



Minutes

Workshop from 20th of August 2010

**Projects:
REACT, BETTER-iS and Sub-Sahara**

**Leibniz-Centre for
Agricultural Landscape Research e.V.**

**Eberswalder Straße 84
15374 Müncheberg**

**Chair: H. Kächele, S. Sieber
Minutes: Harry Hoffmann, Severin Polreich**

Participants:

Name	Project	Institute	Email
Wolfgang Kasten		GTZ	wolfgang.kasten@gtz.de
Kerstin Garcia		GTZ	kerstin.garcia@gtz.de
Harald Kächele		ZALF	hkaechele@zalf.de
Stefan Sieber	ReACCT/Better-iS	ZALF	stefan.sieber@zalf.de
Karin Stahl	ReACCT/Better-iS	ZALF	kstahl@zalf.de
Jans Bobert	ReACCT	ZALF	bobert@zalf.de
Karl-Otto Wenkel	ReACCT	ZALF	wenkel@zalf.de
Ottfried Dietrich	ReACCT	ZALF	odietrich@zalf.de
Meike Schäfer	ReACCT	ZALF	meike.schaefer@zalf.de
Severin Polreich	ReACCT	ZALF	severin.polreich@zalf.de
Christian Kersebaum	ReACCT	ZALF	ckersebaum@zalf.de
Marco Natkhin	ReACCT	ZALF	marcom@zalf.de
Matthias Büchner	ReACCT	PIK	buechener@pik-potsdam.de
Götz Uckert	Better-iS	ZALF	uckert@zalf.de
Harry Hoffmann	Better-iS	ZALF	harry.hoffmann@zalf.de
Anja Fasse	Better-iS	IUW	fasse@iuw.uni-hannover.de
Anna Segerstedt	Better-iS*	IUW	segerstedt@iuw.uni-hannover.de
Till Below	SubSahara	ZALF	till.below@zalf.de

* The other Better-iS project partners “Wuppertal Institute” and “IFPRI” could not join the meeting due to conflicting appointments and earlier planned holidays.

Content:

- Introduction: 4
- Overview (and current status) ReACCT 4
 - 1) Downscaling of IPCC Emission (M. Büchner/PIK) 4
 - 2) Hydrological Monitoring & Modelling (O. Dietrich/ZALF)..... 4
 - 3) Crop Modelling & Agroforestry Practices (J. Bobert/ZALF) 4
 - 4) Socio-Economic Implications (S. Polreich/ZALF)..... 5
- General discussion ReACCT 5
- Overview (and current status) Better-iS 5
 - 1) Biofuel Value Chains (G. Uckert/ZALF) 5
 - 2) Household Survey Kinole (A. Fasse/IUW) 5
 - 3) PhD's of Better-iS (A. Segerstedt(IUW & H. Hoffmann/ZALF) 5
 - 4) Impact Model (IFPRI), Consumption Patterns (WI) (presented by S. Sieber/ZALF) 6
- General discussion Better-iS 6
- IFPRI-Project Sub-Sahara (T. Below/ZALF) 6
 - General discussion SubSahara..... 6
- Issues discussed in final session..... 6

Introduction:

Initially, all participants, especially the external guests, were welcomed by Mr. Kächele and Mr. Sieber to the ZALF in general and to the meeting in particular. Subsequently all present attendees introduced themselves and explained their position within the respective project.

Overview (and current status) ReACCT

Mr. Sieber explained and commented the current state of the project outcomes and achievements, but also the lessons learnt and difficulties were discussed. Special attention was given to the implementation and maintaining of the installed equipment for monitoring and field trials. The project specifics, among others, the capacity building within Reacct have been discussed. Moreover, a brief overview on the financial planning was given.

Subsequently, four representatives of the involved research partners (PIK, ICRAF, ZALF) gave insights into their respective research modules, programmes and outputs.

1) Downscaling of IPCC Emission (M. Büchner/PIK)

As an introduction, Mr. Büchner outlined the research capacity and status quo of PIK concerning the climate modeling approach of ReACCT and gave, additionally, a brief outlook into the potential climate developments in Africa based on the IPCC models (A1B). Including, he specified the current achievements of PIK in the ReACCT project and gave an outlook to future activities.

2) Hydrological Monitoring & Modelling (O. Dietrich/ZALF)

Following a brief introduction into the planned hydrological outputs of ReACCT, Mr. Dietrich gave a closer insight into the research area on the one hand and into the hydrological monitoring (data collection) as well as (already achieved) modelling processes on the other. As an example, he presented a preliminary GIS map of the Ngerengere catchment focussing on its particular hydrologic characteristics. Further important aspects of his presentation were potential and already existing linkages to other sub-projects (e.g. socio-economics and crop modeling). Finally, the upcoming steps were outlined.

3) Crop Modelling & Agroforestry Practices (J. Bobert/ZALF)

Mr. Bobert briefly presented the objectives of the crop modelling component, the chosen target area as well as the applied methodologies for data collection. As preliminary results, additionally to the overall project achievements, an exemplarily Tanzanian master thesis on Maize varieties was discussed. In an outlook, Mr. Bobert informed the audience about future project developments such as further field trials, crop models and potentially upcoming research cooperations.

