

2007-07-10

## Minutes of WG2 meeting in Haikko Manor, Porvoo, Finland

The meeting started with personal presentations by the people taking part in WG2. Specifically, Ricardas Beniusis and Susana Barreiro were welcomed to the group as first time participants.

In the absence of Emil Cienciala, Gerald Kändler was appointed to assist Göran Ståhl as coordinator of the WG2 meeting. Arnór Snorrason volunteered to prepare the minutes.

### Meeting participants

<b>Name</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>e-mail address</b>
Alexandra Freudenschuss	Austria	alexandra.freudenschuss@umweltbundesamt.at
Antoine Colin	France	antoine.colin@ifn.fr
Arnór Snorrason	Iceland	arnor@skogur.is
Bruno Lasserre	Italy	lasserre@unimol.it
Erkki Tomppo	Finland	erkki.tomppo@metla.fi
Esther Thürig	Switzerland	esther.thuerig@bafu.admin.ch
Gal Kusar	Slovenia	gal.kusar@gozdis.si
Gerald Kändler	Germany	Gerald.Kaendler@forst.bwl.de
Gheorghe Marin	Romania	ghmarin@icas.ro
Göran Ståhl	Sweden	goran.stahl@resgeom.slu.se
Hannu Ilvesniemi	Finland	hannu.ilvesniemi@metla.fi
Karsten Dunger	Germany	kdunger@bfh-inst7.fh-eberswalde.de
Michael Prskawetz	Austria	michael.prskawetz@bfw.gv.at
Ricardas Beniusis	Lithuania	ricardasben@yahoo.com
Susana Barreiro	Portugal	smb@isa.utl.pt
Tarja Tuomainen	Finland	tarja.tuomainen@metla.fi
Tibor Priwitzer	Slovakia	priwitzer@nlcsk.org
Vittorio Tosi	Italy	vittorio.tosi@entecra.it

### **Agenda of the WG2 meeting**

Göran Ståhl presented the WG2 agenda and a working plan for the meeting. The proposed agenda was:

- 1) The report on references; status and next steps
  - a. Current status and remaining tasks (Gerald Kändler)
  - b. Discussions
- 2) Building bridges and sensitivity analysis
  - a. Introduction (Göran Ståhl)
  - b. Questionnaire results (Bruno Lasserre)
  - c. In-depth studies for selected countries (Karsten Dunger, Franz Kroihner)
  - d. Workshop on bridges

- e. Summary of workshop and next steps
- 3) WG2 comments on proposed outline of country reports
- 4) Initialising studies on uncertainty analysis (Gerald Kändler, Göran Ståhl)
- 5) Conclusions and summing up

The Agenda was agreed.

### 1) The report on references; status and next steps

Gerald Kändler presented the latest draft of the WG2 report on references. General comments:

- main objectives: to harmonize GHG reporting
- sample based NFIs seems to be dominant sources of relevant data for GHG reporting of forest information

Possible improvements of the report:

1. Put more diagrams in the report. Gerald showed a good diagram of carbon component.
2. Try to link related issues in different chapters in a better way.
3. Try to get final definitions from the other working groups and harmonize them to WG2 definitions.

The WG2 will have to do a final revision of the report and also try to label the references in accordance with the labels agreed upon by the entire COST Action.

Discussion after Gerald's presentation:

Karsten Dunger did not agree on using minimum width in the definition of forest. There was a lot of discussion about this matter. There may be difficulties in using WG1's forest definition in the GHG reporting. Further, the issue of whether poplar plantations should be forest land or cropland was discussed. For example, France includes such plantations as forest whereas Italy includes them as croplands.

Dead wood: dead stumps are lacking in the definition. It may be better to include stumps in the dead wood pool and skip the minimum length requirement? Group leaders will crosscheck this definition with the WG3 definition.

Difficulty with conversion from dead wood volume to carbon stock: Hannu Ilvesniemi pointed out that different decay classes have different conversion factors. Italy has started a project of measuring basic density of 5 different decay classes.

There were some discussions about the separation between dead wood, litter, and soil organic carbon, but all agreed on using the proposed definitions. But if litter and soil organic carbon should be reporting jointly this must be clearly stated in the reporting tables, e.g. with a notation "included elsewhere" in the litter column.

Esther Thürig pointed out possibilities to simulate annual growth and use harvesting statistic to estimate removals.

Summing up: It was decided that the deadline for additional contributions should be mid-August for all the remaining parts of the reference definitions report. The report has to be finalized before the next meeting and published as a technical report after the Romania meeting.

## 2) Building bridges and sensitivity analyses

Bruno Lasserre and Karsten Dunger gave introductory presentations.

Bruno presented the results of the last questionnaire about how well the country definitions match the reference definitions. The results were rather encouraging, i.e. only minor deviation between country definitions and references; however, only 12 countries had answered the questionnaire.

Karsten gave a presentation on building bridges, based on the results from the taskforce meeting held in Eberswalde. The presentation included case examples from the participating countries and pointed towards further steps to be taken.

Discussion: Göran pointed out the interest of reporting on the questionnaire and thus to try to get more countries to answer. Karsten pointed out that results have showed where to focus on bridge building. Göran thought that the results of the questionnaire show rather clearly that the reference definitions have been mainstreamed to most of the countries definitions.

Conclusion: More countries should be invited to perform case studies and the questionnaire should be resubmitted to countries that did not yet respond. Based on these results and the already existing results based on the Eberswalde task force meeting, a scientific article should be prepared.

