

Stockholm, May 28, 2007

EFORWOOD IP Board meeting (17) – Minutes

Date: May 7, 2007, 21:00-22:00 and May 8, 2007, 18:00-19:00. Hotel Kaskády, Zvolen, Slovakia.

Participants

IP Board members:

Gero Becker (GB), M3 Present at the May 7 part of the meeting

Jean-Michel Carnus (JMC), M2

Arie Hooimeijer (AH), M4

Denis Mc Gowan (DMG), M6

Carl Olsmats (CO), M5

Present

Piotr Paschalis (PP), M0

Present

Risto Päivinen (RP), M1 Present

Kaj Rosén (KR), M0 Present, chairman

Others:

Gunilla Rodfors (GR), M0 Present, secretary

Marcus Lindner (ML), M1 Present at the May 8 part of the meeting Ewald Rametsteiner (ER), M1 Present at the May 8 part of the meeting Diana Vötter (DV), M3 Present at the May 8 part of the meeting

1. Opening and adoption of agenda

Responsible

KR welcomed the participants to the 17th EFORWOOD IP Board meeting.

2. Issues from the last IP Board minutes (16)

The Items had either been taken care of or are covered by Items in the current minutes.

3. Report concerning Commission Approval of Annual Reports, Financial Reports and the 13-30 months' Implementation Plan

Nothing new to report (cf. IP Board minutes (16)).

GR, KR

4. EFORWOOD stakeholders and external relations

<u>Discussion on the "CEPI-paper" (May 2, 2007) and guidelines for an EFORWOOD answer</u>

The aim was to finalise a first draft as an answer to the "CEPI-paper", which was supported by CEI-Bois and to some extent also by CEPF. At the May 2 meeting not all items were discussed but there was a genuine attempt of communication and understanding. Based on the first years experiences, the Confederations want to make changes in their way of contributing to EFORWOOD. They are not positioned to contribute to technical parts of the project development. Their expertise could be of better use to EFORWOOD by careful selection of the material they are expected to respond to. This could be achieved by letting the Module Leaders act as prime contact points with the Confederations from now on.

The IP Board can decide on time for and situations when there is a need for an input or a response from the Confederations regarding the progress of the project.

If we go back in time, there was a will from the Confederations to take part many WPs. They have realised that this will not work for them. In changing their role in the project, the Contract with the Commission and the Consortium Agreement must be respected. The Confederations do not wish to decrease their participation in the project and as was pointed out, they have substantial resources (CEI-Bois 42 man-months, CEPI 25 and CEPF 11.5) for taking part in the project.

EFORWOOD needs to specify its requirements as regards the participation of the Confederations in view of the Contract with the Commission and with the Consortium.

RP and CO suggested that a list of FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions) concerning the project should be placed on the EFORWOOD Portal.

Decision:

 KR finalises the project response to the CEPI-paper, asking for comments by the IP Board before sending the response to the Confederations. KR, M-Leaders

5. Timetables and deadlines (cf. Annex)

a) Data collection protocols, Single FWC, Case studies, European FWC This will be an M0 deliverable. The five groups have almost compiled the material by now. DV and Staffan Berg are summarizing the material. After finalising the data collection of the Single FWC, the indicator set will be reviewed and updated. By the end of next week, the draft deliverable will be distributed to the M- and WP-leaders, for them to be able to start data collection for the Single FWCs.

Questions revealed in connection to the data collection protocols should primarily be placed in the discussion forums of the Portal to be answered by the coordinators of the Indicator working groups.

The five WG coordinators have missed a responsible person to take the lead of the group. A Task Force on Indicators composed of the five coordinators of the Indicator Working Groups and lead by ER was proposed. Next meeting will be at next EFORWOOD Week. KR proposed that the Task Force on Indicators should have the mandate to revise the indicators.

Decisions:

- The data collection protocol will be available in the beginning of next week.
- WP1.1 is responsible for the revision of the indicators. A <u>Task Force</u> on <u>Indicators</u> lead by ER and including the coordinators of the Indicator Working Groups, Irina Prokofieva, Jörg Schweinle, Jobien Laurijssen, Åsa Moberg and Elisabeth Le Net, will work on the revision of the indicators and suggest how to proceed. This should be done well ahead of the IP Board September 3 meeting. The group is complemented by Staffan Berg and DV.
- A <u>Task Force on the European FWC</u>, with a first task to define the European case including indicators was formed. Initially the Task

Staffan Berg, DV

RP

Force will be composed of RP (chairman) and Birger Solberg (M1), JMC and Gert-Jan Nabuurs (M2), GB (M3), AH and NN (M4), CO and Petri Vasara (M5). A second person representing M4 will be decided on the next IP Board meeting.

