



International Advisory Board
Response to Reflexions document

Introduction

- The IAB is very appreciative of the very positive way in which the project team has responded to the observations and recommendations made following the first annual meeting in Leipzig
- We have reviewed and commented upon the Reflexions document and you will be pleased to know that we have very few substantive comments to make, which I will now summarise

IAB statements – statement 2

- We note and welcome the response to our statement regarding co-ordination with the HOMBRE project and, in respect of the bullet point “Collaboration will include setting up a joint glossary of terms on brownfield regeneration.“, we would just make the point that it will also be necessary to work together in terms of site selection and remediation criteria.
- We consider the key here to be one of „Interchangability“, so as to avoid duplication of effort and to support common tasks

Annex 1

- Whilst we like the tabular format adopted, it could perhaps be simplified and more helpful, if the criteria are given by a “key word” and the descriptions;
- We feel that this would be particularly helpful in WP4, as these may be regarded in thier present form as ,light‘ technology descriptions, which need to be expanded, for example as follows:-

WP4 Criteria

- Sites data needs to be as comprehensive as possible, whilst conforming with a standardised structure. For example, contaminant details need to include type, concentrations, depths at which located and distribution (e.g. throughout the site or 'hot spots').

Annex 1 – WP6

- Suitability criterion 4 – suggest amending to read “The site is ***either known to be*** contaminated, ***or is potentially impacted by*** contamination and available information is sufficient to fulfil the data requirements given in the annex .
- In relation to B2, Why not include sustainability indicators now? Perfect opportunity to assess change over time

Annex 1 – WP8

- Confirmation from site owner that data and information obtained at sites can be used in timbre activities as foreseen in the Grant Agreement / Dow
- This is of most importance. Should be checked soon.

Annex II

- No substantive comments or recommendations, other than to say we like the selection of the replacement site, especially as it widens the geographic spread of the case study sites.

Annex III – MoU with HOMBRE

- No comments other than to say we are pleased to see this in place.

Annex IV – Web-based platform and target groups

- The IAB is concerned to ensure that the stakeholder group, as originally identified in Leipzig and subsequently expanded, is used throughout all aspects of the project – so as to ensure uniformity.
- We feel that this is not always being achieved, at least in the text of the Reflexions document, as follows:-

- “Moreover, similarly to the gap between users and researchers, gaps occur also within the community of users (e.g. between the site owners and local environmental agencies) and between groups in the research community,
- The general public also needs to be included

Annex IV – Figure 1 TIMBRE concept illustration

- We have spent a significant amount of time considering this illustration and have some questions/comments
- Does the arrow really only go one way? It seems that information flows in both directions in order to fill the gaps.
- Whilst we recognise that many of the listed projects are completed, some of the networks still exist.
- So we feel the arrow should go both ways, it is essential to learn from experience.

Annex IV – Sharing of information

“Sharing among scientists new research findings on the development and implementation of instruments for brownfield regeneration ...”

- We think the 'sharing' aspect has to be wider than just scientists. It needs to include practitioners and decision makers as well. These groups need, or should have, the same level of understanding as the scientists in order to be able to translate, inform and advise subordinate groups, such as land owner, private and public, and policy makers.

Maintenance of platform at the end of the project

- Issues such as stakeholder involvement and sharing of information between stakeholders brings us to the important topic as to how, and by whom, the platform is to be maintained following the end of the project.
- It needs to be kept up to date and be flexible enough to respond to changes, e.g. political and technological, as they occur over time.

