

Assessment of Forest Fire Weather Index at National Level

Donghyun Kim^{1,2}

¹Ecosystem Services and Management, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA),
Schlossplatz 1 - A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria

²Dept. Fire & Disaster Protection Engineering, Changshin University, 51352, Republic of Korea

Abstract: Probability of ignition, extent, severity of forest fire, and the following damage largely depend on weather conditions. To create accurate forest fire control systems, studies on Fire Weather Index (FWI) have been performed all around the world on the national or regional scale. This study compared and analyzed sixteen existing FWI's, and most appropriate five of them were evaluated to see if they would be applicable to Korea. During the process, the study also proposes a formula for estimating annual Forest Fire Occurrence Danger Index based on statistics of forest fire in Rep. of Korea. Meteorological factors applied to the sixteen FWI collected and surveyed around the world include wind, temperature, relative humidity, effective humidity, rainfall, vapor saturation pressure, potential evapotranspiration and dew point. The risk level estimated based on FWI values is generally divided into five classes. After the application of the five FWI to forest area of Republic of Korea, it was found that the risk level of forest fire in Republic of Korea was 2 to 3 classes lower than in countries where these indexes were introduced, and the fire-prone season was different. There was statistical significant correlation between risk indices and meteorological factors based on statistics of forest fire including wind velocity, relative humidity and effective humidity, while temperature did not show any significance. Results of the study present important information for further development of a more appropriate FWI for Republic of Korea.

Keywords: forest fires, fire weather index (FWI), fuel moisture contents (FMC), drought index, national level

1. Introduction

Forest fire is among the major natural disasters as it not only destroy forests but threatens people's lives and properties. Recently, the importance of forests has been growing, especially in association with climate changes and biodiversity. Forest fires can have many serious negative impacts on human life & safety (Viegas, 2002), health (Schwela et al., 1999; Heil and Goldammer, 2001; Kunii et al., 2002; Sastry, 2002), regional economies (e.g., Glover and Jessop, 1999), and global climate change (Crutzen and Goldammer, 1993; Kasischke and Stocks, 2000). In terms of drivers of forest fire, climate change, land utilization, and forest development are main factors to increase the number, extent, and severity of forest fire in many regions of the world. For example, the climate during the recent decades (increase of fire season length, more frequent occurrence of long hot and dry periods) have been attributed to substantially accelerate fire regimes in some Asian regions (Peter F. Moore, 2013). A specific feature of current fire regimes is a wide distribution of mega- or catastrophic fires that envelope vast territories, have a very high intensity, often escaped from control, and provide extremely high damages in terms of social, economic, and cultural values. Current predictions of future fire regimes in the Northern Hemisphere (Stocks, Flannigan, Turetsky, Tchepakova, etc.) indicate at two to three times increase of extent and severity of forest fire by end of the current century. In order to reduce the occurrence of forest fire and subsequent damages, special systems of fire protection need to be developed. Among other activities, it is essential to strengthen existing methods of protection from fire and to in advance decrease risk factors. To this end, Forest Fire Danger Rating System (FFDRS) can be highly instrumental. Among many factors used in the system, weather elements are the most influential. Some of the Fire Weather Index (FWI) used around the world includes Angström Index (Skvarenina et al. 2003), Fuel Moisture Index (FMI, Sharples et al. 2009, Liu et al.

2010), Nesterov Index (Nesterov 1949, Willis et al. 2001), WBKZ-M68 (Käse 1969), Thornthwaite Index (Thornthwaite 1948, Amoriello and Costantini 2003), and The Canadian Fire Weather Index (CFWI, Van Wagner 1985). The CFWI is widely used in different countries providing, e.g., Web-GIS based information in Canada, Indonesia and other countries. The index was developed upon the data of fuel moisture contents in the Arctic Zone, and has been found to be particularly good at warning against mega fires. Fire danger is directly related with forest fuel moisture content (FMC), which is highly affected by climate and fuel conditions (J.J. Sharples et al, 2009). Fuel moisture can be effect on slowing the rate of fuel combustion, through increasing ignition time, decreasing fuel consumption and increasing particle residence time (Nelson 2001).

