

Uppsala, January 11, 2010

EFORWOOD IP Board meeting (45) – Minutes

Time: December 14, 2009, 10:30-16:00 (CET)
Place: Frankfurt Airport Conference Center, Germany.

Invited

IP Board members:

Gero Becker (GB), M3	Present
Jean-Michel Carnus (JMC), M2	Present from the end of Item 4
Denis Mc Gowan (DMG), M6	Present from Item 3
Carl Olsmats (CO), M5	Present
Piotr Paschalis (PP), M0	-
Risto Päivinen (RP), M1	-
Kaj Rosén (KR), M0	Present, Chairman
Helena Wessman (HW), M4	Present

Others:

Janine Fischbach (JF), M3	Present
Marcus Lindner (ML), M1	Present
Gunilla Rodfors (GR), M0	Present, Secretary

1.	Opening KR welcomed the participants to the 45th EFORWOOD IP Board meeting.	
2.	Minutes from IP Board meeting (44) There were no comments to the minutes from IP Board meeting (44).	KR
3.	<p>Present status concerning data collection and ToSIA analyses</p> <p><u>Present status and actions to be taken, focus on the European Case-study</u> ML reported that bugs, linked to the flows, had been found in ToSIA and that corrections were still going on. A new ToSIA version will hopefully be delivered towards the end of this week. It will include a new functionality which makes it easier to check reliability. The reporting units are different, they require a lot of programming which is time-consuming but possible to solve with the current resources. It is also time-consuming to export data from the database. A better way has to be found. Last Friday, the Iberian case was run, with some very strange results, according to CO. ML, however, was positive.</p> <p>HW reported that data are still missing from TUZVO. Marian Babiak has the data for solid wood products in eastern Europe countries but at the moment they are in the wrong format for being added directly to the Data Client. Accordingly, the data seems to be of low quality and Marian Babiak does not approve of them.</p> <p>ML found this worrying and said that cuts may have to be done. It will have to be decided whether to cut out whole countries or the downstream part or to stop at mill gate. Or to use model countries. GB meant that the data that is there should be used and where there is no reliable data, this fact should be</p>	

	<p>admitted rather than to use data that will distort the results/the flows.</p> <p>It was discussed who will be interested in the European Case-study results. Big companies and the Commission were pointed out. For the Commission the results will mainly form a background for policy work. The regional Case-studies are there more to illustrate or demonstrate what will happen when the tool is used on a smaller and more easily defined scale. It was concluded that, for the European case, we may end up with looking at only a very small number of indicators and a limited number of countries. GB suggested that authorization should be given to ML to act when he finds that the material is deficient. ML said that he, Martina, Diana etc. will have to work also after January 31 with this.</p> <p>Decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plan A is to aim for a complete European coverage; Plan B is to aim for a complete European coverage as regards fiber and bio-energy etc. but as regards solid wood only where there is reliable data. - Regarding the TUZVO case, Martina Roubalova should be contacted for determining whether the TUZVO results sent so far are possible to use. - ML to keep an eye on the Cases where solid wood is involved for effects, so that flows are not distorted if solid wood is removed. - Sawmilling needs to be taken care of in a good way. A solution could be to group the sawmills according to size and then to make qualified guesses about conversion factors for them. ML to look into the matter and report back to the IP Board. 	<p>ML</p> <p>ML</p> <p>ML</p> <p>ML</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Final reporting - project results</p> <p><u>Updated list of current state of Ds and PDs</u></p> <p>KR had distributed a list of not yet submitted deliverables which was discussed.</p> <p><u>M0</u> A few non-submitted deliverables, the main one being D0.1.10 “Synthesis report on stakeholder interaction”, which is in progress.</p> <p><u>M1</u> The list of non-submitted deliverables is long which is understandable, M1 coming last in the reporting flow. The reports will be long. There are no deliverables to be deleted. Would need a little more time after January 31.</p> <p><u>M2</u> Also M2 has a long list of non-submitted deliverables. JMC however reported that a handful of deliverables were being reviewed at the moment/ will soon be finalized and yet another few will be finalized by the end of 2009.</p> <p><u>M3</u> KR’s M3 list was OK except for PD3.1.6 being deleted and replaced by PD3.1.8.</p> <p><u>M4</u> See “Decisions” below.</p> <p><u>M5</u> CO promised that the missing deliverables will be submitted in January.</p>	<p>KR</p> <p>RP, ML</p> <p>JMC</p> <p>GB</p> <p>CO</p>


