laplant

Table of contents

RECOMMENDATIONS AND STRATEGIES 3
- Stakeholder participation 3
- Modelling of ecosystem services 4
- Policy level of ecosystem services 4

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT (TECHNICAL BRIEF 1) 5
- Students' perceptions of ecosystem services (ES) 6
- Farmers 7
- Governmental agencies 10
- Summary 12

MODELLING OF ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (TECHNICAL BRIEF 2) 15
- Rainfall – Runoff processes 16
- Soil Erosion 18
- Water Quality 21
- Plant Biodiversity 24
- Ecosystem services 26

POLICY LEVEL OF ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (POLICY BRIEF) 28
- Czech policy and practice regarding mitigation measures in agricultural landscape 28
- Norwegian policy and practice regarding mitigation measures in agricultural landscape 30

List of Figures

Fig. 1: Students' perceptions of environmental impacts derived from agricultural activities (N=965) 6
Fig. 2: Students' perceptions of subsidies and environmental education program (N = 965) 6
Fig. 3: Farmers' responses to the GAEC issues were related to the average land block area 8
Fig. 4: Farmers readily present their opinions if they are listened to 9
Fig. 5: Public officers discussing survey evaluation results 11
Fig. 6: Comparison of the attitudes of three respondent groups; F – farmers, O – officers, S - students 12
Fig. 7: Comparison of the attitudes of three respondent groups – three other questions 13
Fig. 8: NIBIO partners discussing the methods of farmland management optimisation with active involvement of farmers in Jihlava 14
Fig. 9: Kopaninský stream catchment 15
Fig. 10: Runoff response of catchment outlet with different land use and management scenarios 17
Fig. 11: Overview of P32 subwatershed 17
Fig. 12: GAEC 5 categories for erosion endangered fields in P32 subwatershed 19

ICELAND LIECHTENSTEIN NORWAY eea grants

Fig. 13: Long term average soil loss for different vegetation cover of land blocks 20
Fig. 14: Land use changes in the districts of Český Krumlov and Pelhřimov in the period 1990 - 2000 21
Fig. 15: Dependence between nitrate concentrations and the proportion of arable land within a catchment 22
Fig. 16: The change in nitrate concentration trend after conversion of the drainage system source area to grassland 22
Fig. 17: Species richness of a moderately moist and moderately dry Arrhenatherum meadow, respectively, with different cattle slurry application rates, S0 – three-cut unfertilised; S1 –an application rate of 60 kg $N.ha^{-1}$ of cattle slurry; S2 - 120 kg $N.ha^{-1}$; S3 - 180 kg $N.ha^{-1}$; S4 - 240 kg $N.ha^{-1}$.....25
Fig. 18: Sheet erosion on vast land blocks Photo: P. Fučík 29
Fig. 19: GAEC fulfilled, erosion continues... (photo by VUMOP, v.v.i.) 30
Fig. 20: Agricultural landscape in Norway 31
Fig. 21: Distribution of subsidies in the RMP program in 2014 (Snellingen et al., 2015).....31
Fig. 22: Sedimentation pond in Rogaland County 32

List of Tables

Tab. 1: Proportion of the officer's neutral responses to questions relating to legislation 10
Tab. 2: Evaluated scenarios of land use and management as modelled in LaPlaNt.....16
Tab. 3: Protective crop rotation.....16
Tab. 4: Runoff response of P32 Subwatershed with different farmland management.....18
Tab. 5: Dry herbage yields (t ha^{-1}) after applying different doses of slurry on a moderately moist and moderately dry meadow, respectively. 25
Tab. 6: Carbon sequestration in moist and dry Arrhenatherum meadows (t ha^{-1}), Vadčice. 26
Tab. 7: A comparison of the evapotranspiration rate and small water cycle between the potential natural vegetation and the current vegetation in the pilot area.....27