Many studies have been carried out concerning the correlation between climate and fuel conditions in order to determine the danger of forest fire. Forest fire danger index developed around the world mostly uses meteorological factors and partly fuel and topographical factors. Forest fire danger index models can be broadly split into two categories: 1) forest fire danger evaluation by analyzing fuel humidity and 2) forest fire danger evaluation by analyzing drought index. A number of recent studies of the correlation between forest fire and fuel humidity have shown good empirical relations between FMC and satellite-derived variables in several ecosystems (Paltridge and Barber 1988, Chladil and Numez 1995, Chuvieco et al. 1999; 2003). FMC for grasslands was more efficiently estimated than other fuels (Paltridge and Barber 1988, Hardy and Burgan 1999), because water variations in grasslands have a greater influence on other variables that critically affect plant reflectance (such as chlorophyll content or leaf area index) and are more sensitive to seasonal variations than shrubs or trees. Experiences with shrubs have been less successful, with trends varying by species analyzed (Fire Paradox, 2010). In studies of the correlation between forest fire and drought index, drought indices such as KBDI (Keetch-Byram Drought Index) and Palmer Drought Index (PDI) have been used to measure drought for forest fire risk assessment. KBDI, which is now used for forecasting the occurrence risk of forest fire by US Forest Service, was designed based on mathematical models for predicting the likelihood of forest fire considering soil moisture and other conditions related to drought (Keetch & Byram, 1968). The Palmer Drought Index is based on a supply-and-demand model of soil moisture (Wayne C. Palmer, 1965) while the US Forest Service's Wildland Fire Assessment System offers information on soil drought. As stated above, various FWI's have been developed by using FMC and drought index, and they are widely applied. In this context, the aim of this study is to compare and evaluated the factors of 16 released FWI models, and to evaluate 5 of them in terms of their applications for South Korea. Finally, this study aims to see if the existing FWI models can be used regardless of weather conditions and fuel characteristics that vary depending on nation and region, thereby improve their future applicability.

2. Forest Fire Danger Index Models

2.1. Fuel Humidity and Forest Fire Danger Index

GFDI4 (McArthur, 1966) and GFDI5 (McArthur, 1977) applies wind, dry-bulb temperature, relative humidity and degree of grass curing as the basic factors of fire danger index to grassland. GFDI5 applies FMC in combination with dry-bulb temperature, relative humidity, degree of grass curing, and fuel weight (t/ha). Both GFDI4 and GFDI5 divide forest fire danger index into five categories. Fine Fuel (CFWI), Fuel Model (NFDRS) and Grassland (GFDI4, GFDI5) may all be used to evaluate forest fire danger indices based on fuel humidity. The Korea Forest Fire Danger Rating System (KFDRS) consists of three, 10-scale indices: daily weather index (DWI), fuel model index (FMI), and topography model index (TMI). DWI represents the meteorological characteristics, such as effective humidity, temperature and wind speed, and is adapted to local conditions through the use of one of eight logistic regression models (Won et al, 2010). The Canadian Fire Weather Index (CFWI, Van Wagner, 1987), among those, calculates FMC of the three fuel layers in Canada's coniferous forests, which are represented as Fine Fuel Moisture Code (FFMC), Duff Moisture Code (DMC) and Drought Code (DC). Initial Spread Index (ISI), Build Up Index (BUI) and Fire Weather Index (FWI) are then calculated based on the three codes. FWI is divided into six phases, which are used in Canada and Southeast Asia including Indonesia, and can be used as a danger index for Global Mega Fire. U.S. NFDRS (Deeming and others 1972), which has been up and running since its development, has numerous forest fire danger information such as Fire Weather Information, Fuel Moisture Content, Models of Fire Characteristics and Models of Fire Occurrence. Fuel Moisture Contents, which is one of the study's subjects, calculates the whole FMC based on Equilibrium Moisture Content (ECM). The EMC, itself a computed value, represents a steady state moisture content of dead

woody material. This steady state is achieved under constant conditions for a sufficiently long adjustment period. Steady-state conditions do not occur under normal circumstances and, therefore, do not represent the woody moisture contents. On the other hand, EMC can be derived from dry bulb temperature and relative humidity by calculating the equilibrium moisture content (ECM). Equations of ECM are the regression equations development by Simard (1968) on the basis of tables in the Wood Handbook (U.S. Forest Products Laboratory 1955, revised 1974). NFDRS considers two major groups of fuels; live and dead. Models of Live-Fuel Moisture are further classified into annual herbaceous, perennial herbaceous, and lesser woody plants (shrubs and young trees). Models of Dead Fuel Moisture is applied to 1, 10, 100, and 1000 hour time lag classes and wet or ice covered regions. NFDRS uploads danger map information in 1km*1km lattice in the Internet on real-time across the United States.




Fig. 1: Distribution map of the development and use of FWI models throughout the world.

