

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

**Working Group 3**

**Hotel Praia Mar,  
Rua do Gurué, Lisbon,  
Portugal**

**5 – 7 June 2008**

**Participants:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Country</b>
Anna-Lena Axelsson	Sweden
Nadia Barsoum	United Kingdom
Annemarie Bastrup-Birk	Denmark
Urs-Beat Brändli	Switzerland
Vladimir Caboun	Slovakia
Gherardo Chirici	Italy
Jean-Marc Fremont	France
Emilia Martin Queller	Spain
Ronald McRoberts	USA
Stefan Neagu	Romania
Jan Erik Nilsen	Norway
Felipe Perez	Spain
Elena Robla Gonzalez	Spain
Jacques Rondeux	France
Christine Sanchez	Spain
Tarmo Tolm	Estonia
Susanne Winter	Germany

## Thursday, 5 June 2008

14:30-17:30

The WG3 participants were informed about the planned final products of the WG3 work: Springer book, Special Issue of the scientific journal "Forest science".

The general table of content of the Springer book and the timetable and authorship were presented and discussed (for detailed decisions see Friday 6 June).

The list of reference definitions and bridge buildings were presented and discussed. Some final decisions on the definitions have to be discussed once again at the end of the year after finalising the scientific analyses of the common database.

## Friday, 6 June 2008

WG3 book status

The contents and structure of the WG3 book have been discussed and the following points have been retained:

- In order to be sure to have *updated information*, the authors of the chapters must send their sections to all countries for data checking, **after** finalising the drafts. The persons in charge of each core variable must check that the data is updated and contact countries with missing information.
- New data to be included in book (especially chapter 3): data coming from **Portugal, Slovenia, USA** and **Holland**. The persons in charge of each core variable must contact these countries for including the missing information.
- After this step, the "availability" maps must also be updated (see with Roberta?).
- The table of contents and the draft of all (?) chapters will be on the website's private pages so that all participants can consult.
- Springer will be contacted concerning a guideline for conversion draft text to printed text as well as for the **external review process**.

The common structure of chapter 3 was decided:

3.5.1. Background review, assessment purposes (before seeing what individual countries do)

3.5.2. Availability of information

3.5.3. Comparability : definitions (summarized country definitions) and methods – country similarities and differences.

3.5.4. Harmonization process (general aspects on the core variable) – level 3 indicators + level 4 (give reference definitions).

*i.e. this is a proposed structure, still experimental, we will see if it is operational!  
This chapter must be concise (maximum double spaced 10 written pages including figures per section).*

The common structure of chapter 5 was decided:

5.3.1. Components to be tested

5.3.2. Results – what can be harmonised, what not (for example, layers is not label to label)

5.3.3. Discussion – including recommendations on further harmonization and standardization (ex for what cannot be harmonised). i.e. page load : 15-20 double-spaced pages per core variable.

The deadlines for the book were determined:

- first draft of chapter 1: **end of June**
- first draft of chapter 2: **end of August**
- first draft of chapter 3: **end of August**
- first draft of chapter 4:
- first draft of chapter 5: **mid October**

Detailed chapters will be sent for revision as soon as they are prepared.

- deadline for the first full draft : **end of November**
- deadline for the Editorial Board revisions :
- deadline for the revision of the authors : **end of December**
- deadline for submitting the text to Springer: **end of February 2009**

#### Core variable specific analysis

- **Regeneration** (Nadia Barsoum)

As *regeneration* was introduced as a core variable lately, the presentation concerned mainly definitions and questionnaire results.

Definitions: FAO results as a basis, other info source, countries responses.

Data availability: almost all countries responded to the questionnaire.

Once again, countries must check their data !

For regeneration, we do not have data in the database – so it would be useful if some countries can provide this info – be careful to provide the data of the same plots delivered in the common database! Nadia will (maybe) send us a request (little instructions) for the table we can provide.

#### - **Forest Age** (Urs-Beat Brändli)

Introduction on the choice of this core variable.

A query was sent after questionnaire II, 90% of the countries assess forest age. Usually countries assess “stand age” and not tree age. For our analysis, we used only tree age.

Harmonised definition of Forest age.

Indicators of Forest age:

- Dominant age: proportion of plots older than half of the natural tree life span.
- Stand age : proportion of high forest older than 120 years (even-aged plots)
- Tree age : proportion of trees older than 50% of the natural life span

Urs handed out a table of the average between different sources (literature review) of the life-span of all species. He asks for our contribution, especially concerning missing data.

Bridging functions for forest age – models for one species

$Y = \text{age}$

$X = \text{dbh}$

Which gives an aggregate of points.

The indicators have been calculated with the common db data, for ex the proportion of plots older than half of the natural life span of dominant tree species.

#### - **Naturalness** (Ron McRoberts)

This analysis started by a literature review mainly coming from Europe. The definition of naturalness usually involves the concept of the *degree of a continuous gradient between natural and artificial*.

Naturalness is considered as an ecological value and is a very useful tool for conservation management.

For assessing naturalness, mainly two approaches:

- 1- indicators of the state of the ecosystem
- 2- indicators of human activity

Concerning the use of NFI data for assessing Naturalness, the common DB was analysed.

For choosing indicators for Naturalness, the use a combination of indicators coming from other core variables (deadwood, stand structure,...) may be an idea.

- **Forest Structure** (Susanne Winter)

The common DB was used to test the level 3 references (indicators).

A conclusion concerning the relevance of each indicator was given.

### Deadwood references in WG1 and WG3

Annemarie and Jacques came back from WG1 session on deadwood references. They came to an agreement on the thresholds. 10cm and 1m long (standing and lying). Concerning deadwood analysis, we will have to contact Nicola and guide him or take over the analysis.

### Forest Science Special Issue – WG3 papers

- The 14 papers included in the special issue were presented as well as the authorship. Ideas for new papers (Urs Beat Brändli on forest age, Nadia Barsoum on regeneration) and participation to existing papers are welcome.

### Coming meetings

- Task Force meeting in September 17-19 University of Copenhagen, Denmark
- Editorial board meeting in October 7-10<sup>th</sup> 7<sup>th</sup> WG3 8-10 Country book