

PROSPELU
PROSPECTIVE STUDY ON THE POTENTIAL USE OF LUCAS
(LUCAS Studies 2006 – Lot 2)

MINUTES of the **first follow-up meeting** held on December 5th, 2006 in Leuven

Date and place of the meeting:

Tuesday 05/12/2006

GEO-instituut Campus Arenberg, Celestijnenlaan 200E, B-3001 Leuven, Belgium

Participants:

ESTAT: Pascal JACQUES (PJ)

SADL-KUL: Anne GOBIN (AG)

LUXSPACE: Gerd EIDEN (GE)

EFTAS: Carsten HAUB (CH)
Dirk LINDEMANN (DL)

Agenda:

1. Review of the current project status (EFTAS)
2. WP 1 Set up of high level management group: past & upcoming (EFTAS)
3. WP 2 Compilation of policies: past & upcoming + WP 3 Policy monitoring: planning (SADL-KUL)
4. WP4 Analysis of potentialities between LUCAS / IACS / FSS: past & upcoming (LUXSPACE)
5. Action list II

1. Review of the current project status

(→ 01_PROSPELU_FU-I_management_EFTAS_2006-12-05.ppt)

CH presented the general management work done during the last three months and pointed out that now the “key phase” of the study had begun.

Content of the presentation:

- Deliverables, performance and meetings of the first three month project duration were delivered or carried out as agreed
- List of WP indicators (see PowerPoint presentation) was checked to evaluate the progress

CH stressed out that the contacting and interviewing of experts is still an ongoing process and not finished yet.

- Interim payments: done
- Next management issues:

- Action list II (covering 15.12.2006 – 15.03.2007)
- Definition and coordination of upcoming dates
- Next reports and meetings (BMR-II + NL II, IR, BMR-III, d-FR, FU-II)

Discussion:

During the discussion about the management aspects, the presented strategies had been mutually agreed on the

- indicator reporting as future part of BMR and IR
- overall BMR and newsletter structure

2. WP 1 Set up of high level management group: past & upcoming (EFTAS)

(→ 02_PROSPELU_FU-I_wp1_EFTAS_2006-12-05.ppt)

Content of the presentation:

1. Identification of potential users

Past:

- List of experts provided by ESTAT and extended with FAO, OECD, UBA

Upcoming:

- following on to connect selected experts, review and update contacts which will suit most; additional appointed experts by Eurostat are welcome!

2. Organization of workshop I

Past:

- Concept, registration and invitation by the end of September
- Meeting was held on 24/10/2006
- Minutes were provided and uploaded on 15/11/2006

Upcoming:

- Organization of 2nd WS in May will start T0 + 6

3. User interfaces

Past:

- www online since 22/09/2006
- First mailing 29/09/2006
- Newsletter 23/11/2006

Upcoming:

- external links to other lots and CIRCA to be forced
- Newsletter update until 08/12/2006
- Next mailing until 20/12/2006

4. User requirement analysis

Past:

- Repeated enquiries for questionnaire inputs
- Contacting of 58 experts
- Harmonization of external studies

Upcoming:

- Ongoing interviews and communication to users
- Ongoing enquiry for studies
- Further planning of selected interviews and meetings

Discussion:

CH proposed a statistical summary of the number of hits on the PROSPELU website. To differ log-ins for consortium partners, Eurostat and extern accesses. EFTAS will create additional log-ins.

PJ: The link from CIRCA to PROPELU was not established so far, also the www.lucas.eu address is not online until now.

The updated newsletter with the additional inputs of AG will circulate within the consortium + ESTAT and will be published via email and on the web site within the next week (calendar week no. 50). PJ asked for more information on the web site as in the newsletter (→ link to further information in the newsletter).

PJ recommended a cleaning of the experts list. To be deleted:

- BASTIEN Elisabeth, CHARLIER Hubert (ESTAT)
- LUCAS Stephanie, ROBERT Nicolas (IFN, France)

CH proposed a potential meeting at ESA when he is again around in Frascati for GMFS project in order to strengthen the ESA involvement into the HL expert group. PJ would like to participate this meeting and will be informed about any appointments.

EFTAS to update workshop photos on web site and also to provide the list of structured workshop inputs ("yellow cards").

CH explained the possibilities to integrate DeCOVER and GMES to the PROPELU study. Links to approved studies will be placed in the internal section (ex ante evaluation of GMES → to be provided by PJ).

