

Ecosystem Service	Pollination
CICES class name	Pollination (or 'gamete' dispersal in a marine context)
CICES Section	Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic)
CICES Class code	2.2.2.1

Brief Description

- Pollinating fruit trees and other plants
- The fertilization of crops by animals that maintains or increases the abundance and/or diversity of plant species that people use or enjoy, or benefit from

Sample Indicators

Indicator values from			
Experiment or direct measurement	S	Survey	و ۱۱۱۱ ۱۱۱۱
Expert assessment	.	Statistical- or census data	áÓ
Model or GIS	ل	Literature values	
Stakeholder participation		Not provided	\Diamond

Table 1: Field Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[1] Pollen transported by pollinators	kg * yr⁻¹	\otimes
^[11] Abundance and diversity of pollinators	Not provided	\otimes_{μ}
^[15] Abundance of bumblebees	Not provided	<u>\$</u>
^[15] Plant Simpson diversity as an indicator for bumblebee abundance.	Not provided	B
^[11] Number of seeds per fruit	#	\otimes_{μ}
^[11] Share of fruit set pollinated	%	©,₽



Table 2: Farm Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[8] Share of cropland area less than 100m from a non-cropland edge other than water or impervious surfaces. Values were scaled to [0-1]	%	م ر م
^[8] Share of farmers that consider open landscapes a valued landscape feature. Values were scaled to [0-1]	%	<u>م</u> رگر
^[12] Vegetation diversity: four-level index based on the number of plant species	Index [poor-fair- good-excellent]	B
^[19] Richness of pollinators: Total number of Sphingidae collected	#	B

Table 3: Regional Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[2] Area of potential nesting sites for wild bees	m ²	<u>م</u> ر
^[2] Distance between potential nesting sites for wild bees and nearest arable land cell (GIS 10x10 m cells)	m	<u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>
^[2] Number of visitations from wild bees to arable fields, calculated as the sum of visitation probabilities based on proximity between potential nesting sites and arable fields	-	्र
^[3] Relative pollination potential: continuous index, based on the availability of floral resources, bee flight ranges and the availability of nesting sites	-	<u>4</u>
^[5] Share of land cover suitable as pollinator habitat in the direct vicinity of cropland	%	<u>-</u> 4
^[8] Share of cropland area less than 100m from a non- cropland edge other than water or impervious surfaces. Values were scaled to [0-1]	%	<i>न</i> ्
^[13] Share of area reachable by cavity and ground-nesting pollinator species, assuming 100 and 350 m flight and foraging distances, calculated using the equations by (Lonsdorf et al., 2009)	%	ر (
^[8] Share of farmers that consider open landscapes a valued landscape feature. Values were scaled to [0-1]	%	<u></u>
^[6] Pollination contribution by ecosystems (index): For each cropland, a) the crop pollination dependency ratio was calculated based on the specific crop type, b) the pollinator visitation probability was calculated as a regression between	-	<u>ح</u> م



distance to natural habitat and visitation rate. The sum of a) and b) was then assigned to the closest natural ecosystem.		
^[7] Pollination: Values are assigned based on 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	<u>*</u>
^[10] Habitat scores: number of bee species and medicinal plant species found in a specific land use class divided by benchmark value (number of species in land use class with the highest absolute number of species)	%	A, D
^[16] Number of bird & bee pollinators per hectare	# * ha ⁻¹	₽, [™] , ₽
^[16] Yield of pollinated crops	t * ha ⁻¹	₽ . , [₩] , ₽
^[17] Abundance of pollinators	Not provided	
^[17] Richness of pollinators	Not provided	
^[17] Diversity of pollinators	Not provided	
^[17] Effects of pollinators	Not provided	
 ^[18] Area pollination indicators (Lonsdorf et al., 2009), calculated for different assumptions regarding the distances that pollinators can cover (100 m, 350 m, 500 m): Area providing flowering [ha] Area suitable for nesting of wild bees and bumblebees Share of flowering sites reachable from nesting sites 	[ha] [ha] [%]	آر
^[21] Seed weight of pollinated plants	tons / (km ² * year)	\otimes

Table 4: National Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
 ^[4] Resilience of pollination service: number of pollinators morphospecies in the (primarily) pollinator taxa: Lepidoptera, Cerambycidae, Buprestidae and Aculeata. Two or more specimens are considered the same morphospecies if an entomologically trained person (but non-specialist for the respective species groups) can not see external morphological differences. To save costs, only seven weeks where maximum catches are expected were sampled, only the four weeks with the highest catches were identified. 	#	
^[5] Share of land cover suitable as pollinator habitat in the direct vicinity of cropland	%	<u>م</u> رً



^[14] Pollination potential	Not specified	\otimes
^[14] Pollinators distribution	Not specified	\otimes
^[14] Pollinators species richness	Not specified	\otimes
^[14] Number of beehives	Not specified	\otimes
^[14] Areal coverage of vegetation features supporting pollination (hedgerows, flower strips, High Nature Value Farmland etc.)	Not specified	\otimes
^[20] Pollinator visitation probability: Land use classes providing wild bee habitats are identified, with grassland/steppe; garrigue and woodland considered full habitats (100%) and arable land and orchards considered partial habitats (50%). Visitation Probability is then calculated as: Visitation Probability = e ^{(-0.00104 × Distance_to_habitat).}	[-]	<u>áð</u> Í