2.2. Drought Index and Forest Fire Danger Index

Angström Index (Willis et al., 2001) is currently being used throughout the Scandinavia Peninsula and is an aridity index based on temperature and relative humidity, divides forest fire danger index into five categories in the Scandinavia region. Baumgartner Index uses potential evapotranspiration and precipitation to set danger index into five categories. It is widely used in the Scandinavia region and Germany. F* (Sharples et al., 2009), which is computed via Wind, Temperature and RH, is divided into five categories and used in Australia and New Zealand. FFDI (Forest Fire Danger Index, Nobel et al. 1980) divides forest fire danger index into five categories by using wind speed, dry-bulb temperature and relative humidity factors. It is widely used in eastern Australia. FMI (Fuel Moisture Indices, Sharples et al. 2009) calculates FMC of eucalypt litter as temperature and relative humidity. Its index range is 0~30. Average absolute error of FMI's interaction formula is 0.2%. Zhdanko (1965) suggested a recurrent index of potential forest fire risk for the warm snow-free period of the year (Groisman et al. 2005a, b). Zhdanko index is widely used in the Russian fire-rating system together with Nesterov and Modified Nesterov Index. Nesterov index (1967) was devised as the interaction formula for date, average temperature and dew point temperature from the rain day with a precipitation exceeding 3mm. It was used in the former Soviet Union. A modified version of the Zhdanko index (Groisman et al. 2005a,b) is currently widely used in Russia, and it is based on a reduction factor similar to that used by Zhdanko index. Both models divided danger index into five categories. WBKZ-M68 is used in the north eastern part of Germany. WBKZ-M68 divides fire danger level into four levels by using vapour saturation and temperature (Käse 1969). KBDI is a cumulative estimate of moisture deficiency based on meteorological parameters and an empirical approximation for moisture depletion in the upper soil and surface litter levels (Keetch and Byram 1968; Janis et al. 2002). KBDI is a stand-alone index that can be used to measure the effects of seasonal drought on fire potential (Roads et al. 2005).

TABLE I: Physical Properties of The Fire Indexes

Fire Weather Indexes	Weather							Fuel	Topography
	W	D	T	RH	R	V	E		
<i>Drought index</i>									
Angström Index			○	○					
FMI			○	○					
F*	○		○	○					
FFDI	○		○	○					
FFWI	○		○	○					
WBKZ-M68			○			○			
Baumgartner Index					○			○	
Keetch-Byram Drought Index	○		○	○	○	○			○
Nesterov Index		○	○	○	○				
Modified Nesterov Index		○	○	○	○				
Zhdanko Index		○			○				
<i>Fuel humidity</i>									
GFDI4	○		○	○				○	
GFDI5	○		○	○				○	
FFDRI	○		○	○				○	○
CFWI	○		○	○	○			○	
NFDRS	○	○	○	○	○	○		○	○

*Abbreviation Words;

FMI(Fuel Moisture Index), F*(Fire Danger Index), CFWI(Canadian Fire Weather Index), GFDI(Grassland Fire Danger Index), FFDRI(Forest Fire Danger Rating Index), NFDRS(National Fire Danger Rating System), W(wind), D(dew point), T(temperature), RH(relative humidity), R(rainfall), V(Vapor saturation or pressure), E(potential evapotranspiration)

3. Application of five FWIs to South Korea

3.1. Review of Five Indices to be Applied for South Korea

As shown in Table 1 and Fig. 1, FWI's have been developed in a national and regional level and they are being widely and frequently used. Since most indices were developed targeting a specific nation or a specific region that represents a climate zone (a number of regions where similar climate characteristics appear), it shall be investigated if the risk indices works without any problem when they are applied to other climate zones or regions. For this, five regional indices (Angström index, Nesterov Index, CFWI, KFDRS, and FFDI) were applied to the forest fire environment of South Korea, and accordingly the indices were compared and evaluated.

The Angström index (I), is one of the simple drought indices developed using temperatures and relative humidity (Willis et al. 2001, Skyarenina et al 2003). This index has been compared with the Nesterov and Baumgartner indexes for two large forest fire events at the Slovak paradise National Park, which revealed that the Angström index was the most sensitive in fire occurrence risk prediction (Skyarenina et al 2003):

$$I = (R / 20) + ((29 - T) / 10) \tag{1}$$

where, R is Relative humidity (%) and T is temperature (°C),

The Nesterov Index (NI) was developed by V.G. Nesterov in 1967. The Nesterov Index is an empirical drought index widely used in Russia. The index uses synoptic daytime data of temperature, humidity, and daily precipitation (Groisman et al. 2005a, b). The index was derived as an empirical function reflecting the relationship between fire and weather based on historical data (Venevsky 2002), and is calculated as follows (Willis et al. 2001; Skvarenina et al. 2003):

$$NI = \sum_{i=1}^W T_i \times (T_i - D_i) \tag{2}$$

where, W is number of days since last rainfall > 3 mm, T is mid-day temperature (°C), D is dew point temperature (°C). Its computation begins on the first spring day when the height of temperature is above freezing, after snow melting, and continues until the rainfall of 3 mm. The total is calculated for positive temperatures for a sequence of days with precipitation less than 3 mm. Rainfall above 3 mm resets the index NI to zero. It is a cumulative index and reflects drying potential for fuels. It was comparatively tested with other indices (Keetch-Byram drought index, Modified Nesterov and Zhdanko index) over northern Eurasia (Groisman et al. 2005b, Groisman et al. 2007), by testing their values versus forest fire statistics as well as with Keetch-Byram drought