The WG2 meeting was closed at 18.00 hours.

## **Second day of WG2 meeting**

Göran introduced the agenda for the day, which had to be updated due to plenary session expansions. The main topic for the second day would be a workshop on building bridges, where the workgroup participants are split in subgroups. Each subgroup should end its work with short written description of possible solutions.

Before the workshop, Franz Kroiher was invited to present a bridge-building case study from Germany.

### Presentation by Franz Kroiher

The case study compared the German forest definition with the FAO definition, specifically with regard to minimum forest area. The test areas were two Bundesländer in northern Germany. In these areas, NFI plot data were overlaid on existing high-quality land use maps (ATKIS) in order to assess what proportion of the

plots was located in very small or narrow forest patches. The conclusion was that almost all plots were located in patches that are forests according to FOA; the FAO cover was 99.2% of the German cover.

The presentation was followed by a general discussion on different approaches to building bridges.

#### Workshop on building bridges

Three different subject areas for the workshop were identified; each subject would be addressed by one subgroup. Each group had the following tasks:

1. Comment the general bridge document (presented during the introductory plenary session)
2. Identify main problems in your area
3. Identify main bridging options
4. Report:
  - a. short oral presentation
  - b. 1-2 pages written, within a week from now

Group subjects and leaders:

1. Carbon pools: Leader: Hannu Ilvesniemi
2. Land use categories: Leader: Vittorio Tosi
3. ARD and Forest management: Leader: Gal Kusar

The written documentation will be posted separately on the COST E43 homepage. Below, topics brought up during the presentations and discussions are summarized:

#### ARD subgroup

The ARD group concluded that the proposed references had been found appropriate during the discussions. No major problems had been found with regard to the questionnaire results.

#### Land Use subgroup

A comment on the general bridge document was that its relevance should be validated by a number of practical examples (case studies).

A main issue is the definition of forest land, e.g. with regard to the status of poplar plantations. This has to be clarified together with WG1, since we have decided to use “their” definition of forest.

Main bridging options:

- in most cases only minor adjustment are needed and bridge-building is already described by the countries
- maximum width of forest road has to be clarified

### Carbon Pools subgroup

The group had concerns about the quality of data for C-pool assessment in soils. How many countries collect soil sample at same time as NFI measurements? Further, Europe-wide soil sampling, like the Biosoil project, has very few repetitions in small countries (700 sample plots in Finland, which is a rather big forest country).

The group thought it would be more logical to put litter, humus and SOM in one pool, in accordance with the proposition in the reference report. If countries want to do so it is possible in the UNFCCC tables to put an explanation in the litter table, as “included elsewhere”.

Some discussion about GPG arose and Göran stated that the 2003 version of GPG should be used in preparation of country reports to the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol.

Regarding bridges it was concluded that bridges to adopt the 10 cm threshold for dead wood in many cases would be needed. It was suggested that correction factors derived in restricted case studies, or research projects, could possibly solve this matter.

For the below ground biomass BEF's will, for most of the countries, give values for below ground biomass, at least for the trees.

For the above ground biomass definition is clear but many volume and biomass equations used do not include the stump above ground. It has to and can be included with proper BEFs.

Lastly, Susana Barreiro presented a revised flowchart for building bridges.

### 3) WG2 comments on proposed outline of country reports

Before the meeting, the action chairman (Erkki Tomppo) had submitted an outline for country reports for the entire action. The (short) comments by WG2 were:

- The overall contents are good
- The coverage of WG2 issues appears relevant
- But probably the total length of each country report has to be reduced

### 4) Initialising studies on uncertainty analysis

Due to time constraints, it was decided to postpone this topic until the meeting in Romania.

### 5) Conclusions and summing up

A number of urgent tasks to be conducted before the meeting in Romania were identified. The following

References report: Gerald will summarise what details remain to be included in the references report and keep contact with the responsible people so that they deliver the needed materials until mid-August. Göran will then be responsible for compiling a new draft version of the report based on the input.

Bridges and sensitivity analyses: More case examples are needed to provide a good basis for a scientific article. So far, Germany and Sweden have contributed with case study data and Finland has promised to do so. At the meeting, France (Antoine) and Portugal (Susana) volunteered to join the case study group. Karsten will continue to coordinate this group and the next important event will be a task force meeting in France, scheduled for 8-9 October, and arranged by Antoine.

In addition to the case study results, the questionnaire results will be important. Bruno will resend the questionnaire to those countries that did not respond so far.

The output of the work conducted in Eberswalde, the case studies, and the questionnaire should be a scientific article. This article should be the final result of task force meeting in France. Karsten volunteered to coordinate the article work. Tentative participants in the task force meeting are: Karsten, Antonie, Tarja, Susana, Göran, and Bruno.

Regarding uncertainty studies, the initialisation is postponed until the Romania meeting. Participants are encouraged to collect information about research in each country. Göran and Gerald will prepare an introduction to this issue before the Romania meeting.

#### 6) Publications plan

- A technical report on reference definitions
- A scientific article on GHG/LULUCF reporting status in European countries (under processing)
- A scientific article on bridges and sensitivity analysis (draft outline available)
- A scientific article on uncertainty analysis (yet to be prepared)

The meeting of Working Group 2 was closed at 17.00 hours.

Secretary of WG2 minutes:

Arnór Snorrason

