ENVIEVAL

Development and application of new methodological frameworks for the evaluation of environmental impacts of rural development programmes in the EU

(Project Reference: 312071)

Area 2.1.4: Socioeconomic research and support to policies

KBBE.2012.1.4-08: Development and application of methodologies and tools, including indicators, for the assessment of environmental impacts of rural development programmes in the EU

Report D2.1

Summary report on the review of indicator sets and monitoring approaches

Appendix B

List of recommended indicators for measures that lack of indicators per public good

Authors: Alexandra Smyrniotopoulou and George Vlahos (AUA)

Approved by Work Package Manager of WP2: George Vlahos (AUA) Date: July 2013

Approved by Project Coordinator: Gerald Schwarz (TI) Date: July 2013

This document was produced under the terms and conditions of Grant Agreement No. 312071 for the European Commission. It does not necessary reflect the view of the European Union and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area.





Appendix B

List of recommended indicators for measures that lack of indicators per Public Good

List of Tables

| Table B1 | Indicators for Climate Change Mitigation | .301 |
|----------|--|------|
| Table B2 | Indicators for Biodiversity-Wildlife | .307 |
| Table B3 | Indicators for Biodiversity-HNV | .319 |
| Table B4 | Indicators for Water Quality | .328 |
| Table B5 | Indicators for Soil Quality | .333 |
| Table B6 | Indicators for Landscape | .339 |
| Table B7 | Indicators for Animal Welfare | .347 |

Table B1 Indicators for Climate Change Mitigation

| Setting up of farm management/advisory | services (115) | 1 | | 1 |
|--|---|----------|---|-------------------------|
| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
| Contribution to combating climate change: | Fight against climate change through the growth of the | Nuts1 | Number of projects. | Projects which focus on |
| Increase of production of renewable energy | production of renewable energy. | | | the production of |
| from agriculture and forests | | | | renewable energy |
| Number of farmers who use advisory | Indirect impact on sustainable management practices and cross | National | Number of farmers who use advisory | |
| services for climate change mitigation | compliance requirements. | | services for climate change mitigation, | |
| | | | amount of payments realised. | |

Setting up of farm management/advisory services (115)

Improvement of the economic value of forests (122)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|---|---|----------|--|---|
| Contribution to combating climate change: Increase of production of renewable energy from agriculture and forests | Fight against climate change through the growth of the production of renewable energy. | Nuts1 | Number of projects. | Projects which focus on the production of renewable energy from forestry |
| UAA devoted to energy and biomass crops (non-food set aside + energy crops + short rotation coppice on UAA) | Larger territories used for bioenergy production indicate positive effect on climate change mitigation. | National | Area under the measure | |
| Production of energy from renewable sources (Toe) and GHG emission reduction (Mg CO ₂ eq/year) | The aim of the measure is to decrease the GHG emissions. | Regional | IACS, GIS data, Corine land cover, results of business surveys for the structural measures. Parameters and data taken from literature, National and International agencies (IPCC). Annual data. | |
| Increase in C sequestration | For the calculation of C sequestration through afforestation a model developed to Hungarian circumstances (Casmofor 3.0 model) has been used. The model takes into account forestry tending and timber production models for the individual species as its basis to determine C sequestration, including also natural dieback, decay and the impact of forestry technology. The data which provided the basis for the calculations was the land data for the individual types of tree stocks. In the model, the main species were given as the type of tree stocks. | National | Forestry data, IACS. | |
| increased renewable energy production | Implementation of renewable energy use from agricultural | Regional | Data from AVEPA (Paying Agency), | |

| | sector. In addition to the SRF (Short-Rotation Forestry), such as poplar or eucalyptus, it is important to highlight the potential arising from the construction of power plants for co-firing, such as coal and fuel from renewable sources. | ISTAT (National Statistical Office), APAT (Agency for the environmental protection). | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Sequestration of CO ₂ (tonnes per year and | | Area of afforestated land, coefficients | |
| tonnes per life time of biomass) | Therefore support to artificial or natural reforestation activities | of CO ₂ sequestration for living and | |
| | which results in new forests impacts on CO ₂ emission balance. | dead biomass of trees. It seems that a | |
| | | special study/estimation has been | |
| | | made. | |

Cooperation for development of new products, processes and technologies (124)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|--|----------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Contribution to combating climate change: | Fight against climate change through the growth of the | Nuts1 | Number of projects. | Projects which focus on |
| Increase of production of renewable energy | production of renewable energy. | | | the production of |
| from agriculture and forests | | | | renewable energy |
| Number of beneficiaries - enterprises | Investments under this measure could have an indirectly impact | Regional | Number of beneficiaries, area covered | |
| processing plant materials into products | on environmental protection, i.e. through the purchase and | | by the measure, amount of payment | |
| used for energy purposes | installation of equipment the protection of the environment is | | realised. | |
| | improved. | | | |

Improving and developing infrastructure related to the development and adaptation of agriculture and forestry (125)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|--|-------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| | Fight against climate change through the growth of the | Nuts1 | Number of projects. | projects which focus on |
| Increase of production of renewable energy | production of renewable energy. | | | the production of |
| from agriculture and forests | | | | renewable energy |

Supporting farmers who participate in food quality schemes (132)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|--|--|-------------|---|
| Calculation of humus balance (CO ₂ balance) | Increase of humus content in soil. The reduced/improved fertiliser | Regional | |
| | application has positive effects on the C balance in the soil contributing to | and | |
| | reduction of GHG emissions by the maintenance and accumulation of | national | |
| | organic C and reduction of N ₂ O emissions. | | |
| Extend of additional CO ₂ -fixation in agricultural | Maintenance or increase of humus content in the soil. AEMs contribute to | Farm level, | IPCC-Guidelines, Freibauer et al. (2004). The |
| used soils (t ha-1 a-1) on sites with organic | the protection or increase of the sequestration of CO ₂ in the soil, also | data | VDLUFA Method (VDLUFA, 2004) is used, |
| agriculture | promote land-use that could lead to reduced emissions of GHG or NH ₃ | analysed at | without considering the supply of farm |
| | compared to conventional land-use. | regional | fertiliser. |

| | | level | |
|--|--|-------|--|
| Reducing emissions of N from mineral fertilisers | The emission coming from the agriculture fertilization represents one of the highest emissions productions from the agriculture, the objective is to decrease the GHG emissions. | | IACS data. Results of previous analysis of impact. Results of business surveys for the structural measures. Parameters and data taken from the literature and from national and international agencies (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research- ISPRA, IPCC). |

Natura 2000 payments (213)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|--|---|----------|---|
| Balance carbon with mathematic model CENTURY | Estimation of carbon sequestration on area covered by the measure. Balance carbon is better on area covered by the measure. | National | Area covered by the measure. |
| agricultural sector (N ₂ O from fertilization and C sink in forest biomass) | highest emission productions from the agriculture. Since the proposed CMEF indicator doesn't capture the GHG emissions, the additional impact indicator is built in order to be a more complex and complete indicator for the GHG reduction. | Regional | Data from AVEPA (Paying Agency), ISTAT (National Statistical Office), APAT (Agency for the environmental protection). Secondary data from the FADN database-REA for the counterfactual analysis. |
| Livestock density LU/ha UAA | Area covered by the measure and number of beneficiaries have a significant impact on climate change. Extensive farming systems (less LU density/UAA) and rational fertiliser application (less than average use means of production- e.g. less pesticides, fertilisers, petroleum) contribute to GHG emissions. | National | Qualitative data of livestock density LU/ha UAA |
| Production of energy from renewable agricultural sources | | Regional | IPCC data |
| Production of energy from renewable sources (Toe) and GHG emission reduction (Mg CO ₂ eq/year) | The aim of the measure is to decrease the GHG emissions. | Regional | IACS, GIS data, Corine land cover, results of business surveys for the structural measures. Parameters and data taken from literature, National and International agencies (IPCC). Annual data. |
| Reducing emissions of N from mineral fertilisers | The emission coming from the agriculture fertilization represents one of the highest emissions productions from the agriculture, the objective is to decrease the GHG emissions. | Regional | IACS data. Results of previous analysis of impact. Results of business surveys for the structural measures. Parameters and data taken from the literature and from national and international agencies (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research- |

| | | | ISPRA, IPCC). |
|---|--|---------------------------------|---|
| Reduction of NH ₃ emissions through low-loss fertiliser and liquid/biogas manure application | Indicator comes from a study for the NH ₃ losses during the application of farm fertiliser related to the sub-measure "minimal loss application of farm fertiliser and biogas manure". The application of mineral fertiliser causes CO ₂ and N ₂ O emissions. Through improved application the emissions of NH ₃ and thereby N ₂ O are reduced. The calculation of reduced emissions is based on the share of farm fertiliser that was applied close to the ground in 2009. A reduction about 30% of NH ₃ emissions is assumed by close to the ground application. | | Share of close-to-the-ground fertiliser application, data from TIHALO Study (Amon et al., 2007), INVEKOS |
| Amount of emission reduction of CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N ₂ O, NH ₃ from agriculture through AEMs (GG a-1) | A reduction of N-fertiliser application leads to a reduced emission of N_2O . NH ₃ contributes through the release of N to the eutrophication and acidification of soils. | data analysed at regional | Emission factors from the NIR based on literature analysis and international agreements, impact of measures are based on estimations from a literature analysis. Emissions from N-fertiliser application of agricultural land use and emissions from non- fertilised agricultural areas (indirect emissions from N-deposition and eroded and drained N from agriculture). |
| Calculation of humus balance (CO ₂ balance) | Increase of humus content in soil. The reduced/improved fertiliser application has positive effects on the C balance in the soil contributing to reduction of GHG emissions by the maintenance and accumulation of organic C and reduction of N ₂ O emissions. | Regional and national | |
| Extend of additional CO ₂ -fixation in agricultural used soils (t ha-1 a-1) on sites with organic agriculture l | Maintenance or increase of humus content in the soil. AEMs contribute to the protection or increase of the sequestration of CO ₂ in the soil, also promote land-use that could lead to reduced emissions of GHG or NH ₃ compared to conventional land-use. | data analysed at | IPCC-Guidelines, Freibauer et al. (2004). The VDLUFA Method (VDLUFA, 2004) is used, without considering the supply of farm fertiliser. |
| Agricultural land area supported | Impact assessment is based on evaluation question. | | Number of management contracts (output) & area of maintained landscape (results), survey among beneficiaries and interviews with experts. |
| Achievement of environmental objective: Climate change mitigation = Area to be contributing to Climate change mitigation in the specific action (ha) X % financial uptake for this action. | The calculation of the area under climate change mitigation action as a function of the proportion of the financial uptake and the programmed target area is provided as an estimation of the impact. Furthermore reduction in use of agrochemicals and machinery results to an overall reduction of indirect GHG emissions. | Action | Financial uptake, targeted area. |

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|--|----------------------|--|
| | | Regional | IPCC data. |
| of production of renewable energy from agriculture and forests | The aim of the measure is to decrease the GHG emissions as one of the action of the fight against climate change. | Programm e (PDRH) | RICA data. |
| | | | Declarations (Ha of supported area) |
| Net carbon storage with fossil origin, storage between the 2000-2012 thanks to assistance (millions of tons/year) | Less environmental impact thanks to the carbon storage. | Regional | Regional maps, agricultural land use, data from ISTAT (Statistical Institute). Annual data. |
| | Less environmental impact thanks to the carbon storage. | Regional | Data from AIEL (Italian Association for Agroforestry Energy), data related with Short rotation forestry, due to the irrelevant carbon fixation (Reg 2080/92). |
| Increase in C sequestration | For the calculation of C sequestration through afforestation a model developed to Hungarian circumstances (Casmofor 3.0 model) has been used. The model takes into account forestry tending and timber production models for the individual species as its basis to determine C sequestration, including also natural dieback, decay and the impact of forestry technology. The data which provided the basis for the calculations was the land data for the individual types of tree stocks. In the model, the main species were given as the type of tree stocks. | | Forestry data, IACS. |
| Sequestration of CO ₂ (tonnes per year and tonnes per life time of biomass) | The growing trees affect the volumes of CO ₂ captured. Therefore support to artificial or natural reforestation activities which results in new forests impacts on CO ₂ emission balance. | Measure | Area of afforestated land, coefficients of CO ₂ sequestration for living and dead biomass of trees. It seems that a special study/estimation has been made. |
| CO ₂ fixation of afforestated areas (t CO ₂ /year/ha) | Increased carbon sequestration through afforestation. | Regional | Literature analysis (e.g. Paul et al. 2009) |
| Reduction of CO ₂ emissions equivalent thanks to the program | The aim of the measure is to decrease the GHG emissions. Since the proposed CMEF indicator doesn't capture the GHG emissions, the additional impact indicator is built in order to be a more complex indicator for the GHG reduction. | Regional | Source AVEPA (Paying Agency), ISTAT (National Statistical Office), APAT (Agency for the environmental protection) Acquisition of secondary data from the FADN database- REA The information resulting from the FADN database-REA are used for the counterfactual analysis. |
| Area of agricultural land converted to forest | Impact assessment based on EU evaluation questions. Forests contribute to carbon sequestration and renewable resources. | | Analysis of management agreements, monitoring output indicators and survey/interviews with experts. |

