

Uppsala, April 22, 2009

EFORWOOD IP Board meeting (37) – Minutes

Time: April 15, 14:00-15:45 (CET)

Place: Telephone conference

Invited

IP Board members:

Gero Becker (GB), M3	Present
Mikael Poissonnet (MP), M2	In place of Jean-Michel Carnus
Denis Mc Gowan (DMG), M6	Present
Carl Olsmats (CO), M5	Present
Piotr Paschalis (PP), M0	-
Risto Päivinen (RP), M1	Present
Kaj Rosén (KR), M0	Present, Chairman
Helena Wessman (HW), M4	Present for Items 1-3

Others:

Gunilla Rodfors (GR), M0	Present, Secretary
Arie Hooimeijer (AH), M4	-
Marcus Lindner (ML), M1	Present
Gert-Jan Nabuurs (GJN), M1	Present for Items 1-3
Leif Nutto (LN), M3	Present
Diana Vötter (DV), M1	Present

1.	Opening KR welcomed the participants to the 37th EFORWOOD IP Board meeting.	
2.	Minutes from IP Board meeting 36 <u>Item 4. Present status concerning data collection and ToSIA analyses</u> <u>Discussions of the roadmap</u> No roadmaps had yet been sent to KR despite his reminder to the Scandinavian and Iberian Case-study Leaders. In view of the delays, the roadmaps might be somewhat overruled. <u>Item 5. How to proceed with “Research questions”?</u> No sets of suggested FIVE most important research questions had been sent to KR by the Case-study and Module Leaders. The other items had already been taken care of or are covered by Items on the current Agenda.	Scandinavian and Iberian Case-study Leaders Case-study and M-Leaders
3.	Present status concerning data collection and ToSIA analyses <u>Experiences from Scenario Task-Force meeting on March 9, 2009</u> There are big delays in data collection; most people involved are still only halfway through the 2005 figures and have hardly got to the reference futures; there are no scenarios yet. Only some ten organisations are really involved in the work. GJN continues to follow-up the progress of data collection and ToSIA analyses after the March 9 telephone conference.	

<p>KR said that there seems to be a lack of continuous information to all partners involved. Some (new) people also seem to have difficulties working with the data client. KR concluded that the time necessary for the planning phase had obviously been underestimated.</p> <p>According to GB, one reason for the delay is that the DCPs are not as consistent as thought when they were first published and that it is very time-consuming to go over the data over and over again; another reason is that a lot of data depend on the import/export figures. The Baden-Württemberg Case-study is early and therefore early to find problems. The “bucket concept”, which only applies to the EU Case-study, has now been accepted but GB asked for advice on how to do the job <u>concretely</u>, like in a manual. According to him, the rules are not clear yet. A Task-Force was formed in January to work with import/export issues and has developed a document “EU FWC System boundaries treatment, modelling and calculation”, which shall function like a manual.</p> <p>GJN pointed out that the responsibilities are unclear when it comes to the scenarios.</p> <p>ML said that, despite all the negative news, there has been a lot of progress during the past few weeks.</p> <p>Next Monday, April 20, there will be another check-up of the progress of the data collection etc. As said by several speakers, nobody is to blame for the delays.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Task-Force on export/import matters to develop their guidelines one step further, make them operational and to communicate them with the users. The users are asked to send specific feedback regarding unclarities and/or non-operational parts in the document in track-and-change to DV. <p><u>Present status</u></p> <p>As decided at last IP Board meeting, DV had made an updated version of “the colourful table” showing the state-of-the-art of different parts of the data collection. ML found the development promising. DV said the problematic parts still stop the calculations but not the data collection. There was a discussion about conversion factors from product units to euro. KR concluded that you can only put values at “marketplaces”. Conclusion: it is acceptable to the ToSIA team that conversions are made only when possible. The corresponding colourful IFER table was also discussed and DV concluded that Martina Roubalova makes simplifications to the benefit of users. They are marked blue and labelled “new” in the document: 1) the transformation factor is now calculated by ToSIA, based on information provided by the partners at the M2-M3-boundary; 2) conversion factor of product unit to Euro only for market prices of respective process; 3) the conversion factors for products only need to be entered once per designed product and will be updated automatically as soon as this product is reused (design by Marina), the conversion factor of product unit to Euro being excluded from that rule as it varies with country and time-lapse.</p> <p>Decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HW to update the contact information for the Iberian Case-study and send it to DV. 	<p>DV, Elisabeth Le Net</p> <p>HW</p>
---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The produced list of responsible persons for the 2005 data collection should be valid also for the scenarios unless something else is decided. Note: the denoted responsible persons have a coordination role, not necessarily an operational role. <p><u>Actions to be taken</u></p> <p>As work is several months (maybe six) delayed, KR asked if the IP Board thought it plausible that we shall be able to do what we have promised (full ToSIA runs, etc.) and if we could simplify anything: 1) Can we drop any reference futures? 2) Can we simplify the chain structure processes? 3) Is it realistic to believe that the Iberian Case-study will catch up with the others?</p> <p>ML found it too early to make such decisions and would not take away any scenario applications. He recommended partners to calculate their workloads and to discuss the matter thoroughly in Freiburg. He will remain optimistic until Freiburg, but then we may have to act, not by dropping a whole Case-study but rather defined pieces of a Case-study. Concerning 2), he agreed with CO that it is too late to make aggregations; he would rather leave out parts. Concerning 3), CO meant that it looks worse than it is, but that an improved communication with M2 is necessary.</p> <p>RP asked the IP Board to remember its own initial ambitions and meant that cutting off some branches would be OK. CO and GB agreed and GB added that making expert guesses would also be OK.</p> <p>KR concluded that it is better to do a few things well than many in a bad way. But he wondered if there will be more problems when ML starts to run ToSIA.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The matters of data collection and possible reductions concerning analysis of Case-studies to be addressed at the IP Board in Freiburg. 	KR
4.	<p>EFORWOOD Week in Freiburg</p> <p><u>Content of plenary sessions</u></p> <p>Planning runs well. The number of registered participants was 88 this morning. There was a brief discussion on the content of selected sessions.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The meeting with CEPI, CEI-Bois and CEPF will not take place. - A follow-up IP Board meeting was decided for Thursday afternoon, May 7 at 13.00-13.50. 	KR
5.	<p>Expert Advisory Panel</p> <p>PP suggests that the EAP meeting during the EFORWOOD Week in Freiburg should be cancelled as only one EAP member has registered for the Week.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EAP meeting in Freiburg is cancelled. <p><u>How to use the EAP during the final phase of the project?</u></p> <p>PP suggests asking each of the EAP members to act as external reviewer of the EFORWOOD Final Report for their own Module.</p>	PP PP

