

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)  
Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (CLRTAP)

International Co-operative Programme on Assessment and  
Monitoring of Air Pollution Effects on Forests (ICP Forests)

---

# MANUAL

on

methods and criteria for harmonized sampling, assessment,  
monitoring and analysis of the effects of air pollution on forests

---

Part II

---

## **Basic Design Principles for the ICP Forests Monitoring Networks**

updated: 09/2017

---

Prepared by:

Marco Ferretti, Richard Fischer, Volker Mues, Oliver Granke, Martin Lorenz, Walter Seidling

---

Ferretti M, Fischer R, Mues V, Granke O, Lorenz M, Seidling W, 2017: Part II: Basic design principles for the ICP Forests Monitoring Networks. In: UNECE ICP Forests Programme Co-ordinating Centre (ed.): Manual on methods and criteria for harmonized sampling, assessment, monitoring and analysis of the effects of air pollution on forests. Thünen Institute of Forest Ecosystems, Eberswalde, Germany, 23 p. [<http://www.icp-forests.net/page/icp-forests-manual>]

ISBN: 978-3-86576-162-0



Acknowledgements: The authors are grateful to Karin Hansen, Morten Ingerslev, Lars Vesterdal, Bruno De Vos, and Tanja Sanders for providing written comments.

The compilation of this Manual part was co-financed by the European Commission under the LIFE Regulation and supported by Corpo Forestale dello Stato (Rome/Italy).

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this Manual for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the ICP Forests Programme Co-ordinating Centre provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this Manual for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the ICP Forests Programme Co-ordinating Centre of ICP Forests.

Application for such permission should be addressed to:

Programme Co-ordinating Centre of ICP Forests  
Thünen Institute of Forest Ecosystems  
Alfred-Möller-Strasse 1, Haus 41/42  
16225 Eberswalde  
Germany

[pcc-icpforests@thuenen.de](mailto:pcc-icpforests@thuenen.de)

Eberswalde, 2017

# Contents

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. SCOPE AND APPLICATION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. OBJECTIVES .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. PLOT LOCATION AND DESIGN.....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1 DEFINITIONS .....	5
4.1.1 <i>Monitoring intensity levels.....</i>	<i>5</i>
4.1.2 <i>Monitoring plots and sites .....</i>	<i>6</i>
4.1.3 <i>Mandatory and optional variables.....</i>	<i>7</i>
4.1.4 <i>Type of measurements.....</i>	<i>7</i>
4.2 SAMPLE PLOTS .....	7
4.2.1 <i>Large-scale (Level I) plots.....</i>	<i>7</i>
4.2.2 <i>Intensive (Level II) monitoring sites .....</i>	<i>9</i>
<b>5. SAMPLING DESIGN .....</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1 MEASUREMENTS AND REPORTING UNITS.....	11
5.1.1 <i>Plot description (stored in ‘System Instalment’).....</i>	<i>11</i>
5.1.2 <i>Stand description .....</i>	<i>13</i>
5.1.3 <i>Investigations and measurements at plot and site level .....</i>	<i>18</i>
5.2 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND DATA QUALITY REQUIREMENTS.....	20
<b>6. DATA SUBMISSION .....</b>	<b>20</b>
6.1 DATA TRANSMISSION TO PROGRAMME PCO-ORDINATING CENTRE.....	20
6.2 DATA VALIDATION .....	20
<b>7. REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>ANNEX I .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>ANNEX II .....</b>	<b>233</b>

## 1. Introduction

Most of the success of a monitoring programme rests on its design. Design can follow a top-down approach when administrative structure, aims and objectives of the monitoring are simple and can be easily identified (Parr et al. 2002). On the other hand, design may be quite complex when the programme has to face multiple objectives and purposes, carried out by an international and multi-agency co-operation (when different conceptual and operational perspectives have to be considered), and have to integrate existing monitoring “traditions” (which are always reluctant to change) (Parr et al. 2002). Under such circumstances, a top down approach is hardly feasible, and the bottom-up approach remains the only option (Köhl et al. 2000, Parr et al. 2002). This is particularly true for the two ICP Forests monitoring networks: although developed following generally agreed principles, given the nature of the programme the national networks originate from national initiatives and - as such - reflect more or less country-based design concepts. For example, the large-scale (Level I) network is in many cases a subsample of National Forest Inventories. As such, for example, the definition of the target statistical population and the plot design may be different from country to country (Cozzi et al. 2002). The same applies to the intensive monitoring (Level II) network, with a number of different plot designs being used across Europe. After 30 years of monitoring this situation cannot be denied, ignored or changed. Rather it can, and must, be acknowledged and managed as far as possible. This Part II of the ICP Forests Manual provides guidelines about (i) how to achieve basic design requirements and at the same time (ii) allow the continuation and consistency of the existing data series.

## 2. Scope and application

This Part II of the ICP Forests Manual focusses on the description of the overall monitoring structure, the selection and design of sample plots (Level I and Level II), the measurements (plot and stand description and geo-referencing, the variables to be measured) and data submission. The guidelines provided here permit a minimum level of harmonization which is essential to ensure data comparability across participating institutes and proper data processing. To have their data used in the international database and evaluations, National Focal Centers and their scientific partners participating in the UNECE ICP Forests programme should follow the methods described in this Manual.

