METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSMENT AND MAPPING OF ECOSYSTEM CONDITION AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES IN BULGARIA

PART B7

METHODOLOGY

for assessment and mapping of WETLAND ecosystems condition and their services in Bulgaria

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSMENT AND MAPPING
OF ECOSYSTEM CONDITION AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES IN BULGARIA

METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSMENT AND MAPPING
OF WETLAND ECOSYSTEMS CONDITION AND THEIR SERVICES IN BULGARIA

PART B7

ISBN 978-619-7379-14-3

Table of contents

1. Introduction

1.1. What is this methodology about?

The current methodology forms a part of the national methodological framework on mapping and assessment of ecosystem services which aims at streamlining the national ecosystems their biophysical assessment and mapping. The current methodology is not aimed at completing the full cycle of ecosystem service valuation and reporting. It delivers a practical step-by-step guidance to the process of:

1. Assessing the condition of the **Wetland**
2. Assessing the **Wetland ecosystems' potential to deliver ecosystem services** (biophysical valuation).

The methodology is relevant to wetland ecosystems on the entire territory of Bulgaria although its implementation will differ between NATURA 2000 zones and areas outside NATURA 2000 due to different data availability, land use and the spatial distribution of ecosystems. It will form a part of a wider national methodological framework (under development) which details the theoretical background behind the ecosystems approach practiced in Bulgaria, as well as the necessary steps to undertake towards fulfilling Action 5 of the EU Biodiversity strategy to 2020.

1.2. Who is this methodology for?

This methodology is to be used by:

Organizations and scientists who perform ecosystems condition assessment and biophysical valuation of ecosystem services. Such organizations are expected to include the beneficiaries/partners under the programmes that have set aside funding for the national process of ecosystems mapping and assessment – for NATURA 2000, the Operational Programme Environment 2014-2020 and outside NATURA 2000 – programme BG03 Biodiversity and ecosystem services 2009-2014;

National or local authorities who wish to contribute data they produce to the Bulgarian biodiversity information system;

Project promoters and partners under other projects, including for example research organizations and NGOs, who wish to perform:

- contribute to the national assessment results from their past or ongoing projects targeting wholly or in part a more detailed ecosystem biophysical valuation and ecosystem services assessment on a regional or local scale in smaller scale pilots
- plan future projects to complement the national scale assessment and valuation

Data users wishing to understand the contents and collection method of data, including but not limited to, organizations involved in environmental reporting, regional and local authorities, environmentally responsible companies, NGOs, and other stakeholders.

1.3. How to use this methodology?

The methodological framework provides a combination of information on relevant information sources that may be of interest to a wider circle of stakeholders, while the current

methodology is dedicated to specific guidance to assessing ecosystem status and ecosystem services (including data collection and verification, and mapping guidance).

The wider introductory parts are more likely to be of interest to policymakers and the general public. The more targeted use defined in the current methodology will be mostly needed by professionals involved in the national mapping and assessment exercise.

As the current methodology is a living document, comments are welcome in order to shape it as a national, widely reviewed and adopted guidance document.

2. Typology of ecosystems in Bulgaria

2.1. General typology of Wetland ecosystems

We consider "wetlands" as natural vegetation types, with the water table at or above ground level for at least part of the year, dominated by herbaceous or peat forming vegetation. The water body and rock structure of springs, waterlogged habitats dominated by trees or large shrubs are excluded. Note that habitats that intimately combine waterlogged mires and vegetation rafts with pools of open water are considered as complexes. This ecosystem type is very vulnerable because it entirely depends on the continuous water availability. A "wetland ecosystem" includes dynamic associations of different plant species, fauna, soils, water, and the atmosphere.

The proposed typology of "Wetlands" corresponds with the ecosystem classification of MAES (2013) combined with the European Nature Information System (EUNIS) habitat classification types. It is also related to some of CORINE Land Cover (CLC) classes The MAES ecosystem typology on Level 2 follows closely the EUNIS Level 1. The third level of the MAES typology corresponds therefore to the EUNIS level 2. The EUNIS level 2 will be the base for the mapping and assessment approach.

Table 1. Typology of Wetland ecosystems in Bulgaria

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Terrestrial	**Wetlands**	D2. Valley mires, poor fens and transition mires
		D4. Base-rich fens and calcareous spring mires
		D5. Sedge and reedbeds, normally without free-standing water

2.2. Detailed typology of Wetland ecosystems

A selection of EUNIS classification on level 2 is proposed for detailed typology as level 3 for target ecosystem type. Some wetland types are selected. They correspond to levels "D2", "D4" and "D5" from EUNIS group "D". The proposed ecosystem types are modified to a certain degree so that they can reflect more precisely the peculiarities of the Bulgarian natural habitats. Descriptions and relations to other classification systems of proposed subtypes of are offered in Table 2.

Table 2. Wetland ecosystem typology (Level 3)

№	Subtype	Description	Nomenclature(s)
1.	Valley mires, poor fens and transition mires	Acid peatlands, flushes and vegetated rafts formed by receiving water from the surrounding landscape or are intermediate between land and water. Included are quaking bogs and vegetated non-calcareous springs. Excluded are calcareous fens and reedbeds.	EUNIS – D2; Bondev (1991)- 5; HD 92/42/EEC – 7140
2.	Base-rich fens and calcareous spring mires	Peatlands, flushes and vegetated springs with calcareous or eutrophic ground water, within river valleys, alluvial plains, or on hillsides. As in poor fens, the water level is at or near the surface of the substratum and peat formation depends on a permanently high water table. Excluded are reedbeds.	EUNIS –D4 , HD 92/42/EEC – 7210, 7230
3.	Sedge and reedbeds, normally without free-standing water	Sedge and reedbeds forming terrestrial mire habitats, not closely associated with open water. Excluded are reedbeds and sedges where they form emergent or fringing vegetation beside water bodies.	EUNIS – D5; Bondev (1991)- 145;

3. Data availability

3.1. Existing data sources, gaps, uncertainty of data

For mapping and assessing of wetland ecosystem conditions and services the most significant stage is the availability of data. In this section we give a short overview of the data used to map and assess ecosystem state and services in the smaller scale, concerning wetland ecosystems. We then put this in the context of data available at the national level. In order to identify the data used for the quantification of ES, we focused on the parameters included in the tables, used as a basis for the primary and optional indicators proposed. For each parameter, we identified and grouped the type of data used (e.g. land cover maps, land property maps, cadastre, statistics). Available spatial and quantitative database for wetland territories can be found free of charge or after special request to the stakeholders.

Data sources in this guidance include point data (sampled observations from scientific papers), regional data (information and project reports), and data covering European and national extents.

Modeling data could be applied for some parameters and indicators, if models are validated for the specific ecosystems. These parameters could create indicators for the ecosystem condition.

The most commonly used data to derive ecosystem's condition and services indicators were land use/cover maps, national statistics, soil data, and vegetation maps. These data sources include a wide variety of data types including hydrological maps, soil characteristics, pollution data, visitor counts, but also local land cover maps and goods and products statistics. Some European data

available could be applied at national scale, where there are gaps defined. Land cover and vegetation data, obtained using satellite imagery, are widely available and often free of charge.
National statistics are available from the national database which has wide coverage. This data availability is also reflected in some ecosystem services that are mapped at regional level. Local data are needed to quantify supporting or cultural ES. Cultural services such as spiritual or aesthetic enjoyment are very local (i.e. reflect the uniqueness of particular landscape, rare species, traditional activities or historical heritage) with variation from individuals to cultural groups; therefore many data sources can be used. Supporting services could be mapped in terms of habitat suitability, often using sub-national species distribution data and conservation indices.
In the tables proposed there is a list of parameters for primarily and optional indicators found in our review. Primary indicators are mandatory, while optional are those for which there are no data at all and additional investigations and/or case-studies are needed. The majority of these is case-specific and could be produced by several research groups.
As mentioned earlier, for a few parameters and the corresponding data types used (such as tourist information data) the data is missing, but the intention to generate such data is underlined.
The available data sources at national level, which cover the information needed for indicators proposed and relevant parameters are National Plans and Strategies, Master Plans for Municipalities, National Concept for Regional Development, NATURA 2000 habitat mapping, Scientific publications, EU data sources, National data (MOEW, MAF, ME, MRD), National Statistics and other sources – see Annex 5 of part A of METHODOLOGY.

Table 3. Sources of spatial and quantitative/qualitative database

Ecosystem subtype	DATABASE Sources – main stakeholders	
	Spatial	Quantitative/Qualitative
Valley mires, poor fens and transition mires	Maps of Restored Property, MOEW - CORINE project, national data bases; NATURA 2000 mapping and database; Additional remote sensing data	MOEW - CORINE project, national data bases; NATURA 2000 mapping and database; Scientific publications
Base-rich fens and calcareous spring mires	Maps of Restored Property, MOEW - CORINE project, national data bases; NATURA 2000 mapping and database; Additional remote sensing data	MOEW - CORINE project, national data bases; NATURA 2000 mapping and database; Scientific publications
Sedge and reedbeds, normally without free-standing water	Maps of Restored Property, MOEW - CORINE project, national data bases; NATURA 2000 mapping and database; Additional remote sensing data	MOEW - CORINE project, national data bases; NATURA 2000 mapping and database; Scientific publications

4. Mapping of ecosystem types

4.1. Description of the mapping procedure

The workflow for mapping of ecosystem types comprises several main steps:

- Generation of vector dataset with representation of polygon, polyline, or point features each of them containing information on level 3 ecosystem type;
- Assembling the product in the geodatabase schema provided in the Annex 9 (Annex 9.00_EcosystemDatabase_Schema);
- Validation of the product accuracies, described in point 4.6. of this methodology;
- Preparation of digital maps of ecosystem types;
- Generation of metadata.

The specifications of the final product should follow the requirements provided in this section. As the outcome of each mapping project will be used for preparation of national dataset for ecosystem types at level 3, it is mandatory to follow each requirement described below.

4.2. Data format

Output data have to be delivered in GIS compatible vector format - geospatial standards of OGC and INSPIRE.

The vector format should be with the following topology:

– One complete coverage in a single layer – in case all the ecosystems are presented as one geometry type;

– In case the different ecosystem types are represented with different geometry type, up to 3 layers could be delivered – one for polygon, one for polyline and one for point features.

– The vector layer has to be delivered in topologically correct geometries: see rules in http://help.arcgis.com/en/arcgisdesktop/10.0/help/index.html#/An_overview_of_topology_in_ArcGIS/006200000001000000/.

4.3. Geographic projection / Reference system

Vector layer should be delivered in ETRS89-LAEA. The description and definition of ETRS89 is based on the convention of ISO19111, the 'Spatial referencing by coordinates' standard. For further documentation on ETRS89, see:

http://inspire.jrc.ec.europa.eu/documents/Data_Specifications/INSPIRE_DataSpecification_RS_v3.2.pdf, and;

http://www.eionet.eu.int/gis

4.4. Geometric resolution – Scale and Minimum Mapping Units

The source data which will be used for the ecosystem type mapping vary in their geometric resolution, as well as the level of detailisation of different ecosystem types. Hence, the output vector dataset containing the graphical representation of the ecosystem types should be delivered in scale between 1:10 000 and 1:25 000, depending on:

– source data used;

– ecosystem type on level 3.

The minimum mapping area should be between 0.1 and 0.25 ha also depending on the source data used and ecosystem type mapped. The same apply for minimum mapping width for representing linear features: minimum 10 and up to 30m.

4.5. Data structure/schema

The data structure should follow the one provided in the Annex 9.00 – both on number of vector and tables delivered, as well as the structure of each feature class and tables, and nomenclatures provided in the same Annex. The database schema in Annex 9.00 is provided in XML and Personal DataBaseformat – OCG and INSPIRE compatible.