First establishment of agroforestry systems on agricultural land (222) - Natura 2000 payments (224)

| UAA devoted to renewable energy production | The additional impact indicator is built in order to be a more complex | Programm | Data from Paying Agency and Agency for the |
|---|---|----------|--|
| (thousand ha) | indicator for the GHG reduction. | e level | environmental protection |
| | | (PDRN) | |
| | The objective of the measure is to increase the land use devoted to | Programm | Annual data from RICA |
| | renewable energy and the indicator measures this UAA. | e level | |
| | | (PDRH) | |
| Achievement of environmental objective: Climate | The calculation of the area under climate change mitigation action as a | Action | Financial uptake, targeted area. |
| | function of the proportion of the financial uptake and the programmed | | |
| Climate change mitigation in the specific action (ha) | target area is provided as an estimation of the impact. Furthermore | | |
| X % financial uptake for this action. | reduction in use of agrochemicals and machinery results to an overall | | |
| | reduction of indirect GHG emissions. | | |

Encouragement of tourism activities (313) - Conservation and upgrading of the rural heritage (323)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|--|---------|-----------------------|
| Reduction of CO ₂ emission (equivalents) | The production of the renewable energy sources substitutes the use of | Measure | Produced RES (Ktoe/y) |
| | fossil resources. Support is given to produce renewable energy sources. It | | |
| | seems that a special study/estimation has been made. | | |

Table B2 Indicators for Biodiversity-Wildlife

Setting up of farm management/advisory services (115)

| | | - | |
|--|---|----------|--|
| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
| Number of farmers who use advisory services for | Indirect impact on sustainable management practices and cross | National | Number of farmers who use advisory |
| sustainable land management and sustainable land | compliance requirements. | | services for sustainable land management and |
| management of natural resources | | | sustainable land management of natural |
| | | | resources, amount of payments realised. |

Improvement of the economic value of forests (122) - Improving and developing infrastructure related to the development and adaptation of agriculture and forestry (125)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|--|------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Number of farm holdings that received | | National | Number of beneficiaries, amount of | Specify for NATURA |
| investment support in LFAs, NATURA | | | payments realised. | 2000 and HNV |
| 2000, Nitrates Directive areas | | | | |
| Level of improvement of the overall | One of the objectives of the measure is to improve the | National | Number of holdings supported and | Specify for Biodiversity |
| performance of the agricultural holdings | environmental protection. From the survey, conducted during | | number of holdings in livestock | related |
| (competitiveness, sustainability and | the MTE with 279 beneficiaries, 30 % of them reported that | | breeding, number of farms meeting the | |
| protection of environment) | investments are indirectly related to the protection of | | requirements of the nitrate Directive | |
| | biodiversity and 39% declared that there is a significant | | 91/676/EEC were used as additional | |
| | improvement of nature preservation and preservation of | | indicators. Survey results. | |
| | biodiversity. | | | |
| Reversing biodiversity decline (FBI) | The use of farmland bird indicators as a (sole) biodiversity | National, | FBI data | |
| | indicator is based on the concept of umbrella species. AEMs | differenti | | |
| | and their prescriptions maintain and improve land use, habitat | ating | | |
| | and landscape elements which support a high biodiversity and | between | | |
| | are important parts of suitable bird habitats. | different | | |
| | | agricultu | | |
| | | ral land | | |
| | | use | | |
| | | systems, | | |
| | | area | | |
| | | designati | | |
| | | ons | | |

| | | | , |
|---|-----------|--|---|
| Different versions of the farmland index, including European, | - | National monitoring of birds and | |
| Latvian, Boreal protected species. Additional indicators give | Natura | additional inventories. | |
| supplementary information. | 2000 | | |
| | sites | | |
| For the reversal of biodiversity decline analysed how the | Monitori | Data from 3 transect counts (May- | |
| general environmental condition of farms has been preserved | ng in 3 | June). Bird monitoring data, using | |
| or improved due to the application of AES requirements, | regions | Shannon diversity index (number of | |
| considering their habitat function and if the organic farming | | nesting species as well as diversity), | |
| facilitates biological diversity. According to the survey on bird | | number of nesting species on | |
| species richness, abundance and population density, the | | farmland, total population of nesting | |
| potential indirect positive impact of various types of AE | | birds (number of nesting specimens). | |
| support cannot be underestimated despite the lack of aid type | | | |
| impact. Without the agricultural support, many habitats | | | |
| necessary for open field birds may remain fallow and overgrow | | | |
| with woods, resulting irreversible loss of habitat for these | | | |
| species. | | | |
| | Nuts3 | Counting, case study of 55 follow-up | |
| | | areas across the country | |
| The impact indicator is related to the species diversity. | Regional | IFEN, evolution of the bird | |
| Common bird indicators are commonly used for synthetic | 0 | population in forest | |
| comparisons. The bird populations are recognised as excellent | | 1 1 | |
| bio-indicators as they reflect an overall quality of the | | | |
| environments in which they live. | | | |
| | Regional, | FBI data, IACS and payment data | |
| which showed that the umbrella function was effective for 50% | | . · | |
| | me | | |
| a negative result. Overall, the report concludes the farmland | | | |
| birds respond to changes in agricultural land management, but | | | |
| the umbrella effect on other species and habitats requires | | | |
| further examinations. Structural changes in agriculture and | | | |
| changes in land management practices affect the suitability of | | | |
| the habitats for birds, e.g. field margins as breeding habitat for | | | |
| birds, which is reflected in a decline of the FBI. RDP measures | | | |
| such as creation of field margins improve the suitability of the | | | |
| habitat for birds. | | | |
| | Regional | Data from IACS, LPIS and GIS. | |
| j material in the state of the | 0 | ; | |

| Amphibian - species diversity and abundance | The CMEF impact indicator FBI is not sufficient to assess measure-specific impacts on biodiversity. Amphibians are an important animal group for farmland biodiversity and many amphibian species are threatened by habitat loss. The measure 214 promotes the maintenance and creation of suitable habitats and biotopes for amphibians. Changes in the diversity and abundance of amphibians thus provide one measure or indicator for the (potential) biodiversity impacts of measure 214. | 10 pilot areas | Species data from monitoring of trial areas, annually |
|--|---|--|---|
| Indicator plant species | Rare and protected plant species are an important indicator for the ecological quality and biodiversity of grasslands. The number and abundance of these plant species often depends on the (timing of) certain management activities of meadows. The measure 214 promotes the maintenance and creation of suitable meadow habitats for plant species diversity. Changes indicator plant species thus provides an indicator for the (potential) biodiversity impacts of measure 214. The CMEF impact indicator FBI is not sufficient to assess measure-specific impacts on biodiversity. | without support covering different land use | Monitoring data of trial areas, annually. Trials are done in three different regions of agriculturally used habitats. |
| Changes of population of great bustard (Otis tarda) related to AEMs | Specific AEMs aim to the protection of great bustard population. Through actions aimed at special crop rotation, winter forage, nest protection and an overall habitat management for the great bustard (which is based on former surveys and experiences) an increase of the population is expected. | National, HNVs involved in great bustard protectio n | Population census data |
| Composition of tree species | The indicator has been modified taking into account soft and hard broadleaves and conifer trees. Maintaining species composition within the natural variability is an important aspect to conserve biodiversity. Furthermore, maintaining species composition typical of the range of natural variation enables the ecosystem to respond and recover from disturbance. A productive and resilient ecosystem is sustainable and is capable of providing the many products and services desired by the public. | National | |

| Trend in protection of vulnerable non- | Improvement of biodiversity in agricultural areas. | Regional | Data come from the Land use | |
|---|---|------------|--|--|
| commercial (i.e. non-traded forest products) | | Regional | CENSUS (1998-2005) | |
| species/varieties of flora & fauna on land | | | CENSUS (1998-2003) | |
| subject to assisted actions (description, e.g., | | | | |
| number of different species/varieties | | | | |
| affected and where possible change in the | | | | |
| | | | | |
| abundance of key species) | | D · 1 | | |
| Area planted/ regenerated/ improved with | The indicator is related to species diversity. | Regional | Data come from the Land use | |
| indigenous tree species (ha) -of which in | | | CENSUS (1998-2005) | |
| mixture -of which providing in situ | | | | |
| conservation of genetic resources | | | | |
| Area under successful land management | Reference to 'ecological functions' of forests including the | Scales | Result indicator for biodiversity and | |
| contributing to biodiversity and HNV | prevention of forest fires, but without reporting on concrete | range | High Nature Value Forest, indirect and | |
| farming/forestry | biodiversity-related impact indicators. | | secondary literature (Quine & Watts, | |
| | | | 2007), countryside surveys on | |
| | | the | biodiversity. | |
| | | English | | |
| | | national. | | |
| Status of higher plants (quality of | Quality of grasslands is higher in maintained areas. | Case | Investigation in a case study area. | |
| grasslands) | | study in | | |
| | | 18 sites | | |
| | | covering | | |
| | | all 5 | | |
| | | regions | | |
| Number and diversity of day butterflies. | The properly maintained grasslands host higher number of | Case | Investigation in a case study area. | |
| | butterflies compared to non-managed grasslands. | study in | | |
| | | 18 sites | | |
| | | covering | | |
| | | all 5 | | |
| | | regions | | |
| Number of ground beetles' species and | Number of ground beetles is higher in organic farms than in | Case | Investigation in a case study area. | |
| abundance of ground beetles (Carabidae | conventional areas. | study | | |
| sp.) | | (crop | | |
| - Г / | | fields) in | | |
| | | Latgale | | |
| | | region | | |
| | | 1051011 | | |

| Reversal in biodiversity decline: Diversity | The diversity of species of bumblebees and Shannon diversity | National | 3 transect counts during June-August. | |
|---|--|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | index is higher in areas under actions of organic production | | | |
| | and environmentally friendly management. Although for the | | | |
| | abundance of bumblebees such trends is not observed. | | | |
| | | National. | 15 monitoring units per field (5+5 | |
| vascular plants community, species richness | coverage showed that the flora diversity of field edges | Monitori | opposite edges, 5 on field). | |
| and coverage | decreased slightly in the field edges of monitoring farms under | ng farms | | |
| | actions of environmentally friendly management and organic | | | |
| | production. | | | |
| Reversal in biodiversity decline: Species | The indicator analyse the extent and direction of changes in the | National, | Manual sampling (50x50x50cm) and | |
| richness and abundance of earthworms and | composition of species (especially for tolerant and adapted | (66 | soil sample. Monitoring activities | |
| the activity of soil biomass | | producer | conducted every 2 years | |
| | microbial biomass activity. The proportion of earthworms and | s) | | |
| | micro-organisms in the soil of organically and conventionally | | | |
| | cultivated fields was compared. Earthworm abundance showed | | | |
| | no significant differences between the cultivation types. | | | |
| Achievement of environmental objective: | The calculation of the area under biodiversity conservation | Action | Financial uptake and targeted area. | |
| | measure as a function of the proportion of the financial uptake | | | |
| | and the programmed target area is provided as an estimation of | | | |
| the specific action of 223 (ha) X % financial | the impact. | | | |
| uptake for this action within the measures | | | | |

