With: W – water purification and provision, NPP – Net Primary Production calculated from NDVI-values and expressed on a relative scale set to [0 – 1000], VCNPP – coefficient of variation of NPP [0 – 1], IC <sub>s</sub> – soil infiltration capacity [0 – 1], S <sub>cf</sub> – slope average correction factor of the study area [0 – 1]	n/a	
[8] Waste purification, calculated as: $W = NPP * (1 - VCNPP) * I_w * O_w * 1.75$	n/a	



With: NPP – Net Primary Production calculated from NDVI-values and expressed on a relative scale set to [0 – 1000], VCNPP – coefficient of variation of NPP [0 – 1], $I_w$ – water input to the system (calculated as rainfall * (1–runoff coefficient) and scaled to a range of [0 – 1]), $O_w$ – water bodies occupancy percentage and flat floodplain area [0 – 1]		
---	--	--

Table 4: National Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<sup>[9]</sup> "Recycling capacity" of external nutrients: Amount of phosphorus in pig manure that can be spread on tillage soils and P deficient grassland soils.	t P * yr <sup>-1</sup>	

Table 5: Multinational Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<sup>[10]</sup> Nutrient regulation: Values were 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 - 1	



## References

No.	Citation
1	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
2	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
3	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
4*	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
5	Bastian O, Lupp G, Syrbe RU, Steinháúßer R (2013) Ecosystem services and energy crops - Spatial differentiation of risks. <i>Ekologia Bratislava</i> 32(1): 13-29. DOI: 10.2478/eko-2013-0002
6	Kay S, Crous-Duran J, Ferreiro-Domínguez N, García de Jalón S, Graves A, Moreno G, Mosquera-Losada MR, Palma JHN, Roces-Díaz JV, Santiago-Freijanes JJ, Szerencsits E, Weibel R, Herzog F (2018) Spatial similarities between European agroforestry systems and ecosystem services at the landscape scale. <i>Agroforestry Systems</i> 92(4): 1075-1089. DOI: 10.1007/s10457-017-0132-3
7	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
8	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
9	Schulte RPO, Creamer RE, Donnellan T, Farrelly N, Fealy R, O'Donoghue C, O'HUallachain D (2014) Functional land management: A framework for managing soil-based ecosystem services for the sustainable intensification of agriculture. <i>Environmental Science &amp; Policy</i> 38: 45-58. DOI: 10.1016/j.envsci.2013.10.002
10	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

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