## 3. Objectives

Monitoring design has the objective to ensure consistency between the aims of the programme and the activities carried out to achieve them. In this context, it is worth recalling the two main features of ICP Forests described in the Strategy Paper 2016–2023 (c.f. Annex 1 in Part I of this Manual: <http://www.icp-forests.net/page/icp-forests-manual>):

- The systematic large-scale monitoring (Level I) provides periodic overviews of the spatial and temporal variation in forest condition, forests health and vitality, and forest soil condition.
- The intensive monitoring (Level II) is carried out on permanent, highly equipped forest monitoring plots to foster integrative studies on cause-effect relationships based on consistent and harmonized long-term data series.

Given these objectives, relevant design issues are:

1. the type, number and characteristics of large-scale and intensive monitoring plots that will permit quantitative estimates with known uncertainty of forest condition at a given time and changes over time (Aim 1); and the identification of relationships between a given set of predictors and response variables (Aim 2). These issues will be covered in Chapter 4.
2. The set of investigations necessary to obtain data on forest condition (Aim 1) and on the stress factors of concern (Aim 2). This will be covered in Chapter 5.1
3. The set of variables to be measured within each investigation is under the responsibility of individual Expert Panels and will be covered within individual parts of the Manual.
4. The Quality Assurance procedures, summarised in Chapter 5.2, were developed following the approach described in Part III and will be described in Parts IV–Part XVI of the Manual.
5. The rules for data submission and reporting, are summarised in Chapter 6 and described in Part XVII of the Manual.

## 4. Location of measurement and sampling

### 4.1 Definitions

#### 4.1.1 Monitoring intensity levels

The two objectives of ICP Forests provide already some guidance for design, and ask for two different levels of monitoring intensity, the systematic, large-scale (Level I) and the intensive (Level II) monitoring. The two intensity levels of the monitoring are defined by the number, depth, and temporal resolution of investigations carried out on the plot and by the number of plots covered by the investigations. The two monitoring levels differ for the following three elements:

- Network design: Level I requires data to be formally representative at a large-scale intentionally covering the UNECE region (Europe and ECCAA countries). As such, a probabilistic sampling is required in order to allow design-based inference. On the contrary, no formal representativeness is required for Level II, and observation plots can be allocated according to different criteria (purposive sampling).
- Variables to be measured: Level I plots are mostly concerned with forest condition, and attributes to be measured are typically those able to describe tree condition. Level I is also the basis for large-scale assessments of forest soils, foliar nutrient content, and biodiversity. In short, Level I envisages a limited number of measurements on a large number of plots. Level II aims at understanding of the cause-effect relationships between the condition of forest ecosystems on one side and anthropogenic as well as natural drivers and stress factors on the other side. As such, it requires measurements to cover a range of responses (from tree condition to growth and biodiversity), predictors (e.g. deposition, gaseous air pollutants, meteorology) and intermediate variables (having the role of response and predictors, according to the analysis, e.g. soil, soil solution and foliar nutrition) (Vos et al. 2000). In short, Level II envisages

according to the general trade-off between number of objects (plots) and number of parameters a large number of measurements on a limited number of plots.

- Plot design: given the differences in the measurements to be carried out and the different aims, Level I and II differ also in plot design, both in shape and size. Unlike Level I, Level II must accommodate a number of different investigations and at the same time must avoid conflicts between them. Level II can be considered as a long-term monitoring and research infrastructure and hosts permanent equipment. A common requisite for Level I and II is the area frame: both Level I and II plots should have a known area.

#### 4.1.2 Monitoring plots and sites

##### 4.1.2.1 Level I plots

A Level I plot is an area of defined dimension and shape. Most commonly plots are circular plots defined by the coordinates of the centre and by a radius. However, the design of the plot is under the responsibility of the individual countries but should at least be consistent within each country. Level I plots are allocated over the statistical population of concern according to defined sampling design which may be different from country to country (see below), provided it is on a probabilistic basis. In the past, in some cases there was no fixed/defined plot: a fixed number of trees for crown condition were selected around co-ordinates of grid intersections and following a standardized scheme. This kind of design is not – by definition – a plot in formal terms, and has limitations with respect to area related statistical estimates. For countries wanting to keep such a design, it is worth noting that data can be processed only to derive sample statistics but are not suited for estimation purposes and will not be considered in that respect. However, for the sake of time series it is possible to maintain the existing sample trees. Guidelines how to achieve a proper plot design while maintaining the former sample trees (and the existing time series) are provided in the Annex II.

##### 4.1.2.2 Level II sites

A Level II site is a designated homogeneous forest area within which a Level II plot is installed. The area is not necessarily of defined shape and size, but should be large enough to accommodate the set-up of a Level II plot. The minimum size is 0.25 ha (see below). The plot is surrounded by a buffer zone (see below). The plot plus the buffer zone constitute the Level II site.