The schema of the database for the ecosystem types is the following:



The detailed technical description of the classes and tables of the ecosystem types database is provided in Annex 9.01_Schema_Report_ES_Database / 9.01_1_Schema_Report_ES_Database.htm.

The main steps of generation of the geodatabase are the following:

- Feature Class **“EcoUnit”:** This is the vector feature class which contains the information on ecosystem types at level 3. The attribute fields of the feature class which have to be filled are as follows:

- EcoUnit_ID: each object should have unique ID;

- EcosystemType_Code: this field should contain 3 digit value of the ecosystem type at level 3. The value for the ecosystem code should be taken from the nomenclature table N_EcosystemType/EcosystemType_Code provided in Annex 9.02_NOMENCLATURES_XLS. This field is used for relating all the tables and feature classes in the database.

Since, the object geometry of the different ecosystem types could be point, polyline, or polygon, up to 3 feature classes **"EcoUnit"** could be generated and named as follows:

- **EcoUnit_pnt**: for objects with point geometry;

- **EcoUnit_pln**: for objects with polyline geometry;

- **EcoUnit_pgn**: for objects with polygon geometry.

- Table **"N_EcosystemType"**: Nomenclature table for ecosystem type levels at level 2 and 3. This table should not be changed. It has the following fields:

- EcosystemType_Code: integer codes for ecosystem types at level 2 and 3;

- EcosystemType_Name_BG: names in Bulgarian of ecosystem types at level 2 and 3;

- EcosystemType_Name_BG: names in English of ecosystem types at level 2 and 3;

- EcosystemType_Level: check field defining the level of each ecosystem type with values 2, for level 2 and 3 for level 3;

- Table **"EcosystemType_Metadata"**: Table providing information on datasources used when defining the ecosystem type for each feature from the Feature Class **"EcoUnit"**:

- EcoUnit_ID: field to relate with the feature class;

- EcosystemType_Code: integer codes for ecosystem types at level 3;

- Source: free description of the source used to map the specific ecosystem type for each feature;

- Source_Date: date of the source used to map the specific ecosystem type for each feature;

- Table **"EcosystemType_Validation"**: Table providing information on work performed to validate the thematic accuracy for the final product:

- EcoUnit_ID: field to relate with the feature class;

- EcosystemType_Code_M: integer codes for ecosystem types at level 3 of the final product;

- EcosystemType_Code_V: integer codes for ecosystem types at level 3 derived in the validation process;

- Source_V: free description of the source used to validate the ecosystem type;

- Source_Date_V: date of the source used in the validation.

4.6. Thematic accuracy and validation

The overall thematic accuracy for all ecosystem types should be >=85%.

The validation should be based on scientifically sound approach used for validation of the product thematic accuracy.

Apart from providing information in Table **"EcosystemType_Validation"**, the validation should be accompanied by Quality Control/Quality Check Reports for each ecosystem type.

4.7. Digital Maps for Ecosystem Types

Maps in scale 1:125 000 for the ecosystem types should be in PDF at size A2. In addition the maps could also be prepared in paper format in the same size.

Each data frame should contain one cell from the EEA reference grid at 50 km; hence up to 77 maps could be produced for all the cells from the 50km EEA gird for Bulgaria. In case that no objects from Feature Class **"EcoUnit"** fall in certain cell, map for this cell should not be delivered. Therefore, the actual number of maps to be delivered will depend on the number of cells that contain at least one object from Feature "**Class EcoUnit**". The EEA reference grid is available at:

http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/eea-reference-grids/

Color codes for visualization of the ecosystem types at level 3 should be in accordance to these used in the European Map of Ecosystem types:

http://biodiversity.europa.eu/maes/mapping-ecosystems/map-of-european-ecosystem-types

The technical details for the map, as well as color codes are accessible at:

http://projects.eionet.europa.eu/eea-ecosystem-assessments/library/draft-ecosystem-map-europe/

The ecosystem types in the European Map of Ecosystem types are defined based on EUNIS classification. Hence, not all of the level 3 types determined for Bulgaria will correspond to the European ones. In this case, similar color codes should be used, which are closer to these of EUNIS classes. When generating these color codes the guideline of EEA should be used, available here:

http://www.eionet.europa.eu/gis/docs/EEA%20Corporate%20identity%20manual%20Map%20colour%20guide.pdf

The layout of the maps of the ecosystem types should follow the guidelines of EEA:

http://www.eionet.europa.eu/gis/docs/GISguide_v4_EEA_Layout_for_map_production.pdf

4.8. Metadata

Each dataset should be accompanied by INSPIRE conformal metadata. The minimum requirement is the metadata to be generated using the INSPIRE MetadataEditor: http://inspire-geoportal.ec.europa.eu/editor/

5. Assessment of Wetland ecosystems condition

5.1. Assessment of Ecosystem condition

Step 1: Identify the indicators of ecosystem condition for the given ecosystem type - level 3
Indicators are a subset of the many possible attributes that could be used to quantify the condition of a particular landscape, catchment or ecosystem (Walker 1998). According to MAES (2013) choice of indicators should be seen not only by the need to be mapped, but it is essential subsequently to be used for further assessment of ecosystems and the services they provide. In this regard the indicators have to be able to:

- provide information to policy makers and the wider public on the current state and changes in the conditions of the environment in wetlands;
- assist policy makers to better understand the linkages between the causes and effects of the impact of wetlands on the environment, and help to guide their responses to changes in environmental conditions;
- contribute to monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of policies in promoting sustainable management.

There are potentially a large number of indicators that could be developed to help quantify the various components of environment. To assist in the choice of an operational set of indicators within this framework each indicator has to be examined against four general criteria:

- policy relevance- the criterion of policy relevance relates to those identified environmental characteristics as being of importance to policy makers. While the list of indicators is evolving, it must be flexible so as to incorporate new indicators or abandon old ones where is needed;
- analytical soundness - the criterion of analytical soundness concerns, in particular, the extent to which the indicator can establish environmental characteristics, and thus refers more specifically to the attributes which provide the basis to measure the indicator. It should also be possible for the indicator to explain an environmental characteristics which is easy to interpret and applicable to a wide set of wetland ecosystems. The indicator should also be able to show trends and ranges of values over time, which might be complemented by nationally defined targets and thresholds where these exist;
- primary data contribution and measurability - the criterion of measurability, relates to the appropriate data available to measure the indicator. The indicator should be developed from established national or sub-national data, scientific data and publications, data from other data sets available in third parties preferably using an expert based and long time series where this is available given the lengthy time period for many environmental effects to become apparent. Present work has

revealed that while a considerable national and state database exists from which to calculate indicators, problems of data gathering, data providing, definitions, quality, the regularity of data collection and methods of indicator measurement remain obstacles to progressing the work on certain indicators;

• level of aggregation - the criterion of the level of aggregation seeks to determine at which level (i.e. sectoral, regional, national), the indicator can be meaningfully applied for policy purposes and not to conceal more than it reveals. This criterion highlights the issue of encapsulating the spatial and temporal diversity of the environment and the geographical scale of different environmental characteristics ranging from the single region to the global scale. In many cases national data is often collected on the basis of political and/or administrative units, such as sub-national regions (regions, districts, municipalities). There is no unique way to address the aggregation issue for each indicator and it is most effectively tackled pragmatically, on an issue-by-issue and indicator-by-indicator basis. Nevertheless, methods to provide national level indicators that take into account spatial diversity have to be assessed and developed based on spatial databases available at national and European level (CORINE, GMES) and for the purposes of facilitating international comparison.

The proposed condition indicators assess the state of wetland ecosystems, their structure and functional processes. We have defined and quantified 8 primary indicators that are relevant for the wetland ecosystem conditions. The indicators represent the ecosystems structure and ecosystem processes of wetland types. These indicators are listed in Table 4 below. Each of the selected indicators is enough informative.

Table 4. Rationales of ecosystem condition's indicators

Ecosystem condition indicator group	Indicators/Rationales
Biotic diversity	Spatial or temporal variability of resources. Biotic diversity is caused by organisms. It may occur even in absence of abiotic heterogeneity. Positive relationships between plant species habitat heterogeneity and animal species diversity are well documented on different scales (Davidowitz&Rosenzweig, 1998), but empirical and theoretical studies have showed contradictory results (Tews et al., 2004). Effects of biotic heterogeneity may vary considerably depending on what is perceived as a habitat by the species group studied. Structural attributes of the vegetation that constitute habitat heterogeneity for one group may be perceived as habitat fragmentation by another taxonomic group (e.g. Okland, 1996). To determine biotic factors and wetland habitat diversity the following **primary indicators** are proposed: "Ecosystem presence" *"Plant diversity" ,* *"Animal diversity",* *"Invasive species",*

Ecosystem condition indicator group	Indicators/Rationales
Biotic diversity	Possible (optional) indicators are: Plant and animal diversity indicators are of primary importance, positively correlated to the biotic diversity. Alien/invasive species although contributing to the overall diversity are negatively correlated to the ecosystem condition. **Possible (optional) indicators are:** *"Other biotic diversity indicators (for example, naturalness, habitat diversity, etc.)".* The ecosystem service projects using other indicators, must define them consistently to the current methodology.
Abiotic heterogeneity	Spatial or temporal variability of abiotic resources and factors. Abiotic heterogeneity has abiotic origin. To determine abiotic factors and abiotic heterogeneity the following **primary indicators** are proposed: *"Soil heterogeneity",* *"Hydrological heterogeneity"* *"Disturbance regime",* Possible (optional) indicators are: *"Geomorphological heterogeneity",* *"Other abiotic heterogeneity indicators"* The ecosystem service projects using other indicators, must define them consistently to the current methodology.
Energy budget	Energy is an essential functional characteristic of ecosystems and of the biosphere as a whole. At the most fundamental level, what ecosystems do is to capture and transform energy. To account energy budget in wetland ecosystems possible (optional) indicators are: "*Energy balance (capture, storage)*", "*Metabolic efficiency*", "*Other energy budget indicators*" The ecosystem service projects using other indicators, must define them consistently to the current methodology.
Matter budget	Matter budget describes the cycle in which matter is transformed from one state to another within the components of wetland ecosystems. To account matter budget in wetland ecosystems the proposed **primary indicator** is : *"Matter storage"*

Ecosystem condition indicator group	Indicators/Rationales
Matter budget	Other possible (optional) indicators are: *"Matter balance (input, output)"* *"Element concentrations (other state variables)"* *"Efficiency measures"* The ecosystem service projects using other indicators, must define them consistently to the current methodology.
Water budget	Water budget describes the cyclical movement of water between the atmosphere and the ground surface in wetland areas, considering precipitation, evaporation, and runoff. The following **primary indicator** is proposed: *"Water balance (input, output)",* Other possible (optional) indicators are: *"Water storage",* *"Other state indicators",* *"Efficiency measures"* The ecosystem service projects using other indicators, must define them consistently to the current methodology.

Step 2: Identify the parameters and dimensions of each indicator

For the set of indicators describing wetland ecosystem conditions different parameters of evaluation are proposed They are listed in *Annex 6*. In fact, for some indicators there are relevant parameters in current inventories database (biodiversity –plant and/or animal, landcover, etc.). All parameters of one indicator are informative for the ecosystem condition and the scoring depend on the specific case-study and availability of data. For the parameters with no available data (and need for additional studies) relevant models could be used (if applicable) and/or additional case-studies and *in-situ* verification could be performed, if experts opinion requires such activity. These parameters are desirable to be included in the general assessment of selected indicator. Considering the number of proposed parameters, the number of parameter combinations is very large, which ensures the assessment quality of the ecosystems condition.

