

available at www.sciencedirect.comwww.elsevier.com/locate/scitotenv

Review

Soil monitoring in Europe: A review of existing systems and requirements for harmonisation

X. Morvan^{a,b,*}, N.P.A. Saby^a, D. Arrouays^a, C. Le Bas^a, R.J.A. Jones^c, F.G.A. Verheijen^c, P.H. Bellamy^c, M. Stephens^c, M.G. Kibblewhite^c

^aINRA Orleans, Infosol Unit, US 1106, BP 20619, 45166 OLIVET Cedex, France

^bUniversity of Reims Champagne-Ardennes, Gegena Laboratory, EA3795, 51100 REIMS, France

^cCranfield University, Cranfield, Bedfordshire, MK43 0AL, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 9 August 2007

Received in revised form

8 October 2007

Accepted 15 October 2007

Available online 11 December 2007

Keywords:

Soil

Monitoring networks

Representativeness

Harmonisation

Europe

ABSTRACT

Official frameworks for soil monitoring exist in most member states of the European Union. However, the uniformity of methodologies and the scope of actual monitoring are variable between national systems. This review identifies the differences between existing systems, and describes options for harmonising soil monitoring in the Member States and some neighbouring countries of the European Union. The present geographical coverage is uneven between and within countries. In general, national and regional networks are much denser in northern and eastern regions than in southern Europe. The median coverage in the 50 km×50 km EMEP cells applied all over the European Union, is 300 km² for one monitoring site. Achieving such minimum density for the European Union would require 4100 new sites, mainly located in southern countries (Italy, Spain, Greece), parts of Poland, Germany, the Baltic countries, Norway, Finland and France. Options are discussed for harmonisation of site density, considering various risk area and soil quality indicator requirements.

© 2007 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Materials and methods	3
2.1. Soil monitoring networks in Europe	3
2.2. EU-wide databases	3
2.2.1. The European Soil Database	3
2.2.2. Corine Land Cover 2000.	3
2.2.3. Soil erosion risk estimates	3
2.2.4. Peat map.	4
2.2.5. Compaction risk.	4
2.2.6. Heavy metals deposition data	4

* Corresponding author. INRA Orléans, Unité Infosol, avenue de la pomme de pin, BP 20619, 45166 OLIVET Cedex, France. Tel.: +33 2 38 41 48 02; fax: +33 2 38 41 78 69.

E-mail address: xavier.morvan@orleans.inra.fr (X. Morvan).

2.2.7.	Population density	4
2.2.8.	Livestock	4
2.2.9.	Desertification map	4
2.3.	Analysis of representativeness	5
3.	Results and discussion	5
3.1.	Spatial coverage of the monitoring sites	5
3.2.	Spatial coverage based on soil mapping units and land cover	7
3.3.	Spatial coverage based on pressure data	7
3.4.	Indicators of soil threats	7
3.5.	Harmonisation of soil monitoring networks	7
4.	Conclusion	11
	Acknowledgements	11
	References	11

1. Introduction

Soil is a vital non-renewable resource providing essential support to ecosystems and to human life and society. Soils deliver valuable ecosystem goods and services (De Groot et al., 2002), e.g. nutrient release from soil organic matter; water storage and transfer (Lavelle and Spain, 2001); water filtering (Morvan et al., 2006, Weber and Miller, 1989); food security (Carvalho, 2006), cultural heritage, etc. Therefore, it is imperative to the environment and society that soil functions (Blum, 1993) and their quality are maintained. A proposal has been made for establishing a directive of the European Commission for a common strategy for the protection and sustainable use of soil (European Commission, 2006a).

Soil monitoring is the systematic determination of soil variables so as to record their temporal and spatial changes (FAO/ECE, 1994). Soil monitoring is essential for the early detection of changes in soil quality. Such early detection enables the design and implementation of policy measures to protect and maintain the sustainable use of soil so that it continues to deliver ecosystem goods and services. A Soil Monitoring Network (SMN) is defined here as a set of sites/areas where changes in soil characteristics are documented through periodic assessment of an extended set of soil parameters. The use of a harmonised methodology is essential to provide data which is comparable among sites and between countries. In this paper, we focus mainly on classical soil analytical measurements. It is appreciated that other approaches have been proposed, such as the use of 'proxy' indicators easily detectable by surveyors in the field. A typical example is the Land Use Land Cover Annual Survey (LUCAS) that includes some direct field observations on more than 1,000,000 observation points over Europe. However, the results from such surveys are crucially dependent on the expertise of the field surveyors and the harmonisation of the results.

The Communication of the European Commission 'Towards a Thematic Strategy for Soil Protection' identifies eight threats to Europe's soils (European Commission, 2002, 2006a,b; Van-Camp et al., 2004): soil erosion, decline in soil organic matter, soil contamination, soil sealing, soil compaction, decline in soil biodiversity, soil salinisation and landslides. We also considered desertification as a threat to soil in our study. Relevant measurable indicators of the threats to soil have been proposed (Table 1, after Huber et al., 2007).

The objective of this paper is to review existing SMNs in the Member States of the European Union (EU) and Norway, and to identify and describe options for harmonising soil monitoring in these countries. Therefore, in this paper, the soil monitoring network in Switzerland is not taken into account, although it is known to exist (Schmid et al., 2005; Bucheli et al., 2004). Considering the need to produce comparable and consistent results between countries, it is important that differences among EU SMNs are highlighted and that ways of overcoming them are identified. Using these data, we studied the representativeness of the spatial coverage of the monitoring sites in Europe. Using data on the extent of some environmental pressures which are relevant to soil threats and measured within the SMNs, we also studied the representativeness of the spatial coverage of sites in relation to these pressures.

Table 1 – Soil threats and their selected indicators

Soil threats	Main relevant indicators for SMN
Soil erosion	Estimated soil loss Measured soil loss
Decline of soil organic matter	Organic matter or organic carbon content Bulk density C:N ratio
Soil contamination	Heavy metal content pH Nutrients content
Soil sealing	Not relevant for SMN
Soil compaction	Bulk density Organic matter content Particle size distribution Soil water retention Saturated hydraulic conductivity Observation of soil structure
Decline of soil biodiversity	Earthworm diversity Collembola diversity Microbial respiration
Soil salinisation	Salt profile Electrical conductivity Exchangeable sodium percentage
Landslides	Not relevant for SMN
Desertification	Organic matter content Salt content Electrical conductivity

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4433059>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4433059>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)