##### 4.1.2.3 Level II plot

A Level II plot is an area of defined shape and size (mostly 0.25 ha) located within a Level II site. Desirably, all the *in-site* measurements are carried out within the plot's boundaries and according to appropriate statistical requirements. When it is not possible (e.g., limited area, destructive sampling), some measurements can be located outside the plot, but within the Level II site boundaries. Data collected within the plot and with a proper statistical design can be considered formally representative for the plot. Data originated from measurements located outside the plot, or within the plot but with an incorrect design, can not be considered formally representative for the plot. They can however be assumed to be indicative for the site, although with unknown confidence.

##### 4.1.2.4 Level II sub-plots

For specific purposes (e.g. tree condition in dense stands, deposition sampling, ground vegetation assessment), one or more sub-plots may be necessary. A sub-plot is an area of defined dimension and shape within which the measurements are carried out. To be

representative for the plot, the sub-plots must be selected according to a statistically sound procedure. If not, measurements carried out on the sub-plot can not be considered indicative for the plot.

#### 4.1.2.5 Level II buffer zone

The buffer zone is an area surrounding the Level II plots designated to ensure plot protection against direct influence of nearby paths, roads and disturbances. The size and shape of the buffer zone depends on local conditions. However, it must be large enough to protect the plot from direct disturbances and – at the same time – still be characterized by the same plot conditions in terms of aspects, slope, canopy cover and soil condition. In some cases, the buffer zone can also be used for some *in-site* measurements. By definition, these measurements are not formally representative for the Level II plot. However, they can be considered indicative for the site.

### 4.1.3 Mandatory and optional variables

Two main sets of variables are defined, called “*mandatory*” or “*optional*” variables. The status means that within the respective investigations the mandatory variables must be measured. On the other hand, “optional” identifies those parameters that may or may not be measured. This status must not be confused with the obligation of EU-member states to assess and submit data under relevant EU regulations.

### 4.1.4 Type of measurements

Two series of measurements are defined: *in-site* and *off-site* measurements.

*In-site* measurements are all those measurements that are carried out within the Level II sites. They include tree condition, tree growth, tree phenology, biodiversity, ozone injury on plot main tree species, soil sampling, soil solution, foliar sampling, throughfall and stemflow sampling, and litterfall sampling.

*Off-site* measurements are those that – by definition – are carried out outside the forest stand. They include open field bulk deposition, open field meteorological measurements, gaseous air pollutants, ozone injury at the forest edge (light exposed sampling site (LESS)), extraction of tree ring cores, and other additional but destructive investigations.

## 4.2 Sample plots

### 4.2.1 Large-scale (Level I) plots

The selection and characteristics of Level I plots are always within the responsibility of the countries. However, to facilitate data evaluation, the following guidelines must be considered.

#### 4.2.1.1 Plot density

The minimum number of plots per country should be equal to the forest area of the country (in km<sup>2</sup>) divided by 256. This is to keep consistency with the traditional plot density adopted within the ICP Forests. For small countries and/or infrequent forest types, denser sampling should be considered (e.g. Köhl et al. 1994). Data from possibly denser national grids are not submitted to the central database.

#### 4.2.1.2 Plot selection

A probabilistic sampling design is essential to ensure that large-scale plots fit the aims of the monitoring. Plots should be allocated over the target statistical population in a way that

– for each element of the population – a non-zero probability of being selected is ensured. When setting-up a new Level I network, different designs can be adopted (e.g., random sampling, systematic sampling, tessellation stratified sampling) which fit the above requirement. The definition of the sampling scheme is under the responsibility of the individual countries.

#### 4.2.1.3 Plot selection to achieve harmonization/integration with existing networks

Different forest monitoring networks may already exist within a country. Due to their nearly ubiquitous presence in European countries, the most common networks are National Forest Inventories (NFI) and Level I. Two cases may exist (Ferretti, 2010):

1. Level I and NFI are already merged in the same network. This may be the case because Level I was established on existing NFI networks (most frequent) or the other way round. In general, a subsample of NFI plots was used for Level I (Köhl et al. 1994; Neumann 1993). In these cases, networks are already integrated and harmonized or at least co-located. Some further harmonization may be necessary due to a possible adaptation of survey methods in agreement to international procedures, but this can be traced and documented.

2. Countries with separate NFI and Level I networks. This may have happened because (i) there was no NFI in the past, and Level I was created prior to the NFI; (ii) NFI and Level I were developed independently; (iii) countries with a former joint NFI-Level I network (Case 1) abandoned (for a variety of reasons) their original NFI for a newly designed one, thus having now two separate networks. The result is that Level I and NFI are carried out on different networks.

In Case 2, it may be useful to apply some harmonization/integration concept that may allow maximum use of existing networks and information. A functional integration of networks (in the sense of Ferretti 2010) is suggested in Annex I.


#### 4.2.1.4 Plot design and selection of sample trees and sample locations for other surveys

Plot design is under the responsibility of the countries, and must be reported when submitting data. Figure 1 shows different plot designs adopted for Level I in Europe. While different designs are possible, it is important that plots are designed on a fixed area basis, a condition necessary for estimation purposes and to allow a better integration with NFIs. Deviations from the fixed area concept are only possible in exceptional cases for tree condition assessments in order to ensure time series. When such deviations are adopted (e.g. fixed number of trees without area related information), data can be used for descriptive statistics, but not in design-based inference. Although desirable, it is not necessary that plots are of the same size and shape between different countries; rather it is essential that they are of the same design within a country, respectively the federal states within Germany or Belgium. When NFI and Level I networks are separated, it is recommended that the Level I plots will in addition adopt the country-specific NFI design (see Chapter 4.2.1.3). As an alternative, and since it was already used for measurements of dbh, dead wood, and ground vegetation, the BioSoil design is also recommended.

