Horizon 2020
Space Call - Earth Observation: EO-3-2016: Evolution of Copernicus services
Grant Agreement No. 730008

ECoLaSS

Evolution of Copernicus Land Services based on Sentinel data

D10.1

"D35.1a – Methods Compendium: HRL Time Series Consistency for HRL Product (incremental) Updates"

Issue/Rev.: 1.0

Date Issued: 14.05.2018

submitted by:

SIRS

in collaboration with the consortium partners:

GAFAG JOANNEUM RESEARCH DIGITAL DLR UCL Université catholique de Louvain

submitted to:

European Commission – Research Executive Agency

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme, under Grant Agreement No. 730008.

Consortium Partners

No.	Participant Organisation Name	Short Name	City, Country
1	GAF AG	GAF	Munich, Germany
2	Systèmes d'Information à Référence Spatiale SAS	SIRS	Villeneuve d'Ascq, France
3	JOANNEUM RESEARCH Forschungsgesellschaft mbH	JR	Graz, Austria
4	Université catholique de Louvain, Earth and Life Institute (ELI)	UCL	Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
5	German Aerospace Center (DLR), German Remote Sensing Data Center (DFD), Wessling	DLR	Wessling, Germany

Contact:

GAF AG
Arnulfstr. 199 – D-80634 München – Germany
Phone: ++49 (0)89 121528 0 – FAX: ++49 (0)89 121528 79
E-mail: copernicus@gaf.de – Internet: www.gaf.de

Disclaimer:

Document Release Sheet

	Name, Function	Date	Signature
Author(s):	Alexandre Pennec (SIRS) Alice Lhernould (SIRS) Christophe Sannier (SIRS) Monika Kovatsch (GAF) Kathrin Schweitzer (GAF) David Herrmann (GAF) Linda Moser (GAF) Markus Probeck (GAF) Regine Richter (GAF) Heinz Gallaun (JR) Petra Miletich (JR)	20.04.2018	
Review:	Sophie Villerot (SIRS) Monika Kovatsch (GAF) Katharina Schwab (GAF)	10.05.2018	
Approval:	Linda Moser (GAF)	14.05.2018	
Acceptance:	Massimo Ciscato (REA)		
Distribution:	Public		

Dissemination Level

Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	X
CO	Confidential: only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

Document Status Sheet

Issue/Rev	Date	Page(s)	Description / Changes
1.0	14.05.2018	88	First version of WP35 Deliverable

Applicable Documents

ID	Document Name / Issue Date
AD01	Horizon 2020 Work Programme 2016 – 2017, 5 iii. Leadership in Enabling and Industrial Technologies – Space. Call: EO-3-2016: Evolution of Copernicus services. Issued: 13.10.2015
AD02	Guidance Document: Research Needs Of Copernicus Operational Services. Final Version issued: 30.10.2015
AD03	Proposal: Evolution of Copernicus Land Services based on Sentinel data. Proposal acronym: ECoLaSS, Proposal number: 730008. Submitted: 03.03.2016
AD04	Grant Agreement – ECoLaSS. Grant Agreement number: 730008 – ECoLaSS – H2020-EO-2016/H2020-EO-2016, Issued: 18.10.2016
AD05	D8.1 : D33.1a - Methods Compendium: Time Series Analysis for Thematic Classification (Issue 1), Issued: 29.03.2018
AD06	D9.1 : D34.1a - Methods Compendium: Time Series Analysis for Change Detection (Issue 1), Issued: 29.03.2018

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Horizon 2020 (H2020) project, "Evolution of Copernicus Land Services based on Sentinel data" (ECoLaSS) addresses the H2020 Work Programme 5 iii. Leadership in Enabling and Industrial technologies - Space, specifically the Topic EO-3-2016: Evolution of Copernicus services. ECoLaSS will be conducted from 2017–2019 and aims at developing and prototypically demonstrating selected innovative products and methods for future next-generation operational Copernicus Land Monitoring Service (CLMS) products of the pan-European and Global Components. This will contribute to demonstrating operational readiness of the finally selected products, and shall allow the key CLMS stakeholders (i.e. mainly the Entrusted European Entities (EEE) EEA and JRC) to take informed decisions on potential procurement of the next generation of Copernicus Land services from 2020 onwards.

To achieve this goal, ECoLaSS will make full use of dense time series of Sentinel-2 and Sentinel-3 optical data as well as Sentinel-1 Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) data. Rapidly evolving scientific as well as user requirements will be analysed in support of a future pan-European roll-out of new/improved CLMS products, and the transfer to global applications.

This Deliverable "**D35.1a – Time Series Consistency for HRL Product (incremental) Updates**" lays out the feasibility of a higher update frequency for several products – namely, the imperviousness, forest and grassland layers – of Copernicus Land services of the continental and global component, for mid-term (2018) and long-term (2020+) evolution.

An increased update frequency for those products can only be suggested following the conclusions on EO availability drawn from WP 22 "Assessment of EO and other Data Requirements" as well as the conclusions from several WPs from task 3, mainly WPs 33 and 34, whose outputs will be used as a ground to achieve the objectives of this WP:

- To propose a different incremental update frequency for each of the previously mentioned products, tailored to the HRL specific change characteristics;
- To test new methods to correctly identify the automated changes detected in WP34;
- To test new methods to ensure the spatial and temporal coherence of those changes along the time series;
- To test new methods to assess the accuracy of the thematic label associated with the detected changes in WP34.

This report represents the first iteration of the WP35 deliverable at the end of month 14 of the project, only considering the outcome of WP22, 33 and 34 in terms of data availability and change detection methodologies. A second iteration is due at month 29 that will consider a first implementation of the services envisaged over the demonstration sites in Task 4 and should allow a clearer definition of the update frequencies and the various tested methods.

Suggestions are made for update frequencies, but the feasibility of the creation of production for those HRLs in such time range will have to be evaluated and assessed in the first demonstration phase. In the second iteration of this report, the suggested update frequencies will be refined.

Based on the previous parameters, EO data availability and magnitude of change, it is difficult to draw any conclusions on whether the frequency of updates should be increased or decreased. The real question is more on the ability to improve the accuracy of the detected changes and their labels, i.e. provide an estimate with a greater degree of confidence, and reduce the bias, i.e. ensure that the level of omission and commission errors are equivalent.
A post classification procedure was developed for the Imperviousness layer based on a dedicated calibration sample dataset and a reclassification procedure. This seems to provide promising results that will need to be tested over the larger demonstration sites and eventually for other HRL products.

Table of Contents

List of Figures and Tables

Abbreviations

AT	Austria
BE	Belgium
BG	Bosnia and Herzegovina
CEE	Communauté Economique Européenne/European Economic Community
CLC	CORINE Land Cover
CLCC	CORINE Land Cover Change
CLMS	Copernicus Land Monitoring Services
CORINE	Coordination of Information on the Environment
CY	Cyprus
CZ	Czech Republic
DAP	Data Access Portfolio/Differential Attribute Profiles
DE	Germany
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
DK	Denmark
DOM-TOM	Département d'Outre-Mer/Territoire d'Outre-Mer
DWH	Data Warehouse
EC	European Commission
ECoLaSS	Evolution of Copernicus Land Services based on Sentinel data
EE	Estonia
EEA	European Environment Agency
EEE	Entrusted European Entities
EIONET	European Environment Information and Observation Network
EL	Greece
EO	Earth Observation
ES	Spain
ESA	European Space Agency
EU	European Union
EU-DEM	European Union Digital Elevation Model over Europe
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FAOSTAT	Food and Agriculture Organization Corporate Statistical Database
FI	Finland
FR	France
FUA	Functional Urban Area
GRA	Grassland
HR	High Resolution
HRL	High Resolution Layer
HU	Hungary
ICP	International Co-operative Program
IE	Ireland
IMD	Imperviousness Degree
IMP	Imperviousness
IRS	Indian Remote-Sensing Satellite
IT	Italy
JRC	Joint Research Centre
LC	Land cover
LT	Lithuania
Lu	Luxembourg
LU	Land Use
LUCAS	Land Use/Cover Area frame statistical Survey

LV	Latvia
MGRS	Military Grid Reference System
MMU	Minimum Mapping Unit
MT	Malta
NL	Netherlands
NRC	National Reference Centers
OLI	Operational Land Imager
PL	Poland
PT	Portugal
RO	Romania
S-1	Sentinel-1
S-2	Sentinel-2
S-3	Sentinel-3
SAR	Synthetic Aperture Radar
SE	Sweden
SI	Slovenia
SK	Slovakia
SPOT	Satellite Pour l'Observation de la Terre/Satellite for observation of Earth
SRTM	Shuttle Radar Topography Mission
SVM	Support Vector Machine
UA	Urban Atlas
UAA	Utilized Agricultural Area
UK	United Kingdom
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
WHO	World Health Organization

1 Introduction

The Horizon 2020 (H2020) project, “Evolution of Copernicus Land Services based on Sentinel data” (ECoLaSS) addresses the H2020 Work Programme 5 iii. Leadership in Enabling and Industrial technologies - Space, specifically the Topic EO-3-2016: Evolution of Copernicus services. ECoLaSS will be conducted from 2017–2019 and aims at developing and prototypically demonstrating selected innovative products and methods for future next-generation operational Copernicus Land Monitoring Service (CLMS) products of the pan-European and Global Land Components. This will contribute to demonstrating operational readiness of the finally selected products, and shall allow the key CLMS stakeholders (i.e. mainly the Entrusted European Entities (EEE) EEA and JRC) to take informed decisions on potential procurement of the next generation of Copernicus Land services from 2020 onwards.

ECoLaSS will make full use of dense time series of Sentinel-2 (S-2) and Sentinel-3 (S-3) optical data as well as Sentinel-1 (S-1) Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) data. Rapidly evolving scientific as well as user requirements will be analysed in support of a future pan-European roll-out of new/improved Copernicus Land Monitoring Service products, and the transfer to global applications.

This report “**D35.1a – Time Series Consistency for HRL Product (incremental) Updates**” aims at linking the data availability and the user requirements to define higher update frequencies, while testing methods to detect changes in land cover / land use (LC/LU), quantify the accuracy of those outputs and create a new layer by combining the older layer and the detected changes. The objective of this WP35 is to investigate the incremental updates of High-Resolution Layers (HRL) where “incremental” is defined as the combination of full coverage inventories with incremental spatially partial updates. The report focuses more specifically on the Imperviousness, Forest and Grassland products with regards to the envisaged evolution of Copernicus Land Services addressed in ECoLaSS.

1.1 Purpose and objective of this WP

Building on the results from WP34, in which methodologies on change and signal anomaly detection are explored, the objectives of the WP35 are:

- Determine an appropriate incremental update frequency suitable for specific HRL requirements: Imperviousness, Forest and Grassland;
- Develop a suitable method to characterize outputs from automated change detection (WP34) into relevant themes;
- Develop a suitable method to calibrate detected thematic changes to ensure spatial and temporal consistency;
- Identify a relevant method for the assessment of thematic accuracy of changes.

The conclusions will be used as inputs for the WP42 “Incremental Updates of HR Layers”.

1.2 Document structure

Chapter 1 of this document is the introduction. Chapter 2 is focused on the search for an appropriate update frequency for the different HRLs: Imperviousness, Forest, Grassland. Those proposed frequencies must be designed to find balance between the data availability and user requirements for a tighter LC/LU monitoring. Chapter 3 describes the testing of the identified methodologies to characterize and refine the outputs of the candidate methods tested in WP 34, to ensure a spatial and temporal coherence. The last section gives conclusions and outlooks.

2 Determination of appropriate incremental update frequency

For reporting purposes, policy decision makers such as the EEA need regular and consistent map updates in order to provide a synoptic status of the environment or several land monitoring information. The update frequency of current 2015 HRL products is described (section 2.1), followed by a compilation of the temporal coverage of EO data used for the current 2015 production (section 2.2), an analysis of the expected magnitude of changes based on other datasets and existing HRLs (section 2.3), and an elaboration of a potential definition for future most appropriate updates frequencies, which take into account the dynamics/stability of EO data and eventual political requirements.

2.1 Update frequency of current products

The update cycle for producing maps – currently 3 years for HR Layers or 6 years for CORINE Land Cover (CLC) and CORINE Land Cover Change (CLCC) – is not anymore compatible with the long-term EEA requirements. Moreover, the use of time-hybrid products is not straightforward as they are with different update cycles of 3 or 6 years not directly comparable. The objective of this work package is to investigate a methodology for incremental updates of the Copernicus Land HRLs. There is an important need for providing coherent incremental thematic updates for progressive map updates with reduced time frames.

So far, the HR Imperviousness layer is the only HR Layer for which several map updates already exist and have been validated. During the production process it has become apparent that there is a need to reprocess these maps to get a reliable and consistent characterisation of changes over time. Currently, because of the magnitude of change and the spatial coverage of some of the HRL themes in the landscape, it appears difficult to obtain reliable change estimates from the HRL alone because even though the technical specifications requirements are met, the amount of errors present (which should be less than 15% for both commission and omission) is typically above the rate of change observed in several products. Therefore, in the 2015 implementation of the HRL production, there was a need to reprocess the Imperviousness time series to obtain a more consistent dataset and accurate estimation of change. However, such a re-processing exercise should be minimised in the future and an appropriate method is required to accurately identify changes from one period to the next even though the changes are expected to be below the overall level of accuracy of the individual status layers.

2.2 Temporal coverage of EO Data used for current production

The identification of a suitable update frequency is a combination of several factors including (i) the magnitude of changes that are to be expected, (ii) the expected accuracy of the change detection and (iii) the availability of suitable imagery. There is a trade-off between each of these factors, the longer the period between two updates, the more accurate the detection of changes will be because both the magnitude of changes and the number of cloud free satellite observations will be increased. Therefore, the availability of suitable cloud free observations is often the main limiting factor in determining a suitable update frequency particularly when the accuracy of change detection is increased by using dense time series, as illustrated in Figure 2-1 for the image data used for the HRL2015 production. A useful starting point is to assess the situation during the HRL2015 production in terms of satellite image availability considering that this was the first time that denser time series were used in operational production of the HRLs.



Figure 2-1 - Number of cloud free observations for HRL2015 production per MGRS tile (incl. ResourceSat-2, SPOT-5, Landsat 8 and S-2) over the 2014-2017 period

2.2.1 Imperviousness Layer

As already stated, imperviousness is the HRL for which the longer time series is available. The HRL Imperviousness degree consists of a series of 20m and 100m thematic raster status and change products derived from EO data at 20m spatial resolution for the 2006, 2009, 2012 and 2015 reference years. Up until 2015, the production of HRL Imperviousness degree was based primarily on a combination of SPOT4 and 5 and IRS LISSIII with a RapidEye coverage introduced in 2012. The aim was to organise the acquisition around two separate coverages at least 6 weeks apart during the vegetation growing season. The data are often referred to IMAGE20XX and can be accessed from the ESA DWH (Data Warehouse) and documented in the ESA Data Access Portfolio (DAP) document (ESA, 2014). These coverages were aimed to be multi-purposes serving the production of CLC as well as the Imperviousness degree layers for 2006 and for all the other HRLs from 2012. However, the acquisition of a complete cloud free coverage based on these two complete coverages always was problematic with having to rely on gap filling exercise at a final stage to ensure a near complete coverage. Therefore, the target to achieve complete coverage (+/- 1 year) was always difficult to achieve. Further details on the characteristics of the IMAGE2012 dataset is provided below for the description of the Forest layer.

For 2015, the IMAGE2015 dataset was also produced based on IRS LISSIII and SPOT 5 data still coordinated by ESA, but the 2015 production of the Imperviousness degree represented a major change with the production workflow shifting from a centralised approach for the acquisition of input EO data coordinated by ESA based on commercial third-party satellite missions to an HRL specific EO data acquisition approach controlled by the service providers in charge focusing on open data sources. For HRL imperviousness degree, the main data source used was Landsat 8 OLI with some Landsat 7 ETM+ data and IMAGE2015 used only as an additional data source for gap filling in persistent cloud covered areas. The main reason for this approach was to ensure a better control on the input data acquisition and reduce the dependencies with the ESA DWH with a view to reduce the overall timeframe needed to finalise the HRL Imperviousness degree production. S-2 was not considered for the 2015 reference year because the satellite had just been launched and the use of an additional data stream would have made the time series analysis more complex particularly for the calculation of the imperviousness degree which relies on the integration of multiple NDVI observations requiring a good intercalibration between Landsat 8 and S-2 which was not available at the time. However, the acquisition timeframe was still focused within +/- 1 year of the reference year from 4/12/2013 until 28/11/2016 with data acquired in mostly three periods during Spring Summer and Autumn of 2014, 2015 and 2016. The data is more or less equally spread over the three years (only 5 scenes were acquired in December 2013) as shown in Figure 2-2. In itself, this means that reducing the update frequency of HRL Imperviousness below the current 3-year period would not be possible if the current level of accuracy/completeness in terms of change detection is maintained. A total of over 7,000 Landsat scenes were acquired and processed over more than 600 Landsat path and row combinations to cover the whole of Europe, thus representing an average of 12 scenes per path and row. However, there is considerable spatial variability in terms of successful cloud free acquisition as shown in Figure 2-1 and purely from a satellite image acquisition, the image acquisition window could potentially be reduced to the just the reference year in some areas (mostly in southern European regions) increasing to a yearly update frequency for these regions based on the 2015 EO data acquisition strategy.



Figure 2-2 - Number of Landsat scene acquisition per year for the 2015 production of the HRL IMP (Imperviousness)

2.2.2 Forest Layer

The HRL Forest consists of a series of 20m and 100m thematic raster products derived from EO data in 20m spatial resolution for the two reference years 2012 and 2015. The 2012 reference year (+/- 1 year) production relied almost fully on the Coverage_1 of the ESA DWH (Data Warehouse) dataset DWH_MG2_CORE_01, also referred to as HR_IMAGE_2012. More detailed data on this dataset is provided by the ESA Data Access Portfolio (DAP) document (ESA, 2014). Generally, the dataset provides two seasonal pan-European coverages of optical HR EO data, composed during specific acquisition windows in 2011, 2012 – extended in 2013, for the continuation of CLC like exercises and for the generation of the HRLs. Coverage_1 consists of more than 1,700 multispectral satellite scenes from the satellites IRS-p6, ResourceSat-2, SPOT-4 and SPOT-5 with a temporal coverage of 21.01.2011 to 08.09.2013. Almost 50% of the EO data has been acquired in 2011 and more than 50% of the data are represented by IRS-p6 scenes.

The 2015 reference year (+/- 1 year) production of the HRL Forest could strongly benefit from a drastically increased EO data situation due to the availability and accessibility of S-2 and Landsat 8 data. Both satellites formed the primary data source for the HRL Forest 2015 production within the limits of the given reference period, covering the time span from 04.02.2014 to 23.11.2016. Almost 82% of the EO data has been acquired in 2016 and more than 60% of the data are S-2 scenes.



Figure 2-3 - Earth Observation data used in HRL Forest production 2012 and 2015

2.2.3 Grassland

The selection of suitable data (EO data, ancillary data) was a cornerstone step in the production process. The acquisition of EO data was done to meet the classification requirements, such as amount of cloud/haze cover and dates. The best available images that were afterwards processed, derive from satellites S-2 and Landsat 8. Since S-2 represented the main input data source, the Military Grid Reference System (MGRS) has been defined as production unit system. The HRL Grassland 2015 used a multi-temporal and multi-sensor approach for creation of the Grassland mask, as seen on Figure 2-4.

Multi-temporal in this context means a time series of classifications using EO data of the specified reference year 2015 +/-1 year. However, the largest part of satellite data is from 2016 (~71%). The temporal series include images from 2015 (~18%), 2014 (~10%) and 2013 (~0,5%), respectively.

Multi-sensor implies the use of several optical sensors in order to fill data gaps and to increase the number of data coverages per MGRS tile, namely S-2 (~59%) and Landsat 8 OLI (~41%), respectively.

On average, about 3-4 multi-temporal scene coverages (S-2, Landsat 8) have been used for the per-pixel analysis per MGRS tile. An initial land cover classification has been performed for each MGRS tile using Support Vector Machines (SVM). The GRA 2015 mask been derived by classifying nearly 4225 single satellite images (S-2, Landsat 8 OLI) from the 2015 reference year.



Figure 2-4 - Summary of the total amount of images used for the production of the GRA 2015 mask, per year and satellite.

Subsequently, an integration of the optical classification with a SAR classification was made to obtain the final Grassland Mask. Approximately 20,530 SAR images from S-1 from year 2016 were pre-processed and used for elaboration of the SAR classification. The pre-processing enabled the extraction of thematic information using a highly automated processing chain. It included: download, ingestion of data and metadata, geometric correction, coherence estimation and geocoding using ETRS89 LAEA projection to 20m spatial resolution. These steps have been performed using SRTM DEM where available. In Northern Europe (above 60° North latitude) EU-DEM 25m has been used. The SAR classification included a removal of all pixels that are not grassland, i.e. no-data values, urban mask and pixels with a value over a threshold of 0.45 long term coherence along the time series. Finally, these where used an input and together with the optical segments and training samples elaborated on the S-2/Landsat 8 images for an enhancement of the optical grassland classification results.

2.3 Expected magnitude of changes based on existing layers and/or related data sources

The HRL Imperviousness is the only available time series in HRL production. The Forest layer is the only other layer for which a change product will be created for the 2012-15 period, as part of the current 2015 production. Currently, there is no change layer for Grassland, but this may be envisaged in the future.

It is proposed in this section to estimate the percentage of variation (gain or loss in surface for a given class of land cover, regarding the overall European or national area) that can be expected from one year to the other. Ancillary data and their temporal variability, such as CORINE Land Cover (CLC) change layers or Land Use/Cover Area frame statistical Survey (LUCAS) database, are being used to draw a comparison and eventually sketch a trend for the years to come.

2.3.1 Imperviousness Layer

Urban areas, as opposed to rural ones, are used to define human settlement presenting a high population density, as well as a dense tissue of infrastructure and built-up environment. The urban population in 2014 represented 54% of the overall population, and is expecting to keep rising (UN Habitat, 2016). According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), the global urban population should grow approximately 1.84% per year from 2015 to 2020; this percentage slowly decreasing over the years to reach 1.44% per year between 2025 and 2030.

Despise the impression that the temporal change in urban area does not appear to be significant at the global scale, its impact on the neighbouring forests, agriculture, water systems, through consumption rise, can turned out to be critical (Lambin, et al., 2001). A close monitoring of the urban growth is necessary to ensure a sustainable development (Wilson & Chakraborty, 2013). In most developing countries, urban growth is mainly driven by population growth. However, in Europe, population growth no longer increases substantially, but urban areas continue to expand, this phenomenon is known as urban sprawl (EEA, 2006). Datasets such as the HRL Imperviousness degree are key to better inform policy makers on the spatial distribution and extent of urban sprawl.

2.3.1.1 Expected magnitude of changes based on CLC data:

For a better accuracy, the CLC change layers are used, since differences between the status layers are based on a 25 ha MMU whereas the change layers are mapped with a 5ha MMU.

2.3.1.1.1 Change analysis

The CLC products were generated for 28 countries for the 1990 layer then for 39 countries (33 EEA members and 6 cooperating nations) in the following years. There are 2 sets of products that will be used in this analysis:

- CLC change layer (CLCC) from 1990 to 2000, the one from 2000 to 2006 and the one from 2006 to 2012;
- CLC status layer from 1990, and the others from 2000, 2006 and 2012.

The CLC layers (change and status) have been generated by each country, without potentially different methodologies, even though the results have been harmonized – this is why some country results can be set apart in this analysis, due to known technical issues:

- Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia, Switzerland: those countries were not covered in 2000, hence a sharper increase between 1990 and 2006;
- Iceland: there is no data in 1990 and in 2000;
- Norway: there is no data in 1990 and the products for 2000 were created from existing maps;
- Turkey: backdating was used too for the creation of the products for 1990 and 2000;
- French DOM-TOMs were added between 2000 and 2006.

To highlight urban area changes, all classes related to the Imperviousness Layer have been singled out from one layer to the next:

- Continuous urban fabric (code 111);
- Discontinuous urban fabric (code 112);
- Industrial or commercial units (code 121);
- Port areas (code 123);
- Airports (code 124);
- Roads (code 122).

In the CLC nomenclature, several classes are added to the urban area, such as mineral extraction sites (code 131), dump sites (code 132), construction sites (code 133), green urban sites (code 141) and sport and leisure facilities (code 142), but they are not included here to follow as closely as possible the definition of imperviousness for the HRL products.

2.3.1.1.2 Results

For 1990, CLC only covered EU countries. From 2000, this was increased to cover all EEA-39 countries. Therefore the 1990-2000 CLC change layer only cover the EU countries whereas subsequent CLCC layers cover the whole of EEA-39 countries. Therefore, the total urban area increased, but, the ratio (of the urban areas related to the total surface of all countries) in 2000 was smaller than in 1990, meaning that the new countries added were less urbanized that the historical ones. The countries added afterward 1990 then presented a smaller proportion of urban areas, hence the small variation from 2.98% of urban areas in 1990 to 2.85% in 2000.