Supporting farmers who participate in food quality schemes (132)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|--|---|-------------|--|
| (A) Share of UAA under environmentally benign | Programme indicator has been used to answer the evaluation questions. | Regional | IACS data 2000-2006; Census data, FADN |
| farming systems: -of which used for organic | The LU/ha was reduced from 2 to 1.4. The selected indicators are used as | (Mountain | data. In addition, case studies in other Federal |
| farming -of which used as pasture with less than 1.4 | a proxy for environmental impact indicators, based on the assumption that | areas and | States have been carried out by the evaluators |
| LU/ha (B) Share of UAA used for arable farming | an expansion of UAA of organic farming or other environmental friendly | other | in order to obtain additional information on |
| where the quantity of nitrogen applied (farm | land management systems and practices will increase the provision of | disadvanta | public goods and services from agriculture in |
| manure and synthetic) is less than 170 kg/ha per | public goods from agriculture. | ged areas) | those areas. The case studies comprised of |
| year. | | | expert interviews and stakeholder surveys. In |
| | | | a next step interviews with key stakeholders |
| | | | and experts in Baden Württemberg were held |
| | | | to validate the possible relevance of the case |
| | | | study findings for different regions in Baden |
| | | | Württemberg. |
| Share of organic farmland on LFA farms | Organic farmland in Austrian LFAs is of high natural value (and will be | Farm level | IACS data and FADN data, annually. Also, |
| | classified as HNV in the future) and high biodiversity value. The extent of | data | results from surveys and expert interviews |
| | organically managed land on LFA farms provides an indication to what | analysed at | carried out in previous evaluation phases were |
| | extent LFA payments contribute to maintaining farmland biodiversity. The | national/L | integrated in the qualitative assessment of |
| | CMEF impact indicators could not be used for the measure specific | FA level | biodiversity impacts. |
| | evaluation of LFA payments due to missing data. | | |
| Share of extensive grassland of total UAA of LFA | Extensive grazing land in Austrian LFAs is of high natural value (and will | Farm level | IACS data and FADN data, annually. Also, |
| farms | be classified as HNV in the future) and high biodiversity value. The extent | data | results from surveys and expert interviews |
| | of extensive grassland on LFA farms provides an indication to what extent | analysed at | carried out in previous evaluation phases were |
| | LFA payments contribute to maintaining farmland biodiversity. The | national/L | integrated in the qualitative assessment of |
| | CMEF impact indicators could not be used for the measure specific | FA level | biodiversity impacts. |
| | evaluation of LFA payments due to missing data. | | |

Animal welfare payments (215)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|--|---|------------|--|
| (A) Share of UAA under environmentally benign | Programme indicator has been used to answer the evaluation questions. | Regional | IACS data 2000 - 2006; Census data, FADN |
| farming systems: -of which used for organic | The LU/ha was reduced from 2 to 1.4. The selected indicators are used as | (Mountain | data. In addition, case studies in other Federal |
| farming -of which used as pasture with less than 1.4 | a proxy for environmental impact indicators, based on the assumption that | areas and | States have been carried out by the evaluators |
| | an expansion of UAA of organic farming or other environmental friendly | other | in order to obtain additional information on |
| where the quantity of nitrogen applied (farm | land management systems and practices will increase the provision of | disadvanta | public goods and services from agriculture in |
| manure and synthetic) is less than 170 kg/ha per | public goods from agriculture. | ged areas) | those areas. The case studies comprised of |
| year. | | | expert interviews and stakeholder surveys. In |
| | | | a next step interviews with key stakeholders |

| | | 1 | and some sets in Dealers With the set of some set of all |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| | | | and experts in Baden Württemberg were held |
| | | | to validate the possible relevance of the case |
| | | | study findings for different regions in Baden |
| | | | Württemberg. |
| Share of organic farmland on LFA farms | | | IACS data and FADN data, annually. Also, |
| | classified as HNV in the future) and high biodiversity value. The extent of | data | results from surveys and expert interviews |
| | organically managed land on LFA farms provides an indication to what | analysed at | carried out in previous evaluation phases were |
| | extent LFA payments contribute to maintaining farmland biodiversity. The | national/ | integrated in the qualitative assessment of |
| | CMEF impact indicators could not be used for the measure specific | LFA level | biodiversity impacts. |
| | evaluation of LFA payments due to missing data. | | |
| Share of extensive grassland of total UAA of LFA | Extensive grazing land in Austrian LFAs is of high natural value (and will | Farm level | IACS data and FADN data, annually. Also, |
| farms | be classified as HNV in the future) and high biodiversity value. The extent | | results from surveys and expert interviews |
| | of extensive grassland on LFA farms provides an indication to what extent | analysed at | carried out in previous evaluation phases were |
| | LFA payments contribute to maintaining farmland biodiversity. The | national / | integrated in the qualitative assessment of |
| | CMEF impact indicators could not be used for the measure specific | LFA level | biodiversity impacts. |
| | evaluation of LFA payments due to missing data. | | |
| Area with beneficial lay out of crops (types of crop, | The indicator is related to the diversity in crop system. | Regional | Data from the Land use CENSUS. |
| including associated livestock, crop-combinations | | | |
| and size of uniform fields) maintained/reintroduced | | | |
| thanks to assisted actions (ha) | | | |

| Competitiveness (411) | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------|
| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
| Number of trainings on sustainable land management and sustainable land management of natural resources | The aim of the measure is to diffuse scientific knowledge and innovative practises in the agricultural and forestry sector. Indirect impact. | | Number of beneficiaries, amount of payments realised. | |
| Number of farmers who use advisory services for sustainable land management and sustainable land management of natural resources | compliance requirements. | | Number of farmers who use advisory services for sustainable land management and sustainable land management of natural resources, amount of payments realised. | |
| Change in grassland area | Investments to expand and/or rationalise dairy systems can reduce the extent of grazing activities and reduce the amount of grass fed to cattle which can induce the ploughing up of grassland with negative consequences for biodiversity. | Farm level data assessed at regional | IACS data 2000-2010 | |

| | level (Fec State | deral | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Number of farm holdings that received | Nati | tional | Number of beneficiaries, amount of | Specify for NATURA |
| investment support in LFAs, NATURA | | | payments realised. | 2000 and HNV |
| 2000, Nitrates Directive areas | | | | |

Environment/land management (412)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------|---|
| Reversing biodiversity decline (FBI) | The use of farmland bird indicators as a (sole) biodiversity indicator is | National, | FBI data |
| | based on the concept of umbrella species. AEMs and their prescriptions | differentiat | |
| | maintain and improve land use, habitat and landscape elements which | ing | |
| | support a high biodiversity and are important parts of suitable bird | between | |
| | habitats. | different | |
| | | agricultural | |
| | | land use | |
| | | systems, | |
| | | area | |
| | | designatio | |
| | | ns (LFA | |
| | | and | |
| | | Natura) | |
| | | and groups | |
| | | of federal | |
| | | states. | |
| | Different versions of the farmland index, including European, Latvian, | National, | National monitoring of birds and additional |
| | Boreal protected species. Additional indicators give supplementary | Natura | inventories. |
| | information. | 2000 sites | |

| | | Monitorin g in 3 regions | Data from 3 transect counts (May-June). Bird monitoring data, using Shannon diversity index (number of nesting species as well as diversity), number of nesting species on farmland, total population of nesting birds (number of nesting specimens). |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--|
| | | Nuts3 | Counting, case study of 55 follow-up areas across the country |
| | indicators are commonly used for synthetic comparisons. The bird populations are recognised as excellent bio-indicators as they reflect an overall quality of the environments in which they live. | Regional | IFEN, evolution of the bird population in forest |
| | farmland bird species while one third showed a negative result. Overall, the report concludes the farmland birds respond to changes in agricultural land management, but the umbrella effect on other species and habitats requires further examinations. Structural changes in agriculture and changes in land management practices affect the suitability of the habitats for birds, e.g. field margins as breeding habitat for birds, which is reflected in a decline of the FBI. RDP measures such as creation of field margins improve the suitability of the habitat for birds. | programm e | FBI data, IACS and payment data |
| | Biodiversity abundance and diversity of birds species | Regional | Data from IACS, LPIS and GIS. |
| Amphibian - species diversity and abundance | | 10 pilot areas | Species data from monitoring of trial areas, annually |
| Indicator plant species | Rare and protected plant species are an important indicator for the | 119 trial areas with | Monitoring data of trial areas, annually. Trials are done in three different regions of |

| | management activities of meadows. The measure 214 promotes the maintenance and creation of suitable meadow habitats for plant species diversity. Changes indicator plant species thus provides an indicator for the (potential) biodiversity impacts of measure 214. The CMEF impact | and without support covering different land use and habitat | agriculturally used habitats. |
|--|--|---|--|
| Changes of population of great bustard (Otis tarda) related to AEMs | an overall habitat management for the great bustard (which is based on former surveys and experiences) an increase of the population is expected. | HNVs involved in great bustard protection | Population census data |
| Composition of tree species | The indicator has been modified taking into account soft and hard broadleaves and conifer trees. Maintaining species composition within the natural variability is an important aspect to conserve biodiversity. Furthermore, maintaining species composition typical of the range of natural variation enables the ecosystem to respond and recover from disturbance. A productive and resilient ecosystem is sustainable and is capable of providing the many products and services desired by the public. | National | |
| Trend in protection of vulnerable non-commercial (i.e., non-traded forest products) species/varieties of flora & fauna on land subject to assisted actions (description, e.g. number of different species/varieties affected and where possible change in the abundance of key species) | Improvement of biodiversity in agricultural areas. | Regional | Data come from the Land use CENSUS (1998-2005) |
| Area planted/ regenerated/ improved with indigenous tree species (ha) -of which in mixture - of which providing in situ conservation of genetic resources | The indicator is related to species diversity. | Regional | Data come from the Land use CENSUS (1998-2005) |
| Area under successful land management contributing to biodiversity and HNV farming/forestry | Reference to 'ecological functions' of forests including the prevention of forest fires, but without reporting on concrete biodiversity-related impact indicators. | Scales range from the forest to the English | Result indicator for biodiversity and High Nature Value Forest, indirect and secondary literature (Quine & Watts, 2007), countryside surveys on biodiversity. |

| | | national. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Status of higher plants (quality of grasslands) | | Case study in 18 sites covering all 5 regions | Investigation in a case study area. |
| Number and diversity of day butterflies | 1 0 0 | Case study in 18 sites covering all 5 regions | Investigation in a case study area. |
| Number of ground beetles' species and abundance of ground beetles (Carabidae sp.) | areas. | Case study area (crop fields) in Latgale region | Investigation in a case study area. |
| Reversal in biodiversity decline: Diversity and abundance of bumblebees. | The diversity of species of bumblebees and Shannon diversity index is higher in areas under actions of organic production and environmentally friendly management. Although for the abundance of bumblebees such trends is not observed. | National | 3 transect counts during June-August. |
| Reversal in biodiversity decline: Structure of vascular plants community, species richness and coverage | The survey of structure of vascular plants, species richness and coverage showed that the flora diversity of field edges decreased slightly in the field edges of monitoring farms under actions of environmentally friendly management and organic production. | National. Monitorin g farms | 15 monitoring units per field (5+5 opposite edges, 5 on field). |
| Reversal in biodiversity decline: Species richness and abundance of earthworms and the activity of soil biomass | The indicator analyse the extent and direction of changes in the composition of species (especially for tolerant and adapted species), the total number of earthworms and also the microbial biomass activity. The proportion of earthworms and micro-organisms in the soil of organically and conventionally cultivated fields was compared. Earthworm abundance showed no significant differences between the cultivation types. | National, (66 producers) | Manual sampling (50x50x50cm) and soil sample. Monitoring activities conducted every 2 years |
| | The calculation of the area under biodiversity conservation measure as a function of the proportion of the financial uptake and the programmed target area is provided as an estimation of the impact. | Action | Financial uptake and targeted area. |

Quality of life/diversification (413)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|-------------------------------------|--|----------|---|
| Influence to endangered species | Assessment about the influence of measure on endangered species. | Nuts 1 | Expert assessment, combined data produced |
| | | | by Information Centre of the Ministry of |
| | | | Agriculture and Forestry. |
| Created natural areas (ha) | | National | Interviews results on the basis of EU |
| | | | evaluation questions |
| Ecological network connections (km) | | National | Interviews results on the basis of EU |
| | | | evaluation questions |

Table B3 Indicators for Biodiversity-HNV

Setting up of farm management/advisory services (115)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|---|----------|--|
| Number of farmers who use advisory services for | Indirect impact on sustainable management practices and sustainable | National | Number of farmers who use advisory services |
| climate change mitigation | management of natural resources. | | on sustainable land management and |
| | | | sustainable management of natural resources, |
| | | | amount of payments realised. |