Annex II provides a suggestion on how to move from a fixed-number of trees sample point to a fixed area plot, without losing the connection with existing data series.

On Level I, annual tree crown condition assessment is obligatory. On a voluntary basis tree growth, ground vegetation and foliar chemistry are assessed according to the respective methods (see Manual Parts V, VII and XII). A European-wide soil condition survey has been carried out twice on Level I plots. The concept foresees a repetition of the soil survey in larger time intervals (e.g. every ten to twenty years). Soil surveys should be carried out temporally synchronized in all participating countries. Methods for soil condition surveys are described in Part X.





**Figure 1:** Examples of designs adopted for Level I plots in Europe. A. Cross-cluster; B. Circular: 1, subplot for all trees above given dbh thresholds; 2, subplot for large trees only; C. BioSoil plot: 1.30 m<sup>2</sup> subplot; 400 m<sup>2</sup> subplot; 2000 m<sup>2</sup> subplot. (drawing by M. Ferretti).

#### 4.2.2 Intensive (Level II) monitoring sites

The selection and characteristics of Level II plots are always within the responsibility of the countries. However, to facilitate data evaluation, the following guidelines must be considered

##### 4.2.2.1 Number of sites

The number of Level II plots should equal at least approximately 10% of the Level I plots.

##### 4.2.2.2 Selection of sites

Plots are selected on a preferential basis taking into account:

- **Ecological and logistic issues:** The situation shall be as homogeneous as possible (regarding e.g. tree species, stand type and site conditions within the plot). However, the more homogeneous the plot, the higher is the chance its homogeneity will decrease with time as result of different factors (Palmer 1993). Plots should be accessible to allow routine operations;
- **The importance of forest ecosystems within a country:** One important selection criterion is that the Level II plots in a country should be located in such way that the most important forest species and most widespread growing conditions in the country are represented. In order to facilitate data analyses; it is advisable to give priority to replicates within the same forest ecosystem type, rather than spreading plots over a huge variety of forest types;
- **The existence of data series and the importance of their continuation:** Whenever possible, plots should be selected which have been monitored during the last years. The great advantage of existing data on air quality and meteorological parameters from nearby stations should be taken into consideration whenever establishing Level II plots.


#### 4.2.2.3 Site and plot design

There are different designs adopted for Level II sites and plots (Figure 2). Countries are responsible for selecting the most appropriate design, provided they can conduct the investigations as described in the Manual, Parts III-XV. While different designs are allowed, some requirements must be attained:

- Plot boundaries must be permanently identified and geo-referenced;
- Plots must have a minimum size of 0.25 ha. The area of the plot must be always reported.
- Sub-plots are allowed, and the sub-plot selection criteria must be described. Sub-plot boundaries must be permanently identified and geo-referenced. The area of the sub-plots must be always reported.

The selection of sample trees and/or the positioning of measuring devices for different surveys is described in the parts of the Manual dealing with the concerned survey.

Examples of location of a Level II site and plot with in-site and off-site measurements is given in Figure 2.



**Figure 2:** Example of location of a monitoring site and its possible organization, with buffer zone, plot and sub-plots. In-site measurements are those that must be carried out within the site; off-plot measurements are those to be carried out in an open area close to the plot. Note that different shapes (e.g. rectangles, polygons) and sizes (min 0.25 ha) are possible, as well as different types of internal organization of the plot. Size and shape must however be known and reported. (drawing by M. Ferretti).

#### 4.2.2.4 Type of Level II sites and plots

Two types of Level II sites/plots are identified:

1. Level II standard: on these sites the following surveys are obligatory

- Crown condition (annually)
- Tree growth (every 5 years)
- Foliar chemistry (every 2 years)
- Ground vegetation (every 5 years)
- Deposition (continuously)
- Soil solid phase (every 10-20 years)
- Meteorology (at least on 10% of the plots) (continuously)

2. Level II core: these sites are a sub-sample of the previous standard Level II sites. On core sites, the same surveys as on the standard Level II sites are carried out. In addition, the following surveys are conducted:

- Litterfall (continuously)
- Tree phenology (several times within a year)
- Growth (intensive) (every year by growth bands)
- Soil solution (continuously)
- Soil water (continuously)
- Air quality (passive and/or active sampling, continuously)
- Visible ozone injury (continuously, except northern Europe)
- Meteorology (continuously)

Core plot surveys are carried out on a voluntary basis. In case that countries are willing and interested to carry out intensified monitoring beyond standard Level II surveys, it is strongly recommended to carry out the complete set of core plot surveys in order to facilitate transnational and integrated statistical data evaluations and process-based modelling. Preference shall be given to a smaller number of intensive monitoring plots with complete sets of core plot surveys instead of operating bigger numbers of plots that carry different combinations of surveys beyond the Level II standard surveys. (In response to specific national interests and needs and/or thematic focuses - different combinations of surveys can be applicable.)

