

## Pilot call small-scale combustion

### Feedback from researchers

Jyväskylä, 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2007

#### Positive

- Projects were connected closely enough to be of interest to the others (*mentioned twice*) while different enough to support each other
- General positive impression of Call
- End workshop would be good idea, important and interesting (*mentioned twice*)
- Possibility to meet people/make contacts, also for further projects
- The call was well-formulated
- The international cooperation was good
- Good opportunity to gain experiences for upcoming FP7 calls
- ERA-Net Bioenergy as a model for cooperation: perfect for a start, but for a start only. If we go further, we need FP7
- ERA-Net call tell us about the most "interesting" ways to go with FP7
- Information exchange is important within one consortium and with other projects; therefore, this meeting was helpful (plus an end meeting)

#### Neutral: challenges for the future

- How to incorporate non-EU countries into a biomass strategy?
- Could ERA-Net Bioenergy be used for lobbying in [EU] politics → funding for research providing the basis of policy decision making?
- Long-term continuation, also after the end of ERA-Net Bioenergy? ERA-Net should only be a starting point – how can further work be done within the EU framework? These meetings could help to discuss that.
- New calls for bioenergy in future?
- Lack of money: for the future, we need FP7
- European vision: cooperation with countries which do not have biomass on their energy agenda and do not have a tradition of using biomass this way
- More funding needed for experimental research, how this can be done?

#### Negative

- Disappointed how long funding decision took (not all partners received positive funding decision at the same time: Swedish partner did not get "green light" at first)
- Some administrative issues (e.g. obligation to have a consortium agreement) were not clear
- Also not clear: deadline for final report, and how to deal with data (confidentiality)
- Call time too short: two months is very short to get international projects together
- Unclear how to interpret differences between ERA-Net and national rules
- A model consortium agreement would have been helpful
- Some important EU countries are missing in ERA-Net Bioenergy
- The time between invitation and meeting should be longer [for the next meeting, compared to this one]

Karen Görner