

BURLEIGH DODDS SERIES IN AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE

Reconciling agricultural production with biodiversity conservation

Edited by Professor Paolo Bàrberi and Dr Anna-Camilla Moonen,
Institute of Life Sciences – Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna, Italy



Contents

Series list	ix
Acknowledgements	xv
Introduction	xvi

Part 1 Methods to study biodiversity in agroecosystems

1	The challenge of monitoring biodiversity in agricultural landscapes at the EU level	3
	<i>M. L. Paracchini, European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Italy; S. Condé, European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity - Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, France; R. D'Andrimont, European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Italy; B. Eiselt, European Commission, Eurostat, Luxembourg, Luxembourg; O. Fernandez Ugalde, E. Gervasini and A. Jones, European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Italy; V. Kovacevic, European Commission, DG Environment, Belgium; R. Oppermann, Institut für Agrarökologie und Biodiversität (IFAB), Germany; A. Orgiazzi, M. Van der Velde, C. Polce and C. Rega, European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Italy; C. Van Swaay, De Vlinderstichting, The Netherlands; and P. Voříšek, Czech Society for Ornithology, Czech Republic</i>	
	1 Introduction	3
	2 Farmland birds and butterflies	6
	3 Grasslands	11
	4 Pollinators	14
	5 Soil biodiversity	15
	6 Monitoring under the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC	17
	7 European Monitoring of Biodiversity in Agricultural Landscapes (EMBAL)	20
	8 Alien species	21

9	Other monitoring approaches	25
10	New approaches and technologies	27
11	Conclusions	28
12	Where to look for further information	29
13	References	30
2	Modelling biodiversity in agriculture <i>G. R. Squire, James Hutton Institute, UK</i>	37
1	Introduction	37
2	Interaction among individuals for place, space or resource	43
3	Process-based modelling	46
4	Trading biophysical, economic, social and political currencies	53
5	Whole-system multi-attribute decision modelling	59
6	Future trends and conclusion	64
7	Where to look for further information	66
8	References	67
3	Assessing the economic value of agricultural biodiversity: a critical perspective <i>Corrado Topi, Stockholm Environment Institute at York, Department of Environment and Geography and Interdisciplinary Global Development Centre, University of York, UK; and Leonie J. Pearson, Stockholm Environment Institute, Thailand</i>	73
1	Introduction	73
2	The relationship between definitions and economic approaches	76
3	What does valuing agricultural biodiversity mean?	78
4	The ecosystem services framework (ESF)	80
5	Ecosystem interactions	88
6	Understanding the limitations of ecosystem service valuations	91
7	The investor perspective: the natural environment as a legally structured persona	93
8	Conclusions	95
9	References	97
4	Functional biodiversity for the provision of agroecosystem services <i>Paolo Bàrberi and Anna-Camilla Moonen, Institute of Life Sciences - Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Italy</i>	101
1	Introduction	101
2	The rise of studies on agriculture: biodiversity relationships	102
3	Functional biodiversity and the delivery of agroecosystem services	120
4	How can research contribute to the advancement of functional agrobiodiversity?	128

5	Where to look for further information	131
6	References	134
Part 2 Management practices to support agroecosystem services		
5	The role of field margins in biodiversity conservation in agroecosystems <i>Alicia Cirujeda and Gabriel Pardo, Centro de Investigación y Tecnología Agroalimentaria de Aragón (CITA-Universidad de Zaragoza), Spain</i>	149
	1 Introduction	149
	2 Options for promoting biodiversity in agricultural landscapes	150
	3 Field margins: characteristics and types	151
	4 The role of field margins in agroecosystems	158
	5 Managing field margins to promote insect biodiversity	160
	6 Managing field margins to promote rare arable plants, reptiles, amphibians, birds and mammals	163
	7 Conclusions	166
	8 Where to look for further information	166
	9 References	167
6	The role of hedgerows in supporting biodiversity and other ecosystem services in intensively managed agricultural landscapes <i>Audrey Alignier, Léa Uroy and Stéphanie Aviron, INRAE, France</i>	177
	1 Introduction	177
	2 What is a hedgerow?	179
	3 The role of hedgerows as habitat for biodiversity	181
	4 Hedgerows and hedgerow networks	186
	5 Hedgerows and ecosystem services	192
	6 Case study: hedgerow plantation and bocage restoration enhance biodiversity and other ecosystem services	196
	7 Summary and future trends	198
	8 Where to look for further information	199
	9 References	199
7	Reconciling production and biodiversity in management of pastures and grasslands <i>Sylvain Plantureux, Université de Lorraine, INRAE, LAE, France</i>	205
	1 Introduction	205
	2 Analyzing the relationship between biodiversity and productivity in grasslands	207
	3 Biodiversity factors affecting grassland productivity	208

4	Biodiversity factors affecting grassland productivity over time	212
5	Biodiversity factors affecting the quality of forage and animal products	214
6	Grassland biodiversity and ecosystem services	218
7	Assessing the economic value of species-rich grasslands	221
8	Management of grasslands for both biodiversity and production	223
9	Case study: flowering meadows competition	226
10	Summary and future trends	229
11	References	230
8	The importance of agroforestry systems in supporting biodiversity conservation and agricultural production: a European perspective	243
	<i>M. R. Mosquera-Losada, J. J. Santiago-Freijanes, A. Rigueiro-Rodríguez, F. J. Rodríguez-Rigueiro, D. Arias Martínez, A. Pantera and N. Ferreiro-Domínguez, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain</i>	
1	Introduction	243
2	The contribution of agroforestry to global biodiversity goals	245
3	Agroforestry and the protection of species and habitats	248
4	Agroforestry and the maintenance and restoration of ecosystems	249
5	Achieving more sustainable agriculture and forestry	251
6	Stopping the loss of global biodiversity	252
7	Future trends	253
8	Where to look for further information	253
9	Acknowledgements	254
10	References	254
	Index	259