Step 3: Collecting data – national data sets

Given the broad spectrum of scientific disciplines that cover the concept of ecosystem condition and services, a full assessment of the impact of drivers and pressures requires an interdisciplinary data combining approach. Such integrated assessment needs to be translated into suitable indicators for wetland ecosystem condition and services and subsequently to the benefits obtained from these services. Clearly, such development requires, strong scientific cooperation and considerable IT efforts (for instance see Schröter et al. 2005; Metzger et al. 2008). The availability of ecosystem conditions data for smaller regions varies greatly by location and by the

kind of data required for each indicator. In some cases, data constraints at local scales will be greater than at regional scale. For some data international sources of information can be used and applied. Because the data will be needed at multiple scales, in spatial and non-spatial formats, and include ancillary information to support normalization and disaggregation, different sources of information will need to be used.

The proposed methods are designed to minimize measurement problems and maximize the ability to make a plausible (if not definitive) case for demonstrating activity impacts within resource constraints for carrying out monitoring and evaluation activities.

Data collection must be ensured by two main approaches: (i) data gathering and acquisition through national statistical data sets and (ii) data acquisition *in situ* on the field ongoing throughout the growing season.
There is clearly potential for developing the links between measuring indicators addressing this issue and available national data sources. For some of the developed indicators, preliminary work on data gathering and measurement could be applied.
Some of data underlined are highly relevant for establishing indicators (Statistics, reports, remote-sensing, EU and national database), but other data sources as additional measurements must also be utilized.
In order to assess the current conditions of wetland ecosystems, information about the parameters should be collected for a minimum of 3 (three) years. Depending on parameter type of reporting and/or availability of data, shorter or longer periods are also eligible, but information collected should be enough informative.
The following data sources are to be considered:

- *MOEW - ExEA - CORINE project, national data bases*
- *MoAF - National annual Agro statistical reports, Agro statistical surveys - BANSIK, FADN, LUCAS*
- *Scientific publications*
- *Insitu data*
- *EU data sources*
- *Additional remote sensing data*

Step 4: How to assess

For each indicator's parameters for each ecosystem subtype (level 3) of wetlands should be considered range scores accordingly ecosystem's specifics. These scores classes ranged from 1-very bad to 5 very good. The range of each class depends of expert's best knowledge or real data available or data collected during in situ validation of ecosystem condition mapping procedure. When some parameters (for example presence of alien/invasive species) could be measured by different approaches for target ecosystem's polygons only one real data should be choosen. For wetlands the cover of mosses should be calculated in parameter “vegetation cover”.
An example of score classes for mandatory and some possible (optional) indicators and their parameters for wetland ecosystems are indicated in Table 5.

Table 5. Ecosystem condition indicators assessment/scoring for Wetland ecosystems

WETLANDS										
Ecological condition indicators		Indicator	Parameter	Unit	Measurement approach	Assessment scale				
Type	Indicator Group					Score 1 (very bad)	Score 2 (bad)	Score 3 (moderate)	Score 4 (good)	Score 5 (very good)
Ecosytem structure	Biotic diversity	Ecosystem presence	Ecosystem sub-type cover within the polygon	Percent of the wetland subtype coverage withtin the plot area	Estimation	<10%	11-30%	31-50%	51-70%	>70%
		Plant diversity	Plant species richness	number of species per sample plot	Calculation	<5	6-10	11-20	21-30	>30
		Animal diversity	Wild animal species richness	number of species per sample plot area	Calculation	<20	21-50	51-100	101-150	>150
		Alien and invasive species	Alien and invasive species presence	Number per unit area OR Percent cover of alien/invasive species per polygon	Number per grid unit of national data OR Cover per sample plot	>10 >15%	7-9 10-15%	4-6 4-10%	1-3 1-3%	0 0%
		Other biotic diversity indicators	Red list species (plant/ animal) presence	number of species per grid unit OR Presence of species of conservation importance in ecosystem polygon	Grid data according to the Red Data Book of Bulgaria	0 conservation species in polygon	1-4 At least 1 Balkan endemic species in polygon	5-11 Presence of Vulnerable species in polygon	12-22 Presence of Endangered species in polygon	>22 At least 1 Critically endangered species in polygon
	Abiotic heterogeneity	Soil heterogeneity	Soil quality	Soil type	Assessment by soil map	Anthrosols	Arenosols	All other types	Gleysols	Histosols
			Soil organic matter	Percent	Estimation according EU map	<2.5%	2.6-5%	6-10%	11-15%	16-25%
			pH of the soil (for sedge and reedbeds)	Scale	pH meter	<4,0	4,0-4,50	4,50-5,0	5,0-6,30	>6,30
			Proportion of organic C and total N in the soil (orgC/totN)	Scale	mg/kg	<4,0	< 8	8-10	10-12	< 12

WETLANDS										
Ecological condition indicators		Indicator	Parameter	Unit	Measurement approach	Assessment scale				
Type	Indicator Group					Score 1 (very bad)	Score 2 (bad)	Score 3 (moderate)	Score 4 (good)	Score 5 (very good)
Ecosytem structure	Abiotic heterogeneity	Hydrological heterogeneity	General chemistry of the water(pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, ammonium nitrogen, nitrate nitrogen, phosphate, BOD5)	....						
		Disturbance regime	Fire	number of recorded fires	Number per grid unit for the last year	>4	3	2	1	0
		Other abiotic heterogeneity indicators	Concentration of pollutants in soil from surrounding areas	number of dump sites	number per grid unit	>3	3	2	1	0
Ecosystem processes	Matter budget	Matter storage	Biomass	t/ha (air dry)	Estimation/ Assessment by available data	⩽1,5	1,6-2	2,1-3	3,1-5	>5,1
	Water budget	Water balance	Water balance input/output	Number of springs within wetland area and 500m around	Calculation based on topographic map	0	1	2	3	>3
		Water storage	Precipitation	mm/season or months	data from NIMH					

Periodic measurements and comparison of parameter values need to be carried out, in order to verify authenticity of the data obtained within the assesment of ecosystem condition. Periodicity of the measurement approaches, will be described in the Monitoring guide.

The above listed indicators were chosen with aim to serve for a comprehensive assessment of the condition (state) of this ecosystem type. They must be used as described in the present methodology. At the same time, the team realizing the practical assessment may add and test in assessment, after using the above listed, other new indicators – which are being recently developed and under development on European and national level or based on the good practices and practical experience - that the experts involved will consider useful, adequate or more appropriate for the purpose to comprehensively assess the ecosystem condition. Such indicators must be used by the same

methodological manner – by determining parameters, units, measurement and assessment scale from 1 to 5, and must consist with the MAES research activities, guidelines and reports on the EU scale. The more convenient indicators to assess ecosystem condition are those reflecting naturalness, wilderness, status of representative species or species group and communities, high nature value areas, etc, which can rely with the mapping scale. More information regarding the efforts at the EU level to determine the most adequate and appropriate indicators to the ecosystem condition can be obtained via the web-pages of the institutions and research centers involved, for example http://projects.eionet.europa.eu/eea-ecosystem-assessments/library, where can be found publications such as "Developing conceptual framework for ecosystem mapping - part B Ecosystem condition mapping (draft)" and other relevant documents.

Such new indicators, proposed and tested in the course of the practical assessment, must be described in the final reports for task accomplishment and motivated proposals have to be made for the use of the indicators on question in future assessments. At the same time comments and estimations regarding the usefulness and applicability of the indicators listed in this methodology have to be made, on a basis of the experience acquired in their use.

To clarify this step, an example is proposed in table 6.

Table 6. Ecosystem condition indicator assessment template and calculation - example.

The proposed example relates to the wetland ecosystem type in the region of Aldomirovtsi marsh area, Sofia district. This object has ben selected because it is well studied and is a remarkable site for birds, there are rare plants and the territory of the wetland is relatively large.

Indicator type	Indicator group	Indicator	Parameter	Units	Real data measured	Score	Data source
Ecosystem structure	Abiotic heterogeneity	Soil heterogeneity	Soil quality	Soil type	Vertisols	3	Kopralev 2002
			Soil organic matter	percent	20	5	Kopralev 2002
		Hydrological heterogenenity	chemistry of the water(pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, ammonium nitrogen, nitrate nitrogen, phosphate, BOD5)	score			
		Disturbance regime	Concentration of pollutants in soil from surrounding areas	number	0	5	Field observation data

Indicator type	Indicator group	Indicator	Parameter	Units	Real data measured	Score	Data source
Ecosystem structure	Abiotic heterogeneity	Disturbance regime	Fire	number	0	5	Data base of fires for 2009-2012 Map from Directorate Fire Safety and Civil Protection
	Biotic diversity	Plant diversity	Vegetation cover	percent	100%	5	Apostolova et al. 2001
			Plant species richness (per 100 sq. m)	number	24	4	Apostolova et al. 2001
			Red species richness	number	4	2	Red book
		Animal diversity	Animal species richness	number	-	-	No data found
			Red species richness	number	14	4	Data from NATURA programme for Dragoman district
		Invasive species	Alien invasive species presence	number	1	4	Petrova, Vladimirov & Georgiev 2012
Ecosystem processes	Matter budget	Matter storage	Biomass	t/ha	15.36	5	Kochev & Yurukova 1984
	Water budget	Water balance	Water balance input/output	score	0	1	Topographic map

$\Sigma n_i = 46$; $\Sigma n_i(max) = 60$; $n = 12$

$IP = 46/60 = 0.766$

Explanation: for every indicator, according to their parameter measurement, an expert assessment in scores from 1 to 5 is assigned, according to the scale in Table 5.

The assessment score for every parameter measured are then summed up (n_i).

An index of ecosystem performance (IP) is then calculated, as the ratio of the sum of the parameter assessment scores to the maximum possible parameter sum: - $IP=n_i/n_{i(max)}$,

Where:

Σn_i – sum of parameter assessment

$\Sigma n_{i(max)}$ – sum of the maximum of parameter assessment (i.e. n *5)

IP – a real number with values between 0 and 1.

The IP assessment scores for the different conditions of the ecosystem are as follows:

IP 0-0,2 – very bad, 0,21-0,4 – bad, 0,41-0,6 – moderate, 0,61-0,8 – good, 0,81-1,0 – very good,

In our case the ecosystem condition is 0,766 – good

5.2. Mapping of Ecosystem condition

5.2.1. Description of the mapping procedure

The workflow for mapping of ecosystem condition follows the steps described in section 5.1. The technical characteristics of the geodatabase are provided in section 4 and should be applied also for mapping procedures in this section.

5.2.2. Data structure/schema

The data structure should follow the one provided in the Annex 9.00.

The schema of the database for the ecosystem states is the following:



The detailed technical description of the classes and tables of the ecosystem condition database is provided in Annex 9.01_Schema_Report_ES_Database/
9.01_1_Schema_Report_ES_Database.htm

The main steps of generation of the geodatabase should follow the steps described in section 5.1.:

- Table **"N_EcosystemCondition"**: Nomenclature table for ecosystem condition indicators. This table should not be changed. The nomenclatures are given in Annex 9.02_NOMENCLATURES_XLS / N_EcosystemCondition.xls. It has the following fields:

- EcosystemConditionIndicator_Code: integer codes for ecosystem condition indicators at level 3;

- EcosystemConditionIndicator_Name_EN: names in English of ecosystem condition indicators at level 3;

- ESSt_Level1_Name_EN: names in English of ecosystem condition indicators at level 1;

- ESSt_Level1_Code: integer code of ecosystem condition indicators at level 1;

- ESSt_Level2_Name_EN: names in English of ecosystem condition indicators at level 2;

- ESSt_Level2_Code: integer code of ecosystem state indicators at level 2;

- Table **"N_EcosystemConditionIndicator_Parameters"**: Nomenclature table of parameters used to determine the ecosystem condition indicator. The nomenclatures are given in Annex 9.02_NOMENCLATURES_XLS / N_EcosystemConditionIndicator_Parameter.xls. It has the following fields:

- EcosystemConditionIndicator_Code: integer codes for ecosystem state indicators at level 3;

- ESSt_Parameter_Code: integer codes for parameters used to assess the ecosystem indicators at level 3;

- ESSt_Parameter_Name: name of parameters used to assess the ecosystem indicators at level 3;

- UnitOfMeasurement: units of measurement for each parameter.