Cooperation for development of new products, processes and technologies (124)

| | Indicator | * | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------|--------------|----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Number | of enterprises intro | oducing new | | Regional | Number of beneficiaries, area covered | Specify within HNV areas |
| technolo | gies and innovation | ns | | | by the measure, amount of payment | or using HNVF products |
| | | | | | realised. | |
| Total val | ue of investment | | | Regional | Number of beneficiaries, area covered | Specify within HNV areas |
| | | | | | by the measure, amount of payment | or using HNVF products |
| | | | | | realised. | |

Improving and developing infrastructure related to the development and adaptation of agriculture and forestry (125)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|--|--------------|--|
| Maintenance of HNV farmland and forestry: | This is a baseline indicator of HNV areas, taking into account areas under | National, | Maps and statistical data of agricultural land |
| Changes in high nature value areas | successful land management contributing to improvement of biodiversity. | all | where measures are implemented for |
| | The presence of natural habitats and the distribution of wildlife species | agricultural | successful land management contributing to |
| | | | improvement of biodiversity. The monitoring |
| | as HNV. | successful | data concern: Corine Land Cover |
| | | | Classification for y2000, biodiversity data, |
| | | manageme | IBAs of Greece, distribution of bear, wolf |
| | | nt | and bird of prey populations, SCI and habitat |
| | | contributin | mapping of Greek Natura 2000 network, data |
| | | | from environmental protected areas, data |
| | | | gathered by NVZs, data from agricultural |
| | | ent of | census for y2000, olive fields' cadastre, expert |
| | | biodiversit | surveys. |
| | | у. | |
| | | Regional | Database measurements of the RDP, regional |
| | | | land use map, FADN data |

| | Three different types of HNV areas are defined: agricultural areas with natural HNV meadows- extensively managed agricultural areas with natural or semi-natural areas distinguished by high landscape heterogeneity - agricultural areas for preservation of international important species or | | Declaration data (Ha of agricultural area) |
|---|---|----------------------------|--|
| | habitats, parts of international networks (Andersen et al., 2003). During evaluation period (2007-2009) only second and third group of HNV areas were eligible for support. | | |
| | Many agricultural habitats managed through extensive and traditional farming systems are classified as HNV farm land. The maintenance or introduction of extensive and traditional farming systems contributes to the protection of HNV habitats. | | ATKIS data (share of HNV area on total UAA, share of Natura 2000 area, share of protected forests) |
| | The measure contributes to the continued use of agricultural activities with positive impact on biological diversity as a result of compliance with the environmental requirements. | Changes in HNV areas | |
| | | | IACS-GIS data, HNV-GIS data, databases of protected areas. |
| Agricultural areas with high natural value (HNV farmland) | HNV are important areas for the conservation of the biodiversity. | | Database measurements of the RDP, regional land use map, FADN data |
| habitat function or plots of land not cultivated | The impact indicator is proposed as an assessment indicator of measures aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity. One of the characteristics of HNV areas is the prevalence of low intensity farming systems, these areas tend to coincide with those less productive and marginal areas, in which agriculture practices are extensive. | | Regional data based on IACS (2005), regional technical maps, Corine Land Cover, maps of the extent of agricultural land under measure 214, Network of Threatened Species in GRID format for the regional distribution of threatened species prepared by the Project 'National Ecological Network' (REN) by the Ministry of the Environment. |

Supporting farmers who participate in food quality schemes (132)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|---|---|----------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| HNV farmland habitats that have been | The impact indicator is proposed as an assessment indicator of | Regional | Regional data based on IACS (2005), | |
| | measures aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity. One of the | | regional technical maps, Corine Land | |
| sites/agreements; total hectares, average -of | characteristics of HNV areas is the prevalence of low intensity | | Cover, maps of the extent of | |
| which habitats that in particular benefit | farming systems, these areas tend to coincide with those less | | agricultural land under measure 214, | |
| specific species or groups of species (%) -of | productive and marginal areas, in which agriculture practices | | Network of Threatened Species in | |

| which considered rare habitats at the | are extensive. | | GRID format for the regional | |
|---|----------------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| relevant geographical level (%) size) | | | distribution of threatened species | |
| | | | prepared by the Project 'National | |
| | | | Ecological Network' (REN) by the | |
| | | | Ministry of the Environment. | |
| Number of semi-subsistence farm holdings | | National, | Monitoring data. Survey data. | Specify within HNV areas |
| which entered the market and meet the | | regional | | |
| obligatory Community standards related to | | | | |
| veterinary and phyto-sanitary requirements, | | | | |
| animal welfare, environmental protection, | | | | |
| hygiene and occupational health and safety | | | | |

Animal welfare payments (215)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|---|---|----------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Ecological infrastructure object of | The impact indicator is proposed as an assessment indicator of | Regional | Regional data based on IACS (2005), | |
| engagement with habitat function or plots | measures aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity. One of the | | regional technical maps, Corine Land | |
| of land not cultivated linked to agriculture | characteristics of HNV areas is the prevalence of low intensity | | Cover, maps of the extent of | |
| (hectares and / or kilometers and / or | farming systems, these areas tend to coincide with those less | | agricultural land under measure 214, | |
| number of sites / commitments) of which | productive and marginal areas, in which agriculture practices | | Network of Threatened Species in | |
| enhancing existing high nature-value | are extensive. | | GRID format for the regional | |
| habitats by alleviating their fragmentation | | | distribution of threatened species | |
| (%) | | | prepared by the Project 'National | |
| | | | Ecological Network' (REN) by the | |
| | | | Ministry of the Environment. | |
| HNV farmland habitats that have been | The impact indicator is proposed as an assessment indicator of | Regional | Regional data based on IACS (2005), | |
| protected by supported actions (number of | measures aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity. One of the | | regional technical maps, Corine Land | |
| sites/agreements; total hectares, average -of | characteristics of HNV areas is the prevalence of low intensity | | Cover, maps of the extent of | |
| which located in Natura 2000 areas (%) -of | farming systems, these areas tend to coincide with those less | | agricultural land under measure 214, | |
| which habitats that in particular benefit | productive and marginal areas, in which agriculture practices | | Network of Threatened Species in | |
| specific species or groups of species (%) -of | are extensive. | | GRID format for the regional | |
| which considered rare habitats at the | | | distribution of threatened species | |
| relevant geographical level (%) size) | | | prepared by the Project 'National | |
| | | | Ecological Network' (REN) by the | |
| | | | Ministry of the Environment. | |
| Proportion of eligible farms accepting | There is a casual chain between the indicator and the | Program | Data from National agriculture Agency | |
| payments in compensation for | programme due to payment given for the protection of the | me | (PDRN) | |

| environmental constraints. (HNV) | HNV areas. | (PDRN) and | | |
|---|---|---------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | regional | | |
| Proportion of the UAA subject to | There is a casual chain between the indicator and the | Program | Data from National agriculture Agency | |
| environmental constraints for farmers to | programme due to payment given for the protection of the | me | (PDRN) | |
| receive payments | HNV areas. | (PDRN) | () | |
| I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I | | and | | |
| | | regional | | |
| HNV farmland habitats that have been | Many agricultural habitats managed through extensive and | | IACS annual data. Quantification of | |
| protected by supported actions (number of | traditional farming systems are classified as HNV farm land. | (Federal | habitat changes over the programme | |
| sites/agreements; total hectares, average -of | The maintenance or introduction of extensive and traditional | State) | period. | |
| which resulting from specific land-uses or | farming systems contributes to the protection of HNV | , | <u> </u> | |
| traditional farming systems (%) -of which | habitats. | | | |
| resulting from prevention of encroachment | | | Regional data based on IACS (2005), | |
| (colonisation by scrub, etc) or abandonment | | | regional technical maps, Corine Land | |
| (%)-of which located in Natura 2000 areas | | | Cover, maps of the extent of | |
| (%) -of which habitats that in particular | | | agricultural land under measure 214, | |
| benefit specific species or groups of species | The impact indicator is proposed as an assessment indicator of | | Network of Threatened Species in | |
| (%)-of which considered rare habitats at the | | | GRID format for the regional | |
| relevant geographical level (%) size) | characteristics of HNV areas is the prevalence of low intensity | | distribution of threatened species | |
| | farming systems, these areas tend to coincide with those less | | prepared by the Project "National | |
| | productive and marginal areas, in which agriculture practices | | Ecological Network" (REN) by the | |
| | are extensive. | 0 | Ministry of the Environment. | |
| Number of semi-subsistence farm holdings | | Regional | Regional data based on IACS (2005), | Specify within HNV areas |
| which entered the market and meet the | measures aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity. One of the | | regional technical maps, Corine Land | |
| obligatory Community standards related to | characteristics of HNV areas is the prevalence of low intensity | | Cover, maps of the extent of | |
| veterinary and phyto-sanitary requirements, | farming systems, these areas tend to coincide with those less | | agricultural land under measure 214, | |
| animal welfare, environmental protection, | productive and marginal areas, in which agriculture practices | | Network of Threatened Species in | |
| hygiene and occupational health and safety | are extensive. | | GRID format for the regional | |
| | | | distribution of threatened species | |
| | | | prepared by the Project "National | |
| | | | Ecological Network" (REN) by the | |
| | | | Ministry of the Environment. | |

| Maintenance of HNV farmland and | This is a baseline indicator of HNV areas, taking into account | National | Maps and statistical data of agricultural | |
|--|--|-----------|---|--|
| forestry: Changes in high nature value areas | areas under successful land management contributing to | all | land where measures are implemented | |
| forestry. Ghanges in high hature value areas | improvement of biodiversity. The presence of natural habitats | | for successful land management | |
| | | ral land | contributing to improvement of | |
| | farmland and forest can characterise these areas as HNV. | under | biodiversity. The monitoring data | |
| | fairmand and forest can characterise these areas as firvy. | | concern: Corine Land Cover | |
| | | l land | Classification for y2000, biodiversity | |
| | | | data, IBAs of Greece, distribution of | |
| | | manage | bear, wolf and bird of prey | |
| | | ment | | |
| | | | populations, SCI and habitat mapping | |
| | | ing to | of Greek Natura 2000 network, data | |
| | | | from environmental protected areas, | |
| | | | data gathered by NVZs, data from | |
| | | • | agricultural census for y2000, olive | |
| | | 1ty. | fields' cadastre, expert surveys. | |
| | | Regional | Database measurements of the RDP, | |
| | | | regional land use map, FADN data | |
| | Three different types of HNV areas are defined: agricultural | National | Declaration data (Ha of agricultural | |
| | areas with natural HNV meadows- extensively managed | | area) | |
| | agricultural areas with natural or semi-natural areas | | | |
| | distinguished by high landscape heterogeneity - agricultural | | | |
| | areas for preservation of international important species or | | | |
| | habitats, parts of international networks (Andersen et al., 2003). | | | |
| | During evaluation period (2007-2009) only second and third | | | |
| | group of HNV areas were eligible for support. | | | |
| | Many agricultural habitats managed through extensive and | Regional, | ATKIS data (share of HNV area on | |
| | traditional farming systems are classified as HNV farm land. | | total UAA, share of Natura 2000 area, | |
| | The maintenance or introduction of extensive and traditional | me | share of protected forests) | |
| | farming systems contributes to the protection of HNV | | 1 / | |
| | habitats. | | | |
| | The measure contributes to the continued use of agricultural | Changes | | |
| | | in HNV | | |
| | of compliance with the environmental requirements. | areas | | |
| | F | 1 | | |

| Checks of logic consistencies between the RDP strategy and | Regional, | IACS-GIS data, HNV-GIS data, | |
|--|-----------|-------------------------------|--|
| measure descriptions have been summarised. Indicator has | program | databases of protected areas. | |
| been modified and differentiates between different HNV areas | me | _ | |
| and elements classified into different HNV types. | | | |