Figure 2-5 - CLC total urban area in 1990, 2000, 2006 and 2012 in km² for the EEA-39 countries (EEA, 2018c).

Figure 2-5 shows that urban areas tend to expand in time – but at a slower rate with each new CLC release. The 2008 financial crisis has changed the different European housing markets, calling for stricter regulations – which have tightened the credit markets and left fewer options on the mortgage markets – leading to less and less new built-up opportunities. Between 2000 and 2006 the urban areas had a growth rate of 1.46% per year, while between 2006 and 2012, this rate fell to 0.62% per year.

The Figure 2-6 displays the urban area gain for each selected country from the 39 members. Increase from 1990 to 2000 is shown in blue, increase from 2000 to 2006 in orange and increase from 2006 to 2012 in gray.

Spain, as well as France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands exhibit the strongest increases in urban area in km^2, between 1990 and 2012. Most of the change for those countries appeared between 1990 and 2000, and later slowed down their increase rate.

On the other hand, some countries show an increasing amount of new built-up areas (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Montenegro, Sweden and Switzerland). Other countries clearly show a slowing down in the expansion of urban areas (Austria, Belgium, Bosnia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain).

With a few exceptions (mainly due to political instabilities, such as in Kosovo), a clear divide can be made between the Western-Southern countries (Spain, Portugal, France, Italy, Germany, United Kingdom, Ireland, Belgium, Netherlands, …) whose new built-up rates are slowing down, and the Eastern-Northern countries (Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Kosovo, Latvia, …) whose urban area are expanding at an increasing rate.



Figure 2-6 - The gain in urban areas per country as % of the country total area, from 1990 to 2012.

However, for each country, the percentage of new built-up areas remain extremely small compared to the overall surface even within a 6-year window, usually less than one percent of the total country area.

Using the status layer, the results of the comparison between two layers can be found in Table 2-1. The percentage of increase is less accurate than the results given by the change layers, which is mostly due to the addition of new countries in the coverage, as well as to commission and omission errors that were not corrected on the older status layer, but on the newest.

Table 2-1 - Raw difference between status layers for CLC database on a selection of polygons related to urban areas for 1990, 2000, 2006 and 2012.

	CLC 1990	CLC 2000	CLC 2006	CLC 2012
Pixel count on a selection of CLC classes (111, 112, 121, 123, 124)	14145 471	18457 983	19951 054	20588 432
% of increase of the urban areas compared to the urban area of the previous year		30,49 %*	8,09%	3,19%

*due to the increase of European coverage.

2.3.1.2 Expected magnitude of changes based on LUCAS data:

The LUCAS survey is being updated on a three-year basis since 2006 with in-situ measurements, photographs and soil samplings if possible. 27 countries were covered in 2012, generating around 270,000 observations for different types of LCLU. The database is often used as a validation database to assess the accuracy of national or global products and maps (Karydas, et al., 2015).

2.3.1.2.1 Change analysis

For the impervious layer, only the category A for Artificial land is of interest in this analysis – it comprises two sub-categories (A10 for built-up areas and A20 for artificial non-built-up areas) and the following sub-divisions:

- Buildings with one to three floors (code A11);
- Buildings with more than three floors (code A12);
- Greenhouses (code A13) that doubled as a crop land cover;
- Non-built-up area features (code A21) such as yards, cemeteries, parking areas, any soil covered with artificial impervious materials;

Non-built-up linear features (code A22) label artificial covered soils whose width exceeds 3m, that are assimilated to roads.

However, it should be noted that for visual validation, observations falling into the A13 and A20 categories are studied individually and eventually excluded from the selected points. In this analysis, only indisputable categories (A11 and A12) are retained.

2.3.1.2.2 Results

At a pan-European level, the LUCAS database is coherent with an increase of the surface occupied by urban tissue, as seen in Table 2-2.

Table 2-2 - Observations regarding built-up areas in LUCAS database

	2006	2009	2012	2015
Numbers of countries	10	23	28	28
Total numbers of points	168402	234534	270120	339555
Number of A11 and A12 observations	1387	3119	4004	4151
Percentage of built-up points	0.82%	1.33%	1.48%	1.22%

However, at a national level, the database is not representative of the urban areas in each country – too few points are available to characterize the impervious surface (see Annex). In addition, the LUCAS stratification should be taken into account considering the sampling intensity may be different from one period to the next. This would require applying a weighting factor which further complexifies the analysis and was not available here. Finally, the enumerators carrying out the LUCAS survey did not have the information from the previous survey for most of the time period which means that most of the time the survey was performed 'blindly' with respect to change detection which means that some changes may actually be a different interpretation of the land cover/use rather than an actual change and renders the change analysis less reliable particularly for this particular theme which was sampled with low intensity.

2.3.1.3 Example of one urban area: Nantes

SIRS regularly produce LCLU maps for local authorities. The example of Nantes in France is particularly interesting as it was done over several decades with data spanning from the 1950s to the 2010s thus providing insights on long term changes.

2.3.1.3.1 Change analysis

The classes selected to compute the total urban areas are:
- Urban fabric (map label 11);
- Industrial, commercial units with sport and leisure facilities (map label 12).

2.3.1.3.2 Results

As can be seen in Table 2-3, the expansion rate of the city is slowly decreasing over the years, as it is expected in the Southern/Western countries of the EU. Since 2008, the rate has almost stabilized at 0.6-0.7% of new urban areas created per year, compared to the overall occupied land.

Table 2-3 - Urban area expansion for Nantes and its suburbs, from 1951 to 2014

Year	Total of urban area in km²	Percentage of increase of the total area compared to the previous year	Temporal Step (in years)	Average percentage of increase of urban area per year
1951	55.5273661	-		-
1981	121.28	118%	30	1.81%
1999	157.6	30%	18	1.28%
2004	165.64	5.1%	5	0.97%
2008	170.14	2.7%	4	0.66%
2009	171.43	0.7582%	1	0.75%
2012	174.41	1.7383%	3	0.60%
2014	176.93	1.4449%	2	0.71%

2.3.1.4 Expected magnitude of changes based on Urban Atlas data

The analysis in this section will compare the Urban Atlas data from 2006 and 2012 to confirm the trends sketched by the analysis done on the CLC change layers.

The Urban Atlas (UA) 2006 provides European, comparable and detailed 20-class LU/LC map data for the main Functional Urban Areas (FUAs) and covers most of all EU urban areas with more than 100,000 inhabitants and all EU27 member state capital cities as defined by the Urban Audit.

The UA 2012 update and extension covers in addition to the cities mapped in 2006 also all urban areas with a population above 50,000 inhabitants corresponding to a total of 695 FUAs. An extension of the FUAs mapped in 2012 was also recently performed for the West Balkan and Turkey with a total of 800 FUAs now mapped for 2012. However, the 2006-2012 change product is only available for the original 305 FUAs mapped in 2006. For the 2018 update, the 2012-2018 change product will be available for all 800 FUAs. The Minimum Mapping Unit (MMU) of the Urban Atlas is 2,500m² in urban areas and 1ha in rural areas with some exception: some polygons with a MMU as small as 500m² can be included if they are part of a greater unit cut by the transport network (e.g. forest or residential area). This is a much finer resolution compared to that of CLC which is particularly relevant to urban expansion which tends to occur over small dispersed areas thus potentially underestimated by CLC.

2.3.1.4.1 Change analysis

First, the changes in sealed areas between 2006 and 2012 are provided at different levels of aggregation:

- At a pan-European scale, for all EEA-39 members;
- At a national scale, for each country,
- At a biogeographical scale, for aggregated countries, exhibiting the similar characteristics in terms of climate and expected LC.

The impervious areas at different scales are determined by combining information of the UA classes related to the imperviousness topic for both years. It is important to note that the statistics are available but not directly comparable. Indeed, the global extent of the products changed from one period to another with an extension for some FUAs and new ones.

The classes used in the UA 2012 databases are listed in the Table 2-4, and the selection of classes singled out for this study are displayed on a green background.

Table 2-4 - Nomenclature of classes in UA 2012

UA CODE	UA CLASS NAME	Built-up (c1) vs non Built-up areas (c2)
11000	Continuous Urban Fabric (including all types of sealing)	c1
11300	Isolated Structures	c1
12100	Industrial, commercial, public, military and private units	c1
12210	Fast transit roads and associated land	c1
12220	Other roads and associated land	c1
12230	Railways and associated land	c1
12300	Port areas	c1
12400	Airports	c1
13100	Mineral extraction and dump sites	c2
13300	Construction sites	c2
13400	Land without current use	c2
14100	Green urban areas	c2
14200	Sports and leisure facilities	c1
21000	Arable land (annual crops)	c2
22000	Permanent crops	c2
23000	Pastures	c2
24000	Complex and mixed cultivation patterns	c2
25000	Orchards	c2
31000	Forests	c2
32000	Herbaceous vegetation associations	c2
33000	Open spaces with little or no vegetations	c2
40000	Wetlands	c2
50000	Water	c2

The same selection is reproduced on the nomenclature of classes listed in Table 2-5 from the UA 2006 database, which is slightly different from the more recent version of 2012.

Table 2-5 - Nomenclature of classes in UA 2006

CODE	CLASS NAME	Built-up (c1) vs non Built-up areas (c2)
11000	Continuous Urban Fabric (including all types of sealing)	c1
11300	Isolated Structures	c1
12100	Industrial, commercial, public, military and private units	c1
12210	Fast transit roads and associated land	c1
12220	Other roads and associated land	c1
12230	Railways and associated land	c1
12300	Port areas	c1
12400	Airports	c1
13100	Mineral extraction and dump sites	c1
13300	Construction sites	c1
13400	Land without current use	c1
14100	Green urban areas	c1
14200	Sports and leisure facilities	c1
20000	Agricultural and natural areas (including annual and permanent crops, pastures, herbaceous vegetation associations, open spaces with little or no vegetation, wetlands)	c2
30000	Forests	c2
50000	Water	c2

2.3.1.4.2 Results

Hereafter the results obtained at pan-European level, based on FUAs in common between 2006 and 2012, which is a partial snapshot of the global LCLU, can be seen in Table 2-6. The growth rate of the urban areas covered by the UA in 2006 and 2012 is at 3.03% for 6 years, which means a yearly growth rate of 0.51% - close to the growth rate found for the CLC change layer between 2006 and 2012, which amounts to 0.53%, but focuses on the entire area whereas the Urban Atlas only covers larger cities.

Table 2-6 - Pan-European comparison between the UA 2006 and UA 2012 classification results.

	2006 (km²)			2012 (km²)			2006-2012
Level of Reporting	Non Built-up Area	Built-up Area	Total Area	Non Built-up Area	Built-up Area	Total Area	% increase
Pan-European	378 465	60 411	438 876	376 635	62 241	438 876	3,03%

The results for built-up areas in km^2 at national level are displayed in Table 2-7. Since the FUAs target very specific regions, whose urban areas are more prominent, it is expected that the growth rate of impervious surfaces must be higher than on a CLCC layer.

Table 2-7 - Comparison between the UA 2006 and the UA 2012 database at country level.

	2006 (km²)			2012 (km²)			2006-2012
Level of Reporting	Non Built-up Area	Built-up Area	Total Area	Non Built-up Area	Built-up Area	Total Area	% increase
AT	17 135	1 982	19 117	17 036	2 081	19 117	4,99%
BE	5 748	2 061	7 809	5 709	2 100	7 809	1,89%
BG	13 195	1 088	14 283	13 176	1 107	14 283	1,75%
CY	2 498	215	2 713	2 486	227	2 713	5,58%
CZ	25 313	2 994	28 307	25 192	3 115	28 307	4,04%
DE	73 374	13 801	87 175	73 134	14 041	87 175	1,74%
DK	14 516	2 454	16 970	14 470	2 500	16 970	1,87%
EE	6 905	430	7 335	6 875	460	7 335	6,98%
EL	6 744	1 197	7 941	6 716	1 225	7 941	2,34%
ES	11 023	1 547	12 570	10 918	1 652	12 570	6,79%
FI	10 122	1 010	11 132	10 070	1 062	11 132	5,15%
FR	46 685	8 425	55 110	46 416	8 694	55 110	3,19%
HU	11 736	1 675	13 411	11 683	1 728	13 411	3,16%
IE	6 956	1 007	7 963	6 947	1 016	7 963	0,89%
IT	9 839	2 991	12 830	9 720	3 110	12 830	3,98%
LT	7 470	625	8 095	7 437	658	8 095	5,28%
LU	2 318	278	2 596	2 308	288	2 596	3,60%
LV	3 720	236	3 956	3 717	239	3 956	1,27%
MT	164	82	246	163	83	246	1,22%
NL	5 846	1 590	7 436	5 784	1 652	7 436	3,90%
PL	30 115	3 943	34 058	29 845	4 213	34 058	6,85%
PT	3 672	756	4 428	3 621	807	4 428	6,75%
RO	3 546	785	4 331	3 487	844	4 331	7,52%
SE	23 819	2 270	26 089	23 797	2 292	26 089	0,97%
SI	4 252	474	4 726	4 241	485	4 726	2,32%
SK	7 873	800	8 673	7 844	829	8 673	3,63%
UK	23 881	5 695	29 576	23 843	5 733	29 576	0,67%

2.3.1.5 Comparison of the magnitude of change from the data sources analyzed

The overall magnitude of change in percentages is very similar for the Urban Atlas to that obtained with CLC and CLCC analysis at least at pan-European level despite the finer resolution of the Urban Atlas and the fact the CLC cover the whole of EEA-39 whereas the Urban Atlas 2006-2012 change layer only cover cities over 100,000 inhabitants within the EU27. In fact, it is possible that some of these differences compensate each other as one would expect that CLC would underestimate artificial areas due to the large MMU. In fact, when comparing the land use class proportion of the FUAs mapped for the Urban Atlas, CLC slightly underestimate the proportion of artificial areas as compared with the Urban Atlas (see Figure 2-7).

The results from the city of Nantes are interesting because of the long-term time series and the fact that urban expansion tend to have stabilised in recent years. In addition, the magnitude of change is similar to that observed with the pan-European analysis based on a different far more detailed data set even compared with the Urban Atlas.

The analysis of LUCAS for change is problematic particularly for the artificial land theme and would require more in-depth analysis beyond the scope of this deliverable.



(a) (b)

Figure 2-7 - Comparison of level 1 land use class proportion for UA2006 LUZ from (a) UA2006 and (b) CLC2006

Although the Urban Atlas analysis only focuses on the larger cities, it provides a more detailed characterisation of urban expansion which exhibits considerable variability between EU countries as illustrated in Figure 2 6.

The overall magnitude of changes based on UA is approximatively 3% between 2006 and 2012 but regional differences exist, as previously sketched in the CLCC layers analysis:

- Eastern countries present high percentages of changes (up to 6 or 7%) which can be related to the economic growth in the past years for these countries;
- Mediterranean countries exhibit the same pattern – a well-known behaviour for Spain and Portugal with high increase of constructions after 2006, for example;
- The British Islands, some Nordic and Western-Central countries present very low rates of change.

This geographical pattern may be considered for the incremental update of the imperviousness layer with countries where the urban expansion is very high, updated more frequently than countries for which there is little change.



Figure 2-8 - Expansion of artificial areas from the Urban Atlas between 2006 and 2012.

2.3.2 Forest Layer

As people all over the world are highly dependent on intact ecosystems, it gets more and more important to understand how valuable ecosystem services are for humankind. Especially the socio-economic value of forest ecosystem services, e.g. in terms of climate regulation and air quality, carbon sequestration, watershed services and flood mitigation, soil stabilization and erosion control (Krieger, 2001), is of particular importance. Estimates assume a reduction of the global number of trees by 46 % since the beginning of human civilization, and 15 billion trees are being cut down every year (Crowther et al., 2015). While the global forest area decreased in the period 1990–2015 (FAO, 2015a), forest areas in Europe were found stable or slightly increasing, and covered about one-third of the entire European land area (FAO, 2016). Since Europe generally gained forest area over the last 25 years (FAO, 2015b), it would be of great importance to know the quantity of forest area gains and losses, in a more spatially explicit manner, and at finer temporal resolution.

Therefore, the ECoLaSS project aims to determine an appropriate future incremental update frequency for the HRL Forest. For this purpose, information about tree-covered areas in the EEA-39 countries from the HRL Forest reference years 2012 and 2015 and other sources can initially serve as an update indicator. In this chapter, related data from the EEA-39 countries are examined, comprising the 33 EEA member countries and 6 cooperating countries of the West Balkan (EEA, 2018a).

2.3.2.1 Expected magnitude of changes based on CORINE Land Cover data

The CORINE Land Cover (CLC) data are mapped by the EEA-39 countries or derived from their national land cover/land use (LC/LU) databases, and collected, coordinated and harmonized by the European

Environment Agency (EEA) on European level. The data comprise information on LC/LU in 44 classes, with a relatively coarse Minimum Mapping Unit (MMU) of 25 ha (5 ha for changes) and a Minimum Mapping Width (MMW) of 100 m. Generated from high spatial resolution satellite images and specific in-situ data, the development of the first data set began in 1985 and resulted in the "CLC 1990" product, which was updated after 10 years. Whereas the first CLC data of 1990 include LC/LU information of 27 countries, the subsequent data sets of 2000, 2006 and 2012 comprise consistent information for the EEA-39 countries (recent version 18.5) in Europe (EEA, 2018b; EEA, 2018c). The production of CLC 2018 is currently ongoing.

2.3.2.1.1 Change Analysis

First, to quantify the changes in forest area between the different reference years, the forest area per country is determined using the CLC status layers. These have been used in the analysis, as some inconsistencies between CLCC and CLC data have been detected, which extent could not be properly assessed yet. Combined information of the CLC-classes broadleaved forest (Code 311), coniferous forest (Code 312) and mixed forest (Code 313) is used to estimate the magnitude of forest area changes both for the pan-European area and for the individual countries in Europe. For those three CLC-classes, a threshold of > 30% crown cover is a requirement (ETC/ULS 2017).

2.3.2.1.2 Results

The forest area within the CLC data of the years 2000, 2006 and 2012 makes a proportion of 29 % of the total land area. According to the CLC data (Figure 2-9), the change amounts to a gain in forest area between 2000/2006 (0.8 %) and a gain between 2006/2012 (1.8 %). In summary, the overall change between 2000 and 2012, means a gain in forest area of 2.6 % within the EEA-39 countries (Figure 2-10), with absolute change rates of 0.1 % (2000/2006) and 0.3 % (2006/2012) per annum. However, the calculated change rates based on CLC data seem to overestimate the gain in forest area due to the coarse specifications of the CLC status layers. CLCC data 2006 to 2012 indicates at least for some countries significant lower change rates (e.g. for Germany = 0.05 %, France = 0.14 %, Poland = 0.002 %), which needs to be investigated in more detail in the second project phase.



Figure 2-9 - CLC total forest area 2000, 2006 and 2012 in km² for the EEA-39 countries (EEA, 2018c).



Figure 2-10 - CLC, Changes in total forest area in the EEA-39 countries. Changes 2000/2006 and 2006/2012 in km² (EEA, 2018c).

As can be seen in Figure 2-17, the biggest area changes in terms of km² don't necessarily reflect the biggest changes in terms of relative percentages of the overall forest areas of countries. Iceland for example, is the country with the highest relative gain in forest area of 35.2 %, but due to the generally low overall coverage of forests in Iceland, the increase in absolute numbers amounts to only 111 km². Iceland is followed by Liechtenstein with a gain of 28.8 % (17 km²) and Ireland with 27.7 % (810 km²). Spain is the country where the absolute forest area in km² increased the most between 2000 and 2012, with a gain of over 18,000 km² (19.8 %), followed by Finland (>12,000 km², 6.5 %) and Sweden (> 12,000 km², 4.9 %).

However, the notable absolute gains in forest area for some countries (e.g. Spain, Sweden) have to be treated with caution, as they appear disproportionately high. A change in the prevailing methodology of interpreting satellite images, from Computer Assisted Photointerpretation (CAPI) to a semi-automatic methodology, has been taken place in the CLC 2012 update (EEA, 2017) and may have contributed to this. In addition, there have been revealed some topological errors within the geospatial data (e.g. for Spain). This issue has been reported to the entrusted entity and will be addressed by the EEA. An update of the CLC forest analysis might be considered as necessary and could be presumably addressed in the next project phase. For more detailed change rates between the different years (see Annex).



Figure 2-11 - CLC total forest area change 2000/2012 per country in km². Changes, greater or equal 1 % are given in percent (EEA, 2018c).

2.3.2.2 Expected magnitude of changes based on data of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

As defined by FAO, forests are areas with trees ≥ 5 m height at maturity in situ, a spatial extent of > 0.5 ha and with a tree canopy cover of > 10 %, as well as regrowth or temporarily unstocked areas expected to revert to forest. Moreover, there are "other wooded land" areas with different specifications, which could be an additional indicator of change in forest area. Those areas have a tree canopy cover between 5-10 % or a coverage with smaller trees, shrubs and bushes with a tree canopy cover of > 10 % (FAO, 2000). This definition is largely in line with the HRL Forest definition, but different to the one used by CLC with 30 % canopy cover and 25 ha MMU. In this chapter, the FAO data of the State of Europe's Forests Reports 2011 and 2015, as well as of the Global Forest Resources Assessments 2010 and 2015 are examined. On the one hand, the data for forest areas are analyzed (for 25 countries in Europe[1]), on the other hand, also combined information with other wooded land (EEA-39) is examined here. Due to the given data base, however, information on other wooded land is only available for 2010 and 2015.

2.3.2.2.1 State of Europe's Forests

The State of Europe's Forests (SoEF) Report 2015, of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), deals with the status and trends in Europe's forests and their management. Its information ranges from 1990-2015, thus it covers a period of 25 years. Especially the chapters about quantitative indicators (e.g. forest area) and the corresponding tables, are of particular importance, to assess the magnitude of the changes in forest area in Europe over time (FAO, 2015b), not the least because 200 national experts have contributed their knowledge. Although most of the data basis comes from the governments of the individual countries, also international data providers like UNECE, EUROSTAT or ICP-Forests provided additional information (UNECE/FAO, 2015).

2.3.2.2.1.1 Change Analysis

First, to quantify the changes in forest area between the different years, the forest area (without wooded land) per country are determined from the data (see chapter 2.3.2.2.1.2). This information of the forested area in 25 countries in Europe is used to estimate the magnitude of forest area changes in those countries since 1990 (FAO, 2015b) and in Europe (see Annex). Moreover, also the change in other wooded land between 2010 and 2015 is examined here (see chapter 2.3.2.2.1.3).

2.3.2.2.1.2 Results - Forest area

The forest area in the observed 25 European countries changed from a proportion of 33 % of the total land area in 1990, to 34 % in 2000 and 2005, and further increased to 35 % in 2010 and 37 % in 2015. The overall change in forest area from 1990 to 2015 amounts to a relative gain of 10.8 % with absolute change rates of 0.2 % (1990/2000), 0.3 % (2000/2005), 0.2 % (2005/2010) and 1.1 % (2010/2015) per annum. The change rate between the years 1990 and 2010 was decreasing (see Figure 2-12), whereas the observed changes between 2010 and 2015 are by far the largest, with a relative gain in forest area of over 5.8 % (70,000 km²) in the considered 25 countries in Europe (see Figure 2-13). It can be assumed that in case of such large fluctuations in forest area coverage, there might either be a change in the definition of forested area or that different survey methods influenced the

[1] Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey.

data basis between the survey points in time. For more detailed change rates between the different years (see Annex).



Figure 2-12 - Gain in forest area in 25 countries of Europe. Changes 1990/2000, 2000/2005, 2005/2010 and 2010/2015 in km² (FAO, 2015c).



Figure 2-13 - Forest area 1990, 2000, 2005, 2010 and 2015 of 25 countries in Europe (FAO, 2015c).

2.3.2.2.1.3 Results - Forest area and other wooded Land

The combined information on the development of forest area and other wooded land between 2010 and 2015 is shown in Figure 2-15, providing information on the gains and losses for each of the EEA-39 countries. The data exhibit an overall gain in forest area and wooded land (2010/2015) of 2.1 % (> 45,000 km², see Figure 2-14), resulting in an annual change rate of 0.5 %, which seems to be a representative value for assessing forest area changes in Europe.



Figure 2-14 - Forest area and other wooded land 2010, 2015 in km² (EEA-39), (FAO, 2015d).