This nomenclature table should be generated using the example provided in Annex 9.02_NOMENCLATURES_XLS / N_EcosystemConditionIndicator_Parameter.xls, as well as the Table 5. *Ecosystem condition indicator assessment for XXX ecosystems*.

- Table **"EcosystemConditionIndicator_Values"**: This table is the resulting table from the assessment of the ecosystem indicators. How to perform the work on assessment of the indicators is described in Step 4 in section 5.1:

- EcoUnit_ID: field to relate with the feature class;

- EcosystemType_Code: integer codes for ecosystem types at level 3;

- EcosystemConditionIndicator_Code: integer codes for ecosystem condition indicators at level 3;

- ESSt_Parameter_Code: integer codes for parameters used to assess the ecosystem indicators at level 3;

- ESSt_Parameter_Value: value of calculated parameter used to assess the ecosystem indicators at level 3;

- Validity_FromDate: starting date for validity of the parameter;

- Validity_ToDate: end date for validity of the parameter;

- ESSt_Parameter_Source: free text to describe the source of the data used to calculate the value of the parameter;

- EcosystemConditionScore_Results: final score for each parameter calculated using the guidelines provided in Table 5. The values here should be between 1 and 5;

As this resulting table could contain enormous number of records which some GIS software could not support it is acceptable to separate it into smaller tables. In this case the records in the table should be separated based on the ecosystem types at level 3. The naming of the table should be done in the following way:

"EcosystemConditionIndicator_Values_XXX" – where XXX is the code of the ecosystem type at level 3.

- Table **"EcosystemConditionIndicator_Score"**: As for some indicator more than one parameter could be selected for measurement, additional table is required which represents the total score for each condition indicator calculated from the total score of parameters measured. Because some of the parameters could be more important than others, it is of responsibility of the expert to choose what will be the final score based on the values of the parameters calculated:

- EcoUnit_ID: field to relate with the feature class;

- EcosystemType_Code: integer codes for ecosystem types at level 3;

- EcosystemConditionIndicator_Code: integer codes for ecosystem condition indicators at level 3;

- EcosystemConditionScore: final score for each indicator calculated on the base of all parameters selected for its evaluation. The values here should be between 1 and 5;

In order the database to be more informative, one table for each condition indicator at level 3 should be prepared and named as follows: "**EcosystemConditionIndicator_Score_YYY"** where YYY is the code for condition indicators at level 3.

- Table **"EcosystemCondition_IP_Results"**: This table is the resulting table from the assessment of the ecosystem indicators and calculation of the IP for each ecosystem type at level 3. How to perform the work on assessment of the indicators is described in Step 4 in section 5.1:

- EcoUnit_ID: field to relate with the feature class;

- IP_Index_TotalScore: value for the index of ecosystem performance (IP) for each polygon representing ecosystem type at level 3. How to calculate the value is described in Step 4 in section 5.1 and an example is given in Table 7*Ecosystem condition indicator assessment template and calculation – example*.

5.2.3. Accuracy and validation

The validation should be based on scientifically sound approach being able to assess the accuracy reached for each ecosystem condition parameter. For each validation accuracy reports should be generated and provided.

5.2.4. Digital Maps for Ecosystem Condition

Maps in scale 1:125 000 fortheecosystemconditionshould be delivered in PDF at size A2 presenting the results from calculation of the IP index. In addition the maps could also be prepared in paper format in the same size.

Each data frame should contain one cell from the EEA reference grid at 50km, hence up to 77 maps couldbe producedfor all the cells from the 50km EEA gird for Bulgaria. In case that no objects from Feature Class **"EcoUnit"** fall in certain cell, map for this cell should not be delivered. Therefore, the actual number of maps to be delivered will depend on the number of cells that contain at least one object from Feature "Class **EcoUnit**". The EEA reference grid is available at:

http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/eea-reference-grids/

For visualization of the IP index graduated colors should be used. Five classes should be generated as follows: 1 – very bad (values > 0 to 0.20); 2 - bad (values > 0.20 to 0.40); 3 – moderate (values > 0.40 to 0.60); 4 – good (values > 0.60 to 0.80); 5 – very good (values > 0.80 to 1).

The colour ramp should use for class 1 bluecolor (CMYK:50;100;5), class 2 violet color (CMYK:18;100;0), class 3 pink color (CMYK:0;70;40), class 4 orange color (CMYK:0;30;100), and for class 5 green color (CMYK:40;5;100).

The layout of the maps of the ecosystem types should follow the guidelines of EEA:

http://www.eionet.europa.eu/gis/docs/GISguide_v4_EEA_Layout_for_map_production.pdf

5.2.5. Metadata

Each dataset should be accompanied by INSPIRE conformal metadata. The minimum requirement is the metadata to be generated using the INSPIRE MetadataEditor:

http://inspire-geoportal.ec.europa.eu/editor/

6. Assessment of ecosystem services

6.1. Identification of indicators, parameters, data

Provisioning services

The primary role of wetlands is to provide ground water for drinking and in some cases fiber and some materials from plants. For wetlands the production of reeds for fibres or energy, as well as the production of peat for energy, are indicators similar to those used in forest and cropland ecosystems. In the absence of information, the surface of wetlands, peat soils and riparian areas is suggested as proxy for these services. However, only areas within the wetland that contain the necessary vegetation cover should be delineated for the service.

Regulating/Maintenance Services

Natural and seminatural wetland ecosystems have a great impact on regulating/maintenance services. The perspective from which the mapping must be done is of how much these ecosystems support regulation of ecological processes such as bio-remediation, filtration, mass stabilisation, flood protection, soil formation. There is a difficulty in mapping this type of services like protection of soil erosion, pollution by nitrates versus soil loss mitigation and nitrogen removal). Drivers, pressures and impacts can be associated to the ecosystem services frame in a post-analysis context to explain links and trends. Some indicators are readily available, for example information on soil weathering processes is available in the LUCAS topsoil survey organic carbon content and percentage of soil cover are available in the AEI framework.

Cultural services

Cultural manifestations of the link between human society and wetlands are numerous and very different throughout the EU, therefore the MAES table, especially for intellectual and spiritual ecosystem services, cannot be exhaustive. Moreover, due to this variety, and also to some methodological and practical difficulties in mapping this type of services EU wide (often surveys are needed), only a few indicators are readily available in monitoring frameworks. The mapping of physical interaction services is based on indicators describing the experiential use people make of wetlands. These refer to visitors/tourism in the areas; number of rural enterprises offering tourism-related services; density of walking, riding, biking trails; number of flowerwatchers or birdwatchers. Among these, visitors' data are the most appropriate variable to directly map the actual service. Most of this information can be available at national/regional level. Data on visitors can be used in this context. The number of photos of wetland ecosystems uploaded on websites is becoming an option for estimation spiritual and emblematic services. Wetland ecosystems included in conservation or protection programmes on the basis of their importance for the maintenance of biodiversity and other cultural values (e.g. NATURA2000, Biosphere reserves, Ramsar sites, IUCN category V areas, landscape conservation areas) can be taken as representative of 'existence' services in the CICES typology. The synthesis of the different layers is the product of a spatial overlay and not of the sum of areas.

The indicators and parameters for assessing the ecosystem services of wetland ecosystems are listed in Table 7 below.

Table 7. Indicators for assessing and mapping of Ecosystem Services in Wetland ecosystems

Section	Division	Group	Class (CICES codes)	Indicator	Parameters and units	Data sources	% error
Provisio-ning	Nutrition	Water	P1 Ground water for drinking (1122)	Consumption of groundwater	l/day per capita	Water permits for wells, groundwater permits, concessions	
	Materials	Biomass	P2 Fibres and other materials from plants, algae and animals for direct use or processing (1211)	Biomass production of plants, fungi and animals for materials	1. t/ha 2. t/livestock unit	1. Statistics; 2. Ecosystem condition assessment	
		Water	P3 Surface water for non-drinking purposes (1221)	Total gross freshwater abstraction from fresh surface water	mill m3/year	Water permits for the water body	
			P4 Ground water for non-drinking purposes (1222)	Total gross freshwater abstraction from fresh ground waters	mill m3/year	Water permits for the water body	
Regulation & Mainte-nance	Mediation of flows	Mass flows	R1 Mass stabilisation and control of erosion rates (2211)	Erosion prevention	Scale	Available map	
			R2 Buffering and attenuation of mass flows (2212)	Mass flows prevention	*To be chosen by the applicant*	*To be chosen by the applicant*	
		Liquid flows	R3 Hydrological cycle and water flow maintenance (2221)	*To be chosen by the applican*	*To be chosen by the applicant*	*To be chosen by the applicant*	
			R4 Flood protection (2222)	*To be chosen by the applican*	*To be chosen by the applicant*	*To be chosen by the applicant*	
	Mainte-nance of physical, chemical, biological conditions	Lifecycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection	R5 Maintaining nursery populations and habitats (2312)	Biodiversity maintaining	Overlapping with protected areas in percentage	national data/MOEW	
		Soil formation and composition	R6 Decomposition and fixing processes (2332)	soil organic matter content	g/kg	EU	

Section	Division	Group	Class (CICES codes)	Indicator	Parameters and units	Data sources	% error
Regulation & Maintenance	Maintenance of physical, chemical, biological conditions	Water conditions	R7 Chemical condition of freshwaters (2341)	*To be chosen by the applicant*	*To be chosen by the applicant*	*To be chosen by the applicant*	
		Atmospheric composition and climate regulation	R8 Micro and regional climate regulation (2352)	*To be chosen by the applicant*	*To be chosen by the applicant*	*To be chosen by the applicant*	
Cultural	Physical and intellectual interactions with biota, ecosystems and land-/seascapes [environmental settings]	Physical and experiential interactions	C1 Experiential use of plants, animals and land-/seascapes in different environmental settings (3111)	Wilderness experiences	1. Number of visitors (e. g. tourists, birdwatch, plantwatch, etc.) per year; 2. Number of activities (e.g. farm tourism, walking and biking traits, etc.)	National data	
			C2 Physical use of land-/seascapes in different environmental settings (3112)				
		Intellectual and representative interactions	C3 Scientific (3121)	Scientific interest	1. number of published papers; 2. number of projects	1. WEB; 2.libraries	
			C4 Educational	Education potential	number of educational activities (festivals, visiting centers, green school, etc.)per year	National data	
			C5 Aesthetic (3125)	Aestetic experience	number of photos uploaded in Google Earth	WEB	
	Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with biota, ecosystems and land-/seascapes [environmental settings]	Spiritual and/or emblematic	C6 Symbolic (3211)	Symbolic species	number of species	National data	
		Other cultural outputs	C7 Existence (3221	Conservation significance	Number of sites in protected areas (e.g. NATURA2000, Biosphere reserves,etc.)	national data, MOEW	

6.2. Assessment of Ecosystem services

The assessment of ecosystem services is a further step in the valuation process. There are various methods for ecosystem services assessment but common standards require to be quantifiable, replicable and affordable. Burkhard et al. (2012) propose general matrix for ecosystem service demands and provisions including all main ecosystem types. This matrix could be applied at national or regional level for decision making. For more accurate estimation, also for valuation economic potential, it should be considered that each service type is dependent on two factors: ecosystem area and condition. The better condition and larger the area the higher value of service should be provided. It is not appropriate to compare between services as they are represented by different measurements.

