

Report on the second round of Feedback Sessions

1 Introduction and objective

Five feedback sessions were organized within the first round of feedback sessions foreseen in WP5.

Project partners AEBIOM, BE2020, RVO and VREG organized these feedback sessions between May 2014 and February 2015. These sessions were organised at different locations as to allow stakeholders to easily participate. Brussels, Vienna and Utrecht were the selected places.

The objective of this initiative is to get feedback from companies on the draft of the BioGrace-II GHG calculation tool, intending to improve the GHG calculation tool and make it as user-friendly possible. A second and more general objective of the feedback sessions is to demonstrate to participants how the BioGrace GHG calculation tool works and to inform participants on the background of the development of the tool and the relation with the existing (COM(2010)11) and new EC report on sustainability of solid and gaseous biomass and the work performed by the Joint Research Centre (JRC).

These sessions were intended to be small group meetings, rather than large workshops, with the purpose of being more interactive and to give to all the participants the opportunity to give their feedback. An average number of 12 participants attended to the session, coming from different EU countries. It was a wide variety of participants: utilities, research institutions, certification bodies, national energy agencies, etc. This entails in a wider range of comments and will help the consortium to have the perspective from the different stakeholders involved in the GHG calculations.

In the table below in it listed the day, place and number of participants of the 5 feedback session. For the list of participants as well as the other specificities of each feedback session, please refer to the minutes of the meetings.

Date	Place	Partner	Number of participants
12 May 2014	Brussels, BE	AEBIOM	12
11 September 2014	Utrecht, NL	RVO	7
18 November 2014	Vienna, AT	BE2020	8
19 December 2014	Brussels, BE	VREG	32 in total for the both sessions organized by VREG
17 February 2015	Brussels, BE	VREG	

The last draft of version 1 of the tool was used in the 2nd round of feedback sessions and was sent beforehand to all the participants of the feedback session. They were asked to already work with the tool in preparation to the sessions and prepare their questions and suggestions.

2 Programme of the feedback sessions

The agenda of all the session was very similar, starting by an introductory presentation of the BioGrace project, its calculations tools (from BioGrace-I and BioGrace-II) and the European legislative documents that serve as background of the project: COM(2010)11, the recently published EC Staff Working Document on sustainability of solid and gaseous biomass, SWD(2014)259 and the associated JRC scientific report.

After this general introduction, it was a demonstration of the BioGrace-II tool that was discussed and commented by the participants. The small number of participants, made these demonstrations very dynamic and participants asked questions at the same time that the tool was presented and discussed among them sharing case examples in the different companies.

During the sessions, project partners also clarified to participants the fact that there are other alternative GHG calculation tools for electricity and heat from biomass, such as the tool in the Wallonian part of Belgium and the UK solid biomass and biogas calculator that was developed by E4Tech. The project BioGrace-II also aims to cause that these different tools will be modified in such a way that they will give the same result when making a calculation for the same biomass/biogas and conversion unit to heat and/or electricity.

3 Suggestions for improving the tool

The participants asked questions and discussed (with the presenter but also amongst each other) on a large number of subjects, related with the background methodology, the implementation of the tool, the European legislation, etc. Nevertheless the purpose of this report is only to summarize the comments or suggestion that were specifically related with the tool and the methodology applied by the Biograce II consortium.

Many comments were made and questions were asked, project partners answer to all this question during the feedback sessions or afterwards by email.

Only the most relevant suggestions made during these sessions are listed bellow:

- One specific question was asked on how to demonstrate that ships have another emission coefficient (in MJ/t/km) due to a higher fuel efficiency and/or a lower share of empty returns. Should this always be demonstrated using peer reviewed references – which is in fact not feasible in this example? One participant therefore requested for more clarity in the hierarchy of evidence at verification.

- The sheet "Final conversion only" was largely discussed: additions for the emissions of end use (CH_4 and N_2O) and whether transport and handling emissions should be taken into account from the place where the chips or pellets with certified GHG emission value arrive. The chips or pellets logically arrive in a sea harbour, so should inland transport (by river or road) be added? Moreover, should handling emissions (electricity for transport bands) be added to the emissions or should this be included in calculating the net electrical efficiency? These important comments were afterwards discussed with the project consortium partners.
 - When chipping in the pellets plant the fuel use is usually not diesel but electricity. Therefore this option should be added.
 - The new tab 'final conversion only (diff temperatures)' doesn't work.
 - If the n-fertilizer input changes, how to calculate the emissions from acidification? Does the user have to do this on his own or will the tool provide a sheet? The tool should indicate that changing the n-fertilizer implies also changing the acidification.
 - It most of the session it was a discussion on whether the use of BioGrace is mandatory (nationally, EC). Participants to the workshop expressed that they are strongly in favour of one tool or – in case more tools exist –tools that give the same outcome when fed with the same data. The BioGrace partners explained that BioGrace is working to achieve such harmonisation.
- Transport
 - The possibility to include an extra transport step for some pathways was discussed. We invited participants to send to BioGrace partners more information and reference on additional transport steps which they believe should be included in the common pathways. In this way, their suggestions can be implemented in the following versions of the tool.
 - Track 40 ton, it should be specified if this is only the cargo or the payload plus truck. Besides, it would be useful to insert also data for more common European trucks.
 - The possibility of the electric train should be included.
 - Is the transport distance of 20km turn-return?
 - User friendliness
 - The user should be able to identify quickly the cells that should be filled to the ones that provide results or make intermediate calculations. It is confusing that cells containing formulas can also be changed.
 - Participants commented that many videos are delivered to explain the tool which could be confusing.