Introduction

More intensive, monocultural agriculture has been associated with a decline in diversity of habitat and plant species which leads to corresponding declines in diversity of insect, bird and mammal species. There is mounting evidence that a more biodiverse landscape improves ecosystem services which benefits farmers. This collection summarises the wealth of research on ways of improving biodiversity in agricultural landscapes, with a focus on temperate agriculture.

The first part of this volume reviews landscape approaches to biodiversity conservation, mapping and modelling biodiversity as well as assessing the economic value of biodiversity conservation practices. Part 2 reviews management practices promoting biodiversity such as field margins and hedgerows, ways of reconciling agricultural production and biodiversity in grassland management as well as the role of agroforestry in promoting biodiversity.

Part 1 Methods to study biodiversity in agroecosystems

The book begins with a focus on the challenge of mapping biodiversity in agricultural landscapes at the EU level. Chapter 1 reviews the current surveys of biodiversity in agricultural areas in the EU. It begins by examining established surveys, ongoing pilots and plans for new surveys at the EU level, focusing specifically on the monitoring of farmland birds and butterflies, grasslands, pollinators and soil biodiversity. The chapter also assesses where we stand in the short-medium term in terms of our knowledge of agrobiodiversity in the EU and which gaps still need to be filled to sufficiently describe biodiversity dynamics.

The next chapter looks at modelling biodiversity in agriculture. Models have been widely used in agricultural science to understand complexity, predict the consequence of change and extend knowledge to new scales. 'Crop modelling' began in the 1960s and is now well advanced and applied globally but is restricted to a few economic species. More recently, modelling has been expanded to cover biota as mediators of ecological process or as endpoints for assessment of environmental status. Chapter 2 examines the range of modelling approaches in biodiversity studies, including individual-based approaches that combine within- and between-species diversity, process-based models operating at plot, field and increasingly at landscape scales, integrated system models that seek optimal trade-offs between biodiversity and economic outputs, and global frameworks that combine the biophysical, economic, social and political forces acting on biodiversity. The chapter concludes with a more

practical approach known as multi-attribute decision modelling that can be developed and applied by biodiversity managers and planners.

The subject of Chapter 3 is assessing the economic value of agricultural biodiversity. The chapter reviews developments in methods to assess the economic value of agricultural biodiversity, outlines their limitations and proposes a possible, novel way forward. It discusses the different definitions of agrobiodiversity. It then highlights ways of evaluating agrobiodiversity. This is followed by two sections, the first introducing and discussing the ecosystem services framework (ESF) and its limitations, the second outlining the integration of ecosystem interactions in the ESF. The chapter then explores two fundamental problems affecting the evaluation of agricultural biodiversity: the ecosystem services whose value cannot be derived from the market and uncertainty. On the basis of these considerations, the authors propose a novel way forward, the investor perspective, where by giving the natural environment the rights of a legal persona enshrined in a Bill of Rights, the authors address many of the drawbacks of current evaluation methods. The chapter concludes with recommendations for evaluators and decision and policy makers, and with an extended bibliography.

The final chapter of Part 1 examines functional biodiversity for the provision of agroecosystem services. In the context of sustainable agricultural development, the provision of other services beyond production is becoming a priority. Chapter 4 highlights that a functional approach to agrobiodiversity is the best approach to meeting this goal in both research and agricultural practice. The chapter includes an analysis of the development of studies on agriculture-biodiversity relationships and refers to two milestones that had a tremendous impact on research: the United Nation's Convention on Biological Diversity (1992) and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005). Interest in the functional aspects of agrobiodiversity, i.e. the potential or actual provision of ecosystem services, has boomed in the latest 15 years, yet use of the term 'functional biodiversity' is still scarce. The chapter also provides a trait-based definition of functional biodiversity and a four-step methodology that should shed light on the potential of elements at each agrobiodiversity level - from gene to species and habitat - to provide single or multiple agroecosystem services in any context.

Part 2 Management practices to support agroecosystem services

Part 2 begins by discussing the role of field margins in biodiversity conservation in agroecosystems. Chapter 5 reviews research on ways of modifying the agricultural landscape to reverse the decline in a range of fauna and flora. The chapter starts by looking at the range of options for promoting biodiversity in

agricultural landscapes. It then focuses on field margins, their characteristics and types as well as the role of field margins in agroecosystems. The chapter then reviews research on managing field margins to promote insect biodiversity. It also looks at managing field margins to promote rare arable plants (RAP), reptiles, amphibians, birds and mammals.

Chapter 6 considers the role of hedgerows in supporting biodiversity and other ecosystem services in intensively-managed agricultural landscapes. Over the past half century, agricultural intensification has substantially changed agricultural landscapes and farming systems. These changes have been beneficial to provisioning services, i.e. agricultural yields, but detrimental for biodiversity and associated ecosystem services. As a contribution to halting and reversing the decline, it has been suggested that conserving and/or restoring hedgerows would be beneficial. Hedgerows are key features of agricultural landscapes. The chapter begins by highlighting what hedgerows are and their role as a habitat in promoting biodiversity. It then looks at hedgerows and hedgerow networks and goes on to examine how hedgerows contribute to the provision of ecosystem services. The chapter also provides a case study on hedgerow plantation and bocage restoration and how it enhances biodiversity and other ecosystem services. It concludes by providing potential areas for future research as well as resources for further information.

