European Commission

WG3 – Considering LPIS Characteristics

- Dealing with PG in IACS (the HV challenge)
- Changes in design can bring conformance (e.g. LF)
- Other measures that could be useful for LPIS QA

- What can EC offer more to support the LPIS implementation?

Moderator: Pavel Milenov / Rapporteur: Dominique Fasbender

European Commission

WG3 – Dealing with PG in LPIS QA

- EU MSs appreciate the option given in ETS with HV (+waiver E) in LPIS QA
  - Although each EU MS might use it differently
  - It allows the inherently required degree of flexibility
  - However, it does not work well in case of RP aggregation
- No particular needs for methods or tools to tackle PG in ETS
  - It is more a problem how to handle the PG in the IACS
- Classification correctness
  - Keep the checks only with respect to the presence of LC type and area, NOT location
  - Unaccounted presence of even a small grass strips or arable patch in the LPIS renders a RP of being non-conforming
    - Thresholds?, Waivers?

WG3 – Dealing with PG in IACS

- PG qualification
  - No problem to detect presence of natural PG, but the activity cannot be seen
  - Difficult to discriminate from one time snapshot (image) between managed (ploughed) PG and temporal grassland
  - Farmer might have different understanding of what PG is
  - Currently a change of the species of ploughed grassland might `dissqualify` a grassland as being permanent
- PG handling in the system
  - Difficult to deal with small changes of the PG parcels in the contact zones with AL parcels
  - Small parcels – RP subdivision based on LC might result in units bellow the minimum RP size

WG3 – Data inputs for PG

- Farmer declaration is the main source of information on the presence of PG in a given year in case of lack of orthophoto
  - Photos collected from OTSC and imagery from Google Earth are used as well
  - Any relevant information from third parties
- Sentinels not yet tested
  - Too coarse for area measurements, but can be useful to monitor PG ploughing

WG3 – Changes in design can bring conformance

- LPIS QA can provide evidence for presence of LPIS design issues
  - By changing the design LPIS QA issues can be resolved
    - critical defect, measurability
  - However, other issues might appear
    - contamination, classification correctness
- Role of mapping of GAEC LFs in ETS not entirely clear
  - How far this info is used by EC?
  - Difference in LFs treatment (if recorded as RP)
- LFs for GAEC and LFs for EFA
  - Conceptual gap exists
  - Who defines which are the GAEC LFs?
  - Who provides the instructions on how to identify GAEC LFs?

WG3 – Other measures that could be useful for LPIS QA

- No particular supplementary measures proposed
- EU MSs know well what their problems might be
  - LPIS QA helps them to understand the magnitude of the problem
  - It allows dealing with emerging issues in advance and prioritize the work
    - By applying trend analysis
- In the course of ETS, MS collect supplementary (more detailed) information they use in their analysis
  - Usually available in the ETS archive package

European Commission

WG3 – What can EC offer more to support the LPIS implementation?

- Keep LPIS QA stability – don't change
- More examples are needed
  - Mapping, Assessing, Reporting (also tools)
- Provide feedback on the quality of MTS reporting
- Tolerances/thresholds for small LC patches within the RP
- Simplification of the mapping procedures for GAEC LFs
  - NB: Role of the environmental authorities in their definition
- Dealing with Pro-rata
  - Same procedure during audits as the one used internally
- Temporal ineligibility
  - Not to trigger ETS non-conformities
- Follow-up on IACS data sharing

European Commission