## 5. Sampling design

### 5.1 Measurements and reporting units

#### 5.1.1 Plot description (stored in 'System Instalment')

Plot descriptive information has to be submitted once at plot installation or whenever changes have occurred (e.g. due to storm damage, species change) (Table 1).

### 5.1.1.1 Plot number.

The plot number is an identifier and must be unique within each participating country or region (e.g. federal state). For each new plot a new plot number has to be used and submitted. In case that an existing plot is replaced by a newly installed plot, a new plot number (never been used before) has to be chosen.

**Table 1:** Quick reference of variables to be reported for the general plot description.

Variable	Reporting unit	Target plot type		
		Level I	Level II standard	Level II core
Country code	Code	m	m	m
Plot number	Number	m	m	m
Plot size	hectare	m	m	m
Plot design	Code	m	m	m
Installation date	Date	m	m	m
Plot status	Active/not active	o	m	m
NFI status	Y/N	m	o	o
Latitude	WGS84	m	m	m
Longitude	WGS84	m	m	m
Altitude class	Code	m	m	m
Altitude	meters	o	o	o
Orientation	Code	m	m	m
Slope	degrees	o	m	m

o – optional, m - mandatory

### 5.1.1.2 Plot design:

The plot design of Level I and Level II plots is described by codes. Coding dictionaries are part of the online documentation.

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaries/d\\_plot\\_design.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaries/d_plot_design.html)

### 5.1.1.3 Plot coordinates:

A plot centre, so called “reference point” has to be marked permanently. Its geographic coordinates are specified in geographic degrees, minutes and seconds. Format description is available under: <http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/ExplanatoryItems/4.html>.




Figure : Exemplary definition of a plot area providing the exact coordinates for the SW-corner of the plot as well as the azimuth from North and the distance to the other corner points.

#### 5.1.1.4 Additional information:

For definitions of additional attributes see the online documentation under:

Level I: <http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Y1/index.html>

Level II: <http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/SI/index.html>

### 5.1.2 Stand description

Information on the stand must be reported every five years. Reporting should occur every full and half decade (year 2010, 2015, 2020, ...). Table 2 presents an overview of variables to be reported. Each variable is explained in the following text.

#### 5.1.2.1 Stand history

The continuity of forest cover is of relevance for a number of ecological forest functions, including forest species composition. Stand history is reported in 5 classes according to Bastrup-Birk et al. 2006.

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d\\_stand\\_history.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d_stand_history.html)

**Table 2.** Quick reference of variables to be reported for the general stand description.

Variable	Reporting unit	Target plot type		
		Level I	Level II	Level II core
Stand history	code	o	m	M
Previous land use	code	o	m	M
Origin of current stand	code	o	m	M
Main tree species	code	m	m	M
Type of tree species mixture	code	o	m	M
Top height	meter	o	m	M
Forest type	code	m	m	M
Age class	code	m	m	M
Number of tree layers	code	o	m	M
Coverage of tree layers	5% steps	o	m	M
Canopy closure	5% steps	m	m	M
Protection status	code	o	m	M
Fencing	code	o	m	M
Non-timber utilisation	code	o	m	M
Management type	code	o	m	M
Intensity of management	code	o	m	M
Management method	code	o	m	M
Forest ownership	code	o	m	M

o – optional, m – mandatory

#### 5.1.2.2 Previous land use

Previous land use information is reported in 7 classes.

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d\\_prev\\_landuse.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d_prev_landuse.html)

#### 5.1.2.3 Origin of current stand

The origin of the stand on the plot is reported in 5 classes according to Bastrup-Birk et al. 2006.

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d\\_stand\\_actual.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d_stand_actual.html)

#### 5.1.2.4 Main tree species

The tree species dominating the forest canopy in terms of canopy closure of the plot is reported using a three-digit code.

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d\\_tree\\_spec.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d_tree_spec.html)

#### 5.1.2.5 Type of tree species mixture

The type of tree species mixture on the plot is reported in 5 classes (Anonymous 2005).

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionary/d\\_tree\\_species\\_mix.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionary/d_tree_species_mix.html)

#### 5.1.2.6 Top height

Average top height can be derived from measured values (usually the case on Level II plots) or from estimates. The method of determination is to be indicated in the data submission forms. Top height is defined as the mean height of the 100 thickest stems per ha.

#### 5.1.2.7 Forest type

The forest type of the plot is reported following the nomenclature of the European Environment Agency (EEA 2006), and further developed by UNECE/FAO (2010).

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionary/d\\_forest\\_type.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionary/d_forest_type.html)

#### 5.1.2.8 Age class

The mean age of the dominant storey is given in age classes (20-year classes).

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionary/d\\_mean\\_age.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionary/d_mean_age.html)

#### 5.1.2.9 Number of tree layers

The number of layers is reported in 4 classes (Anonymous 2005).

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionary/d\\_tree\\_layers.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionary/d_tree_layers.html)

#### 5.1.2.10 Coverage of tree layers

The coverage of each layer is reported in 5% steps, only layers are included that have at least a 10% coverage. The sum of the coverage of all tree layers may be > 100%. Coverage of tree layers is estimated as a projection of branches and foliage to the plot surface. (Note: The coverage estimate refers to the plot area, whereas tree coverage estimates conducted within the ground vegetation survey are related to the ground vegetation subplot.)