<p><u>M6</u> Deliverable PD6.1.6 Completed stakeholder interviews/Road show summary report was deleted and replaced by D0.1.10. Most of the other not yet submitted deliverables are Year 4-versions of different dissemination material and activity plans.</p> <p>Decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - External reviews to be kept. - Also Module Leaders are suitable reviewers. - HW to check KR's list with her Module partners, especially BRE, and come back to KR. - Regarding Template 2 of the Final reporting, deadline Dec. 15, DMG to add a "descriptive summary" with the focus on important items. Some 10 partners who have still not submitted their Template 2 to DMG to do so immediately. - Also to list the scientific publications in Template 2. - To distribute a press-release in January-February presenting the final EFORWOOD results ("What did we arrive at?"). To translate the press-release and distribute it to national press in the partner countries. - Important missing Deliverables will be asked for in draft format. <p><u>Final publishable report – current situation. Deadline for initial contributions is Dec. 15, 2009</u> The outline of the final publishable report is still the same as in July 2009. So far only M2 and Erik Valinger have reported but their versions need to be updated.</p>	<p>DMG</p> <p>KR, M-leaders KR, M-leaders HW</p> <p>DMG All partners who have still not reported All partners</p> <p>KR, DMG</p> <p>KR</p>
<p><u>M1</u> Not started yet but will send draft to KR by the end of the week. Eric Arets will report to ML.</p>	<p>RP, ML</p>
<p><u>M2</u> Will shorten the submitted texts and highlight interesting examples.</p>	<p>JMC</p>
<p><u>M3</u> Draft text to be sent to KR this week by Franka Brüchert.</p>	<p>GB, JF</p>
<p><u>M4</u> Almost ready.</p>	<p>HW</p>
<p><u>M5</u> The Iberian Case-study is half ready; the transport part is on track. A first draft of the industry-consumer interactions will be ready tomorrow.</p>	<p>CO</p>
<p><u>M6</u> Not started yet but will send draft to KR and Christian Gamborg by the end of the week.</p> <p>KR wants the Final publishable report to be finalized by an editor with a journalistic view. Unfortunately the person intended is not available. Skogforsk will be responsible for the layout.</p>	<p>DMG</p> <p>KR</p>
<p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All M-Leaders to look for a suitable editor and to report to KR. 	<p>M-leaders</p>

	<p><u>EJFR – Special issue EFORWOOD – current situation</u> So far five papers had been received. They are up-loaded to the Editorial Manager. There are several new submissions in the pipeline. The second deadline is tomorrow.</p> <p>M1 has started the process (sent the paper to review).</p> <p>The M3 paper on harvesting is still waiting for results and will not be ready until after Christmas. KR meant that delays could be accepted by the journal.</p> <p>M4 and M5 have also started the process but M4 will not write a <u>scientific</u> paper.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DMG to remind partners to submit manuscripts. - A new deadline will be set. <p><u>Other joint efforts and plans</u></p> <p>a) “Challenges in implementing a sustainability impact assessment of Forest-Wood-Chains – Lessons learnt from EFORWOOD” This report is likely to be much appreciated by the European Commission. There was uncertainty regarding where to publish. The EJFR was one suggestion. Target groups should clearly be scientists (the methodology) and policy-makers.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KR to check what subjects different journals (similar to EJFR) focus on. <p>b) “High level synthesis paper” after a successful completion of EFORWOOD (ML’s idea), see: http://www.pnas.org/site/misc/sustainability.shtml Such a paper would clearly be targeted at scientists. The website content referred to also exists in paper version.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - b) is an announcement for later on. 	<p>RP, ML</p> <p>GB</p> <p>HW, CO</p> <p>DMG KR</p> <p>KR</p> <p>KR</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Data availability after the project At the end of the project, we will have at least four sets of data in the Database Client: Iberia, Baden-Württemberg, Scandinavia and EU25+2. Behind each of these databases stand a number of organisations which have contributed. ToSIA will be more or less freely available to third parties. But ToSIA is of no use without access to data. Some partners have expressed concerns regarding the conditions on which the databases should be available after the project.</p> <p>Proposal: So as to stabilise the situation after the project, a solution might be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) identify the responsible partners for each set of data, b) agree among the partners on common rules for distribution and use of the respective datasets. These rules could be implemented in the TMUG Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). <p>To the problem with some partners regarding free provision of data, KR said</p>	