Step 1: Indicators for Ecosystem services assessment for wetlands

Provisioning services are one of the most easy to understand. Food provision is fundamental service ensuring existence of human society. It includes plants, their fruits, reared and wild animals. Fibers, medicinal plants and other material from plant and animal species could be mapped using different parameters, but for the current purpose only one should be applied depending on the available data.
Wetlands take part in regulating and maintenance process as control of erosion, buffering mass flow, maintaining existence of particular species and habitats and ecosystem remediation. Assessment of this group of services is to be based on maps or models on national or European scale. Currently only scarce national or regional data is available. Further projects for additional measures and field data collection should be implemented.
Cultural services can be assessed in many different ways. They mostly are of non-material benefit for the society, but play important role. This is why selected parameters are more numerous as compared to other services.
The indicators and their parameters that should be used to assess ecosystem services for wetlands are listed in table 7 above.

Step 2: Collect data – national datasets

Egohetal et al. (2012) underlines that the primary data leads to more accurate representation of spatial distribution. However, currently most of the data should be derived from existing national and sub-national data sources. Methods that can quantify the uncertainty and validity of ES maps should be further explored.

The following data sources are to be considered:

- *MOEW - ExEA - CORINE project, national data bases*
- *MoAF - National annual Agro statistical reports, Agro statistical surveys - BANSIK, FADN, LUCAS*
- *Scientific publications*
- *Insitu data*
- *EU data sources*
- *Additional remote sensing data*

Step 3: How to assess

The applicants should collect precise data by each parameter and further on it will be subject of valuation. Burkhard et al. (2012) proposed general matrix for ecosystem service demands and provisions including all main ecosystem types presented by land cover classes and selection of ecosystem services. Filling the data matrix will allow set up the dimensions of each indicator's parameter. This matrix could be applied at national and regional levels for decision making. Ecosystem services much depend on the ecosystem condition. The better condition is related with higher value of service which should be provided. This necessitates developing a procedure for transformation of quantitative data from different sources and different units into unified scoring system. The assessment scale consists of six scores - from 0 to 5. The score "0" indicates that the ecosystem has no relevant capacity to supply particular services and the score "5" indicates the highest relevant capacity for the supply of these services. Scores of 1, 2, 3 and 4 represent respective intermediate capacities.

Depending on the specific case and availability of data, each ecosystem services class could be assessed by a different number of indicators and parameters respectively or complex of indictors, defined by the experts. Additional (optional) parameters and/or indicators could be proposed for the specific case-study if enough informative.

Scores are assigned on the basis of group consensus after discussions. The dimensions of the intervals depend on the specific characteristics of the indicator and should be defined by the expert based on scientifically sound approach. The scores should be filled in the corresponding field in table 8.

Table 8. Scoring table for ecosystem service assessment

Section	Division	Group	Class (CICES codes)	Indicator	Parameter/ Units	Assessment score					
						Score 0 (not relevant)	Score 1 (low capacity)	Score 2 (relevant capacity)	Score 3 (medium capacity)	Score 4 (high capacity)	Score 5 (very high capacity)
Provisioning	Nutrition	Water	1122	Consumption of groundwater	l/day per capita	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Materials	Biomass	1211	Biomass production of plants, fungi and animals for materials	t/ha	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Water	1221	Total gross freshwater abstraction from fresh surface water	mill m^3/year	-	-	-	-	-	-
			1222	Total gross freshwater abstraction from fresh ground waters	mill m^3/year	-	-	-	-	-	-

Section	Division	Group	Class (CICES codes)	Indicator	Parameter/ Units	Assessment score					
						Score 0 (not relevant)	**Score 1** (low capacity)	**Score 2** (relevant capacity)	**Score 3** (medium capacity)	**Score 4** (high capacity)	**Score 5** (very high capacity)
Regulation & Maintenance	Mediation of flows	Mass flows	2211	Erosion prevention	scale	0	1-2	3-8	9-15	16-25	>25
			2212	Mass flows prevention	*To be chosen by the applicant*	0	<40	40-55	56-75	76-85	86-100
		Liquid flows	Hydrological cycle and water flow maintenan-ce 2221	*To be chosen by the applicant*	*To be chosen by the applicant*						
			Flood protection 2222	*To be chosen by the applicant*	*To be chosen by the applicant*						
	Maintenance of physical, chemical, biological conditions	Lifecycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection	2312	Biodiversity maintaining	ha	0	<15	15-30	31-55	56-75	>75
		Soil formation and composition	2332	Soil organic matter content	g/kg	0	<0,5	0,5-1,0	1,01–1,5	1,51-2,5	>2,5
		Water conditions	Chemical condition of freshwaters 2341	*To be chosen by the applicant*	*To be chosen by the applicant*	0	1	2	3	4	5
		Atmospheric composition and climate regulation	Micro and regional climate regulation 2352	*To be chosen by the applicant*	*To be chosen by the applicant*						
Cultural	Physical and intellectual interactions with biota, ecosystems, and land-/seascapes [environ-mental settings]	Physical and experiential interactions	3111, 3112	Wilderness experiences	number per year	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Intellectual and representa-tive interactions	3121	Scientific interest	Number of published papers	0	<5	5-15	16-30	31-45	>45
			3122	Education potential	Number of educational activities (festivals, visiting centers, green school, etc.) per year	-	-	-	-	-	
			3125	Aestetic experience	Number of photos uploaded in Google Earth	0	1	2-3	4-5	6-10	>10
	Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with biota, ecosystems, and land-/seascapes [environ-mental settings]	Spiritual and/or emblematic	3211	Symbolic species	number	0	1	2-5	6-10	11-15	>15
		Other cultural outputs	3221	Conservation significance	Number of sites in protected areas (e.g. NATURA2000, Biosphere reserves,etc.)	0	1	2	3	4	>4

The assessment of ecosystem services should be based on real parameters (measurable and available) and presents the Real (expert assessed) ESs Capacity. The example in Table 9 is based on expert evaluations/scoring of the parameter`s dimensions and can be seen as research hypotheses which are to be tested in further case study applications with data from measurements, modeling or additional expert assumptions.

Table 9. Assessment of ecosystem services - example

Section	Division	Class	Real (expert assessed) ESs Capacity
Provisioning	Nutrition	P1 Ground water for drinking	2
	Biomass	P2 Fibres and other materials from plants, algae and animals for direct use or processing	2
	Materials	P3 Surface water for non-drinking purposes	3
		P4 Ground water for non-drinking purposes	3
Regulation & Maintenance	Mediation of flows	R1 Mass stabilisation and control of erosion rates	3
		R2 Buffering and attenuation of mass flows	4
		R3 Hydrological cycle and water flow maintenance	3
		R4 Flood protection	2
	Maintenance of physical, chemical, biological conditions	R5 Maintaining nursery populations and habitats	3
		R6 Decomposition and fixing processes	3
		R7 Chemical condition of freshwaters	2
		R8 Micro and regional climate regulation	2
Cultural	Physical and intellectual interactions with biota, ecosystems, and land-/seascapes [environmental settings]	C1. Experiential use of plants, animals and land-/seascapes in different environmental settings	4
		C2. Physical use of land-/seascapes in different environmental settings	3
		C3. Scientific	5
		C4. Educational	2
		C5. Aestetic	1
	Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with biota, ecosystems, and land-/seascapes [environmental settings]	C6. Symbolic	4
		C7. Existence	4

Step 4. Fullfill the matrix

The ecosystem service matrices consist of ecosystem services (currently 4 provisioning, 8 regulating and 7 cultural services; according to Table 7) on the y-axis are ecosystem services and on the x-axis are ecosystem sub-types on level 3. At the intersections, the different wetland ecosystems sub-type for realized ecosystem service supply should be assessed. The applied scale ranges from 0 (no relevant supply) to 5 (maximum relevant supply) defined by the experts at regional (national) level after completing step 3, taking into consideration the complexity of ecosystems and their specifics. The score (1 to 5) obtained in Table 8 should be used as a basis to define the scores for each ecosystem service and the relevant ecosystem subtypes and the results should be filled in table 10. All services which are defined as not relevant for particular grassland ecosystem subtypes (see annex7) will have 0 score in table 10. Furthermore, the ecosystem services marked as "not supported by data'' will have 0 score. This indicates that they have no relevant capacity at the time of the assessment due to the lack of data but could have higher scores in future assessments. The normalization to this relative 0-5 scale aims at making different ecosystem services (measured and assessed by various indicators and units) comparable with each other. The values obtained in the matrix are useful for detailed mapping of pilots and monitored regions (see Monitoring Guide).

The following table 10 presents an example matrix. The scores should be expert evaluations and based on a combination of expert judgement/experience with statistical data. Each ecosystem service relevant to and provided by wetland ecosystems then should be assessed at national level. After analyzing information for the listed indicators, describing relevant ecosystem services for different types of wetland ecosystems, the lowest and the highest values should be determined at national level.

Table 10. Summarized data for the wetland ecosystem subtypes at national level

		Wetland ecosystem subtypes		
		D2. Valley mires, poor fens and transition mires	**D4. Base-rich fens and calcareous spring mires**	**D5. Sedge and reedbeds, normally without free-standing water**
ESs class codes CICES	1111			
	1112			
	1113			
	1114			
	1115			
	1116			
	1121			
	1122			
	1311			
	1312			
	1321			
	2111			

	2121			
	2122			
	2123			
	2211			
	2212			
	2221			
	2222			
	2231			
	2232			
	2311			
	2312			
	2321			
	2322			
	2331			
	2332			
	2341			
	2351			
	2352			
	3111			
	3112			
	3121			
	3122			
	3123			
	3124			
	3125			
	3211			
	3212			
	3221			
	3222			

The assessment scale reaches: 0 = no capacity of the current sparsely vegetated ecosystem polygon to provide this particular ecosystem service, 1 = low capacity, 2 = relevant capacity, 3 = medium capacity, 4 = high capacity and 5 = very high capacity.

When comparing different Ecosystem Services between different ecosystem subtypes, the full list of ESs included in Annex 7 should be considered.

6.3. Mapping of Ecosystem services

6.3.1. Description of the mapping procedure

The workflow for mapping of ecosystem services follows the steps described in section 6.2. The technical characteristics of the geodatabase are provided in section 4 and should be applied also for mapping procedures in this section.

6.3.2. Data structure/schema

The data structure should follow the one provided in the Annex 9.00.

The schema of the database for the ecosystem services is the following:



The detailed technical description of the classes and tables of the ecosystem services database is provided in Annex 9.01_Schema_Report_ES_Database / 9.01_1_Schema_Report_ES_Database.htm

The main steps of generation of the geodatabase should follow the steps described in section 6.2.:

- Table **"N_EcosystemService"**: Nomenclature table for ecosystem services. This table should not be changed. The nomenclatures are given in Annex 9.02_NOMENCLATURES_XLS / N_EcosystemService.xls. It has the following fields:
  - EcosystemService_Code: integer codes for ecosystem services at level 4;
  - EcosystemService_Name_EN: names in English of services at level 4;
  - ESS_Level1_Name_EN: names in English of ecosystem services at level 1;
  - ESS_Level1_Code: integer code of ecosystem services at level 1;
  - ESS_Level2_Name_EN: names in English of ecosystem services at level 2;
  - ESS_Level2_Code: integer code of ecosystem services at level 2;
  - ESS_Level3_Name_EN: names in English of ecosystem services at level 3;
  - ESS_Level3_Code: integer code of ecosystem services at level 3;

Table **"N_EcosystemService_Indicator"**: Nomenclature table of indicators used to determine the ecosystem services. The nomenclatures are given in Annex 9.02_NOMENCLATURES_XLS / N_EcosystemService_Indicator.xls. It has the following fields:

- EcosystemService_Code: integer codes for ecosystem service at level 4;
- ESS_Indicator_Code: integer codes for indicators used to assess the ecosystem services at level 4;

- ESS_Indicator_Name: name of indicators used to assess the ecosystem services at level 4;
- UnitOfMeasurement: units of measurement for each indicator.

