



BEF  
LITHUANIA

BALTIJOS APLINKOS FORUMAS

EUROPEAN  
EVALUATION  
HELPDESK  
FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT



THÜNEN

Institute of Farm Economics

# IDENTIFICATION, MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT OF HNV FARMING – CURRENT APPROACHES IN EU MEMBER STATES

## SOME OBSERVATIONS FROM A HELPDESK SURVEY

Zymantas Morkvenas, BEF Lithuania  
Gerald Schwarz, Thünen Institute

Good Practice Workshop  
07th & 08th June 2016, Bonn





# Background and Objectives of the HNV survey

## Background:

- For the new period a complete picture is missing about the approaches taken by the Member States to identify HNV farming and on developments to improve the monitoring and assessment of HNV farming

## Objective and purpose of the survey:

- To take stock of the approaches chosen by Member States to identify, monitor and assess HNV farming (extent & quality) in the period 2014-2020
- To provide information and a summary for the Working Document “Overview of current practices to identify and monitor HNV farmland” .
- To provide an introduction to more detailed presentations and discussions at the workshop



# Survey themes and participation

Main themes and parts of the survey:

- Contact information
- Identification of HNV farming, including quality aspects, changes implemented and baseline
- Monitoring of HNV farming (extent, quality and trends)
- Assessment of HNV farming, further improvements planned

Survey participation:

- Good participation: Information from 21 Member States collected.
- Level of detail of responses very variable
- Follow-up after the workshop



This presentation can't and will not provide a complete overview of the responses but aims at highlighting some key observations and examples



# Identification of HNV farming - methodology

## General key characteristics:

- Most countries applied general classification of three different types of farmland to identify HNV farming. Example for derivations:
  - Only type 1 and type 2 have been used to identify HNV farming (e.g. ES-regions and SE)
- Development of HNV mapping tools (e.g. AT, BE-W, DE, DK, EE, SK and UK)
- Some countries used rather static parameters (e.g. protected area status) for identifying HNV – others (e.g. DK, UK, EE) used more dynamic approach based on e.g. actual occurrences of protected species;
- Data sources varies between standard EU databases (CORINE, IACS, LIPIS) and specific data gathered by expert surveys.

## Particular issues:

- PL has not determined a value for the HNV indicator, yet.



# Identification of HNV farming – definition HNV quality

## Different levels of sophistication followed, some examples:

- DK: scoring system (1-13 levels) counted annually;
- D: Grid-based mapping tools differentiate HNV quality into 3 levels (based on higher species and habitat structural diversity).
- RO, SE, SK: occurrence of indicator species for grasslands
- LT, SI: rely on the protected area status (Natura 2000) or habitat occurrence
- BE, FI, NL: is not monitoring quality of HNV, but working on methodology.



# Identification of HNV farming – changes to 2007/2013

**No (or minor) changes:** BE, DE, LT, FI, NL, SE, UK

**Under consideration:** HU, ES, RO, SI,

## **Examples for more significant changes introduced:**

- DK: Totally new mapping-based approach enabling assessment of areas outside Natura 2000;
- EE: New methodology and calculations for identifying HNV farmland proposed;
- IT: Expecting more detailed data availability for biodiversity;
- SK: New methodology considering extent and quality of HNV farming introduced in 2014.
- HU: New system is being introduced – currently in planning phase



# Identification of HNV farming – baseline

2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
								AT			
				DE(1)				DE (2)		DK	
			ES			ES	ES				
	FI										
		IT						IT	SE		

## Particular issues:

- FI: Annual data from previous programming period form baseline
- RO: Study carried out in 2015 to calculate baseline
- SI: Will use data calculated in the framework of the ex-post evaluation
- UK: Baseline defintion currently finalised.



# Monitoring of HNV farming – extent

## Monitoring and data sources:

- Wide range of data used reflecting the complexity of HNV definition(s), including agricultural and land use statistics, IACS data and different environmental monitoring data.
- HNV monitoring mainly relies on secondary data sources collected for other purposes
- Part of RDP related monitoring and data from paying agencies (e.g. HU, PL and RO)
- Part of more general monitoring of semi-natural grasslands and habitats (e.g. EE and SE)

## Frequencies of updates

- Frequency of updates varies between yearly (e.g. DK, FI, SK), biannual (e.g. LT) and 12 years (e.g. BE-W) , as well as irregular updates depending on data availability (ES-NV).
- Frequency of updates (partly) depends on, and reflects, types of data used.



# Monitoring of HNV farming – quality

Some general observations:

- Examples for data sources used: Agricultural land use data, Natura 2000 data, data on species composition (flora and fauna).
- HNV scores are used to assess quality (e.g. DK).
- Different quality categories are considered in HNV mapping tools (e.g. DE)
- Differentiation between indirect assessments using agricultural land use data (e.g. SI) and more direct biodiversity assessment using data from habitat monitoring.
- Examples of monitoring of semi-natural habitats:
  - Changes in vegetation composition reflect changes in management practices and HNV quality (e.g. EE, RO)
  - Combination of field inventory and aerial photos with more in-depth monitoring of flora and fauna species of selected grassland areas (e.g. SE)
- A number of Member States have not set up HNV quality monitoring (e.g. BE-W, FI, and NL).
  - Efforts needed to carry out quality monitoring in the future varies
  - Specific field studies used to test changes in indicators and quality (e.g. FI)



# Monitoring of HNV farming – trends

## General observations:

- Fewer replies on questions related to assessment of trends
- Decrease in the share of HNV farmland at the total agricultural area from 2008/9 to 2015 reported from a number of Member States (e.g. DE, FI and SI)
- In other cases the extent of HNV farmland remained constant over a similar period (e.g. BE-W and RO)
- In some cases baselines have been established and assessments of trends are envisaged in the future (e.g. DK, ES-regions and SK).

## Suggested improvements to assess in trends in the future:

- To assess trends in HNV-farming, biodiversity monitoring data are needed on a regular basis (e.g. BE-W, ES-regions)
- Extent can be regular assessed using GIS maps. Qualitative aspects require more data and specific research projects to fill the gap (e.g. LT)
- For better results of monitoring to exclude any areas with intensive land use (e.g. SI).



# Further improvements planned

Some suggestions made:

- Improvements of databases (e.g. LT, SE)
- Further development of type 3 HNV farmland (e.g. AT)
- Developing a method to assess the quality of HNV farming (e.g. ES-regions)
- Better utilisation for net-impact assessments in RDP evaluations (e.g. DE)
- Work on HNV farming systems and linking land cover to farms in order to assess impacts (e.g. IT).
- Review and adjustments of method to definitions of HNV-land and recalculation of baseline levels (e.g. SE).
- Setting up of new subgroups for monitoring different types of HNV (e.g. SK)
- Concern raised about the applicability of the HNV concept to intensive farming systems and about possible confusion due to parallel HNVF work going on



# In summary

## Emerging key issues

- The assessment of changes in the quality of HNV farming is currently restricted by available environmental monitoring data.
- But new approaches and methods to enable an assessment of HNV quality are emerging and will be pursued in this programming period.
- One particular emphasis is placed on GIS based mapping tools for HNV assessments
- HNV farmland just remnant areas – how does this fit with a systems approach?

## Key questions for today and tomorrow:

-  What lessons can be learnt from the following case studies and good practices?
-  How can practical solutions and recommendations be derived to improve the evaluation of impacts of RDP and CAP on HNV farming?



# Thank you for your attention



Contact: [zymantas.morkvenas@bef.lt](mailto:zymantas.morkvenas@bef.lt) & [gerald.schwarz@thuenen.de](mailto:gerald.schwarz@thuenen.de)