Just four countries show recorded losses of over 1 % (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Liechtenstein, Malta and Bulgaria) across the EEA-39. Whereas the “loss” areas in Malta (0.5 km²) and Liechtenstein (13 km²) are just marginal in terms of absolute areas, the losses in Bosnia and Herzegovina amount to over 2,000 km². The largest absolute gains (in km²) are observed in Norway (17,400 km², 14.1 %), Portugal (13,000 km², 35.9 %) and Germany (3,400 km², 3.1 %). Especially such large and exceptional fluctuations as reported for Norway and Portugal suggests that there might be either a change in the (national) forest definition or that different survey methods and/or statistical corrections influencing the data basis have been applied between the two reporting dates. The European average of 2.1 % gain in forest area, however, seems to be a more representative value in terms of forest change assessment. For more detailed change rates between the different years, see Annex.



Figure 2-15 - Forest area and other wooded land, change 2010/2015 per country in km². Changes, greater or equal then 1 % are given in percent (FAO, 2011 and FAO, 2015d).

2.3.2.2.2 Global Forest Resources Assessment

The Global Forest Resources Assessment is also provided by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), but it deals with the status and trends in forests and their management at a global scale. Its information ranges from 1990-2015, thus it covers a period of 25 years, too (FAO, 2015e). Data were collected by the countries, with their specific survey methods, but with agreed definitions of the investigation object (Keenan et al., 2015). In this chapter, only information on forests and other wooded land is examined, thus data with other wooded land, only available for 2010 and 2015, is used here.

2.3.2.2.2.1 Results - Forest area and other wooded Land

According to the Global Forest Resources Assessment data of 2010 and 2015, the forest area changed from a proportion of 38 % of the land area to 39 % in 2015, in 36 of the EEA-39 countries. The data suggest that there is an overall gain in forest area of 1.6 % (> 35,000 km²) from 2010 to 2015 (see **Figure 2-16**), which is slightly lower (annual change rate of 0.3 %) than the data of the State of Europe's Forests Reports, is as well in a representative range for assessing forest area changes in Europe.



Figure 2-16 - Forest area and other wooded land 2010, 2015 in km² (EEA-39), (FAO, 2015e).

The relative changes in the individual countries exhibit that particularly Sweden is confronted with a loss in forest area of 7,400 km² (2.4 %), followed by Finland with (2,500 km², 1.1 %) and Spain (1,200 km², 0.4 %). Nevertheless, the huge amount of gains in forest area in e.g. Norway (10.6 %) or Portugal (35.9 %) of each about 13,000 km² and Germany (3,400 km², 3.1 %), lead to an overall gain in forest area. Especially such large and exceptional fluctuations as reported for Norway and Portugal suggests that there might be either a change in the (national) forest definition or that different survey methods and/or statistical corrections influencing the data basis have been applied between the two reporting dates. For more detailed change rates between the different years (see Annex).



Figure 2-17 - Forest area and other wooded land, change 2010/2015 per country in km². Changes, greater or equal then 1 % are given in percent (FAO, 2010 and FAO, 2015e).

2.3.2.3 Conclusion

In synopsis, the investigated data on forested areas in Europe all agree in showing an overall gain in forest area over the last years, until 2012/2015, however at different magnitudes. Whereas CLC data show an overall gain in forest area of 1.6 % from 2000 to 2012, the data of the Global Forest Resources Assessment (GFRA) Report 2015 display the same increase in forest area of 1.6 %, but within the time interval 2010 to 2015. The State of Europe's Forests (SoEF) Report 2015 indicates a gain in combined forest area and other wooded land of 2.1 % between 2010 and 2015. Although GFRA and SoEF reports have been both published by the FAO, the reported figures differ at least partially significantly per country.

An increase of the forest area across Europe in the order of magnitude of 1-2% in 5-10 years seems to have taken place. Considering the related overall areas, these are significant gains in forest cover. However, breaking the figures down to smaller time intervals, e.g. to one year, it becomes obvious that the extent of annual net increase of forest area is rather small on European extent, i.e. presumably < 0.5% per year. The trend however also seems to indicate an accelerating increase rate in the recent few years.

It should be mentioned that this investigated overall change rate shows only the net result over all regional increases and decreases, whereas spatially explicit change patterns do frequently show higher rates of changes, as also indicated by individual member state figures above. Furthermore, the changes in forested or tree-covered areas do not reflect changes in quality or properties of these areas, such as (long-term) changes in the dominant leaf type composition (broadleaved vs. coniferous) or (mid-term) in tree cover density, etc. Thus, the overall extent of all "changes" in forested and tree-covered areas will be higher than the indicated figure of forest area change. Anyway, for the ECoLaSS goal to identify the optimal incremental HRL Forest update frequency, the changes in forest/tree cover extent are considered more relevant, since any incremental update methodology will have to primarily focus on this, potentially rather short-term changing, feature, whereas the very slow changes in the forest properties will have to be captured in longer cycles.

2.3.3 Grassland

As the largest biome of the planet, grassland - comprising both soil and plants - houses a variety of ecosystems, counters soil erosion, stimulates remineralisation and accumulation of humus, protects groundwater and has – similar to forest – high potential of long-term storage of CO2 (Ciais et al., 2010). The wide geographic spread of grasslands across different climatic, topographic and geological conditions within the European countries reflects their adaptiveness and resilience. However, human impact and climate change will have strong implications on the dissemination of grasslands, their biological diversity and their biomass production potential (Chang et al., 2017).

Studies at national and European level identify a loss of grassland areas in the EEA countries as well as a considerable degradation of grassland ecosystems within the last decades (Velthoff et al., 2014; FAOSTAT, 2017; CLC, 2017; EUROSTAT, 2017; CORINE Land Cover Data, 1990-2012; BfN: Agrarreport, 2017; Gang et al., 2014; European Commission: Environment Directorate-General, 2008).

The decrease in grassland areas – in a pan-European as well as in global context - results on the one hand from growing demands for crop and fodder production and a general intensification in industrial crop and livestock farming in favourable areas which fosters the conversion of highly valuable grassland areas into cropland; on the other hand, it is the consequence of abandoning vast grassland in marginal areas leading to widespread bush encroachment due to the reduced practice of extensive management system (Landau et al., 2000; Bernuès et al., 2000; Ates et al., 2012). As part of natural as well as cultivated landscape, it is of great importance to have detailed knowledge about distribution and expansion of grasslands as well as to have a reliable basis for change detection in the future in order to preserve natural grasslands and to adopt management schemes for cultivated grasslands.

Data sources concerning grassland in a pan-European context are Corine Land Cover, LUCAS data from Eurostat or Land cover data from FAOSTAT. The CORINE inventories have been produced since 1990 and are updated in 2000 continuing with a 6 years update cycle. The layer of CLCC is produced since 2000. The data sets provide a broad overview of grassland changes at European level (European Union, 2018). The LUCAS points are available with an update rate of every 3 years since 2006 to identify changes in land use and land cover in the European Union. The latest published LUCAS survey is from 2012 and covers all 27 EU countries including observations at more than 270,000 points. The newest LUCAS survey has been carried in 2015 over 28 members states with 273 401 points (Eurostat, 2018). These data cannot provide an adequate basis for direct comparison and change detection due to their individual data acquisition methods, updating different coverage, diverse categories regarding land cover classes and/or differing definitions on grassland vegetation. An analysis of available time series of these data sources, however, could give a basic indication of potential change, its amount and temporal and spatial dynamic and thus supports a definition of possible update frequencies of the HRL grassland.

2.3.3.1 Expected magnitude of changes based on land cover data from FAOSTAT

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations FAO collects annual data on land cover and land use from all EEA countries. Concerning the grassland status in the EEA countries the FAO provides a data basis which allows grassland dynamic analysis and the identification of trends. For most EEA countries the annual data collection of the FAO starts in 1961. Within the first decades, data were either provided by “manual estimation” or “FAO estimate”, later on by “Official data reported on FAO Questionnaires from countries” or by “Data reported on country official publications or web sites (Official) or trade country files”.

2.3.3.1.1 Change Analysis

In order to get representative figures, data from 2000 onwards are used for the following analyses. Since then most of the todays EEA countries provided statistical data concerning land cover.

FAOSTAT specifies several land cover categories forest, agricultural and other; the category agriculture is subdivided into arable land, permanent crops and permanent meadows and pastures. The defining approach for permanent meadows and pastures is not completely identical to the definition of the HRL Grassland 2015 (AD06), however it could support an estimating concerning the magnitude of expected grassland changes and their spatial and temporal dynamic.

Definitions of the FAO

Permanent meadows & pastures – cultivated:
Permanent meadows and pastures is the land used permanently (for a period of five years or more) for herbaceous forage crops that are managed and cultivated.

Permanent meadows & pastures - naturally growing:
Permanent meadows and pastures - Naturally growing is the land used permanently (for a period of five years or more) for herbaceous forage crops that is naturally growing.

Permanent meadows & pastures cultivated, non-irrigated:

Permanent meadows and pastures - Cultivated and non- irrigated, area of the "Cultivated Permanent meadows and pastures" which development relies on rainfed irrigation in a given year.

Permanent meadows and pastures - cultivated & actually irrigated:
Permanent meadows and pastures - Cultivated and irrigated, area of the "Cultivated Permanent meadows and pastures" which is actually irrigated in a given year.

2.3.3.1.2 Results

The analysis of the data for permanent pastures in the EEA countries reveals a decrease of 5,203ha of grassland between the years 2000 and 2015 presented in Figure 2-18. Countries like Spain, Poland and France show the greatest decrease of grassland between the years 2000 and 2015, whereas in Croatia Lithuania, Portugal and Turkey are showing a decrease in grasslands.



Figure 2-18 - Comparison of the change in permanent pastures for selected EEA countries for the years 2000 - 2015 (FAOSTAT 2017); excluded are those countries having joined the EU later.

Although the dynamic of the pastures differs a lot regarding amount of area and spatial dynamic (increase/decrease) over the years (there are countries revealing strong increase of pasture area) as shown in Figure 2-19, the tendency for a general decrease in permanent pastures in the pan-European area continued through the years (see Annex) . In order not to tamper the outcome, those countries having joined the EU after the year 2000 or providing no data have been excluded (such as Cyprus, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro or Serbia).



Figure 2-19 - Spatial dynamic of permanent pastures in selected EEA countries from the years 2000 - 2015 (FAOSTAT, 2017).

2.3.3.2 Expected magnitude of changes based on CORINE Land Cover data

The CLC data inventory starts in 1985, with reference year of 1990 with updates in 2000, 2006 and 2012 consisting of 44 land cover classes. The CLC databases are produced by the EIONET network National Reference Land Cover (NRC/LC), coordinated by the EEA. They base on visual interpretation of high resolution imagery, applying semi-automated solutions and national in-situ data as well as GIS integration and generalisation. Since the 1990 database provides reliable data for only a selected number of countries, the analysis concerning grassland areas in the EEA countries focusses on the years 2000, 2006 and 2012. In this way they can be compared to the FAOSTAT data.

2.3.3.2.1 Change Analysis

Within the CLC land cover classification, grassland is part of several subclasses and shapes various types of landscapes, such as Complex cultivation patterns (242), Beaches, dunes and plains (331), Sparsely vegetated areas (333) and salt marshes (421). The classes of Pastures (231) and Natural grassland (321) (see Table 2-8) are not exactly in accordance to the grassland definition of the HRL Grassland 2015, but provide an adequate basis for a rough analysis of the spatial and temporal dynamic of grassland.

Table 2-8 - CLC data definitions

Definition of the CLC data		
231 Pastures **Dense grass cover, of floral composition, dominated by graminacea, not under a rotation system. Mainly for grazing, but the fodder may be harvested mechanically. Includes areas with hedges (bocage).**	This heading includes: ▪ temporary and artificial pastures not under a rotation system which become permanent grasslands five years after ploughing. Significant number of natural vegetation species are present (as Taraxacum officinale, Ranunculus spp., Chrisanthemum leucantemum, Knautia arvensis, Achillea millefolium, Salvia spp., etc.), ▪ abandoned arable land not under a rotation system used as pastures (after 3 years), ▪ pastures may include patches of arable land which do not cover 25 % of the total surface, ▪ humid meadows with dominating grass cover. Sedges, rushes, thistles, nettles, cover ▪ less than 25 % of the parcel surface, ▪ scattered trees and shrubs (10–20% of surface).	This heading excludes: ▪ military exercising grass fields (without grazing) (class 321), ▪ salt meadow located in intertidal flat areas (class 423), ▪ lawns inside sport and leisure facility areas (class 142), ▪ high-productive natural alpine meadows far from houses and/or crops (class 321), ▪ fodder crops (class 211), ▪ derelict grassland where semi-ligneous/ligneous vegetation cover at least 25 % of the parcel (class 322/324), ▪ strong humid meadows where hydrophile plant species cover at least 25 % of the parcel (class 411), ▪ herbaceous grass cover composed of non-palatable and undesirable species for cattle as Molinia spp. and Brachypodium spp. (class 321).
321 Natural Grassland **Low productivity grassland. Often situated in areas of rough, uneven ground. Frequently includes rocky areas, briars and heathland.**	This heading includes: ▪ Low productivity grassland. Often situated in areas of rough, uneven ground. Frequently includes rocky areas, briars and heathland. ▪ This heading includes: ▪ saline grasslands grown on temporary wet areas of saline soils, ▪ humid meadows where sedges, rushes, thistles, nettles cover more than 25 % of the parcel, ▪ natural grasslands with trees and shrubs if they do not cover more than 25 % of the surface to be considered, ▪ high-productive Alpine grasslands far from houses, crops and farming activities, ▪ herbaceous military training areas, ▪ grasslands which can be grazed, never sown and not otherwise managed by way of ▪ application of fertilizers, pesticides, drainage or reseeding except by burning, ▪ grasslands with a yearly productivity less than 1.500 units of fodder per ha, ▪ herbaceous grass covered composed of non-palatable gramineous species such as *Molinia spp.*and *Brachypodium spp.*, ▪ derelict natural grassland where ligneous vegetation cover less than 75 % of the area, ▪ grasslands found on calcareous soils with a high proportion of calcicole species of limestone, chalk Machair or Karst, ▪ grasslands dotted with bare rock areas which represent less than 25 % of the surface.	This heading excludes: ▪ grey dunes (class 331), ▪ swampy grassland (class 411), fallow land (class 211).

2.3.3.2.2 Results

The analysis of the dynamic of the CLC data for the years 2000-2012 reveals a high diversity concerning the amount of the grassland area, the percentage of both classes as well as the amount of change within these classes as shown in Figure 2-20 and Figure 2-21. The data from the year 1990 reflect a different database and is therefore not suitable for interpretation and comparisons. Although the overall area of grasslands seems to slightly increase, the dynamic within the different grassland classes reveals that natural grassland is on decline whereas the area of pasture increases between 2000 and 2012 (see Annex).



Figure 2-20 - Summarized grassland areas (Pastures and natural grasslands and their dynamic 1990-2012 (CLC 1990-2012); data from the year 1990 reflect a different database and are therefore not suitable for interpretation.



Figure 2-21 - Differing dynamic of pastures and natural grassland areas (CLC 2000-2012)



Figure 2-22 - Change of Pasture and Natural Grassland areas from the years 2000 up to 2012 (CLC 2000-2012).

Figure 2-22 shows the grassland loss or gain based on the CLC data for the years 2000-2012. Pastures show a high increase from 2000 to 2012 in Germany and smaller increases in countries like Ireland, Turkey and the United Kingdom. Decreasing pasture areas can be observed in Austria, France, Latvia, Netherlands and Romania. On the other hand, natural grasslands increased over the period from 2000 to 2012.



Figure 2-23 - Gain and loss within the pasture areas of the EEA countries (2000-2012) in percentages based on the status layers.

Furthermore, Figure 2-23 illustrates in detail the gain and loss for pasture areas in the EEA countries. The percentages over all countries indicate changes over 20% for pastures. Strongly increasing pasture areas with over 20% gain can be observed in Albania, Finland, Greece, Portugal and France. On the other hand, strongly decreasing pasture areas with over 20 % loss are located in Cyprus and Lichtenstein. Further details on the dynamics could be gathered by analyzing the CLCC data as opposed to the status layers which exhibit a 25ha MMU compared with a 5ha MMU. Within the CLC status layer, only net changes are considered and not the combined areas which are affected by gains and losses. However, in order to show the dynamic of grasslands from the years 2000-2015 – in comparison to the FAOSTAT analysis the status layers are more suitable for an analysis.



Figure 2-24 - Gain and loss within the natural grassland areas of the EEA countries (2000-2012) in percentage based on the status layers.

The analysis of the gain and loss within natural grasslands for the years 2000-2012 indicate changes over 30% for pastures as shown in Figure 2-24. Strongly increasing natural grassland areas with over

30% gain can be observed in Finland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, and Romania. On the other hand, strongly decreasing natural grassland areas with over 30% loss are located in Ireland, Luxemburg, Norway and Portugal. Additionally, to the gain of loss of natural grassland and pastures the changes between grassland and agricultural areas needs to be considered.



Figure 2-25 - Change in agriculture 2000-2006; Land Cover Flow (LCF) codes taken into account for the map: LCF41, LCF46, LCF6 (EEA, 2013).

Figure 2-25 shows the recorded changes in three categories of CLC. Conversion from pasture to arable land and permanent crops mainly took place in the Baltics and northern Germany as well as sparsely throughout central France and southern Spain. Extension of set aside fallow land and pasture intensely took place in the Czech Republic and to a lesser degree in Scandinavia, western Spain and the Balkans. Withdrawal of farming was predominantly recorded in the Republic of Ireland, Portugal, eastern Hungary, Poland and the Netherlands.

Although the time range of the CLC data base (see Annex) being not sufficient to draw final conclusions on the expected change of pastures and Natural grassland dynamic, some point can be stated:
There are countries where both types of grassland are roughly balanced within this time period, such as Austria, Bulgaria, Switzerland, Cyprus, Croatia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Macedonia or the Republic of Serbia (see Figure 2-24 and Figure 2-23). On the other hand, some countries reveal a disproportionally high percentage of natural grassland compared to pastures in both time slots, 2000 and 2012, namely Albania (433/616 km^2 pastures and 2.948/3.208 km^2 natural grassland), Greece (700/1.005 km^2 pastures and 11.935/10.624 km^2 natural grassland), Italy (4.271/4.286 km^2 pastures and 14.690/13.796 km^2 natural grassland) or Turkey (15.803/19.534 km^2 pastures and 91.311/88.937 km^2 natural grassland). Furthermore, several countries show a significant increase in pasture and at

the same time a strongly decrease in natural grassland, here to name Germany (+42,02% pastures, -13,95% natural grassland), Greece (+43,48% pastures, -10,98% natural grassland), Portugal (+37,76% pastures, -39,42% natural grassland), Ireland (+7,34% pastures, -49,84% natural grassland), Turkey (+23,61% pastures, -2,60% natural grassland) and the UK (+4,0% pastures, -27,12% natural grassland). Other countries reveal an overall increase in both areas. It may be assumed that arable or forest areas have here been converted into pastures. Two countries, namely Liechtenstein (-63,44% pastures, -0,34% natural grassland) and Luxembourg (23,73% pastures, -100,00% natural grassland) show a high loss in grassland areas of both classes. Of course, one has to keep in mind that these states show in general very small areas of grassland and it can be assumed that their priority lies in creating arable land.

As already mentioned, the data source has to be analysed with care. Outliers like the example of Finland might not necessarily reflect real change but could also rely on changing methods of data acquisition.

2.3.3.3 Expected magnitude of changes based on LUCAS data from EUROSTAT

According to Eurostat the European Union had 172 million ha of UAA in 2007. 104 million ha (60%) were arable land while 57 million ha (33%) were permanent grassland and 11 million ha (6%) were crops. Grassland plays an important role in animal fodder production as grassland and fodder drops together made up 43% of UAA in 2007.



Figure 2-26 - Change in points of percentage for the share of grassland in total UAA, 2003-2007 (EU, 2013).

Overall, the share of grassland throughout the European Union increased slightly from 2003 to 2007. However, as can be seen in Figure 2-26, for some countries the changes were significant. Lithuania and Slovakia both lost more than 7 percent of their grassland area during these years. On the other hand, Bulgaria experienced an increase of over five, Portugal one of over 10%.



Figure 2-27 - Distribution between agricultural crops and pastures in 2010 (EU, 2013).

In 2010 the majority of UAA regions was mainly covered by arable crops (yellow in Figure 2-27) or made up of arable land and pastures (yellow and orange stripes in Figure 2-27). Exceptions are Wales, Scotland, Ireland, western Austria and western Bulgaria, all of which are covered manly by pastures (orange in Figure 2-27). In the Mediterranean many regions are mixed between all three land uses.

The changes between the share of UAA in 2010 (see Figure 2-27) and 2013 (see Figure 2-28) show that the number of regions dominated by two land use types combined significantly decreased. These regions tended to have a 67% majority of a land use class in 2013 where they were mixed in 2010. This large scale change appears in all larger countries, from Spain though southern France and western Germany to eastern Poland and northern Romania. It is also visible in England, smaller CEE countries and Latvia. Among the changing regions mountainous ones tend to a majority of permanent grassland and meadows while relatively flat areas tend to a majority of arable land. On the contrary, formerly mixed agricultural areas largely remained mixed.



Figure 2-28 - Distribution between agricultural crops and pastures in in 2013; https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-indicators/context/2017/c18_en.jpg

In 2015 the shares of total land use in the EU-28 were 22.2% of cropland, 20.7 was grassland. Forests, artificial areas, scrublands, wetlands and water area made up the rest of the land cover. Grasslands mainly appear in regions where either crop growing is unfeasible or as overgrowth over forest clear-cuts. Areas with low shares of grassland have harsh (extremely hot or extremely cold) conditions. This is visible in the northern countries (Finland and Sweden) as well as on Mediterranean islands (Malta and Cyprus). On the contrary the temperate Republic of Ireland is the only EU member state with more than half of its area as grassland in 2015 (56.3 percent) (Eurostat, 2017).



Figure 2-29 - EU land cover - grassland in percentage (Eurostat, 2017).

Figure 2-29 shows the change of grassland in the entire European Union. The three-year intervals show a decrease of grassland since 2009. Since data is only available from the date of a country joining the union, data for all 28 countries is missing for 2012 and 2009 as data for 27 countries is missing for 2009. Still, a trend is visible, even when taking into account that Croatia's membership brought a country with below average grassland share into the union.



Figure 2-30 - land cover - grassland in percentage for European member states from 2009 – 2012 (Eurostat, 2017).

Looking at Figure 2-30 the strong differences between countries become visible. The lowest shares of grassland are to be found in Sweden and Finland. This was also established in the CLC data, but there Hungary was found to have a comparable share of grassland to Sweden, which in LUCAS data is not the case. Ireland and the UK have the highest percentages of grassland, followed by Belgium and The Netherlands. What these countries with high shares have in common is a reduction of their grassland since 2009. Like in the overall European statistics the lacking data from countries before their joining of the European Union makes comparisons difficult.

2.3.3.4 Conclusion

The analysis of all three data sources, FAO, Eurostat and CLC shows that there is high diversity within the EEA countries concerning both, amount of grassland areas as well as the spatial and temporal dynamic of those land cover types. Whereas grassland cover is stable for most EEA member states with change rates below 1%, for several countries, high dynamics occurred in the previous years. For example, grassland cover in Ireland decreased from 65% in 2009 to 56% in 2015. In Lithuania, a decrease from 30% in 2012 to 25% in 2015 is reported by Eurostat. In Malta, an increase from 17% in 2012 to 23% in 2015 is reported by Eurostat. The investigated data on grassland areas in Europe all agree in showing an overall loss in grassland areas over 2000 - 2015 however at different magnitudes. The FAO statistics show a general trend of grassland loss from 2000 – 2015 with ~5%. Also, LUCAS data shows a trend for grassland loss within the EEA-39 countries varying from 1-2%. Furthermore, it should be considered that the results from different data sources are based on different grassland definitions. The CLC data differentiates between natural grasslands and pastures showing an overall gain for pastures of ~17% from 2000 to 2012, whereas the only a small gain for natural grasslands could be observed. Although the overall area of grasslands seems to slightly increase, the dynamic within the different grassland classes reveals that natural grassland is on decline whereas the area of pasture increases between 2000 and 2012. The trend however also seems to indicate an accelerating decrease rate in the recent few years. Given the knowledge that grasslands are highly valuable ecosystems that need protection, these analyses confirm the need for a dense and accurate monitoring and therefore the need for a reliable data basis. The production of such an accurate data basis by use of HR data and the combination of a highly automated classification and an elaborate approach resulting in a pan-European grassland vegetation cover may in the one hand show the effects of precedent political, economic and agricultural decisions and on the other hand provide the basis for future regulating measures.

2.4 Defining the most appropriate update frequency, considering the dynamics/stability and EO data requirements

Most land cover types at a pan-European or global scale include a wide range of variation in vegetation cover, plant structure, and understory or background condition, as well as significant variability in the way the vegetation cover changes throughout the annual cycle. In such a highly variable environment, classification algorithms often need considerable tuning to optimize their accuracy (Strahler et al., 2006). For each thematic product, an analysis will be performed for defining the optimal update period related to environmental conditions (e.g., vegetation phenology, cloud coverage etc.) and the expected accuracy related to the user needs. However, this ideal time period will be mainly facing the EO data availability which is the principal limitation. The data source for the HRLs production will progressively be shifted from the European HR image coverage 2012/2015 (ESA DWH) to the S-1/-2 data provision. This will ensure more frequent acquisition and continuous change monitoring services. The proposed yearly update frequency combining full coverage inventories with incremental spatially partial updates will be tested with different data provisions and assessed in real monitoring conditions over some prototype sites.

