

Ecosystem Service	Nursery populations and habitats
CICES class name	Maintaining nursery populations and habitats (Including gene
	pool protection)
<b>CICES Section</b>	Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic)
CICES Class code	2.2.2.3

# **Brief Description**

- Providing habitats for wild plants and animals
- The presence of ecological conditions necessary for sustaining populations of species

## **Sample Indicators**

Indicator values from			
Experiment or direct measurement	S	Survey	ြ >>۳ []
Expert assessment	<b>.</b>	Statistical- or census data	áÓ
Model or GIS	<b>ل</b>	Literature values	
Stakeholder participation	₩% %	Not provided	$\bigcirc$

#### Table 1: Field Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<sup>[1]</sup> Biodiversity & habitats: Earthworms	Not provided	$\otimes$
<sup>[2]</sup> Species richness of birds	#	<b>4</b> <b>1</b>
<sup>[2]</sup> Species richness of farmland birds	#	<b>4</b> <b>1</b>
<sup>[2]</sup> Species richness of birds listed as vulnerable or threatened in Annex I of the EU Birds Directive	#	<b>4</b> <b>4</b>
<sup>[6]</sup> Overall species richness of flowers relevant to pollinators	#	
<sup>[6]</sup> Overall species richness of flowers	#	<u>B</u>
<sup>[15]</sup> Herbaceous species richness	#	



<sup>[9]</sup> Ant species richness as a predictor of overall bird species richness and abundance.	#	B
<sup>[7]</sup> Aboveground biodiversity: number of trees species with DBH≥ 1 cm	# per plot	B
<sup>[16]</sup> Number of carabid- and plant species (alpha diversity)	#	A, O
<sup>[16]</sup> Number of red listed species	#	Å, 🛱
<sup>[7]</sup> Aboveground biodiversity: Shannon index of trees species with DBH≥ 1 cm in the plot	-	<u>B</u>
<sup>[12]</sup> Diversity of plant community (calculated from species richness and structural diversity)	Dimensionless	<del>م</del> ۳
<sup>[13]</sup> Diversity of plant community (calculated from species richness and structural diversity)	Dimensionless	<del>م</del> ۳
<sup>[14]</sup> Abundances of soil microathropods (Acari: Oribatida, Acari: Mesostigmata and Collembola)	Not provided	<u>B</u>
<sup>[7]</sup> Belowground biodiversity: Number of arthropods per soil pit (25 cm x 25 cm x 30 cm)	#	\$
<sup>[7]</sup> Belowground biodiversity: Number of earthworms per soil pit (25 cm x 25 cm x 30 cm)	#	B
<sup>[7]</sup> Belowground biodiversity: macrofauna richness per soil pit (25 cm x 25 cm x 30 cm)	# of species	B
<sup>[7]</sup> Belowground biodiversity: macrofauna diversity per soil pit (25 cm x 25 cm x 30 cm) calculated as Shannon index	-	<u>B</u>
<sup>[1]</sup> Biodiversity & habitats: Microarthropod-based soil quality index	Not provided	$\bigcirc$
<sup>[1]</sup> Biodiversity & habitats: dsDNA content (Fornasier et al., 2014, DOI:10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.03.028)	µg dsDNA * g <sup>-1</sup> soil	$\otimes$
<sup>[2]</sup> Connectivity. Weighted Euclidean distance between smaller patches of natural habitat and the nearest large habitat patch (i.e.>25 km <sup>2</sup> ). Distances were weighted by the resistance values of land use types in between areas of natural habitat. Resistance values were expert-based, and no distinction was made for species-specific dispersal capacities. In summary, built-up areas were assigned a high resistance value (10), cropland and open water were assigned intermediate resistance values (4), and other land use types, including pasture and recently abandoned farmland, were assigned low resistance values (1 or 2).	Not provided	<u>مر</u>
<sup>[3]</sup> Distance-to-Nature-Potential (DNP)	Index 0 - 1	
<sup>[9]</sup> Plant species richness as a predictor of butterfly abundance and species richness	#	<u>B</u>
<sup>[6]</sup> Colour richness of flowers relevant for pollinators	# of colour groups visible to	B



