

## General format of the SoEF2015

### Comments:

**RM1: General Question: FRA includes a separate approach to the description of data quality. Which approach should be applied in the SoEF?**

Two alternative views on reporting on sources and comments on data and trends were expressed:

- To change the tables into the one developed for the CFRQ? – to harmonise and avoid overlaps
- To maintain the SoEF2011 system - better addressing the regional needs

### Suggestions:

Ask the ToS for recommendation

## Criterion 1: Maintenance and Appropriate Enhancement of Forest Resources and their Contribution to Global Carbon Cycles

### Definition of Forest

Explanatory notes (proposal by ES):

EN 3. In European conditions the following types of land cover and land use should be considered when allocating national classes to meet the criteria of the definition of forest or other wooded land:

- Mountain shrubland (e.g. Pinus mugo)
- Other shrubland (e.g. maquis and garrigue)
- Short rotation coppices / Short rotation forestry
- Poplar plantations
- Agro-forestry (silvo-pastoral) areas
- Plantations of nut-producing trees or shrubs (e.g. almonds, walnuts, hazelnuts)
- Plantations of Sweet chestnut (*Castanea sativa*)

*Comment SG: why should plantations of nut-producing trees be included when plantations of fruit-producing trees are not?*

EN 4. Land that is predominantly under agricultural or urban land use should not be included here.

“Predominant” means that over the five-year reporting period; the added value generated by agricultural or urban economic activities is greater than the added value generated by forestry.

*Comment SG: proposal by Eurostat: This may be reasonable for agricultural, but not for urban. Urban trees are mostly planted for social benefits, and in areas which also provide social benefits (e.g. parks), so value added is not a good way to compare their relative importance.*

EN 4. Includes abandoned shifting cultivation land with a regeneration of trees that have, or is expected to reach, a canopy cover of 10 percent and tree height of 5 meters in a given timeframe. Excludes Christmas tree plantations

*Comment CM: Where agroforestry could fit? Under OWL?*

### Suggestions:

Ask the ToS for recommendation

### 1.1: Forest area

**Reporting for 2011:** Data on “Forest” and “Other wooded land” was available for all countries (of which 11 reported “0” for OWL). Forest area available for wood supply was reported for the year 2005 by 41 countries (no data for Andorra, Ireland, Malta, Rep. of Moldova and Serbia).

#### Comparison to FRA2015: CFRQ T1a covers this

#### Comments:

##### RM3. Should we ask for an area of forests temporarily or permanently unstocked?

It was commented as a serious step in improving forest statistics; however would need clear definition what is “unstocked”, e.g. classification of “unstocked” may allow for some occurrence of trees, but below a certain limit. Another comment was in favour of reporting on temporarily unstocked but not permanently. KK: Adding age class 0 = unstocked would partly solve this issue, but not permanently/temporarily.

##### RM4. FRA questionnaire request also information about “Other land with tree cover”

It was observed that the availability of information on “other land with tree cover” is not very high. Information on “Trees outside the forest” would be more interesting from the perspective of total wood supply, but such data are also scarce. Thus including these categories under SoEF reporting was not supported.

#### Suggestions:

Leave the table as it is, discuss the opportunity of including are of permanently or temporarily unstocked forest.

### 1.2: Growing stock

**Reporting for 2011:** Data on “Forest” was available for 45 countries (no data for Andorra). Data on “Other wooded land” was available for 33 countries (of which 10 reported “0”). Growing stock of forest available for wood supply was reported for the year 2005 by 38 countries.

#### Comparison to FRA: CFRQ T3a uses 10 cm limits,

#### Comments:

**RM7. Availability for wood supply will be discussed by the group dealing with Criterion – Productive functions**

The proposal for improving reporting on forest available for wood supply, will be presented and discussed together with Criterion 3.

Clear description on how to define coniferous and broadleaved forests especially for Mixed forests was requested

#### **Suggestions:**

Should we aim at 0 cm limit (as recommended by ENFIN) or 10 cm threshold as requested by FRA

#### **1.3a: Age structure**

**Reporting for 2011:** Data on “Even-aged forests” was available for 29 countries (at least for one reporting year). Data on “Even-aged forests available for wood supply” was available for 25 countries (at least for one reporting year). The number of countries able to provide data increases (18-25 and 16-23).

