



# Meeting Minutes

---

## MacroFuels WP6 meeting

*Date:* 11-02-2016  
*Time:* 14.00-16.00 (UK time)  
*Location:* Teleconference

### *Participants*

Name:	Company:
Jan Wilco Dijkstra	ECN
Jonna Meyhoff Fry	Environmental Resources Management
Rita Clancy	EURIDA
Adrian Macleod	SAMS
Michele Stanley	SAMS
Benny Pycke	Sioen Industries

Apologies received from:

Annette Bruhn, Aarhus University

Jaap van Hal, ECN

### *Agenda*

- *Tasks and responsibilities within WP6*
- *Concept and approach for WP6*
- *Data required from the other WPs*
- *Meeting schedule*



## *Minutes of meeting*

### ***Tasks and responsibilities within WP6***

- The main Work Tasks for WP6 are individual stand-alone exercises, with limited interaction needed between the Work Tasks.
- The exception is Work Task 6.1, which main purpose is to define the scenarios to be assessed in the other Work Tasks, and Work Task 6.6, which main aim is to pull the findings of the other Work Tasks together into an integrated sustainability assessment (an extended “executive summary”).
- In terms of timescales, Rita Clancy suggested that preliminary results be provided to the General Assembly at an earlier stage, allowing for sustainability issues to be considered for MacroFuels strategies and outputs and for feedback given by the GA to be incorporated into final LCA results.

### ***Concept and approach for WP6***

- The purpose of WP6 was discussed. On top of assessing the sustainability (economic/social/environmental) of the overall MacroFuels concept, there is also a need to compare the sustainability of the product portfolio from MacroFuels against conventional (fossil based) and potentially other biofuels product portfolios.
- The types of questions that may be directed at WP6 were discussed. These could be:
  - Which MacroFuels variant (feedstock + product portfolio) is best from a sustainability point of view?
  - How does the biochemical approach perform compared to the thermochemical?
  - What is the influence of different product/co-product uses?
  - Which unit processes influences the results significantly and what are the optimization potentials?
  - Are there differences depending on plant capacity?
  - Do the results differ depending on geographies?
- These are important to keep in mind when developing the scenarios for consideration by WP6.
- Jonna Meyhoff Fry gave an example from another EU project <sup>1</sup>, which had investigated four main scenarios, and 12 further scenarios where selected aspects of one main scenario were varied. The main

---

(<sup>1</sup>) [BICORE project](#).



scenarios considered four different products or product combinations, with feedstock, scale and location being constants. The further scenarios considered different feedstocks; locations; process variants; energy provisions; and fallback options.

- The Parties agreed that a maximum of four main scenarios should be considered for this project. The focus of potential further scenarios were discussed:
  - Michele Stanley said that there was quite a lot of literature on seaweed cultivation and geography, eg the [Enalgae project](#);
  - Jan Wilco Dijkstra suggested that as a proxy for a commercial scale seaweed biofuel plant, the Abengoa bioethanol plant in the Port of Rotterdam, processing 1.2 mega tonnes (dry weight) grains per year, be used – assuming same dry weight for seaweed. [Link to website.](#)
- It was agreed that, through discussions with the other WP leaders, ERM will define potential scenarios for WP6 – with the view to finalise and agree them at the June meeting.

#### ***Data required from the other WPs***

- At the kick-off meeting in January 2016, it was requested that the other WPs be given an indication of the data they will be asked to provide to WP6.
  - Michele Stanley advised that data measurements had already been discussed with Annette Bruhn for WP1, as this WP is already underway.
  - Michele Stanley suggested that literature from the Enalgae project may be useful.
- It was agreed that, in as far as possible, data collection be coordinated and combined for all the separate Work Tasks of WP6.
- The Parties agreed that a data collection template with preliminary data (quantitative and qualitative) needs should be ready for the June meeting. Time will be set aside at the meeting to discuss and finalise the template.
- ERM will send out an initial draft data collection template - the aim is for this to be circulated to the Parties in March.

#### ***Meeting schedule***

- The Parties agreed that the next meeting will be held in conjunction with the project meeting in June in Reykjavik, Iceland. The WP6 meeting (F2F) is currently scheduled for the afternoon of Monday 27<sup>th</sup> June 2016 (exact timings and venue tbd).



- As several members of WP6 also are members of other WPs, the possibility of Parties being invited to overlapping WP meetings on the 27<sup>th</sup> June was discussed. It was suggested to possibly have combined WP meetings. Jonna Meyhoff Fry will seek to coordinate with the other WPs.

*Noted by Jonna Meyhoff Fry*

Action Items:

Action item	Person responsible	Completed by
Develop potential scenarios to be assessed as part of WP6, through discussions with the other WP leaders.	Jonna Meyhoff Fry	1/6/2016
Draft data collection template, incorporating data required for LCA	Jonna Meyhoff Fry	31/3/2016
Further populate data collection template	All	27/6/2016
Distribute links to relevant literature, data sources, etc	All	On-going