

# IPA Action Group Rock glacier inventories and kinematics

Towards standard guidelines for inventorying rock glaciers

## **Baseline concepts**

*(Version 3.0)*



<https://www3.unifr.ch/geo/geomorphology/en/research/ipa-action-group-rock-glacier> (Action Group website)



## Authors and contributions

The document has been edited by Reynald Delaloye and Thomas Echelard (University of Fribourg, Switzerland) with the contribution of the participants at the workshop held in Evolène (Switzerland) on 23 -27 September 2019 (Amschwand, D., Arenson, L., Balestri, G., Barboux, C., Bodin, X., Bolch, T., Brardinoni, F., Cicoira, A., Cusicanqui, D., Darrow, M., Faria, S., Fernandes, M., Ferri Hidalgo, L., Gärtner-Roer, I., Hendrickx, H., Hu, Y., Huenante, J., Jones, N., Kellerer-Pirklbauer, A., Kummert, M., Lambiel, C., Lehmann, B., MacDonell, S., Martinez-Fernandez, A., Nötzli, J., Pellet, C., Popescu, R., Rouyet, L., Ruiz, L., Schoeneich, P., Scotti, R., Sirbu, F., Strozzi, T., Trombotto, D., Vivero, S., Wee, J., Winterberger, M.) as well as further members of the Action Group.

---

*The purpose of this document is to serve as a baseline for the establishment of practical guidelines permitting to inventory rock glaciers on a global scale.*

---

## Contents

Authors and contributions .....	1
Preamble .....	2
1. Purpose of standardized guidelines .....	3
2. Rock glacier inventory .....	4
a) Motivations for inventorying rock glaciers.....	4
b) Inventories achievement.....	5
3. Rock glaciers .....	5
a) Technical definition of rock glaciers .....	5
b) Rock glacier morphological system and units .....	6
c) Spatial connection of the rock glacier to the upslope unit(s) .....	7
d) Rock glacier activity .....	8
e) Rock glacier destabilization .....	10
f) Outlining rock glaciers .....	10
g) Differentiation of rock glaciers and debris-covered glaciers.....	11
4. Inventorying strategy .....	11
a) Detecting rock glaciers .....	12
b) Locating rock glaciers .....	12
c) Characterizing rock glaciers.....	12
d) Delineating rock glaciers .....	13



## Preamble

Rock glacier inventories have been set up for decades all around the world, yet without any real coordination, making their global assemblage and uniform completion not feasible. In the meantime, quantitative information about kinematics has been made available for numerous rock glaciers, particularly with the development of remote sensing techniques. The IPA (International Permafrost Association) Action Group *Rock glacier inventories and kinematics* (2018-2020) aims to **explore the feasibility of developing widely accepted standard guidelines for inventorying rock glaciers on a global scale, including information on their kinematics.**

Defining standard guidelines (task 1 of the Action Group) has been divided in three sub-tasks, namely:

- 1.1: definition of the main concepts and principles (present document),
- 1.2: establishment of *practical inventorying guidelines* (including worldwide examples),
- 1.3: establishment of a *technical (operational) manual*, on how to implement a rock glacier inventory in an open-access database.

The present document (**version 3.0**) is intending to set the necessary **baseline concepts** for inventorying rock glaciers at a global scale (sub-task 1.1). Its content is the result of a preparatory workshop held in Chambéry (France) on 23 March 2019, comments received about the workshop wrap-up, further informal meetings and discussions between participants of the Chambéry meeting, [comments](#) received on [version 1.0](#) until 15 August 2019 and the revision of [version 2.0](#) during the international workshop held in Evolène (Switzerland) on 23-27 September 2019.

Most of the proposed concepts have been discussed and agreed upon by the participants at the Evolène workshop, but some may be still subject to comment and adaptation. Any input as well as any further suggestion for improving the clarity of the document are warmly welcome **until 15 December 2019** using the dedicated boxes inserted at the end of each section.

The former additional remarks by the authors, which were inserted between paragraphs in the previous versions have been either integrated in the document, or transferred toward the *practical inventorying guidelines* document, or simply deleted.

The illustrations have been removed as well at this stage, but are still accessible via the previous version of this document. A call for “best illustrating” rock glaciers will be launched at a later stage for integration in the final version (4.0) or in the *practical inventorying guidelines* document.