Table 5: Multinational Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[3] Relative pollination potential: continuous index, based on the availability of floral resources, bee flight ranges and the availability of nesting sites	[-]	<u>र</u> ्
^[9] Pollination: 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 ^{9*}	Fagerholm N, Torralba M, Burgess PJ, Plieninger T (2016) A systematic map of ecosystem
	services assessments around European agroforestry. Ecological Indicators 62: 47-65. DOI:
	10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.11.016
2	Lautenbach S, Kugel C, Lausch A, Seppelt R (2011) Analysis of historic changes in regional
	ecosystem service provisioning using land use data. Ecological Indicators 11(2): 676-687.
	DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2010.09.007
3	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.
	Ecological Indicators 73: 23-28. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.00.026
4	Obrist MK, Duelli P (2010) Rapid biodiversity assessment of arthropods for monitoring
	average local species richness and related ecosystem services. Biodiversity and Conservation
	19(8): 2201-2220. DOI: 10.1007/s10531-010-9832-y

 $^{^{\}mathfrak{9}^*}$ The impact area discussed on this factsheet is not a focus of the cited paper



No.	Citation
5	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.
	Land Use Policy 57: 151-163. DOI: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.05.018
6	Vigl LE, Tasser E, Schirpke U, Tappeiner U (2017) Using land use/land cover trajectories to
	uncover ecosystem service patterns across the Alps. Regional Environmental Change 17(8):
	2237-2250. DOI: 10.1007/s10113-017-1132-6
7*	Zhang ZM, Gao JF, Fan XY, Lan Y, Zhao MS (2017) Response of ecosystem services to
	socioeconomic development in the Yangtze River Basin, China. Ecological Indicators 72: 481-
	493. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.08.035
8	Andersson E, Nykvist B, Malinga R, Jaramillo F, Lindborg R (2015) A social–ecological analysis
	of ecosystem services in two different farming systems. Ambio 44(1): 102-112. DOI:
	10.1007/s13280-014-0603-y
9	Clerici N, Paracchini ML, Maes J (2014) Land-cover change dynamics and insights into
	ecosystem services in European stream riparian zones. Ecohydrology and Hydrobiology
	14(2): 107-120. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecohyd.2014.01.002
10	Cotter M, Häuser I, Harich FK, He P, Sauerborn J, Treydte AC, Martin K, Cadisch G (2017)
	Biodiversity and ecosystem services–A case study for the assessment of multiple species and
	functional diversity levels in a cultural landscape. Ecological Indicators 75: 111-117. DOI:
	10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.11.038
11	Demestihas C, Plénet D, Génard M, Raynal C, Lescourret F (2017) Ecosystem services in
	orchards. A review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development 37(2): 12. DOI: 10.1007/s13593-
	017-0422-1
12	Fleming WM, Rivera JA, Miller A, Piccarello M (2014) Ecosystem services of traditional
	irrigation systems in northern New Mexico, USA. International Journal of Biodiversity
	Science, Ecosystem Services and Management 10(4): 343-350. DOI:
	10.1080/21513732.2014.977953
13	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. Agroforestry Systems 92(4): 1075-1089. DOI:
	10.1007/s10457-017-0132-3
14	Maes J, Liquete 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, Czúcz B, Drakou
	EG, Zulian G, Lavalle C (2016) An indicator framework for assessing ecosystem services in
	support of the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020. Ecosystem Services 17: 14-23. DOI:
	10.1016/j.ecoser.2015.10.023
15*	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. Biodiversity and Conservation 25(8): 1481-1501. DOI:
	10.1007/s10531-016-1120-z
16	Adhikari S, Baral H, Nitschke CR (2018) Identification, Prioritization and Mapping of
	Ecosystem Services in the Panchase Mountain Ecological Region of Western Nepal. Forests
	9(9): 554. DOI: 10.3390/f9090554
17	Duarte GT, Santos PM, Cornelissen TG, Ribeiro MC, Paglia AP (2018) The effects of landscape
	patterns on ecosystem services: meta-analyses of landscape services. Landscape Ecology
	33(8): 1247-1257. DOI: 10.1007/s10980-018-0673-5



No.	Citation
18	Kay S, Crous-Duran J, García de Jalón S, Graves A, Palma JHN, Roces-Díaz JV, Szerencsits E,
	Weibel R, Herzog F (2018) Landscape-scale modelling of agroforestry ecosystems services in
	Swiss orchards: a methodological approach. Landscape Ecology 33(9): 1633-1644. DOI:
	10.1007/s10980-018-0691-3
19*	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. Environmental
	Management 61(5): 772-785. DOI: 10.1007/s00267-018-1004-y
20	Balzan MV, Caruana J, Zammit A (2018) Assessing the capacity and flow of ecosystem
	services in multifunctional landscapes: Evidence of a rural-urban gradient in a
	Mediterranean small island state. Land Use Policy 75: 711-725. DOI:
	10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.08.025
21	Gasparatos A, Romeu-Dalmau C, von Maltitz GP, Johnson FX, Shackleton C, Jarzebski MP,
	Jumbe C, Ochieng C, Mudombi S, Nyambane A, Willis K (2018) Mechanisms and indicators
	for assessing the impact of biofuel feedstock production on ecosystem services. Biomass &
	Bioenergy 114: 157-173. DOI: 10.1016/j.biombioe.2018.01.024