



## COST ACTION FP1301

**“Innovative management and multifunctional utilization of traditional coppice forests - an answer to future ecological, economic and social challenges in the European forestry sector (EuroCoppice)”**

### **SG Meeting MINUTES**

**Impact Hub “Boardroom”, Amsterdam  
14<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup> of February, 2017**

#### **Participants**

Chair: Gero Becker

Vice-Chair: Raffaele Spinelli

Organisation: Alicia Unrau

STSM Coordinator: Pieter Kofman

WG 1: Dagnija Lazdina

WG 2: Norocel-Valeriu Nicolescu

WG 3: Natascia Magagnotti

WG 4: Florian Borlea

WG 5: Debbie Bartlett

#### **Agenda**

1. Short introduction to the “Impact Hub” by staff
2. Welcome, approval of agenda & nomination of rapporteur
3. Budgets and spending
  - a. Grant Period 4 (current GP) – review of spending; options for leftover funds
  - b. STSM applications (last call) – vote
  - c. Grant Period 5 (final GP) – planning
  - d. Decisions to be made by the end of the meeting (revisited in (7); end of day 1)
4. Deliverables:
  - a. Status and Timeline
  - b. Data and Statistics
  - c. Formats
  - d. Possible small meeting(s) in March/April for the above
  - e. Review Committee
  - f. Dissemination until end of Action (especially Limoges and Freiburg Conferences)
  - g. Final Action Dissemination (FAD)
5. Decisions on upcoming budgets (point 3 continued) ----- END OF DAY 1 -----
6. Policy Paper (*\*in depth\**)
7. Typology (*\*in depth\**)
8. Limoges Final Conference
  - a. Status
  - b. Plan Action presentations (*\*in depth\**)
  - c. Panel discussion
  - d. Attracting external participants
9. Meeting in Freiburg (Sept 2017)
10. Closing remarks



## 1. Short introduction to the “Impact Hub” by staff

A representative from the Impact Hub outlined the history of the movement and the current community in Amsterdam. <http://www.impacthub.net/> <http://amsterdam.impacthub.net/>

## 2. Welcome, approval of agenda & nomination of rapporteur

Action Chair Gero Becker welcomed the participants to Amsterdam and thanked everyone for joining. The Agenda for the two days was approved; some WG1 points were moved forward since DL had to leave early. AU volunteered to write the minutes.

## 3. Budgets and spending

### a. Grant Period 4 (current GP) – review of spending; options for leftover funds

The status of spending for this Period was reviewed:

#### Overview:

141 000.00 €	Total Budget
18 391.31 €	15 % Coordination (included in “Total Budget” above)
79 077.65 €	spent
25 670.96 €	planned (Amsterdam, TS & Printing)
8 234.00 €	STSM applications
9 600.00 €	left over; to reallocate

Approximately 9 600 € can still be allocated. The SG members discussed possible options agreed to return to the decision after the point on the Deliverables.

### b. STSM applications (last call) – vote

The following applications were submitted before the Feb 13<sup>th</sup> final deadline:

Name	From – To	Dates	Request	Title
Angela Blazquez	Spain to Finland	15.03 – 15.04	2500 €	Modelling methodologies focused on different machine learning using Rstudio for stand classification and productivity
Ivalyo Tsvetkov	Bulgaria to Belgium	02.04. – 14.04.	1870 €	Improving skills for ecophysiological (and meteorological) research applicable to poplar SRC
Giovanni Aminti	Italy to Spain	19.03 – 15.04	2410 €	Study performance of a new coppice harvesting system
Abel Rodrigues	Portugal to Denmark	03.04 – 07.04.	800 €	The technical evaluation, through methodologies in field and laboratory, of poplar and willow SRCs biomass concerning its lifecycle, from production to thermal conversion
Abhishek Tripathi	Czech R. to Latvia	18.03. – 25.03	654 €	Measurement of tree height using lidar and gas fluxes by chamber methods
		Total:	8234 €	

**SG vote:** The SG approved all STSMs

It was agreed that the STSMs are a valuable tool for the Action - the STSM hosts are much appreciated!  
It would not be possible without them.

Since no funds will be available next Period, the Call for STSMs is now closed.