### Provisional timeline

- The current document (**version 3.0**) is open to comment until 15 December 2019, using the dedicated boxes inserted at the end of each section.
- The final version (4.0) is intended to be submitted for approbation in January/February 2020.
- The **practical guidelines** for inventorying rock glaciers (sub-task 1.2) and a **glossary** will be compiled at a later stage starting in 2020 on the basis of version 4.0 of the baseline concepts. Many technical details have already been settled during the Workshop I and will be further detailed in these *practical inventorying guidelines*.

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 0](#)



## 1. Purpose of standardized guidelines

Today, although many (published or unpublished) regional rock glacier inventories exist, they are not exhaustive worldwide. Existing rock glacier inventories have different ages and have been compiled using different methodologies, which mainly depend on the quality and availability of source data (e.g. satellite imagery), as well on the varying objectives that motivated each single study. For these reasons, merging all inventories in a fully coherent way is presently not possible.

The increasing emergence of open-access satellite imagery (e.g. optical, SAR) facilitates the set-up of new inventories and/or the update of the former ones. Current increasing availability of remotely sensed data (e.g. Sentinel SAR) makes an almost systematic integration of kinematic attributes in a rock glacier inventory potentially feasible.

Inventorying rock glaciers is a manual (visual) procedure, which cannot be automatized yet and requires geomorphological expertise by the operator(s). Identifying and characterizing rock glaciers has often led to various and sometimes controversial opinions due to the complexity of morphologies (e.g. multiple generations, coalescent landforms, heterogeneous dynamics, interaction with glacier) and the diversity of environments in which rock glaciers have developed. In order to overcome any endless discussion, it must be accepted that subjectivity is part of the action of recognizing rock glaciers, and will continue to be so. Establishing standard guidelines aims at minimizing its impact. It could even be envisaged that an increasing number of manually identified rock glaciers based on a widely accepted standard would support the development of automatic techniques (e.g. deep learning) as a complementary tool to compile inventories.

Previous glacier-oriented initiatives such as the World Glacier Inventory (WGI) or Global Land Ice Measurements from Space (GLIMS) tried to include rock glaciers but have not succeeded in being systematic and homogeneous. It has been in particular difficult to properly include rock glaciers due to the complexity of detecting them automatically by remote sensing (GLIMS methodology).

Inventorying rock glaciers requires the latter to be specifically defined in this purpose: what is a rock glacier inventory effectively inventorying and why? Therefore, the motivation for producing a rock glacier inventory and later the way of exploiting it (by a third user) within the framework of another study may (have) strongly differ(ed).

The set-up of widely accepted standard guidelines including kinematical information is becoming an urgent task to be fulfilled by the scientific community of concern. It will serve the compilation of new regional inventories and the adaptation of existing ones, hence leading – as a final objective – to the merging of all inventories in a more homogeneous open-access worldwide database. Standard guidelines should also help to avoid or at least minimize potential discrepancies between various usages of rock glacier datasets.

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 1](#)



## 2. Rock glacier inventory

### a) Motivations for inventorying rock glaciers

Rock glaciers are characteristic landforms associated to mountainous periglacial landscape. They are prevalent periglacial items of the Earth geomorphological heritage. However, their identification can be challenging, especially for people lacking experience and knowledge in the field of mountain geomorphology. Therefore, **inventorying rock glaciers allows their visibility**.

Scientific motivations for producing and/or for exploiting an exhaustive rock glacier inventory (at various scales) can be summarized as follows:

