

Impact Area & Indicator Factsheet: Ecosystem Services

Ecosystem Service	Pest control (including invasive species)
CICES class name	Pest control (including invasive species)
CICES Section	Regulation & Maintenance (Biotic)
CICES Class code	2.2.3.1

Brief Description

- Controlling pests and invasive species
- The reduction in the abundance of pests by biological interactions such as predation, competition or parasitism

Sample Indicators

Indicator values from			
Experiment or direct measurement	Ś	Survey	
Expert assessment	•	Statistical- or census data	áÍ
Model or GIS	Ţ	Literature values	
Stakeholder participation	∭% €	Not provided	\otimes

Table 1: Field Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[1] Injuries by root-lesion nematodes: Number of root-lesion nematode in 100 g of roots	# * 100g ⁻¹	ß
^[1] Injuries by root-knot nematodes: Number of root-knot nematode in 100 g of roots	# * 100g ⁻¹	ß
^[7] Level of injury severity, fruit loss, leaf loss, LAI loss	%	$\otimes_{,} \square$
^[9] Damage from pests six weeks after planting. Based on visual inspection of 40 randomly selected plants.	Index 1-3	B
^[5] Biological control: total number of plant species	#	B
^[15] Nematode abundance	Not provided	
^[9] Weed cover	kg * ha ⁻¹	B
^[15] Weed biomass	Not provided	



^[15] Weed density	Not provided	
^[7] Rates of predation by natural enemies, rates of parasitism by parasitoids	Not provided	⊘ _, □
^[7] Indicators or models to assess the impact of pesticides	Not provided	⊗, ©
^[11] Abundance of ladybird beetles (natural enemies of aphids and other sap-sucking pest species)	Not provided	<u>B</u>
^[11] Plant Simpson diversity as predictor of beetle abundance	Not specified	B
^[11] Abundance of birds from species that are known insectivores in agricultural fields	Not provided	B
^[11] Ant species richness as predictor of the abundance of birds, including those from species that are known insectivores.	Not provided	B
^[12] Indicator value calculated as: $I = \frac{\sum log(\frac{i}{l_{max}}) }{n}$ With: 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}{l_{max}}) $ is subtracted from the sum instead of added. For this ecosystem service, variables were: -Soil organic matter [% dw] -pH in KCl -Number of nematode taxa [-] -Density of nematode plant-parasites [number per 100 g soil]	-	s, D
^[14] Aphid biocontrol index; based on pairwise pot experiment introducing and exposing twenty-four aphids over a five-day period. The number of pests in an open treatment was divided by the number of pests in a caged treatment that excluded ground-dwelling and flying natural enemies. Values were standardized to a maximum value of 1.	Index 0-1	B
^[14] Use of bundles of indicator species identified for a certain region. Species may belong to different taxonomic groups	Not provided	ß
^[21] Carabid activity density	-	B
^[21] Number of carabid species caught in pitfall traps	#	B



Impact Area & Indicator Factsheet: Ecosystem Services

^[21] Spider activity density	-	B
^[21] Rove beetle activity density	-	B

Table 2: Farm Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[6] Share of cropland area less than 100m from a non-cropland edge other than water or impervious surfaces. Values were scaled to [0-1]	%	
^[6] Share of farmers surveyed that clearly expresses a value and care for the health of the land. Values were scaled to [0-1]	%	ر ا ا ا ا ا ا
^[8] Vegetation diversity: four-level index based on the number of plant species	Index [poor-fair- good-excellent]	B
^[14] Aphid biocontrol index; based on pairwise pot experiment introducing and exposing twenty-four aphids over a five-day period. The number of pests in an open treatment was divided by the number of pests in a caged treatment that excluded ground-dwelling and flying natural enemies. Values were standardized to a maximum value of 1.	Index 0-1	ß
^[14] Use of bundles of indicator species identified for a certain region. Species may belong to different taxonomic groups	Not provided	ß

Table 3: Regional Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[16] Pest abundance	Not provided	
^[16] Pest richness	Not provided	
^[16] Pest damage	Not provided	
^[16] Natural enemy abundance	Not provided	
^[16] Natural enemy richness	Not provided	
^[16] Natural enemy diversity	Not provided	
^[16] Direct natural enemy effects on pest reduction	Not provided	
^[2] Capacity for biological regulation: number of habitats for pest control species	Not provided	<u>.</u>
^[3] Number of species providing natural control of invertebrate and rodent pest species	#	ل ر