	pollinators:	
	green, white,	
	yellow, purple,	
[11] Ushitat fay authy an also tatal your hay of plant an asian	violet, UV	
Habitat for arthropods: total number of plant species	#	B
<sup>[9]</sup> Plant Simpson diversity as a predictor of bee and beetle	Index 0 - 1	
abundance.		B
<sup>[9]</sup> Floristic Quality Assessment (FQA) as a predictor of	-	
butterfly species richness and abundance. FQA is the sum of		
the products of a species' "coefficient of conservatism" and		Â
its percentage of cover (or presence/absence data),		<u>~</u>
calculated over all species.		
<sup>[17]</sup> Share of semi-natural habitats	%	0
		Q
<sup>[11]</sup> Habitat for soil microbes and invertebrates: Soil carbon (0-	kg C * m <sup>-2</sup>	8
100cm)		
<sup>[12]</sup> Share of years within management period in which	%	<del>ال</del> ا
protection plant products were used		
<sup>[13]</sup> Share of years within management period in which	%	
protection plant products were used		Ĩ. Ĵ
<sup>[5]</sup> Groundcover: appual mean daily value expressed as a	0/	
fraction	70	T
		÷
<sup>[3]</sup> Relative reduction in species richness	%	<u></u>
[3] Deletine and estimation in an erice from the set diversity	0/	
Relative reduction in species functional diversity	%	
<sup>13</sup> Number of species lost regionally and globally	# * m <sup>-</sup>	
<sup>[6]</sup> Functional stability: Average species richness of flowers	# of species	
within colour groups during the flowering season (of flowers		8
relevant for pollinators)		
<sup>[6]</sup> Functional intensity: Average size of flowers or discernible	cm	12
sub-sets of inflorescences that are relevant for pollinators		<u> 1</u>
<sup>[17]</sup> Carabidae diversity and traits	Not provided	
		$\otimes$
<sup>[16]</sup> Difference among carabid- and plant species compositions	-	~
under different management types (beta diversity)		<u>5</u>
		,



<sup>[14]</sup> Biodiversity indices for microbial communities (Shannon, Pielou, Evenness); based on genetic fingerprinting of microbial communities in DNA extracted from bulk soil, rhizosphere soil, and roots.	Not provided	B
<sup>[9]</sup> AntQA index as a predictor of abundance of grassland bird and butterfly species. AntQa is the sum of the products of an ant species' "coefficient of conservatism" and its percentage of presence/absence in an area, calculated over all species.		B
<sup>[10]</sup> EPX (ecosystem-service performance index) Indicator value calculated as: $I = \frac{\sum  log(\frac{i}{i_{max}}) }{n}$ With: I – Indicator value, i – variable i measured, i <sub>max</sub> – 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 ecosystem service, variables were: -pH in KCl -Number of nematode taxa [-] -Number of micro-athropode taxa [-]	-	\$, O
<ul> <li>[<sup>8]</sup> Soil biodiversity indicator) based on a principal component analysis (PCA) of soil macro invertebrate data. Variables included:</li> <li>-Abundance of soil macro invertebrate communities (endogeic earthworms, epigeic earthworms, termites, ants, coleoptera, myriapoda, other litter invertebrate) [individuals * m<sup>2</sup>]</li> <li>-Taxonomic richness of soil macro invertebrates [not provided]</li> <li>-Sum of soil macro invertebrate collected at each plot [individuals * m<sup>2</sup>]</li> <li>Variables with significant contribution (&gt;50% of the maximum value) to either of the first two principal components, axes were selected and 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.</li> </ul>	-	B
<sup>[4]</sup> Coffee plantations: 5 level shade index	Index 5 (unshaded monoculture) - 1 (leguminous	B



	trees and other plants)	
<sup>[57]</sup> Cumulative avian species richness: number of species and number of breeding pairs observed during 4 site visits, walking at a slow pace and thoroughly surveying the entire site.	n/a	B