- *Geomorphological mapping*: rock glaciers are identified and mapped as *functional* or *inherited (relict)* landforms (items) of the geomorphological landscape: they are part of the mountain sediment cascade and as such, contribute to control the pace of periglacial mountain landscape evolution. Enhancing the value of geomorphological heritage could also be the main motivation to realize a rock glacier inventory.
- *Proxy for permafrost occurrence*: functional rock glaciers are geomorphological indicators of the occurrence of permafrost conditions. Even if it is accepted that functional rock glaciers may export perennially frozen ground outside of a permafrost prone area, they can be used for approximating the regional lower limit of the mountain “discontinuous” permafrost belt and to validate spatial models of permafrost extent, whereas relict rock glaciers are discriminative items for current non-permafrost areas. It must be carefully taken into consideration that functional rock glaciers attest the occurrence of permafrost at depth, but with regards to the ongoing climate change, may gradually no longer attest that the surface conditions are still favorable for permafrost to potentially occur.
- *Paleo-climate studies*: relict rock glaciers in particular can be used as proxies for various paleo-permafrost extents. The distinction between a relict state and a functional state is often difficult to assess, particularly in case of coalescent landforms, making a strict delimitation between what should be inventoried or not very difficult to be set, and thus the integration of relict landforms in a global inventory indispensable.
- *Climate relevant variable*: rock glacier movement is particularly sensitive to changing permafrost temperature. Repeating (updating) inventories of functional rock glaciers which include a temporally well-defined kinematical information can be used to regionally assess the impact of ongoing climate change on the mountain periglacial environment.
- *Hydrological significance*: functional rock glaciers are, by nature, ice (and water) storage features, which may play a role on the hydrological regime of river/stream catchments of concern, especially in dry areas. Rock glacier inventories have been set up and/or used in particular for estimating their regional water-equivalent significance. In addition to being ice storage features, rock glaciers can affect water transit time and water chemistry in a catchment.
- *Geohazards*: functional rock glaciers may be the source of direct or indirect hazard phenomena (e.g. destabilization, conveying of loose debris into a debris flow prone gully) that may threaten an anthropogenic environment (e.g. transport infrastructures, buildings, livelihoods). Rock glacier inventories and related kinematic data can be used to locate and assess some potential geohazards at local to regional scales. It must be noted that in the context of infrastructure construction/maintenance, using a rock glacier inventory will not be enough to fully understand the issues related to permafrost. However, it may provide clues for assessing the occurrence (or not) of permafrost in the study area.



It is very important to note that the **motivation for producing and later for exploiting an inventory by a third user may (have) strongly differ(ed)**. Standardized guidelines should help to avoid or at least to minimize potential discrepancies.

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 2a](#)

### b) Inventories achievement

Two main approaches have been commonly used for inventorying rock glaciers:

- **Geomorphological approach:** rock glacier features are recognized by a systematic visual inspection of the (imaged) landscape and DEM-derived products, whereas surface texture and morphometric analysis could also be used. This is the classical approach, also locally based on field visits. It allows the production of exhaustive inventories of moving and non-moving landforms, whose discrimination (activity classes) is primarily based on morphological characteristics. LIDAR-DEM surveys, upon availability, facilitates the identification of (relict) rock glaciers in forested areas.
- **Kinematical approach:** moving areas, which may be temporally and spatially heterogeneous, on rock glaciers are detected using multi-temporal remotely sensed data (e.g. SAR-derived products, multi-temporal airborne LIDAR, high resolution optical satellite and aerial images). The typology assessment (rock glacier discrimination) is then mainly performed by the recognition of the association of rock glacier feature(s) to a moving area on optical images. This approach is limited to the non-exhaustive identification (and delimitation) of moving areas on rock glaciers, whereas relict rock glaciers, for instance, are missed. It provides quantitative data for evaluating the motion rate of rock glaciers and allows also the identification of moving areas, which cannot be morphologically related to a rock glacier (but which can be driven – or not – by a permafrost creep process).

While these two approaches yield different resulting inventories, both are complementary and the *practical inventorying guidelines* (task 1.2) must have to make them as far as possible compatible.

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 2b](#)

## 3. Rock glaciers

### a) Technical definition of rock glaciers

The present definition (also called working definition) is exclusively addressed to frame the objects of concern by a rock glacier inventory, beyond any controversy about rock glacier genesis, origin of ice, etc. The present technical definition relies on the most common geomorphological evidences allowing the identification of rock glaciers in the landscape.

**Rock glaciers are debris landforms generated by a former or current gravity-driven creep of permafrost, detectable in the landscape with the following morphology: front, lateral margins and optionally ridge and furrow topography.** In a geomorphological slope sequence, rock glaciers are (or





were) landforms conveying debris from an upslope unit (source area or rooting zone) towards their front. The debris grain size is not specified and can be various.