The subject of Chapter 7 is reconciling production and biodiversity in management of pastures and grasslands. Grasslands are crucial for the conservation of biodiversity across the world. Current agricultural practices have increasingly replaced grasslands by crops or managed them more intensively, resulting in a dramatic reduction of biodiversity. Is it possible to reconcile profitable grassland production with conservation of biodiversity? The chapter reviews research on the relationship between biodiversity and the quantity and quality of biomass produced by grasslands. It also shows it is possible to manage grasslands to reconcile production and biodiversity of grasslands. A case study on flowering meadows is also provided, followed by an analysis of potential future trends in research.

The final chapter of the book focuses on the importance of agroforestry systems in supporting biodiversity conservation and agricultural production from a European perspective. Chapter 8 begins by reviewing the contribution of agroforestry to global biodiversity goals. It then discusses agroforestry and the protection of species and habitats, followed by a discussion of agroforestry and the maintenance and restoration of ecosystems. The chapter also analyses the importance of achieving sustainable agriculture and forestry practices as well as preserving global biodiversity.

Part 1

Methods to study biodiversity in agroecosystems

Chapter 1

The challenge of monitoring biodiversity in agricultural landscapes at the EU level

M. L. Paracchini, European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Italy; S. Condé, European Topic Centre on Biological Diversity – Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle, France; R. D’Andrimont, European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Italy; B. Eiselt, European Commission, Eurostat, Luxembourg; O. Fernandez Ugalde, E. Gervasini and A. Jones, European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Italy; V. Kovacevic, European Commission, DG Environment, Belgium; R. Oppermann, Institut für Agrarökologie und Biodiversität (IFAB), Germany; A. Orgiazzi, M. Van der Velde, C. Polce and C. Rega, European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Italy; C. Van Swaay, De Vlinderstichting, The Netherlands; and P. Voříšek, Czech Society for Ornithology, Czech Republic

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Farmland birds and butterflies
- 3 Grasslands
- 4 Pollinators
- 5 Soil biodiversity
- 6 Monitoring under the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC
- 7 European Monitoring of Biodiversity in Agricultural Landscapes (EMBAL)
- 8 Alien species
- 9 Other monitoring approaches
- 10 New approaches and technologies
- 11 Conclusions
- 12 Where to look for further information
- 13 References

1 Introduction

Following the acknowledgement that biodiversity in agricultural lands globally and in the European Union (EU) has been strongly impacted by the intensification of agricultural practices (Dudley and Alexander, 2017; IPBES, 2019), many efforts have been carried out to revert the trend, starting with

agri-environmental schemes becoming compulsory for EU Member States in 1992 (EU Regulation 2078/92) (Batary et al., 2015) aimed at reducing pressures from agriculture in order to meet environmental objectives such as the protection or enhancement of biodiversity, the improvement of soil, water, landscape and air quality, climate change mitigation and adaptation.

Through the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) cycles that followed, the concern for biodiversity has been embedded into the legislation as a target in general (e.g. protection and enhancement of biodiversity in axis 2 of rural development policy) and in specific terms (e.g. high nature value farming and forestry) (2006/144/EC). Persisting concerns about the fate of biodiversity, which emerged most evidently in the public consultation on modernizing and simplifying the common agricultural policy launched by the European Commission (EC) in 2017¹, have been embedded in the legislative proposal for the CAP post-2020 (COM (2018) 392 final), which identifies as one of its nine priorities to 'contribute to the protection of biodiversity, enhance ecosystem services and preserve habitats and landscapes'.

In parallel, environmental legislation through the decades has targeted rare and threatened species, and rare natural habitats (EEC, 1979; EEC, 1992; European Parliament and the Council of the European Union, 2009): as a result, the European Union currently hosts the largest coordinated network of protected areas in the world, the Natura 2000 Network². By adding the concept of restoration to the protection concept, the legislation of the past two decades has widened the scope, addressing all habitats and not only those more endangered and ecologically valuable. This started with the Commission's proposal to the Gothenburg European Council (EC, 2001), which calls for protecting and restoring habitats and natural systems and halting the loss of biodiversity by 2010, a concept which was reinforced in the EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 (EC, 2011). The latter, introducing the concept of ecosystem services, makes all habitats possible targets for restoration. In particular, target 3, which relates to agriculture specifically, defines the goal of maximizing '*areas under agriculture across grasslands, arable land and permanent crops that are covered by biodiversity-related measures under the CAP so as to ensure the conservation of biodiversity and to bring about a measurable improvement in the conservation status of species and habitats that depend on or are affected by agriculture and in the provision of ecosystem services as compared to the EU2010 Baseline, thus contributing to enhance sustainable management*'. The EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2030 reinforces this line of action by dedicating a whole section to bringing nature back to agricultural land (EC, 2020 - Section 2.2.2)³.

¹ https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/consultations/cap-modernising/highlights-public-consul_en.pdf

² (https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/natura2000/index_en.htm)

³ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1590574123338&uri=CELEX:52020DC0380>

Lastly, legislative requirements that contribute to biodiversity preservation also include the so-called 'environmental safeguards' directives, requiring formal environmental assessments to be carried out for projects (under Directive 85/337/EEC⁴ and following amendments), and plans/programs (under Directive 2001/42/EC⁵) with potential detrimental effects, including on biodiversity and habitats.