2.4.1 Imperviousness Layer

As shown earlier, the current production of the HRL Imperviousness relies on data acquired over a three-year period (reference year +/- one year). Therefore, it is not currently possible to reduce the current 3-yearly cycle based on the experience from the HRL2015 production. Nevertheless, with the full availability of the S-2 constellation complemented by S-1, a yearly update will be investigated as part of Task 4 of the project. However, the rate of change although always steadily increasing, is still very small particularly when compared against the whole area of Europe. The average annual increase between 2006 and 2012 is just over 0.5% for a total area representing less than 5% of the total area. At European level, this represents an area of between 1-2,000 km² per annum which is extremely little especially considering that it tends to be scattered over the entire country in a large number of small patches. This makes the detection of urban expansion quite a challenging task.

It is also clear that there seems to be a geographical heterogeneity in the magnitude of changes observed. Interestingly, this pattern seems to correlate quite well with the difficulty in obtaining cloud free EO data coverage with a lower expansion of urban areas in countries in the British Isles and northern Europe for which cloud free EO data is problematic and a greater expansion rate in southern European countries. Therefore, the update frequency could potentially be higher in those countries with a greater urban expansion rate and better image coverage.

For imperviousness, the small area concerned with changes and image availability does not play in favour of increasing the update frequency, but this is based on the past situation in terms of image availability. The combined use of S-2 and Landsat will certainly improve the cloud free situation and the accuracy of detecting new built-up areas, although the availability of cloud free optical data is still likely to remain critical in cloud prone northern Europe, but the use of S-1 could also improve the situation by guaranteeing an image acquisition every 6 days. However, this still remains unproven and will need to be tested in the demonstration phase of the project.

2.4.2 Forest Layer

The choice of an appropriate incremental update frequency for the HRL Forest on a pan-European level depends on both, practical constraints (i.e. the magnitude and detectability of actual forest change rates) as well as technical constraints (i.e. associated data requirements etc.). In terms of practical constrains, section 2.3.2 showed the overall order of magnitude of possible change rates which can be expected for Europe’s forests. In terms of technical constraints, section 2.3.1 introduced the data used for the HRL 2015 production as a minimum indication. Beyond that, the current Sentinel satellite constellation (primarily S-1 and S-2) does already today offer a higher frequency of relevant satellite data coverages than available for any previous CLMS products and HR Layers. This can be leveraged for future HR Layers.

To define adequate update frequencies of the forest layer product, it is also crucial to understand the dynamics of loss and regrowth in forest cover and its characteristics. Regeneration of forest cover can take up to 5–10 years in temperate climate conditions until a recovery (increase) of tree canopy cover to reach a level of 10 % in a “disturbed” forested area is observed. The loss of forest cover after natural or man-made impacts such as wind-throw or selective logging, an acute loss of tree cover (i.e. a clear-felling or deforestation) can be monitored immediately after a related event (Bartels et al., 2016). Besides that, it should be taken into consideration that in context of an increasing industrial biomass production, certain tree species (e.g. Salix viminalis) have a faster regrowth rate and can be harvested already 2-5 years after planting (Slepetys et al., 2012).

In the end, the crucial aspect for defining an appropriate update frequency may not be the small overall net change (i.e. currently: gain) in forest area as observed during the last years in Europe. Any future incremental HRL Forest update methodology must rather be capable of properly depicting the changes also in those regions where losses occur with a higher magnitude and/or frequency compared to other areas of Europe, and where the current HRL 3-year update cycle is particularly insufficient to allow policy-makers to understand and react to such rapid changes and/or change ‘focus areas’. In that respect, especially countries, where the impact of climate change is stronger, may need more attention in terms of monitoring environmental and forest disturbances. As climate change is linked with an enlarged risk of extreme events, pests and diseases, certain impacts on forest ecosystems can already be observed today. Southern Europe for example, is confronted with such changes due to climate change, which are often linked to extreme drought and a rapid loss of green biomass due to forest fires (Lindner et al., 2014).

In terms of technical feasibility (i.e. availability of necessary EO data frequencies in combination with state-of-the-art information extraction algorithms), a yearly (or two-yearly) HR Forest Layer update cycle for the whole EEA-39 appears technically feasible, and will be tested in the second project phase. Presumably a one-year cycle is more appropriate as it can be aligned with the regular 3-year update cycle of the CLMS products. Shorter frequencies (e.g. less than one year) seem to not allow ensuring a sufficient thematic quality of identified changes in a homogeneous manner across Europe, mainly due to the small overall change extents in such short time spans and the associated difficulty to discriminate ‘real changes’ from ‘noise’ (i.e. the typical and unavoidable mapping uncertainty/error) in the data linked to an insufficient information depth/length of a reduced EO data time series.

In a practical sense, rapid changes of the tree-covered area in a major extent occur very unevenly distributed over the European land surface, as described in the previous two paragraphs. Such rapid changes are always linked to a local/regional decreases of forest/tree cover and can appear due to (legal or illegal) logging, storm damage, fire, diseases or other natural disasters. In contrast, regional increases of forest/tree cover take place over longer time spans and consequently need longer monitoring cycles. The same is true for changes in forest characteristics and properties such as tree cover density or dominant leaf type.

A synoptic assessment of the above discussed technical and practical aspects of change monitoring leads to the conclusion that an incremental update scheme for the HRL Forest may have to follow a two-staged approach:

1) Changes in the extent of tree/forest cover can be monitored in an incremental update cycle of 1 year, capturing primarily rapid (negative) changes (i.e. logging, deforestation, forest damage);
2) Changes in forest characteristics/properties (such as tree cover density, dominant leaf type) as well as typically slower increases in the tree-stocked area (i.e. regrowth, reforestation) can be complemented in the established 3-year update cycle (as is currently the case).

Such incremental update concept would allow retrieving spatially explicit information on the overall most relevant variable, i.e. the tree/forest cover extent, in a three times more frequent fashion than currently, on the full EEA-39 extent. Furthermore, this approach would ensure the fitting of the HRL Forest product into the pan-European Copernicus Land Monitoring Service concept and observation cycles. Additionally, it would allow also setting up more regional downstream services, building on the enhanced and more frequent (incremental) HRL Forest information, e.g. in combination with local/regional in-situ data such as forest inventories, management plans, etc.

2.4.3 Grassland

The analysis in chapter 2.3.2, Expected magnitude of changes, comprises the different data sources of FAOSTAT, EUROSTAT and CLC which have some limitation concerning differing definitions of grassland, different spatial and temporal ranges and acquisition methods. varying availability of data) Nevertheless these data can be well used as proxy for tendencies on grassland development. The analysis indicates the high spatial diversity of grassland areas and their spatial and temporal dynamics within the EEA-39 countries. In terms of change detection, that raises the question of update frequencies relating to a full coverage product versus partial incremental updates. Several aspects contribute to the assessment of how closely grassland vegetation should be monitored:

- the natural variability and growing dynamic
- the role of human intervention
- the availability of EO data
- differentiation between real changes and technical changes

NATURAL VARIABILITY AND GROWING DYNAMIC

Grassland vegetation is first and foremost determined by the local and seasonal climatic conditions. It is well adapted to regional variations of biogeographic conditions. Annual as well as perennial grasslands turn out to be reliably growing every year in the same areas (Cosentino et al., 2014). In case of human impact like mowing, intensive grazing or even tilling, photosynthetic activity declines rapidly and spectral characteristics change. The increase and decrease of photosynthetic activity, as well as the diversity of different grassy plants, is reflected in a highly variable spectral range for grasslands. Additionally, grasslands are part of manifold different landscapes and environments, mixing up with trees, shrubs, humid and swampy areas or dry and rocky landscapes, surrounding water bodies, or are influenced by growing on different soil types. All these land cover features influence the spectral response of grassland, ending up in a highly diverse range of “typical” grassland spectra.

For mapping grassland, it is required to consider the whole growing cycle which is slightly shifted from Northern to Southern Europe, due to varying climatic conditions (see AD06, chapter 2.3.3.3: *Mapping*

Mediterranean Grassland with Multi-temporal Earth Observation Data). In order to consider the most adequate time slots of the growing season for *all* European countries, in some climate zones even winter months of the previous calendar year (October – February) have to be taken into account for grassland detection. In order to accurately detect grassland vegetation cover and its life cycle changes, it is recommendable to use time series that comprise imagery covering at least one full growing season per climate zone. Relating to a pan-European approach this means data acquisition for two years in order to provide imagery for ideal time slots for all growing seasons.

ROLE OF HUMAN INTERVENTION

Grassland change appears in both directions (loss and gain) within a short time period, caused by natural phenomena like permanent droughts or flooding, but in most cases related to human interventions. Grassland *loss* may occur through conversion to agricultural fields, for example, or through conversion to urban areas or due to the abandonment of pastures which leads to the development of shrubby vegetation within a short time period and in medium term even to regrowth of trees. Grassland *gain* may happen when arable land has not been tilled for a certain amount of time and regrowth of grassy vegetation takes place. It should be noted that what is visible on the ground (i.e. the actual 'land cover') may differ from what is regarded a grassland from a legal-administrative point of view – which typically resembles more 'land use' aspects. For example, in Germany, cropland that has not been tilled for a 5-years period will be legally regarded as grassland. These regulations differ between the European countries.

Grassland, like other land cover types with (at least partially) semi-natural vegetation, are under pressure due to conflictive land use demands, competing with economic activity, increased mobility, urbanization and pollution to name some. The analysis of national statistics reveals a decline of (semi-)"natural grasslands" (corresponding to the CLC-land cover nomenclature), whereas the area of permanent pastures seems to slightly increase. In order to protect (semi-) natural grassland areas and to manage grasslands in a sustainable way, the EU and national entities have made efforts to establish common rules and regulations for grassland protection and management within the Common Agricultural Policy of the European Union CAP (EC about CAP, 2017). The *Greening* requirements, for example, linked with the direct payments of the EU to farmers, the necessity of an approval obligation for the tilling of grassland and the complete prohibition of the conversion of Ecologically High Sensitive Grassland areas (protected by Natura 2000 regulations in areas of the Flora-Fauna-Habitat FFH Directive) are exemplary parts within the CAP guidelines and decisions. Farmers, as well as states who aim at benefitting from EU payments, have to be compliant with EU regulations (BfN: Agrarreport, 2017; BfN: Grünlandreport, 2014; CAP, 2015). Temporal and spatial implementation of these regulations strongly differs within the EU member countries.

Availability of EO data in theory, the availability of EO data is not anymore a limiting factor for detecting grassland with a pan-European coverage. Optical S-2 A and B data are available about every 5 days. SAR data of S-1 A and B provide data every 6 days. However, depending on the geographical location and climate conditions in Europe, clouds, haze and shadow effects due to low solar zenith angles in late autumn and winter months, can significantly reduce the number and quality of suitable optical satellite data for certain regions. SAR imagery similarly suffer from radar shadowing effects in mountainous areas or from data gaps caused by snow. Thus, despite additional use of Landsat data and the integration of S-1 SAR data (see AD06, chapter 2.3.3.1 *HRL Grassland production*), there still might be an insufficient coverage of EO data per growing season for certain regions. The research on this topic is still ongoing and the potential of using SAR data for bridging the information gap in optical data is still an issue to be worked on.

DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN REAL CHANGES AND TECHNICAL CHANGES

As a consequence of management schemes like mowing or intense grazing, or caused by weather effects like drought, large areas of grassland might appear as non-grassland in satellite imagery, but this is only a temporary effect and therefore no real change. In order to largely avoid being misled by such effects, a careful selection of adequate image acquisition time slots for the reliable detection of grassland is essential. Another challenge is the differentiation of real land cover/use changes and "technical changes", i.e. differences in two consecutive classification time steps caused by e.g. increases in the spatial resolution of the used EO imagery, advancements in the detection technology, etc., resulting in a thematic and/or spatial accuracy enhancement of a more recent compared to a former grassland classification. The reliable discrimination of real vs. temporary or technical changes within any regular update frame is still an issue, specifically if the time intervals between the inventories are shortened, e.g. towards annual schemes.

CONCLUSION

The EU aims at the protection of important ecosystems such as grasslands and needs basic information for this purpose. Detected first signs of changes often indicate general tendencies of transformation and potential threats. In that sense, the detection of (negative) change (i.e. grassland loss) can indicate the need for implementing regulatory counter-measures, whereas a positive change (i.e. a grassland increase) can be an indicator for the effectiveness of already established measures. Therefore EO based change detection can be an important monitoring tool for agro-political and environmental issues as well as e.g. for urban planning. Defining an adequate update frequency strongly depends on the definition of *change* itself, e.g. on which scale (variations caused by macro conditions like climate change or such caused by potentially smaller scale human impact), for which magnitude and for which purpose a change is regarded significant.
Changes in grassland are highly dynamic by nature within one growing season – and loss and gain can happen within a short time period induced by extreme weather conditions or by human intervention. These considerations speak in favour of an annual incremental update.
Concerning the implementation of a higher (e.g. annual) update frequency, several factors are still challenging:

- Identification of adequate optical EO data acquisition time slots for the accurate detection of grassland: within a pan-European approach, these time slots have to cover varying growing seasons (e.g. also over winter time in Mediterranean areas) and therefore may have to span more than one calendar year. This calls for regionally adjusted, different time slots.
- Differentiation of real changes versus temporary or technical changes
- Mitigation of certain information gaps (i.e. less dense time series) due to cloud cover, haze or low sun angles in certain geographical regions.

These topics are still open issues and part of the ongoing research.

3 Testing of methods for incremental updates

The previous chapter has shown that despite the experience accumulated during the HRL 2015 production, the main limiting factor to increase the update frequency of HRLs still remain in the availability of cloud free EO data. This is mainly because the S-2 constellation has yet to be fully deployed and the use of S-1 data was so far only introduced for the production of the grassland layer, but has yet to be implemented for the imperviousness and forest layer. Another factor that would contribute to increase the update frequency is to improve the accuracy of the change detection. However, even though the focus of the HRLs is on change detection, there are no detailed specifications on determining the accuracy of changes. Specifications only focus on the accuracy of status layers for which the target is set at 90% for both producer and user accuracy, but the results from the previous chapter show that in all three cases (imperviousness, forest and grassland), this level of accuracy is still above the expected level of change over the current 3-year period. Therefore, the specifications should now shift to focus more on change detection and set targets in terms of change area estimate uncertainty, but this means that the focus should not only be on the HRL itself, but also on the sampling design and intensity (i.e. number of sample per unit area) of the reference data used to assess the uncertainty.



Figure 3-1 - Proposed workflow

Currently, the only experience available is that of HRL Imperviousness for which 4 dates are now available, but little analysis was performed in relation to uncertainty analysis. There was just a recognition that the previous implementation of the HRL production led to inconsistent results temporally and spatially and as a result, a re-analysis of the previous status and change layers was performed during the 2015 production. However, there was still not target set in terms of level of uncertainty to be reached. Therefore, the objective of this chapter is to assess the level of improvement achieved by the re-analysis of the historical layer during the HRL2015 production and develop suitable methods for ensuring spatially and temporally consistent incremental updates of HRL products at an appropriate time frequency based on the combination between time series-derived classification and change detection algorithm for the HRL Imperviousness. The production of the HRL imperviousness (as well and other HRLs) focuses on the creation of a reliable built-up mask, which is then combined with NDVI data to derive the imperviousness degree, since most of the sources of errors are attributable to the correctness of the input built-up mask, all the effort of this chapter is dedicated to improving the accuracy of the detection of new built-up areas. Changes within the existing built-up mask (i.e. increase or decrease of imperviousness degree) will be dealt with the second phase of the implementation of this WP. A general overview of the workflow applied over the selected test site in France is illustrated in the figure above.

3.1 Characterization of outputs from automated change detection

A specific Reference sample dataset for the statistical calibration of changes needs to be created as part of this WP35 in order to characterize the changes detected by comparing the original HRL2015 built-up mask with the new built-up mask layer for the 2017 reference year to ensure that there are no spatial inconsistencies between the layers of the different epochs.

3.1.1 Detection of new built-up areas

Following the outcomes of the WP 33 and 34, two products were generated, a new built-up status mask for 2017 and a 2015-17 change built-up mask.

The Imperviousness built-up mask layer for 2017 was created as part of WP33 (see Figure 3-2) and the classification was performed using supervised machine learning methods to create the updated built-up mask for 2017. The production of the built-up mask is achieved with selection of reference (or training) data. It works in both interactive and batch mode. In the former case, the user is given some specific pixels to label (e.g. by photo-interpretation), while in the latter case only relevant samples from the training sets will be used (leading to a better modelling of land cover classes as well as a more efficient classification process). Following the results of the WP31 (separability of the information for thematic classifications) and WP33 (Time Series Analysis for Thematic Classification), the input data selected rely on multispectral information and granulometry by mathematical morphology (Differential Attribute Profiles (DAP)).

The results of the validation exercise performed in the frame of the WP33 for the HRL IMD 2017 input layer are quantified in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1 - New HRL 2017 - accuracy.

	Producer accuracy	User accuracy
HRL IMD 2017 Input data	85.19%	85.19%



Figure 3-2 - The Imperviousness built-up mask layer 2017.

The Change 2015-2017 layer was then produced. To determine the built-up changes 2015-2017, the supervised classification result for 2017 (machine learning algorithm using DAP profiles) is combined with the built-up mask from the HRL Imperviousness 2015 produced during the operational HRL production outside this project (see Figure 3-3). This step not only reveals 2015-2017 built-up changes, but, as said before, it also detects potential omission errors in the built-up mask 2015 as well as potential commission errors of the 2017 built-up area.



Figure 3-3 - HRL IMD 2015 built-up mask layer



Figure 3-4 - Change layer detection.

3.1.2 Characterisation of areas of change

One of the key requirement is to ensure the temporal consistency and comparability between the different time intervals and that there should be no spatial inconsistencies between the layers of the different epochs. The main reasons for the presence of temporal and spatial inconsistencies are as follows:

- Impervious areas typically represent less than 5% of the total EEA-39 even though the level of omission and commission are still below the set threshold of 10% the area represented by a 10% error in the delineation of the built-up mask can still be greater than the actual area of change between the two periods.
- Although some errors are included in the reference layer, new errors can be included in the detection of change between two periods. The change layers' errors can be due to the following factors:
    - Omission of change
    - Technical change (i.e. commission errors) due to:
        - Geometric and phenological differences between the two periods leading to false increase or decrease of Imperviousness degree (these can be filtered out to some extent by applying a suitable threshold adapted to local circumstances
        - Commission errors added for the new period
        - Omission errors detected for the previous period

Due to the semi-automated nature of the HRL production workflow, it is not possible to guarantee that all errors can be removed from the change layer. However, the relative magnitude of actual change versus the errors contained in the change layer for each time interval should be known in order to provide a basis for improving the temporal consistency between each layer. Therefore, there is a need to develop a reference dataset that will be used to determine the relative proportion of actual change versus all the error components described above. To be valid, this calibration dataset should be selected based on a probability sampling approach. Since the focus is on change, the approach will help assess:

- The new built-up for the year 2017;
- The omission errors from 2015 – the undetected built-up pixels of 2015;
- And the commission errors from 2017 – the pixels falsely flagged as built-up in 2017.



Figure 3-5 - Reference calibration samples overlaid on the change mask

197 sample point/pixel units were randomly selected based on the change stratum defined as the output from WP34 by comparing the HRL2015 built-up mask with the newly created 2017 layer as illustrated in the figure above. The results obtained from the reference calibration dataset confirmed the outcome of the WP34 and are as follows:

Table 3-2 - Characterisation of change stratum

	% of total change areas
New built-up 2017	9,64%

Omission errors 2015 (undetected built-up 2015):	76,65%
Commission errors 2017 (false built-up 2017)	13,71%

Based on the calibration dataset, the relative magnitude of actual change is estimated to only represent 9.64% of the total area detected as changed from the automated change detection procedure. Thus, the errors concern the remaining 90% of the change areas detected. Most of these, almost 77%, represent omission errors from 2015 and just less than 14% represent new commission errors from 2017.

As explained in WP34 and regarding the omission errors from the previous period, it should notice that the specifications of the reference image data for 2015 is different to that of the 2017 input data. For 2015, the production was mostly based on Landsat data whereas the 2017 built-up was produced from S-2 resulting in a 9-fold improvement in spatial resolution (i.e. a Landsat pixel is characterized by 9 S-2 pixels); explaining that most of the omission errors concern small and isolated built-up features as illustrated in the figures below.



Figure 3-6 - Example of calibration point for the newly detected built-up in 2017



Figure 3-7 - Example of omission errors 2015 (undetected built-up in 2015)

Figure 3-8 - Example of commission errors for 2017, false built-up in 2017

The level of omission detected in the 2015 built-up mask means that it will need to be re-processed in order to provide spatially and temporally consistent changes. This is not a reflection of the lower quality of the 2015 data, but is linked to the change in input EO data now based on S-2. At the very least, omission should be flagged in the built-up change mask layer.

3.2 Assessment of spatial and temporal consistency: Ensuring continuous traceability of changes

For the re-processing of the 2015 and 2017 built-up masks the existing Imperviousness layer 2015 and 2017 are utilized, together with the re-processed HR IMAGE2015 and 2017 (Landsat and S-1/-2) datasets and, where appropriate, additional information from Google Earth/Bing Maps. The main target is to finetune the classification outputs to ensure better consistency over time.

3.2.1 Reduction of bias algorithm

In an initial step, the new 2017 built-up mask is overlaid to the existing 2015 mask, and an initial change 2015-2017 is created and thematically classified (stable areas, built-up changes 2015-2017 and potential omission from 2015 and commission errors from 2017

The procedures described above resolve potential geometry issues between the layers at different reference year, but there could be substantial differences in the relative amount of changes detected which needs to be corrected to ensure consistency over time.

That is why a Post-Classification Comparison (PCC) is implemented (see Figure 3-9).



Figure 3-9 - Post-classification processing.

This method involves the following steps:

- A post-processing filtering procedure was applied (see AD06). Indeed, there is a significant portion of noise due to single pixels or isolated pixels (small aggregated group of pixels), which are most likely misclassifications. Such noises should be reduced/removed with post-classification filtering approaches.
- A spatial and temporal consistency procedure relying on the reference calibration data– the purpose is to ensure the consistency and comparability between the different dates, so as to prevent problems linked to an "image-to-image approach", related to the possible divergences in terms of acquisition, and/or of geometry between the two periods.

This procedure relies heavily on the use of the reference dataset for the statistical calibration of changes described above.

This dataset is used to produce statistics representing the expected area of change for each of the target categories and strata following the structure presented in the table below. As illustrated and because sample units were selected as a probability sample, an area estimate accompanied by its uncertainty expressed as a confidence interval can be produced for each listed category and time interval based on the following formulas (Taylor et al., 1997). The estimate of the proportion of land area covered by category c is given by:

$$\overline{y_c} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i$$

With the variance:

$$var(\overline{y_c}) = \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right)\frac{1}{n(n-1)}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - \overline{y_c})^2$$

Where y_i is the proportion of segment i covered by class c, N is total number of segments in the region, n is number of segments in the sample. The estimate of the class area is:

$$\hat{Z}_c = D\,\overline{y_c}$$

With the variance:

$$var(\hat{Z}_c) = D^2\, var(\overline{y_c})$$

Where D is the production unit area.

Table 3-3 - Example of area statistics generated from the reference dataset for the statistical calibration of changes for a given time interval and production unit Z Time interval: 2006-12

	Actual change	Commission from new reference year	Omission from previous reference year
Change 2015-2017 stratum	A ± 95% CI	B ± 95% CI	C ± 95% CI

The estimates obtained for the 2015-2017 change layer provide a basis to target the re-processing that needs to be applied for each layer. In the change stratum, the objective is to separate the three categories listed above. This is achieved by adopting a re-classification approach linking the three categories with suitable training data between 2015 and 2017 imagery.

	
Ressoursat-02 (2015)	S-2 (2017)
	
S-2 (2017) and change mask (WP34) Red: Stable built-up Green: Change built-up	S-2 (2017) and Reclassified change mask (WP35) Red: Stable built-up Blue: omissions from 2015 Green: New built-up 2017

Figure 3-10 - Extract of the reclassified 2015_17 HRL Imperviousness built-up masks

Based on the reprocessing process (confirmed by the calibration dataset), the relative magnitude of actual change is estimated to just under 10% of the total change areas. In other words, of the total area initially detected as changed from the output of WP34, only about 10% effectively represent new built-up areas and the remaining 90% are mostly omissions undetected in 2015 (76.7%) and new commission errors introduced by the 2017 new built-up mask (13.7%) as indicated in Table 3-2.