First establishment of agroforestry systems on agricultural land (222)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| Maintenance of HNV farmland and forestry: | | National, | Maps and statistical data of agricultural land |
| Changes in high nature value areas | successful land management contributing to improvement of biodiversity. | all | where measures are implemented for |
| | | | successful land management contributing to |
| | | | improvement of biodiversity. The monitoring |
| | as HNV. | successful | data concern: Corine Land Cover |
| | | land | Classification for y2000, biodiversity data, |
| | | manageme | IBAs of Greece, distribution of bear, wolf |
| | | nt | and bird of prey populations, SCI and habitat |
| | | | mapping of Greek Natura 2000 network, data |
| | | | from environmental protected areas, data |
| | | | gathered by NVZs, data from agricultural |
| | | ent of | census for y2000, olive fields' cadastre, expert |
| | | biodiversit | surveys. |
| | | у. | |
| | | Regional | Database measurements of the RDP, regional |
| | | | land use map, FADN data |
| | 71 0 | National | Declaration data (Ha of agricultural area) |
| | natural HNV meadows- extensively managed agricultural areas with | | |
| | natural or semi-natural areas distinguished by high landscape heterogeneity | | |
| | - agricultural areas for preservation of international important species or | | |
| | habitats, parts of international networks (Andersen et al., 2003). During | | |
| | evaluation period (2007-2009) only second and third group of HNV areas | | |
| | were eligible for support. | | |
| | | Regional, | ATKIS data (share of HNV area on total |
| | | programm | UAA, share of Natura 2000 area, share of |
| | introduction of extensive and traditional farming systems contributes to | e | protected forests) |
| | the protection of HNV habitats. | | |

| | The measure contributes to the continued use of agricultural activities with | Changes in | |
|--------------------------------------|--|------------|---|
| | positive impact on biological diversity as a result of compliance with the | HNV | |
| | | areas | |
| | Checks of logic consistencies between the RDP strategy and measure | Regional, | IACS-GIS data, HNV-GIS data, databases of |
| | descriptions have been summarised. Indicator has been modified and | programm | protected areas. |
| | differentiates between different HNV areas and elements classified into | e | |
| | different HNV types. | | |
| | Reference to "ecological functions" of forests including the prevention of | Scales | Result indicator for biodiversity and High |
| contributing to biodiversity and HNV | forest fires, but without reporting on concrete biodiversity-related impact | range from | Nature Value Forest, indirect and secondary |
| farming/forestry | indicators. | the forest | literature (Quine & Watts, 2007), countryside |
| | | to the | surveys on biodiversity. |
| | | English | |
| | | national. | |

Environment/land management (412)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|--|----------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Conservation of biodiversity and HNV | HNV areas are important areas for the conservation of the | Regional | Database measurements of the RDP, | |
| farmland habitats | biodiversity. This aspect is really important when the impact of | | regional land use map "farmers data" | |
| | the measure "agri- environmental payments" is evaluated. | | | |
| Ecological infrastructure object of | The impact indicator is proposed as an assessment indicator of | Regional | Regional data based on IACS (2005), | |
| engagement with habitat function or plots | measures aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity. One of the | | regional technical maps, Corine Land | |
| of land not cultivated linked to agriculture | characteristics of HNV areas is the prevalence of low intensity | | Cover, maps of the extent of | |
| (hectares and / or kilometers and / or | farming systems, these areas tend to coincide with those less | | agricultural land under measure 214, | |
| number of sites / commitments) of which | productive and marginal areas, in which agriculture practices | | Network of Threatened Species in | |
| enhancing existing high nature-value | are extensive. | | GRID format for the regional | |
| habitats by alleviating their fragmentation | | | distribution of threatened species | |
| (%) | | | prepared by the Project "National | |
| | | | Ecological Network" (REN) by the | |
| | | | Ministry of the Environment. | |
| Proportion of the UAA subject to | | Program | Data from National agriculture Agency | |
| environmental constraints for farmers to | programme due to payment given for the protection of the | me | (PDRN) | |
| receive payments | HNV areas. | (PDRN) | | |
| | | and | | |
| | | regional | | |

| HNV farmland habitats that have been protected by supported actions (number of sites/agreements; total hectares, average -of which resulting from specific land-uses or traditional farming systems (%) -of which | Many agricultural habitats managed through extensive and traditional farming systems are classified as HNV farm land. The maintenance or introduction of extensive and traditional farming systems contributes to the protection of HNV habitats. | Regional (Federal State) | IACS annual data. Quantification of habitat changes over the programme period. | |
|--|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| resulting from prevention of encroachment (colonisation by scrub, etc) or abandonment (%)-of which located in Natura 2000 areas (%) -of which habitats that in particular benefit specific species or groups of species (%)-of which considered rare habitats at the relevant geographical level (%) size) | characteristics of HNV areas is the prevalence of low intensity farming systems, these areas tend to coincide with those less productive and marginal areas, in which agriculture practices | Regional | Regional data based on IACS (2005), regional technical maps, Corine Land Cover, maps of the extent of agricultural land under measure 214, Network of Threatened Species in GRID format for the regional distribution of threatened species prepared by the Project "National Ecological Network" (REN) by the Ministry of the Environment. | |
| Number of semi-subsistence farm holdings which entered the market and meet the obligatory Community standards related to veterinary and phyto-sanitary requirements, animal welfare, environmental protection, hygiene and occupational health and safety | | National, regional | Monitoring data. Survey data. | Specify within HNV areas |
| Maintenance of HNV farmland and forestry: Changes in high nature value areas | This is a baseline indicator of HNV areas, taking into account areas under successful land management contributing to improvement of biodiversity. The presence of natural habitats and the distribution of wildlife species populations that exist in farmland and forest can characterise these areas as HNV. | all agricultu ral land under successfu l land manage ment contribut ing to improve ment of | Maps and statistical data of agricultural land where measures are implemented for successful land management contributing to improvement of biodiversity. The monitoring data concern: Corine Land Cover Classification for y2000, biodiversity data, IBAs of Greece, distribution of bear, wolf and bird of prey populations, SCI and habitat mapping of Greek Natura 2000 network, data from environmental protected areas, data gathered by NVZs, data from agricultural census for y2000, olive fields' cadastre, expert surveys. | |

| | D · 1 | | |
|---|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | Regional | Database measurements of the RDP, | |
| | | regional land use map, FADN data | |
| | National | Declaration data (Ha of agricultural | |
| areas with natural HNV meadows- extensively managed | | area) | |
| agricultural areas with natural or semi-natural areas | | | |
| distinguished by high landscape heterogeneity - agricultural | | | |
| areas for preservation of international important species or | | | |
| habitats, parts of international networks (Andersen et al., 2003). | | | |
| During evaluation period (2007-2009) only second and third | | | |
| group of HNV areas were eligible for support. | | | |
| Many agricultural habitats managed through extensive and | Regional, | ATKIS data (share of HNV area on | |
| traditional farming systems are classified as HNV farm land. | program | total UAA, share of Natura 2000 area, | |
| The maintenance or introduction of extensive and traditional | me | share of protected forests) | |
| farming systems contributes to the protection of HNV | | | |
| habitats. | | | |
| The measure contributes to the continued use of agricultural | Changes | | |
| activities with positive impact on biological diversity as a result | in HNV | | |
| of compliance with the environmental requirements. | areas | | |
| | Regional, | IACS-GIS data, HNV-GIS data, | |
| | program | databases of protected areas. | |
| been modified and differentiates between different HNV areas | me | | |
| and elements classified into different HNV types. | | | |

Table B4 Indicators for Water Quality

Setting up of farm management/advisory services (115)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|---|----------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Number of farmers who use advisory | Indirect impact on sustainable management practices and cross | National | Number of farmers who use advisory | Water protection oriented |
| services for climate change mitigation | compliance requirements. | | services on sustainable land | |
| | | | management and sustainable | |
| | | | management of natural resources, | |
| | | | amount of payments realised. | |

Improvement of the economic value of forests (122)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Resources/assets enjoying improved protection due to assisted forest actions (hectare): (b) of which water bodies (%) | | Regional | ISTAT, Agricultural census |
| Area under the effective management of the territory, which has successfully contributed: to improve water quality | The additional indicator was created to evaluate the impact of the use of the principal fertilisers in agriculture that provoke the water pollution. | Regional | Agricultural census and regional database (info about the fertilisers and pesticide used in agriculture) |
| Achievement of environmental objective: Area to be contributing to Water quality in the specific action (part of 211 in ha) X % financial uptake for this action. | The calculation of the area under water quality measure as a function of the proportion of the financial uptake and the programmed target area is provided as an estimation of the impact. | Action | Financial uptake, targeted area |
| Improvement in water quality-Changes in gross nutrient balance GNB | Forestry is a more extensive land-use than agriculture, lower fertiliser application reduces N and P surpluses. | Supported area | |
| | | National | Different ground and surface water quality monitoring data, studies on discharge from agriculture land and forested areas |
| | Reduced nutrient inputs from agriculture (N, P and pesticides) improve water quality. Comparison of the GNB of AEM participants with non- participants. | Regional | GNB |

Cooperation for development of new products, processes and technologies (124)

| | Indicator | | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--------|-------------------------|------------|--------------|----------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Numbe | er of enterprises intro | ducing new | | Regional | Number of beneficiaries, area covered | Improvement of water |
| techno | logies and innovation | s | | | by the measure, amount of payment | quality or decrease water |
| | | | | | realised. | consumption projects |

| Area of land affected by measure (ha) and | National | Improvement of water |
|---|----------|---------------------------|
| Added value by land use and operation | | quality or decrease water |
| | | consumption projects |

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Concentration of plant nutrients in drainage water | It is very difficult to evaluate the impact of measures on water quality and results can only be seen after many years. The evaluators, in order to assess the indirect impact of environmentally friendly management and organic farming, conducted studies, analysing the use of nutritional elements, pesticides performance load and plant nutritional elements concentration in drain water. | | Analysis of water and soil samples, interviews and focus group. |
| Proportion of UAA subject to friendly farming systems environment which affected area (a) to organic farming, (b) Integrated production or integrated control agencies harmful, and (c) pasture with less than 2 LU / ha. | The quantification of nutrient impact thanks to the indicator. | Programm e level (PDRN) | Data from PDRN monitoring system RICA |
| Improvement in water quality-(Changes in gross nutrient balance GNB | Reduced nutrient inputs from agriculture (N, P and pesticides) improve water quality. Comparison of the GNB of AEM participants with non- participants. | Regional | GNB |
| | The impact indicator "Improvement in water quality" is proposed by the CMEF. Quantitative change in the estimations of GNB that can be attributed to the intervention should be measured. The GNB indicates potential nutrient losses to the water bodies likely to be detrimental for the quality of water. | NUTS III regions | Nutrient balances, nitrate and phosphate, by the OECD/EUROSTAT Method, (years 1995, 1999, 2003, 2005 and 2007) EUROSTAT Project (Grant 2007, topic 67, Pilot Survey on the use of fertilisers, conducted for Austria by Statistic Austria and the Federal Environmental Agency, 2010). |
| | | National | Different ground and surface water quality monitoring data, studies on discharge from agriculture land and forested areas |
| Amount of organic fertiliser: stock density (LU)/ha | Nitrogen inputs from organic fertiliser in ground and surface water bodies are detrimental to water quality. | | InVeKos, (year 2008), stock density (LU)/ha; comparison participants/non-participants. |
| Gross nutrient balance: reduction of nitrogen and phosphorus surplus in the areas of intervention) | Measure 214 Agri-environment is related to several environmental aspects, such us fertilization impacts. The overall objective of this indicator is to asses the benefit of implementing a series of measures that have among their objectives the improvement of the quality of water that run off from | Regional | Measures' database of the RDP, statistical data, agricultural production and agri- environmental system commitments. Technical itineraries for major crops |

Supporting farmers who participate in food quality schemes (132)

| | cultivated fields. | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Reduction of "risk index" resulting from use of pesticides | Measure 214 Agri-environment is related to several environmental aspects, such us fertilization impacts. | | Measures' database of the RDP, statistical data. Production specifications and system agri-environmental commitments. Technical itineraries for major crops (contributed by experts) |
| Reduction of agricultural inputs per hectare thanks to agreements (%) | system. In fact the Measure "Agri- environment" is related with several environmental aspects. | Regional scale, all agriculture land that contribute d to the use of inputs | ISTAT (2001-2003), Agricultural census |