index in East Kalimantan, Indonesia (Buchholz and Weidemann 2000). In both cases it was proved applicable and a useful tool for early warning. The CFWI was developed for the prediction of forest fire risk in response to weather data in Canada. The CFWI requires daily temperature, RH, wind speed and 24-hour accumulated rainfall inputs for its calculation (Van Wagner 1987). CFWI is composed based on three fuel moisture codes, the drought code (DC), duff moisture code (DMC), and the fine fuel moisture code (FFMC) and three behavioral indices which are the buildup index (BUI), initial spread index (ISI), and fire weather index (FWI). All indices are then combined into the FWI which gives estimation about the overall Fire danger situation and is used to classify and communicate fire danger. FFMC represents the moisture of the uppermost layer of litter in a pine forest, approximately 1.2cm deep. FFMC is in itself based on wind speed, RH, precipitation, and temperature data as calculated in Equation 3. DMC represents the moisture in the 7 cm deep layer below the fine fuel layer, assumed to be a layer of loosely compacted organic material. DMC is based on RH, precipitation, and temperature data as calculated in Equation 4. DC represents the moisture in a layer of compact organic matter extending 18 cm below DMC layer. DC is calculated only from rainfall and temperature data by Equation 5. ISI is a numerical rating of the combination of wind and the FFMC that presents the expected rate of spread. BUI is a numerical rating of the total amount of fuel available for combustion that combines the DMC and the DC. CFWI is thus a numeric rating of fire intensity based on ISI and BUI. This indicates the fire intensity by combining the rate of spread with the amount of fuel being consumed (De Groot, 1987).

$$FFMC = 59.5 \times (250 - m) / (147.2 + m) \tag{3}$$

Where m is the fine fuel moisture content after drying.

$$P = P_0(P_r) \times K \times 100 \tag{4}$$

Where P is the new DMC, P₀ is the previous day DMC, P_r is the DMC after rain and K is the log drying rate in DMC.

$$D = D_0(\text{or}D_r) + 0.5 \times V \tag{5}$$

Where D is the new DC, D₀ is the previous DC, D_r is the DC after rain and V is the potential evapotranspiration.

The KFDRS was developed for the prediction forest fire risk in South Korea. The KFDRS was estimated using a logistic regression model with forest fire occurrence by region as the dependent variable and meteorological factors as the independent variables. Formulas for nine administrative districts' models of KFDRS have been presented as shown in Table 2. In comparative analysis of forest fire occurrence statistics and prediction models, the accuracy of 75.83% has been (Won et al, 2010).

TABLE II: Regional Model of forest fire occurrence probability model using logistic regression analysis (Won et al, 2010).

Regions	Models	PV (%)
Gyeonggi	$[1 + \exp\{-(2.507 + (0.112 \times T_{\max}) - (0.061 \times RH) - (0.123 \times W_{\text{mean}}))\}]^{-1}$	73.6
Gangwon	$[1 + \exp\{-(1.932 + (0.109 \times T_{\max}) - (0.047 \times RH) - (0.057 \times EH) + (0.646 \times W_{\text{mean}}))\}]^{-1}$	80.7
Gyeongnam	$[1 + \exp\{-(4.713 + (0.076 \times T_{\max}) - (0.055 \times RH) - (0.023 \times EH) - (0.572 \times W_{\text{mean}}))\}]^{-1}$	74.4
Gyeongbuk	$[1 + \exp\{-(2.030 + (0.052 \times T_{\max}) - (0.062 \times RH) + (0.038 \times EH) - (0.320 \times W_{\text{mean}}))\}]^{-1}$	68.7
Jeonnam	$[1 + \exp\{-(1.931 + (0.087 \times T_{\max}) - (0.055 \times RH) - (0.014 \times EH) + (0.329 \times W_{\text{mean}}))\}]^{-1}$	70.1
Jeonbuk	$[1 + \exp\{-(-0.281 + (0.127 \times T_{\max}) - (0.042 \times RH))\}]^{-1}$	73.5
Chungnam	$[1 + \exp\{-(-0.188 + (0.113 \times T_{\max}) - (0.041 \times RH) + (0.182 \times W_{\text{mean}}))\}]^{-1}$	70.6
Chungbuk	$[1 + \exp\{-(-0.857 + (0.127 \times T_{\max}) - (0.066 \times RH) + (0.038 \times EH))\}]^{-1}$	72.8
Jeju	$[1 + \exp\{-(-6.224 + (0.040 \times T_{\max}) + (0.399 \times W_{\text{mean}}))\}]^{-1}$	98.1

Where, T_{max} is the maximum temperature, RH is relative humidity, EH is effective humidity, W_{mean} is the mean of wind velocity and PV is predict value.