Table 2: Farm Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<sup>[18]</sup> Vegetation richness: Number of planted crop species	Index 0 - 1	
The index is calculated by dividing the observed value with a		[]
target value. Target values may be average or maximum		
values found in region or empirical values from the literature.		
If the calculated index is higher than 1, it is set to one.		
<sup>[18]</sup> Number of different land cover types	Index 0 - 1	
The index is calculated by dividing the observed value with a		
target value. Target values may be average or maximum		
values found in region or empirical values from the literature.		
If the calculated index is higher than 1, it is set to one.		
<sup>[18]</sup> Share of the farmland in non-crop vegetation (percent of	Index 0 - 1	
non-crop)		
		رقب
The index is calculated by dividing the observed value with a		
target value. Target values may be average or maximum		
values found in region or empirical values from the literature.		
If the calculated index is higher than 1, it is set to one.		
<sup>[18]</sup> Share of the farmland covered by rare landscape elements	Index 0 - 1	
(e.g. wetlands, riparian areas, primary forest and prairie)		
		ren
The index is calculated by dividing the observed value with a		
target value. Target values may be average or maximum		
values found in region or empirical values from the literature.		
If the calculated index is higher than 1, it is set to one.		
<sup>[10]</sup> Birds: observed of indicator species	Index 0 - 1	
The index is calculated by dividing the observed value with a		
target value. Target values may be average or maximum		
values found in region or empirical values from the literature.		
If the calculated index is higher than 1, it is set to one.		



<ul> <li><sup>[18]</sup> Native to total bird species ratio: Index based on observation of indicator species</li> <li>The index is calculated by dividing the observed value with a target value. Target values may be average or maximum values found in region or empirical values from the literature. If the calculated index is higher than 1, it is set to one.</li> </ul>	Index 0 - 1	
<sup>[19]</sup> Structural vegetation diversity: four-level index based on the number of different vegetation height classes that occur together (grass, shrubs, trees)	Index poor-fair- good-excellent	B
<sup>[21]</sup> Number of plant species observed during surveys within 1000 m from a farmhouse. Values were scaled [0-1].	#	
<sup>[17]</sup> Carabidae diversity and traits	Not provided	$\otimes$
<sup>[20]</sup> Biodiversity index based on number of moths, birds, bees, fruit flies, spiders, ants, soil macrofauna, termites, earthworms, and small, medium, and tall plants	Index 0.1 - 1	B
<sup>[21]</sup> Number of bird species observed during surveys within 300 m from farmhouse. Values were scaled [0-1].	#	
<sup>[22]</sup> Red-list biodiversity potential: weighted sum of red-listed species; number of red-listed species across all sampled taxonomic groups in each landscape, weighted by the respective IUCN category in the Swedish national red list. Multiplicators were: near threatened (1), vulnerable (2), endangered (3), regionally extinct (4).	#	B
<sup>[22]</sup> Use of bundles of indicator species identified for a certain region. Species may belong to different taxonomic groups	Not provided	B
<sup>[19]</sup> Wildlife diversity: four-level index based on the number of species occurring	Index poor-fair- good-excellent	B
<sup>[17]</sup> Share of semi-natural habitats	%	$\otimes$
<sup>[21]</sup> Landscape variation: length of land cover "edges" per hectare land surface. Values were scaled [0-1].	km * ha⁻¹	ب ۲ ۲
<sup>[21]</sup> Share of farmers surveyed that consider open landscapes valuable landscape elements. Values were scaled [0-1].	%	ر پیر پیر

### Table 3: Regional Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<sup>[21]</sup> Number of plant species observed during surveys within 1000 m from farmhouse. Values were scaled [0-1].	#	ر ۱۱۱۱۱ ۱۱۱۱۱۱