Animal welfare payments (215)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|--|----------|--|
| Livestock density per ha UAA near body of water | | National | Livestock density per ha UAA near body of |
| | | | water |
| Amount of organic fertiliser: stock density (LU)/ha | Nitrogen inputs from organic fertiliser in ground and surface water bodies | | |
| | are detrimental to water quality. | | comparison participants/non-participants. |
| Improvement in water quality-(Changes in gross | | Regional | GNB |
| nutrient balance GNB | water quality. Comparison of the GNB of AEM participants with non- | | |
| | participants. | | |
| | The impact indicator "Improvement in water quality" is proposed by the | NUTS III | Nutrient balances, nitrate and phosphate, by |
| | | regions | the OECD/EUROSTAT Method, (years |
| | attributed to the intervention should be measured. The GNB indicates | | 1995, 1999, 2003, 2005 and 2007) |
| | potential nutrient losses to the water bodies likely to be detrimental for the | | EUROSTAT Project (Grant 2007, topic 67, |
| | quality of water. | | Pilot Survey on the use of fertilisers, |
| | | | conducted for Austria by Statistic Austria and |
| | | | the Federal Environmental Agency, 2010). |
| | | National | Different ground and surface water quality |
| | | | monitoring data, studies on discharge from |
| | | | agriculture land and forested areas |
| Proportion of UAA subject to friendly farming | The quantification of nutrient impact thanks to the indicator. | Programm | Data from PDRN monitoring system RICA |
| systems environment which affected area (a) to | | e level | |

| organic farming, (b) Integrated production or integrated control agencies harmful, and (c) pasture with less than 2 LU / ha. | | (PDRN) | |
|--|--|--------------------------|--|
| Reduction of agricultural inputs per hectare thanks to agreements (%) | 1 | Regional scale, all | ISTAT (2001-2003), Agricultural census |
| 0 | environmental aspects. | agriculture land that | |
| | | contribute | |
| | | d to the use of | |
| | | inputs | |
| Achievement of environmental objective: Area to | The calculation of the area under water quality measure as a function of | Action | Financial uptake, targeted area |
| be contributing to Water quality in the specific | the proportion of the financial uptake and the programmed target area is | | |
| | provided as an estimation of the impact. | | |
| this action. | - | | |

First establishment of agroforestry systems on agricultural land (222)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|---|-----------|--|
| Improvement in water quality-(Changes in gross | Forestry is a more extensive land-use than agriculture, lower fertiliser | Supported | |
| nutrient balance GNB | application reduces N and P surpluses. | area | |
| | | | Different ground and surface water quality monitoring data, studies on discharge from agriculture land and forested areas |
| | Reduced nutrient inputs from agriculture (N, P and pesticides) improve water quality. Comparison of the GNB of AEM participants with non- participants. | Regional | GNB |
| Resources/assets enjoying improved protection due to assisted forest actions (hectare): (b) of which water bodies (%) | | Regional | ISTAT, Agricultural census |
| Area under successful land management contributing to improvement of water quality | Afforestation contributes to flood risk management, and also to the deduction if diffuse water pollution. Generic conclusions drawn from indirect sources. | | Scientific literature, such as Morrow, Silgram & Nisbett (2010), generic conclusions from the Environment Agency (2009) and the Forestry Commission |
| Area under the effective management of the territory, which has successfully contributed: to improve water quality | The additional indicator was created to evaluate the impact of the use of the principal fertilisers in agriculture that provoke the water pollution. | Regional | Agricultural census and regional database (info about the fertilisers and pesticide used in agriculture) |

| Achievement of environmental objective: Area to | The calculation of the area under water quality measure as a function of | Action | Financial uptake, targeted area |
|---|--|--------|---------------------------------|
| be contributing to Water quality in the specific | the proportion of the financial uptake and the programmed target area is | | |
| action (part of 211 in ha) X % financial uptake for | provided as an estimation of the impact. | | |
| this action. | | | |

Diversification into non-agricultural activities (311) - Support for business creation and development (312) - Conservation and upgrading of the rural heritage (323)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|-----------------------------|---|----------|------|---|
| Number of supported actions | Indirect influence of measure on water quality. | National | 1 | Improvement of water quality or decrease water consumption projects |
| Total volume of investment | Indirect influence of measure on water quality. | National | 1 5 | Improvement of water quality or decrease water consumption projects |

Training and information for economic actors operating in the fields covered by axis 3 (331)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|---|---|----------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Number of trainings on sustainable land | The aim of the measure is to diffuse scientific knowledge and | National | Number of training days, number of | Water protection oriented |
| management | innovative practises in the agricultural and forestry sector. | | beneficiaries, amount of payments | |
| | Indirect impact. | | realised, annually. | |

Table B5 Indicators for Soil Quality

Setting up of farm management/advisory services (115)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|---|----------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Number of farmers who use advisory | Indirect impact on sustainable management practices and cross | National | Number of farmers who use advisory | Soil protection oriented |
| services for climate change mitigation | compliance requirements. | | services on sustainable land | |
| | | | management and sustainable | |
| | | | management of natural resources, | |
| | | | amount of payments realised. | |

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|--|----------|---|--------------------------|
| Level of improvement of the overall | The measure supports the modernisation of the production | National | Survey results. Number of holdings | Soil protection oriented |
| performance of the agricultural holdings | factors, introducing new technologies and processes. This is | | supported and number of holdings in | * |
| (competitiveness, sustainability and | directly linked to improved soil quality. | | livestock breeding, number of farms | |
| protection of environment) | | | meeting the requirements of the nitrate | |
| | | | Directive 91/676/EEC were used as | |
| | | | additional indicators. | |
| Number of enterprises introducing new | | Regional | Number of beneficiaries, area covered | Soil protection oriented |
| technologies and innovations | | | by the measure, amount of payment | |
| | | | realised | |
| Risk of soil erosion | Regeneration of forest stands reduces the risk for soil erosion. | | Ha of promoted areas | |
| Soil erosion - estimation of the C factor for | Different cropping and land management practices affect the | | IACS data. Indicator is based on data | |
| soil erosion | vegetation coverage of soils which has an influence on the risk | | and applications of the State Authority | |
| | and extent of soil erosion. The crop management factor C | | for Mining, Energy and Geology. | |
| | measures the impact of different management practices on soil | | | |
| | erosion, which reduces the soil functionality and quality. The | | | |
| | CMEF does currently not include an impact indicator for soils. | | | |
| Achievement of environmental objective: | The calculation of the area under soil quality measure as a | Action | Financial uptake, targeted area | |
| Area to be contributing to Soil quality in the | function of the proportion of the financial uptake and the | | | |
| specific action (part of 211 in ha) X % | programmed target area is provided as an estimation of the | | | |
| financial uptake for this action. | impact. | | | |
| Yearly soil loss (t/ha) | Soil loss through erosion is detrimental to soil quality. | Regional | Estimation of soil loss rate per year; | |
| | | | impact of the measures is based on | |
| | | | literature. | |
| Change in risk of erosion | The erosion risk is an indicator of the soil loss due to the | | IACS data | |

Improvement of the economic value of forests (122)
| | process and is in relation with the measure that evaluates the impact on soil characterisation. | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Areas at risk of erosion (tn/ha/year) | CMEF does not provide soil impact indicator. The measure does not allow land ploughing, so declared territories should be more resistant to erosion processes as well as have natural chemical cycles. | Declarations (ha of area under measure) | |
| | Soil plays a number of key environmental, social and economic issues, is relevant for the protection of water, air and biodiversity (habitat), the conservation of the landscape and cultural heritage. | Regional database, CORINE Land Cover, land use maps. | |
| | | 2005 monitoring database is the most representative of the number of beneficiaries and areas affected by agri- environmental measures. Regional database, CORINE Land Cover, AVEPA, Land use maps. | |

Cooperation for development of new products, processes and technologies (124)

| | Indicator | | Caus | al chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------|------|----------|----------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Number of e | enterprises intro | oducing new | | | Regional | Number of beneficiaries, area covered | Soil protection oriented |
| technologies | s and innovatior | 15 | | | | by the measure, amount of payment | |
| | | | | | | realised | |

Supporting farmers who participate in food quality schemes (132)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|--|---|-------|--|
| (Risk of soil erosion)-Phosphorus content, humus | Measures key aspects of soil quality | | Ha of area supported |
| content and pH of the soil | | | |
| Soil loss | Determine areas threatened by soil erosion (water and wind erosion) and | | Studies conducted on selected areas by |
| | areas of actual erosion in Estonia based on land use. | | analysing orthophotos and IACS/LPIS |
| | | | databases. GIS land use data. LIDAR relief |

| | | | data (2011 study) |
|--|---|-------------|--|
| Changes in the content of plant nutrients (P, K, Ca, | | Monitorin | Analysis of soil samples (extra analysis of |
| Mg, Cu, Mn, B), acidity, nitrogen mineralization | | | organic matter content and Nmin). |
| (Nmin) and organic matter content | | across | |
| | | Estonia | |
| | | (areas with | |
| | | different | |
| | | soil- | |
| | | climatic | |
| | | conditions | |
| | | and | |
| | | different | |
| | | production | |
| | | types) | |
| Proportion of UAA subject to friendly environment | The introduction of innovative management projects aimed at promoting | National, | Agricultural survey PDRN (RICA). |
| farming systems which affected area (a) to organic | | programm | |
| farming, (b) Integrated production or integrated | reference to "quality certification in agriculture", "computerization in | e level | |
| control agencies harmful, and (c) pasture with less | agriculture" and "food safety and traceability products". These aspects are | (PDRN) | |
| than 2 LU/ ha. | linked with the measure and the investments in agricultural farms. | | |
| Soil erosion - estimation of the C factor for soil | Different cropping and land management practices affect the vegetation | | IACS data. Indicator is based on data and |
| erosion | coverage of soils which has an influence on the risk and extent of soil | | applications of the State Authority for |
| | erosion. The crop management factor C measures the impact of different | | Mining, Energy and Geology. |
| | management practices on soil erosion, which reduces the soil functionality | | |
| | and quality. The CMEF does currently not include an impact indicator for | | |
| | soils. | | |
| Maintenance / increase the organic matter content | For the conservation of the soil and its fertility, the monitoring activities | | IACS data, results of the previous analysis of |
| in soils | on the soil organic matter become essential, for this purpose this indicator | | the impact. Results of business surveys for |
| | evaluate the impact on this aspects in soil | | the structural measures. Parameters and data |
| | | | taken from the literature and national, |
| | | | international agencies (Padua University). |

First establishment of agroforestry systems on agricultural land (222)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------|---|
| | Measures key aspects of soil quality | | Ha of area supported |
| content and pH of the soil | | | |
| Changes in the content of plant nutrients (P, K, Ca, | | Monitorin | Analysis of soil samples (extra analysis of |

| Mg, Cu, Mn, B), acidity, nitrogen mineralization | | g in 3 areas | organic matter content and Nmin). |
|--|--|--------------|--|
| (Nmin) and organic matter content | | across | organie matter content and r (min). |
| (i (iiiii) and organic matter content | | Estonia | |
| | | (areas with | |
| | | different | |
| | | soil- | |
| | | climatic | |
| | | conditions | |
| | | and | |
| | | different | |
| | | production | |
| | | 1 | |
| Minternet / in second flag and in sector of | | types) | IACS data manufactoria and the second |
| 0 | For the conservation of the soil and its fertility, the monitoring activities | | IACS data, results of the previous analysis of |
| in soils | on the soil organic matter become essential, for this purpose this indicator | | the impact. Results of business surveys for the structural measures. Parameters and data |
| | evaluate the impact on this aspects in soil | | |
| | | | taken from the literature and national, |
| | | N.T. 1. 1 | international agencies (Padua University). |
| Model Universal Soil Loss Equation per ha per year | 1 1 0 7 | National | Number of beneficiaries, amount of payment |
| (USLE) | qualities of the soil and increase humus. | | realised |
| | Different cropping and land management practices affect the vegetation | | IACS data. Indicator is based on data and |
| erosion | coverage of soils which has an influence on the risk and extent of soil | | applications of the State Authority for |
| | erosion. The crop management factor C measures the impact of different | | Mining, Energy and Geology. |
| | management practices on soil erosion, which reduces the soil functionality | | |
| | and quality. The CMEF does currently not include an impact indicator for | | |
| | soils. | | |
| Achievement of environmental objective: Area to | The calculation of the area under soil quality measure as a function of the | Action | Financial uptake, targeted area |
| be contributing to Soil quality in the specific action | proportion of the financial uptake and the programmed target area is | | |
| (part of 211 in ha) X % financial uptake for this | provided as an estimation of the impact. | | |
| action. | * * | | |
| Soil loss | Determine areas threatened by soil erosion (water and wind erosion) and | | Studies conducted on selected areas by |
| | areas of actual erosion in Estonia based on land use. | | analysing orthophotos and IACS/LPIS |
| | | | databases. GIS land use data. LIDAR relief |
| | | | data (2011 study) |
| Yearly soil loss (t/ha) | Soil loss through erosion is detrimental to soil quality. | | Estimation of soil loss rate per year; impact of |
| | | | the measures is based on literature. |
| Change in risk of erosion | The erosion risk is an indicator of the soil loss due to the process and is in | | IACS data |

| | relation with the measure that evaluates the impact on soil | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------|---|
| | characterisation. | | |
| Areas at risk of erosion (tn/ha/year) | CMEF does not provide soil impact indicator. The measure does not | National | Declarations (ha of area under measure) |
| | allow land ploughing, so declared territories should be more resistant to | | |
| | erosion processes as well as have natural chemical cycles. | | |
| | Soil plays a number of key environmental, social and economic issues, is | Programm | Regional database, CORINE Land Cover, |
| | relevant for the protection of water, air and biodiversity (habitat), the | e level | land use maps. |
| | conservation of the landscape and cultural heritage. | (PDRH) | |
| | For this environmental resource, the purpose is related to the knowledge | Regional | 2005 monitoring database is the most |
| | and the preservation of its many functions, and productive environment. | | representative of the number of beneficiaries |
| | The need for a sustainable use of soil resources is linked to its slow | | and areas affected by agri-environmental |
| | regeneration capacity, the need to maintain and promote all of its | | measures. Regional database, CORINE Land |
| | functions, to conserve resources present in it, but also to its possible role | | Cover, AVEPA, Land use maps. |
| | as a "biological filter" that can within certain limits, to curb any negative | | |
| | impacts on the environment and likely produced by other major | | |
| | environmental matrices compromised by human activities. The protection | | |
| | of soil from erosion and pollution, is one of the objectives of the Sixth | | |
| | Environment Action Programme. | | |