Most of the omission errors (as shown in the Figures above) concern small and isolated built-up features and roads. As explained in the WP34, this is mostly attributable to the change of resolution between Landsat and S-2.

Regarding the commissions from 2017, we find mostly usual errors like small gardens, bare soils in the neighbourhood of impervious scattered areas, as seen in Table 3-4. It should be noted that the original change layer represented a nearly 50% increase of the artificial area in the test area which is huge and unrealistic considering that in fact over 75% of the detected changes were omission from 2015. In the re-classified layer, new built-up areas represent a 4% increase which appear more realistic and already represent a substantial increase over a 2-year period.

Table 3-4 - Results of the reclassification for 2015-2017.

	2015	2017	2015-2017
Original built-up mask (km²)	212,00	350,90	138,90
Reclassified built-up areas (omission - km²)	104,96	-	-
Reclassified non built-up areas (commission - km²)	-	20,26	-
Final reclassified built-up mask (km²)	316,96	330,64	13,68

Figure 3-11 below shows the results of the re-classification procedure performed on the original built-up change masks for 2015 and 2017. Results are now much closer than the values as based on the calibration data.



Figure 3-11 - Comparison of the original built-up change layer, calibration data and the reclassification results for the 2015-2017 period.

The improvement is even more visible when focusing on change statistics as illustrated in Figure 3-12. The re-classified change layer is well within the confidence interval of the calibration data thus providing spatially and temporally consistent change detection.



Figure 3-12 - Comparison of the detected change areas from the original new built-up mask stratum.

3.2.2 Added value of methodologies in comparison to the ones used in other (CLMS) contracts

It is worth comparing the performance of the new procedure developed as part of the project with the one which was implemented as part of the "HRL 2015 – Lot 1: Imperviousness products" project. The main differences between the two approaches is that a more sophisticated reclassification procedure (involving the combination of Differential Attribute profiles with SVM) was applied here taking full advantage of the increased spatial and temporal resolution of S-2. The method could potentially be further developed within an active learning framework. Regarding the CLMS HRL re-analysis of the historical HRLs, a simpler re-classification procedure was applied based on was limited to the EO data available then (mostly Landsat, IRS and SPOT). In addition, the calibration data used for ECoLaSS was densified and optimised to better focus on initially detected changed areas compared with the HRL2015 production. This also shows in the results obtained by exhibiting a wider confidence interval. Further work is required to determine the optimal level of sampling intensity needed to apply the method operationally. Nevertheless, there was still a substantial improvement in the re-processing of the 2006, 2009 and 2012 layer as part of the CLMS HRL2015 production, even though the improvement is more substantial in the procedure developed as part of this work (as shown in the previous section).



Figure 3-13 - Comparison of the detected change areas expressed as a percentage of the total area for the HRL2015 production within the selected test area for the original historical layers, the calibration reference data and the re-analysed reclassified HRL.

3.2.3 Accuracy assessment of changes

Finally, even though the main objective of the HRL production is to obtain reliable change area statistics by reducing the bias, as demonstrated above, improving the accuracy of change detection will result in a reduction of the uncertainty (i.e. confidence intervals of change area statistics). An accuracy assessment procedure was carried out based on selecting 200 sample units randomly selected within the change stratum and compared with the original and re-classified layer. Results are shown in the tables below.

Table 3-5 - Error matrix for the original 2015-17 change layer

Original		REF					
		New Built-up	Omi. 2015	Comi. 2017	Total	User	Comi.
MAP	New Built-up	14	157	29	**200**	**7,00%**	**93,00%**
	Omi. 2015	0	0	0	**155**	**0,00%**	**100,00%**
	Comi. 2017	0	0	0	**26**	**0,00%**	**100,00%**
	Total	**14**	**157**	**29**	**200**		
	Prod.	**100,00%**	**0,00%**	**0,00%**			
	Omi.	**0,00%**	**100,00%**	**100,00%**			

Table 3-6 - Error matrix for the reclassified 2015-17 change layer

Reclassified		**REF**					
		New Built-up	Omi. 2015	Comi. 2017	Total	User	Comi.
MAP	New Built-up	12	7		**19**	**63,16%**	**36,84%**
	Omi. 2015		149	6	**155**	**96,13%**	**3,87%**
	Comi. 2017	2	1	23	**26**	**88,46%**	**11,54%**
	Total	**14**	**157**	**29**	**200**		
	Prod.	**85,71%**	**94,90%**	**79,31%**			
	Omi.	**14,29%**	**5,10%**	**20,69%**			

It should be noted that the reclassification procedure is most effective in re-assigning omission errors to the 2015 layer with accuracies above or close to 95% for both producer and user accuracies. The classification of commission errors is less effective, but still with high accuracies approaching respectively 90% for user and 80% for producer accuracies. The identification of actual changes is above 85% for producer accuracy which is satisfactory, but just above 60% for user accuracy. This is still much improved from the initial value and most of the remaining commission actually relate to omission from the 2015 layer. This may be due to the lower quality of the imagery from 2015 and the fact that the 2015 omission cover an area nearly 8 times larger than the new built-up area. This may mean that an additional iteration is required to remove the outstanding omission from 2015 from the new built-up area. This could be achieved through the following procedure:

- Apply an additional reclassification procedure on the revised new built-up area perhaps based on active learning methods
- Perform a manual enhancement procedure considering that this should take minimal effort since the entire exercise would only focus on a very small portion (4%) of the study area.

4 Conclusions and outlook

This chapter provides an overview of the main findings and identifies priorities for further work.

4.1 Availability of input EO data

Based on the outcome of the HRL 2015 production, the availability of EO data remained a major limiting factor with data acquired +/- one-year of the reference year, thus requiring nearly three years of data in total to achieve complete coverage and as a result limiting the update to the current 3-year period. However, this was the first implementation of the HRL production based on dense time series as opposed to a two coverages per year approach in the past.

The number of cloud free observations still remains limited in some areas, but is substantially improved in some areas particularly in southern Europe for which more frequent incremental updates could be achieved. However, the production of the 2015 HRL could only begin to take advantage of the availability of the S-2 constellation and further tests should be conducted notable as part of task 4 of the project to identify whether more frequent update could be achieved.

However, even with the full availability of the S-2 constellation, cloud cover is likely to remain a problem, particularly over northern latitudes. Therefore, the synergy between S-1 and S-2 should be further explored and extended to the production of all the HRLs in the future and should also be tested as part of Task 4.

4.2 Expected magnitude of Change

The analysis of available statistics at pan-European level show contrasting change patterns. With respect to imperviousness, the trend is overwhelmingly in the steady increase of artificial areas to the point that the conversion of artificial areas back to agriculture or other land use is negligible. However, artificial areas still represent of very small proportion of the overall area and even though the trend is steadily increasing it seems to have stabilised in the last decade, but it is difficult to see whether this is a result of new policies or just due to the economic activity. Nevertheless, the increase of artificial areas typically represents about 6,000 km² over EEA-39, which is still very small and challenging to characterise, but there is considerable variability across Europe with steadier growth in Southern Europe compared with Northern Europe. This could justify more frequent incremental update in areas where the growth is more substantial. Interestingly, this also coincides with areas less prone to cloud cover.

Forest dynamics are more complex with both areas where forest is increasing and decreasing even though the net change is toward increasing forested areas. Forest also covers a much greater area than urban areas by a factor of 6 to 8 and the net change represent about 30,000 km² at the European scale, but this represent net change and the area affected by forest dynamics can theoretically be larger when considering the areas affected by loss and gain of forest cover.

Grassland is much more challenging to apprehend as grassland cover is a much more dynamic vegetation type to characterise for which it is often difficult to decouple between phenological and long-term trend. In addition, there was no attempt so far to implement a change analysis for the grassland HRL. The magnitude of change appears less than that of forest making more challenging to characterise. In addition, grassland can also expand or decrease depending on the area event though the overall trend is probably towards a reduction.

4.3 Improvement of the accuracy and reduction of bias of change detection

Based on the previous parameters, EO data availability and magnitude of change, it is difficult to draw any conclusions on whether the frequency of updates should be increased or decreased. The real question is more on the ability to improve the accuracy, i.e. provide an estimate with a greater degree of confidence and reduce the bias, i.e. ensure that the level of omission and commission errors are equivalent.

A post classification procedure was developed for the Imperviousness layer based on a dedicated calibration sample dataset and a reclassification procedure seem to provide promising results that will need to be tested over the larger demonstration sites and eventually for the other HRLs.

It should also be noted that the likely change of resolution between the previous 20+m data and now with S-2 data are likely to yield to substantial so-called technical changes that cannot be ignored due to their magnitude rendering such a bias reduction and accuracy improvement of change detection procedure essential. In fact, although it is not desirable to reprocess the whole time series every time a new update is produced, it would seem good practice to at least re-process the previous status layer to ensure spatial and temporal consistency between subsequent reference year considering the small magnitude of changes, e.g. when HRL 2018 is produced, HRL2015 should be re-processed to be consistent with the re-classified 2015-18 change layer based on the procedure described in Chapter 3. This means that two versions of a status layer should be kept: one that is consistent with the previous change period, e.g. 2012-15 and one that is consistent with the new period, e.g. 2015-18.

5 References

Ates, S. and Louahichi, M. (2012). Reflexions on Agro-pastoralists in the WANA region: challenges and future priorities. In: New approaches for grassland research in a context of climate and socio-economic changes by Z. Acar, A. López-Francos, C. Porqueddu (edtrs.). Publisher: Options Méditerranéennes, Série A (Séminaires Méditerranéens), No. 102 Zaragoza: CIHEAM / FAO / CITA-DGA.

Bartels, S. F., Chen, H. Y., Wulder, M. A. & White, J. C. (2016). Trends in post-disturbance recovery rates of Canada's forests following wildfire and harvest. Forest Ecology and Management, 361, 194-207.

Bernuès, A., Riedel, J.L., Casasús, I. (2012). Temporal and spatial simulation of vegetation dynamics in a Mediterranean protected mountain area under different farming management scenarios. In: New approaches for grassland research in a context of climate and socio-economic changes by Z. Acar, A. López-Francos, C. Porqueddu (edtrs.).

Bundesamt für Naturschutz BfN (2017). Agrarreport 2017. Biologische Vielfalt in der Agrarlandschaft. Bonn.

Bundesamt für Naturschutz BfN (2014). Grünlandreport 2014. Alles im Grünen Bereich? Bonn.

Chang, J., Viovy, N., Vuichard, N., Ciais, P., Campioli, M., Klumpp, K., … Soussana, J.-F. (2015). Modeled Changes in Potential Grassland Productivity and in Grass-Fed Ruminant Livestock Density in Europe over 1961–2010. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(5), e0127554.

Cerda, A., Gonzalez-Penaloza, F., Burguet, M., Gimenez-Morera, A. (2012). Intensification of citrus production and soil loss in Eastern Spain.

Chang, J., Ciais, P., Viovy, N., Soussana, J. F., Klumpp, K., & Sultan, B. (2017). Future productivity and phenology changes in European grasslands for different warming levels: implications for grassland management and carbon balance. Carbon balance and management, 12(1), 11.

Ciais, P., Soussana, J. F., Vuichard, N., Luyssaert, S., Don, A., Janssens, I. A., Viovy. N., Sultan, B. and Wattenbach, M. (2010). The greenhouse gas balance of European grasslands. Biogeosciences Discussions, (4), 5997-6050.

Cosentino, S. L., Porqueddu, C., Copani, V., Patanè, C., Testa, G., Scordia, D., & Melis, R. (2014). European grasslands overview: Mediterranean region. The Future of European Grasslands, 41.

Crowther, T. W., Glick, H. B., Covey, K. R., Bettigole, C., Maynard, D. S., Thomas, S. M., Smith, J. R., Hintler, G., Duguid, M. C., Amatulli, G., Tuanmu, M.-N., Jetz, W., Salas, C., Stam, C., Piotto, D., Tavani, R., Green, S., Bruce, G., Williams, S. J., Wiser, S. K., Huber, M. O., Hengeveld, G. M., Nabuurs, G.-J., Tikhonova, E., Borchardt, P., Li, C.-F., Powrie, L. W., Fischer, M., Hemp, A., Homeier, J., Cho, P., Vibrans, A. C., Umunay, P. M., Piao, S. L., Rowe, C. W., Ashton, M. S., Crane, P. R. & Bradford, M. A. (2015). Mapping tree density at a global scale. Nature, 525, p. 201.

Dabrowska–Zielinska, K., GolińskiB, P., JorgensenC, M., MølmannC, J., TaffC, G., TomaszewskaA, M., ... and GatkowskaA, M. (2015). New methodologies for grasslands monitoring. In proceedings of 23rd International Grassland Congress.

DG Agriculture and Rural Development, Unit Farm Economics (2017). Land cover and land use. – Online source: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/statistics/facts-figures/land-cover-use.pdf

EEA/Chris Steenmans (2000). The revised and supplemented Corine land cover nomenclature. Prepared by M. Bossard, J. Feranec & J. Otahel. EEA Copenhagen.

EEA (2006). Urban sprawl in Europe, The ignored challenge, 56 pp, ISBN 92-9167-887-2

EEA (2012). Climate change, impacts and vulnerability in Europe 2012. An indicator-based report, EEA Report No 12/2012, European Environment Agency, Copenhagen, Denmark.

EEA (2013). Agriculture and land cover change 2000 – 2006. Online Source: https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/figures/agriculture-clc-change-2000-2006.

EEA (2017). European Environment Agency (EEA), Release Lineage of Corine Land Cover (CLC) and Corine Land Cover Change (CLCC), p. 1.

EEA (2018a). European Environment Agency (EEA), About Eionet, available: https://www.eea.europa.eu/about-us/countries-and-eionet, accessed: March 2018.

EEA (2018b). European Environment Agency (EEA) under the framework of the Copernicus programme, CORINE Land Cover metadata, last updated march 2018, https://land.copernicus.eu/pan-european/corine-land-cover/clc-1990?tab=metadata, accessed: March 2018.

EEA (2018c). European Environment Agency (EEA) under the framework of the Copernicus programme, Evolution of CORINE Land Cover, last updated march 2018, available: https://land.copernicus.eu/pan-european/corine-land-cover, accessed: March 2018.

ESA (2014). Copernicus Space Component Data Access Portfolio: Data Warehouse 2011-2014 (extended till March 31st, 2015), Issue 2, Revision 10, pp. 48-50.

ETC/ULS (2017). Updated CLC illustrated nomenclature guidelines. Final report, pp. 68/70/72.

European Commission, Environment Directorate-General (2008). LIFE. "The Financial Instrument for the Environment". Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg. ISBN 978-92-79-10159-5.

European Commission, Directorate-General for Communication (2017). Agriculture. A partnership between Europe and Farmers. Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, Belgium.

European Commission, Directorate-General for Communication (2017). Agriculture. The EU's common agricultural policy (CAP): for our food, for our countryside, for our environment.

European Commission, Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development (2015). Permanent Grassland Guidance Document. DS/EGDP/2015/02 rev 4. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

European Commission and Environment Directorate-General (2008). LIFE and European Grasslands. Restoring a forgotten Habitat. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. ISBN 978-92-79-10159-5

European Commission, Environment Directorate-General (2008). LIFE. "The Financial Instrument for the Environment". Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg. sISBN 978-92-79-10159-5

European Commission (2016a). Cap Context Indicator 2014-2020. 31. Land Cover. 2016 update. – Online source: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/cap-indicators/context/2016/c31_en.pdf.

European Commission (2017a). Cap Context Indicator 2014-2020. 18. Agricultural area. 2017 update. – Online source: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/cap-indicators/context/2017/c18_en.pdf.

European Commission (2017b). Cap Context Indicator 2014-2020. 20. Irrigated land. 2017 update. – Online source: https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/cap-indicators/context/2017/c20_en.pdf.

European Union (2013). Statistics Explained Archive, Vol. 4 – Agriculture, environment, energy and transport statistics Online source: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/4031688/5930284/KS-FM-13-004-EN.PDF.

European Union (2018). Copernicus Land Monitoring Service 2018, European Environment Agency (EEA); CORINE Land Cover – Online source: https://land.copernicus.eu/pan-european/CORINE-land-cover.

Eurostat (2012). Archive: Agri-environmental statistics. – Online source: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Archive:Agri-environmental_statistics&oldid=91427.

Eurostat (2017). Land cover statistics. Online source: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Land_cover_statistics.

Eurostat (2018). European Commission – Eurostat - Land cover/use statistics (LUCAS) - Overview. Online source: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/lucas.

FAO (2000). Forest Resources Division. Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) 2000, On definitions of forest and forest change. Definitions of forest, other land uses, and trees outside forests, available: http://www.fao.org/docrep/006/ad665e/ad665e03.htm, accessed: March 2018.

FAO (2010). Global forest resources assessment 2010, Annex 3, Table 2, pp. 225-227.

FAO (2011). State of Europe's forests 2011 (revised report), Annex 8, Table A1.2, p. 288.

FAO (2015a). Global forest resources assessment 2015, p. 3.

FAO (2015b). State of Europe's forests 2015. Forest Europe, pp. 6/16/67.

FAO (2015c). State of Europe's forests 2015, Annex 8, Table 27, pp. 272/273.

FAO (2015d). State of Europe's forests 2015, Annex 8, Table 2, p. 244.

FAO (2015e). Global forest resources assessment 2015, Desk Reference, Table 1, pp. 3-8.

FAO (2016). State of the world's forests 2016, Forests and agriculture: land-use challenges and opportunities, p. 12.

Folts-Zettner T, Gatewood R., Bennetts R. and Cherwin K. (2011): Grassland Monitoring Protocol and Standard Operating Procedures for the Southern Plains I&M Network and Fire Group. Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/SOPN/NRTR—2011/00X. – Online source: https://irma.nps.gov/DataStore/DownloadFile/514704.

Griffiths, P., Kuemmerle, T., Baumann, M., Radeloff, V. C., Abrudan, I. V., Lieskovsky, J., Munteanu, C., Ostapowicz, K. and Hostert, P. (2014). Forest disturbances, forest recovery, and changes in forest types across the Carpathian ecoregion from 1985 to 2010 based on Landsat image composites. Remote Sensing of Environment, 151, 72-88.

George, M.R. and Rice, K. (2016). Plant Growth and Development. In: M.R. George (ed.). Ecology and Management of Annual Rangelands. Davis, CA: Department of Plant Science. Pps. 73-95.

Karydas, C., Gitas, I., Kuntz, S. and Minakou, C. (2015). Use of LUCAS LC Point Database for Validating Country-Scale Land Cover Maps. Remote Sensing, Volume 7, pp. 5012-5041.

Keenan, R. J., Reams, G. A., Achard, F., de Freitas, J. V., Grainger, A. and Lindquist, E. 2015. Dynamics of global forest area: Results from the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment (2015). Forest Ecology and Management 2015, 352, p. 9.

Krieger, D. J. (2001). The economic values of forest ecosystem services: a review. The Wilderness Society, p. iii.

Lambin, E. et al. (2001). The causes of land-use and land-cover change: moving beyond the myths. *Global* Environmental Change, Volume 11, pp. 261-269.

Landau, S., Perevolotsky, A., Bonfil, D., Barkai, D., and Silanikove, N. (2000). Utilization of low quality resources by small ruminants in Mediterranean agro-pastoral systems: the case of browse and aftermath cereal stubble. Livestock Science, 64(1), 39-49.

Lindner, M., Fitzgerald, J. B., Zimmermann, N. E., Reyer, C., Delzon, S., van der Maaten, E., Schelhaas, M. J., Lasch, P., Eggers, J., van der Maaten-Theunissen, M., Suckow, F., Psomas, A., Poulter, B. and Hanewinkel, M. (2014). Climate change and European forests: what do we know, what are the uncertainties, and what are the implications for forest management? Journal of environmental management, 146, 69-83.

Louhaichi, M., Johnson, M. D., Clark, P. E., and Johnson, D. E. (2012). Developing a coherent monitoring system for Mediterranean grasslands. New Approaches for Grassland Research in a Context of Climatic and Socio-Economic Changes. Options Méditerranéennes Série A, 102, 47-51.

Peeters, A. (2009). Importance, evolution, environmental impact and future challenges of grasslands and grassland-based systems in Europe. Grassland Science, 55(3), 113-125.

Porqueddu, C., Ates, S., Louhaichi, M., Kyriazopoulos, A. P., Moreno, G., Pozo, A., ... and Nichols, P. G. H. (2016). Grasslands in 'Old World'and 'New World'Mediterranean-climate zones: past trends, current status and future research priorities. Grass and Forage Science, 71(1), 1-35.

Slepetys, J., Kadziuliene, Z., Sarunaite, L., Tilvikiene, V. and Kryzeviciene, A. (2012). Biomass Potential of Plants Grown for Bioenergy Production. Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency, 66-72.

UNECE/FAO (2015). Third Meeting of United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Team of Specialists on Monitoring Sustainable Forest Management, November 2015, Third Meeting during Silva2015 in Engelberg, Switzerland, available: https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/timber/meetings/20151102/ToS_Meeting/8-StEF15-MARTIN.pdf, accessed: March 2018.

Vacek S., Cornett M., Carlson D. and Ahlering M. (2012). Grassland Monitoring Team Standardized Monitoring Protocol. Version 7. – Online source: https://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationByGeography/NorthAmerica/UnitedStates/minnesota/Documents/GMT_Protocol_v7.pdf.

Velthof, G.L., J.P. Lesschen, R.L.M. Schils, A. Smit, B.S. Elbersen, G.W. Hazeu, C.A. Mucher, and O. Oenema (2014). Grassland, Production and Use. Lot 2. Methodological studies in the field of Agro-Environmental Indicators. Research by Alterra Wageningen UR.

Vrahnakis, M. (2016). Mediterranean Type Ecosystems (MTEs): A brief introduction. Technological Educational Institute of Thessaly, Greece.

UN Habitat (2016). Global Report on Urban Health equitable, healthier cities for sustainable development, s.l.: s.n.

Wilson, B. & Chakraborty, A. (2013). The Environmental Impacts of Sprawl: Emergent Themes from the Past Decadeof Planning Research. Sustainability, Volume 5, pp. 3302-3327.

Wu, B., Meng, J., Li, Q., Yan, N., Du, X., and Zhang, M. (2014). Remote sensing-based global crop monitoring: experiences with China's CropWatch system. International Journal of Digital Earth, 7(2), 113-137.

Links:
Umweltbundesamt: Information on tilling of permanent grassland (2017): Grünlandumbruch.
https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/bo-r-2-das-indikator
https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/daten/land-forstwirtschaft/gruenlandumbruch Last updated 18.05.2017

FAOSTAT statistics:
http://www.fao.org/statistics/en
http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data Last updated 2018; country data updated individually

EUROSTAT data:
http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database Updates depending on country information

Data of Corine Land Cover
https://land.copernicus.eu/pan-european/corine-land-cover Last updated 11 Apr 2018

Definitions of CLC data:
https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/COR0-landcover Published January 1995

EEA:
https://www.eea.europa.eu/ Last updated 04 April 2018

CAP at a glance:
https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-overview_en

6 Annex

Imperviousness Layer

Table 6-1 - Observations per countries related to urban areas in LUCAS database for 2006, 2009, 2012 and 2015

Countries	LUCAS Database A11 and A12 points for 2006	LUCAS Database A11 and A12 points for 2009	% of increase between 2006 and 2009	LUCAS Database A11 and A12 points for 2012	% of increase between 2009 and 2012	LUCAS Database A11 and A12 points for 2015	% of increase between 2012 and 2015
Austria (AT)	-	110	-	159	44.55%	132	-16.98%
Belgium (BE)	41	91	121.95%	144	58.24%	142	-1.39%
Bosnia and Herzegovina (BG)	-	-	-	49	-	50	2.04%
Cyprus (CY)	-	-	-	28	-	23	-17.86%
Czech Republic (CZ)	30	52	73.33%	73	40.38%	89	21.92%
Germany (DE)	341	486	42.52%	601	23.66%	619	3.00%
Denmark (DK)	-	60	-	85	41.67%	n/a	-
Estonia (EE)	-	10	-	13	30.00%	11	-15.38%
Greece (EL)	-	79	--	82	3.80%	90	9.76%
Spain (ES)	138	291	110.87%	392	34.71%	369	-5.87%
Finland (FI)	-	89	-	60	-32.58%	58	-3.33%
France (FR)	243	460	89.30%	604	31.30%	647	7.12%
Hungary (HU)	61	71	16.39%	63	-11.27%	36	-42.86%
Ireland (IE)	-	46	-	42	-8.70%	33	-21.43%
Italy (IT)	257	413	60.70%	534	29.30%	534	0.00%
Lithuania (LT)	-	36	-	37	2.78%	37	0.00%
Luxembourg (Lu)	3	3	0.00%	5	66.67%	7	40.00%
Latvia (LV)	-	21	-	20	-4.76%	20	0.00%
Malta (MT)	-	-	-	15	-	15	0.00%
Netherlands (NL)	37	86	132.43%	84	-2.33%	78	-7.14%
Poland (PL)	216	188	-12.96%	253	34.57%	275	8.70%
Portugal (PT)	-	85	-	143	68.24%	126	-11.89%
Romania (RO)	-	-	-	143	-	148	3.50%
Sweden (SE)	-	78	-	75	-3.85%	103	37.33%
Slovenia (SI)	-	10	-	14	40.00%	13	-7.14%
Slovakia (SK)	20	25	25.00%	27	8.00%	26	-3.70%
United Kingdom (UK)	-	329	-	259	-21.28%	320	23.55%

Forest Layer



Figure 6-1 - CLC total forest area change 2000/2006 per country in km². Changes, greater or equal 1 % are given in percent (EEA, 2018c).