This nomenclature table should be generated using the example provided in Annex 9.02_NOMENCLATURES_XLS / N_EcosystemService_Indicator.xls, as well as the table 7 *Additional optional indicators, which could be applied in assessing and mapping ESs in XXX ecosystems* from this methodology.

Table **"EcosystemServiceIndicator_Values"**: This table is the resulting table from the assessment of the ecosystem services. How to perform the work on assessment of the indicators is described in Step 3 in section 6.2:

- EcoUnit_ID: field to relate with the feature class;
- EcosystemType_Code: integer codes for ecosystem types at level 3;
- EcosystemService_Code: integer codes for ecosystem service at level 4;
- ESS_Indicator_Code integer codes for indicators used to assess the ecosystem services at level 4;
- ESS_Indicator _Value: value of calculated indicator used to assess the ecosystem service at level 4;
- Validity_FromDate: starting date for validity of the indicator;
- Validity_ToDate: end date for validity of the indicator;
- ESS_Indicator_Source: free text to describe the source of the data used to calculate the value of the indicator;
- ES_Capacity_Score: calculated value for ES; how to define the score for each indicator is explained in Chapter 6.2. / Step 1;

As this resulting table could contain enormous number of records which some GIS software could not support it is acceptable to separate it into smaller tables. In this case the records in the table should be separated based on the ecosystem types at level 3. The naming of the table should be done in the following way:

"EcosystemServiceIndicator_Values_XXX" – where XXX is the code of the ecosystem type at level 3.

- Table **"EcosystemServiceCapacity"**: As for some services more than one indicator could be selected for measurement, additional table is required which represents the total score for each service calculated from the total score of indicators measured. Because some of the indicators could be more important than others, it is of responsibility of the expert to choose what will be the final score based on the values of the indicators calculated:
  - EcoUnit_ID: field to relate with the feature class;
  - EcosystemType_Code: integer codes for ecosystem types at level 3;
  - EcosystemService_Code: integer codes for ecosystem service at level 4;
  - ESS_Capacity_Score: final score for each service calculated on the bases of all indicators selected for its evaluation. The values here should be between 1 and 5 and 0 for not relevant capacity;

In order the database to be more informative, one table for each service at level 4 should be prepared and named as follows: "**EcosystemServiceCapacity_ZZZ"** where ZZZ is the code for services at level 4.

6.3.3. Accuracy and validation

The applicant should provide scientifically sound approach to describe the accuracy reached for each ecosystem service indicator; hence validation approach should be applied. For each validation, accuracy reports should be generated and provided.

6.3.4. Digital Maps for Ecosystem Services

Maps in scale 1:125 000 fortheecosystemtypesshould be delivered in PDF at size A2 presenting the results from calculation for Ecosystem Capacity. In addition the maps could also be prepared in paper format in the same size

Each data frame should contain one cell from the EEA reference grid at 50 km, hence up to 77 maps could be produced for all the cells from the 50km EEA gird for Bulgaria. In case that no polygons from Feature Class **"EcoUnit"** fall in certain cell, map for this cell should not be delivered. Therefore, the actual number of maps to be delivered will depend on the number of cells that contain at least one polygon from Feature "**Class EcoUnit**". The EEA reference grid is available at: http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/eea-reference-grids/

The Applicant should deliver at least one set of maps for the ecosystem services. The maps representing the results for calculating the ecosystem services capacity using the approach 1 is mandatory. For visualization of the capacity graduated colors corresponding to the colors in example matrix table (table 10) should be used. Six classes should be generated as follows: 0 - no relevant capacity of the urban sub-type type to provide this particular ecosystem service, 1 - low relevant capacity, 2 - relevant capacity, 3 - medium relevant capacity, 4 - high relevant capacity and 5 - very high relevant capacity.

The layout of the maps of the ecosystem services should follow the guidelines of EEA: http://www.eionet.europa.eu/gis/docs/GISguide_v4_EEA_Layout_for_map_production.pdf

Each applicant should prepare map layout containing all the attributes for the Map of Ecosystem Services and deliver it for discussion. The final map layout which to be used for all the ecosystem mapping projects will be prepared and will be mandatory to be used for map generation.

6.3.5. Metadata

Each dataset should be accompanied by INSPIRE conformal metadata. The minimum requirement is the metadata to be generated using the INSPIRE MetadataEditor:
http://inspire-geoportal.ec.europa.eu/editor/

7. Annexes

Annex 1 - B7

Terms and definitions

Term	Definition
Assessment	The analysis and review of information derived from research for the purpose of helping someone in a position of responsibility to evaluate possible actions or think about a problem. Assessment means assembling, summarising, organising, interpreting, and possibly reconciling pieces of existing knowledge and communicating them so that they are relevant and helpful to an intelligent but inexpert decision-maker (Parson, 1995).
Benefits	Positive change in wellbeing from the fulfilment of needs and wants (TEEB, 2010).
Biodiversity	The variability among living organisms from all sources, including inter alia terrestrial, marine, and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part, this includes diversity within species, between species, and of ecosystems (cf. Article 2 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992).
Biophysical valuation	Valuation of the physical ecosystem properties and changes that take place over a period of time related to a specific indicator and using an accepted measurement procedure.
Drivers of change	Any natural or human-induced factor that directly or indirectly causes a change in an ecosystem. A direct driver of change unequivocally influences ecosystem processes and can therefore be identified and measured to differing degrees of accuracy; an indirect driver of change operates by altering the level or rate of change of one or more direct drivers (MA, 2005).
Economic valuation	The process of expressing a value for a particular good or service in a certain context (e.g., of decision-making) in monetary terms (TEEB, 2010).
Ecosystem	A dynamic complex of plant, animal, and microorganism communities and their non-living environment interacting as a functional unit (MA, 2005). For practical purposes it is important to define the spatial dimensions of concern.
Ecosystem assessment	A social process through which the findings of science concerning the causes of ecosystem change, their consequences for human well-being, and management and policy options are brought to bear on the needs of decision-makers (UK NEA, 2011).
Ecosystem condition	The physical, chemical and biological condition of an ecosystem at a particular point in time which can also be referred to as its quality. It is reffered to the capacity of an ecosystem to yield services, relative to its potential capacity (MA, 2005).

Ecosystem function	Subset of the interactions between biophysical structures, biodiversity and ecosystem processes that underpin the capacity of an ecosystem to provide ecosystem services (TEEB, 2010).
Ecosystem process	Any change or reaction, which occurs within ecosystems, physical, chemical or biological. Ecosystem processes include decomposition, production, nutrient cycling, and fluxes of nutrients and energy (MA, 2005).
Ecosystem service	The benefits that people obtain from ecosystems (MA, 2005). The direct and indirect contributions of ecosystems to human well-being (TEEB, 2010). The concept 'ecosystem goods and services' is synonymous with ecosystem services. The service flow in MAES conceptual framework refers to the actually used service.
Fragmentation	Fragmented habitats are those that were once contiguous but are now separated into smaller, isolated areas.
Habitat	Terrestrial or aquatic areas distinguished by geographic, abiotic and biotic features, whether entirely natural or seminatural.
Indicator	Observed value representative of a phenomenon to study. In general, indicators quantify information by aggregating different and multiple data. The resulting information is therefore synthesised.
Invasives (plant, animals)	Invasive alien species are non-native species that are deliberately or unintentionally introduced by human action outside their natural habitats where they establish, proliferate and spread in ways that cause damage to biological diversity.
Peatland	A type of ecosystem in which organic matter is produced faster than it is decomposed, resulting in the accumulation of partially decomposed vegetative material called “peat”
Reedbed	Natural habitats found in floodplains, waterlogged depressions colonized by reed
Restoration	Refers to the process of actively managing the recovery of an ecosystem that has been degraded, damaged or destroyed as a means of sustaining ecosystem resilience and conserving biodiversity (CBD, 2012).
Species diversity	Number of species for specified area
Vegetation cover	the observed plant cover on the earth's surface
Wetland	Areas where water covers the soil, or is present either at or near the surface of the soil all year or for varying periods of time during the year

Annex 2 - B7

List of acronyms

AEI	Agri-environmental Indicator
CICES	Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services
CORINE	Coordinate Information on the Environment
EEA	European Environmental Agency
ES	Ecosystem Services
EU	European Union
EUNIS	European Union Nature Information Sysytem
FADN	Farm Accountancy Data Network
HD	Habitats Directive
IP	Index of performance
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MAES	Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services
MAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Food
MF	Ministry of Finances
MOEW	Ministry of Environment and Waters
MRD	Ministry of Regional Development
NGO	Non-governmental organization

Annex 3 - B7

Table of ecosystem types

Level 1 (Major ecosystem category)	**Level 2** (Sub-classes)	**Methodology part**
Terrestrial	Urban	B1
	Cropland	B2
	Grassland	B3
	Woodland and forest	B4
	Heathlands and shrubs	B5
	Sparsely vegetated land	B6
	Wetlands	**B7**
Rivers and lakes	Rivers and lakes	B8
Marine	Marine	B9

Wetlands

Level 3 (Ecosystem types)	
Valley mires, poor fens and transition mires	Acid peatlands, flushes and vegetated rafts formed by receiving water from the surrounding landscape or are intermediate between land and water. Included are quaking bogs and vegetated non-calcareous springs. Excluded are calcareous fens and reedbeds.
Base-rich fens and calcareous spring mires	Peatlands, flushes and vegetated springs with calcareous or eutrophic ground water, within river valleys, alluvial plains, or on hillsides. As in poor fens, the water level is at or near the surface of the substratum and peat formation depends on a permanently high watertable. Excluded are reedbeds .
Sedge and reedbeds, normally without free-standing water	Sedge and reedbeds forming terrestrial mire habitats, not closely associated with open water. Excluded are reedbeds and sedges where they form emergent or fringing vegetation beside water bodies .