Diversification into non-agricultural activities (311) - Support for business creation and development (312) - Conservation and upgrading of the rural heritage (323)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|-----------------------------|--|----------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Number of supported actions | Indirect influence of measure on soil quality. | National | Number of operations | Soil protection oriented |
| Total volume of investment | Indirect influence of measure on soil quality. | National | Amount of payment | Soil protection oriented |

Training and information for economic actors operating in the fields covered by axis 3 (331)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|---|---|----------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Number of trainings on sustainable land | The aim of the measure is to diffuse scientific knowledge and | National | Number of training days, number of | Soil protection oriented |
| management | innovative practises in the agricultural and forestry sector. | | beneficiaries, amount of payments | |
| | Indirect impact. | | realised, annually. | |

Competitiveness (411)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|---|---|----------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Number of trainings on sustainable land | The aim of the measure is to diffuse scientific knowledge and | National | Number of training days, number of | Soil protection oriented |
| management | innovative practises in the agricultural and forestry sector. | | beneficiaries, amount of payments | |
| | Indirect impact. | | realised, annually. | |

| Number of farmers who use advisory | Indirect impact on sustainable management practices and cross | National | Number of farmers who use advisory | Soil protection oriented |
|--|---|----------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| services for sustainable land management | compliance requirements. | | services on sustainable land | _ |
| | | | management and sustainable | |
| | | | management of natural resources, | |
| | | | amount of payments realised. | |

Quality of life/diversification (413)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|-----------------------------|--|----------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Number of supported actions | Indirect influence of measure on soil quality. | National | Number of operations | Soil protection oriented |
| Total volume of investment | Indirect influence of measure on soil quality. | National | Amount of payment | Soil protection oriented |

Table B6 Indicators for Landscape

Setting up of farm management/advisory services (115)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|--------------|----------|--|
| Number of farmers who use advisory services f | | National | Number of farmers who use advisory services |
| | | | on sustainable land management and |
| | | | sustainable management of natural resources, |
| | | | amount of payments realised. |

Improvement of the economic value of forests (122)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|---|----------|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Patch Density Index | | National | Number of complex with mosaic | |
| | | | UAA, forest on areas covered by | |
| | | | measure | |
| Preservation of traditional landscape | From contextual information can be concluded that indicator is | National | Declarations (area under support) | |
| features | based on prerequisite, that schemes which determine particular | | | |
| | requirements from environmental point of view are important | | | |
| | also for preservation of landscape. Therefore supports for | | | |
| | territories where those schemes are applied allow to preserve | | | |
| | landscape. | | | |
| Maintenance of a diverse landscape and | Study: changes in landscape features (e.g. tree rows, hedgerows) | | | |
| landscape elements | are visualised by comparing orthophotos between 1994 and | | | |
| | 2008 in 5 regions and are assessed with the participation data of | | | |
| | AEMs. Changes in landscapes are assessed qualitatively and | | | |
| | additionally, farmers are interviewed regarding their attitude | | | |
| | towards AEMs and their impacts on landscape. | | | |
| Farmland under agreement contributing to | The aim of the impact indicator is to assess the extent to which | Regional | Land use Veneto Region | |
| perceptive/ cognitive, in particular visual, | agri-environmental activities can contribute to the protection / | | | |
| differentiation (homogeneity/diversity) in | enhancement of the landscape, this is the link with the measure | | | |
| the landscape (number of sites and | 214 that promotes the agri-environmental activities. | | | |

| hectares/ kilometres) (a) of which due to | | Regional | IACS data, Ha of promoted areas. | |
|--|---|----------|---|---------------------------|
| the visual complexity resulting from land- | | (Federal | | |
| use/crop patterns influenced by the | | State) | | |
| supported actions (extent, spatial | | S) | | |
| arrangement including height, colours) (%) | | | | |
| (b) of which due to environmental features | | | | |
| such as flora, fauna or habitats | | | | |
| directly/indirectly resulting from the | | | | |
| supported actions (%) (c) of which due to | | | | |
| man-made objects (hedgerows, ditches, | | | | |
| tracks) introduced/preserved by the | | | | |
| supported actions or the possibility, thanks | | | | |
| to support for vegetation management, of | | | | |
| viewing the landscape differentiation | | | | |
| (homogeneity / diversity) (%) | | | | |
| Measuring the attractiveness of the area: | There is a casual chain between the link indicator and the | Regional | National statistics on agricultural | Needs further elaboration |
| Effect of abandonment on the landscape | programme. | | production and agri-environmental | |
| | | | system commitments; | |
| Additional attractive/valuable area or sites | The relationship between the areas that received the aid and the | Regional | ISTAT database | |
| due to assistance | measure is given by the assessment of the monetary help and | | | |
| | the impact on the agricultural landscape | | | |
| Created natural areas (ha) | | National | Monitoring data, questionnaire or | |
| | | | interviews. | |
| Ecological network connections (km) | | National | Monitoring data, questionnaire or | |
| | | | interviews. | |
| Changes in the structure of the landscape in | The objective of the indicator is to assess if the application of | | All elements of the landscape structure | |
| | AES requirements has affected the visual attractiveness, | | must be indicated on the field work | |
| Changes in the general upkeep of the farms. | coherence, cultural characteristics and homogeneity/diversity | | map, the condition of the farms is | |
| | of agricultural land | | identified by using photos and | |
| | | | descriptions. Monitoring activities are | |
| | | | carried out on the first and last year of | |
| | | | the programme | |

Adding value to agricultural/forestry products (123)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|--|---|----------|-----------------------------------|
| Preservation of traditional landscape features | From contextual information can be concluded that indicator is based on | National | Declarations (area under support) |

| | | 1 | 1 |
|--|---|----------|----------------------------------|
| | prerequisite, that schemes which determine particular requirements from | | |
| | environmental point of view are important also for preservation of | | |
| | landscape. Therefore supports for territories where those schemes are | | |
| | applied allow to preserve landscape. | | |
| Maintenance of a diverse landscape and landscape | Study: changes in landscape features (e.g. tree rows, hedgerows) are | | |
| elements | visualised by comparing orthophotos between 1994 and 2008 in 5 regions | | |
| | and are assessed with the participation data of AEMs. Changes in | | |
| | landscapes are assessed qualitatively and additionally, farmers are | | |
| | interviewed regarding their attitude towards AEMs and their impacts on | | |
| | landscape. | | |
| Farmland under agreement contributing to | The aim of the impact indicator is to assess the extent to which agri- | Regional | Land use Veneto Region |
| perceptive/ cognitive, in particular visual, | environmental activities can contribute to the protection / enhancement | 0 | |
| differentiation (homogeneity/diversity) in the | of the landscape, this is the link with the measure 214 that promotes the | | |
| landscape (number of sites and hectares/ | agri-environmental activities. | | |
| kilometres) (a) of which due to the visual | | Regional | IACS data, Ha of promoted areas. |
| complexity resulting from land-use/crop patterns | | (Federal | |
| influenced by the supported actions (extent, spatial | | State) | |
| arrangement including height, colours) (%) (b) of | | , | |
| which due to environmental features such as flora, | | | |
| fauna or habitats directly/indirectly resulting from | | | |
| the supported actions (%) (c) of which due to man- | | | |
| made objects (hedgerows, ditches, tracks) | | | |
| introduced/preserved by the supported actions or | | | |
| the possibility, thanks to support for vegetation | | | |
| management, of viewing the landscape | | | |
| differentiation (homogeneity / diversity) (%) | | | |

Animal welfare payments (215)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|--|----------|------------------------------------|---------|
| Stocking density (LU) per ha forage area | Low stocking density protects ecologic sensitive areas and | National | Stocking density (LU) in different | |
| | biodiversity. | | regions | |
| Preservation of traditional landscape | From contextual information can be concluded that indicator is | National | Declarations (area under support) | |
| features | based on prerequisite, that schemes which determine particular | | | |
| | requirements from environmental point of view are important | | | |
| | also for preservation of landscape. Therefore supports for | | | |
| | territories where those schemes are applied allow to preserve | | | |

| | landscape. | | | |
|--|---|----------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Maintenance of a diverse landscape and | Study: changes in landscape features (e.g. tree rows, hedgerows) | | | |
| landscape elements | are visualised by comparing orthophotos between 1994 and | | | |
| | 2008 in 5 regions and are assessed with the participation data of | | | |
| | AEMs. Changes in landscapes are assessed qualitatively and | | | |
| | additionally, farmers are interviewed regarding their attitude | | | |
| | towards AEMs and their impacts on landscape. | | | |
| Farmland under agreement contributing to | The aim of the impact indicator is to assess the extent to which | Regional | Land use Veneto Region | |
| perceptive/ cognitive, in particular visual, | agri-environmental activities can contribute to the protection / | | | |
| differentiation (homogeneity/diversity) in | enhancement of the landscape, this is the link with the measure | | | |
| the landscape (number of sites and | 214 that promotes the agri-environmental activities. | | | |
| hectares/ kilometres) (a) of which due to | | Regional | IACS data, Ha of promoted areas. | |
| the visual complexity resulting from land- | | (Federal | - | |
| use/crop patterns influenced by the | | State) | | |
| supported actions (extent, spatial | | | | |
| arrangement including height, colours) (%) | | | | |
| (b) of which due to environmental features | | | | |
| such as flora, fauna or habitats | | | | |
| directly/indirectly resulting from the | | | | |
| supported actions (%) (c) of which due to | | | | |
| man-made objects (hedgerows, ditches, | | | | |
| tracks) introduced/preserved by the | | | | |
| supported actions or the possibility, thanks | | | | |
| to support for vegetation management, of | | | | |
| viewing the landscape differentiation | | | | |
| (homogeneity / diversity) (%) | | | | |
| Measuring the attractiveness of the area: | There is a casual chain between the link indicator and the | Regional | National statistics on agricultural | Needs further elaboration |
| Effect of abandonment on the landscape | programme. | | production and agri-environmental | |
| | | | system commitments; | |
| Additional attractive/valuable area or sites | The relationship between the areas that received the aid and the | Regional | ISTAT database | |
| due to assistance | measure is given by the assessment of the monetary help and | | | |
| | the impact on the agricultural landscape | | | |

