

Ecosystem Service	Groundwater for drinking
CICES class name	Ground (and subsurface) water for drinking
CICES Section	Provisioning (Abiotic)
CICES Class code	4.2.2.1

Brief Description

- Drinking water from below ground sources
- Ground water bodies or aquifers that provide a source of drinking water

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
^[23] Groundwater replenishment	$\text{m}^3 * \text{m}^{-2} * \text{yr}^{-1}$	
^[5, 22] Annual total drainage	$\text{mm} * \text{yr}^{-1}$	
^[6] Seepage rate: the amount of water that leaves the rooting zone toward the groundwater table	$\text{mm} * \text{yr}^{-1}$	
^[7] Seepage rate: the amount of water that leaves the rooting zone toward the groundwater table	$\text{mm} * \text{yr}^{-1}$	

Table 2: Farm Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[14] Aquifer recharge from irrigation channels: Four-level index based on the share of water lost through seepage in open channel irrigation [%]. The higher the value, the higher the recharge	poor-fair-good-excellent	





[14] Aquifer recharge from irrigation channels: Four-level index based on the share of irrigation channels that are unlined [%]. The higher the value, the higher the recharge	poor-fair-good-excellent	
--	--------------------------	---

Table 3: Regional Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
[1] Groundwater recharge, calculated with the soil-water balance model (SWBM) by the U.S. Geological Survey	mm	
[15] Provisioning of water: Groundwater recharge rate calculated from water balance	mm	
[2] Groundwater recharge, calculated as: (Precipitation - Evapotranspiration) * (1 - Share of anthropogenic surface sealing) / (Discharge factor). Discharge factor [-] is determined based on distance from the surface to groundwater and slope.	mm * yr ⁻¹	
[12] Groundwater recharge: mean annual infiltration rate	l * m ⁻²	
[19] Groundwater recharge: Share of precipitation not used by evapotranspiration or surface-runoff	%	
[4, 16] Freshwater supply: Annual groundwater recharge	cm * yr ⁻¹	
[21] Groundwater recharge rate	mm * ha ⁻¹ * yr ⁻¹	
[10] Groundwater recharge: values for 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	
[20] Water yield: calculated as annual precipitation - evapotranspiration	m ³ * area ⁻¹ * yr ⁻¹	
[9] Precipitation – Evapotranspiration, calculated with InVEST model	1000 m ³	
[21] Annual average water yield	mm * yr ⁻¹	
[21] Annual sectoral water yield (e.g., domestic, agriculture and industry)	mm * yr ⁻¹	
[22] Annual total drainage	mm	
[10] Freshwater supply: values for 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	
[18] Water for drinking and non-drinking uses: expert based index for ecosystem service supply by land cover class [1-5], multiplied by the area of the land cover class [km ²]	Index 1-5 * km ²	 ,  , 
[18] Water for drinking and non-drinking uses' value: expert based index for ecosystem service supply by land cover class	\$ * ha ⁻¹ * yr ⁻¹	 ,  , 









[1-5], multiplied by the area of the land cover class [km ²] and a literature-based monetary value of the ecosystem service		
^[3] Water purification and provision: $NPP \times (1 - VCNPP) \times ICs \times Scf$; where 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), ICs: soil infiltration capacity (0 - 1), Scf: slope average correction factor of the study area (0 - 1)	-	
^[21] Leakage of nutrients	kg * ha ⁻¹ * yr ⁻¹	
^[21] Total dissolved solids	mg * l ⁻¹	
^[8] Designated drinking water protection areas	ha	
^[17] Runoff: renewable water supply. Values were normalized [0-1] using benchmark values where available and observed values otherwise	mm	
^[24] Freshwater recharge from the entire landscape	m ³ / (km ² * year)	

Table 4: Multinational Scale

Indicator	Unit	Indicator values from
^[13] Groundwater recharge: 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	
^[13] Freshwater: 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	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
2	Nordborg M, Sasu-Boakye Y, Cederberg C, Berndes G (2017) Challenges in developing regionalized characterization factors in land use impact assessment: impacts on ecosystem services in case studies of animal protein production in Sweden. International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment 22(3): 328-345. DOI: 10.1007/s11367-016-1158-x
3	Barral MP, Oscar MN (2012) Land-use planning based on ecosystem service assessment: A case study in the Southeast Pampas of Argentina. Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment 154: 34-43. DOI: 10.1016/j.agee.2011.07.010
4	Qiu JX, Turner MG (2015) Importance of landscape heterogeneity in sustaining hydrologic ecosystem services in an agricultural watershed. Ecosphere 6(11): 229. DOI: 10.1890/es15-00312.1



No.	Citation
5	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
6 ^{27*}	Tsonkova P, Bohm C, Quinkenstein A, Freese D (2015) Application of partial order ranking to identify enhancement potentials for the provision of selected ecosystem services by different land use strategies. <i>Agricultural Systems</i> 135: 112-121. DOI: 10.1016/j.agsy.2015.01.002
7	Tsonkova P, Quinkenstein A, Bohm C, Freese D, Schaller E (2014) Ecosystem services assessment tool for agroforestry (ESAT-A): An approach to assess selected ecosystem services provided by alley cropping systems. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 45: 285-299. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.04.024
8*	Vejre H, Vesterager JP, Andersen PS, Olafsson AS, Brandt J, Dalgaard T (2015) Does cadastral division of area-based ecosystem services obstruct comprehensive management? <i>Ecological Modelling</i> 295: 176-187. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.09.027
9	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. <i>Land Use Policy</i> 61: 487-500. DOI: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2016.12.003
10*	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
12	Bastian O, Lupp G, Syrbe RU, Steinhäuser 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
13	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
14	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
15	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
16	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
17	Rodríguez-Loinaz G, Alday JG, Onaindia M (2014) 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
18	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

^{27*} The impact area discussed on this factsheet is not a focus of the cited paper

No.	Citation
19	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. <i>Landscape Ecology</i> 33(9): 1633-1644. DOI: 10.1007/s10980-018-0691-3
20	Peng J, Tian L, Liu Y, Zhao M, Hu Y, Wu J (2017) Ecosystem services response to urbanization in metropolitan areas: Thresholds identification. <i>Science of the Total Environment</i> 607-608: 706-714. DOI: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.06.218
21	Phama 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
22	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
23*	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
24	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. <i>Biomass & Bioenergy</i> 114: 157-173. DOI: 10.1016/j.biombioe.2018.01.024