6.	<p>Publication of EFORWOOD deliverables?</p> <p><u>Offer from EFI to publish EFORWOOD deliverables in their web-based Technical Reports</u></p> <p>Decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most D and a selection of PD deliverables will be published as Technical Reports. - The M-Leaders agreed to select publishable D & PD deliverables from their respective Module. KR to send lists of D & PD deliverables for them to chose from. - The authors of deliverables to be published will be asked by the Coordinator if they would like to edit/"wash" them before publication. - KR to draft a clear policy for how to cite the EFORWOOD deliverables in the future and to ask the M-Leaders for their comments to the draft before distributing it within EFORWOOD. 	<p>KR, M-Leaders</p> <p>KR, GR</p> <p>KR, M-Leaders</p>
7.	<p>Final EFORWOOD Conference in Uppsala, September 23-24, 2009</p> <p><u>Key note speakers (current status)</u></p> <p>KR had got some names from Daniel Deybe, former EFORWOOD EU Project Officer, of possible speakers from the Commission but had no response from them yet. A possible new name to ask could be Astrid Kaemena. As earlier reported, neither suggested speaker Kimmo Kalela, new FTP Director, nor Magnus Hall being available, KR had asked Andreas Kleinschmit who had agreed to make a presentation from an industry perspective. As earlier reported, Roger Sedjo had accepted. Neither Ewald Rametsteiner nor Markku Simula being available, Christopher Prince, UNECE/FAO Timber Committee, had agreed to make a presentation.</p> <p><u>Submitted abstracts (current status)</u></p> <p>Only two abstracts had so far been received by GR.</p> <p>KR underlined that it is important that also EFORWOOD partners send in abstracts. So far only a few partners had announced that they will submit abstracts. ML said he will come back to this after the meeting next week on data collection. According to DMG over 5000 reminders of the call for abstracts had been distributed.</p> <p><u>Scientific Committee (work plan) and Conference publication (current status)</u></p> <p>KR reported that PP plans to have a meeting with the Scientific Committee during the second week of May for evaluating the abstracts. PP would like the deadline for abstracts to be prolonged but DMG pointed out that the Conference programme needs to be printed before the end of May for it to be distributed before the summer holidays. DMG had so far not had any news from the European Journal.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A prolongation of the deadline for submitting abstracts might be considered later. 	<p>KR</p> <p>Partners, ML</p> <p>PP</p> <p>DMG</p> <p>KR, PP</p>
8.	<p>Post EFORWOOD activities</p> <p><u>Management of ToSIA post EFORWOOD</u></p> <p>KR said he was content with the documents from ML and AH but that they need to be finalized, including the formalities for the suggested "ToSIA Association".</p>	

Date as above.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gunilla Rodfors". The script is cursive and somewhat stylized.

Gunilla Rodfors

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kaj Rosén". The script is cursive and somewhat stylized.

Kaj Rosén