

ENFORS (COST Action E25)

European Network for Long-term Forest Ecosystem and Landscape Research

Minutes from the third Steering Committee meeting March 18, 2002, at the Berlin Brandenburg Academy of Sciences, Berlin, Germany

Participants:

Folke Andersson (Sweden, chairman)
Reinhard Hüttl (Germany)
Norbert Kräuchi (Switzerland)
Olivier Laroussinie (France)
Ernst Leitgeb (Austria)
Anders Mårell (secretary)
Giorgio Matteucci (Italy)
Berndt-Uwe Schneider (Germany, co-ordinator of the second Management Committee meeting)

Time: 10.30 – 14.30

Location: Berlin Brandenburg Academy of Sciences, Jägerstr. 12, Berlin (Berlin-Mitte)

Agenda:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Welcome | Chairman |
| 2. Today's agenda | Chairman |
| 3. E 25 - a pilot project | Chairman |
| 4. Working plan March 2002 - Dec 2003 | Chairman, Secretary |
| 5. Budget 2002- 2003 | Chairman, Secretary |
| 6. Reports from WG 1 A and B | Laroussinie, Leitgeb, Secretary |
| 7. Theory papers WG 2 A and B, WG 3 | Huettl, Matteucci, Kräuchi |
| 8. Guidelines for nomination of working group members | Huettl, Matteucci, Kräuchi |
| 9. Future realisation of ENFORS - action in relation to the 6th Framework Program | Chairman, Laroussinie |
| 10. Agenda for Cottbus and additional items there | Chairman |
| 11. Additional items (e.g. pamphlet, STSM, newsletter No. 3) | Chairman, Secretary |
| 12. Closing of the SC meeting | |

1. Welcome

The chairman opened the meeting.

2. Today's agenda

The chairman went through and adjusted the agenda.

3. E 25 – a pilot project

The chairman informed that COST Action E25 has been chosen as a pilot project for the evaluation of a new administration system for COST Actions. ENFORS will have its own administration and budget from May 1, 2002 and onwards for one and a half years (*i.e.* end of 2003). The ENFORS Secretariat will take on this new role of administrating the Action and ECOFOR in Paris will be the beneficiary institute.

(Comment added by Anders Mårell 20 March 2003: Arne Been informed the ENFORS Secretariat March, 20 that the contract will be for one year and that it will be valid July 1, 2002 – July, 1 2003. Then a new contract will have to be worked out for the next period.)

4. Working plan March 2002 – Dec 2003

A detailed working plan for ENFORS during 2002 and 2003 was presented by the ENFORS secretariat. The working plan was discussed in relation to the allocated budget and the coming administrative changes.

Proposed changes:

- January – Preliminary report "Comparative study of the development of research programmes at European field research facilities associated with forest ecosystem and landscape research".
- To move the combined third Management Committee (MC), first Working Group (WG) 2, and first WG 3 meeting to end of March instead of February.

An inquiry about the possibilities for having the first WG 2 meeting in combination with the last WG1 meeting in November 2001 was raised. However, the allocated budget form a major restriction on the number of meetings possible to accomplish during a budget year and it seems unlikely to include such a meeting within the present budget frame.

5. Budget 2002 – 2003

The ENFORS secretariat presented a suggestion for a budget for 2002 and 2003 that was based on the allocated amount by the COST Secretariat in Brussels. The budget was discussed in relation to the working plan and the future progress of the Action. A total budget of 63 801 Euro have been allocated per year to the COST Action E25 by the Commission, which impose restrictions on the number of meetings and STSM possible to combine within a budget year. Depending on the number of delegates attending the Cottbus meeting, there might the possibility for having additional STSM than the two missions suggested in the present budgetary proposal.

Modern information technology such as electronic conferences, e-mail meetings, and telephone-meetings will be used as complements to traditional meetings in order to reduce the costs and increase the efficiency within the Action.

An adjusted budget according to the proposed changes with regard to the working plan 2002-2003 will be presented to the Brussels administration and at the next MC meeting.

6. Reports from WG 1 A and B

The draft reports from WG 1 were discussed. The Chairman stressed the importance that the Technical Report No. 1 on Scientific issues should presents a clear platform on which the future work of ENFORS should build upon, and that the next MC meeting clarifies this platform and validate the conclusions made by WG 1.