<sup>[23]</sup> Biodiversity of plant species: number of species	#	<u>ب</u> ( ک
<sup>[23]</sup> Biodiversity of plant species: total abundance (i.e. species cover)	Not provided	<b>ب</b>
<sup>[23]</sup> Biodiversity of plant species: true species diversity (i.e. exponential of Shannon entropy)	-	<u>چ</u> ر ک <u>ج</u>
<sup>[25]</sup> Richness of wild higher plants	#	áÍ
<sup>[37]</sup> Plant diversity: Plants Simpson's biodiversity index	Index 0 - 1	<u> </u>
<sup>[41]</sup> Number of weed species on arable land per relevé (method of Braun-Blanquet, 1964)	#	
<sup>[17]</sup> Carabidae diversity and traits	Not provided	$\otimes$
<sup>[21]</sup> Number of bird species observed during surveys within 300 m from farmhouse. Values were scaled [0-1].	#	
<sup>[25]</sup> Richness of wild higher animals	#	<u>íÓ</u>
<sup>[29]</sup> Terrestrial vertebrate species richness, calculated with the GAP Analysis program from the U.S. Geological Survey	# of species * ha <sup>-</sup>	<u>حر</u>
<sup>[31]</sup> Biodiversity & biological activity index: The index is based on the collection and sorting of soil macrofauna (including ants) into 16 taxonomic groups (e.g., Oligochaeta, Isoptera, Coleoptera) largely separated by order.	Index 0.1 - 1	B
<sup>[31]</sup> 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 a correlation between the presence of species and ecosystem service provision.		B
<sup>[46]</sup> Number of endangered species of vertebrates, invertebrates and plants	# * km <sup>-2</sup>	<b>4</b> <b>1</b>
<sup>[22]</sup> Red-list biodiversity potential: weighted sum of red-listed species; number of red-listed species across all sampled taxonomic groups in each landscape, weighted by the respective IUCN category in national red list. Multiplicators were: near threatened (1), vulnerable (2), endangered (3), regionally extinct (4).	#	B
<sup>[22]</sup> Use of bundles of indicator species identified for a certain region. Species may belong to different taxonomic groups	Not provided	B
<sup>[24]</sup> Biological diversity: composition of flora and fauna communities in relation to the potential natural communities	Not provided	<b>.</b>



<sup>[25]</sup> Number of endemic species	#	<u>íð</u>
<sup>[28]</sup> Wetland habitats: Number of unique species in wetlands and floodplains	#	
<sup>[34]</sup> Bioscore index based on national biodiversity map. Scores are calculated as sum of scores for the distribution of endangered species (1-9), and from scores based on selected species and habitat indicators (1-11). All intensively cultivated fields are assigned a score of 0 by default.	Index 0 - 20	Ţ
<sup>[35]</sup> Alpha, beta and gamma diversity of bird species and woody species. Bird species values based on point measurements, recording all birds seen or heard up to a 30 m radius within a 10 min period (except flyover birds). Woody species values based on determining all woody plants with diameter at breast height > 5 cm.	-	B
<sup>[36]</sup> Habitat scores: number of 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).	%	ŝ, 🕮
<sup>[36]</sup> Habitat scores for endangered species: number of endangered species found in a specific land use class divided by benchmark value (number of endangered species in land use class with the highest absolute number of endangered species).	%	ŝ,
<sup>[45]</sup> Number and identity of selected species in rivers or lakes	#	$\otimes$
<sup>[45]</sup> Biodiversity value (e.g., species richness, species composition)	Not provided	$\otimes$
<sup>[49]</sup> Mean species value per hectare: score based on the habitat suitability for all vertebrate and vascular plant species listed in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan, each rated $[0 - 1]$ multiplied by their respective colonization potential, each $[0 - 1]$ . The scores are weighted so that each species contributes equally, regardless of how many habitat types it occurs in.	-	<b>.</b>
<sup>[40]</sup> Genetic Resources: Number and varieties of species	#	
<sup>[17]</sup> Share of semi-natural habitats	%	$\otimes$
<sup>[44]</sup> Share of semi-natural habitat	%	لي ب
<sup>[44]</sup> Number of the semi-natural habitat types	#	بگ آ
<sup>[21]</sup> Landscape variation: length of land cover "edges" per hectare land surface. Values were scaled [0-1].	km * ha <sup>-1</sup>	