- Geomorphological criteria :
  - **Front** (mandatory criterion): a discernable talus delimiting the terminal part of a (former) moving area overriding a non- or less-moving terrain and, when non-eroded, drawing a convex morphology perpendicular to the principal (former) flow direction. For a rock glacier developing in a steep slope, the front may nevertheless be difficult to be recognized.
  - **Lateral margins** (mandatory criterion): discernible lateral continuation of the front. Lateral margins may nevertheless be absent in particular in the upper part of the landform.
  - **Ridge-and-furrow topography** (optional criterion): pronounced convex downslope or longitudinal surface undulations associated with (former) compressive flow.

The threshold for the minimum rock glacier size applied for an inventory to be included into a global compilation must be 0.01 km<sup>2</sup>. Inventories at higher resolutions are encouraged.

### ***Avoiding confusion with other geomorphological features***

It must be specified that without the knowledge of the environmental context and/or for non-specialists, some landforms may express rock glacier morphology (e.g. solifluction lobe, earthflow, lava flow) leading to possible confusion.

Permafrost creeping areas that can be detected as moving (kinematic approach) but that do not express a morphology of rock glacier (as it is for many push-moraines and for frozen debris lobes) are also excluded from this definition. Therefore a rock glacier inventory is an inventory of rock glacier landforms and neither of any ground ice occurrences, nor of any mountain permafrost-related landforms.

Rock glaciers should also not be confused with debris-covered glaciers that are glaciers where (the terminal) part of the ablation zone has a continuous cover of supraglacial debris. In some cases, the transition from glacier to debris-covered glacier and possibly rock glacier is continuous and challenging to define (cf. section 3c).

Do you have any comment about the previous section or counter example? Please use this box.

[Comment box 3a](#)

### ***b) Rock glacier morphological system and units***

Rock glaciers with complicated morphology (e.g. multiple generations, multiple lobes, coalescent lobes, heterogeneous dynamics) are common and difficult to characterize unequivocally. Solving the depiction issues requires the use of an imbricated **system of units**:

- **Rock glacier system**: landform identified as rock glacier according to the technical definition in section a), which is composed of either a single or multiple *rock glacier unit(s)* that are for the latter spatially connected (in a toposequence or in coalescence).
- **Rock glacier unit**: single rock glacier landform that can be unambiguously discerned according to the technical definition in section a) and, in case of spatial connection, can be differentiated from other rock glacier units according to the following non-cumulative criteria:



- morphological and land cover attributes suggest a distinct generation of formation (e.g. overlapping lobes),
- connection(s) to the upslope unit can be discriminated (see section c),
- activity is clearly differing.

A rock glacier unit is basically consisting of a single lobate structure, otherwise it is classified as **composite** (multiple lobes). In the latter case, it is composed **rock glacier sub-units**, which in turn could be single or composite features. The morphological aspect of a rock glacier (sub-)unit can be **simple** or **complex**. Overridden (sub-)units are only partially visible and must be considered as so when characterized.

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 3b](#)

### *c) Spatial connection of the rock glacier to the upslope unit(s)*

The geomorphological unit located directly upslope of a rock glacier system can hold implications on its characterization (e.g. internal structure and composition, ice origin, ice content), as well as the designation of attributes (e.g. landform outlining, definition of the rooting zone). The focus is set on spatial (structural) connection because it is most of the time discernable on optical images. The spatial connection of the upslope unit to the rock glacier does not necessarily mean that there is a dynamic and/or genetic connection. The term “derived” is not used because it implies an interpretation on the origin of both debris and/or ice.

- **Talus-connected** - Continuous sequence headwall – talus slope – rock glacier (sometimes the talus slope is almost lacking): the rock glacier unit is subjacent and connected to a talus slope unit which is dominantly fed by rock fall activity but also by surface runoff, debris flow and/or avalanche events from the headwall unit. The sediment transfer throughout the talus slope unit can be caused by various and imbricated processes. The connection area between the talus and the rock glacier is often characterized by a concave morphology, where the episodic to frequent occurrence of long-lasting avalanche cones, snow/ice patches or even relatively small glaciers (paying regard to the extent of the rock glacier) are possible during the lifetime of the rock glacier. The development of a glacier in the rooting zone may imply, in its absence, the lack of any efficient connection between the upslope unit and the rock glacier. The rock glacier of concern is still classified as talus-connected.

Protalus ramparts are included in this category as “embryonic” rock glaciers if they are related to permafrost creep. They should not be confused with protalus related to snow accumulation.