4) Socio-Economic Implications (S. Polreich/ZALF)

In an introduction, Mr. Polreich compared and analysed in a six point overview the current status of the socio-economic component of ReACCT with the expected outputs.

Subsequently, he streamlined the various components according to the DPSIR framework. Concludingly, he predicted the impact of the incorporation of good agricultural/agroforestry practice into the scenario development.

General discussion ReACCT

Subsequently to the presentation of the projects' status quo, Mr. Kasten commented the project development as satisfying, especially when the high turnover of team members is considered. Mrs. Garcia perceived as broad overview and achievements as positive. Furthermore, synergies between the ReACCT project and Better-iS have been highlighted as especially ReACCT had to act as "pathfinder" in the local setting.

Overview (and current status) Better-iS

Initially, Mr. Sieber explained the general outline of the project, the interaction of its components and the integration of the outputs in a planned web based tool. Subsequently, the projects' unique features were highlighted (e.g. capacity building and network component). Another main aspect of the presentation was the discussion and visualisation of the planned outputs on the one hand and the current achievements and delays on the other. These aspects were merged in a timeframe to explain the ongoing and current processes. Finally, the to-be-developed web based tool was outlined and an insight in the financial situation was given.

1) Biofuel Value Chains (G. Uckert/ZALF)

As starting point, the Pros and Cons for choosing wood, jatropha and oil palm as main feedstocks for the to-be-analysed value chains were discussed. In this regard the potential visualisation technique was presented to the audience to exemplify the project outputs. This discussion was guided by a three-step method to define the value chains, weight the respective factors and allow therefore their comparison. Additionally, some preliminary results of the first data collection were presented and an outlook into future field research was given.

2) Household Survey Kinole (A. Fasse/IUW)

Following a geographical localisation as well as a general introduction into the case study village, its special bioenergy feature (jatropha as carrier plant for spices) was highlighted. Additionally a more detailed insight into the field survey concerning e.g. the number of interviewed households and the energy consumption patterns were given. Subsequently, the research projects involved in the field survey were briefly explained.

3) PhD's of Better-iS (A. Segerstedt/IUW & H. Hoffmann/ZALF)

In these two short presentations, the two PhD projects embedded in the Better-iS project were outlined. In this context, the general situation of the Tanzanian biofuel industry was described and (potential) future cooperation partners identified.

In accordance to the PhD projects, their main research questions and procedures were explained.

4) Impact Model (IFPRI), Consumption Patterns (WI) (presented by S. Sieber/ZALF)

As Better-iS input from partners not present in the audience, Mr. Sieber explained their respective project statuses and future developments.

IFPRI: After a general outline of IFPRIs outputs in the Better-iS project (e.g. development of global scenarios and shock modeling), alternative scenarios for the Tanzanian energy demand were highlighted. Following this, the planned next steps in the scenarios development especially in the context of bioenergy implementation into IFPRIs models were outlined.

WI: The team from Wuppertal outlined in a first step their project contributions such as the planned scientific summary report and the input into the sustainability indicator set. Following this, the current state of the project in relation to potentially available biomass on the national level was outlined. Finally, an outlook into the upcoming next steps such as the inclusion of new data and the trend analysis was given.

General discussion Better-iS

The broad overview was positively perceived by Mr. Kasten and Mrs. Garcia. Mr. Uckert highlighted, again, that the success of Better-iS is, at least partly based upon the preliminary work of ReACCT. Another point of discussion was the sensitivity of certain issues surrounding especially the location of outgrower villages suitable for the second data collection as these information are often declared as confidential by the involved companies.

IFPRI-Project Sub-Sahara (T. Below/ZALF)

This IFPRI coordinated project, whereby the ZALF collaboration is jointly organised by Mr. Sieber and Mrs. Siebert, was represented at the meeting by Mr. Below and Mr. Sieber. Mrs. Siebert could not attend due to conflicting appointments.

Mr. Below's presentation started with an overview of the "Sub-Sahara" project, which is coordinated by IFPRI. Following this overview, the conceptual model of his PhD and its implication within the project were discussed. Subsequently, the field research was outlined, including preliminary results from the data analysis on the one hand and a local workshop on the other. It was mentioned that also Astrid Artner conducts the PhD within the scope of Sub-Sahara.

General discussion SubSahara

Concerning the overall achievements of the projects, the audience discussed whether and how the results of the project, especially the good practices, might be implemented into ReACCT and how synergies among all projects might be used in the future.

Issues discussed in final session

- It was stated by all participants that a complementary funding strategy is needed. Several general options have been discussed and a brief road map outlined.

- It will be intended to present the three BEAF-Projects also at the level of the GTZ at the beginning of 2011.
- Long term options, especially in terms of further potential collaboration with the CGIAR-centre have been discussed.
- There was a general consensus that the collaboration between ZALF and GTZ should be strengthened and intensified.