First establishment of agroforestry systems on agricultural land (222)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|---------------------|--------------|----------|-------------------------------|---------|
| Patch Density Index | | National | Number of complex with mosaic | |

| | | | UAA, forest on areas covered by measure | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Preservation of traditional landscape features | From contextual information can be concluded that indicator is based on prerequisite, that schemes which determine particular requirements from environmental point of view are important also for preservation of landscape. Therefore supports for territories where those schemes are applied allow to preserve landscape. | National | Declarations (area under support) | |
| Maintenance of a diverse landscape and landscape elements | Study: changes in landscape features (e.g. tree rows, hedgerows) are visualised by comparing orthophotos between 1994 and 2008 in 5 regions and are assessed with the participation data of AEMs. Changes in landscapes are assessed qualitatively and additionally, farmers are interviewed regarding their attitude towards AEMs and their impacts on landscape. | | | |
| Farmland under agreement contributing to perceptive/ cognitive, in particular visual, differentiation (homogeneity/diversity) in the landscape (number of sites and | The aim of the impact indicator is to assess the extent to which agri-environmental activities can contribute to the protection / enhancement of the landscape, this is the link with the measure 214 that promotes the agri-environmental activities. | Regional | Land use Veneto Region | |
| hectares/ kilometres) (a) of which due to the visual complexity resulting from land- use/crop patterns influenced by the supported actions (extent, spatial arrangement including height, colours) (%) (b) of which due to environmental features such as flora, fauna or habitats directly/indirectly resulting from the supported actions (%) (c) of which due to man-made objects (hedgerows, ditches, tracks) introduced/preserved by the supported actions or the possibility, thanks to support for vegetation management, of viewing the landscape differentiation (homogeneity /diversity) (%) | | Regional (Federal State) | IACS data, Ha of promoted areas. | |
| Measuring the attractiveness of the area: Effect of abandonment on the landscape | There is a casual chain between the link indicator and the programme. | Regional | National statistics on agricultural production and agri-environmental system commitments; | Needs further elaboration |

| Additional attractive/valuable area or sites | The relationship between the areas that received the aid and the | Regional | ISTAT database | |
|--|--|----------|--------------------------------------|--|
| due to assistance | measure is given by the assessment of the monetary help and | | | |
| | the impact on the agricultural landscape | | | |
| Characteristic landscape | Extensification of grassland use increases biodiversity which | Regional | Frida database (DLR RNH): floristic | |
| | has positives effects on landscape characteristics (e.g. increased | | and faunistic survey of 470 selected | |
| | diversity). | | areas covering AEM participants and | |
| | | | non-participants | |
| Created natural areas (ha) | | National | Monitoring data, questionnaire or | |
| | | | interviews. | |
| Ecological network connections (km) | | National | Monitoring data, questionnaire or | |
| | | | interviews. | |

Competitiveness (411)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|--|----------|--|
| Number of trainings on sustainable land | The aim of the measure is to diffuse scientific knowledge and innovative | | Number of training days, number of |
| management | practises in the agricultural and forestry sector. Indirect impact. | | beneficiaries, amount of payments realised, |
| | | | annually. |
| Number of farmers who use advisory services | | | Number of farmers who use advisory services |
| | | | on sustainable land management and |
| | | | sustainable management of natural resources, |
| | | | amount of payments realised. |
| Area of land affected by measure (ha) and Added | | National | Area of land affected by measure (ha) and |
| value by land use and operation | | | Added value by land use and operation |
| Maintenance and creation of cultural landscapes | | | |
| (e.g. landscape protective forest roads) | | | |

Environment/land management (412)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|---|----------|---|---------|
| Stocking density (LU) per ha forage area | Low stocking density protects ecologic sensitive areas and | National | Stocking density (LU) in different | |
| | biodiversity. | | regions | |
| Changes in the structure of the landscape in | The objective of the indicator is to assess if the application of | | All elements of the landscape structure | |
| terms of point, linear- and areal elements - | AES requirements has affected the visual attractiveness, | | must be indicated on the field work | |
| Changes in the general upkeep of the farms. | coherence, cultural characteristics and homogeneity/diversity | | map, the condition of the farms is | |
| | of agricultural land | | identified by using photos and | |
| | | | descriptions. Monitoring activities are | |
| | | | carried out on the first and last year of | |

| | | | the programme | |
|--|---|----------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Patch Density Index | | National | Number of complex with mosaic | |
| | | | UAA, forest on areas covered by | |
| | | | measure | |
| Preservation of traditional landscape | From contextual information can be concluded that indicator is | National | Declarations (area under support) | |
| features | based on prerequisite, that schemes which determine particular | | | |
| | requirements from environmental point of view are important | | | |
| | also for preservation of landscape. Therefore supports for | | | |
| | territories where those schemes are applied allow to preserve | | | |
| | landscape. | | | |
| Maintenance of a diverse landscape and | Study: changes in landscape features (e.g. tree rows, hedgerows) | | | |
| landscape elements | are visualised by comparing orthophotos between 1994 and | | | |
| 1 | 2008 in 5 regions and are assessed with the participation data of | | | |
| | AEMs. Changes in landscapes are assessed qualitatively and | | | |
| | additionally, farmers are interviewed regarding their attitude | | | |
| | towards AEMs and their impacts on landscape. | | | |
| Farmland under agreement contributing to | The aim of the impact indicator is to assess the extent to which | Regional | Land use Veneto Region | |
| perceptive/ cognitive, in particular visual, | agri-environmental activities can contribute to the protection / | | | |
| differentiation (homogeneity/diversity) in | enhancement of the landscape, this is the link with the measure | | | |
| the landscape (number of sites and | 214 that promotes the agri-environmental activities. | | | |
| hectares/ kilometres) (a) of which due to | | Regional | IACS data, Ha of promoted areas. | |
| the visual complexity resulting from land- | | (Federal | | |
| use/crop patterns influenced by the | | State) | | |
| supported actions (extent, spatial | | | | |
| arrangement including height, colours) (%) | | | | |
| (b) of which due to environmental features | | | | |
| such as flora, fauna or habitats | | | | |
| directly/indirectly resulting from the | | | | |
| supported actions (%) (c) of which due to | | | | |
| man-made objects (hedgerows, ditches, | | | | |
| tracks) introduced/preserved by the | | | | |
| supported actions or the possibility, thanks | | | | |
| to support for vegetation management, of | | | | |
| viewing the landscape differentiation | | | | |
| (homogeneity / diversity) (%) | | | | |
| Additional attractive/valuable area or sites | The relationship between the areas that received the aid and the | Regional | ISTAT database | |

| due to assistance | measure is given by the assessment of the monetary help and the impact on the agricultural landscape | | | |
|---|--|----------|--|---------------------------|
| Characteristic landscape | Extensification of grassland use increases biodiversity which has positives effects on landscape characteristics (e.g. increased diversity). | | Frida database (DLR RNH): floristic and faunistic survey of 470 selected areas covering AEM participants and non-participants | |
| Measuring the attractiveness of the area: Effect of abandonment on the landscape | There is a casual chain between the link indicator and the programme. | Regional | National statistics on agricultural production and agri-environmental system commitments; | Needs further elaboration |
| Created natural areas (ha) | | National | Monitoring data, questionnaire or interviews. | |
| Ecological network connections (km) | | National | Monitoring data, questionnaire or interviews. | |

Table B7 Indicators for Animal Welfare

Setting up of farm management/advisory services (115)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|------------------------------------|--------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Number of farmers who use advisory | | National | Number of farmers who use advisory | Specify for animal welfare |
| services | | | services on sustainable land | issues |
| | | | management and sustainable | |
| | | | management of natural resources, | |
| | | | amount of payments realised. | |

Improvement of the economic value of forests (122)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|---|----------|------|
| Type of animal husbandry system after support: | (Changes in the indicator and impacts on animal welfare have not been | Regional | |
| share of particularly animal appropriate husbandry | assessed. Animal welfare aspects were only referred to in the synopsis of | | |
| systems; conversion from 'stanchion barns' to 'free | the assessment) | | |
| stall barn' | | | |

Adding value to agricultural/forestry products (123)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|---|----------|--|-----------------------------|
| Type of animal husbandry system after | | Regional | | |
| support: share of particularly animal | | | | |
| appropriate husbandry systems; conversion | | | | |
| from 'stanchion barns' to 'free stall barn' | | | | |
| A large set of ethological indicators | | Regional | IACS data, since sufficient husbandry | Needs further clarification |
| differentiated by functions (social | can be observed and measured through behavioural indicators. | (Federal | data are not available from secondary | |
| behaviour, movement, rest and sleep, food | Different husbandry systems affect animal behaviour and allow | States) | data, hence, a farmer survey was | |
| intake, excretion, reproduction, comfort and | animals to show different extents of natural behaviour patterns | | carried out to collate husbandry data. | |
| exploration) and animal species (cattle, | which can be measured through ethological indicators. | | | |
| pigs). | Ethological indicators are widely accepted as a sensitive | | | |
| | measure of animal welfare. | | | |
| Share animals on assisted holdings enjoying | | Regional | Regional monitoring system, the | |
| improved welfare thanks to assisted | information and promotion activities of agricultural quality | | sources also report uses national | |
| investments (%) (a) of which with animal | products, is linked with the impact indicator for the | | statistics (ISTAT) and the regional | |
| | improvement of animal welfare conditions occur indirectly | | database of the Italian network of | |
| animal welfare as a collateral effect (e.g., due | through assisted investments. | | agricultural accounting (RICA) | |
| to new housing or equipment acquired | | | provided by INEA for the years 2000- | |

| mainly for other reasons) (%) (c) of which | | | 2006. | |
|--|--|----------|--------------------------------------|--|
| related to welfare standards (%) (d) of | | | | |
| which related to EU-welfare standards (%) | | | | |
| Share of assisted products sold with quality | The introduction of innovative management projects are | Regional | Regional monitoring system, (ISTAT) | |
| label (%) (a) of which EU-level labelling | aiming to promote and develop methodologies and innovative | | and regional database of the Italian | |
| schemes (%) (b) of which national level | systems management and organization, with specific reference | | network of agricultural accounting | |
| labelling schemes (%) (c) of which other | to 'quality certification in agriculture', 'computerization in | | (RICA) | |
| labelling schemes (%) | agriculture' and 'food safety and traceability', these aspects are | | | |
| | linked with the measure and investments in agricultural farms. | | | |

Adaptation of demanding standards based on Community legislation (131)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data |
|---|---|----------|---|
| Share animals on assisted holdings enjoying | The measure 133 is related to the producer group support for information | Regional | Regional monitoring system, the sources also |
| improved welfare thanks to assisted investments | and promotion activities of agricultural quality products, is linked with the | | report uses national statistics (ISTAT) and the |
| (%) (a) of which with animal welfare as a direct aim | impact indicator for the improvement of animal welfare conditions occur | | regional database of the Italian network of |
| (%) (b) of which with animal welfare as a collateral | indirectly through assisted investments. | | agricultural accounting (RICA) provided by |
| effect (e.g., due to new housing or equipment | | | INEA for the years 2000-2006. |
| acquired mainly for other reasons) (%) (c) of which | | | |
| related to welfare standards (%) (d) of which related | | | |
| to EU-welfare standards (%) | | | |
| Share of assisted products sold with quality label | The introduction of innovative management projects are aiming to | Regional | Regional monitoring system, (ISTAT) and |
| (%) (a) of which EU-level labelling schemes (%) (b) | promote and develop methodologies and innovative systems management | | regional database of the Italian network of |
| of which national level labelling schemes (%) (c) of | and organization, with specific reference to 'quality certification in | | agricultural accounting (RICA) |
| which other labelling schemes (%) | agriculture', 'computerization in agriculture' and 'food safety and | | |
| | traceability', these aspects are linked with the measure and investments in | | |
| | agricultural farms. | | |

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|--------------|----------|--|---------|
| Action 3.3 Breeding animal species in | | Regional | UAA and regional agricultural database | |
| danger of extinction or % of area used for | | | | |
| any pets indicates the traditional farm | | | | |
| animal species with agri-environmental aid | | | | |
| Number of supported farms and number of | | National | IACS data | |
| contracts, and two additional output type | | | | |
| indicators were used number of supported | | | | |

| animals and area of grazed land | | | | |
|--|---|----------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Animal welfare: number of animals breeds |] | Regional | Data from RICA, FADN | |
| endangered subject of aid | | | | |
| Relationship between intensification and |] | Regional | UAA and regional UAA | Needs further clarification |
| extensification | | | | |
| Organic Farming -% of organic UAA in the |] | Regional | UAA and regional UAA | |
| total regional UAA | | | | |

First afforestation of non agricultural land (223) - Restoring forestry potential and introducing prevention actions (226)

| Indicator | Causal chain | Scale | Data | Comment |
|--|--------------|----------|--|-----------------------------|
| Action 3.3 Breeding animal species in | | Regional | UAA and regional agricultural database | |
| danger of extinction or % of area used for | | | | |
| any pets indicates the traditional farm | | | | |
| animal species with agri-environmental aid | | | | |
| Number of supported farms and number of | | National | IACS data | |
| contracts, and two additional output type | | | | |
| indicators were used number of supported | | | | |
| animals and area of grazed land | | | | |
| Animal welfare: number of animals breeds | | Regional | Data from RICA, FADN | |
| endangered subject of aid | | | | |
| Relationship between intensification and | | Regional | UAA and regional UAA | Needs further clarification |
| extensification | | | | |