Figure 6-2 - CLC total forest area change 2006/2012 per country in km². Changes, greater or equal 1 % are given in percent (EEA, 2018c).

Table 6-2 - CLC total forest area change 2000/2006 per country and year (interpolated).

Change per year CLC 2000/2006																	
Country	CLC 2000		CLC 2001		CLC 2002		CLC 2003		CLC 2004		CLC 2005		CLC 2006	2000/2006		per year	
	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	Change	%	Change	Mean %
Albania	7.669,96	-0,08753	7.663,25	-0,08760	7.656,53	-0,08768	7.649,82	-0,08776	7.643,11	-0,08784	7.636,39	-0,08791	7629,68	-40,28	-0,5	-6,71	-0,088
Austria	37.351,51	-0,10782	37.311,24	-0,10794	37.270,96	-0,10806	37.230,69	-0,10817	37.190,42	-0,10829	37.150,14	-0,10841	37109,87	-241,64	-0,6	-40,27	-0,108
Belgium	6.114,12	-0,00954	6.113,54	-0,00954	6.112,95	-0,00954	6.112,37	-0,00954	6.111,79	-0,00954	6.111,20	-0,00955	6110,62	-3,50	-0,1	-0,58	-0,010
Bosnia and Herzegovina	22.645,31	0,41449	22.739,17	0,41278	22.833,04	0,41109	22.926,90	0,40940	23.020,76	0,40773	23.114,63	0,40608	23208,49	563,18	2,5	93,86	0,410
Bulgaria	34.923,58	0,01801	34.929,87	0,01800	34.936,16	0,01800	34.942,45	0,01800	34.948,73	0,01799	34.955,02	0,01799	34961,31	37,73	0,1	6,29	0,018
Croatia	20.706,44	-0,21812	20.661,28	-0,21860	20.616,11	-0,21908	20.570,95	-0,21956	20.525,78	-0,22004	20.480,62	-0,22053	20435,45	-270,99	-1,3	-45,16	-0,219
Cyprus	1.546,76	-0,09385	1.545,31	-0,09394	1.543,86	-0,09403	1.542,41	-0,09412	1.540,95	-0,09421	1.539,50	-0,09429	1538,05	-8,71	-0,6	-1,45	-0,094
Czech Republic	25.925,49	0,16489	25.968,24	0,16462	26.010,99	0,16435	26.053,74	0,16408	26.096,48	0,16381	26.139,23	0,16354	26181,98	256,49	1,0	42,75	0,164
Denmark	3.851,50	0,31572	3.863,66	0,31473	3.875,82	0,31374	3.887,98	0,31276	3.900,14	0,31178	3.912,30	0,31081	3924,46	72,96	1,9	12,16	0,313
Estonia	20.957,18	-0,23189	20.908,58	-0,23242	20.859,99	-0,23297	20.811,39	-0,23351	20.762,79	-0,23406	20.714,20	-0,23461	20665,6	-291,58	-1,4	-48,60	-0,233
Finland	196.126,75	0,05905	196.242,57	0,05902	196.358,39	0,05898	196.474,21	0,05895	196.590,02	0,05891	196.705,84	0,05888	196821,66	694,91	0,4	115,82	0,059
France (cont.)	143.231,09	-0,08429	143.110,36	-0,08436	142.989,63	-0,08443	142.868,90	-0,08450	142.748,17	-0,08458	142.627,44	-0,08465	142506,71	-724,38	-0,5	-120,73	-0,084
Germany	103.920,44	0,04996	103.972,36	0,04994	104.024,28	0,04991	104.076,20	0,04989	104.128,12	0,04986	104.180,04	0,04984	104231,96	311,52	0,3	51,92	0,050
Greece	23.759,55	1,25071	24.056,71	1,23526	24.353,88	1,22019	24.651,04	1,20548	24.948,20	1,19112	25.245,37	1,17710	25542,53	1.782,98	7,5	297,16	1,213
Hungary	17.382,11	-0,15164	17.355,75	-0,15187	17.329,39	-0,15210	17.303,04	-0,15233	17.276,68	-0,15257	17.250,32	-0,15280	17223,96	-158,15	-0,9	-26,36	-0,152
Iceland	314,73	5,70542	332,69	5,39747	350,64	5,12106	368,60	4,87159	386,56	4,64529	404,51	4,43908	422,47	107,74	34,2	17,96	5,030
Ireland	2.921,26	4,67247	3.057,76	4,46390	3.194,25	4,27315	3.330,75	4,09803	3.467,24	3,93670	3.603,74	3,78760	3740,23	818,97	28,0	136,50	4,205
Italy	78.609,03	0,18319	78.753,03	0,18285	78.897,03	0,18252	79.041,04	0,18219	79.185,04	0,18185	79.329,04	0,18152	79473,04	864,01	1,1	144,00	0,182
Kosovo	4.275,56	0,26234	4.286,78	0,26166	4.297,99	0,26097	4.309,21	0,26030	4.320,43	0,25962	4.331,64	0,25895	4342,86	67,30	1,6	11,22	0,261
Latvia	27.061,46	-0,66695	26.880,97	-0,67143	26.700,49	-0,67597	26.520,00	-0,68057	26.339,51	-0,68523	26.159,03	-0,68996	25978,54	-1.082,92	-4,0	-180,49	-0,678
Liechtenstein	57,40	4,79675	60,15	4,57719	62,91	4,37685	65,66	4,19332	68,41	4,02456	71,17	3,86885	73,92	16,52	28,8	2,75	4,306
Lithuania	18.762,17	0,14201	18.788,81	0,14180	18.815,46	0,14160	18.842,10	0,14140	18.868,74	0,14120	18.895,39	0,14100	18922,03	159,86	0,9	26,64	0,142
Luxembourg	908,88	0,44249	912,90	0,44054	916,92	0,43860	920,95	0,43669	924,97	0,43479	928,99	0,43291	933,01	24,13	2,7	4,02	0,438
Macedonia	8.673,09	-0,71718	8.610,89	-0,72236	8.548,69	-0,72762	8.486,49	-0,73295	8.424,28	-0,73836	8.362,08	-0,74385	8299,88	-373,21	-4,3	-62,20	-0,730
Malta	2,10	0,00000	2,10	0,00000	2,10	0,00000	2,10	0,00000	2,10	0,00000	2,10	0,00000	2,1	0,00	0,0	0,00	0,000
Montenegro	5.685,24	0,32907	5.703,95	0,32799	5.722,66	0,32692	5.741,37	0,32585	5.760,07	0,32479	5.778,78	0,32374	5797,49	112,25	2,0	18,71	0,326
Netherlands	3.142,65	0,06465	3.144,68	0,06461	3.146,71	0,06456	3.148,75	0,06452	3.150,78	0,06448	3.152,81	0,06444	3154,84	12,19	0,4	2,03	0,065
Norway	109.345,02	-0,13729	109.194,91	-0,13747	109.044,79	-0,13766	108.894,68	-0,13785	108.744,56	-0,13804	108.594,45	-0,13823	108444,33	-900,69	-0,8	-150,12	-0,138
Poland	93.837,40	0,31273	94.130,86	0,31176	94.424,32	0,31079	94.717,79	0,30983	95.011,25	0,30887	95.304,71	0,30792	95598,17	1.760,77	1,9	293,46	0,310
Portugal	24.444,23	-2,79867	23.760,12	-2,87925	23.076,00	-2,96461	22.391,89	-3,05518	21.707,78	-3,15147	21.023,66	-3,25402	20339,55	-4.104,68	-16,8	-684,11	-3,017
Romania	69.866,03	0,54286	70.245,31	0,53993	70.624,58	0,53703	71.003,86	0,53416	71.383,13	0,53132	71.762,41	0,52851	72141,68	2.275,65	3,3	379,27	0,536
Serbia	22.821,52	0,15437	22.856,75	0,15413	22.891,98	0,15390	22.927,21	0,15366	22.962,44	0,15342	22.997,67	0,15319	23032,9	211,38	0,9	35,23	0,154
Slovakia	20.017,12	0,24232	20.065,63	0,24173	20.114,13	0,24115	20.162,64	0,24057	20.211,14	0,23999	20.259,65	0,23942	20308,15	291,03	1,5	48,51	0,241
Slovenia	11.390,30	0,06176	11.397,34	0,06172	11.404,37	0,06169	11.411,41	0,06165	11.418,44	0,06161	11.425,48	0,06157	11432,51	42,21	0,4	7,04	0,062
Spain	92.871,41	3,41355	96.041,63	3,30088	99.211,84	3,19540	102.382,06	3,09646	105.552,27	3,00346	108.722,49	2,91588	111892,7	19.021,29	20,5	3.170,22	3,154
Sweden	252.545,35	-0,44461	251.422,50	-0,44660	250.299,65	-0,44860	249.176,81	-0,45062	248.053,96	-0,45266	246.931,11	-0,45472	245808,26	-6.737,09	-2,7	-1.122,85	-0,450
Switzerland	12.457,58	-0,16171	12.437,44	-0,16197	12.417,29	-0,16223	12.397,15	-0,16250	12.377,00	-0,16276	12.356,86	-0,16303	12336,71	-120,87	-1,0	-20,15	-0,162
Turkey	118.758,51	-0,33822	118.356,84	-0,33937	117.955,17	-0,34053	117.553,51	-0,34169	117.151,84	-0,34286	116.750,17	-0,34404	116348,5	-2.410,01	-2,0	-401,67	-0,341
United Kingdom	19.839,95	1,33717	20.105,24	1,31952	20.370,54	1,30234	20.635,83	1,28560	20.901,12	1,26928	21.166,42	1,25337	21431,71	1.591,76	8,0	265,29	1,295
	1.664.719,78	**0,1**	**1.666.991,14**	**0,1**	**1.669.262,49**	**-0,1**	**1.667.224,64**	**0,1**	**1.669.484,77**	**0,1**	**1.671.759,01**	**0,4**	**1678347,91**	**13.628,13**	**0,42**	**2.271,35**	**0,1**

Table 6-3 - CLC total forest area change 2006/2012 per country and year (interpolated).

Change per year CLC 2006/2012																	
Country	CLC 2006		CLC 2007		CLC 2008		CLC 2009		CLC 2010		CLC 2011		CLC 2012	2006/2012		per year	
	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	Change	%	Change	Mean %
Albania	7.629,68	-0,21041	7.613,63	-0,21085	7.597,57	-0,21130	7.581,52	-0,21174	7.565,47	-0,21219	7.549,41	-0,21264	7533,36	-96,32	-1,3	-16,05	-0,212
Austria	37.109,87	-0,07464	37.082,17	-0,07469	37.054,47	-0,07475	37.026,78	-0,07481	36.999,08	-0,07486	36.971,38	-0,07492	36943,68	-166,19	-0,4	-27,70	-0,075
Belgium	6.110,62	-0,04879	6.107,64	-0,04882	6.104,66	-0,04884	6.101,68	-0,04887	6.098,69	-0,04889	6.095,71	-0,04891	6092,73	-17,89	-0,3	-2,98	-0,049
Bosnia and Herzegovina	23.208,49	0,03384	23.216,34	0,03383	23.224,20	0,03382	23.232,05	0,03380	23.239,90	0,03379	23.247,76	0,03378	23255,61	47,12	0,2	7,85	0,034
Bulgaria	34.961,31	-0,04822	34.944,45	-0,04824	34.927,59	-0,04827	34.910,74	-0,04829	34.893,88	-0,04831	34.877,02	-0,04834	34860,16	-101,15	-0,3	-16,86	-0,048
Croatia	20.435,45	-0,13671	20.407,51	-0,13689	20.379,58	-0,13708	20.351,64	-0,13727	20.323,70	-0,13746	20.295,77	-0,13765	20267,83	-167,62	-0,8	-27,94	-0,137
Cyprus	1.538,05	-0,03522	1.537,51	-0,03523	1.536,97	-0,03524	1.536,43	-0,03526	1.535,88	-0,03527	1.535,34	-0,03528	1534,8	-3,25	-0,2	-0,54	-0,035
Czech Republic	26.181,98	0,07523	26.201,68	0,07517	26.221,37	0,07512	26.241,07	0,07506	26.260,77	0,07500	26.280,46	0,07495	26300,16	118,18	0,5	19,70	0,075
Denmark	3.924,46	-0,37513	3.909,74	-0,37654	3.895,02	-0,37796	3.880,30	-0,37940	3.865,57	-0,38084	3.850,85	-0,38230	3836,13	-88,33	-2,3	-14,72	-0,379
Estonia	20.665,60	0,36864	20.741,78	0,36729	20.817,96	0,36594	20.894,15	0,36461	20.970,33	0,36328	21.046,51	0,36197	21122,69	457,09	2,2	76,18	0,365
Finland	196.821,66	1,01630	198.821,95	1,00607	200.822,24	0,99605	202.822,53	0,98623	204.822,82	0,97660	206.823,11	0,96715	208823,4	12.001,74	6,1	2000,29	0,991
France (cont.)	142.506,71	-0,09156	142.376,24	-0,09164	142.245,76	-0,09172	142.115,29	-0,09181	141.984,82	-0,09189	141.854,34	-0,09198	141723,87	-782,84	-0,5	-130,47	-0,092
Germany	104.231,96	0,70645	104.968,31	0,70150	105.704,66	0,69661	106.441,02	0,69179	107.177,37	0,68704	107.913,72	0,68235	108650,07	4.418,11	4,2	736,35	0,694
Greece	25.542,53	-0,24149	25.480,85	-0,24208	25.419,16	-0,24266	25.357,48	-0,24325	25.295,80	-0,24385	25.234,11	-0,24444	25172,43	-370,10	-1,4	-61,68	-0,243
Hungary	17.223,96	0,00218	17.224,34	0,00218	17.224,71	0,00218	17.225,09	0,00218	17.225,46	0,00218	17.225,84	0,00218	17226,21	2,25	0,0	0,38	0,002
Iceland	422,47	0,11756	422,97	0,11742	423,46	0,11729	423,96	0,11715	424,46	0,11701	424,95	0,11688	425,45	2,98	0,7	0,50	0,117
Ireland	3.740,23	-0,04215	3.738,65	-0,04217	3.737,08	-0,04219	3.735,50	-0,04221	3.733,92	-0,04223	3.732,35	-0,04224	3730,77	-9,46	-0,3	-1,58	-0,042
Italy	79.473,04	-0,02176	79.455,75	-0,02176	79.438,45	-0,02177	79.421,16	-0,02177	79.403,87	-0,02178	79.386,57	-0,02178	79369,28	-103,76	-0,1	-17,29	-0,022
Kosovo	4.342,86	-0,08973	4.338,96	-0,08981	4.335,07	-0,08989	4.331,17	-0,08997	4.327,27	-0,09005	4.323,38	-0,09013	4319,48	-23,38	-0,5	-3,90	-0,090
Latvia	25.978,54	-1,20411	25.665,73	-1,21878	25.352,92	-1,23382	25.040,11	-1,24924	24.727,30	-1,26504	24.414,49	-1,28125	24101,68	-1.876,86	-7,2	-312,81	-1,242
Liechtenstein	73,92	0,00000	73,92	0,00000	73,92	0,00000	73,92	0,00000	73,92	0,00000	73,92	0,00000	73,92	0,00	0,0	0,00	0,000
Lithuania	18.922,03	-0,04431	18.913,65	-0,04433	18.905,26	-0,04435	18.896,88	-0,04437	18.888,49	-0,04439	18.880,11	-0,04441	18871,72	-50,31	-0,3	-8,38	-0,044
Luxembourg	933,01	-0,02090	932,82	-0,02090	932,62	-0,02091	932,43	-0,02091	932,23	-0,02092	932,04	-0,02092	931,84	-1,17	-0,1	-0,19	-0,021
Macedonia	8.299,88	-0,11239	8.290,55	-0,11252	8.281,22	-0,11264	8.271,90	-0,11277	8.262,57	-0,11290	8.253,24	-0,11303	8243,91	-55,97	-0,7	-9,33	-0,113
Malta	2,10	0,00000	2,10	0,00000	2,10	0,00000	2,10	0,00000	2,10	0,00000	2,10	0,00000	2,1	0,00	0,0	0,00	0,000
Montenegro	5.797,49	-0,07506	5.793,14	-0,07512	5.788,79	-0,07517	5.784,44	-0,07523	5.780,08	-0,07529	5.775,73	-0,07534	5771,38	-26,11	-0,5	-4,35	-0,075
Netherlands	3.154,84	-0,04776	3.153,33	-0,04778	3.151,83	-0,04780	3.150,32	-0,04783	3.148,81	-0,04785	3.147,31	-0,04787	3145,8	-9,04	-0,3	-1,51	-0,048
Norway	108.444,33	-0,07557	108.362,38	-0,07563	108.280,43	-0,07568	108.198,48	-0,07574	108.116,52	-0,07580	108.034,57	-0,07586	107952,62	-491,71	-0,5	-81,95	-0,076
Poland	95.598,17	0,11613	95.709,19	0,11600	95.820,21	0,11586	95.931,23	0,11573	96.042,24	0,11559	96.153,26	0,11546	96264,28	666,11	0,7	111,02	0,116
Portugal	20.339,55	0,34154	20.409,02	0,34038	20.478,49	0,33923	20.547,96	0,33808	20.617,42	0,33694	20.686,89	0,33581	20756,36	416,81	2,0	69,47	0,339
Romania	72.141,68	-0,05790	72.099,91	-0,05793	72.058,14	-0,05797	72.016,37	-0,05800	71.974,60	-0,05803	71.932,83	-0,05807	71891,06	-250,62	-0,3	-41,77	-0,058
Serbia	23.032,90	-0,01503	23.029,44	-0,01503	23.025,98	-0,01503	23.022,52	-0,01504	23.019,05	-0,01504	23.015,59	-0,01504	23012,13	-20,77	-0,1	-3,46	-0,015
Slovakia	20.308,15	-0,25587	20.256,19	-0,25652	20.204,23	-0,25718	20.152,27	-0,25785	20.100,30	-0,25851	20.048,34	-0,25918	19996,38	-311,77	-1,5	-51,96	-0,258
Slovenia	11.432,51	-0,00741	11.431,66	-0,00741	11.430,82	-0,00741	11.429,97	-0,00741	11.429,12	-0,00741	11.428,28	-0,00741	11427,43	-5,08	0,0	-0,85	-0,007
Spain	111.892,70	-0,09406	111.787,46	-0,09415	111.682,21	-0,09423	111.576,97	-0,09432	111.471,73	-0,09441	111.366,48	-0,09450	111261,24	-631,46	-0,6	-105,24	-0,094
Sweden	245.808,26	1,28936	248.977,63	1,27295	252.146,99	1,25695	255.316,36	1,24135	258.485,72	1,22613	261.655,09	1,21128	264824,45	19.016,19	7,7	3169,37	1,250
Switzerland	12.336,71	0,01537	12.338,61	0,01537	12.340,50	0,01537	12.342,40	0,01537	12.344,30	0,01536	12.346,19	0,01536	12348,09	11,38	0,1	1,90	0,015
Turkey	116.348,50	-0,06171	116.276,70	-0,06175	116.204,90	-0,06179	116.133,10	-0,06183	116.061,29	-0,06187	115.989,49	-0,06190	115917,69	-430,81	-0,4	-71,80	-0,062
United Kingdom	21.431,71	-0,59943	21.303,24	-0,60305	21.174,77	-0,60670	21.046,31	-0,61041	20.917,84	-0,61416	20.789,37	-0,61795	20660,9	-770,81	-3,6	-128,47	-0,609
	1.678.347,91	**0,3**	**1.683.397,11**	**0,3**	**1.688.446,30**	**0,0**	**1.689.164,33**	**0,3**	**1.694.217,42**	**0,3**	**1.699.270,32**	**0,6**	**1708643,09**	**30.295,18**	**1,25**	**5.049,20**	**0,3**



Figure 6-3 - State of Europe's Forests, forest area change without other wooded land 1990/2000 per country in km². Changes, greater or equal 1 % are given in percent (FAO, 2015c).



Figure 6-4 - State of Europe's Forests, forest area change without other wooded land 2000/2005 per country in km². Changes, greater or equal 1 % are given in percent (FAO, 2015c).



Figure 6-5 - State of Europe's Forests, forest area change without other wooded land 2005/2010 per country in km². Changes, greater or equal 1 % are given in percent (FAO, 2015c).



Figure 6-6 - State of Europe’s Forests, forest area change without other wooded land 2010/2015 per country in km². Changes, greater or equal 1 % are given in percent (FAO, 2015c).

Table 6-4 - State of Europe's Forests, interpolated forest area change without other wooded land 1990/2000 per country (FAO, 2015c).

