



Keywords

Results-based schemes
Pilot programmes
Indicators
Scorecards
Grasslands

Measuring Success in Results-Based Schemes: Assessing Results-based Indicators

Once a set of result-based indicators have been selected, we need to know how to measure these indicators. Indicators are usually monitored through on-farm assessments, to determine each indicator's quality and/or abundance. Score cards can be an effective tool to measure the indicators' presence and quality in each habitat. Scorecards can vary from very specific assessment devices to more holistic tools. Here we compare two scorecards (A and B) for grassland habitats.

Scorecard A is from the English results-based grassland pilot for species rich hay meadows, ran by Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority and Natural England. The scorecard is an example of a more specific scorecard: the scoring directly counts the individual occurrence of positive and negative plant species at set points on a transect line. The scorecard then adds this score to an additional indicator for habitat quality: the area of cover which is negatively impacted by 'damaging activities.' The damaging activities are more loosely defined.

Scorecard B is from Wild Atlantic Nature (WAN) in West Ireland for their results-based pilot programme to promote blanket bog conservation and restoration. This grassland scorecard is more holistic: it assesses more indicators, but it is slightly with less precise in counting the presence of indicator species. The card identifies present positive species, and the assessment score groups species variety for banded scores. The combined cover of species is also scored in bands.

Author(s)

Jennifer Dodsworth
(University of Aberdeen)

Contacts

jennifer.dodsworth@abdn.ac.uk

Country/Region

UK
Ireland

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Scorecard A: Species rich hay meadows score sheet, Natural England (2019)

STOPS	Species Score	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total species score ¹
Positive plant species (V)												
Betony	3											
Lesser/greater birds foot trefoil	3											
Bugle	3											
Burnet saxifrage	3											
Common bistort	3											
Common black knapweed	3											
Cowslip	3											
Eyebright	2											
Fairy Flax	3											
Globe flower	4											
Greater burnet	4											
Harebell	2											
Hawkbits/cats ear	2											
Lady's mantle (sp)	4											
Marsh marigold	2											
Meadowweet	2											
Melancholy thistle	4											
Orchids	4											
Ox eye daisy	3											
Plantain	2											
Ragged robin	3											
Red clover	2											
Ribwort plantain	2											
Salad burnet	3											
Scabious (sp)	3											
Sedges - short & tall	2											
Sneezewort	3											
Verches	2											
Water avens	3											
Water mint	3											
Wood / Meadow cranesbill	4											
Yellow (hay) rattle	2											
Clanking grass	4											
Sweet vernal grass	2											
Negative plant species												
Common dock	-2											
Cow Parsley	-1											
Creeping thistle	-2											
Nettle	-2											
Ragwort	-2											
Rush	-1											
Spear thistle	-2											
Meadow score												
2. % cover of field area affected by damaging activities												
10 - 25%	-20											
5 - 10%	-10											
under 5%	0											
TOTAL MEADOW SCORE												

¹ Total species score - multiply species score by how many stops the species was seen in
² sp - all species within the Lady's mantle family
³ sp - all species within the Scabious family

Scorecard B: Grassland Habitat Score Card, Wild Atlantic Nature (WAN) (2021)

The form is divided into several sections:

- Header:** Grassland Habitat Score Card, Wild Atlantic Nature (WAN) (2021). Includes fields for Farmer ID, Surveyor, Plot number, and Survey date. Total Score: 100.
- A Ecological Integrity:** A checklist of positive and negative indicators. Positive indicators include species like Marsh Marigold, Meadowweet, and various grasses. Negative indicators include Common dock, Cow Parsley, and Creeping thistle. A combined cover score is calculated.
- B Hydrological Integrity:** Questions about watercourse contribution, wetland indicators, and artificial drainage features. Includes a 'Total score B' field.
- C Threats to Site Integrity:** Questions about encroaching scrub, cover of bracken, cover of rhododendron, ground poaching, and evidence of damaging activities. Includes a 'Total score C' field.
- Management advice / comments:** A text area for providing recommendations.

ABOUT CONTRACTS2.0

March 2023

Contracts2.0 aims to develop innovative contract-based solutions, which increase the motivation for farmers and land managers to produce more environmental public goods and allow them to reconcile the profitability of their farms with sustainability objectives. To do so, 28 research and practice partners closely cooperate to co-design and evaluate the novel contracts. Lessons learned from successfully tested contracts will also provide support for policy makers on local, national and EU-Level.

www.project-contracts20.eu
[contracts2_0](https://twitter.com/contracts2_0)
contact@project-contracts20.eu



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 818190.

All Practice Abstracts prepared by the contracts2.0 project can be found here: <https://www.project-contracts20.eu/practice-abstracts/> & <https://ec.europa.eu/eip/agriculture/en/find-connect/projects/contracts20-co-design-von-innovativen>