



# Copernicus HRL-Small Woody Features for monitoring agricultural landscapes and Ecological Focus Areas

NIBIO: Svein Olav Krøgli, Wendy Fjellstad, Linda Aune-Lundberg IGIK: Milena Chmielewska, Agata Hościło

2nd InCoNaDa webinar 17.10.2023







Lodz University of Technology





Small Woody Features (SWF)

Vector/ raster layer



Forest Mask (FM)

Woody Vegetation Mask (WVM)

Raster layers





Small woody features (patches/lines) are important to maintain biodiversity in farmland (e.g. connectivity) and for visual characteristics in (often) homogeneous landscapes Support a number of ecosystem services



### Objective

- To examine the potential of SWF products for supporting the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in Poland and national agricultural policy in Norway
- Determine the suitability of SWF for monitoring status and change







- Linear or patchy structures of woody/scrubby/bushy vegetation
- High Resolution Layer (HRL)
- Copernicus Land Monitoring Service (CLMS)
  - Jointly implemented by
    - European Environment Agency (EEA)
    - European Commission DG Joint Research Centre (JRC)
  - Copernicus Programme
- Freely and openly accessible
- SWF 2018 released August 2023?







### Linear or patchy structures of woody/scrubby/bushy vegetation

- Linear structures include
  - Hedgerows
  - Tree alignments or scrubs along field margins
  - Tree alignments or scrubs along roads
  - Riparian woody vegetation along waterways and streams
- Patchy structures include
  - Scattered group of trees/scrubs
  - Isolated trees/scrubs





- Main data source: Very High Resolution (VHR) satellite imagery
- 2–4 m spatial resolution, 4 spectral bands
- Semi-automated production workflow
- Geometric rules

	Linear Structures	Patchy Structures
Width	≤ 30 m	n/a
Length	≥ 30 m (was 50m for 2015)	n/a
Area	n/a	200 m² ≤ area ≤ 5000 m²
Compactness	$\leq$ 0.785 (was 0.75 for 2015)	> 0.785 (was 0.75 for 2015)

+ ensure connectivity

### SWF 2018 product portfolio





### Agriculture in Norway and Poland

- Agricultural land accounts for around 40 % of the EU land area
- Norway
  - 3.5 % agricultural land
  - 1 million hectare
- Poland
  - 57 % agricultural land
  - 18.7 million hectare?





### Compare SWF with national agriculture relevant map data

- Norway
  - Monitoring Programme for Agricultural Landscapes (3Q)
  - Land Resource Map (AR5)
- Poland
  - Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS)
    - Ecological Focus Area (EFA) elements
    - «Management fields» layer
  - Topographic Objects database (BDOT10K)

Norway

Data from the Monitoring Programme for Agricultural Landscapes (3Q)

- Statistical sampling (1 x 1 km2)
- Polygons
- Linear elements
- Points elements



### SWF and 3Q





Left: SWF (black outline) and 3Q (agricultural fields yellow, forest green, built-up areas grey, semi-natural grassland orange Right: SWF (black outline) and aerial orthophoto



### Land Resource Map (AR5)

- Scale of 1:5 000
- Full coverage below tree line (all agricultural land)
- Part of data for applications for agricultural production subsidies
- Aerial photograph interpretation, parts updated every fifth year
- Land type 'Forest'

### SWF and AR5





Left: SWF (light green) and FM (dark green) Right: AR5 forest transparent white, SWF red



Data from the Land Parcel Identification System (LPIS) database

- Ecological Focus Areas (EFA) elements
  - Group of trees up to 0.3 ha
- The land cover layer «management fields» (PZ)
  - Woodland and shrubs
  - Forest

### SWF 2018 and FM 2018 vs EFA: group of trees up to 0.3 ha





1:2 000 → | 🕂 💥 🎟 → 🔥 |

19,2156991°E 52,7832931°N 😒

Norway grants







Forest Mask 2018

### SWF 2018 and FM 2018 vs PZ: forest











Data from Topographic Objects database (BDOT10K)

• Forest and wooded area





Figure 5: The example of wooded areas along agricultural fields (a) on the ortophotomap, (b) with SWF – Small Woody Feature and FM – Forest Mask layers and (c) with BDOT10K data: PTLZ01 – forest, PTLZ02 – woodland area and PTLZ03 – mountain pine.

### Norway grants

## Key findings and recommendations

- In general, relatively poor correspondence with national datasets, but can generally be explained by different mapping rules
- Product provider report high accuracy values (LUCAS points)
- Recommend national quality assessment with aerial photographs
  - No national datasets exactly correspond for proper verification
- Lack of up-to-date data a possible drawback (SWF2018 released 2023)
- Expert products exists, but user friendly (e.g. Forest Mask)?
- Promising
  - Fill a gap, used in conjunction with other data, flag areas for updating, full coverage, standardised product for international comparison, ...



# Geir Harald Strand / NIBIO

### Thank you!