

Assessment of RDP results under the Focus Area 4C Case of evaluation AIR 2017 – Estonia

Kadri Allik

kadri.allik@pmk.agri.ee

Estonian Agricultural Research Centre (ARC)

Developing the assessment to answer CEQ10

- No additional evaluation sub-questions
- 4C1 Soil erosion has been prevented: 7 additional indicators
- 4C2 Soil management has improved: 3 additional indicators

Judgement criteria	Additional indicator
<i>4C1 Soil erosion has been prevented</i>	Change in relative importance of acidic soils within the selection
	Change in relative importance of soil potassium deficiency within the selection
	Change in relative importance of soil phosphorus deficiency within the selection
	Change in relative importance of soils with a low soil carbon content (Corg) within the selection
	Change in relative importance of Corg > 12% (peat soils) in agricultural land
	Change in relative importance of permanent grassland under single area payment
	Change in relative importance of short-term grassland under single area payment
<i>4C2 Soil management has improved</i>	Change in relative importance of eroded soils under regional soil protection support
	Change in relative importance of average soil Corg content in agricultural land
	Change in relative importance of soils Corg stock in agricultural land

Developing the assessment to answer CEQ10

Additional Indicator	Base year	Current year	Data source
Acidic soils, soils with potassium and phosphorus deficiency and low carbon content within the selection, (%)	2011-2012	2016	ARC soil study
Corg > 12% (peat soils) in agricultural land, (%)	2011	2016	ARC soil study, GIS analysis of Estonian soil map
Permanent and short-term grassland under single area payment, (%)	2009-2013 (average)	2014-2016 (average)	ARIB* Land use analysis
Eroded soils under regional soil protection support, (ha)	2015	2016	ARIB*
Average soil Corg content (g kg ⁻¹) and soil Corg stock (Mt) in agricultural land	2015	N/A	ARC soil study, national soil monitoring

*Estonian Agricultural Registers and Information Board

Evaluation findings

Focus area	Result indicator	Target value (2023)	Current value (2016)	Implementation
4C	R10/T12. % of agricultural land under management contracts to improve soil management/or prevent soil erosion	71,0 %	60,0%	84,6%

Evaluation findings

Additional evaluation indicators	Ratio value
Change in relative importance of acidic soils within the selection, (%)	1%*
Change in relative importance of soil potassium deficiency within the selection, (%)	-8%*
Change in relative importance of soil phosphorus deficiency within the selection, (%)	-2,0%*
Change in relative importance of soils with a low soil carbon content (Corg) within the selection, (%)	-22,0%*
Change in relative importance of Corg > 12% (peat soils) in agricultural land,(%)	-0,68%*
Change in relative importance of permanent grassland under single area payment, (%)	3,0%*
Change in relative importance of short-term grassland under single area payment, (%)	-4,0%*
Change in relative importance of eroded soils under regional soil protection support, (ha)	316,4%

* Final results in the end of 2017

Evaluation findings

Additional evaluation indicators	Absolute value
Change in relative importance of average soil Corg content in agricultural land, (g kg ⁻¹)	36,5 g kg ⁻¹
Change in relative importance of soils Corg stock in agricultural land, (Mt)	92,1 Mt

Three additional evaluation indicators were proposed by ARC, but were not covered in AIR 2017:

- 1) The average soil pH value within the selection of samples
- 2) The average of mobile potassium within the selection of soil samples, (mg/kg)
- 3) The average of mobile phosphorus within the selection of soil samples, (mg/kg)



Thank you!