FFDI was derived to assess forest and grassland fire danger ratings in southeastern Australia. According to Nobel et al. (1980), FFDI can be expressed as:

$$FFDI = 2 \exp(-0.45 + 0.987 \ln(D) + 0.0338T - 0.0345H + 0.0234U) \quad (6)$$

where T and H are temperature and relative humidity as before, U is average wind speed and D is the drought factor, which ranges from 1 from to 10, where D=10 indicates maximum fuel availability.

In conclusion, the risk index of the five FWI models can be classified based on the levels of forest fire risk as shown in Table 3.

TABLE III: Risk levels of the five selected FWI models

Models	Levels				
	1	2	3	4	5
Angström index	> 4	4.0 - 3.0	3.0-2.5	2.5-2.0	< 2.0
Nesterov Index	< 300	300-1000	1000-4000	4000-10000	> 10000
CFWI	0-4.5	4.5-10.5	10.5-18.5	18.5-	
KFDRS	0-20	20-40	40-60	60-80	> 80
FFDI	0-5	5-12	12-24	24-50	50-100

3.2. Forest Fire Risk of South Korea Assessed By 5 Models

The five FWI models were applied to the Gyeongbuk region of South Korea, using the last 8-year weather data (2005-2012). As displayed in Fig. 2, Gyeongbuk has the highest frequency of forest fire outbreaks in South Korea. In the weather data, the average meteorological observation area of this region is approximately 33km × 33km. The weather data was based on the annual average of 8-year daily observation data prepared by Korea Meteorological Administration (KMA). As shown in Fig. 2 (b), about 90% of forest fires in South Korea occur during spring (February to May) while roughly 10% of forest fires break out during fall (October to November). Much less forest fire (damaged area of less than 0.1 ha) has occurred during summer due to hot and humid climate (Korea Forest Service, 2012).




Fig. 2: Regional distribution of forest fire occurrence in South Korea (8-year average, 2005-2012), and Gyeongbuk to which the five FWI models will be applied (a), and forest fire occurrence rates by month (b) (data source from KFS, 2013).

4. Results

4.1. Model comparison daily risk index

When applying the five FWI models to Gyeongbuk, South Korea, daily risk index for each model was displayed with a certain pattern of changes as shown in Fig. 3. As for changes of the models' risk indices, first, Angström index (a) showed lower risk index value in summer than the one from fall to spring, which means higher forest fire risk is posed during summer. Nesterov index (b) showed higher risk index from May through July (the highest) to October than any other period of the year. CFWI (c) showed higher risk level in January and

around May and June. KFDRS (d) showed higher risk index in 3 months from February to April. FFDI (e) showed lower risk index overall, and no significant deviations were observed in the monthly risk index.




Fig. 3: Time series of the five FWI models, Jan 2005 ~ Dec 2012, Gyeongbuk Republic of Korea. (a) Angström index, (b) Nesterov index, (c) CFWI, (d) KFDRS, (e) FFDI.

As for the average monthly risk level for eight years, only KFDRS showed higher risk index in spring and fall, which are the seasons considered to be the forest fire-danger periods. AI, NI, CFWI, and FFDI assessed the forest fire risk lower than Risk Level 2 and in those indices, no significant difference was shown between spring and summer (spring is considered to be fire-danger period, but summer is not). The forest fire risk levels of Gyeongbuk assessed by the five FWI models are shown in Fig. 4




Fig. 4: Monthly assessment results by five FWI models (8-year average based on data for 2005 to 2012).

4.2. Model Comparison of Weather Factors

To further evaluate the performance of the five FWI models for South Korea, the connection between forest fire risk levels and weather factors (i.e. wind speed, temperature, relative humidity (RH), effective humidity (EH)) was evaluated based on significance analysis. According to the analysis results, P-values of wind speed, RH, and EH were all 0.05 and P-value of temperature was 0.08, which indicates low significance. Distribution diagrams of correlations between fire risk index and each weather factor are as shown in Fig. 5. The fire risk index was presented using fire occurrence rates as shown in the following equation:

$$FI = \frac{O_k \cdot D_k}{\sum_{k=1}^{12} (O_k - D_k)} \quad (7)$$

where, O_k is fire occurrence rate in each month, D_k is Fire damaged area rate in each month.




Fig. 5: Distribution diagram showing correlation between fire risk index of South Korea and forest fire weather factors. (a) Wind speed, (b) Temperature, (c) RH, (d) EH.

