



Uppsala, June 17, 2007

EFORWOOD IP Board meeting (18) – Minutes

Date: June 13, 2007, 11:00-18:00. European Forestry House, Brussels, Belgium.

Participants

IP Board members:

Gero Becker (GB), M3	Present
Jean-Michel Carnus (JMC), M2	Present
Arie Hooimeijer (AH), M4	-
Denis Mc Gowan (DMG), M6	Present
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
--------------------------	--------------------

1. Opening and adoption of agenda

Responsible

KR welcomed the participants to the 18th EFORWOOD IP Board meeting.

There were three additional items to the agenda: Item 5b: The Book Project, Item 15: ToSIA after the Project – Rules, and Item 16: Data Client – Access to Data.

2. Issues from the last IP Board minutes (17)

Item 5a), Module-specific indicators: There were comments to the limited engagement in this matter by M4 and M5. There was a fear for inconsistency between Modules as there may be differences in criteria chosen and in detailedness between Modules. Should we accept these inconsistencies and would it be accepted by ToSIA?

As an example, the "hot spots", like land use and water pollution from factories, should be found. GB commented that water pollution is already an indicator, so M4 and M5 must address it, and that module-specific indicators are necessary but not throughout the whole chain. RP said it must be defined whether an indicator is module-specific, general or "partial" and noted that some whole-chain indicators do not exist in all Modules. DMG suggested the EAP should be approached before we go out to the outside world with the indicator list, but maybe it is too early tomorrow, and wondered: What is ToSIA? Is it made up of all Modules or not? There is a hierarchy of indicators.

Also the mapping of the whole chain(s) with their specific processes was discussed. In M2 and M3, the number of processes is greater than in M4 and M5. What does that mean for the EFORWOOD and ToSIA credibility? Do M4 and M5 have the right level of aggregation? Could we aggregate later in

the project? Disaggregating is more difficult. We must also take care not to lose results. We have no answers yet, but we must come back to this issue. We have to be prepared for criticism and decisions made must be defensible. It was decided to leave the matter of the mapping of the whole chain(s) for the moment but it should be noted that it is a matter that must be solved.

Decisions:

- The Indicators' Coordination Group should be provided with a definition on the different kinds of indicators a) module-specific indicators, b) general indicators and c) partial ToSIA indicators (see below for IPB's definition). IPB

The following definitions were agreed on:

Whole chain indicators are:

- those existing in processes in all modules (such as energy consumption or labour consumption) or
- those existing in processes in some modules only, but are relevant for the performance of the whole chain (such as biodiversity, recreation or industrial pollution).

Module-specific indicators are used within module modeling only, for:

- detailed analysis to produce whole-chain indicators as a result,
- 'partial ToSIA' in assessing the processes without linking other parts of the chain.

3. Report concerning Commission approval of Annual reports, Financial reports and 13-30 months' Implementation Plan

Nothing new to report. Hopefully the arrival of new Scientific Officer, Karen Fabbri, starting on June 16, will speed up the process. KR/GR

GR also informed that the Annual reporting process for the second year will start in August, and that we hope to have got the payment for the first year by then.

4. The Task Force on the European FWC

Various matters were discussed. See also "ToSIA version for EFWC", draft June 7, 2007/RP, BS, which was distributed at the meeting.

There was a discussion whether the 80 % goal is appropriate. RP proposed that all National FWCs should be explored in the same way as the presented examples from Finland and Germany. Discussion followed. RP said let's drop it if we don't agree. KR said it might be the subject of an interesting master thesis to be carried out.

At IPB 17, the following composition of the Task Force on the European FWC was decided:

- M1: RP (chairman), Birger Solberg
- M2: JMC, Gert-Jan Nabuurs
- M3: GB
- M4: AH, NN
- M5: CO, Petri Vasara

Decision:

- Chris van Riet should complement AH in M4.
- GB would also nominate an additional person for M3.

GB

5. a) Communication

There was a discussion based on the EFORWOOD Communication strategy & plan, "Vision document", brochure (attached with the Agenda) and EFORWOOD "Road show" (from Christian Gamborg, distributed at the meeting), see further below.