### c. Grant Period 5 (final GP) – planning

COST has already sent the figure for next (final) budget, as well as the mandate to prepare the Work and Budget Plan (requires an MC vote).

Grant Period 5 (GP5)

01.05.2017 – 15.10.2017 (5.5 months)

73.600 € Total Budget

There are comparatively few funds in the final GP as it is less than a full year and COST calculates the funds proportionally. Since the Final Conference in Limoges is in GP5, most of the funds must be invested in the Conference.

The WBP options were discussed. It was agreed that more funds are needed to ensure the sustainable impact of Action results.

The following was proposed:

Activity	Specifics	Funds
Meeting	Final Conference Limoges	56.700,00€
Meeting	IUFRO Freiburg	11.440,00€
Dissemination	COST Website	1.500,00€
Dissemination	Printing	3.000,00€
Bank Fees	bank fees	300,00€

→ This exceeds the budget by approx. 10 000€. In case we are obliged to cut back activities, the meeting in Freiburg will be reduced and the printing will be removed.

#### Final Conference Limoges:

A) Lowering the flat-rate for accommodation to 100 EUR per night (in the “TRRs”)

There are hotels already pre-reserved for the Conference that range from 60 – 100 EUR a night, so the reduced rate will still cover the costs. This change allows the optimisation of the (tight) budget and more Action Members can be invited to Limoges.

B) List of eligible participants

A two-phase invitation process for the eligible participants in Limoges:

\* Phase 1 – invitation to the following Members, who are especially important for the Conference, giving a deadline for registration:

- MC Members and MC Observers (as per COST rules),
- SG Members and Action Management,
- accepted 1st author oral and poster presenters
- Local Organisers
- Panelists for the Panel Discussion as external experts (if necessary)

\* Phase 2 – invitation to all other Members

According to the response from Phase 1, a second round of invitations would be sent to all other Action Members. The remaining spaces will then be filled to the number of eligible participants to be reimbursed by COST on a first-come-first-serve basis.

The number of eligible participants to be reimbursed by COST depends on the outcome of the Work and Budget Plan (see above); the proposal is 62. This is a reasonable number based on the experience of previous Conferences and we think it will be very likely that members from "Phase 2" to have the chance to join the Conference.

In case of leftover funds from Limoges, these would be reallocated to the Freiburg meeting and to printing.

#### Freiburg IUFRO meeting

The eligible participants to be reimbursed by COST would be those taking part as first author in the Conference.

**SG vote:** all in favour of all points above.

→ These points are now subject to COST and MC approval.

## **4. Deliverables:**

### **a. Status and Timeline**

#### **Timeline:**

April 1st	→	Deliverables to be printed must be ready
June 19th	→	Action Conference, Limoges
Sept 18th	→	IUFRO Congress, Freiburg
Oct 15th	→	Action Ends

Deliverables that are published by EuroCoppice should be

- (1) Edited, finalised and formatted by Limoges
- (2) Available for download on the website

#### **Status:**

The status of all Deliverables was reviewed.

- It was clear that the Dels will need to be compared and harmonised before publication.
- The authors'/contact person's email should be on each Deliverable.
- List of Deliverables on the website: once Dels are completed and put on the website, it should be easy to see where information can be found for specific countries.

#### WG1 Factsheet:

- Noro send will send pictures to DL, PK, & AU;
- Two illustrations will be modified: on the bottom left and "Coppice with Standards"
- The title for the illustrations on the right (bottom) will be changed (could include "ligniculture"?)

#### WG2 Country Reports:

Countries reports still missing are Bosnia, Israel, Latvia and France. VNN will contact the first two, DL promised the Latvian report soon and GB will contact the French Team.

#### WG3 Factsheet:

Final draft will be sent to AU by 15.03, with the pictures sent separately.

WG3 Guidelines: a first draft will be sent to AU by 25.03.; the Deliverable will be finalised at the WG3 Meeting in Limoges.