In general, the impact of weather factors such as wind speed, temperature, and humidity on forest fire becomes stronger when more factors reach higher fire risk level, thus raising the likelihood of forest fire and causing damage to wide area. To see if this is also the case for South Korea, the weather factors were plotted against each other in Fig. 6. According to this Figure, temperature is not affected by wind speed, RH, and EH, but wind speed is affected by RH and EH.




Fig. 6: Distribution diagram showing correlation between forest fire weather factors such as wind speed, temperature, RH, EH (Jan 2005-Jun 2012). (a)EH vs. Temp., (b)RH vs. Wind speed, (c) RH vs. Temp. (d) EH vs. Wind speed, (e) EH vs. RH.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This study examined sixteen FWI models developed and used for monitoring forest fire risk. The sixteen FWI models were divided into two groups based on fuel humidity and drought. Out of the sixteen models, fuel humidity-based models were: GFDI4, FDI5, KFDRI, CFWI, and NFDRS. To assess forest fire risk of the Gyeongbuk region in South Korea, AI, NI, CFWI, KFDRI, FFDI models were selected and examined. The results revealed that all models developed outside of South Korea failed to produce suitable results for determining fire-danger periods. The models assessed forest fire risk much lower than the actual risk posed and the forest fire rates were estimated higher in summer (which is not considered forest fire-danger period) than spring (during which more forest fires actually break out). This may be because the coefficients of factors used for the development of most FWI models were determined based on empirical data and regression evaluation of regional weather, forest conditions, and forest fires. In South Korea, unlike U.S.A., Canada, Australia, Russia, and European and Southeast Asian countries, forest fires occur more frequently during early spring than any other seasons due to Monsoon, dry and strong seasonal winds; however, less forest fire risk is posed in hot and humid summer. Northeast Asian countries like Mongolia, China, and Japan, which lie in the same latitude range

with South Korea and are affected by dry seasonal winds in spring, experience more forest fires during spring than any other periods.

Therefore, it is considered that when applying national or regional FWI models to a certain nation or a region that has different forest fire environments, relevant assessment and verification needs to be performed, though for the nations or regions that has the same or similar forest fire environment, the applicable FWI can work properly. Thus, in order to identify the risk of forest fire more precisely, further studies are required on how to effectively use FWI for each region and how to develop a FWI model with expanded applicability through further forest fire weather analysis and numerical analysis. Such studied would significantly help to develop FWI models with enhanced applicability from a national, regional level to a global level

6. Acknowledgements

This research was supported by Fire Fighting Safety & 119 Rescue Technology Research and Development Program funded by the Ministry of Public Safety and Security(“MPSS-소방안전-2015-75”). I would like to gratefully and sincerely thank Dr. Anatoly Shvidenko (IIASA) for his helpful assistance. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my colleagues, Dr. Dmitry Schepashchenki, Dr. Florian Kraxner, Dr. Michael Obersteiner and Dr. Nicklas Forsell in ESM, IIASA.

7. References

- [1] Amoriello, T. & A. Costantini, (2003). Meteorological monitoring and climatological trends in Italian forest ecosystems. *Journal of Limnology*, 61, pp. 93-99.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4081/jlimnol.2002.s1.93>
- [2] Arpaci Alexander, Vacik Harald, Formayer Herbert, Beck Alexander (2010). *A collection of possible Fire Weather Indices (FWI) for alpine landscapes*, Alpine Forest Fire Warning System, pp. 29.
- [3] Buchholz G. and Weidemann D. The use of simple Fire Danger Rating System as a tool for early warning in forestry. 2000. *International Forest Fire News* No. 23: pp. 32-36.
- [4] Crutzen, P.J., Goldammer, J.G. (eds) (1993). *Fire in the Environment: The Ecological, Atmospheric, and Climatic Importance of Vegetation Fires*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK.
- [5] Chladil M.A., Nunez M. (1995) Assessing grassland moisture and biomass in Tasmania: The application of remote sensing and empirical models for a cloudy environment. *International Journal Wildland Fire* 5(3): pp. 165-171.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/WF9950165>
- [6] Chuvieco E., Deshayes M., Stach N., Cocero D., Riano D., “Short-term fire risk: foliage moisture content estimation from satellite data”, In: *Remote Sensing of Large Wildfires in the European Mediterranean Basin*. Chuvieco E. (ed.). Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1999, pp. 17-38.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-60164-4_3
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-60164-4>
- [7] Glover, D., Jessup, T., “Indonesia’s fires and haze: the costs of a catastrophe. Singapore Institute of Southeast Asian Studies. Singapore. 1999.
- [8] Groisman P.Y., Knight R.W., Easterling D.R., Levinson D.H., Heim R.R., Karl T.R., Whitfield P.H., Hegerl G.C., Razuvaev V.N., Sherstyukov B.G., Enloe J.G., Stroumentova N.S., “Changes in precipitation distribution spectra and contemporary warming of the extratropics: implications for intenserainfall, droughts, and potential forest fire danger”, Presented at *the 16th AMS Conference on Climate Variability and Change*, 9-13 January 2005(2005a), San Diego.
- [9] Groisman P.Y., Sherstyukov B.G., Razuvaev V.N., Knight R.W., Enloe J.G., Stroumentova N.S., Whitfield P.H., Forland E., Hannsen-Bauer I., Tuomervirta H., Aleksandersson H., Mescherskaya A.V. and Karl T.R. “Potential forest fire danger over northern Eurasia: Changes during the 20th century”, Presented at *the Sixth AMS Fire and Forest Meterology Symposium /19th Interior West Fire Council Meeting*, 25-27 October 2005(2005b), Cammore, Alberta, Canada.
- [10] Groisman P.Y., Sherstyukov B.G., Razuvaev V.N., Knight R.W., Enloe J.G., Stroumentova N.S., Whitfield P.H., Forland E., Hannsen-Bauer I., Tuomervirta H., Aleksandersson H., Mescherskaya A.V. and Karl T.R., “Potential forest fire danger over northern Eurasia: Changes during the 20th century”, *Global and Planetary Change* 56: 2007. pp. 371-386.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2006.07.029>