^[14] Aphid biocontrol index; based on pairwise pot experiment introducing and exposing twenty-four aphids over a five-day period. The number of pests in an open treatment was divided by the number of pests in a caged treatment that excluded ground-dwelling and flying natural enemies. Values were standardized to a maximum value of 1.	Index 0-1	B
^[13] Number of cases of reduced pest infestation in the locality	#	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
^[6] Share of cropland area less than 100m from a non-cropland edge other than water or impervious surfaces. Values were scaled to [0-1]	%	, () () () () () () () () () () () () ()
^[6] Share of farmers surveyed that clearly expresses a value and care for the health of the land. Values were scaled to [0-1]	%	ر ۱۳۳۳ ک ۱۳۳۳ ک
^[14] Use of bundles of indicator species identified for a certain region. Species may belong to different taxonomic groups	Not provided	B
^[17] Expert-/stakeholder rating of how much of this ES can be provided by a landscape (represented by a land use map)	6-point Lickert- scale (none – highest capacity)	
^[17] 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	1 (equal capacity) – 9 (absolute preference of one landscape)	
^[18] Area used for organic agriculture	n/a	<u>íÓ</u>
^[19] Pests' natural enemy biomass	n/a	\oslash
^[19] Pests' egg predation	n/a	\bigcirc
^[19] For plants with insecticidal properties: amount of active ingredient	kg/ km ⁻²	\otimes
^[19] Amount of insecticide used per unit	tons / km ⁻²	\otimes
^[20] Area of flower strips suitable for natural enemies of agricultural pests	n/a	\otimes

Table 4: National Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[4] Resilience of pest control service: number of arthropod morphospecies from (primarily) carnivorous taxa divided by number of morphospecies from (primarily) herbivorous taxa. Two or more specimens are considered the same morphospecies if an entomologically trained person (but non- specialist for the respective species groups) cannot see external morphological differences	[-]	



Impact Area & Indicator Factsheet: Ecosystem Services

^[10] Density of hedgerows	m * ha⁻¹	\otimes

Table 5: Multinational Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[3] Number of species providing natural control of invertebrate and rodent pest species	#	٩

References

No.	Citation
1	Allinne C, Savary S, Avelino J (2016) Delicate balance between pest and disease injuries, yield
	performance, and other ecosystem services in the complex coffee-based systems of Costa
	Rica. Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment 222: 1-12. DOI: 10.1016/j.agee.2016.02.001
2 ^{11*}	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. Journal of
	Environmental Management 127: S96-S116. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.09.020
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
5	Syswerda SP, Robertson GP (2014) Ecosystem services along a management gradient in
	Michigan (USA) cropping systems. Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment 189: 28-35. DOI:
	10.1016/j.agee.2014.03.006
6	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
7	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
8	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
9	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.
	Ecological Indicators 105: 264-278. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.08.032
10	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, Perez-Soba M, Grêt-Regamey A, Lillebø Al, 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

 $^{^{\}mbox{\scriptsize 11}\mbox{\scriptsize *}}$ The impact area discussed on this factsheet is not a focus of the cited paper



No.	Citation
11*	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
12	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. Science of the Total Environment 415: 39-48.
	DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.04.041
13	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
14	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
15	Daryanto S, Fu BJ, Wang LX, Jacinthe PA, Zhao WW (2018) Quantitative synthesis on the
	ecosystem services of cover crops. Earth-Science Reviews 185: 357-373. DOI:
	10.1016/j.earscirev.2018.06.013
16	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
47	33(8): 1247-1257. DOI: 10.1007/s10980-018-0673-5
1/	Inkoom JN, Frank S, Greve K, Furst C (2018) A framework to assess landscape structural
	capacity to provide regulating ecosystem services in West Africa. Journal of Environmental
10	Management 209: 393-408. DOI: 10.1016/J.Jenvman.2017.12.027
18	Chatzinikolaou P, Viaggi D, Raggi M (2018) Using the Ecosystem Services Framework for
	Policy Impact Analysis: An Application to the Assessment of the Common Agricultural Policy
	2014-2020 in the Province of Ferrara (Italy). Sustainability 10: 890. DOI:
10	10.3390/Su10030890.
19	Gasparatos A, Romeu-Daimau C, von Martitz GP, Jonnson FX, Shackleton C, Jarzebski MP,
	for associate the impact of hiefuel foodstock production on associate services. Diamass 8
	Picenergy 114, 157, 172, DOI: 10.1016/j. biombios. 2018.01.024
20	Bioenergy 114: 157-173. DOI: 10.1018/j.bioinbioe.2018.01.024
20	arrightural landscapes with a multi-chiestive programming approach. Landscape and Urban
	Blanning 172: 20.26. DOI: 10.1016/i landurhalan 2017.12.008
21	Van Vooren I, Reubens B, Ampoorter F, Broeky S, Dardon, D, Van Waes C, Verbouen K (2019)
21	Monitoring the Impact of Hedgerows and Grass Strins on the Performance of Multiple
	Frosystem Service Indicators, Environmental Management 62, 2/1-259
	$DOI:10 \ 1007/c00267-018-10/3-4$
	001.10.1007/300207-010-1043-4