To assess the effectiveness of such efforts different techniques are applied, spanning from the analysis of case study areas (Kettunen and Ten Brink, 2006; Kleijn et al., 2006) to the use of proxies (Alliance Environnement, 2017) or models (Kok et al., 2018). In this frame, there is, overall, a lack of data recorded through monitoring efforts, EU wide assessments are in fact presently relying on a limited set of surveyed data: farmland birds (Gregory et al., 2005)⁶, grassland butterflies (EEA, 2013a) and the reporting under the Birds and Habitats Directive (EC, 2015).

Biodiversity decline, and in particular the loss of genetic diversity, is within the nine global-scale processes that are essential to maintain the earth system in a resilient and accommodating state defined by Steffen et al. (2015), one of the two processes laying outside the safe operating space. Despite the urgency to revert the trend and the efforts from the policy side to incorporate the concern, signals are not encouraging (EC, 2020). Better targeting and improved assessments need filling knowledge gaps and using updated and detailed data, covering different taxa. Moreover, in the frame of planning, implementing, monitoring and assessing EU policy, sources of information should cover the entire European Union, and should be based on a harmonized approach for data collection. Establishing surveys is an important way to guarantee that such information becomes available.

The EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 defines biodiversity as 'the unique variety of life on our planet', the UN Convention on Biological Diversity as 'the variability among living organisms from all sources including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems' (UN, 1993). Such definitions suggest a complexity that is probably the reason why it has been so difficult to put in place a large-scale monitoring system that includes surveys of the main components of biodiversity. Surveys can be burdensome and therefore the costs can exceed current financial and administrative capacity, especially when an entire continent should be covered. Nevertheless, initiatives and pilots are ongoing, to enlarge the available data pool.

This chapter reviews where we stand in surveying biodiversity in agricultural areas at the EU level as well as plans to increase monitoring efforts.

⁴ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:01985L0337-20090625>

⁵ <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A32001L0042>

⁶ <https://pecbms.info/trends-and-indicators/indicators>

The sections that follow describe established surveys, ongoing pilots and plans for new surveys at the EU scale. A multiplicity of information is available at local/regional/national scale, but this chapter focusses on the long and winding road to wall-to-wall coverage of the European Union. At the end, the point can be made on where we will stand in the short-medium term with our knowledge of agro-biodiversity in the European Union, and which gaps still need to be filled to appropriately and sufficiently describe biodiversity dynamics.

2 Farmland birds and butterflies

2.1 The Pan-European common bird monitoring scheme

Many countries of the European Union are characterized by a long-lasting tradition of bird-watching, on which scientifically grounded countrywide surveys were nested. Countries such as Finland, Sweden and Denmark organized a countrywide monitoring scheme in 1975, the United Kingdom in the 1960s. Others started later on, but nowadays all EU countries except Malta have a monitoring scheme in place.

In 2002, the Pan-European Common Bird Monitoring Scheme (PECBMS) was started as a joint initiative of the European Bird Census Council (EBCC) and BirdLife International, with the aims of: collecting data on European common bird species from national monitoring schemes and calculate European common bird indices and indicators, to raise awareness and to feed the policy process; support the national coordinators in setting up the schemes, and guarantee a harmonized approach in the calculation of the indices; explore the relation between population trends and main driving forces (EBCC, 2019).

Most surveys are carried out through point or line transect counts, where the selection of the plots to be surveyed (each plot containing one or more point or transect) is made either following rigorous statistical procedures (e.g. systematic selection, stratified random selection) or a free choice approach (Table 1). The surveyor visits the assigned location one or more times during the year, in predetermined time windows (e.g. 10 May–20 June as in the Italian survey), and records the individuals seen or heard. A thorough statistical analysis is followed to identify errors and outliers.

The extraordinary component of PECBMS are the thousands volunteers who count the birds in the field, each year, according to a methodology standardized at national level. The data are sent to the national offices, where, using TRIM software made available by PECBMS (van Strien et al., 2001; Statistics Netherlands, 2017), calculate the national species indices and trends. PECBMS combines national species indices with supra-national indices for individual species for the European Union and its main regions (new and old European Union, and West, South, North, Central and East Europe), plus Europe

Table 1 Principal characteristics of national breeding birds monitoring schemes

Country	Generic breeding bird monitoring scheme	Contributes to PECBMS	Start year	Field survey methods	Selection of plots	Number of species
Austria	Yes	Yes	1998	Point counts	Free choice	85
Belgium	Yes	Yes	1990	Point counts	Stratified random, other	134
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	2004	Line transects	Stratified random	63
Croatia	Yes	Not yet	2015	Point counts	Stratified semi-random	30
Cyprus	Yes	Yes	2006	Line transects	Other	45
Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	1982	Point counts, line transects	Free choice, stratified random	218
Denmark	Yes	Yes	1975	Point counts	Free choice	143
Estonia	Yes	Yes	1983	Point counts	Free choice	90
Finland	Yes	Yes	1975	Point counts, line transects, other	Systematic, other	140
France	Yes	Yes	1989	Point counts	Other	150
Germany	Yes	Yes	1989	Line transects, point counts, territory mapping	Free choice, stratified random	100
Greece	Yes	Yes	2007	Point counts	Stratified random	233
Hungary	Yes	Yes	1999	Point counts	Stratified random	420
Ireland	Yes	Yes	1998	Line transects	Stratified random	55
Italy	Yes	Yes	2000	Point counts	Random	103
Latvia	Yes	Yes	1995	Point counts, territory mapping	Random, systematic, other	90
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	1994	Point counts	Stratified semi-random	70