<sup>[25]</sup> Diversity of ecosystem types	#	<u>íÓ</u>
<sup>[25]</sup> Proportion of woodland, garden and grassland area in total	%	<u>íð</u>
<sup>[26]</sup> Area of "ecological compensation areas"	ha	<b>ا</b>
<sup>[38]</sup> Share of special protection area relative to municipality's surface area. Values were normalized [0-1] using benchmark values where available and observed values otherwise.	%	$\otimes$
<sup>[38]</sup> Share of habitats of community interest relative to municipality's surface area. Values were normalized [0-1] using benchmark values where available and observed values otherwise.	%	$\otimes$
<sup>[39]</sup> Designated Natura 2000 areas	ha	<mark>ـ</mark> طر
<ul> <li><sup>[27]</sup> Indicator for ecological integrity, based on:</li> <li>-Naturalness: Hemeroby index [not provided]</li> <li>-Land use diversity: Number of plant species [not provided]</li> <li>-Landscape fragmentation (landscape metrics): Effective mesh size [not provided],</li> <li>-Core area index [not provided]</li> <li>-Landscape diversity: Shannon diversity index [-]</li> <li>-Patch density [not provided]</li> <li>-Shape index [not provided]</li> <li>-Habitat connectivity: Cost distance analysis [not provided]</li> </ul>	Index 1 - 100	٣
<sup>[32]</sup> Habitat index from InVEST model	Index 0 - 1	<b>4</b> %
<sup>[33]</sup> Size and distribution of strictly protected areas (nature reserves, biosphere reserve, Natura 2000)	Not provided	<b>*</b>
<sup>[42]</sup> Landscape heterogeneity: Satoyama index, calculated as Simpson's diversity index for land uses multiplied by the proportion "non-urban, non-agricultural" land use classes.	Index 0 - 1	<u>r</u>
<sup>[43]</sup> Providing nurseries, habitat for species and conserving genetic diversities: expert-based index for ecosystem service provision by each land cover class [1-5], multiplied by the area of the land cover class	km <sup>2</sup>	₽, Щ, Ţ
<sup>[43]</sup> Providing nurseries, habitat for species and conserving genetic diversities value: expert-based index for ecosystem service provision by each land cover class [1-5], multiplied by the area of the land cover class and literature-based monetary value of the ecosystem service	km <sup>2</sup> , \$ * ha <sup>-1</sup> * yr <sup>-</sup>	₽, □, ₽
<sup>[44]</sup> Structural diversity measured by the Simpson diversity index	-	<u> </u>
<sup>[45]</sup> Ecological-morphological status	preferences, e.g., good, neutral, bad	$\otimes$