<http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/ExplanatoryItems/15.html>

#### 5.1.2.11 Canopy closure

Canopy closure is reported as the estimated percentage of coverage of the tree layer > 5 m in 5 classes (Bastrup-Birk et al. 2006). As multiple layers are not considered separately the maximum value is 100%.

As layers may overlap, the sum of the coverage of single layers may be higher than the canopy closure. Canopy closure is estimated as a projection of branches and foliage to the plot surface. (Note: The canopy closure estimate refers to the plot area, whereas tree coverage estimates conducted within the ground vegetation survey are related to the ground vegetation subplot).

<http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/ExplanatoryItems/16.html>

#### 5.1.2.12 Protection status

The protection status of the monitoring plot is described following the MCPFE classification (MCPFE 2006).

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaries/d\\_protection\\_status.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaries/d_protection_status.html)

- MCPFE Class 1.1: No Active Intervention

The main management objective is biodiversity. No active, direct human intervention is taking place. Activities other than limited public access and non-destructive research not detrimental to the management objective are prevented in the protected area.

- MCPFE Class 1.2: Minimum Intervention Guidelines

The main management objective is biodiversity. Human intervention is limited to a minimum. Activities other than listed below are prevented in the protected area:

- ungulate/game control
- control of diseases/insect outbreaks<sup>1</sup>
- public access
- fire intervention
- non-destructive research not detrimental to the management objective
- subsistence resource use<sup>2</sup>.

- MCPFE Class 1.3: Conservation Through Active Management

The main management objective is biodiversity. A management with active interventions directed to achieve specific conservation goals of the protected area is taking place. Any resource extraction, harvesting, silvicultural practices detrimental to the management objective, as well as other activities negatively affecting the conservation goal, are prevented in the protected area.

- MCPFE Class 2 : Main Management Objective 'Protection of Landscape and Specific Natural Elements'

Interventions are clearly directed to achieve the management goals landscape diversity, cultural, aesthetic, spiritual and historical values, recreation, specific natural elements. The use of forest resources is restricted. A clear long-term commitment and an explicit designation as specific protection regime, defining a limited area exists. Activities negatively affecting characteristics of landscapes or/and specific natural elements mentioned are prevented in the protected area.

- MCPFE Class 3 : Main Management Objective 'Protective Functions'

The management is clearly directed to protect soil and its properties or water quality and quantity or other forest ecosystem functions, or to protect infrastructure and managed natural resources against natural hazards. Forests and other wooded lands are explicitly designated to fulfil protective functions in management plans or other legally authorised equivalents. Any operation negatively affecting soil or water or the ability to protect other ecosystem functions, the ability to protect infrastructure and managed natural resources against natural hazards is prevented.

---

<sup>1</sup> in case of expected large disease/insect outbreaks control measures using biological methods are allowed, provided no other adequate control possibilities in the buffer zone are feasible.

<sup>2</sup> subsistence use to cover the needs of indigenous people and local communities, in so far as it will not adversely affect the objectives of management



#### 5.1.2.13 Fencing

Fencing is reported in 3 classes according to Bastrup-Birk et al. 2006.

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d\\_fencing.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d_fencing.html)

#### 5.1.2.14 Non-timber utilisation

Non-timber utilisation is reported in 5 classes. Only regular non-timber utilization is to be reported which may have a measurable impact on nutrient and water cycles. Do not report very occasional utilizations.

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d\\_notimb\\_util.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d_notimb_util.html)

#### 5.1.2.15 Management type

Management type is reported in 3 classes

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d\\_manage\\_type.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d_manage_type.html)

#### 5.1.2.16 Intensity of management

Intensity of management is reported in 4 classes according to Bastrup-Birk et al. 2006.

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d\\_manage\\_intensity.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d_manage_intensity.html)

#### 5.1.2.17 Management method

Management method is reported in 5 classes (Anonymous 2005).

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d\\_manage\\_method.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d_manage_method.html)

#### 5.1.2.18 Forest ownership

Forest ownership is reported in classes following the FAO Forest Resource Assessment 2010 (FRA 2010,).

[http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d\\_forest\\_owner.html](http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/Dictionaryes/d_forest_owner.html)

- Public ownership: forest owned by the State, by administrative units of the public administration, or by institutions or corporations owned by the public administration.
- Private ownership: forest owned by individuals, families, communities, private co-operatives, corporations and other business entities, private religious and educational institutions, pension or investment funds, NGOs, nature conservation associations and other private institutions.
  - Individuals (sub-category of Private ownership): Forest owned by individuals and families.
  - Private business entities and institutions (*sub-category of Private ownership*): Forest owned by private corporations, co-operatives, *companies and other business entities*, as well as private non-profit organizations such as NGOs, nature conservation associations, and private religious and educational institutions, etc.
  - Local communities (*sub-category of Private ownership*): Forest owned by a group of individuals belonging to the same community residing *within or in the vicinity of a forest area*. The community members are co-owners that share exclusive rights and duties, and benefits contribute to the community development.
  - Indigenous or tribal *communities* (*sub-category of Private ownership*): Forest owned by communities of indigenous or tribal people.