RP

IPB

b) ToSIA prototypes including a draft user interface, scenarios

C.f. Annex. It was pointed out that the work with the ToSIA interface was scheduled very late in the time table. To improve communications with stakeholders, we need to start the work earlier.

c) Communication plan and brochure

DMG shortly presented the communication plan (it was further presented during a plenary session) and invited partners to give comments to the new EFORWOOD brochure, which had been produced for the Zvolen meeting, before May 22.

M-Leaders, partners

d) Annual reporting

The coordinating team has started the planning of the second annual reporting. To a great extent the process will be the same as for the first year, but some improvements will be made. Information will go out to partners by midsummer.

KR, GR

6. EFORWOOD Conference Brussels and EFORWOOD Week Brussels – update

Decisions concerning the following matters were decided to be made at the coming IP Board meetings.

Decisions:

- For the Conference, there is a need for organising with the Module Leaders parallel Module meetings and a poster session with posters presenting results from different WPs.

DMG, M-Leaders

7. Issues generated during the present EFORWOOD Week

a) Classification of agenda points, IP Board meetings

Decisions:

- It was decided that the agenda points, as far as possible, should be classified as follows: Decision, definition, discussion, information.

KR

- The IP Board meetings will occur about monthly in order to reduce the length of the telephone conferences. Meeting dates should be fixed long in beforehand.

KR

b) External reviewers (EAP or other) of deliverables

KR distributed PP's list. For D deliverables there will be two reviewers (one module-internal and one module-external), for PDs there will be only one, preferably from another Module. The EAP will look at D deliverables.

Decision:

- The IPB agreed to give comments to the list of external reviewers before Friday, May 11.

Module Leaders

8. Next meetings

Already decided:

- **IPB:** June 13 at 11:00 CET, Forestry House, Brussels (problem for M4)
- **Info to EUSTAFOR:** June 13 or 14, Brussels

- **EAP:** June 14, Forestry House, Brussels (arranged by PP)(decision to look closer at the market needs)
- **IPB:** July 12, teleconference
- **IPB:** September 3 at 08:00 CET, Warsaw, physical meeting

9. Any other business

There was no other business.

Date as above.

Gunilla Rodfors

Kaj Rosén

Working Time Tables

SINGLE FWCs

Reference Cases and Scenarios for Single FWCs	Month no.	Month
Finalised collection of complete whole chain and module specific indicator	(15/16) 19-20	(Feb/Mar) May-June
Presentation of ToSIA applications and results of first indicator data collection for EFORWOOD conference		
Presentation of scenario analysis using Single FWC for EFORWOOD conference	24	Oct

	Month	Month
Policy Scenarios for Single FWCs	no.	
Select policy cases	24	Oct
First results ready for sustainability conference in Berlin, April 2008	31	Apr

CASE STUDIES

0/102 0100120		
	Month no.	Month
Specification of Case Studies according to schedule finalised at Zvolen meeting	19	May
Data collection scheduled for month 19-27 – but should be delayed until after revision of indicator sets	(19-27)	(May-Jan)
	23-27	Sep-Jan
Scenario analysis of external drivers and chain innovations on sustainability in Case Studies	31-36	Maj-Oct

ToSIA PROTOTYPE

	Month no.	Month
Start of test of the implementation of ToSIA in OpenMI after finalisation of prototype 2	22-	Aug-
Prototype 2 will still be used for Single FWC analysis of technology changes comparing alternative scenarios (including projections until 2025).		
The application of ToSIA for Case studies and the analysis of scenarios with response functions is planned with ToSIA 1.0		

FURTHER TOSIA DEVELOPMENT

	Month no.	Month
Focus on Prototype 2 development and applications for Single FWCs	19-24	May-Oct
Focus on developing ToSIA 1.0 in OpenMI with response functions	25-30	Nov-Apr
Focus on case study analysis using different scenarios	31-36	May-Oct
Focus on user interface, sensitivity studies and improvement of tool usage	37-45	Nov-Jul

EUROPEAN FWC

	Month no.	Month
Specification of the European FWC	19 -	May -
European FWC analysis	37-45	Nov-Jul