#### **Comparison to FRA: Does not exist in CFRQ or FRA**

#### **Comments:**

**RM10: Should we continue this approach or replace this classification by e.g. three classes:**

- **Forest under regeneration phase**
- **Intermediate forest**
- **Matured forest**

The proposal of having three classes was supported in general, however technical problems and the need for clear guidelines was noted. Furthermore this reporting would be further developed by additional information: *CM: I would also question the use of this particular table and support the proposed new structure with the clarification that mature forests could be those reaching their (potential) harvest period within 10 (or up to the country) year while forests under regeneration phase would become closed forests within 5-7 (or up to the country) year. If adopted the whole table should refer not only to even-aged stands and for mature forests volume could be requested as well – this might align with the volume of FAWS and relates to the Indicator 1.3.*

*KK: To avoid the problem of using fixed no. of years something as follows could be considered:*

*Matured=mature for final felling immediately or age is at least 90 % of average rotation length on the site*

*Forest under regeneration phase=Majority of growing stock below industrial roundwood size*

#### **RM11: Should we request information for 2015 (forecasted)**

Mixed comments were received in favour and against requesting information for 2015

Collection of this information for OWL was proposed as well - as collection of data for forests only may lead to misinterpretations as considerable differences are with the OWL.

KK: It seems that there is misinterpretation of the concept OWL. OWL cannot have any significant importance in wood production, stocking is too low. Perhaps the comment above refers to ToF?

**Suggestions:**

- replace age by maturity classes: regeneration/seedling stage, intermediate, mature
- Add age class 0 = unstocked.
- ask for 2015

**1.3b: Diameter distribution**

**Reporting for 2011:** Data on “Uneven-aged forests” was available for 16 countries (at least for one reporting year). Data on “Uneven-aged forests available for wood supply” was available for 15 countries (at least for one reporting year). The number of countries able to provide data slowly increases (10-15 and 12-15).

**Comparison to FRA: Does not exist in CFRQ or FRA**

**Comments:**

No specific comments for this table

**Suggestions:**

Analyse national criteria for reporting on this table, precise international definition for uneven aged: management aiming at continuous forest cover, often includes protected forests

**1.4: Carbon stock**

**Reporting for 2011.** Relatively high number of countries reported on carbon, for example information on above ground biomass was available for all but one country (Andorra). Detailed information on completeness of reporting for 2010 is presented in the table below.

| Pool            | Biomass      |              | Deadwood | Litter | Soil |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------|------|
|                 | Above-ground | Below-ground |          |        |      |
| No of countries | 45           | 43           | 28       | 31     | 31   |

**Comparison to FRA: CFRQ T3e. Note: soil down to 1 m**

**Comments:**

SoEF 2011 requested information about a depth of soil, for which carbon amount was calculated, this should be maintained.

**Suggestions:**

Align with the FRA format; clarify which method on soil carbon reporting is applied.

**Criterion 2: Maintenance of Forest Ecosystem Health and Vitality**

**2.4: Forest damage**

**Reporting for 2011:** Number of countries reporting for the year 2005:

| Forest         | Total area of forest with damage | Forest            |                    |                         |                   |       |                           |    |
|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------|---------------------------|----|
|                |                                  | Biotic agents     |                    | Abiotic agents          | Human induced     |       | Primarily damaged by fire |    |
|                |                                  | Insects & disease | Wildlife & grazing | Storm, wind, snow, etc. | Forest operations | Other | Area                      | No |
| Total          | 19                               | 29                | 26                 | 31                      | 14                | 15    | 38                        | 29 |
| Other than "0" | 18                               | 28                | 19                 | 25                      | 5                 | 7     | 29                        | 22 |

**Other wooded land**

|                |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|----------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Total          | 12 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 27 | 19 |
| Other than "0" | 2  | 1  | 2  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 9  | 3  |

**Comparison to FRA: CFRQ T8a: total area burned and no. of fires, annually damaged area 2003-2012, not cumulative area. Asks also list for other outbreaks: category, year, area**

**Comments:**

**RM14 Two alternative approaches could be considered: a) reporting as so far (periodical averages) or b) reporting on individual years.**

There are often good (annual) data on forest fires, while other damages are more difficult to quantify. Annual figures on all different damages are likely not to be available. Damage due to forest operations are often misinterpreted and probably inconsistent.

**RM15 FRA (Table 8a) requests information on Total land area burned and Forest area burned in years 2003-2012 (for individual year)**

Does reporting on forest damages refer to damage to the wood? It was proposed to split the forest fire column into two: causing wood damage and not (i.e. causing other damage). Further more information on volume and not only area affected by damage would be useful as well.

**RM16 The SoEF Table 2.4b practically fully corresponds to the FRA 8b; the only major difference is that FRA requests information on forest damaged (insect, disease, weather event) while SoEF needs information on the area affected by these factors.**

KK: the difference above is a major difference

**Suggestions:**

Harmonize SoEF Table 2.4b and FRA Table 8a. Analyse possibilities for having a separate and harmonized (FRA and SoEF) reporting on forest fires (separate table on annual basis). Discuss options for reporting on damage by other factors.