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Preface

This country fact sheet is prepared as part of task 2.1: Stakeholder identification and initial analysis of activities. The initial analysis draws upon information collected by Esmeralda project partners and previous relevant work on ecosystem mapping and assessment activities and policy and research activities in connection to that. The goal was to consider at least Draft Agenda MAES WG 2015-03-06-rev; MAES WG 06 March 2015; MESEU Final Technical report 2013-14; MESEU Inception Report 2014-15 (Final 29-01-2015); MESEU update March 2015; MESEU Synthesis Report 2012-2014 (14-01-2015); NCA Draft Reference Document for Consultation 06-01-2015 and written communication on undertaken MAES related activities by Joachim Maes (see point 5 references for tracing the source of information for this particular fact sheet). Specific for this document is the identification of obstacles and opportunities (table 1).

1. Country status of activities, prerequisites and needs

Table 1: Country status of activities, prerequisites and needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of mapping ecosystem services in the country (1-3)*</th>
<th>Scale of mapping (1-3)**</th>
<th>Type of support needed (1-5)***</th>
<th>Needed support relates to (1-3)****</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In initial phase, much support needed</td>
<td>1. National</td>
<td>5. Other: Lack of funding</td>
<td>[No Information]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On-going, still support needed</td>
<td>2. Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advanced, only little support needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1. In initial phase, much support needed, 2. On-going, still support needed, 3. Advanced, only little support needed
** 1. National, 2. Regional, 3. Local
*** 1. Setting up a national network, 2. Policy and stakeholder identification, 3. Technical mapping support (data, GIS, mapping methods), 4. Lacking personnel with appropriate expertise, 5. Other
**** WP2 stakeholder mapping/networking, WP3 ES mapping methods, WP4 ES assessment methods/tools

Prerequisites and strengths for carrying out the mapping and assessment of ecosystem services: (Greece, Esmeralda project partner, 2015)

2. Policy activities

2.1. The current implementation plans and execution of the Biodiversity Strategy and in particular concerned with Target 2, Action 5

A detailed national habitat mapping took place in HU between 2003–2006 (MÉTA, Molnár et al. 2007). Quality of natural and semi-natural habitats (ecosystem state) was also assessed and mapped. Despite their age these data could be a valuable basis for a MAES-HU. Most initiatives for a national ES assessment so far have come from the science side. All initiatives at the national scale were stuck due to lack of funding. The organization of a national MAES board is still in progress. The Environment and Energy Efficiency Operational Program for 2014-2020 includes a special measure
dedicated among others to the mapping and evaluation of ecosystem services at the national level. A new project management team (the project manager is Mr. A.A. Takács) was set up at the Nature Conservation Department, Ministry of Agriculture in August 2015. The team started to develop the project documentation, consortium agreements etc. in September-October 2015. The project is planned to be launched in early 2016 and will last for a maximum of 5 years.

2.2. The position of (the) case study / studies in those plans

There are several ongoing and completed ES projects in the country, many of which include case studies (listed in the case study fact sheets). These case studies are primarily research driven, with little coordination and cooperation among the different teams. A stronger networking and more cooperation would be needed – which could be facilitated by the establishment of the national MAES board. Lessons from these case studies are however expected to support the forthcoming national MAES assessment in Hungary.

2.3. List of the case studies done in the country

(A separate Case Study Fact Sheet is filled in for each case study.)

2.4. The possible future use of (the) case study results in Target 2 - Action 5

Lessons from the previous ES case studies is expected to support a later national MAES assessment in Hungary.

2.5. Stakeholder involvement

Most of the local/regional level case studies performed so far contained some degree of stakeholder involvement, some of the studies (e.g. Kovács et al 2015, Kelemen et al 2015) were even designed with stakeholder participation in the focus. Once established, the national MAES board may serve as the “advisory board” of a national ES assessment.

2.6. Executive institutes involved by the National Government

The Department of Nature Conservation, Ministry of Agriculture coordinates the planning and implementation of the official national MAES activities (mapping, quantification, valuation and organisation of data into accounts).

3. Research activities

3.1. The Ecosystems covered in the country

A Hungarian classification based on CORINE LC and MÉTA (a national vegetation map and database for HU, Molnár et al. 2007): urban, gardens, cropland, orchard / vineyard, dry grassland, meadow, shrubland, timber plantation, forest, wetland, freshwater. For a potential national MAES there will be probably rougher categories, such as agroecosystems (cropland), grassland, forest, wetland, freshwater (rivers and lakes), and urban.

The ecosystem condition indicators covered in the country

There is already a national-level general purpose ecosystem state (i.e. naturalness) indicator available for entire Hungary, called vegetation-based Natural Capital Index (NCI, Czúcz et al. 2008, 2012).
3.2. The Ecosystem Services covered in the country

No national-level ES assessment in Hungary has been done yet. Therefore, no ES have been covered at country level. **However, several ES have been studied in various regional projects:**

- food provision: crop, animal, wild food, honey (Tisza, Kiskun),
- production of raw materials: timber and hay (Tisza, Kiskun),
- medicinal resources (Tisza),
- water quality regulation (Tisza),
- water flow regulation (Tisza),
- soil quality regulation (Tisza),
- habitat and population maintenance (genetic resources, birds) (Tisza, Kiskun)
- pollination (Lendület),
- pest control (Tisza),
- disease control: ragweed pollen (Kiskun),
- decomposition (Lendület),
- climate regulation: urban, global (Kiskun, Szeged),
- recreation (Tisza, Kiskun, Szeged),
- aesthetic value (Tisza),
- cultural heritage (Tisza)


3.3. The indicators per ecosystem / ecosystem service (cells in the (MAES) matrix)

Such summary or analysis is not available yet.

3.4. Quantification methods of the indicators

The quantification of the indicators for mapping and assessment of ES will presumably be based on primary data (e.g. national statistics), field data, modelling, and expert interviews / workshops. The process will hopefully be characterized with a deep involvement of the different sectors/disciplines and all major stakeholder groups.

3.5. EU Directive reporting indicators & data used


3.6. Scientific analysis

Most of the existing case studies were primarily project or funding-driven and they were coordinated and conducted by scientists. Accordingly, the scientists coordinating the case studies did their best to identify the most relevant questions and publish the results and lessons learned. There are no plans for scientific analysis at the national level yet.

3.7. Maps, reports, papers, (language)
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