<sup>[45]</sup> Floodplain area	ha	$\otimes$
<sup>[23]</sup> Floodplains: Riparian Quality Index (RQI). The index considers (i) average width of riparian corridor; (ii) longitudinal continuity, coverage and distribution pattern of riparian corridor (woody vegetation); (iii) composition and structure of riparian vegetation; (iv) age diversity and natural regeneration of woody species; (v) bank conditions; (vi) floods and lateral connectivity; and (vii) substratum and vertical connectivity	Index 0 - 100	\$, <b>F</b>
<sup>[46]</sup> Number of ecosystem types per area (based on classification in national ecosystem assessment)	# * area <sup>-1</sup>	<u>م</u> لاً ا
<sup>[47]</sup> Habitat richness based on landscape metrics: Simpson diversity index	-	<b>4</b> <b>2</b>
<sup>[47]</sup> Habitat richness based on landscape metrics: Share of seminatural habitat	%	<b>ح</b> ر ا
<sup>[47]</sup> Habitat richness based on landscape metrics: Number of seminatural habitat types	#	<u>بر</u>
<sup>[48]</sup> Biodiversity conservation, calculated as: $BC = NPP * (1 - VC_{NNP}) * I_W * N_f$ With: BC – Biodiversity conservation, NPP – Net Primary Production calculated from NDVI-values and expressed on a relative scale set to (0 -1000), VC <sub>NPP</sub> – coefficient of variation of NPP [0 – 1], I <sub>W</sub> – water input to the system, calculated as rainfall * (1-runoff coefficient) and scaled to a range of [0 -1], N <sub>f</sub> – naturalness factor considering naturalness and structural complexity of the ecosystem [0 – 1]	-	<u>ب</u>
<sup>[49]</sup> Habitat conservation score, based on conservation priorities and significance of habitats. Conservation priorities were derived from the policy document, while significance was determined by calculating the proportion of the national and regional resource that occurred for each habitat type at each site, and particular site-specific features.	-	••, <u>F</u>
<sup>[21]</sup> Share of farmers surveyed that consider open landscapes valuable landscape elements. Values were scaled [0-1].	%	, ,
<sup>[30]</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.	-	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1



Table 4: National Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<sup>[53]</sup> Area weighted mean species richness of vascular plants	# of species	<u>لاگ</u>
<sup>[50]</sup> Diversity of breeding bird species (Simpson-index)	-	<u>م</u> ر م
<sup>[50]</sup> Number of farmland bird species	#	<u>حر</u>
<sup>[51]</sup> Species diversity: Expert assessment for each land use class, based on the indicators: species number; endangered species; invasive species (units not given)	very negative (-3) to very positive (+3)	
<sup>[52]</sup> Species of conservation concern: based on species listed in U.K. Biodiversity Action Plan and recorded in a grid cell (further specification lacking)	not provided	<u>گ</u> , ش
<sup>[51]</sup> Genetic diversity: Expert assessment for each land use class, based on the indicator: crop variety (units not given)	very negative (–3) to very positive (+3)	<u></u>
<sup>[51]</sup> Habitat diversity: Expert assessment for each land use class, based on the indicators: intensive agriculture; homogeneity; fragmentation; extensive/organic agriculture (units not given)	very negative (−3) to very positive (+3)	<b>2</b>
<sup>[53]</sup> Degree of naturalness: 7-point scale indicator	1 (natural) - 7 (artificial)	<del>ر</del> ۲
<sup>[54]</sup> Area of high nature value farmland	ha	<u>íÓ</u>
<sup>[55]</sup> Share of high nature value farmland	%	$\otimes$

#### Table 5: Multinational Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
<sup>[56]</sup> Biodiversity: Values assigned for 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	Index 0 - 5	<b>.</b>
zones.		



### **References**

dge and
nent of
an Union.
l Impacts
stainability
uries, yield
of Costa
02.001
ricultural
1
l
ator
9
cosystem
alvador.
rez A,
2014) Soil
mbia.
.12.020
ist TO
rvation
e Aivi
20.40
59-40.
ontin
55. DOI.
ranking to
Jy
es
em
l:
ori S.
Pelengić R.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 10^{\ast}}$  The impact area discussed on this factsheet is not a focus of the cited paper



