

Different approaches to soil monitoring: comparison between national soil information monitoring systems (N-SIMS) and LUCAS soil

E. Tondini, Claire Froger, Dominique Arrouays, Katrien Oorts, Christopher Poeplau, Johanna Wetterlind, E. Putku, Nicolas P. A. Saby, M. Fantappie, Claire Chenu, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

E. Tondini, Claire Froger, Dominique Arrouays, Katrien Oorts, Christopher Poeplau, et al.. Different approaches to soil monitoring: comparison between national soil information monitoring systems (N-SIMS) and LUCAS soil. Centennial Celebration and Congress of the International Union of Soil Sciences, IUSS (International Union of Soil Sciences), May 2024, Florence, Italy. hal-04634033

HAL Id: hal-04634033 https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-04634033

Submitted on 3 Jul 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



ORAL PRESENTATIONS

ID ABS WEB: 137918

4. Soil health in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals 4.27 133609 - How will we monitor soils in the coming century?

DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO SOIL MONITORING: COMPARISON BETWEEN NATIONAL SOIL INFORMATION MONITORING SYSTEM (N-SIMS) AND LUCAS SOIL

<u>E TONDINI</u>¹, C FROGER ², D ARROUAYS ², K OORTS ³, C POEPLAU ⁴, J WETTERLIND ⁵, E PUTKU ⁶, N SABY ², M FANTAPPIE' ¹, C CHENU ⁷, J SALOMEZ ³, S CALLEWAERT ³, F VANWINDEKENS ⁸, B HUYGHEBAERT ⁸, J HENRICKX ⁸, S HEILEK ⁴, L. S. HARBO ^{9,4}, L DE CARVALHO GOMES ⁹, A L LÓPEZ ¹⁰, J. A. RODRIGUEZ ¹⁰, S PINDRAL ¹¹, B SMRECZAK ¹¹, A BENÕ ¹², Z BAKACSI ¹², K TEULING ¹³, F VAN EGMOND ¹³, V HUTÁR ¹⁴, B PALKA ¹⁴, D ABRAHAM ¹⁴, A BISPO ²

¹ Council for Agricultural Research and Economics, Florence, ITALY

- ² Institute National de la Recherche Agronomique Info&Sols, Orleans, FRANCE
- ³ VPO Departement Omgeving, Antwerp, BELGIUM
- ⁴ Thünen Institute of Climate-Smart Agriculture, Braunschweig, GERMANY
- ⁵ Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Skara, SWEDEN
- ⁶ Centre of Estonian Rural Research and Knowledge (METK), Tartu, ESTONIA
- ⁷ Institute National de la Recherche Agronomique, AgroParisTech, Palaiseau,, FRANCE
- ⁸ Center Wallon de Recherches Agronomique, Gembloux, BELGIUM
- ⁹ 9Aarhus University Department of Agroecology, Slagelse, Denmark
- ¹⁰ Spanish National Research Council, Madrid,, SPAIN
- ¹¹ 11Institute of Soil Science and Plant Cultivation, Pu³awy, POLAND
- ¹² Institute for Soil Sciences, Centre for Agricultural Research, Martonvásár, HUNGARY
- ¹³ Wageningen Environmental Research, Wageningen, the Netherlands
- ¹⁴ National Agricultural and Food Centre (NPPC), Bratislava, Slovakia

The EU Soil Strategy for 2030 and the Proposal for a Directive on Soil Monitoring and Resilience aim to achieve healthy soils by 2050. This information is currently provided at European level by LUCAS soil survey and nationally through monitoring networks (N-SIMS) developed individually by each member state with different approaches. In this context, integrating data from diverse sources (i.e. LUCAS soil and N-SIMS) is essential.

Under the EJPSOIL programme, twelve countries employed a common methodology to compare their N-SIMS to LUCAS Soil in terms of sampling strategy and representativeness of land use and soil types. This analysis revealed significant disparities in monitoring strategies, including variations in sampling design, monitored land cover, and sampling depth. While most N-SIMS and LUCAS Soil used a stratified random sampling design, some N-SIMS employed a regular grid approach. Sampling depth varied across countries, with some using fixed depth intervals and others opting for soil horizons sampling, while LUCAS Soil sampled topsoil at O–20 cm depth (O-30cm in LUCAS 2022). Site density was generally higher in N-SIMS than in LUCAS Soil, with some cases exhibiting a difference of one order of magnitude. The significant increase in the number of sites in the LUCAS Soil 2022 campaign partially filled this gap. The spatial distribution of N-SIMS appeared more homogeneous than LUCAS Soil, especially in countries like France and Spain where N-SIMS followed a grid-based system and in regions with extensive mountainous areas systematically excluded by LUCAS Soil. Comparisons of site proportions in different soil types or land cover classes indicated that N-SIMS results were more aligned with the current estimated proportions (calculated by using Corinne Land Cover and WPR

WRB, respectively) compared to LUCAS Soil. However, both methods exhibited significant variations from current estimated proportions. This work underscores differences in sampling protocols and representativeness among N-SIMS and between N-SIMS and LUCAS Soil. This is a preparatory work towards the soil properties comparisons among soil monitoring programs.

Keywords: Soil monitoring networks,LUCAS soil survey,Sampling strategies