(Continued)

Table 1 (Continued)

Country	Generic breeding bird monitoring scheme	Contributes to PECBMS	Start year	Field survey methods	Selection of plots	Number of species
Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	2002	Point counts, territory mapping, line transect	Random, stratified random	120
Malta	No					
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	1984	Territory mapping, point counts, line transects	Free choice, random, stratified random	100
Poland	Yes	Yes	2000	Line transects	Stratified random	110
Portugal	Yes	Yes	2004	Point counts	Stratified random	64
Romania	Yes	Yes	2006	Point counts	Stratified semi-random	70
Slovak Republic	Yes	Yes	1994	Point counts	Free choice	100
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	2007	Line transects	Stratified non-random	29
Spain	Yes	Yes	1996	Point counts, line transects	Stratified random, other	200
Sweden	Yes	Yes	1975	Point counts, line transects	Free choice, systematic	180
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	1966	Territory mapping, line transects	Free choice, stratified random	111

Table 2 Species composing the EU farmland bird index

<i>Alauda arvensis</i>	<i>Emberiza melanocephala</i>	<i>Passer montanus</i>
<i>Alectoris rufa</i>	<i>Falco tinnunculus</i>	<i>Perdix perdix</i>
<i>Anthus campestris</i>	<i>Galerida cristata</i>	<i>Petronia petronia</i>
<i>Anthus pratensis</i>	<i>Galerida theklae</i>	<i>Saxicola rubetra</i>
<i>Bubulcus ibis</i>	<i>Hirundo rustica</i>	<i>Saxicola torquatus</i>
<i>Burhinus oediconemus</i>	<i>Lanius collurio</i>	<i>Serinus serinus</i>
<i>Calandrella brachydactyla</i>	<i>Lanius minor</i>	<i>Streptopelia turtur</i>
<i>Carduelis cannabina</i>	<i>Lanius senator</i>	<i>Sturnus unicolor</i>
<i>Ciconia ciconia</i>	<i>Limosa limosa</i>	<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>
<i>Corvus frugilegus</i>	<i>Melanocorypha calandra</i>	<i>Sylvia communis</i>
<i>Emberiza cirlus</i>	<i>Miliaria calandra</i>	<i>Tetrax tetrax</i>
<i>Emberiza citrinella</i>	<i>Motacilla flava</i>	<i>Upupa epops</i>
<i>Emberiza hortulana</i>	<i>Oenanthe hispanica</i>	<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>

as a whole. All indices are annually updated, and EU indices are regularly sent to and published by EUROSTAT⁷. Thirty-nine species compose the Farmland Bird Index (FBI, Table 2). These are common species, which are dependent from agroecosystems for feeding and nesting, and as such are considered to be a descriptor of the state of agroecosystems. The index is a composite, multispecies index calculated using Monte Carlo simulations as described in Soldaat et al. (2017).

Of the monitoring initiatives presented in this paper, this is the only one that has a wall-to-wall coverage of the European Union, with a sampling density sufficient to derive statistically meaningful information at different scales (EU, national, regional), on different ecosystem types (farmland, forest; montane birds and mire birds for North Europe indicators are under development) or climate change (Gregory et al., 2009).

The information is valuable and widely used, since it is considered that, being at the top of the food chain, birds are indicators of the environment's health. The farmland bird indicator is to date the most widespread biodiversity indicator used in EU policies (impact indicator of the CAP⁸; condition indicator of the Monitoring and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services – MAES⁹), indicator frameworks (Streamlining European Biodiversity Indicators – SEBI¹⁰; agri-environmental indicators – AEIs¹¹; OECD agri-environmental indicators¹²) and global assessments (e.g. FAO, 2019).

⁷ https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-datasets/-/t2020_rn130

⁸ https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/food-farming-fisheries/key_policies/documents/impact-indicator-fiches_en.pdf

⁹ https://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/knowledge/ecosystem_assessment/pdf/5th%20MAES%20report.pdf

¹⁰ <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/abundance-and-distribution-of-selected-species-8/assessment-1>

¹¹ <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/agriculture/agri-environmental-indicators>

¹² <https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?QueryId=77269&lang=en>

Index

- Abax parallelepipedus* 191
ABLE. *see* Assessing ButterFlies in Europe (ABLE)
AEIs. *see* Agri-environmental indicators (AEIs)
AES. *see* Agri-environmental scheme (AES)
AFINET project 252
Agricultural intensification 37, 109, 110, 125, 150, 163, 164, 186, 187, 192
Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 122
Agri-ecological equilibrium 226
Agri-environmental indicators (AEIs) 9
Agri-environmental scheme (AES) 102, 151-153, 159, 162, 165
Agri-food value chain 77
Agrobiodiversity 76-77, 93, 94
Agroecology 58, 102, 129, 205-207
Agroecosystem services 102, 108, 112, 114, 117-119, 122, 127
Agroforestry systems 57, 254
 contribution to global biodiversity goals 245-248
 loss of global biodiversity 252-253
 maintenance and restoration of ecosystems 249-251
 overview 243-245
 species and habitats protection 248-249
 sustainable agriculture and forestry 251-252
Amaranthus retroflexus 159
Amsynckia intermedia 159
Aphis fabae 159
AQUATOX 47
Arundo donax 159
Assessing ButterFlies in Europe (ABLE) 11