-

No.	Citation
	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.
	Journal of Environmental Management 223: 614-624. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.06.065
15	Daryanto S, Fu B, Zhao W (2019) Evaluating the use of fire to control shrub encroachment in
	global drylands: A synthesis based on ecosystem service perspective. Science of the Total
	Environment 648: 285-292. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.08.140
16	Van Vooren L, Reubens B, Broekx S, Reheul D, Verheyen K (2018) Assessing the impact of
	grassland management extensification in temperate areas on multiple ecosystem services
	and biodiversity. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 267: 201-212. DOI:
	10.1016/j.agee.2018.08.016
17*	Feld CK, Sousa JP, da Silva PM, Dawson TP (2010) Indicators for biodiversity and ecosystem
	services: towards an improved framework for ecosystems assessment. Biodiversity and
	Conservation 19(10): 2895-2919. DOI: 10.1007/s10531-010-9875-0
18*	Quinn JE, Brandle JR, Johnson RJ (2013) A farm-scale biodiversity and ecosystem services
	assessment tool: the healthy farm index. International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability
	11(2): 176-192. DOI: 10.1080/14735903.2012.726854
19	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
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. Environmental
	Management 61(5): 772-785. DOI: 10.1007/s00267-018-1004-y
21	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-у
22	Birkhofer K, Rusch A, Andersson GKS, Bommarco R, Dänhardt J, Ekbom B, Jönsson A,
	Lindborg R, Olsson O, Rader R, Stjernman M, Williams A, Hedlund K, Smith HG (2018) A
	framework to identify indicator species for ecosystem services in agricultural landscapes.
	Ecological Indicators 91: 278-286. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.04.018
23	Felipe-Lucia MR, Comin FA (2015) Ecosystem services-biodiversity relationships depend on
	land use type in floodplain agroecosystems. Land Use Policy 46: 201-210. DOI:
2.4*	10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.02.003
24*	Furst C, Frank S, Witt A, Koschke L, Makeschin F (2013) Assessment of the effects of forest
	and use strategies on the provision of ecosystem services at regional scale. Journal of
25	Environmental Management 127: 96-116. DOI: 10.1016/J.Jenvman.2012.09.020
25	Hou Y, Zhou SD, Burkharda B, Muller F (2014) Socioeconomic influences on biodiversity,
	light the services and numan weil-being. A quantitative application of the DPSIR model in
	Jangsu, China. Science of the Total Environment 490: 1012-1028. DOI:
26	10.1016/J.Scholenv.2014.05.071
20	Ruber R, Lemmann B (2010) Economies of Scope in the Agricultural Provision of Ecosystem
	Services. An Application to a righ cost Production Region. German Journal of Agricultural
27	Koschke L. Furst C. Lorenz M. Witt A. Frank S. Makeschin E (2012) The integration of cron
~ /	rotation and tillage practices in the assessment of ecosystem services provision at the
	rotation and unage practices in the assessment of ecosystem services provision at the rogical provision of the services provision at the rogical provision 20:157-171. DOI: 10.1016/j. acalind 2012.02.009
	regional scale. Ecological indicators 52, 157-171, DOI: 10.1010/J.ecolinu.2013.03.008