- **Debris-mantled slope-connected** - Absence of any (significant) headwall: the debris are dominantly produced by in-situ bedrock weathering (debris mantle) and gradually put into motion by shallow mass movement processes (e.g. solifluction) before developing into a rock glacier feature.
- **Landslide-connected** – The rock glacier is located in direct downslope spatial connection to a landslide (i.e. rock or debris slide) or superimposed to a landslide (i.e. deep-seated slope deformation). The talus slope unit is usually lacking where the mass movement is developing upslope of the rock glacier.
- **Glacier-connected** - Continuity from a (debris-covered) glacier or ice patch to a rock glacier feature (debris-covered glacier-to-rock glacier transition). Delimitation between the glacier or





the ice patch section and the rock glacier section is not feasible without further direct or geophysical prospection. Embedding of glacier ice within the rock glacier is likely to occur. Morphological indices evidencing the presence of a debris-covered glacier upslope of the apparent rock glacier feature can be observed (crevasses, thermokarst, meltwater channels, etc.).

- **Glacier forefield-connected** – Interaction between a glacier or ice patch and the rock glacier feature is prevalent, but essentially restricted to phases of glacier advance (e.g. Little Ice Age). Embedding of glacier ice within the rock glacier is possible. When retreating (e.g. a common pattern nowadays), the glacier has disconnected from the rock glacier or may have completely disappeared. This category includes till-derived rock glaciers (corresponds to the classical debris rock glacier definition) and push-moraines (glacitectedonized frozen sediments).
- **Other** – Other type of geomorphological sequence related to a rock glacier landform.
- **Poly-connected** – Two or more upslope connections (e.g. talus and glacier connected). The use of poly-connected should be restricted to cases where there is no large dominance of one type of upslope connection.

An attribute value defining if the rock glacier is currently connected or not to the upslope unit must be added.

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 3c](#)

#### d) Rock glacier activity

##### **Background**

The activity of rock glaciers was conceptually and classically categorized regarding the presumed flow behavior and in consequence the ice occurrence. Primarily based on the visual observation of morphological and vegetation-related indicators (that differ locally to regionally due to lithological and climatic settings) rock glaciers have been commonly classified into the following categories of activity:

- Intact:
  - Active : rock glaciers (with excessive ice) which are in effective motion
  - Inactive: rock glaciers that remain (almost) motionless (but contain ice)
- Relict: rock glaciers that have stopped moving often several hundreds to thousands of years ago due to the loss of (almost) all their ice content.

Regional inventories of rock glaciers have been historically achieved using a *geomorphological approach*. Measurements (in-situ or remotely sensed) as well as valuable field visits have remained almost occasional. With this approach, the activity attribution has always been a highly subjective task depending on the “operators’ skills”. Thanks to the development of operational procedures to the rock glacier surface motion from remote sensing technics in particular (e.g. photogrammetry, satellite-borne InSAR), kinematical information can be obtained for a large majority of rock glaciers, allowing potentially finer categorizations of rock glacier activity to be developed.

Whereas the classical categorization was considering the activity rate of rock glaciers as almost constant over the long-term (decades to centuries), the observations on the rock glacier kinematical behavior in particular in the European Alps have shown that an acceleration by a factor 2 to 10 of the



surface velocities between the 1980s and the 2010s has been a common feature, probably in response to increased permafrost temperature resulting from warmer air temperature. Whereas a significant majority of the rock glaciers follows this regional trend, some single features experience singular behaviors (e.g. reactivation, rapid acceleration, destabilization or decrease in velocity). In cold permafrost regions (e.g. Arctic or high altitude Andes), heavily frozen rock glaciers, which are almost not moving or only very slowly, may be expected to accelerate significantly if a warming occurs.

These scientific advances have suggested to explore the necessity of redefining and/or refining the categorization of rock glacier activity. It has resulted in both a partial renewal of the categorization and the integration of any areal or point kinematical data as supplementary attributes.