Annex 4 - B7

Map of ecosystem types



Annex 5 - B7

Data Sources

Ecological condition indicators				
Type	***Indicator group***	***Indicator***	***Parameter***	***Data Sources***
Ecosytem structure	Biotic diversity	Ecosystem presence	Ecosystem sub-type cover within the polygon	Scientific publications, Project reports etc.; Personal inpublished data; Field collected data.
		Plant diversity	Plant species richness	Phytosociological releves from Phytosociological Data Bases, scientific publications, Project reports etc.; Personal inpublished data; Field collected data.
		Animal diversity	Animal species richness	Literature data from Data Bases, scientific publications, Project reports etc.; Personal inpublished data; Field collected data.
		Red list species	Number of red list species (plant/animal)	Information according Red Data Book in Bulgaria (2015); Literature data from Data Bases, scientific publications, Project reports etc.; Personal inpublished data; Field collected data.
		Alien and invasive species presence	number of alien and invasive species	Information according Invasive alien plant species in Bulgaria (2012), ESENIAS Poject; ; Literature data from Data Bases, scientific publications, Project reports etc.; Personal inpublished data; Field collected data.
		Other biotic diversity indicators (for example, naturalness, habitat diversity, etc.)		
	Abiotic heterogeneity	Soil heterogeneity	Soil quality	Soil type maps of Bulgaria
			Soil organic matter	Soil monitoring data from Executive environment agency; Literature data from Data Bases, scientific publications, Project reports etc.; Personal inpublished data
		Hydrological heterogeneity	Hydrological heterogeneity	
		Geomorphological heterogeneity	Geomorphological heterogeneity	
		Disturbance regime	Soil erosion risk	Wind and water soil erosion risk maps from Executive environment agency;
			Pollution	
			Fire	
		Other abiotic heterogeneity indicators		

Ecosystem processes	Energy budget	Energy balance (capture, storage)	Energy balance (capture, storage)	
		Metabolic efficiency	Metabolic efficiency	
		Other energy budget indicators	Other energy budget indicators	
	Matter budget	Matter storage	Biomass	Literature data from Data Bases, scientific publications, Project reports etc.; Field collected data.
		Matter balance (input, output)	Matter balance (input, output)	
		Element concentrations (other state variables)	Element concentrations (other state variables)	
		Efficiency measures	Efficiency measures	
	Water budget	Water balance (input, output)	Water balance (input, output)	
		Water storage	Water storage	
		Efficiency measures	Efficiency measures	

Ecosytem services indicators						
				Indicator	Parameters and units	Data sources
Section	**Division**	**Group**	**Class (code)**			
Provisioning	Nutrition	Biomass	Cultivated crops (1111)			
			Reared animals and their outputs (1112)			
			Wild plants, algae and their outputs (1113)			
			Wild animals and their outputs (1114)			
			Plants and algae from in-situ aquaculture (1115)			
			Animals from in-situ aquaculture (1116)			
		Water	Surface water for drinking (1121)			
			Ground water for drinking (1122)	Consumption of groundwater	l/day per capita	Water permits for wells, groundwater permits, concessions

	Materials	Biomass	Fibres and other materials from plants, algae and animals for direct use or processing (1211)	Biomass production of plants, fungi and animals for materials	T/ha	Statistics; Ecosystem state assessment
			Materials from plants, algae and animals for agricultural use (1212)			
			Genetic materials from all biota (1213)			
		Water	Surface water for non-drinking purposes (1221)	Total gross freshwater abstraction from fresh surface water	mill m^3/year	Water permits for the water body
			Ground water for non-drinking purposes (1222)	Total gross freshwater abstraction from fresh ground waters	mill m^3/year	Water permits for the water body
	Energy	Biomass-based energy sources	Plant-based resources for energy (1311)			
			Animal-based resources (1312)			
		Mechani-cal energy	Animal-based energy (1321)			
Regulation & Maintenance	Mediation of waste, toxics and other nuisances	Mediation by biota	Bio-remediation by micro-organisms, algae, plants, and animals (2111)			
			Filtration/sequestration/storage/accumulation by micro-organisms, algae, plants, and animals (2112)			
		Mediation by ecosys-tems	Filtration/sequestration/storage/accumulation by ecosystems (2121)			
			Dilution by atmosphere, freshwater and marine ecosystems ecosystems (2122)			
			Mediation of smell/noise/visual impacts (2123)			
	Mediation of flows	Mass flows	Mass stabilisation and control of erosion rates (2211)	Erosion prevention	Scale	available map
			Buffering and attenuation of mass flows (2212)	Mass flows prevention	To be chosen by the applicant	To be chosen by the applicant
		Liquid flows	Hydrological cycle and water flow maintenance (2221)	To be chosen by the applicant	To be chosen by the applicant	To be chosen by the applicant
			Flood protection (2222)	To be chosen by the applicant	To be chosen by the applicant	To be chosen by the applicant
		Gaseous / air flows	Storm protection (2231)			
			Ventilation and transpiration (2232)			

	Maintenance of physical, chemical, biological conditions	Lifecycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection	Pollination and seed dispersal (2311)			
			Maintaining nursery populations and habitats (2312)	Biodiversity maintaining	Overlapping with protected areas in percentage	national data/MOEW
		Pest and desease control	Pest control (2321)			
			Disease control (2322)			
		Soil formation and composition	Weathering processes (2331)			
			Decomposition and fixing processes (2332)	soil organic matter content	g/kg	EU; Ecosystem condition assessment; Statistics
		Water conditions	Chemical condition of freshwaters (2341)	To be chosen by the applicant	To be chosen by the applicant	To be chosen by the applicant
			Chemical condition of salt waters (2342)			
		Atmospheric composition and climate regulation	Global climate regulation by reduction of greenhouse gas concentrations (2351)			
			Micro and regional climate regulation (2352)	To be chosen by the applicant	To be chosen by the applicant	To be chosen by the applicant
Cultural	Physical and intellectual interactions with biota, ecosystems, and land-/seascapes (environmental settings)	Physical and experiential interactions	Experiential use of plants, animals and land-/seascapes in different environmental settings (3111)	Wilderness expierience	Number of visitors (e. g. tourists, birdwatch, plantwatch, etc.) per year; Number of activities (e.g. farm tourism, walking and biking traits, etc.)	national data
			Physical use of land-/seascapes in different environmental settings (3112)	Wilderness expierience	Number of visitors (e. g. tourists, birdwatch, plantwatch, etc.) per year; Number of activities (e.g. farm tourism, walking and biking traits, etc.)	national data

		Intellec-tual and represen-tative interact-ions	Scientific (3121)	Scientific interest	Amount of scientific studies: number of published papers; number of projects	WEB, libraries
			Educational (3122)	Education potential	Number of educational activities (festivals, visiting centers, green school, etc.)per year	national data
			Heritage, cultural (3123)			
			Entertainment (3124)			
			Aesthetic (2125)	Aestetic experience	Number of photos uploaded in Google Earth	WEB
	Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with biota, ecosystems, and land-/seascapes [environmental settings]	Spiritual and/or emblema tic	Symbolic (3211)	Symbolic species	Number of species	national data
			Sacred and/or religious (3212)	Sacred and religious tourism	Number of monasteries, churches, places	national data
		Other cultural outputs	Existence (3221)	Conservation significance	Number of sites in protected areas (e.g. Natura2000, Biosphere reserves,etc.)	national data, MOEW
			Bequest (3222)			

Available as a spreadsheet at:
http://www.metecosmap-sofia.org/methodological-framework/

Annex 6 - B7

Ecological condition indicators - Wetlands

Ecological condition indicators			Valley mires, poor fens and transition mires					
Indicator type	***Indicator group***	***Indicator***	***Parameter***	***Dimentions (units)***	***Available data (Y/N)***	***New data needed (tick by "V")***	***Periodicity of measurring (years etc.)***	***Significance***
Ecosytem structure	Biotic diversity	Ecosystem presence	Ecosystem sub-type cover within the polygon	%		V	3 years	primary
		Plant diversity	Plant species richness	Number of species per sample plot	Y	V	3 years	primary
		Animal diversity	Wild animal species richness	number of species	Y	V	3 years	primary
		Alien and invasive species presence	Alien and invasive species presence	number of species	Y		3 years	primary
		Other biotic diversity indicators (for example, naturalness, habitat diversity, etc.)	Red list species (plant/animal) presence	number of species	Y		3 years	optional
	Abiotic heterogeneity	Soil heterogeneity	Soil quality	soil type	Y		once only	primary
			Soil organic matter	Percent	Y		5 years	primary
			soil pH (for sedge and reedbeds)	scale		V	5 years	primary
			Soil organic C to total N ratio (C/N)	scale		V	5 years	primary
		Hydrological heterogeneity	General water chemisrty (pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, ammonium nitrogen, nitrate nitrogen, phosphate, BOD5)	score		V	5 years	primary
		Geomorphological heterogeneity	Geomorphological heterogeneity					optional
		Disturbance regime	Soil erosion risk	score	Y		5 years	primary
			Pollution	Number of dump sites	Y		5 years	primary
			Fire	Number of recorded fires	Y		5 years	primary
		Other abiotic heterogeneity indicators	Concentration of pollutants in soil from surrounding areas					optional
Ecosystem processes	Energy budget	Energy balance (capture, storage)	Energy balance (capture, storage)					optional
		Metabolic efficiency	Metabolic efficiency					optional
		Other energy budget indicators	Other energy budget indicators					optional
	Matter budget	Matter storage	Biomass	t/ha		V	3 years	primary
		Matter balance (input, output)	Matter balance (input, output)					optional
		Element concentrations (other matter budget variables)	Element concentrations (other matter budjet variables)					optional
		Efficiency measures	Efficiency measures					optional
	Water budget	Water balance (input, output)	Water balance (input, output)	l/year	Y		3 years	primary
		Water storage	Precipitation					optional
		Efficiency measures	Efficiency measures					optional

Ecological condition indicators			Base-rich fens and calcareous spring mires					
Indicator type	***Indicator group***	***Indicator***	***Parameter***	***Dimentions (units)***	***Available data (Y/N)***	***New data needed (tick by "V")***	***Periodicity of measurring (years etc.)***	***Significance***
Ecosytem structure	Biotic diversity	Ecosystem presence	Ecosystem sub-type cover within the polygon	%		V	3 years	primary
		Plant diversity	Plant species richness	Number of species per sample plot	Y	V	3 years	primary
		Animal diversity	Wild animal species richness	number of species	Y	V	3 years	primary
		Alien and invasive species presence	Alien and invasive species presence	number of species	Y		3 years	primary
		Other biotic diversity indicators (for example, naturalness, habitat diversity, etc.)		number of species	Y		3 years	optional
	Abiotic heterogeneity	Soil heterogeneity	Soil quality	soil type	Y		once only	primary
			Soil organic matter	Percent	Y		5 years	primary
			soil pH (for sedge and reedbeds)	scale		V	5 years	primary
			Soil organic C to total N ratio (C/N)	scale		V	5 years	primary
		Hydrological heterogeneity	General water chemisrty (pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, ammonium nitrogen, nitrate nitrogen, phosphate, BOD5)	score		V	5 years	primary
		Geomorphological heterogeneity	Geomorphological heterogeneity					optional
		Disturbance regime	Soil erosion risk	score	Y		5 years	primary
			Pollution	Number of dump sites	Y		5 years	primary
			Fire	Number of recorded fires	Y		5 years	primary
		Other abiotic heterogeneity indicators	Concentration of pollutants in soil from surrounding areas					optional
Ecosystem processes	Energy budget	Energy balance (capture, storage)	Energy balance (capture, storage)					optional
		Metabolic efficiency	Metabolic efficiency					optional
		Other energy budget indicators	Other energy budget indicators					optional
	Matter budget	Matter storage	Biomass	t/ha		V	3 years	primary
		Matter balance (input, output)	Matter balance (input, output)					optional
		Element concentrations (other matter budget variables)	Element concentrations (other matter budjet variables)					optional
		Efficiency measures	Efficiency measures					optional
	Water budget	Water balance (input, output)	Water balance (input, output)	l/year	Y		3 years	primary
		Water storage	Water storage					optional
		Efficiency measures	Efficiency measures					optional