No.	Citation
28	Liu S, Crossman ND, Nolan M, Ghirmay H (2013) Bringing ecosystem services into integrated
	water resources management. Journal of Environmental Management 129: 92-102. DOI:
	10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.06.047
29	Meyer MA, Chand T, Priess JA (2015) Comparing Bioenergy Production Sites in the
	Southeastern US Regarding Ecosystem Service Supply and Demand. Plos One 10(3):
	e0116336. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0116336
30	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. Regional Environmental Change 14(1): 237-251. DOI:
	10.1007/s10113-013-0488-5
31	Sanabria C, Lavelle P, Fonte SJ (2014) Ants as indicators of soil-based ecosystem services in
	agroecosystems of the Colombian Llanos. Applied Soil Ecology 84: 24-30. DOI:
	10.1016/j.apsoil.2014.07.001
32	Zarandian A, Baral H, Stork NE, Ling MA, Yavari AR, Jafari HR, Amirnejad H (2017) Modeling
	of ecosystem services informs spatial planning in lands adjacent to the Sarvelat and
	Javaherdasht protected area in northern Iran. Land Use Policy 61: 487-500. DOI:
	10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.12.003
33	Bastian O, Lupp G, Syrbe RU, Steinháußer R (2013) Ecosystem services and energy crops -
	Spatial differentiation of risks. Ekologia Bratislava 32(1): 13-29. DOI: 10.2478/eko-2013-0002
34	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. Ecological Indicators 77: 151-165. DOI:
	10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.12.001
35	Muñoz JC, Aerts R, Thijs KW, Stevenson PR, Muys B, Sekercioglu CH (2013) Contribution of
	woody habitat islands to the conservation of birds and their potential ecosystem services in
	an extensive Colombian rangeland. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 173: 13-19.
	DOI: 10.1016/j.agee.2013.04.006
36	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
37	Quétier F, Lavorel S, Daigney S, de Chazal J (2009) Assessing ecological and social uncertainty
	in the evaluation of land-use impacts on ecosystem services. Journal of Land Use Science
	4(3): 1/3-199. DOI: 10.1080/1/4/4230903036667
38	Rodriguez-Loinaz G, Alday JG, Onaindia M (2015) Multiple ecosystem services landscape
	Index: A tool for multifunctional landscapes conservation. Journal of Environmental
20*	Management 147: 152-163. DOI: 10.1016/J.Jenvman.2014.09.001
39*	Vejre H, Vesterager JP, Andersen PS, Olatsson AS, Brandt J, Dalgaard T (2015) Does cadastral
	division of area-based ecosystem services obstruct comprehensive management? Ecological
10	Modelling 295: 176-187. DOI: 10.1016/J.ecolmodel.2014.09.027
40	Adhikari S, Barai H, Nitschke CR (2018) Identification, Prioritization and Mapping of
	Ecosystem Services in the Panchase Mountain Ecological Region of Western Nepal. Forests
4.1	9(9): 554. DOI: 10.3390/19090554
41	Baude IVI, IVIEVER BC, Schindewolf IVI (2019) Land use change in an agricultural landscape
	causing degradation of soil based ecosystem services. Science of the Total Environment 659:
42	1520-1530. DUI: 10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2018.12.455
42	Hasnimoto S, DasGupta R, Kabaya K, Matsul I, Haga C, Saito O, Takeuchi K (2018) Scenario
	analysis of land-use and ecosystem services of social-ecological landscapes: implications of



-

No.	Citation
	alternative development pathways under declining population in the Noto Peninsula, Japan. Sustainability Science 14: 53-75. DOI: 10.1007/s11625-018-0626-6
43	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. Science of the Total Environment 650: 132-143. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.08.430
44	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
45*	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). Science of the Total Environment 652: 1347-1365. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.10.303
46	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. Ecosystem Services 35: 43-51. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecoser.2018.11.006
47	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
48	Barral MP, Oscar MN (2012) Land-use planning based on ecosystem service assessment: A case study in the Southeast Pampas of Argentina. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 154: 34-43. DOI: 10.1016/j.agee.2011.07.010
49	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. Ecological Economics 69(7): 1510-1523. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2010.02.011
50	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. Environmental & Resource Economics 57(2): 273-297. DOI: 10.1007/s10640-013-9662-y
51	Helfenstein J, Kienast F (2014) Ecosystem service state and trends at the regional to national level: A rapid assessment. Ecological Indicators 36: 11-18. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2013.06.031
52	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. Ecological Applications 21(6): 2034-2048. DOI: 10.1890/09-2195.1
53	Kirchner M, Schmidt J, Kindermann G, Kulmer V, Mitter H, Prettenthaler F, Rudisser J, Schauppenlehner T, Schonhart M, Strauss F, Tappeiner U, Tasser E, Schmid E (2015) Ecosystem services and economic development in Austrian agricultural landscapes - The impact of policy and climate change scenarios on trade-offs and synergies. Ecological Economics 109: 161-174. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.11.005
54	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. Environmental Science & Policy 38: 45-58. DOI: 10.1016/j.envsci.2013.10.002



No.	Citation
55	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
56	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
57	Assandri G, Bogliani G, Pedrini P, Brambilla M (2018) Beautiful agricultural landscapes
	promote cultural ecosystem services and biodiversity conservation. Agriculture Ecosystems
	& Environment 256: 200-210. DOI: 10.1016/j.agee.2018.01.012