- Other types of ownership: Other kind of ownership arrangements not covered by the categories above. Also includes areas where ownership is unclear or disputed.

### **5.1.3 Investigations and measurements at plot and site level**

Several measurements should be carried out within individual investigations at the large-scale plots (Level I) and/or at the intensive monitoring (Level II) sites. Table 3 reports a quick reference for the various investigations foreseen, their target plots and expected frequency. Specific measurements foreseen within individual investigations as well as their status (mandatory/optional) are described and reported in detail in the individual parts of the Manual, also indicated in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Quick reference for surveys to be carried out on different plot types.

Survey	Provide data on	Methods described in	Target plots and frequency of assessment/measurement/sampling		
			Level I	Level II	Level II core
Plot description	Location, size and status of the plot,	Part II	Install.	Install.	Install.
Stand description	Basic characteristics of the stand	Part II	5 yr	5 yr	5 yr
Tree condition	Indicators of crown, branches and stem status of the trees	Part IV	1 yr	1 yr	1 yr
Tree growth and yield	Actual periodic growth of the stand and of individual trees	Part V	-	5 yrs	5 yrs
Tree growth and yield (intensive)	Intra-annual and annual growth of individual trees	Part V	-	-	continuously
Tree phenology	Timing of the annual development stages of forest trees (plot level)	Part VI	-	-	weekly
Tree phenology (intensive)	Timing of the annual development stages of forest trees (individual tree level)	Part VI	-	-	continuously
Ground vegetation	Species richness and abundance	Part VII	project	5 yrs	5 yrs
Ozone injury on plants	Presence on visible injury attributable to tropospheric ozone	Part VIII	-	-	1 yr
Meteorological measurements	Basic (T, Pr, wind speed) meteorological variables	Part IX	-	continuously	continuously
Soil sampling and analysis	Soil profile and chemical concentration of elements and ions in soil solid phase. Information	Part X	project	10 yrs	10 yrs
Soil solution collection and analysis	Chemical content of elements and ions in soil liquid phase	Part XI	-	-	1-2 weeks
Foliar sampling and analysis	Chemical concentration of elements in foliage of trees	Part XII	project	2 yrs	2 yrs
Sampling and analysis of litterfall	Amount, composition and chemical content of litter	Part XIII	-	-	1-2 weeks
Sampling and analysis of deposition	Chemical concentration of elements and ions in open field, throughfall and stemflow precipitation	Part XIV	-	2-4 weeks	2-4 weeks
Ambient air quality	Concentration of SO <sub>2</sub> , NO <sub>x</sub> , O <sub>3</sub> in the air	Part XV	-	-	1-2 weeks
Install – at plot instalment, project – within dedicated projects					

## 5.2 Quality Assurance and Data Quality Requirements

At its 22<sup>nd</sup> Task Force Meeting in 2007, ICP Forests adopted an overall Quality Assurance (QA) perspective. The overall concept and the QA components are described in Part III, while individual QA/QC measures are reported in detail in individual Parts for the investigations based exclusively on field measurements, and in Part XVI for investigations involving laboratory analysis.

## 6. Data Submission

Data is submitted yearly to the European central data storage facility at the ICP Forests Programme Co-ordinating Centre (PCC) using formats specified in standardized documents under: <http://www.icp-forests.org/documentation/>.

### 6.1 Data Transmission to Programme Co-ordinating Centre

Data will be sent to PCC using a data submission web application at any time of the year, however, deadlines for annual reporting should be considered. Data is submitted survey by survey and year by year. Thus, each NFC has to submit a complete set of files/forms per survey and year via the submission module. In general, this set includes a reduced plot file and data files. Additionally, all files containing respective QA/QC information (e.g. results of laboratory ring tests or field comparison courses) and data accompanying reports (word documents) should be submitted together with the data files.

An exception to the annual submission is the general plot information which is submitted only in case of a need for updating the ICP Forests database (e.g. new plots or improved/updated plot relevant information).

### 6.2 Data Validation

Submitted data will be tested in three stages: Compliance, Conformity and Uniformity tests (Houston & Hiederer 2009). Only those data which pass those stages successfully will be up-loaded into the ICP Forests database.

Compliance tests will test the format of the submitted data.

Conformity tests focus on the submitted values and compare them with test ranges or test their relation to the values of other attributes or of the same attribute from former years.

Uniformity tests check the spatial and temporal comparability of the data by the production of graphs and maps. Whereas compliance and conformity checks will be applied in time by the submission application of the database during the transmission procedure, uniformity checks will be applied by staff of the PCC data centre.