- [11] Hardy C.C., Burgan R.E. (1999) Evaluation of NDVI for monitoring live moisture in three vegetation types of the western U.S. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 65: pp. 603-610.
- [12] Heil, A., Goldammer, J.G. (2001) Smoke-haze pollution: a review of the 1997 episode in Southeast Asia. *Reg. Environ. Change* 2, pp. 24-37.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s101130100021>
- [13] J.J. Sharples a,b,*, R.H.D. McRae b,c, R.O. Weber a,b, A.M. Gill b,d (2009) A simple index for assessing fuel moisture content, *Environmental Modeling & Software* 24; pp. 637-646.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2008.10.012>
- [14] Janis M. J., Johnson M.B. and Fortum G. (2002) Near-real time mapping of Keetch-Byram drought index in the southeastern United States. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 11: pp. 281-289.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/WF02013>
- [15] Keetch, John J; Byram, George., "A drought index for forest fire control." Res. *Paper SE-38*. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station. 1968. p.32.
- [16] Keetch J.J. and Byram G.M. "A Drought Index for Forest Fire Control", USDA Forest Service Research Paper *SE-38*, 1968. p.32.
- [17] Käse, H. (1969) Ein Vorschlag für eine Methode zur Bestimmung und Vorhersage der Waldbrandgefährdung mit Hilfe komplexer Kennziffern. Akademie Verlag Berlin. p.68.
- [18] Kasischke, E.S., Stocks, B.J. (Eds) (2000) Fire, Climate Change, and Carbon Cycling in the Boreal Forest. *Springer-Verlag*, New York.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-21629-4>
- [19] Kunii, O., Kanagawa, S., Yajima, I., Hisamatsu, Y., Yamamura, S., Amagai, T., Ismail, I.T.S. (2002) The 1997 haze disaster in Indonesia: its air quality and health effects. *Arch. Environ. Health* 57, pp. 16-22.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00039890209602912>
- [20] Korea Forest Service (KFS) (2012) Annual report of Korea Forest Fire Situation in 2012, *KFS Annual Report*. p.185.
- [21] Myung Soo Won, Si Young Lee, Myung Bo Lee and Shoji OHGA (2010) Development and Application of a Forest Fire Danger Rating System in South Korea, *Journal of the Faculty of Agriculture Kyushu University* 55(2), pp. 221-229.
- [22] McArthur A.G. "Weather and grassland fire behavior", Commonwealth of Australia Forest and Timber Bureau, Leaflet Number 100, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, 1966. p.23.
- [23] McArthur A.G. "Fire behaviour in eucalypt forests Commonwealth of Australia Forest and Timber Bureau", Leaflet Number 107, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, 1967. p.25.
- [24] Nesterov, V., (1949) Forest Fires and Methods of Fire Risk Determination. Russian, Moscow: Goslesbumizdat.
- [25] Noble, I.R., G.A.V. Bary, and A.M. Gill, (1980) McArthur's fire-danger meters expressed as equations. *Australian Journal of Ecology*, 5, pp.201-203.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.1980.tb01243.x>
- [26] Nelson RM. "Water relations of forest fuels. In Forest fires: Behavior and ecological effects," Eds EA Johnson and K Miyanishi. *Academic Press: San Diego, USA*. 2001. pp. 79-150.
- [27] N.S., Whitfield P.H., Forland E., Hannsen-Bauer I., Tuomervirta H., Aleksandersson H., Mescherskaya A.V. and Karl T.R. "Potential forest fire danger over northern Eurasia: Changes during the 20th century". Presented at *the Sixth AMS Fire and Forest Meteorology Symposium /19th Interior West Fire Council Meeting*, 25-27 October 2005 (2005b), Cammore, Alberta, Canada.
- [28] Paltridge G.W., Barber J. (1988) Monitoring grassland dryness and fire potential in Australia with NOAA/AVHRR data. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 25: pp.381-394.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0034-4257\(88\)90110-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0034-4257(88)90110-1)
- [29] Roads J., Fujioka F., Chen S. and Burgan R. (2005) Seasonal fire danger forecasts for the USA. *International Journal of Wildland Fire* 14: pp.1-18.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/WF03052>
- [30] Peter F. Moore. "Fire regimes in SE Asia and shifting cultivation, What? Who? Where? Still? Who else?," 2nd *International Wildland fire Ecology and Fire Management Congress*, Seeion 3C. 2013. p.9.
- [31] Simard A.J. "The moisture content of forest fuels-I. A review of the basic concepts. Canadian Department of Forest and Rural Development", Forest Fire Research Institute, *Information Report FF-X-14*. Ottawa, Ontario. 1968. p.47.