BIODEPTH project 209, 211
'Biodiversity Can Pay' 222

Biodiversity Information System for Europe (BISE) 25
Biodiversity modelling 65-66
 biophysical, economic, social and political currencies
 crop simulation modelling 55, 57
 integrative ecosystem models 57-59
 multisectoral policy frameworks 53-55
 chain of effect 39-40
 individual-based approaches
 incorporating variability 43-44
 in trait space across explicit resource 44-46
 multi-attribute decision modelling (MADM) 59
 biota as integral 61, 63-64
 structure 60-61
 overview 37-39
 process-based modelling 46
 scaling-up 51-53
 stimulus of environmental risk assessment 47, 50-51
 units, trajectory, scale and boundary 40-42
Biodiversity monitoring 29-30
 Alien species 21-24
 approaches and technologies 27-28
 BioBio Project 25
 Biodiversity Information System for Europe 25
 butterflies 10-11
 Copernicus Land Monitoring Service 25
 European Breeding Bird Atlas (EBBA) 10
 European Monitoring of Biodiversity in Agricultural Landscapes (EMBAL) 20-21
 grasslands 11-13

- Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC 17–18, 20
 overview 3–6
 Pan-European Common Bird Monitoring Scheme (PECBMS) 6, 9
 pollinators 14–15
 Sentinel imagery 26
 soil 15–17
- Biodiversity–production (BP) 208, 209
 Biotechnology 108
 BirdLife International 6
 BISE. *see* Biodiversity Information System for Europe (BISE)
 BMUB. *see* German Federal Ministry for the Environment (BMUB)
 BP. *see* Biodiversity–production (BP)
 Bramble. *see* *Rubus fruticosus*
Bromus sterilis 182
 Buckwheat. *see* *Fagopyrum esculentum*
 Bumblebees 194, 196
 Bumblebee transect count method 15
 Butterfly Conservation 11
 Butterfly Monitoring Scheme 10
- CAP. *see* Common agriculture policy (CAP)
Castanea sativa 196
 CBD agricultural biodiversity work programme 112
 CEAM. *see* Centre for Exposure Assessment Modeling (CEAM)
 Cellular automaton model 43
 Centre for Ecology and Hydrology 11
 Centre for Exposure Assessment Modeling (CEAM) 47
 Chestnut. *see* *Castanea sativa*
 CICES. *see* Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES)
- Cirsium arvense* 159, 182
 Citizen Science 24, 28
 Climate mitigation service 129
 Commission Implementing Regulation 22
 Common agriculture policy (CAP) 4, 9, 102, 250–253
 Common holly. *see* *Ilex aquifolium*
 Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES) 82–84, 87, 219
 Computer-vision-based algorithms 27
 Conservation headlands 152, 163
 Conservation status 18
 Coppicing 182
- Council Directive 2000/29/EC 21
 Cover crops 151
 CP. *see* Crude protein concentration
 Crop models 55
 Cropping practices 151
 Crop simulation 38
 Crude protein (CP) concentration 216
- Decision-making process 77, 93
 Decision trees. *see* Multi-attribute decision modelling (MADM)
 DEXi software 60
Digitalis purpurea 181
 Direct herbicide spraying 182
 Directive 2000/60/EC 23
 Directive 2008/56/EC 23
 Direct molecules transfer 217
 DNA meta-barcode analysis 16
 Driver–Pressure–State–Impact–Response (DPSIR) 55, 65
 Dutch Butterfly Conservation 11
- Earth Macrobiome Project (EMP) 16
 Earth Observation Programme 25
 EASIN geodatabase 24
 EBBA. *see* European Breeding Bird Atlas (EBBA)
 EBCC. *see* European Bird Census Council (EBCC)
 EBVs. *see* Essential Biodiversity Variables (EBVs)
- EC. *see* European Commission (EC)
 ‘Eco-agriculture’ approach 117
 Ecological economics 75
 Ecological process 39–41, 46, 61, 64
Ecology and Society 120
 Economic abstraction 77
 The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) 53, 55, 77, 82–84, 87, 88, 221
 Economic sustainability 212
 Economic value assessment 73–97
 on agricultural biodiversity 78, 80
 definitions and approaches 76–77
 ecosystem interactions 88–91
 ecosystem services framework (ESF) 75, 80–88
 limitations of ecosystem service 91–93
 natural environment as legally structured persona 93–95
 overview 73–76
 Ecosystem functioning 212