Ecological condition indicators			Sedge and reedbeds, normally without free-standing water					
Indicator type	***Indicator group***	***Indicator***	***Parameter***	***Dimentions (units)***	***Available data (Y/N)***	***New data needed (tick by "V")***	***Periodicity of measurring (years etc.)***	***Significance***
Ecosytem structure	Biotic diversity	Ecosystem presence	Ecosystem sub-type cover within the polygon	%		V	3 years	primary
		Plant diversity	Plant species richness	Number of species per sample plot	Y	V	3 years	primary
		Animal diversity	Wild animal species richness	number of species	Y	V	3 years	primary
		Alien and invasive species presence	Alien and invasive species presence	number of species	Y		3 years	primary
		Other biotic diversity indicators (for example, naturalness, habitat diversity, etc.)		number of species	Y		3 years	optional
	Abiotic heterogeneity	Soil heterogeneity	Soil quality	soil type	Y		once only	primary
			Soil organic matter	Percent	Y		5 years	primary
			soil pH (for sedge and reedbeds)	scale		V	5 years	primary
			Soil organic C to total N ratio (C/N)	scale		V	5 years	primary
		Hydrological heterogeneity	General water chemisrty (pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, ammonium nitrogen, nitrate nitrogen, phosphate, BOD5)	score		V	5 years	primary
		Geomorphological heterogeneity	Geomorphological heterogeneity					optional
		Disturbance regime	Soil erosion risk	score	Y		5 years	primary
			Pollution	Number of dump sites	Y		5 years	primary
			Fire	Number of recorded fires	Y		5 years	primary
		Other abiotic heterogeneity indicators	Concentration of pollutants in soil from surrounding areas					optional
Ecosystem processes	Energy budget	Energy balance (capture, storage)	Energy balance (capture, storage)					optional
		Metabolic efficiency	Metabolic efficiency					optional
		Other energy budget indicators	Other energy budget indicators					optional
	Matter budget	Matter storage	Biomass	t/ha		V	3 years	primary
		Matter balance (input, output)	Matter balance (input, output)					optional
		Element concentrations (other matter budget variables)	Element concentrations (other matter budjet variables)					optional
		Efficiency measures	Efficiency measures					optional
	Water budget	Water balance (input, output)	Water balance (input, output)	l/year	Y		3 years	primary
		Water storage	Water storage					optional
		Efficiency measures	Efficiency measures					optional

Available as a spreadsheet at:
http://www.metecosmap-sofia.org/methodological-framework/

Annex 7 - B7

Indicators services - Wetlands

Section	Division	Group	Class	CICES Codes	Indicator	Parameters and units	Data sources	% error	WETLANDS subtypes: Valley mires, poor fens and transition mires	WETLANDS subtypes: Base-rich fens and calcareous spring mires	WETLANDS subtypes: Sedge and reedbeds, normally without free-standing water
1. Provisioning	1. Nutrition	1. Biomass	1. Cultivated crops	1111							
			2. Reared animals and their outputs	1112							
			3. Wild plants, algae and their outputs	1113							
			4. Wild animals and their outputs	1114							
			5. Plants and algae from in-situ aquaculture	1115							
			6. Animals from in-situ aquaculture	1116							
		2. Water	1. Surface water for drinking	1121							
			2. Ground water for drinking	1122	1. Consumption of groundwater	l/day per capita	Water permits for wells, groundwater permits, concessions	Difference between permits and statistical data	X	X	
	2. Materials	1. Biomass	1. Fibres and other materials from plants, algae and animals for direct use or processing	1211	1. Biomass production of plants, fungi and animals for materials	1. t/ha 2. t/livestock unit	1. Statistics; 2. Ecosystem condition assessment				X
			2. Materials from plants, algae and animals for agricultural use	1212							
			3. Genetic materials from all biota	1213							
		2. Water	1. Surface water for non-drinking purposes	1221	1. Total gross freshwater abstraction from fresh surface water	mill m3/year	Water permits for the water body	Difference between permits and statistical data	X	X	
			2. Ground water for non-drinking purposes	1222	1. Total gross freshwater abstraction from fresh ground waters	mill m3/year	Water permits for the water body	Difference between permits and statistical data	X	X	X
	3. Energy	1. Biomass-based energy sources	1. Plant-based resources	1311							
			2. Animal-based resources	1312							
		2. Mechanical energy	1. Animal-based energy	1321							

									WETLANDS subtypes		
Section	**Division**	**Group**	**Class**	**CICES Codes**	**Indicator**	**Parameters and units**	**Data sources**	**% error**	**Valley mires, poor fens and transition mires**	**Base-rich fens and cal-careous spring mires**	**Sedge and reedbeds, normally without free-standing water**
2. Regulation & Maintenance	1. Mediation of waste, toxics and other nuisances	1. Mediation by biota	1. Bio-remediation by micro-organisms, algae, plants, and animals	2111							
			2. Filtration/sequestration/storage/ accumulation by micro-organisms, algae, plants, and animals	2112							
		2. Mediation by ecosystems	1. Filtration/sequestration/storage/ accumulation by ecosystems	2121							
			2. Dilution by atmosphere, freshwater and marine ecosystems	2122							
			3. Mediation of smell/noise/visual impacts	2123							
	2. Mediation of flows	1. Mass flows	1. Mass stabilisation and control of erosion rates	2211	1. Erosion prevention	1. scale	1. available map		X	X	X
			2. Buffering and attenuation of mass flows	2212	1. Mass flows prevention				X	X	X
		2. Liquid flows	1. Hydrological cycle and water flow maintenance	2221					X	X	X
			2. Flood protection	2222					X	X	X
		3. Gaseous / air flows	1. Storm protection	2231							
			2. Ventilation and transpiration	2232							
	3. Maintenance of physical, chemical, biological conditions	1. Lifecycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection	1. Pollination and seed dispersal	2311							
			2. Maintaining nursery populations and habitats	2312	1. Biodiversity maintaining	1.Overlapping with protected areas in percentage	national data/MOEW		X	X	X
		2. Pest and disease control	1. Pest control	2321							
			2. Disease control	2322							
		3. Soil formation and composition	1. Weathering processes	2331							
			2. Decomposition and fixing processes	2332	soil organic matter content	g/kg	EU		X	X	X
		4. Water conditions	1. Chemical condition of freshwaters	2341					X	X	X
			2. Chemical condition of salt waters	2342							
		5. Atmospheric composition and climate regulation	1. Global climate regulation by reduction of greenhouse gas concentrations	2351							
			2. Micro and regional climate regulation	2352					X	X	X

									WETLANDS subtypes		
Section	**Division**	**Group**	**Class**	**CICES Codes**	**Indicator**	**Parameters and units**	**Data sources**	**% error**	**Valley mires, poor fens and transition mires**	**Base-rich fens and cal-careous spring mires**	**Sedge and reedbeds, normally without free-standing water**
3. Cultural	1. Physical and intellectual interactions with biota, ecosystems, and land-/seascapes [environmental settings]	1. Physical and experiential interactions	1. Experiential use of plants, animals and land-/seascapes in different environmental settings	3111	1. Wilderness experiences	1. Number of visitors (e. g. tourists, birdwatch, plantwatch, etc.) per year; 2. Number of activities (e.g. farm tourism, walking and biking traits, etc.)	1. national data		X	X	X
			2. Physical use of land-/seascapes in different environmental settings	3112							
		2. Intellectual and representative interactions	1. Scientific	3121	1. Scientific interest	Amount of scientific studies 1.number of published papers; 2. number of projects	1. WEB; 2.libraries		X	X	X
			2. Educational	3122	1. Education potential	1. number of educational activities (festivals, visiting centers, green school, etc.) per year	1. national data		X	X	X
			3. Heritage, cultural	3123							
			4. Entertainment	3124							
			5. Aesthetic	3125	1. Aestetic experience	1. number of photos uploaded in Google Earth	1. WEB		X	X	X
	2. Spiritual, symbolic and other interactions with biota, ecosystems, and land-/seascapes [environmental settings]	1. Spiritual and/or emblematic	1. Symbolic	3211	1. Symbolic species	1. number of species	1. national data		X	X	X
			2. Sacred and/or religious	3212							
		2. Other cultural outputs	1 Existence	3221	1. Conservation significance	1. Number of sites in protected areas (e.g. NATURA2000, Biosphere reserves,etc.)	1. national data, MOEW		X	X	X
			2. Bequest	3222							

not relevant for Wetlands ecosystems

not supported by

Annex 8 - B7

References

Apostolova, I. et al. (2001) Flora and vegetation of the Aldomirovsko marsh protected area. Ann. Univ. Sof. 93:115-132.

Burkhard, B. et al. (2012) Mapping ecosystem service supply, demand and budgets. Ecological Indicators 21:17-29.

Davidowitz, G. & Rosenzweig, M.L. (1998) The latitudinal gradient of species diversity among North American grasshoppers within a single habitat: a test of the spatial heterogeneity hypothesis. Journal of Biogeography, 25: 553– 560

Egoh, B. et al. (2012) Indicators for mapping ecosystem services: a review. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

Kochev, J. & Yurukova, L. (1984) Primary biological production and energy values of the vegetation in the swamp of Aldomirovo, Sofia district. Savremenni teoretichni I prilojni aspecti na rastitelnata ecologia, v.1: 166-174.

Kopralev, I. 2002. Geography of Bulgaria. Physical Geography. Socio -economic Geography. ForCom. Sofia (in Bulgarian).

MAES (2014) Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services. An analytical framework for ecosystem assessments under action 5 of the EU biodiversity strategy to 2020.Technical Report 2014 – 080, European Commission.

Metzger, JP. et al. (2008) A spatially explicit and quantitative vulnerability assessment of ecosystem service change in Europe. Reg Environ Change 8:91–107.

Økland, B. (1996) A comparison of three methods of trapping saproxylic beetles. Eur. J. Entomol. 93: 195-209.

Petrova, A., Vladimirov, V. & Georgiev, V. (2012) Invasive alien plant species in Bulgaria. Sofia, IBER-BAS (in Bulgarian).

Schröter, D*, et al.* (2005) Ecology: Ecosystem service supply and vulnerability to global change in Europe. *Science* 310(5752):1333-1337

Tews, J. et al. (2004) Animal species diversity driven by habitat heterogeneity/diversity: the importance of keystone structures. Journal of Biogeography, 31: 79 –92

Walker, T. (1998) Can shark resources be harvested sustainably? A question revisited with a review of shark fisheries. Marine and Freshwater Research, 49(7): 553–572.

Annex 9 - B7

Database templates and nomenclature tables

The databases and related tables and vector layers described in the methodological part of the document, as well as the nomenclature tables for ecosystem types and indicators for condition and ecosystem services are provided in a digital format to this Methodology.

The structure and content of the data under Appendix 9 is as follows:

1. Directory: 9.00_EcosystemDatabase_Schema

Contains a template of the database to this methodology in several different formats:
- Ecosystem_DB_v07.diagram: database structure for review in ArcGIS Diagrammer - free software for creating, editing and analyzing geodatabase schemas
- Ecosystem_DB_v07.mdb: database structure in MDB format;
- Ecosystem_DB_v07. XML: database structure in XML format;
- Ecosystem_DB_v07. jpg: preview of the database schema in JPG format.

2. Directory: 9.01_Schema_Report_ES_Database

It contains a descriptive geodatabase document including the specifications of all the tables and vector layers, as well as a description of all the attribute fields in them:
- 9.01_0_Schema_Report_ES_Database.htm: document describing the structure of the database.

3. Directory: 9.02_NOMENCLATURES_XLS

Contains nomenclature tables for ecosystem types and for the indicators for condition and ecosystem services:
- N_EcosystemType.xls: table in MS Excel format containing all ecosystem types at different hierarchical levels;
- N_EcosystemCondition.xls: MS Excel table containing nomenclatures for ecosystem condition indicators up to level 3;
- N_EcosystemConditionIndicator_Parameter.xls: MS Excel table containing information on how to create a table for ecosystem condition parameters for each specific ecosystem type;
- N_EcosystemService.xls: MS Excel table containing ecosystem services nomenclatures up to level 4
- N_EcosystemService_Indicator.xls: an MS Excel table containing information on how to create a table for ecosystem service indicators for each specific ecosystem type;
- Instruction_Nomenclature_Tables_ES_Condition_Services.docx: document in MS Word format containing a description of the sequence and specifics for filling in all the nomenclature tables of the Methodology as well as the tables in the database for each specific ecosystem type.

4. Directory: 9.03_Data_Maps

Contains the EEA (European Environment Agency) reference grid for Bulgaria at 50 km grid.

The data and documents in Annex 9 are available on:

http://www.metecosmap-sofia.org/methodological-framework/