- [32] Schwela, D.H., Goldammer, J.G., Morawska, L.H., Simpson, O. "Health Guidelines for Vegetation Fire Events. Guideline document. Published on behalf of UNEP, WHO, and WMO". Institute of Environmental Epidemiology, Ministry of the Environment, Singapore. Double Six Press, Singapore. 1999.
- [33] Sastry, N., "Forest fires, air pollution, and mortality in Southeast Asia". *Demography* 39, 2002. pp. 1–23.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/dem.2002.0009>
- [34] Skvarenina J., Mindas J., Holecý J and Tucek J. "Analysis of the natural and meteorological conditions during two largest forest fire events in the Slovak Paradise National Park". In Proceeding of the *Int. Scientific Workshop on Forest Fires in the Wildland-Urban Interface and Rural areas in Europe*. May 15-16, Athens, Greece. (2003)
- [35] Skvarenina, J., J. Mindas, J. Holecý & J. Tucek, "Analysis of the natural and meteorological conditions during two large forest fire events in the Slovak Paradise National Park", 2003.
- [36] Thornthwaite, C. W., "An Approach toward a Rational Classification of Climate", *Geographical Review*, 1948. p.38.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/210739>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00010694-194807000-00007>
- [37] U.S. Forest Products Laboratory, "Wood handbook : basic information on wood as a material of construction with data for its use in design and specifications", prepared by *Forest Products Laboratory*, Forest Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture., Washington, D.C. : U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Forest Products Laboratory, Forest Service, 1955. p.528.
- [38] Van Wagner C.E., "Development and Structure of the Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index System", Canadian Forestry Service, *Forestry Technical Report 35*, Ottawa. 1987. p.37.
- [39] Viegas, D.X. (Ed.), "Proceedings of the IV International Conference on Forest Fire Research & Wildland Fire Safety Summit", Millpress, Rotterdam, Netherlands. 2002.
- [40] Venevsky, S., K. S. Thonicke, S. Sitch, and W. Cramer (2002) Simulating fire regimes in human dominated ecosystems: Iberian Peninsula case study. *Global Change Biol.*, 8, pp. 984–998.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2486.2002.00528.x>
- [41] Wayne Palmer, "Meteorological Drought". *Research paper no.45*, U.S. Department of Commerce Weather Bureau, February, 1965. pp. 1-58.
- [42] Willis C., van Wilgen B., Tolhurst K., Everson C., D'Abreton P., Pero L. and Fleming G., "The Development of a National Fire Danger Rating System for South Africa", *Department of Water Affairs and Forestry*, Pretoria. 2001.
- [43] Willis, C., B. van Wilgen, K. Tolhurst, C. Everson, P. D'Abreton, L. Pero & G. Fleming, "Development of a National Fire Danger rating system for South Africa", Pretoria, South Africa: *Department of Water Affairs and Forestry*, Pretoria. 2001.
- [44] William J. de Groot, Johann G. Goldammer, Tom Keenan, Michael A. Brady, Tim J. Lynham, Christopher O. Justice and Ivan A. Csiszar, Kevin O'Loughlin, "Developing a global early warning system for wildland fire", *V International Conference on Forest Fire Research*, 2006. p.12.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2006.08.025>
- [45] Zhdanko V.A. (cited in Groisman et al. 2005a,b), "Scientific basis of development of regional scales and their importance for forest fire management", In: *I.S. Melekhov (ed.) Contemporary Problems of Forest Protection from Fire and Firefighting*. Lesnaya Promyshlennost' Publ., Moscow, 1965. pp. 53-89.