	<p>that it is crucial that all partners are treated in the same way. He also stressed that a case-by-case solution to a) should be avoided.</p> <p>GB asked about the status of the Data Client. ML replied that, in the future, it will be possible to run on a local server of the partners.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KR to update the present draft MoU according to today's discussions concerning data availability. The new draft will be distributed among the IP Board and rapid replies are expected from the IP Board members. 	KR
6.	<p>Post EFORWOOD arrangements and activities</p> <p><u>Amendment to the Consortium Agreement (decision needed to allow for all partners signature before the end of the project!), TMUG MoU (decision needed in order to allow for an announcement to partners on the possibility to join TMUG)</u></p> <p>Decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The draft amendment to the Consortium Agreement sent out by KR was gone through and accepted with the suggested changes. - KR to distribute a new version of the TMUG Memorandum of Understanding on Thursday afternoon. - In that version the mechanisms for "protection" of data should be better defined according to ALUFR and FVA. - When the formal amendments have been added by GR to the Amendment to the Consortium Agreement; KR to formulate a letter to all partners before the end of the week in which he asks them to sign the Consortium Agreement and to invite partners to be members of TMUG on conditions set by the Memorandum of Understanding . - The Amendment to the Consortium Agreement and the TMUG Memorandum of Understanding to be treated as A PACKAGE. <p><u>Follow-up activities</u></p> <p>6a) R&D: Existing/planned/new ideas on application and development of ToSIA and other parts of the project?</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In early January, KR to distribute an e-mail inquiry in which partners will be asked to fill in planned and future follow-up projects related to EFORWOOD before the end of January. A number of such planned projects were mentioned during the meeting. <p>6b) Training activities for potential users? DMG said he is waiting for M1 results before he starts any training activities for project-internal or external users. There is certain basic documentation already, but more will be required.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ML and DMG to send out a survey, asking partners how many of them would need a ToSIA training course. Such a course would probably take place in March 2010. 	<p>KR, M-leaders</p> <p>KR</p> <p>KR</p> <p>GR, KR, all partners</p> <p>KR</p> <p>KR</p> <p>DMG, ML</p>
7.	<p>XXIII IUFRO World Congress, Seoul, 23-28 August 2010</p> <p><u>EFORWOOD representation in Technical Session E05</u></p> <p>KR reported that papers are slowly dropping in. Now at least 2 presentations</p>	

	<p>and 2 posters plus 2 contributions from third parties have been received. The coverage of EFORWOOD is, however, weak so far.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KR to make an overview, listing what would be needed to cover industrial aspects, demonstration, data collection, scenarios, etc. At least one comprehensive EFORWOOD overview would be necessary (perhaps to be presented by GB and/or RP/ML). 	KR
8.	<p>Next IP Board meetings</p> <p>Decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - February 18, 2010, at 13:00 CET (telephone conf.) - March 17-18, 2010, in Brussels in connection with the evaluation. 	KR
10.	<p>Dates for the final evaluation of EFORWOOD</p> <p>Astrid Kaemena accepts March 17-18, 2010, provided that the evaluators accept those dates. She is currently contacting possible evaluators. Angeles Blanco and Liisa Myllinen have accepted, Franz Schmithüsen, however, has not for private reasons. Astrid Kaemena had proposed replacements.</p> <p>Decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The following replacements to Frans Schmithüsen were chosen by the IP Board in order of priority: Peter Brang, Bernard Möring, Alfred Teichinger. - Instructions about how to prepare will be distributed by KR to the persons who will take part in the final evaluation well in advance of the meeting. 	<p>IP Board, KR</p> <p>KR</p>

Date as above.



Gunilla Rodfors



Kaj Rosén