3. WP 2 Compilation of policies: past & upcoming + WP 3 Policy monitoring: planning (SADL-KUL)

(→ 03_PROPELU_FU-I_wp2+3_SADL_2006-12-05.ppt)

Content of the presentation:

1. Experts interviews & interpellation

Results of Questionnaire

2. Policy Matrix → Initial Focus on the following policy domains

- a) CAP (Cross-compliance: GAEC, AES & RD, SMR); GAEC:
 - Protection of Permanent Pasture (PP)
 - Avoiding encroachment of unwanted vegetation on agricultural land
 - Retention of landscape features
- b) ENV Policy (soil protection, landscape & habitat, forestry)
 - Water Framework Directive (SMR, link to CC)
 - Proposed Soil Framework Directive (SMR, link to CC)
 - Soil issues in existing legislation (SMR, link to CC)
 - Soil erosion (SFD) (SMR, link to CC)
 - Forest Monitoring
 - EC NATRUA 2000 network
- c) REGIO: Urban environment
 - Thematic Strategy on Urban Environment
 - Link with air pollution
 - Link with newly proposed soil framework directive

3. Conclusions:

- LUCAS & Indicators for policy monitoring
- LUCAS & EU (spatial) policy

Discussion :

PJ requested a draft report from AG to be delivered at the beginning of January 2007 as an input for his *ex ante* report on LUCAS next year.

PJ: **IRENA** is missing in the compilation.

GE: Protection of **Permanent Pasture** → with LUCAS it can be checked if the general balance between arable land and grassland on a national level is correct (arable land should not increase compared to grassland).

PJ: EC planed an area frame survey for **waste deposits**: 200,- € per point! This potentially can be an additional feature of LUCAS, which should be analyzed.

PJ: In the case of **erosion** LUCAS data can be used as input for erosion models. In 2001 and 2003 the focus was set on the wrong parameters.

PJ: If **LUCAS** will move to **GMES** the sampling will be changed and the focus will be more on environmental issues rather than crop area estimates. LUCAS may **substitute** old forestry surveys like **ICP forest**, but this decision will not be made by ESTAT.

Example for member states: France is establishing a completely new 1x1 grid in Lambert projection for monitoring forests (ask Claude Vidal).

NATURA 2000: Overall there are not enough matches between LUCAS points and NATURA 2000 areas. The task of LUCAS is to keep record of **landscape features** (PJ). Other monitoring requires expert knowledge and should be left to specialists.

GE: Concerning **biodiversity**, the detection of different types of grassland needs skilled surveyors. To avoid higher costs an alternative would be to count the "number of flowering plants" inside grassland as a **simple indicator**. → The method was used in the German federal state of Baden-Württemberg by Greenpeace and the federal government

GE: LUCAS should focus on **one thematic block every 5 years**, and not try to collect all information every year. This methodology will substantially reduce costs!

PJ: With regard to the **urban environment**, the major question concerns the **main changes** between the survey and visible elements on the ground documents?

PJ: LUCAS will be used for **GMES** as an **institutionalized instrument**. In this case the main focus of LUCAS will **move from crop statistics to more environmental issues** and **calibration of satellite images**. The proposal could therefore be a larger sample, less focused of crops, and incorporating CORINE validation. At present the focus is on crop statistics rather than satellite calibration., A proposal is therefore needed for modifying the sampling in order to meet the new objectives! ("How many points of observation are needed?")

GE: We should embed into WP3 more technical aspects, e.g. how to use LUCAS data as ancillary input into models? The survey requirements must focus on the objectives of models, otherwise the collected data cannot be used properly.

PJ explained why a **3-m-diameter** was chosen for a **LUCAS point** as related to the minimum Level of feature recognisability on printed ground documents. The reason for 20-m-radius while using the extended window is unknown at the moment.