#### WG 4 rules and regulations:

It was discussed that:

- The audience for the “Country Reports” and “Rules and Regulations” are different and should, thus, be separate documents.
- The author(s) should be added under each country headline (as opposed to the beginning of the document) with contact data of the corresponding author. Additional contributing persons can be mentioned underneath the author’s name(s). It is important that a distinction be made between the author of the text and “supporting experts”.
- The title should reflect that not all COST countries are covered. It could be “some European countries”, “sample European countries” or simply “European countries”(?), but **not** “selected European countries”.

→ This information will be communicated to WG Leader Peter Buckley and he will be asked to elaborate on the timing.

#### WG 5 Factsheet

DB will send AU the word version of the Factsheet.

#### **b. Data and Statistics**

Country data is being collected by different WGs:

**DL** Coppice definition in English & local language; legal framework; statistics; types of coppice

**VNN** Country Reports (still missing Israel, Bosnia, Latvia and France)

**PB** Rules and Regulations for 13 countries (more to come?)

**AU** ha & %: Forest, Broadleaved/Conifer, Coppice, SRC(?), Forest Ownership, Coppice Ownership & Map of coppice distribution (approximate)

It was agreed that these be left separate as different Deliverables (rather than combining them).

Statistics are considered important, but will never really be “true” → the gaps and difficulties with the figures should be highlighted in the document(s). It is important to make sure that the data is consistent in all documents and, if not, that it is explicitly mentioned, preferably with the respective references.

The WG1 & WG2 factsheets should also be compared to spot contradictions.

#### **c. Formats**

All Deliverable documents will be in a common format. All formatting will be done by AU. Draft templates were presented & feedback will be considered.

Depending on the length of the Deliverable, they will either be in a leaflet (e.g. factsheets) or booklet (e.g. guidelines) format.

#### **d. Possible small meeting(s) in March/April for the above**

It was agreed that a small, task-oriented meeting (optimally 3-4 persons) should be held to do a final review of all Deliverables that are ready by the end of March. Participants would review all Deliverables for consistency and harmonise if necessary. AU, GB and VNN would attend, as well as PK, who offered to host in Denmark. Since WG 3 should also be represented, but NM and RS are unavailable, DB agreed to ask David Rossney if he is able to attend. His participation would have the added benefit of another native speaker.

→ A proposal for the meeting will be sent to the MC for a vote.

DB noted that if there are extra funds, members of WG5 would like to meet in Serbia to progress on their review paper → unfortunately there no more funds available for single WGs (see point 5).

#### **e. Deliverables Review Committee**

The Deliverables will be reviewed by those present at the meeting (point above).

#### **f. Dissemination until end of Action**

The SG agreed to have as many Deliverables for printing by the beginning of April as possible (to be reviewed in March – see 4.d.); optimally all “document” Deliverables will be finalised other than the WG3 Guidelines.

Deliverables will be distributed in Limoges to all participants on a memory stick.

Printed Deliverables will mainly be distributed at larger Conferences that are not organised by the Action: e.g. the 125<sup>th</sup> IUFRO Congress and FORMEC.

#### **g. Final Action Dissemination**

##### **Background**

A detailed formal application must be approved by the MC and submitted to COST 6 months prior to the Action end date (= April 15th). The Grant Holder is responsible for all invoices and activities. It is not feasible to do any extra research / produce new material after the Action is finished.

##### **Format: Must be a „product“ for Dissemination**

Since online documents (and also leaflets) are not accessible for longer periods, it would be beneficial to have a “longer-lasting” Action output, also for future scientific work on coppice. Another important point in this regard is that the Chair & Grant Holder (GB & AU) do not have the time or resources after the end of the Action to produce / coordinate extensive FAD outputs.

→ It was agreed that the production of a „Coppice Handbook“ as FAD is the only feasible option.

This proposal was already discussed by the SG in Mainz and subsequently put to a MC vote in Antwerp, but some MC members suggested exploring further options. The issue will again be put to an MC vote, but the reason for the proposal will be explained more in detail.

