



Greening session: questions & answers

Joint
Research
Centre

2014 LPIS Workshop
Brussels, 22-24 April 2014



DISCLAIMER

This presentation has been prepared by JRC staff together with DG AGRI staff in order to facilitate the discussion on the Greening in the LPIS 2014 Workshop. The feasibility of the approach is still being assessed. This document cannot in any circumstances be regarded as the official position of the Commission.

Joint
Research
Centre

2



Q: how shall the decimal rounded up for EFA area?

All measurements and calculation rounded in meter for addition, reporting in ha 2 decimals

Q: how shall EFA elements between two farmers be declared?

At the rate of disposal of the farmer.

Q: if a MS applies conversion factors, shall only length and width be controlled and not the area?

Yes and be consistent with your definition and LPIS implementation



Q: Shall the farmer mark on application all EFA areas or only the ones to reach 5%? Shall the farmer locate newly established EFA each year?

5% is enough, but it would be safer if he declares a bit more.

Q: Is an attribute enough to register areas with catch crops or green cover, nitrogen-fixing crops and land lying fallow?

No, according to Article 16 of draft IA IACS the size, type and location of the EFA needs to be declared with the geo-spatial application.

Q: Use of orthoimagery to identify/measure EFA elements. Is there a list of elements that can be identified only with orthoimagery?

No answer possible at European scale: adapt to your applicable eligibility profile

Q: shall a measurement of a parcel be capped to the digitised boundary?

Yes, under the geospatial application.

Q: Will be the digitised EFA considered as Inspire data?

GAEC Landscapes feature are probably directly attributable to an INSPIRE theme, however the EFA layer, as the LPIS Reference Parcels, is not uniquely linked to an INSPIRE theme.

Q: How shall the information on LFA, Natura2000 and Water directive be integrated in the LPIS? Only visible layers? Information for the farmers? Information for the controller?

The data in IACS must be interoperable, hence topological conditions and other business logic must be implemented considering the scale differences. They shall constitute information to be used by the farmers and by controllers.

Q: Can the validation procedure for imagery be entirely or partially replaced by the criteria included in contract for purchasing imagery?

Image specifications do not necessarily constitute image validation results. However the validation can be subcontracted.

Q: Is the validation procedure required for each imagery product used? (e.g. in the same MS: ortho-springtime, ortho-summertime, VHR-springtime, VHR-summertime)

Only for the products/sensor which are used to determine areas. In most cases, the eligible hectares at the disposal of the farmer at time of application.
The validation of the sensor is sufficient.

Q: If the same type of imagery comes from different contractors in different part of a country, is the validation procedure required for each product from each contractor?

Yes, because different production processes lie behind their products. This applies also if different photo equipment etc.

Q: Depending on both time of year and path, the VHR-imagery from each satellite might have differences in angle of inclination and therefore the imagery could be interpreted differently in the validation test depending on which product used in the test. Should this factor be ignored?

The factor can be ignored, one can assume that the different incidence angles within the profile are equivalent

Q: Should the validation procedure be conducted again each year on all imagery products or only on new products?

New validation only if the sensor or ortho-procedure has changed



Q: If no validation test at all has been conducted so far on orthoimagery, should the member state conduct a validation test on all older imagery or only on new, future products?

No, only on the new conditions.

Q: Would it be possible to conduct a common validation (e.g. by JRC) each year for VHR imagery from the same satellites that replaces individual validation by the MS?

No, local conditions (latitude, landscape) are not homogeneous over Europe.

Q: In various imagery products you might experience various inaccuracy in different parts of the map. Should this be taken into account when pointing out the validation test parcels?

If the validation is done on a representative sample, these variations are accounted for in the procedure. If local imagery is outside specification, obviously, it cannot be used.