### ***Updated categorization of activity***

The following renewed conceptual categorization of rock glaciers activity refers exclusively to the efficiency of the sediment conveying (expressed by the surface movement) at a time of observation and should not be used to infer about any ground ice content. The categories are still based on geomorphological indicators, which have to be adapted regionally (or contextually). If areal or point kinematical data is available, it is integrated as a supplementary attribute and must be considered to assign the category of activity, which are defined as follow:

- ***Active***: rock glaciers that move downslope in most of their surface.
  - If no kinematic data is available: active rock glaciers show morphologic signs of downslope movement such as steep fronts (steeper than the angle of repose) and eventually lateral margins with freshly exposed material on top.
  - If kinematic data is available: rock glaciers that show coherent movement downslope over most of their surface. As an indication, displacement rate can range between a decimeter to several meters per year in an annual mean.
- ***Transitional***: rock glaciers with low movements only detectable by measurement and/or restricted to area(s) of non-dominant extent. According to the topographic and/or climatic context, transitional rock glaciers can either evolve towards either a relict (degraded) or an active state.
  - If no kinematic data is available: transitional rock glaciers have less distinct morphologic signs of current downslope movement than active rock glaciers in the same regional context.
  - If kinematic data is available: rock glaciers that show little to no downslope movement over most of their surface. As an indication, displacement rate is less than a decimeter per year in an annual mean on most of the rock glacier.
- ***Relict***: rock glaciers with no detectable movement and no morphological evidence of recent movement and/or ice content.
  - If no kinematic data is available: there is no morphological evidence of recent movement. The relict state could also be indicated by vegetation and soil cover patterns (e.g. lichen, grass, forest), subdued topography, ice collapse structure, and smoothed lateral and frontal slopes/margins. Relict rock glaciers are generally found at lower elevation than the active ones.
  - If kinematic data is available: rock glaciers that show no downslope movement over most of their surface, and the characteristics as described above. Downslope movement must not be confused with subsidence.
- ***Undefined***: inadequate data for discriminating between the activity classes.



Any activity assessment must be dated and defined (i.e. based on geomorphological clues only or supported by kinematic data).

The details about the implementation and/or use of kinematic data in a standardized inventory will be developed in the *practical inventorying guidelines*.

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 3d](#)

### e) Rock glacier destabilization

The motion rate of some rock glaciers may be characterized by a drastic acceleration that can bring the landform, or a part of it, to behave abnormally fast (i.e. not following the regional trend anymore) for several years at least. The term **destabilization** has been progressively used since the 2000s to refer to rock glaciers with obvious signals of abnormally fast behavior, which can be expressed geomorphologically by the opening of large cracks and/or scarps.

Destabilized rock glaciers are generally characterized by a significant acceleration phase, followed by a high velocity phase and finally a deceleration phase. A destabilization morphology can be preserved for a long time at the surface of a rock glacier, without the latter being still in high velocity phase. Whereas the destabilization morphology can be documented in an inventory as an evidence of a current or past destabilization phase, an actual state of destabilization can only rely on kinematic data. Rock glaciers experiencing an ongoing destabilization phase are constituting a sub-category of active rock glaciers and must be inventoried as such.

Geomorphological features including large scarps and/or cracks in particular, allow the recognition of a rock glacier as having been or being in a destabilization phase. Multiannual time series showing displacement rates of several meters per year and migrating out of the regional trend (if known) attest among others on the actual destabilization phase of a rock glacier.

---

*In a geotechnical perspective in particular, the term “destabilization” may be incorrect. During the workshop I, the term “hyperactive” has been proposed in replacement (the definition will remain the same), but was not unanimously accepted. We need to know the overall opinion of the community of concern: [Click here to give your opinion](#).*

---

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 3e](#)

### f) Outlining rock glaciers

Technically defining a rock glacier as a landform implies an outlining task and for various practical issues (e.g. area calculation) it has to be a closed polygon. The operation retains some degree of subjectivity, i.e. is dependent of the “operator”. It has been shown that the “operators’ mapping styles” may highly differ, which consequently impact significantly the exploitation of any rock glacier inventory data as for instance the basin-wide rock glacier density, rock glacier specific area as well as maximum and minimum rock glacier elevation, which therefore interfere directly, for example, with



altitudinal thresholds for modelling past or present occurrence of discontinuous mountain permafrost and with first-order assessment of inherent water content. Therefore, “outlining rules” must be clearly defined in order to minimize the subjectivity of the task as much as possible. Nevertheless, if boundaries are uncertain, it should be specified and highlighted in the database.

