



COST ACTION E43
**Harmonisation of National Inventories in Europe:
Techniques for Common Reporting**

9th Joint Working Group and Management Committee Meeting
Draft agenda For Working Group 3

Minerva Hotel, Bucharest, Romania
24-26 October 2007

Minute of Working Group 3

Wednesday, 24. October 15:00 to 19:00

Meeting of the sub-working group on “forest structure” at the Forest Institute in Bucharest

Participants:

Annemarie Bartrup-Birk (Denmark), Ugo Chiavetta (Italy), Gherardo Chirici (Italy), Dieter Rudolf Pelz, Ronald McRoberts, at the beginning Erkki Tomppo, Susanne Winter

The results of the STSM in Freising (Germany), 30.09.-21.10., referring to the forest structure were presented by Susanne Winter and Ugo Chiavetta. The common data base showed that most data refer to tree data and secondly to the plot data which are needed mainly for stratification of the data (e.g the forest types).

The first data analyses were presented: 1) the dbh distribution according to the forest categories of the EEA-Guideline, 2) the mean and variability of the dbh within the forest categories and 3) the harmonisation possibilities for layering data.

It was decided to continue with the analyses when the common data base is completed at the end of December 07.

Thursday, 25. October 11:30-12:30 and 13:30-18:00 WG3 Plenary Sessions

19 Participants: Annemarie Bastrup-Birk (Denmark), Urs-Beat Brändli (Switzerland), Ugo Chiavetta (Italy), Vladimir Caboun (Slovakia), Gherardo Chirici (Italy), Jean Marc Fremont (France), Jonas Fridman (Sweden), Paolo Godinho-Ferreira (Portugal), David Hladnik (Slovenia), Albertas Kasperavicius (Lithuania), Mark Lawrence (United Kingdom), Helena Mäkela (Finland), Ronald McRoberts (USA), Dieter Rudolf Pelz (Germany), Jaques Rondeaux (Belgium), Christine Sanchez (Belgium), Mitja Skudnik (Slovenia), Tarmo Tolm (Estonia), Susanne Winter (Germany),

1) Presentation and discussion of the built common data base (according to the results of the STSM in Freising). We decided that the common data base will be completed by the end of December 07. In additionally to the data of 12 countries, four countries (Finland, Slovenia, Portugal and France) should provide data within this year.

2) Discussion on the legal use of the data

Some countries have problems with the distribution of the data to different people and countries when the distribution is not precisely defined.

Furthermore, we discussed the types of analyses that are acceptable for publications (reports, papers and so on). We agreed that we do not report individual results from plots or a country. Mainly we will work with aggregated data (e.g.: gamma diversity referring to the EEA forest types). If it is useful to present data at the country level, the countries will be asked for permission.

The following text was agreed:

“Who will manipulate the DB? Who is the owner and who has access to the DB? In a very first phase the DB will be manipulated centrally by the leaders of the WG3 just to have a quality check and to “clean” the database. Once this first phase will finish the definitive complete and “clean” DB will be distributed to all those people who have provided the data. For the moment the DB is a kind of “common property” of data providers. After the presentation in plenary COST E 43 session of the DB and with the agreement of data providers the DB could be used within all the COST E43. The DB is anyhow intended as a product of the COST action E43 and not specifically of the WG3 that do not have this kind of autonomy. Specific rules for the use of the DB will have anyhow to be agreed within the COST E43 once the DB will be completed. In general, after the end of the COST E43, and the publication of the scientific papers based on the analysis of the DB, also considering that the DB do not contain sensitive data (no coordinates of the plots), the policy for the distribution of the DB for scientific activities should be quite open (possible global distribution via internet) but according to the legal rules of the data providing countries, specified by contract.”

3) Analyses of the WG3 common data base

The following schedule for the common data analyses were discussed and agreed:

- Deadline for data providing: 31.12.07 (Finland, Slovenia, Portugal, France stated interest to provide additional data for the common data base)

- Deadline for analyses within the subwork groups and providing results (data/figures/tables/text for the WG3 book): 31.03.08

- The data will be analysed mainly by the following persons with its subworking groups:

- Iciar Alberdi: Ground vegetation
- Jean-Marc Fermont /Nabila/Cathrine, Ronald McRoberts and Stefan Neagu agreed for naturalness, we agreed to test the proposed flow chart of the naturalness assessment
- Gherardo Chirici: Forest types
- Jaques Rondeaux and Cathrine Sanchez: Deadwood
- Susanne Winter and Elmar Hauk: Forest structure
- Urs-Beat Brädli, Jana Beranova: Forest age

4) WG3 book

It is planned to publish a book on the result of the Cost Action E43. Gherardo Chirici proposed to publish a book especially on the results of the Working Group three. The advantage is that we have more pages to describe and document our results. After discussing the advantage against the disadvantage (publishing a book will require a lot of working time), we agreed to publish the book. The editors will be all committed people who will work on the book.

After a discussion with Erkki Tomppo, Gherardo Chirici got the consent for the WG3 book and the cost supply for publishing it.

5) Agreement of scientific paper and ideas for papers

Agreement on authorship:

1. First inform the WG3 leaders and subwork group leaders that you prepare a paper.
2. Ask for co-authors which really contribute to the paper.
3. Acknowledge all data providers in each paper!

Ronald McRoberts informed us about a paper draft for Forest ecology and management. He is preparing a draft on the:

- Comparison of different approaches
- restrictions of the harmonisation process

Susanne Winter informed that after the final analyses (end of March), she will prepare a separate paper on the forest structure results as the results are a lot.

6) Questionnaire about regeneration

Nadia Barsoun send a questionnaire about regeneration. We agreed to send the questionnaire to the countries after small changes in the topics of questionnaire.

7) Final list of definition the indicators

The list of the indicator definitions has to be completed to the end of March 2008.

Friday, 26. October 9:00-12:30 Work in two subgroups: Forest categories/type and naturalness

- Discussion on Forest categories/types

The first result of the linkage of the countries plots to the EEA Forest type guideline show that most of the provided plot data were not connected with the EEA Forest type system.

- Reasons for the unclassified plots:

NFI data or not sufficient for the linkage to the EEA. To fit to the EEA Forest type classification you need information from the field (information on hydrology - location at a riverside, sea level, slope, natural region, regular spacing)

1. The 14 Categories are regarded as not sufficient: Sweden (Jonas Fridman) and Finland will provide a proposal for more forest types, especially on mountain birch communities;

plantation in transition (both for exotic and native plantations) as a new type (proposal from Paolo Godinho-Ferreira)

2. Problems with the plantation category:

- We propose to divide the category 14 into two categories 14 Site-Native species plantation and 15 Exotic plantations
- Deadline for changing EEA classification: End of November – Gherardo Chirici will ask Anna Barbati for changing the categories.
- Urs-Beat Brädli: We need a digital algorithm for the forest type key. Gherardo Chirici has to report that to Anna Barbati.
- A definition of “mountainous and lowland forests” is missing.
- Proposal of Ron McRoberts to link the “forest types” only to the tree species composition, Ron will send the algorithm of USA.
- Paolo Godinho-Ferreira will provide a definition for plantations in conversions for the divided category 14.

9) Others:

Improvement of the report: WE HAVE TO CHECK WHICH COUNTRY DATA ARE INCLUDED: PORTUGAL DATA/ANSWERS ARE AVAILABLE BUT MISSING MAINLY IN THE REPORT! Iciar Alberdi Asensio should review the answer of Portugal. Paolo Godinho-Ferreira claimed that there is wrong information in the tables.