Comments about overlaps and interactions between working groups:

General remarks were made about the importance of defining the aim of each WG so that the overlaps are minimised, but that they will nevertheless be present and should be identified and clarified in the documents produced by the different WGs. WGs 2 and 3 will follow after WG 1, and their work should be based on the conclusions given by WG 1. The MC is the body to validate the conclusions given by WG 1 and the task of the MC is also to organise and direct the iterative process by which the working groups will develop during the Action.

Scientific issues:

Additions were discussed around the following items:

- to include something about methodology and already existing methods, planning, decision support models, programmes, networks etc., and
- the role of productivity.
- the importance of having a clear direction for ENFORS that is easy to see when reading the document.

Guidelines:

Comments and additions were discussed around the following items/questions:

- the inventory should have a well-defined objective of its own,

- how closed or open should the inventory be ("Scientific issues" could be directives for narrowing down the inventories and the "Guidelines" could be open)?, the general feeling was to have an open inventory,
- the inventories and the development of the network is a hierarchy composed of three steps that involve feedback mechanisms (Step 1: matching the general criteria; Step 2: matching the specific criteria; Step 3: selection sites to be included in the ENFORS network),
- hierarchy of sites in the database (where the sites fulfil different levels of the criteria and aspects of ENFORS), and
- the guidelines should not be too strict so that valuable sites with additional and specific information complementing other sites are excluded.

Word-documents of the draft reports will be sent out to the SC-members directly after the SC-meeting, where the SC-members will be asked to give their comments and additions before the end of March so that a new draft can be sent out to the MC and WG 1 members a minimum of two weeks before the next MC meeting in Cottbus.

7. Theory papers WG 2 A and B, WG 3

The drafts of the theory papers of WG 2 and 3 were discussed. A standard layout will be applied to the drafts by the ENFORS secretariat before the next MC meeting.

WG2 A – Research program

Comments and additions were discussed around the following items/questions:

- integration of existing data and integration tools,
- down-scaling should be added as an important aspect,
- the goal should be changed to sustainable ecosystem and landscape forestry

At this stage, the theory paper of WG 2 would benefit from developing the methodology of the working group rather than elaborate the research programme. This could be organised around the following items:

- the need for a hierarchy of objectives that is already mentioned in the draft,
- the analysis of the current situation,
- the role of a modelling - use of decision support models - as part of the future scientific programme, and
- the use, nature and content of a common set of data.

Overlaps between WG 1 and WG 2

The MC will conclude on the work of WG 1 and those conclusions will have to be discussed again within WG 2. The discussion should remain open and rather describe the iterative process by which the final programme of the net will be developed. This process will also depend on the selection of sites that will be made by the MC after the call for participation.

WG2 B – Instrumentation

Comments and additions were discussed around the following items/questions:

- dependence on the national inventories,
- the provided list should be seen as recommendations and suggestions for possible methods and measurements at the sites ("there are no musts"),
- modelling approaches and integration tools should be added,
- access to and harmonisation of data, and
- harmonisation of headings with that of working group 1 "Scientific issues".

WG3 – Linking with monitoring and research programs

Comments and additions were discussed around the following items/questions:

- add an introduction on the win-win situation for research-monitoring networks,
- how recognised is ENFORS within the scientific community?,
- does or will ENFORS have the mandate for imposing standards or shall they be in the form of suggestions?,
- it is important to define the niche of ENFORS so that other networks can see what ENFORS will be able to contribute with, and

- the importance of collaborating with co-ordinators of other related monitoring and research networks.

Suggested additions for the win-win situation:

To develop the objectives and the possible content of the win-win relation between the network of research sites and the monitoring programmes as follows.

Objectives

For researchers using monitoring data : to explore new questions, to test models, to look for permanent variables, generalisation, to catch interannual variations. For monitoring people expecting research help : improvement in the assessment provided (or let say the valorisation of their data), development of data collecting, both from the point of view of the nature of data (which is correlated to the assessment you are able to provide with them) and of technological progress, development of predictive models.

Content

Data harmonisation, modelling...

Suggested additions with regard to inventories

To add something about the existing national forest inventories. In France they try to broaden the scope of it to the C&I of sustainable forest management, and they have been collecting ecological data for more than 10 years for that. Andreas Schuck (andreas.schuck@efi.fi) of EFI could probably provide information of existing initiatives at the European level to link the inventories. In France, Gerome Pignard could be asked for existing works in harmonisation of national inventories data (gpignard@cer.ifn.fr).