The test version of the brochure had got a lot of comments in Zvolen (layout, content, not selling enough, target audience). DMG commented the current work in M6:

- a) Instead of the brochure or maybe together with the brochure, a corporate folder will be produced in which different sorts of material targeted at research or industrial groups may be put. A dummy was sent around for comments. DMG
- b) User stories from Modules are being collected for diverse uses (JMC is for instance producing one). DMG and M-Leaders
- c) The web portal: following discussions with GR and Maria Jonsson, the internal and external web portal are both getting a greater focus on news reporting. M6 and M0
- d) The EFORWOOD Conference, already late in planning. DMG
- e) The EFORWOOD Road show. KR stressed that Christian Gamborg must urgently find business key persons, NGOs and Commission key persons to address. The Road show meetings will be small. On Conference Day 2, there will be meetings with key persons within the different Commission DGs (see Item 10 below). DMG, Christian Gamborg

Generally, external comments say that EFORWOOD communication messages must be more distinct. In view to improve this, KR will have an exercise meeting with industry in Sweden in August together with Christian Gamborg as a model for the Road show meetings.

Decision:

- Christian's paper on the Road show should be commented by the Module Leaders, with a copy to KR and GR. GB volunteered to provide names of key persons. M-Leaders, GB
- KR suggested, in agreement with the Commission evaluation of the first EFORWOOD year, that the very ambitious communications' plan should be made more focused, some things dropped and a division between the tasks/role of M0 and M6 be made more clear. DMG/M6, M0
- A definition of stakeholders/target groups for different documents/events etc. should be made. The target groups should include the sister projects SENSOR and SEAMLESS etc. DMG
- Concerning the public web portal, it was agreed that news items concerning public D deliverables should include a link to this deliverable. This to be noted by all authors of PU deliverables. See also Item 9 below. DMG
- It was stated that we need a brochure as a stand alone tool for stakeholders, industry, NGOs, the Commission. This does not however exclude folder-making. DMG

b) Book project

As reported earlier, there is now a proposal from Springer Verlag with a

number of questions to be answered by EFORWOOD. There has been an e-mail from AH, saying that nobody in M4 has the possibility to contribute to the book, with a reference to ECOTARGET having decided not to produce a book. From the other Modules, external scientific communication was considered crucial with an opinion that the book would form a scientific basis for EFORWOOD result reporting.

Decisions:

- KR stated that there was a majority in favour of making the book. All partners
- Everybody should fill in the inquiry by DMG as well as possible as required by Springer. Answers to DMG before June 22. KR, PP
- KR and PP were accepted as editors of the book. An editorial board will have to be formed later. KR, AH
- KR will speak with AH. A non-contribution by M4 cannot be accepted.

6. EFORWOOD Week Brussels, October 3-5, 2007

Module meetings, cross-Module meetings and workshops were discussed. Module meetings are getting more and more complex as all Task Forces are cross-Module.

M1 will need 3-4 meetings on indicator and Task Force subjects. RP asked for more plenary meetings to keep partners on track. "Half a day in total for plenaries." To this KR commented that Day 2 of the Conference will present the status of where we are in EFORWOOD, focusing on results.

It was discussed if Friday could be cut from the EFORWOOD Week.

Decisions:

- Cross-Module meetings should be encouraged, Module meetings will have second priority. KR, M-Leaders
- There will be an IP Board meeting on Wednesday morning, while the rest of the EFORWOOD Week starts at 11. KR, M-Leaders
- The EFORWOOD Week will end at 15-16 o'clock on Friday. KR/GR/Maria
- Andreas Kleinschmit should be highlighted concerning budget solutions for hotel prices. Jonsson

7. Preparation of the EAP

The workload of the EAP was discussed (review of deliverables D and PD were discussed and how to use the EAP to the greatest advantage). Several options could be seen:

Option 1: Only to review deliverables selected by the Module Leader as crucial to elaborate.

Option 2: To add to that list those deliverables compliant with the professional area of the EAP members.

Option 3: To let each member of the EAP select deliverables in which they have a special interest.

Decision:

- A revised list of deliverables and reviewers will be established. The matter was decided to be taken up with the EAP at tomorrow's meeting. KR
- For Ds, there shall be one internal Module reviewer and 1-2 cross-Module or other external reviewer. KR
- For PDs, there shall be one project-internal or cross-Module reviewer. KR

8. Answer to the federations

a) The "Why EFORWOOD?" document was discussed.

Decision:

- There should not be a question-mark in a headline. KR
- The M-Leaders were asked to read and comment. Then the paper will be sent to a journalist for getting a journalistic touch. M-Leaders, KR
- Finalised, the document will be of great use for DMG for the brochure, the folder, the web portal etc, etc.

b) "How to use ToSIA" and the "comparison between ToSIA and LCA" was discussed. Jörg Schweinle, Staffan Berg, Hans Welling and Tina Pajula had looked at the LCA-version. The short version was preferred by the IPB to be used for the federations. The names of the authors should be included. RP had a comment for KR that he would provide after the meeting. CO would also send a track- and change-version to KR with changes.