- Ecosystem services (ESs) 4, 61, 63, 88, 218-219
- Ecosystem services framework (ESF) 80-88, 87
- e-DNA. *see* Environmental DNA (e-DNA)
- EEA. *see* European Environment Agency (EEA)
- Elsevier Scopus® database 103, 107
- Elytrigia repens* 159
- EMBAL. *see* European Monitoring of Biodiversity in Agricultural Landscapes (EMBAL)
- EMP. *see* Earth Macrobiome Project (EMP)
- Environmental DNA (e-DNA) 23
- Environmental legislation 4
- Environmental risk assessment (ERA) 37, 47, 51
- 'Environmental safeguards' directives 5
- ERA. *see* Environmental risk assessment (ERA)
- ESDAC. *see* European Soil Data Centre (ESDAC)
- ESF. *see* Ecosystem services framework (ESF)
- ESs. *see* Ecosystem services (ESs)
- Essential Biodiversity Variables (EBVs) 28
- EU. *see* European Union (EU)
- EU Biodiversity Strategy 4, 5, 22, 249-252
- EU Framework Directive 23
- EU NATURA 2000 network 248
- Euonymus europaeus* 196
- EU Regulation 1143/2014 22
- Europe 2020 Strategy 244
- European Alien Species Information Network 23
- European Bird Census Council (EBCC) 6, 10
- European Breeding Bird Atlas (EBBA) 10
- European Commission (EC) 4, 11, 14, 20, 23, 83, 128, 248
- European Community 130
- European Environment Agency (EEA) 83, 219
- European Grassland Butterfly Indicator 11
- European Monitoring of Biodiversity in Agricultural Landscapes (EMBAL) 20-21
- European Research Infrastructure Consortium 27
- European Soil Data Centre (ESDAC) 17
- European Union (EU) 3-5, 9, 11-13, 16, 129, 162, 252-253
- EUROSTAT 9
- Expert Meeting on Agri-Biodiversity Indicators 112
- Extrapolation techniques 76
- Fagopyrum esculentum* 189
- Farming heterogeneity 193
- Farmland Bird Index (FBI) 9
- Farmland birds vs. woodland birds 101-102
- FBI. *see* Farmland Bird Index (FBI)
- Federal State of Baden Württemberg 226
- FEGS-CS. *see* Final Ecosystem Goods and Services Classification System (FEGS-CS)
- Field margins and biodiversity conservation 167
- characteristics and types 151-158
- managing and promoting birds 164-165
- insect biodiversity 160-162
- mammals 165-166
- rare arable plants (RAPs) 163
- reptiles and amphibians 163-164
- overview 149-150
- promoting in agricultural landscapes 150-151
- role in agroecosystems 158-160
- Final Ecosystem Goods and Services Classification System (FEGS-CS) 84
- Flux-based simulation modelling 55, 57
- Food-web approach 116
- FRAMEwork project 130
- Fraxinus excelsior* 155
- Functional biodiversity 132-134
- and agroecosystem services definitions 120-121
- functional traits approach 123, 125-128
- re-defining and focus 122-123
- overview 101-102
- relationships 102-107
- 1990-1992 108-109
- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA, 2006-2019) 112-118
- research and rising interest 118-120
- United Nations' Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD, 1993-2005) 109-112
- research and advancement of 128-131
- Functional composition 126
- Functional diversity 126-127

- GAEC. *see* Good agricultural and environmental conditions (GAEC)
- Galium aparine* 182
- 'Garbage in garbage out' issues 92
- Generalist vs. specialist enemies 114–115
- Genetic agrobiodiversity 127
- GEO BON. *see* Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON)
- Geranium robertianum* 181
- German Federal Ministry for the Environment (BMUB) 83
- Global policy frameworks 53
- GM crop traits 51, 52, 58
- Good agricultural and environmental conditions (GAEC) 251
- Gothenburg European Council 4
- Grassland Butterfly Index 10
- 'Greening' concept 151
- Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON) 28
- Habitat and Birds Directives 248
- Hedera helix* 181
- Hedgerows 199
 - description 179–181
 - and ecosystem services 192
 - density and configuration promoting pest natural enemies 192–194
 - enhancing pollinators 194–196
 - effective dispersal of plants 189
 - evolution 186
 - as habitat for biodiversity 181
 - managed elements 182
 - management and conservation 184–186
 - part of farming systems 183–184
 - and landscape connectivity 187
 - network connectivity to forest carabid species 189–191
 - overview 177–179
 - plant assemblages for animal-dispersed species 187–189
 - plantation and bocage restoration 196–198
- Hedonic pricing 90
- Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research 11
- Herbaceous layer management 182
- Herbicide-tolerant crops 58
- High nature value (HNV) systems 248
- Horizon 2020-funded research projects 128, 130
- 'Hump-backed' model 209
- IACS. *see* Integrated Administration and Control System (IACS)
- IAS. *see* Invasive Alien Species (IAS)
- IBPES. *see* Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IBPES)
- Ilex aquifolium* 196
- iNaturalist 27
- Indirect effect 217
- Individual-based modelling 43
- Integrated Administration and Control System (IACS) 52
- Integrated pest management (IPM) 38, 57
- Intensive farming practices 151
- Intercropping 151
- Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IBPES) 54, 84, 219
- International Bill of Human Rights 92
- International Bill of Universal Rights 94
- International Organisation for Biological and Integrated Control (IOBC) 119
- Invasive Alien Species (IAS) 22–24
- IOBC. *see* International Organisation for Biological and Integrated Control (IOBC)
- IPBES. *see* Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IBPES)
- IPM. *see* Integrated pest management (IPM)
- Jena Experiment 120, 222
- Joint Research Centre (JRC) 23, 24
- Land consolidation programs 186
- Landscape heterogeneity 192
- Landscape Management for Functional Biodiversity 119
- Landscape-scale modelling 52
- 'Land sparing' vs. 'land sharing' approach 110
- Land-use change 110, 113
- Land Use/Cover Area-Frame Survey (LUCAS) 11, 16, 17, 21, 25, 52
- Leaf dry matter content (LDMC) 216
- Lepus europaeus* 52, 165
- LiDAR 28
- LIFE project 23