Change per year SoEF 1990/2000																									
Country	SoEF 1990		SoEF 1991		SoEF 1992		SoEF 1993		SoEF 1994		SoEF 1995		SoEF 1996		SoEF 1997		SoEF 1998		SoEF 1999		SoEF 2000	1990/2000		per year	
	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	Change	%	Change	Mean %
Albania	7888	-0,24848	7868,4	-0,24910	7848,8	-0,24972	7829,2	-0,25034	7809,6	-0,25097	7790	-0,25160	7770,4	-0,25224	7750,8	-0,25288	7731,2	-0,25352	7711,6	-0,25416	7692	-196	-2,48	-19,6	-0,251
Austria	36845	0,18510	36913,2	0,18476	36981,4	0,18442	37049,6	0,18408	37117,8	0,18374	37186	0,18340	37254,2	0,18307	37322,4	0,18273	37390,6	0,18240	37458,8	0,18207	37527	682	1,85	68,2	0,184
Belgium	6488	0,02466	6489,6	0,02465	6491,2	0,02465	6492,8	0,02464	6494,4	0,02464	6496	0,02463	6497,6	0,02462	6499,2	0,02462	6500,8	0,02461	6502,4	0,02461	6504	16	0,25	1,6	0,025
Bulgaria	22410	0,49085	22520	0,48845	22630	0,48608	22740	0,48373	22850	0,48140	22960	0,47909	23070	0,47681	23180	0,47455	23290	0,47231	23400	0,47009	23510	1100	4,91	110	0,480
Croatia	18500	0,18919	18535	0,18883	18570	0,18848	18605	0,18812	18640	0,18777	18675	0,18742	18710	0,18707	18745	0,18672	18780	0,18637	18815	0,18602	18850	350	1,89	35	0,188
Cyprus	1611	0,65798	1621,6	0,65368	1632,2	0,64943	1642,8	0,64524	1653,4	0,64110	1664	0,63702	1674,6	0,63299	1685,2	0,62901	1695,8	0,62507	1706,4	0,62119	1717	106	6,58	10,6	0,639
Estonia	22060	0,16591	22096,6	0,16564	22133,2	0,16536	22169,8	0,16509	22206,4	0,16482	22243	0,16455	22279,6	0,16428	22316,2	0,16401	22352,8	0,16374	22389,4	0,16347	22426	366	1,66	36,6	0,165
Finland	218968	0,25652	219529,7	0,25587	220091,4	0,25521	220653,1	0,25456	221214,8	0,25392	221776,5	0,25327	222338,2	0,25263	222899,9	0,25200	223461,6	0,25136	224023,3	0,25073	224585	5617	2,57	561,7	0,254
Germany	112250	0,04811	112304	0,04808	112358	0,04806	112412	0,04804	112466	0,04801	112520	0,04799	112574	0,04797	112628	0,04795	112682	0,04792	112736	0,04790	112790	540	0,48	54	0,048
Greece	32990	0,91543	33292	0,90712	33594	0,89897	33896	0,89096	34198	0,88309	34500	0,87536	34802	0,86777	35104	0,86030	35406	0,85296	35708	0,84575	36010	3020	9,15	302	0,880
Hungary	11922	0,51753	11983,7	0,51487	12045,4	0,51223	12107,1	0,50962	12168,8	0,50703	12230,5	0,50448	12292,2	0,50194	12353,9	0,49944	12415,6	0,49696	12477,3	0,49450	12539	617	5,18	61,7	0,506
Iceland	161	7,95031	173,8	7,36479	186,6	6,85959	199,4	6,41926	212,2	6,03205	225	5,68889	237,8	5,38267	250,6	5,10774	263,4	4,85953	276,2	4,63432	289	128	79,50	12,8	6,030
Ireland	4650	3,65376	4819,9	3,52497	4989,8	3,40495	5159,7	3,29283	5329,6	3,18786	5499,5	3,08937	5669,4	2,99679	5839,3	2,90960	6009,2	2,82733	6179,1	2,74959	6349	1699	36,54	169,9	3,164
Italy	75440	1,09358	76265	1,08175	77090	1,07018	77915	1,05885	78740	1,04775	79565	1,03689	80390	1,02625	81215	1,01582	82040	1,00561	82865	0,99560	83690	8250	10,94	825	1,043
Latvia	31730	0,21431	31798	0,21385	31866	0,21339	31934	0,21294	32002	0,21249	32070	0,21204	32138	0,21159	32206	0,21114	32274	0,21070	32342	0,21025	32410	680	2,14	68	0,212
Liechtenstein	65	0,61538	65,4	0,61162	65,8	0,60790	66,2	0,60423	66,6	0,60060	67	0,59701	67,4	0,59347	67,8	0,58997	68,2	0,58651	68,6	0,58309	69	4	6,15	0,4	0,599
Luxembourg	858	0,11655	859	0,11641	860	0,11628	861	0,11614	862	0,11601	863	0,11587	864	0,11574	865	0,11561	866	0,11547	867	0,11534	868	10	1,17	1	0,116
Malta	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0	0,00	0	0,000
Norway	121320	-0,01566	121301	-0,01566	121282	-0,01567	121263	-0,01567	121244	-0,01567	121225	-0,01567	121206	-0,01568	121187	-0,01568	121168	-0,01568	121149	-0,01568	121130	-190	-0,16	-19	-0,016
Romania	63710	-0,00785	63705	-0,00785	63700	-0,00785	63695	-0,00785	63690	-0,00785	63685	-0,00785	63680	-0,00785	63675	-0,00785	63670	-0,00785	63665	-0,00785	63660	-50	-0,08	-5	-0,008
Slovakia	19220	-0,00520	19219	-0,00520	19218	-0,00520	19217	-0,00520	19216	-0,00520	19215	-0,00520	19214	-0,00520	19213	-0,00520	19212	-0,00521	19211	-0,00521	19210	-10	-0,05	-1	-0,005
Slovenia	11850	0,37131	11894	0,36993	11938	0,36857	11982	0,36722	12026	0,36587	12070	0,36454	12114	0,36322	12158	0,36190	12202	0,36060	12246	0,35930	12290	440	3,71	44	0,365
Sweden	280630	0,03563	280730	0,03562	280830	0,03561	280930	0,03560	281030	0,03558	281130	0,03557	281230	0,03556	281330	0,03555	281430	0,03553	281530	0,03552	281630	1000	0,36	100	0,036
Switzerland	10940	0,53931	10999	0,53641	11058	0,53355	11117	0,53072	11176	0,52792	11235	0,52514	11294	0,52240	11353	0,51969	11412	0,51700	11471	0,51434	11530	590	5,39	59	0,527
Turkey	75242	0,20175	75393,8	0,20134	75545,6	0,20094	75697,4	0,20054	75849,2	0,20013	76001	0,19973	76152,8	0,19934	76304,6	0,19894	76456,4	0,19854	76608,2	0,19815	76760	1518	2,02	151,8	0,200
	1.187.751,00	**0,2**	**1.190.379,70**	**0,2**	**1.193.008,40**	**0,2**	**1.195.637,10**	**0,2**	**1.198.265,80**	**0,21938**	**1.200.894,50**	**0,2**	**1.203.523,20**	**0,2**	**1.206.151,90**	**0,2**	**1.208.780,60**	**0,2**	**1.211.409,30**	**0,2**	**1.214.038,00**	**26.287,00**	**2,2**	**2.628,70**	**0,2**

Table 6-5 - State of Europe's Forests, interpolated forest area change without other wooded land 2000/2005 per country (FAO, 2015c).

Change per year SoEF 2000/2005															
Country	SoEF 2000		SoEF 2001		SoEF 2002		SoEF 2003		SoEF 2004		SoEF 2005	2000/2005		per year	
	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	Change	%	Change	Mean %
Albania	7692	0,34321	7718,4	0,34204	7744,8	0,34087	7771,2	0,33972	7797,6	0,33857	7824	132	1,72	26,4	0,341
Austria	37527	0,07142	37553,8	0,07136	37580,6	0,07131	37607,4	0,07126	37634,2	0,07121	37661	134	0,36	26,8	0,071
Belgium	6504	0,22448	6518,6	0,22397	6533,2	0,22347	6547,8	0,22298	6562,4	0,22248	6577	73	1,12	14,6	0,223
Bulgaria	23510	0,34879	23592	0,34758	23674	0,34637	23756	0,34518	23838	0,34399	23920	410	1,74	82	0,346
Croatia	18850	0,19098	18886	0,19062	18922	0,19025	18958	0,18989	18994	0,18953	19030	180	0,95	36	0,190
Cyprus	1717	0,12813	1719,2	0,12797	1721,4	0,12780	1723,6	0,12764	1725,8	0,12748	1728	11	0,64	2,2	0,128
Estonia	22426	0,08472	22445	0,08465	22464	0,08458	22483	0,08451	22502	0,08444	22521	95	0,42	19	0,085
Finland	224585	-0,26404	223992	-0,26474	223399	-0,26544	222806	-0,26615	222213	-0,26686	221620	-2965	-1,32	-593	-0,265
Germany	112790	0,05054	112847	0,05051	112904	0,05049	112961	0,05046	113018	0,05043	113075	285	0,25	57	0,050
Greece	36010	0,83866	36312	0,83168	36614	0,82482	36916	0,81807	37218	0,81144	37520	1510	4,19	302	0,825
Hungary	12539	0,79592	12638,8	0,78963	12738,6	0,78345	12838,4	0,77736	12938,2	0,77136	13038	499	3,98	99,8	0,784
Iceland	289	5,25952	304,2	4,99671	319,4	4,75892	334,6	4,54274	349,8	4,34534	365	76	26,30	15,2	4,781
Ireland	6349	1,88691	6468,8	1,85197	6588,6	1,81829	6708,4	1,78582	6828,2	1,75449	6948	599	9,43	119,8	1,819
Italy	83690	0,88422	84430	0,87647	85170	0,86885	85910	0,86137	86650	0,85401	87390	3700	4,42	740	0,869
Latvia	32410	0,34557	32522	0,34438	32634	0,34320	32746	0,34203	32858	0,34086	32970	560	1,73	112	0,343
Liechtenstein	69	0,00000	69	0,00000	69	0,00000	69	0,00000	69	0,00000	69	0	0,00	0	0,000
Luxembourg	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0	0,00	0	0,000
Malta	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0	0,00	0	0,000
Norway	121130	-0,03467	121088	-0,03469	121046	-0,03470	121004	-0,03471	120962	-0,03472	120920	-210	-0,17	-42	-0,035
Romania	63660	0,07854	63710	0,07848	63760	0,07842	63810	0,07836	63860	0,07830	63910	250	0,39	50	0,078
Slovakia	19210	0,11452	19232	0,11439	19254	0,11426	19276	0,11413	19298	0,11400	19320	110	0,57	22	0,114
Slovenia	12290	0,16273	12310	0,16247	12330	0,16221	12350	0,16194	12370	0,16168	12390	100	0,81	20	0,162
Sweden	281630	0,03906	281740	0,03904	281850	0,03903	281960	0,03901	282070	0,03900	282180	550	0,20	110	0,039
Switzerland	11530	0,48569	11586	0,48334	11642	0,48102	11698	0,47871	11754	0,47643	11810	280	2,43	56	0,481
Turkey	76760	3,39578	79366,6	3,28425	81973,2	3,17982	84579,8	3,08182	87186,4	2,98969	89793	13033	16,98	2606,6	3,186
	1.214.038,00	**0,3**	**1.217.920,40**	**0,31877**	**1.221.802,80**	**0,3**	**1.225.685,20**	**0,3**	**1.229.567,60**	**0,3**	**1233450**	**19412**	**1,6**	**3882,4**	**0,3**

Table 6-6 - State of Europe's Forests, interpolated forest area change without other wooded land 2005/2010 per country (FAO, 2015c).

Change per year SoEF 2005/2010															
Country	SoEF 2005		SoEF 2006		SoEF 2007		SoEF 2008		SoEF 2009		SoEF 2010	2005/2010		per year	
	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	Change	%	Change	Mean %
Albania	7824	-0,15593	7811,8	-0,15617	7799,6	-0,15642	7787,4	-0,15666	7775,2	-0,15691	7763	-61	-0,78	-12,2	-0,156
Austria	37661	0,04673	37678,6	0,04671	37696,2	0,04669	37713,8	0,04667	37731,4	0,04665	37749	88	0,23	17,6	0,047
Belgium	6577	0,22199	6591,6	0,22149	6606,2	0,22100	6620,8	0,22052	6635,4	0,22003	6650	73	1,11	14,6	0,221
Bulgaria	23920	-3,55351	23070	-3,68444	22220	-3,82538	21370	-3,97754	20520	-4,14230	19670	-4250	-17,77	-850	-3,837
Croatia	19030	0,17867	19064	0,17835	19098	0,17803	19132	0,17771	19166	0,17740	19200	170	0,89	34	0,178
Cyprus	1728	0,00000	1728	0,00000	1728	0,00000	1728	0,00000	1728	0,00000	1728	0	0,00	0	0,000
Estonia	22521	-0,16074	22484,8	-0,16100	22448,6	-0,16126	22412,4	-0,16152	22376,2	-0,16178	22340	-181	-0,80	-36,2	-0,161
Finland	221620	0,05009	221731	0,05006	221842	0,05004	221953	0,05001	222064	0,04999	222175	555	0,25	111	0,050
Germany	113075	0,04157	113122	0,04155	113169	0,04153	113216	0,04151	113263	0,04150	113310	235	0,21	47	0,042
Greece	37520	0,80490	37822	0,79848	38124	0,79215	38426	0,78593	38728	0,77980	39030	1510	4,02	302	0,792
Hungary	13038	0,76085	13137,2	0,75511	13236,4	0,74945	13335,6	0,74387	13434,8	0,73838	13534	496	3,80	99,2	0,750
Iceland	365	3,39726	377,4	3,28564	389,8	3,18112	402,2	3,08304	414,6	2,99083	427	62	16,99	12,4	3,188
Ireland	6948	0,88659	7009,6	0,87879	7071,2	0,87114	7132,8	0,86362	7194,4	0,85622	7256	308	4,43	61,6	0,871
Italy	87390	0,66140	87968	0,65706	88546	0,65277	89124	0,64853	89702	0,64436	90280	2890	3,31	578	0,653
Latvia	32970	0,34577	33084	0,34458	33198	0,34339	33312	0,34222	33426	0,34105	33540	570	1,73	114	0,343
Liechtenstein	69	0,00000	69	0,00000	69	0,00000	69	0,00000	69	0,00000	69	0	0,00	0	0,000
Luxembourg	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0	0,00	0	0,000
Malta	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0	0,00	0	0,000
Norway	120920	0,01654	120940	0,01654	120960	0,01653	120980	0,01653	121000	0,01653	121020	100	0,08	20	0,017
Romania	63910	0,38805	64158	0,38655	64406	0,38506	64654	0,38358	64902	0,38211	65150	1240	1,94	248	0,385
Slovakia	19320	0,06211	19332	0,06207	19344	0,06203	19356	0,06200	19368	0,06196	19380	60	0,31	12	0,062
Slovenia	12390	0,04843	12396	0,04840	12402	0,04838	12408	0,04836	12414	0,04833	12420	30	0,24	6	0,048
Sweden	282180	-0,10277	281890	-0,10288	281600	-0,10298	281310	-0,10309	281020	-0,10320	280730	-1450	-0,51	-290	-0,103
Switzerland	11810	-0,01693	11808	-0,01694	11806	-0,01694	11804	-0,01694	11802	-0,01695	11800	-10	-0,08	-2	-0,017
Turkey	89793	1,78900	91399,4	1,75756	93005,8	1,72720	94612,2	1,69788	96218,6	1,66953	97825	8032	8,95	1606,4	1,728
	1.233.450,00	**0,2**	**1.235.543,40**	**0,2**	**1.237.636,80**	**0,2**	**1.239.730,20**	**0,2**	**1.241.823,60**	**0,2**	**1243917**	**10472**	**0,85**	**2094,4**	**0,2**

Table 6-7 - State of Europe's Forests, interpolated forest area change without other wooded land 2010/2015 per country (FAO, 2015c).

Change per year SoEF 2010/2015															
Country	SoEF 2010		SoEF 2011		SoEF 2012		SoEF 2013		SoEF 2014		SoEF 2015	2010/2015		per year	
	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	Change	%	Change	Mean %
Albania	7763	0,22414	7780,4	0,22364	7797,8	0,22314	7815,2	0,22264	7832,6	0,22215	7850	87	1,12	17,4	0,223
Austria	37749	0,49856	37937,2	0,49608	38125,4	0,49363	38313,6	0,49121	38501,8	0,48881	38690	941	2,49	188,2	0,494
Belgium	6650	0,55338	6686,8	0,55034	6723,6	0,54733	6760,4	0,54435	6797,2	0,54140	6834	184	2,77	36,8	0,547
Bulgaria	19670	18,87138	23382	15,87546	27094	13,70045	30806	12,04960	34518	10,75381	38230	18560	94,36	3712	14,250
Croatia	19200	0,02083	19204	0,02083	19208	0,02082	19212	0,02082	19216	0,02082	19220	20	0,10	4	0,021
Cyprus	1728	-0,01157	1727,8	-0,01158	1727,6	-0,01158	1727,4	-0,01158	1727,2	-0,01158	1727	-1	-0,06	-0,2	-0,012
Estonia	22340	-0,01791	22336	-0,01791	22332	-0,01791	22328	-0,01791	22324	-0,01792	22320	-20	-0,09	-4	-0,018
Finland	222175	0,00045	222176	0,00045	222177	0,00045	222178	0,00045	222179	0,00045	222180	5	0,00	1	0,000
Germany	113310	0,15533	113486	0,15509	113662	0,15485	113838	0,15461	114014	0,15437	114190	880	0,78	176	0,155
Greece	39030	0,00000	39030	0,00000	39030	0,00000	39030	0,00000	39030	0,00000	39030	0	0,00	0	0,000
Hungary	13534	10,57633	14965,4	9,56473	16396,8	8,72975	17828,2	8,02885	19259,6	7,43214	20691	7157	52,88	1431,4	8,866
Iceland	427	2,99766	439,8	2,91041	452,6	2,82810	465,4	2,75032	478,2	2,67670	491	64	14,99	12,8	2,833
Ireland	7256	0,78280	7312,8	0,77672	7369,6	0,77073	7426,4	0,76484	7483,2	0,75903	7540	284	3,91	56,8	0,771
Italy	90280	0,59592	90818	0,59239	91356	0,58890	91894	0,58546	92432	0,58205	92970	2690	2,98	538	0,589
Latvia	33540	0,01193	33544	0,01192	33548	0,01192	33552	0,01192	33556	0,01192	33560	20	0,06	4	0,012
Liechtenstein	69	-2,02899	67,6	-2,07101	66,2	-2,11480	64,8	-2,16049	63,4	-2,20820	62	-7	-10,14	-1,4	-2,117
Luxembourg	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0,00000	868	0	0,00	0	0,000
Malta	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0,00000	3	0	0,00	0	0,000
Norway	121020	0,01653	121040	0,01652	121060	0,01652	121080	0,01652	121100	0,01652	121120	100	0,08	20	0,017
Romania	65150	1,06216	65842	1,05100	66534	1,04007	67226	1,02936	67918	1,01888	68610	3460	5,31	692	1,040
Slovakia	19380	8,07018	20944	7,46753	22508	6,94864	24072	6,49718	25636	6,10080	27200	7820	40,35	1564	7,017
Slovenia	12420	11,23994	13816	10,10423	15212	9,17697	16608	8,40559	18004	7,75383	19400	6980	56,20	1396	9,336
Sweden	280730	0,00000	280730	0,00000	280730	0,00000	280730	0,00000	280730	0,00000	280730	0	0,00	0	0,000
Switzerland	11800	1,25424	11948	1,23870	12096	1,22354	12244	1,20876	12392	1,19432	12540	740	6,27	148	1,224
Turkey	97825	4,41707	102146	4,23022	106467	4,05853	110788	3,90024	115109	3,75383	119430	21605	22,09	4321	4,072
	1.243.917,00	**1,2**	**1.258.230,80**	**1,1**	**1.272.544,60**	**1,1**	**1.286.858,40**	**1,1**	**1.301.172,20**	**1,1**	**1315486**	**71569**	**5,745**	**14313,8**	**1,1**

Table 6-8 - State of Europe's Forests, interpolated forest area change with other wooded land 2010/2015 per country (FAO, 2015c).

Change per year SoEF with other wooded land 2010/2015															
Country	SoEF 2010		SoEF 2011		SoEF 2012		SoEF 2013		SoEF 2014		SoEF 2015	2010/2015		per year	
	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	Change	%	Change	Mean %
Albania	10.310,00	4,0	10.722,40	3,85	11.134,80	3,70	11.547,20	3,57	11.959,60	3,45	12.372,00	2.062,00	20,0	412,4	3,7
Austria	39.910,00	0,2	39.972,00	0,31	40.034,00	0,15	40.096,00	0,15	40.158,00	0,15	40.220,00	310,00	0,8	62	0,2
Belgium	7.064,00	0,4	7.089,40	0,72	7.114,80	0,36	7.140,20	0,36	7.165,60	0,35	7.191,00	127,00	1,8	25,4	0,4
Bosnia and Herzegovina	30.210,00	-1,5	29.766,40	-2,98	29.322,80	-1,51	28.879,20	-1,54	28.435,60	-1,56	27.992,00	-2.218,00	-7,3	-443,6	-1,8
Bulgaria	39.270,00	-0,4	39.106,00	-0,84	38.942,00	-0,42	38.778,00	-0,42	38.614,00	-0,42	38.450,00	-820,00	-2,1	-164	-0,5
Croatia	24.740,00	0,1	24.774,00	0,27	24.808,00	0,14	24.842,00	0,14	24.876,00	0,14	24.910,00	170,00	0,7	34	0,2
Cyprus	3.870,00	0,0	3.868,40	-0,08	3.866,80	-0,04	3.865,20	-0,04	3.863,60	-0,04	3.862,00	-8,00	-0,2	-1,6	0,0
Czech Republic	26.570,00	0,1	26.590,80	0,16	26.611,60	0,08	26.632,40	0,08	26.653,20	0,08	26.674,00	104,00	0,4	20,8	0,1
Denmark	6.350,00	0,7	6.395,40	1,42	6.440,80	0,70	6.486,20	0,70	6.531,60	0,70	6.577,00	227,00	3,6	45,4	0,8
Estonia	23.370,00	1,1	23.627,20	2,18	23.884,40	1,08	24.141,60	1,07	24.398,80	1,05	24.656,00	1.286,00	5,5	257,2	1,3
Finland	231.160,00	-0,1	230.966,00	-0,17	230.772,00	-0,08	230.578,00	-0,08	230.384,00	-0,08	230.190,00	-970,00	-0,4	-194	-0,1
France (cont.)	175.720,00	0,0	175.734,00	0,02	175.748,00	0,01	175.762,00	0,01	175.776,00	0,01	175.790,00	70,00	0,0	14	0,0
Germany	110.760,00	0,6	111.446,00	1,23	112.132,00	0,61	112.818,00	0,61	113.504,00	0,60	114.190,00	3.430,00	3,1	686	0,7
Greece	65.390,00	0,0	65.390,00	0,00	65.390,00	0,00	65.390,00	0,00	65.390,00	0,00	65.390,00	0,00	0,0	0	0,0
Hungary	20.390,00	1,5	20.692,80	2,93	20.995,60	1,44	21.298,40	1,42	21.601,20	1,40	21.904,00	1.514,00	7,4	302,8	1,7
Iceland	1.160,00	13,3	1.314,60	23,52	1.469,20	10,52	1.623,80	9,52	1.778,40	8,69	1.933,00	773,00	66,6	154,6	13,1
Ireland	7.870,00	0,4	7.898,40	0,72	7.926,80	0,36	7.955,20	0,36	7.983,60	0,36	8.012,00	142,00	1,8	28,4	0,4
Italy	109.160,00	0,4	109.548,00	0,71	109.936,00	0,35	110.324,00	0,35	110.712,00	0,35	111.100,00	1.940,00	1,8	388	0,4
Kosovo					incl. in Serbia									incl. in Serbia	
Latvia	34.670,00	0,0	34.672,00	0,01	34.674,00	0,01	34.676,00	0,01	34.678,00	0,01	34.680,00	10,00	0,0	2	0,0
Liechtenstein	80,00	-3,2	77,40	-6,72	74,80	-3,48	72,20	-3,60	69,60	-3,74	67,00	-13,00	-16,3	-2,6	-4,2
Lithuania	22.490,00	0,3	22.560,00	0,62	22.630,00	0,31	22.700,00	0,31	22.770,00	0,31	22.840,00	350,00	1,6	70	0,4
Luxembourg	880,00	0,0	880,40	0,09	880,80	0,05	881,20	0,05	881,60	0,05	882,00	2,00	0,2	0,4	0,1
Macedonia	11.410,00	-0,2	11.389,00	-0,37	11.368,00	-0,18	11.347,00	-0,19	11.326,00	-0,19	11.305,00	-105,00	-0,9	-21	-0,2
Malta	3,50	-2,9	3,40	-5,88	3,30	-3,03	3,20	-3,13	3,10	-3,23	3,00	-0,50	-14,3	-0,1	-3,6
Montenegro	7.440,00	5,9	7.880,60	11,18	8.321,20	5,29	8.761,80	5,03	9.202,40	4,79	9.643,00	2.203,00	29,6	440,6	6,4
Netherlands	3.650,00	0,6	3.672,00	1,20	3.694,00	0,60	3.716,00	0,59	3.738,00	0,59	3.760,00	110,00	3,0	22	0,7
Norway	123.840,00	2,8	127.320,00	5,47	130.800,00	2,66	134.280,00	2,59	137.760,00	2,53	141.240,00	17.400,00	14,1	3480	3,2
Poland	93.190,00	0,2	93.422,00	0,50	93.654,00	0,25	93.886,00	0,25	94.118,00	0,25	94.350,00	1.160,00	1,2	232	0,3
Portugal	36.110,00	7,2	38.702,40	13,40	41.294,80	6,28	43.887,20	5,91	46.479,60	5,58	49.072,00	12.962,00	35,9	2592,4	7,7
Romania	67.330,00	0,6	67.766,00	1,29	68.202,00	0,64	68.638,00	0,64	69.074,00	0,63	69.510,00	2.180,00	3,2	436	0,8
Serbia	31.230,00	0,7	31.440,00	1,34	31.650,00	0,66	31.860,00	0,66	32.070,00	0,65	32.280,00	1.050,00	3,4	210	0,8
Slovakia	19.380,00	0,0	19.384,00	0,04	19.388,00	0,02	19.392,00	0,02	19.396,00	0,02	19.400,00	20,00	0,1	4	0,0
Slovenia	12.740,00	0,0	12.734,00	-0,09	12.728,00	-0,05	12.722,00	-0,05	12.716,00	-0,05	12.710,00	-30,00	-0,2	-6	-0,1
Spain	277.470,00	-0,1	277.229,40	-0,17	276.988,80	-0,09	276.748,20	-0,09	276.507,60	-0,09	276.267,00	-1.203,00	-0,4	-240,6	-0,1
Sweden	306.250,00	-0,1	306.010,00	-0,16	305.770,00	-0,08	305.530,00	-0,08	305.290,00	-0,08	305.050,00	-1.200,00	-0,4	-240	-0,1
Switzerland	13.110,00	0,2	13.136,00	0,40	13.162,00	0,20	13.188,00	0,20	13.214,00	0,20	13.240,00	130,00	1,0	26	0,2
Turkey	217.020,00	0,1	217.341,00	0,30	217.662,00	0,15	217.983,00	0,15	218.304,00	0,15	218.625,00	1.605,00	0,7	321	0,2
United Kingdom	29.010,00	1,8	29.536,00	3,56	30.062,00	1,75	30.588,00	1,72	31.114,00	1,69	31.640,00	2.630,00	9,1	526,00	2,1
	2.240.577,50	**0,4**	**2.250.057,40**	**0,84**	**2.259.537,30**	**0,42**	**2.269.017,20**	**0,42**	**2.278.497,10**	**0,42**	**2.287.977,00**	**47.399,50**	**2,1**	**9479,90**	**0,5**

Table 6-9 - Global Forest Resources Assessment, interpolated forest area change with other wooded land 2010/2015 per country (FAO, 2010 and FAO, 2015e).