Further points on a possible “Coppice Handbook”:

- Target Audience: Selected EU and national stakeholders, scientific libraries → to be distributed via MC Members
- It would incorporate all Deliverables in a consistent way
- The contributing authors would be named in each respective deliverable (section)
- An Annex can include additional material/literature
- Volume: 200 – 300 pages
- Number of copies (approx.): 300

### **5. Decisions on upcoming budget (point 3 cont.)**

1) Small meeting in Denmark (3-5 persons) to compare, harmonise and finalise all Action Deliverables --> estimate = 3925 EUR

2) Printing of Action Deliverables --> all remaining funds = ca. 5675 EUR

This would apply to all Deliverables that are finalised on time, likely: Coppice Factsheet, Coppice Typology, Silviculture Guidelines, Country Reports, Products Factsheet, Interface between Silviculture and Operations, Governance Factsheet, Policy Paper, Statistics & Glossary.

**SG vote:** all in favour

→ This will be sent to the MC for a vote.

## **6. Policy Paper**

GB and AU had circulated a draft prior to the meeting based on a previous draft by DB.

In general, SG Members agreed that our audience is on the European level in areas related to forest management, energy, rural development, environment and conservation. The backgrounds of such policy makers is very broad; it is likely that many (/most) do not have a forestry background and do not know what coppice is.

→ A basic description coppice should be included as a box

→ The paper should be simple, structured and straight forward

The draft Paper was discussed in detail and shortened to the most important points. GB and AU will continue adapting the draft and will circulate the new version by mid-March.

## **7. Typology**

Each point in the draft document provided by VNN was discussed and amended. AU will send the new document to VNN and he will check the Forest Types document and provide pictures.

## **8. Limoges Final Conference**

### **a. Status**

The Scientific Committee reviewed all abstracts and NM sent acceptance emails in January – GB thanks them very much for their work.

AU has been in contact with the French Orga Team regarding invitations etc – GB and AU are very thankful for their work. The invitations will be sent around soon.

NM will organise three moderators for the sessions – members of the French Team will have priority if they are willing. It is important that the moderators realise that time is short and that presentation must be 12 min max, 3 min for discussion.

The Book of Abstracts should be ready by the end of April if possible.

### **b. EuroCoppice presentation**

AU will present “EuroCoppice in a nutshell” in Limoges. She will draft the main points to be highlighted in the presentation and review these with the WG Leaders / SG, asking for feedback. The presentation can be up to 45 min, but can be less (e.g. 20 min) to allow for a discussion period with WG Leaders.

### **c. Panel Discussion**

GB & AU have been contacting possible candidates. Three panelists have agreed to participate thus far, representing (1) the EC, (2) COST, (3) a pulpmill supplier. Other candidates have been approached (forest owners and nature conservation) and we are awaiting their reply.

RS & NM will review possible Italian candidates and send the options to GB & AU.

DB suggested ENEP and will send AU contact information.

GB will chair the discussion and will give the SG the opportunity to supply possible questions/topics in advance of the Conference.

## 9. Meeting in Freiburg (Sept 2017)

Timeframe: September 19 – 20, 2017

The meeting will be held in parallel with the IUFRO Congress, to cooperate with the new WP 1.03.01 and ensure the sustainable impacts of the Action.

The new WP 01.03.01 (initiated by the Action) has an approved coppice session at the Congress:

- Coordinated by VNN
- „**Traditional coppice: ecology, silviculture and socio-economic aspects**”
- Date of the session not yet allocated (t.b.d. by IUFRO)
- Min. 2.5 hours

26 abstracts submitted (19 oral, 7 poster)

- IUFRO requested a (2<sup>nd</sup>) prioritized selection proposal
- Proposal sent by Noro, Gero & Alicia:
  - 1<sup>st</sup> Priority = 7 (10/10 points)
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> Priority = 9 (9/10 points)
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> Priority = 10 (8/10 points; includes posters)
- The posters will likely be invited regardless of the points
- Orals that are declined may be invited as posters
- Definitive decision to be made by IUFRO (pending)

Participation and participation fee for the IUFRO Congress is ca. 600 - 650 € - it cannot be sponsored by COST!

## 10. Future Projects

Contact has been made with Frederic Berger (IRSTEA, Grenoble), the coordinator of a new INTERREG project on rock fall called “RockTheAlps” regarding a possible exchange or cooperation.

## 11. Closing remarks

The Chair thanked all SG Members for a fruitful meeting and looks forward to meeting again in Limoges.