## 7. References

- Anonymous, 2005: Stand structure assessments including deadwood within the EU/ICP Forests Biodiversity Test-Phase (ForestBIOTA). <http://www.forestbiota.org/> (accessed 17 June 2010).
- Bastrup-Birk A, Neville P, Chirici G, Houston T, 2006: The BioSoil Forest Biodiversity Field Manual. <http://www.icp-forests.org/EPbiodiv.htm> (accessed 17 June 2010)
- Cozzi S, Ferretti M, Lorenz M, 2002: Quality assurance for crown condition assessment in Europe. UN/ECE, Geneva: 111 p.
- EEA, 2006: European Forest types. Categories and types for sustainable forest management reporting and policy. EEA Technical Report No 9/2006. European Environment Agency
- Ferretti M, 2010: Harmonizing forest inventories and forest condition monitoring - the rise or the fall of harmonized forest condition monitoring in Europe? *iForest* 3: 1-4.
- FRA, 2010: Global forest resources assessment. [[www.fao.org/forestry/fra](http://www.fao.org/forestry/fra), accessed 31 March 2016].
- Houston TD, Hiederer R, 2009: Applying quality assurance procedures to environmental monitoring data: a case study. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 11: 774–781.
- Köhl M, Innes JL, Kaufmann E, 1994: Reliability of differing densities of sample grids used for the monitoring of forest condition in Europe., *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 29: 201-220.
- Köhl M, Traub B, Päivinnen R, 2000: Harmonisation and standardisation in multi-national environmental statistics – mission impossible? *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 63: 361-380.
- MCPFE, 2006: MCPFE information document on data collection and compiling the statistics on protected and protective forest and other wooded land in Europe. Warsaw, 16 p. [[http://www.foresteuropa.org/docs/reporting/MCPFE\\_INFO\\_DOC\\_on\\_data\\_collection\\_on\\_Protected\\_forests.pdf](http://www.foresteuropa.org/docs/reporting/MCPFE_INFO_DOC_on_data_collection_on_Protected_forests.pdf), assessed 31 March 2016]
- Neumann M, 1993: Forest Damage Assessments in Austria. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 28: 183-188.
- Palmer MW, 1993: Potential biases in site and species selection for ecological monitoring. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 26: 277–282.
- Parr TW, Ferretti M, Simpson IC, Forsius M, Kovács-Láng E, 2002: Towards a long-term integrated monitoring programme in Europe: Network design in theory and practice, *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 78: 253–290.
- UNECE/FAO, 2010: Annex to Enquiry State of Forests and Sustainable Forest Management in Europe 2011. New European Forest Types. Complementary documentation. <http://timber.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/publications/european-forest-type.pdf> (accessed 18 March 2010)
- Vos P, Meelis E, Ter Keurs WJ, 2000: A framework for the design of ecological monitoring programs as a tool for environmental and nature management, *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 61: 317–344, 2000.

## Annex I

### **Recommendations for functional integration between Level I and National Forest Inventory for tree condition assessment**

Marco Ferretti

(adapted after Ferretti M. 2010: Harmonizing forest inventories and forest condition monitoring - the rise or the fall of harmonized forest condition monitoring in Europe? *iForest* 3: 1-4).

First, in addition to the ongoing annual assessments on the existing Level I plots, Level I variables are measured annually according to Level I methods on (a subsample of) NFI plots (to be selected according to the country-specific NFI design). Permanent numbering on trees should be avoided in order to keep the plot as anonymous and undisturbed as possible. Level I assessment on the selected NFI plots may be carried out at every NFI repetition (e.g. every 5 or 10 yrs) to favour data integration.

Secondly, at the same time, the country-specific NFI plot design and attributes are applied on the existing Level I plots. This includes the selection of new sample trees on existing Level I plots. However, even the former sample trees at the Level I plots are retained. Annual Level I assessments on the old as well as on the newly selected sample trees are carried out on an annual basis.

This functional integration will result in several advantages: the existing time series is maintained by the continuation of the assessment on existing sample trees); comparison between the two datasets (Level I and NFI) will be possible at defined time intervals (e.g., at each NFI cycle); combined and more precise estimates may be possible at defined time intervals (e.g., at each NFI cycle). This latter possibility depends, however, on the nature of the Level I network (its origin and target statistical population), and under the assumption that Level I and NFI samples concern the same statistical population. NFI plots will stay undisturbed. The disadvantage is a slight increase of costs (Level I plots adaptation in the first year; some new attributes in addition on NFIs every 5 or 10 yrs).


## Annex II

### Recommendations for converting cross cluster plots into fixed area Level I plots

Marco Ferretti

Figure 1 shows an approach to convert a cross-cluster design (with undefined shape and size) into a fixed area plot, while keeping the old sample trees. This kind of procedure is applicable for different plot sizes (e.g., different radius, according to the country) and/or may allow sub-sampling of trees (e.g. angle count sampling; concentric plots for smaller DBH class) in case of dense stands and/or with many small trees where the assessment of all the trees is not feasible. This procedure can be of interest for those countries facing the integration between NFI and Level I.

Note that – according to this procedure – data series on “old” sample trees can be kept. At the same time, the adoption of fixed area plot will favour the estimation process.



**Figure 1:** Example of change from a cross-cluster sample to a circular plot. Left, cross cluster plot with six trees (dark green ones) selected at each compass direction, 25 m from the centre; middle, a 25 m radius plot is designed; right, the trees within the 25 m radius plot previously not considered are now incorporated in the sample trees (red ones). The old sample trees are kept to ensure continuation of data series. The same procedure is applicable for different plot sizes (e.g. 18 m radius). (drawing by M. Ferretti).