Change per year GFRA with other wooded land 2010/2015															
Country	GFRA 2010		GFRA 2011		GFRA 2012		GFRA 2013		GFRA 2014		GFRA 2015	2010/2015		per year	
	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	%	Forest [km²]	Change	%	Change	Mean %
Albania	10.310,0	-0,058195926	10.304,0	-0,058229814	10.298,0	-0,058263741	10.292,0	-0,116595414	10.286,00	-0,058331713	10.280,00	-30,00	-0,3	-6	-0,07
Austria	40.060,0	0,07988018	40.092,0	0,079816422	40.124,0	0,079752766	40.156,0	0,159378424	40.188,00	0,079625759	40.220,00	160,00	0,4	32	0,10
Belgium	7.060,0	0,368271955	7.086,0	0,366920689	7.112,0	0,365579303	7.138,0	0,728495377	7.164,00	0,36292574	7.190,00	130,00	1,8	26	0,44
Bosnia and Herzegovina	27.340,0	0	27.340,0	0	27.340,0	0	27.340,0	0	27.340,00	0	27.340,00	0,00	0,0	0	0,00
Bulgaria	39.270,0	-0,417621594	39.106,0	-0,419372986	38.942,0	-0,42113913	38.778,0	-0,845840425	38.614,00	-0,424716424	38.450,00	-820,00	-2,1	-164	-0,51
Croatia	24.740,0	0,137429264	24.774,0	0,137240656	24.808,0	0,137052564	24.842,0	0,273729973	24.876,00	0,136677922	24.910,00	170,00	0,7	34	0,16
Cyprus	3.870,0	-0,051679587	3.868,0	-0,051706308	3.866,0	-0,051733057	3.864,0	-0,103519669	3.862,00	-0,051786639	3.860,00	-10,00	-0,3	-2	-0,06
Czech Republic	26.570,0	0,075272864	26.590,0	0,075216247	26.610,0	0,075159714	26.630,0	0,150206534	26.650,00	0,075046904	26.670,00	100,00	0,4	20	0,09
Denmark	5.910,0	2,267343486	6.044,0	2,217074785	6.178,0	2,168986727	6.312,0	4,245880862	6.446,00	2,078808563	6.580,00	670,00	11,3	134	2,60
Estonia	23.500,0	0,90212766	23.712,0	0,894062078	23.924,0	0,886139442	24.136,0	1,756711966	24.348,00	0,870708066	24.560,00	1.060,00	4,5	212	1,06
Finland	232.690,0	-0,214878164	232.190,0	-0,215340885	231.690,0	-0,215805602	231.190,0	-0,43254466	230.690,00	-0,216741081	230.190,00	-2.500,00	-1,1	-500	-0,26
France (cont.)	175.720,0	0,007967221	175.734,0	0,007966586	175.748,0	0,007965951	175.762,0	0,015930633	175.776,00	0,007964682	175.790,00	70,00	0,0	14	0,01
Germany	110.760,0	0,619357169	111.446,0	0,615544748	112.132,0	0,611778975	112.818,0	1,216117995	113.504,00	0,604383986	114.190,00	3.430,00	3,1	686	0,73
Greece	65.390,0	0,021410002	65.404,0	0,021405419	65.418,0	0,021400838	65.432,0	0,042792517	65.446,00	0,021391682	65.460,00	70,00	0,1	14	0,03
Hungary	20.290,0	1,586988664	20.612,0	1,562196779	20.934,0	1,538167574	21.256,0	3,029732781	21.578,00	1,492260636	21.900,00	1.610,00	7,9	322	1,84
Iceland	1.160,0	13,27586207	1.314,0	11,71993912	1.468,0	10,49046322	1.622,0	18,98890259	1.776,00	8,671171171	1.930,00	770,00	66,4	154	12,63
Ireland	7.890,0	0,30418251	7.914,0	0,303260045	7.938,0	0,302343159	7.962,0	0,602863602	7.986,00	0,30052592	8.010,00	120,00	1,5	24	0,36
Italy	109.160,0	0,355441554	109.548,0	0,354182641	109.936,0	0,352932615	110.324,0	0,703382763	110.712,00	0,350458848	111.100,00	1.940,00	1,8	388	0,42
Kosovo						n/a								n/a	
Latvia	34.670,0	0,005768676	34.672,0	0,005768343	34.674,0	0,005768011	34.676,0	0,011535356	34.678,00	0,005767345	34.680,00	10,00	0,03	2	0,01
Liechtenstein	80,0	0	80,0	0	80,0	0	80,0	0	80,00	0	80,00	0,00	0	0	0,00
Lithuania	22.400,0	0,392857143	22.488,0	0,391319815	22.576,0	0,389794472	22.664,0	0,776561948	22.752,00	0,386779184	22.840,00	440,00	2,0	88	0,47
Luxembourg	880,0	0	880,0	0	880,0	0	880,0	0	880,00	0	880,00	0,00	0,0	0	0,00
Macedonia						n/a								n/a	
Malta						n/a								n/a	
Montenegro	7.180,0	6,852367688	7.672,0	6,412930136	8.164,0	6,026457619	8.656,0	11,36783734	9.148,00	5,378224749	9.640,00	2.460,00	34,3	492	7,21
Netherlands	3.650,0	0,602739726	3.672,0	0,59912854	3.694,0	0,595560368	3.716,0	1,184068891	3.738,00	0,588550027	3.760,00	110,00	3,0	22	0,71
Norway	127.680,0	2,12406015	130.392,0	2,079882201	133.104,0	2,037504508	135.816,0	3,993638452	138.528,00	1,957726958	141.240,00	13.560,00	10,6	2712	2,44
Poland	93.370,0	0,209917532	93.566,0	0,209477802	93.762,0	0,20903991	93.958,0	0,417207689	94.154,00	0,208169594	94.350,00	980,00	1,0	196	0,25
Portugal	36.110,0	7,178067017	38.702,0	6,697328303	41.294,0	6,27694096	43.886,0	11,8124231	46.478,00	5,57683205	49.070,00	12.960,00	35,9	2592	7,51
Romania	67.330,0	0,64755681	67.766,0	0,643390491	68.202,0	0,639277441	68.638,0	1,270433288	69.074,00	0,631207111	69.510,00	2.180,00	3,2	436	0,77
Serbia	31.230,0	0,672430355	31.440,0	0,667938931	31.650,0	0,663507109	31.860,0	1,31826742	32.070,00	0,654817587	32.280,00	1.050,00	3,4	210	0,80
Slovakia	19.330,0	0,07242628	19.344,0	0,072373863	19.358,0	0,072321521	19.372,0	0,144538509	19.386,00	0,072217064	19.400,00	70,00	0,4	14	0,09
Slovenia	12.740,0	-0,047095761	12.734,0	-0,047117952	12.728,0	-0,047140163	12.722,0	-0,094324792	12.716,00	-0,047184649	12.710,00	-30,00	-0,2	-6	-0,06
Spain	277.470,0	-0,086495837	277.230,0	-0,086570717	276.990,0	-0,086645727	276.750,0	-0,173441734	276.510,00	-0,086796138	276.270,00	-1.200,00	-0,4	-240	-0,10
Sweden	312.470,0	-0,474925593	310.986,0	-0,477191899	309.502,0	-0,479479939	308.018,0	-0,963580051	306.534,00	-0,484122479	305.050,00	-7.420,00	-2,4	-1484	-0,58
Switzerland	13.110,0	0,198321892	13.136,0	0,197929354	13.162,0	0,197538368	13.188,0	0,394297847	13.214,00	0,196761011	13.240,00	130,00	1,0	26	0,24
Turkey	217.020,0	0,131785089	217.306,0	0,131611644	217.592,0	0,131438656	217.878,0	0,262532243	218.164,00	0,131094039	218.450,00	1.430,00	0,7	286	0,16
United Kingdom	29.010,0	1,813167873	29.536,0	1,780877573	30.062,0	1,749717251	30.588,0	3,439257225	31.114,00	1,690557305	31.640,00	2.630,00	9,1	526	2,09
	2.237.420,00	**0,3**	**2.244.680,00**	**0,3**	**2.251.940,00**	**0,3**	**2.259.200,00**	**0,3**	**2.266.460,00**	**0,3**	**2.273.720,00**	**36.300,00**	**1,6**	**7260,00**	**0,3**

Grassland Layer

Table 6-10 - Permanent meadows and pastures in European countries 2000-2015 in km^2 and annual change rate in % (FAOSTAT, 2010; FAOSTAT, 2015e).

state	2000	2001	change in %	2002	change in %	2003	change in %	2004	change in %	2005	change in %	2006	change in %	2007	change in %	2008	change in %	2009	change in %	2010	change in %	2011	change in %	2012	change in %	2013	change in %	2014	change in %	2015	change in %
Albania	4,45	4,40	-1,12	4,41	0,22727273	4,22	-4,31	4,23	0,24	4,18	-1,18	4,15	-1,43	4,21	1,45	4,84	14,96	5,05	4,40	5,05	0,00	5,05	-0,06	5,05	0,06	4,91	-2,83	4,78	-2,59	4,78	-0,02
Austria	14,70	14,58	-0,82	14,46	-0,81613058	14,34	-0,83	14,22	-0,84	14,10	-0,84	13,98	-1,69	13,86	-0,86	13,74	-0,87	13,62	-0,87	13,50	-0,88	13,32	-1,31	13,15	-1,32	12,97	-1,35	12,97	0,00	13,07	0,75
Bosnia + Herzegovina	10,30	10,19	-1,07	10,30	1,0794897	10,57	2,62	10,44	-1,23	10,37	-0,67	10,36	-0,19	10,32	-0,39	10,32	0,00	10,29	-0,29	10,35	0,58	10,44	0,87	10,48	0,38	10,45	-0,29	10,45	0,00	10,49	0,38
Belgium	5,07	5,21	2,76	5,36	2,87907869	5,36	0,00	5,30	-1,12	5,19	-2,08	5,17	-0,77	5,07	-1,93	5,00	-1,38	5,02	0,40	5,00	-0,40	4,89	-2,20	5,07	3,68	4,98	-1,74	4,92	-1,24	4,76	-3,25
Bulgaria	18,04	17,86	-1,00	17,42	-2,46360582	17,89	2,70	18,06	0,95	19,04	5,43	18,76	-2,93	18,42	-1,81	18,29	-0,71	17,19	-6,01	17,02	-0,99	16,78	-1,41	16,47	-1,85	13,81	-16,15	13,64	-1,23	13,69	0,34
Croatia	2,58	2,55	-1,16	2,53	-0,78431373	2,61	3,16	2,59	-0,77	2,65	2,32	2,73	6,01	2,70	-1,10	3,42	26,81	3,43	0,26	3,45	0,61	3,46	0,29	3,46	-0,23	6,18	78,82	6,18	0,00	6,18	0,00
Cyprus	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data
Czech Republic	9,61	9,66	0,52	9,68	0,20703934	9,71	0,31	9,72	0,10	9,74	0,21	9,76	0,41	9,78	0,20	9,80	0,20	9,83	0,31	9,86	0,31	9,89	0,30	9,92	0,30	9,94	0,20	9,97	0,30	10,01	0,40
Denmark	3,58	3,76	5,03	3,82	1,59574468	3,84	0,52	3,70	-3,65	3,68	-0,54	3,57	-5,95	3,50	-1,96	2,61	-25,43	1,97	-24,52	2,00	1,52	1,87	-6,50	2,00	6,95	1,95	-2,50	1,93	-1,03	2,55	32,12
Estonia	1,31	1,94	48,09	0,67	-65,4639175	2,68	300,00	2,36	-11,83	2,79	18,07	3,31	36,73	3,07	-7,11	3,01	-1,95	3,27	8,74	2,97	-9,35	3,07	3,34	3,29	7,18	3,27	-0,49	3,20	-2,14	3,18	-0,69
Finland	0,26	0,25	-3,85	0,27	8	0,28	3,70	0,28	0,00	0,33	17,86	0,36	18,09	0,34	-5,56	0,33	-2,94	0,34	3,03	0,33	-2,94	0,32	-3,03	0,32	0,00	0,31	-3,13	0,33	6,45	0,28	-15,76
France	103,12	102,33	-0,77	101,11	-1,19030168	100,64	-0,47	99,80	-0,84	99,02	-0,78	98,77	-0,50	98,48	-0,30	97,91	-0,58	97,37	-0,56	96,15	-1,25	95,97	-0,18	95,59	-0,39	94,72	-0,92	94,38	-0,35	92,62	-1,87
Germany	50,48	50,13	-0,69	49,70	-0,8577698	49,68	-0,04	49,13	-1,11	49,29	0,33	48,82	-1,90	48,75	-0,14	47,89	-1,76	47,41	-1,00	46,55	-1,81	46,44	-0,24	46,30	-0,30	46,21	-0,19	46,51	0,65	46,77	0,56
Greece	46,75	46,50	-0,53	46,00	-1,07526882	46,00	0,00	45,80	-0,43	45,80	0,00	45,50	-1,30	45,50	0,00	45,20	-0,66	45,00	-0,44	44,90	-0,22	44,80	-0,22	44,70	-0,22	44,60	-0,22	44,50	-0,22	44,50	0,00
Hungary	10,51	10,61	0,95	10,63	0,18850141	10,62	-0,09	10,60	-0,19	10,57	-0,28	10,15	-7,91	10,17	0,20	10,10	-0,69	10,04	-0,59	7,63	-24,00	7,59	-0,52	7,59	0,00	7,59	0,00	7,61	0,26	7,62	0,13
Iceland	17,60	17,60	0,00	17,58	-0,11363636	17,56	-0,11	17,55	-0,06	17,53	-0,11	17,52	-0,11	17,51	-0,06	17,51	0,00	17,51	0,00	17,51	0,00	17,51	0,00	17,51	0,00	17,51	0,00	17,51	0,00	17,51	0,00
Ireland	33,33	32,20	-3,39	31,94	-0,80745342	31,86	-0,25	30,98	-2,76	31,15	0,55	31,04	-0,70	32,13	3,51	30,96	-3,63	30,97	0,02	35,55	14,79	34,92	-1,77	33,62	-3,72	33,63	0,03	34,07	1,31	34,00	-0,21
Italy	43,53	43,65	0,28	43,79	0,3207331	43,68	-0,25	43,54	-0,32	44,02	1,10	42,82	-5,42	44,60	4,16	44,16	-0,99	44,23	0,16	46,98	6,22	46,12	-1,83	41,69	-9,61	45,43	8,97	40,41	-11,05	38,97	-3,56
Kosovo	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data
Latvia	6,06	6,11	0,83	6,10	-0,16366612	6,13	0,49	6,21	1,31	6,29	1,29	6,37	2,53	6,41	0,63	6,48	1,09	6,59	1,70	6,25	-5,16	6,51	4,16	6,57	0,92	6,63	0,91	6,57	-0,90	6,48	-1,37
Liechtenstein	0,03	0,03	0,00	0,03	0	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,03	0,00
Lithuania	4,97	12,22	145,88	12,03	-1,55482815	9,73	-19,12	9,55	-1,84	8,91	-6,74	8,76	-3,22	8,30	-5,24	7,83	-5,68	6,08	-22,42	6,14	1,09	5,89	-4,05	5,50	-6,69	5,68	3,36	5,68	-0,05	7,99	40,63
Luxembourg	0,65	0,65	0,00	0,65	0	0,65	0,00	0,65	0,00	0,67	3,08	0,67	0,00	0,68	1,49	0,67	-1,47	0,67	0,55	0,68	0,33	0,68	0,07	0,67	-0,52	0,67	-0,58	0,67	-0,10	0,67	0,13
Macedonia, former Yugoslav	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data
Malta	0	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00
Montenegro	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data
Netherlands	10,12	9,93	-1,88	10,00	0,70493454	9,85	-1,50	7,91	-19,72	7,95	0,52	8,17	5,56	8,21	0,44	8,28	0,87	8,27	-0,07	8,13	-1,68	8,16	0,33	7,95	-2,59	7,73	-2,74	7,58	-1,98	7,66	1,08
Norway	1,58	1,61	1,90	1,63	1,24223602	1,64	0,61	1,66	1,22	1,69	1,81	1,72	3,53	1,75	1,51	1,75	0,29	1,75	-0,17	1,76	0,57	1,77	0,46	1,77	-0,06	1,76	-0,06	1,76	-0,45	1,76	0,17
Poland	40,83	38,64	-5,36	35,62	-7,81573499	32,68	-8,25	33,65	2,97	33,87	0,65	32,16	-10,05	32,71	1,71	31,84	-2,66	31,80	-0,13	32,30	1,57	32,91	1,89	32,06	-2,58	32,06	0,00	31,20	-2,68	30,93	-0,87
Portugal	14,33	14,29	-0,28	14,68	2,72918125	15,07	2,66	15,07	0,00	17,69	17,39	17,32	-4,16	17,82	2,87	17,83	0,06	17,85	0,11	17,93	0,45	18,01	0,45	18,09	0,44	18,17	0,44	18,17	0,00	18,17	0,00
Romania	49,49	49,36	-0,26	49,59	0,46596434	49,58	-0,02	47,86	-3,47	46,85	-2,11	46,31	-2,29	44,94	-2,96	44,50	-0,98	43,72	-1,75	45,47	4,00	45,43	-0,09	44,89	-1,19	47,17	5,08	46,27	-1,91	46,55	0,61
Serbia	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data
Slovakia	8,65	7,84	-9,36	7,99	1,91326531	7,95	-0,50	5,14	-35,35	5,24	1,95	5,36	4,56	5,28	-1,49	5,32	0,76	5,24	-1,50	5,27	0,63	5,18	-1,73	5,15	-0,64	5,14	-0,23	5,11	-0,45	5,21	1,80
Slovenia	3,14	3,07	-2,23	3,07	0	3,08	0,33	2,87	-6,82	3,05	6,27	2,85	-13,05	2,97	4,21	3,85	29,66	3,90	1,27	3,88	-0,62	3,84	-0,99	3,76	-1,98	3,73	-0,85	3,78	1,28	3,79	0,38
Spain	114,62	114,76	0,12	115,33	0,49668874	111,72	-3,13	111,14	-0,52	113,20	1,85	110,35	-5,01	106,08	-3,87	108,70	2,47	107,54	-1,07	103,24	-4,00	100,22	-2,93	94,03	-6,18	96,00	2,10	93,90	-2,19	92,32	-1,68
Sweden	4,47	4,60	2,91	4,90	6,52173913	4,94	0,82	5,23	5,87	5,13	-1,91	5,03	-3,88	4,89	-2,78	4,58	-6,34	4,36	-4,80	4,51	3,44	4,47	-0,89	4,41	-1,43	4,43	0,52	4,36	-1,63	4,50	3,24
Switzerland	11,33	11,29	-0,35	11,27	-0,1859559	11,26	-0,10	11,23	-0,24	11,20	-0,27	11,17	-0,69	11,14	-0,27	11,11	-0,24	11,08	-0,30	11,06	-0,13	11,04	-0,23	11,01	-0,28	10,97	-0,28	10,97	-0,04	10,85	-1,09
Turkey	141,00	146,17	3,67	146,17	0	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00	146,17	0,00
United Kingdom	110,36	112,51	1,95	111,40	-0,98657897	112,48	0,97	111,83	-0,58	111,80	-0,03	116,99	9,24	115,16	-1,56	116,33	1,02	112,33	-3,44	112,08	-0,22	110,57	-1,35	109,24	-1,20	109,40	0,15	109,54	0,13	110,78	1,13
EEA39 countries	896,86	906,50	1,08	900,13	-0,7024813	894,50	-0,63	884,50	-1,12	889,19	0,53	886,20	-0,67	880,94	-0,59	880,37	-0,06	869,92	-1,19	869,69	-0,03	863,31	-0,73	847,49	-1,83	854,20	0,79	845,11	-1,06	844,82	-0,03

Table 6-11 - Pastures and Natural Grasslands in European countries 1990-2012 (CLC, 2012).

		1990		2000		2006		2012	
state		231_pastures	321_natural grassland	231_pastures	321_natural grassland	231_pastures	321_natural grassland	231_pastures	321_natural grassland
AL	Albania	no data	no data	432,62	2.947,60	616,12	3.209,17	615,66	3.208,32
AT	Austria	8.262,62	5.440,91	7.474,38	5.997,47	6.925,98	6.065,75	6.923,00	6.092,43
BA	Bosnia+Herzegowina	54,12	43,71	4.083,10	2.485,69	3.404,39	3.011,95	3.403,40	3.009,76
BE	Belgium	3.608,01	9,89	3.550,78	9,10	3.547,75	8,88	3.542,82	8,88
BG	Bulgaria	4.150,24	3.993,39	4.126,49	3.928,33	3.985,63	4.059,49	3.940,72	4.054,33
CH	Switzerland	1.797,59	5.951,75	3.743,36	4.490,46	3.720,31	4.475,27	3.719,86	4.475,15
CY	Cyprus	***no data***	***no data***	11,64	296,52	8,85	260,76	8,85	260,23
CZ	Czech Republic	2.528,23	404,40	6.446,48	280,39	7.185,74	261,98	7.944,47	256,64
DE	Germany	44.350,72	1.976,28	45.365,24	1.763,88	43.940,02	1.681,35	64.429,20	1.517,86
DK	Denmark	562,95	269,02	568,69	261,92	603,33	253,59	587,76	250,06
EE	Estonia	***no data***	***no data***	2.579,86	390,81	3.085,18	355,26	3.049,64	357,02
EL	Greece	734,04	12.069,84	700,19	11.934,80	1.042,48	10.619,78	1.004,64	10.624,43
ES	Spain	6.594,58	27.009,78	6.511,49	26.170,60	8.903,01	39.478,93	8.758,24	39.407,80
FI	Finland	***no data***	***no data***	43,60	35,62	43,13	35,62	64,63	159,95
FR	France	88.091,52	13.512,41	87.200,27	12.486,42	86.240,46	12.599,69	85.729,86	12.329,98
HR	Croatia	4.758,34	776,59	3.070,83	2.517,52	2.861,82	2.528,64	2.837,33	2.543,49
HU	Hungary	6.809,47	2.257,59	6.782,89	2.283,76	6.849,68	2.282,01	6.883,07	2.285,62
IE	Ireland	38.156,07	936,45	35.972,55	896,96	38.445,15	444,46	38.614,28	449,88
IT	Italy	4.551,46	14.496,37	4.271,20	14.690,18	4.292,98	13.816,40	4.286,45	13.796,22
LI	Liechtenstein	***no data***	***no data***	14,03	22,25	5,13	22,18	5,13	22,18
LT	Lithuania	4.891,58	8,57	4.235,89	9,94	3.991,46	10,65	3.834,12	10,40
LU	Luxembourg	306,35	1,83	303,16	1,80	375,96	0,00	375,09	0,00
LV	Latvia	9.334,08	64,37	8.545,90	53,50	7.709,06	80,26	7.430,64	82,15
ME	Montenegro	343,41	1.222,59	210,57	1.323,80	269,05	1.018,36	266,54	1.017,93
MK	Macedonia	***no data***	***no data***	2.095,40	1.683,56	1.972,83	2.002,15	1.975,01	1.999,84
NL	Netherlands	11.380,65	260,03	10.714,20	322,47	10.245,02	425,99	10.131,14	479,42
NO	Norway	***no data***	***no data***	251,09	0,31	251,06	0,09	250,90	0,09
PL	Poland	27.682,55	453,03	27.168,07	377,40	27.708,31	348,80	27.453,06	324,67
PT	Portugal	1.118,22	2.205,21	1.001,46	2.017,82	1.392,59	1.223,31	1.379,65	1.222,48
RO	Romania	25.349,30	3.484,77	25.258,39	3.491,87	24.784,42	5.917,51	24.738,16	5.919,51
RS	Republic of Serbia	1.873,11	2.209,12	1.612,21	2.040,44	1.659,67	2.052,05	1.650,74	2.047,27
SE	Sweden	***no data***	***no data***	2.675,63	1.921,46	2.652,81	1.925,90	2.655,50	1.926,26
SI	Slovenia	***no data***	***no data***	1.161,99	206,56	1.152,89	206,16	1.153,10	206,21
SK	Slovakia	3.186,97	319,98	2.733,81	285,99	2.598,32	275,15	2.580,63	274,04
TR	Turkey	16.324,22	91.609,60	15.802,75	91.310,51	19.753,71	89.294,94	19.534,38	88.937,45
UK	United Kingdom	***no data***	***no data***	67.371,42	19.642,36	70.017,68	14.293,58	69.953,46	14.314,62
EEA		316.800,42	190.987,47	394.091,60	218.580,11	402.241,99	224.546,06	421.711,15	223.872,55
EEA total grassland area		507.787,88		612.671,72		626.788,06		645.583,69	



Figure 6-7 - Grassland (permanent pastures and natural grassland) dynamic for selected EEA countries (countries providing data for the whole period of time) (CLC, 2012).