8. Guidelines for nomination of working group members

The co-ordinators of WGs 2 A and B, and 3 are responsible for making a strategy and instructions for the nomination of members to WG 2 and 3. These guidelines are to be distributed to the MC-members through the ENFORS secretariat well in advance for the next MC meeting.

9. Future realisation of ENFORS – action in relation to the 6th Framework Program

The chairman gave a short presentation of the 6th Framework Program (FP6) in relation to ENFORS possibilities to apply for funding within the program. There are research topics within the FP6 with which the ENFORS profile fit very well, and the instruments to be considered are "Network of excellence" and "Integrated projects". However, more information about the FP6 is needed and Folke Andersson will ask Arne Been if he could give a short presentation of the FP6 (with special emphases on instruments) at the next Management Committee meeting in Cottbus.

The MC at its next meeting should create a group that will develop a strategy for ENFORS in relation to the FP6. Meanwhile, the Chairman and the ENFORS secretariat have the mandate to write and send in a declaration of interest for the FP6. Then, it is up to the next MC meeting to decide if ENFORS should continue with developing an application for November 2002 and on what basis.

10. Agenda for Cottbus and additional items there

The Agenda for the Cottbus meeting was discussed. The following additions were made:

- item 8 add the third SC meeting,
- item 14 change to "Budget for 2002 and 2003,
- item 15 change to "Activities in the Action 2002-2003 as well as 2004-2005.

Because of the earlier postponement of this second MC meeting, some keynote speakers for the session on "Landscape ecology and sustainable forestry" have been replaced and there are some vacant places.

The suggestion of restricting the representation at the meeting to only one delegate per country was turned down. The invitation will be sent to all MC and WG 1 members as well to the invited keynote speakers. The invitation will be sent out as soon as possible and the registration deadline will be set to end of March.

11. Additional items (e.g. pamphlet, STSM, newsletter No. 3)

Newsletter:

A third newsletter will be distributed before the next MC meeting. The Chairman is responsible for making a first draft. The co-ordinators for each working group are asked to contribute with a paragraph related to the development and the status of their WG.

Pamphlet:

Minor corrections of a draft pamphlet presenting ENFORS were discussed and a new draft is to be developed by the ENFORS secretariat, which will be presented at the next MC meeting.

Poster:

A poster presenting ENFORS will be developed by the ENFORS secretariat and it will be ready for use at conferences, workshops etc. by the ENFORS members during the summer 2002.

Website:

A shorter web-address is recommended to be introduced (e.g. www.enfors.edu, www.enfors.at).

(Roland Berger answered March 28, 2002, that: "Of course this is possible. However, this would mean that you have to apply for your own (ENFORS) web domain on a public web provider. This costs money! and for me it would be less handy to work on it, because now I write directly on our Institute server.")

STSM:

Olivier Laroussinie and Ernst Leitgeb are responsible for drafting some guidelines for the first call for proposals for STSM.

12. Closing of the SC meeting

The chairman closed the meeting and expressed his gratitude to the Brandenburger Academy of Sciences for hosting the meeting and Uwe Schneider for the arrangements, as well the hospitality met.

Larv, 3 April 2002

Paris, 3 April 2002

Folke Andersson
Chairman

Anders Mårell
Secretary

Appendices:

Content

- Time schedule for the entire Action period as presented in the Technical Annex and adjusted according to the development of the Action
- Budget and frame programme for 2002-2003
- Third draft of the Technical Report No. 1 "Scientific issues related to sustainable forest management in an ecosystem and landscape perspective"
- Second draft of the Technical Report No. 2 "Guidelines for national inventories of field research facilities"
- Draft theory paper of Working Group 2a "Scientific programme"
- Draft theory paper of Working Group 2b "Instrumentation and infrastructure"
- Draft theory paper of Working Group 3 "Linking with monitoring and research networks"
- Strategy for the realisation of the future of ENFORS – the 6th Framework Programme
- Agenda for the second Management Committee meeting April 18-20 in Cottbus, Germany
- Draft of the first "Call for proposals for STSM"
- First draft of an ENFORS pamphlet

Documents

TimeSchedule.doc

Budget2002and03.doc
ScIssues3Draft.pdf

Guidelines2Draft.pdf

WG2aTP1draft.doc
WG2bTP1draft.doc

WG3TP1draft.doc

FP6Strategy.doc
FP6Documents.pdf
MC2Agenda.doc

STSM1Call.pdf
PamphletE25large.pdf