4. **WP4 Analysis of potentialities between LUCAS / IACS / FSS: past & upcoming (LUXSPACE)**

(→ 04_PROSPERLU_FU-I_wp4_LUXSPACE_2006-12-05.ppt)

Content of the presentation:

Objective: To investigate whether and how IACS/LPIS data can be integrated into LUCAS as a data provider

Tasks: Collect at national level all necessary details about the IACS/LPIS set up (national contact persons, JRC) and investigate how IACS/LPIS data can be practically used

1. Requirements

- Timing of IACS/LPIS: IACS/LPIS have to respect the LUCAS schedule
- Content of IACS declaration: IACS/LPIS data need to be compatible with LUCAS nomenclature
- LPIS spatial detail of IACS crop declaration: Unique correspondence between IACS crop declaration and LPIS spatial database

2. Spatial reference in the LPIS and IACS

- Parcel reference (reference : crop → 1:1)
- Cadastral references (reference : crop → 1:1 or 1:n)
- Physical Blocks (reference : crop → 1:1 or 1:n)
- ilots (Farmers Block) (reference : crop → 1:1 or 1:n)

3. Preliminary Conclusions

IACS/LPIS data could serve as a data source, but limited mainly to arable land.

Main issues to be tackled are:

- LPIS – geographical reference
- Content of IACS declaration
- Timing
- Organisation
- Legal question

Discussion:

GE: upcoming tasks:

- Continue and analysis of interviews
- Comparison of compatibility on IACS and LUCAS
- Comparison of compatibility on FSS and LUCAS

PJ: LPIS as spatial reference for IACS is updated only every 3-5 years, IACS is updated every year

PJ: LUCAS is not precise enough for small countries: IACS can help to increase the precision!

PJ described how **FSS + IACS data and LUCAS** could be **combined** to **support** a new LUCAS “**Phase 2**” **survey** (= farmer’s interviews). Will it be possible to link FSS with IACS data to get access to general information about the farm (farming practicing, fertilisation, use of pesticides,...)? FSS/IACS ID’s are different, so there is a barrier. Can this problem be solved using spatial intersection in GIS?

Old problems for “Phase 2”:

- identify the farmer
- does he tell the truth? → no legal issue!
- data are not representative

AG: Is it possible to get access to non aggregated IACS data? → potential solution: ask for a random production number (as it was done for Belgium).

PJ: WP 4 should describe:

- What are the reasons for requesting non aggregated IACS data on farm level for LUCAS?
- Where lie the legal and technical borders?
- Define new solution approaches for “Phase 2” to be started in 2010

CH: photo interpretation (→ strata) should be extended to other parameters

5. Action list II

The following action list for the upcoming three months was agreed:

ACTION LIST II (15.12.2006 - 15.03.2007)

05.12.2006 FU-I LUCAS LOT 2

code	Action	responsible	date due	status
WP 1.1 potential users				
1	clean & improve HL-list	EFTAS	ongoing	
2	recommend further experts	EUROSTAT	ongoing	
WP 1.2 organization of workshops				
3	report of WS results	consortium	15.01.07	
4	upload to web page	EFTAS	15.01.07	
WP 1.3 Users interface				
5	1.Newsletter update	consortium	08.12.06	
6	www.lucas-project.eu	Eurostat	15.01.07	
7	external links: CIRCA	EUROSTAT	20.12.06	
8	External links: other lots	EFTAS	20.12.06	
9	improve login management to monitor web access	EFTAS	20.12.06	
10	upload dig. pictures of meeting to web page	EFTAS	20.12.06	
11	2.Mailing	EFTAS	20.12.06	
WP 1.4 URQ				
11	WS output (see items 3+4)	consortium	15.01.07	
12	provide links to existing URQ-studies on web page in internal section	EFTAS	15.01.07	
13	support access to <i>ex ante GMES URQ report</i>	EUROSTAT	15.01.07	
14	selected phone interviews & meetings	EFTAS	ongoing	
15	ESA to invite PJ			
WP 2 + 3				
16	policy report	consortium	15.01.07	
17	improve with GMES	consortium	15.01.07	
18	identify observed parameters + grid	consortium	ongoing	
19	SWOT to be started	consortium	ongoing	
20	BANCIK parameters	consortium	ongoing	
WP 4 LUCAS - IACS – FSS				
21	finalise IACS enquiries			
22	investigate FSS approach in farmer coding			
WP 5 PM				
	minutes FU-I	EFTAS	20.12.06	
	place action list on web platform (see action 12) but distribution per mail in advance	EFTAS	20.12.06	
	final agreement on FU-II date	all	BMRI	
	informal meeting (LUX)	consortium	mid Feb:07	
	defined dates:			
	BMR-II		15.01.07	
	IR		15.02.07	
	BMR-III		15.03.07	
	d-FR		15.03.07	
	FU-II		20.03.07	