Annex IV – Target groups numbered list 1-7

- Needs to be consistent with stakeholder groups, suggested amendments:-
 2. Site owners ***and users***, project managers, municipalities, site developers, investors, insurers, agencies interested in assessing the economic and environmental effectiveness and sustainability of Megasite regeneration – as **beneficiaries of TIMBRE product's application**

3. Planners, municipalities, authorities and further interested stakeholders, such as NGOs, citizens' groups ***and, in some instances, end users*** – as **non-expert users**

NOTE: The seven groups identified in this section could act as a Beta test group and this is recommended by the IAB

Annex V – List of Stakeholders

We like the tabular format of the expanded list of stakeholders and would like to propose some small revisions:-

- In the Stakeholder group under Landowners etc amend sub-group as follows:-

“Subsidiary interest group ***and decision makers not listed elsewhere(e.g. regulators acting under enforcement procedures)***”

Annex V – Stakeholder Groups

Under “Site occupiers” amend sub-groups as follows:

- Legal ***and liability issues***
- illegal, such a “informal” users ***and trespassers***

Our thinking is that some 'informal' users may actually be condoned by the landowners and not creating a worsening of the environmental or legal situation. Whilst others may be occupying sites without the knowledge of the landowner and carrying out activities that exacerbate the environmental and legal situation. A third group may comprise children being illegally present on the site and at risk of injury or the recipient of harmful impacts.

Annex V – Stakeholder groups

Under group “Local authorities” add in sub-group:-

Building approval and economic promotion

As the responsibilities of local authorities extend far beyond town planning

Annex V – Stakeholder groups

Under the Stakeholder group **Region and sub-regional government**, we think the sub-group should read ***Spatial Planning***, not Special Planning

We also consider that environmental regulation and enforcement should be included within this stakeholder group, although we appreciate that there may be differences between countries

Annex V – WP3 Table 1

Suggest amending target groups of stakeholders as follows:-

- Investors, developers ***and other decision makers***
- Policy makers and planners
- Local residents and other users
- NGOs, media,
- Scientists ***and other experts***

Annex V – general comment

We have noticed some inconsistencies in relation to terminology and request that all WP leaders review their relevant sections, so as to ensure consistency in relation to stakeholders and interest groups.

Annex VI – QA and QC

- This is fundamental to the success of the entire project
- We are concerned that the statement “A specific quality system for research projects does not exist” may be misleading, as some guidance is available in both the US and the EU, including ANSI-ASQC-E4... and Joint Research Centre guidance

Annex VI – section 1.3 Definitions

- In relation to “Products” arising out of TIMBRE we are concerned to ensure that full QA review is undertaken before dissemination outside TIMBRE.
- This brings us to the question of peer review. The IAB does not see itself as being in a position to undertake peer review, we are too close to the project, but we may wish to recommend aspects of the work for independent peer review or QA assessment.

Annex VI –
Elements of the Quality Management Plan

- ***Resources (e.g. staff , finances);***

IAB question “How does the TIMBRE team ensure that staff are qualified and have the appropriate training?”

Annex VI –
Elements of the Quality Management Plan

- ***Roles and responsibilities;***

- Clearly defined roles and responsibilities will be critical. This needs to be written and documents for all staff. In case someone leaves and new member takes over this will be helpful.

2.1.1 Implementation of QA project plans

- USEPA has some QAPP requirements documents that might be useful. There may also be useful documents in other FP6 and FP7 projects.
-

2.6 Quality evaluation and improvement

Technical Review and Advice by International Advisory Board

- The TIMBRE group has made tremendous progress over the year. It would be good now to focus on timelines and deliverable dates projected out till the completion of the project.

Annex VII – Success Indicators for Task 4.1

“Feasibility of phytoremediation will be investigated systematically for common subsurface contaminants, including (i) plant toxicity tests, (ii) plant uptake studies and (iii) metabolism studies. In addition (iv), potential field application will be evaluated by modelling.”

- This could be very costly.... Not really sustainable.

Annex VII – cont'd

“important point is biodegradation of compounds (iii): a success criterion in this respect is (statistically) significant degradation (which is strongly depending on the experimental conditions; in an earlier experiment with trichloroethylene it was e.g. more than 25 %)”

- How do you distinguish between volatilization and degradation or plant uptake?

Annex VII - Success indicators for Task 4.3

Members of the IAB felt that this was rather vague and difficult to understand.

And finally

- The International Advisory Board would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all members of the project team on the high quality and dedication demonstrated in the work undertaken to date.
- We are sure that these high standards will be maintained throughout the rest of the project, so as to produce outputs of highest quality and benefit.
- Best wishes to you all