RP
CO

Decisions:

- What to communicate to the federations will be a standing item on the IPB agenda for the future. (See item 13 of these minutes.) KR
- The proposed decision by KR was accepted: Based on the discussion, KR is given the mandate to answer the federations. The answer shall include the document "How to use ToSIA" (new title?), the "comparison between ToSIA and LCA" and the IPB point of view on the working practices with the federations. KR
- The contribution to M6 by the federations is assumed to remain as originally decided. KR

9. Publication of "public/PU" deliverables on the public web Portal

Decision:

- Deliverables (D) marked PU should be published on the public EFORWOOD web Portal. They should be called "Draft" until they are accepted by the Annual Report evaluation. DMG
- DMG, in communication with KR, provides a suitable space at the web Portal. DMG
- DMG, in communication with KR, is responsible for marketing and uploading/linking these deliverables on the public web Portal. DMG

10. EFORWOOD Conference

The status of the planning was discussed. It was noted that ample time must be left to coffee (45 minutes) and lunch breaks when so many people are expected. Day 1 would last preliminarily 14:00-16:45, Day 2 09:00-15:00 followed by a meeting with Commission representatives 15:00-17:00. A linear or thematic approach of the conference program was discussed. DMG would make a new draft and sent it around.

DMG

Decision:

- Electronic distribution was agreed on. Mailing from DMG or Andreas Kleinschmit and some 500 printed (nice layout) copies (hand-outs). DMG, Andreas Kleinschmit
- The conference will include a poster session. DMG
- A call for posters shall be distributed to EFORWOOD scientists (up to one poster per WP = 26). Internal posters only. Quality check by the Module Leader. Posters to be brought to the meeting by the WPs. DMG, WPs, M-Leaders
- Instructions to be made and distributed by DMG (size, layout etc).

- DMG is responsible for the poster session. The posters will be transported to the EFORWOOD Week from the Conference centre. DMG
- 11. Update of EFORWOOD working time table**
This is intended as a standing item at the IPB meetings.
- Decision:*
- The Working Time-table is approved without changes (see annex). KR
- 12. Request from "Indisputable Key" to use EFORWOOD results**
Through Staffan Berg, a message had been forwarded from EU-project "Indisputable Key" requesting to use EFORWOOD results or at least structure. The general feeling was positive, provided that references to EFORWOOD are made accordingly.
- Decision:*
- An authorised person in "Indisputable Key" may contact Ewald Rametsteiner to discuss the use of the indicator structure in EFORWOOD.
- 13. What to communicate to the federations?**
According to earlier decision, the IPB/M-Leaders are responsible for deciding what should be communicated to the federations.
- Decision:*
- Apart from the answer to the federations (cf. Item 8), the Coordinator shall communicate the following to the federations: KR
- The vision document "Why ToSIA?"
 - The Communications strategy and plan
 - The Working Time-table
- A decision concerning case studies will be made at the July 12 meeting. KR
- 14. Next IPB meetings**
Already decided:
- **IPB:** July 12, Teleconference
 - **IPB:** September 3 (Monday) at 08:00-16:00 CET, Warsaw, physical meeting (arrival on Sunday; PP informs about 2 possible hotels and arranges with transfer to the airport; meeting to be held at the Faculty) PP
- Decision:*
- **IPB:** October 3 at 08:30 (CET), physical meeting at CEI-Bois during the EFORWOOD Week
 - **IPB:** November 9 at 13:00-15:00 (CET), teleconference
- 15. ToSIA after EFORWOOD – Rules**
The Coordinator after consulting M1 has asked the Commission about the requirements regarding the openness of the project and how to deal with the results after the project. The question was whether the open source technology will require licensing to ToSIA (same problem for SENSOR and SEAMLESS). An official answer from the Commission has not yet been received. KR
- EFI will probably be the host of ToSIA after EFORWOOD. EFI

Decision:

The session reports from Zvolen should be edited into one document and be published on the portal.

KR/GR

16. Data client – Access to data

Protection was discussed. It is possible to include a functionality in the data client for the protection of sensitive data. Martin Cerny will be asked to give his opinion on that. After EFORWOOD, will the data client be an integral part of ToSIA? If you would wish to change parameters, yes. KR concluded that no doubt it would be an advantage if we can say that there is a protected area. During the project, however, there will be no external user of ToSIA.

Decision:

KR continues the discussion with M1.

KR, M1

Date as above.



Gunilla Rodfors



Kaj Rosén