- LifeWatch ERIC 27
- Long-Term Socio-Ecological Research (LTSER) 178
- LTSER. *see* Long-Term Socio-Ecological Research (LTSER)
- LUCAS. *see* Land Use/Cover Area-Frame Survey (LUCAS)
- MADM. *see* Multi-attribute decision modelling (MADM)
- Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services (MAES) 9, 82, 219
- Marine Strategy Framework Directive 23
- 'Massif des Bauges' 226
- Mass ratio hypothesis 210-211
- Matricaria inodora* 196
- Maximum technical potential (MTP) 73
- Mayweed. *see* *Matricaria inodora*
- MEA. *see* Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA)
- MEKAll program 226
- Member States National Plant Protection Organizations 22
- Microtus agrestis* 52
- Microtus arvalis* 166
- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA) 81, 84, 103, 107, 109, 112-118, 122, 178, 218, 221
- Millet. *see* *Panicum miliaceum*
- Mixed cropping 57
- Monte Carlo simulations 9
- MTP. *see* Maximum technical potential (MTP)
- Multi-attribute decision modelling (MADM) 42, 59, 60, 65
- biota as integral 61, 63-64
- structure 60-61
- Multi-function agricultural biodiversity 121
- Multifunctionality 178, 196
- Myzus persicae* 159
- Natura 2000 Network 4, 248
- Natural Environment Bill of Rights 94, 95
- Natural regeneration margin management 152-153
- Natural Resource Restoration Projects 150
- Neonicotinoid insecticides 115
- Net primary productivity (NPP) 207, 211-213
- Non-GM crops 51, 52
- Non-use values 93
- NPP. *see* Net primary productivity (NPP)
- OECD. *see* Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
- OECD agri-environmental indicators 9
- OMD. *see* Organic matter digestibility (OMD)
- Operationalization of Natural Capital and Ecosystem Services: From Concepts to Real-World Applications (OpenNess) 84
- Optimisation modelling 59
- Organic farming 102, 110-112, 115, 163
- Organic matter digestibility (OMD) 216
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) 112, 121
- Pan-European Common Bird Monitoring Scheme (PECBMS) 6, 9, 10
- Panicum miliaceum* 189
- Pan-trapping 15
- Pastures and grasslands management 230
- assessing economic value 221-223
- biodiversity and productivity
- analyzing relationship 207-208
- over time 212-213
- parameters 210-212
- species richness 208-209
- and ecosystem services 218
- biodiversity conservation 219
- cattle methane emissions and global warming 220
- control of plant invasions 221
- pollination and pollinators 219-220
- recreation, education and research 221
- soil biological activity 220
- flowering meadows competition 226-229
- overview 205-207
- production for farmers and biodiversity conservation 223-226
- quality of forage and animal products
- feeding value 214-216
- medicinal value 216-217
- organoleptic value 217-218
- PECBMS. *see* Pan-European Common Bird Monitoring Scheme (PECBMS)
- Pepsin cellulase 216
- Permanent grasslands 247, 248
- Philaenus spumarius* 159
- Photosynthesis rate 51
- Phragmites communis* 159
- Phytosanitary legislation 21

- Pl@ntNet 27
 Plant ecology 123
 Plant life cycle 46
 Plant-pollinator interactions 194
 Private enterprises and corporations 94
 Process-based models 42, 52–53, 59
 Protein-based diets 102
Pterostichus madidus 191
 Pyrethroid insecticides 116
- Rare arable plants (RAPs) 150, 163
 Regulation (EU) 2016/2031 22
 Resistance distance 188
 River-wetlands ecosystems 89
 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) 181
Rubia tinctorum 158
Rubus fruticosus 122, 182, 196
- SDGs. *see* Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)
 SEBI. *see* Streamlining European Biodiversity Indicators (SEBI)
 Secondary metabolites 215, 216
 SEEA. *see* System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA)
 Selection probability effect 209
 Semi-natural grasslands 44, 206–209, 211, 213–217, 221, 225
 Shrub hedges management 251
 Silvopastoralism 248, 253
Smilax aspera 158
Solanum nigrum 159
Sonchus arvensis 159
 Spatial connectivity index 191
 Spatial models 43
 Species diversity 25
 Species-rich grasslands 214–217, 219, 221–223, 228
 Spindle. *see* *Euonymus europaeus*
 Standardized transect walks 15
 Statistical models 46
 Streamlining European Biodiversity Indicators (SEBI) 9
- Sustainable agriculture. *see* Integrated pest management (IPM)
 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 39, 92, 95
 Sustainable farming systems 102
 Syrphids 194–195
 Systemic farming practices 80
 System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) 54
- TEEB. *see* The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB)
 Travel cost method 90
 Tree layer management 182
 TRIM software 6, 11
- UK Countryside Commission Survey 187
 UK Environment Agency 47
 UK National Ecosystems Assessment 84
Ulex europaeus 251
 UN Convention on Biological Diversity (UN CBD) 5, 83, 103, 107, 109–112, 121, 243, 252
 Uncropped annual cultivation 152, 163
 United Nation's Environmental Programme (UNEP) 53, 109, 221
 Unsaturated FA content 217
 Urban expansion 186
Urtica dioica 159, 182
 US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) 47
- Vascular plant species 181
Veronica hederifolia 159
 'The Visible and Invisible Flows of Agricultural Production' 53
- Web of Knowledge 77
 Wild blackberry. *see* *Rubus fruticosus*
 Willingness-to-pay approaches 90, 91
- Xylella fastidiosa* 159
- Zone Atelier Armorique 178, 185, 188, 189, 191, 193, 194