In order to fulfill all inventorying motivations (*c.f.* section 2.a), two ways of delineating rock glacier boundaries are recommended to be included as standards: the ***extended*** and the ***restricted geomorphological footprint***. If only one footprint is chosen, it needs to be clearly specified which one it is.

- ***Extended geomorphological footprint***: the outline embeds the entire rock glacier body up to the rooting zone and includes the external parts (front and lateral margins).
- ***Restricted geomorphological footprint***: the outline embeds the entire rock glacier body up to the rooting zone and excludes the external parts (front and lateral margins).

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 3f](#)

#### *g) Differentiation of rock glaciers and debris-covered glaciers*

Rock glaciers, as landforms resulting of a permafrost creep process, should not be confused with debris-covered glaciers. There are two main configurations that can lead to a misconception: either the entire glacier landform is confused with a rock glacier (or the reverse), or the rock glacier is located at the end of a glacier in a debris-covered glacier-to-rock glacier sequence (*c.f.* section 3.c, glacier-connected) and is difficult to be recognized/delineated unambiguously in the absence of direct observation at depth.

An arbitrary separation between rock glaciers and debris-covered glaciers can be based on morphological and textural criteria. A “checklist table” will be designed in the *practical inventorying guidelines* helping the distinction.

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 3g](#)

## 4. Inventorying strategy

Proceeding to a rock glacier inventory implies the next steps to be followed:

- Recognition of landforms (system/unit(s)) to be inventoried (*i.e. detecting rock glaciers*)
- Attribution of a unique identifier code (ID attribution) and georeferencing (*i.e. locating rock glaciers*)
- Attribution of characteristics (attributes), including kinematical information if available (*i.e. characterizing rock glaciers*)
- Outlining (*i.e. delineating rock glaciers*)



The detailed procedure for inventorying rock glaciers will be described in the *practical inventorying guidelines*, but the baseline concepts are provided hereafter.

#### a) *Detecting rock glaciers*

Detecting rock glaciers consists **primarily in recognizing landforms** (rock glacier systems and related unit(s)) according to the technical definition proposed in section 3a. It could be basically performed on ortho-imagery as well as DEM-derived products, but also with the help of kinematical data (e.g. InSAR) as a complementary approach.

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 4a](#)

#### b) *Locating rock glaciers*

Any rock glacier system and related unit(s) must be identified by a **primary marker** (primary ID). The marker is a **point** whose associated **primary attributes** allow to:

- locate the rock glacier (system/unit(s)) (georeferencing),
- discriminate it clearly from other rock glacier system/unit(s),
- associate unambiguously a rock glacier system to it(s) constituting unit(s), and vice-versa.

Any other information related to a rock glacier system/unit can then be linked to the primary marker of concern.

The positioning of the point on the rock glacier should avoid, as far as possible, any (frequent) temporal updating. It should not refer to anything else than the three identifying aspects listed above.

In case of a composite rock glacier system (*c.f.* section 3.b), the scale of discrimination between units depends of the study motivation(s), the operator, the available data and the complexity of the landform (in particular for relict rock glaciers for which interpretation is complicated by vegetation and/or time/erosion), a **multi-level (-tiered) system of marking** has to be adopted. It is expected that 3 or 4 levels will be enough for the trickiest cases, but it is basically not restricted.

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 4b](#)

#### c) *Characterizing rock glaciers*

Rock glacier characteristics are attributed to each rock glacier unit (*c.f.* section 3.b) defined by a primary marker (e.g. connection to upslope unit, activity), regardless the unit level.

“Unknown” or “undefined” should be used more frequently than today in case of obvious uncertainty in characterizing rock glaciers.

Areal or point-related kinematic data could be integrated as supplementary data associated to the primary markers, but not necessarily describing the same entire area. Specific guidelines are in preparation within the framework of ESA CCI+ Permafrost – Options Mountain Permafrost (2019-2021).



Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 4c](#)

#### *d) Delineating rock glaciers*

Specifics for delineating the boundaries (outlines) of a rock glacier will be provided in the *practical inventorying guideline*. Bounding rules for drawing the extended and restricted footprints have to be defined specifically for each category of *connection to the upslope unit(s)* and to be followed as strictly as possible. Any pre-existing bounding which is not fitting with the defined rules should not be included in a standardized global inventory.

Do you have any comment about the previous section? Please use this box.

[Comment box 4d](#)

---