



<http://ceubiom.org/>

CLASSIFICATION OF  
EUROPEAN BIOMASS  
POTENTIAL FOR  
BIOENERGY USING  
TERRESTRIAL & EARTH  
OBSERVATIONS

CONTRACT №:

2 1 3 6 3 4

*Funded by:*

European Commission  
Framework Programme 7  
Cooperation

Thematic Area  
Energy 3.7  
Cross-Cutting Issues

**WP4 – COMBINATION AND HARMONIZATION  
OF EO AND TERRESTRIAL METHODS**

**DELIVERABLE D 4.3  
REPORT ON HARMONIZED APPROACH-  
ES FOR BIOMASS ASSESSMENT**

*Date of preparation: October 2010*

**FEEDBACKS**

*Submitted by:*

GEONARDO Environmental Technologies Ltd.  
(Project coordinator)

*Project coordinator name:*

Mr. Balazs Bodo

*Project coordinator organization name:*

GEONARDO, Hungary



## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Corneliu Rotaru

Country: **Romania**

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	X	Biomass (practice)		Biomass (theory and research)		Remote sensing		Other
Government/EU	X	Research/academic		Industry/SME		Consulting		

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor		Fair		Good	X	Very Good		Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	---	-----------	--	-----------	--

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	X	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	X	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

**Much more interesting in the incipient phase of application**

**Advanced approach:**

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Gasper Artac

Country: Slovenia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	X	Biomass (practice)		Biomass (theory and research)		Remote sensing		Other
Government/EU		Research/academic	X	Industry/SME		Consulting		

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	X	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor		Fair		Good	X	Very Good		Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	---	-----------	--	-----------	--

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor		Fair		Good	X	Very Good		Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	---	-----------	--	-----------	--

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

The assumption that the amount of biomass, based on statistical figures, is correct is not always true.

**Advanced approach:**

Good plan, but the question is if this can always be realized in practice.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

/

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Blaz Kladnik

Country: Slovenia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

Good practice

**Advanced approach:**

Good practice, but it is a question if it is going to work.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

/

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

V. Jelavić, EkonerG

Project is surely useful and it has a great meaning. Conceptually and politically looking, a new approach is suggested, different from the national approaches in relation to FAO and a very precise methodology from IPCC?

Considering the fact that EC they have written the Call for Applications for this topic, it is very interesting and it can be assumed that there will be implications according to the results of the project.

The thing is that CEUBIOM suggests the already known approaches: 1) terrestrial as the basic one and 2) advanced based on the remote sensing. Here a harmonised and control method is suggested. When something is being simplified then there need to be a very strong scientific and social consensus and it must be clearly defined for what purposes it is being made.

There is a solid reason why there is such an inequality in creating inventories in countries. FAO and other organizations have been dealing with the issue for years. This should be thoroughly studied because later it could be turned into a matrix, without taking into considerations like those we have in Croatia.

In Croatia there is a very developed forest management system with a long tradition. This system also includes determining values which are required by the Project. There are very detailed data up to the level of very small territorial units, and soon there will be remote sensing data available as well.

Serious reply to the questions from the Evaluation form requires more detailed considerations and some of the assumptions made are technically questionable. There is mention of the European soil maps usage, which is as *if trying to lift a needle with a bulldozer*.

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Domagoj Puzak

Country: Croatia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)		Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing		Other
Government/EU		Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME		Consulting		

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor		Fair		Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good		Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--	-----------	--

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

Too theoretical...

**Advanced approach:**

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

High importance of implementing research activities specifically on rural area, rich with biomass potential. Not covered here enough...

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Ivana Alerić

Country: Croatia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

**Advanced approach:**

Both approaches are evidently correct, depending on the needs and the possibilities of the user.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Atanaska Toneva, Association Energy 21, Sofia

Country: Bulgaria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy		Biomass (practice)		Biomass (theory and research)		Remote sensing		Other
Government/EU		Research/academic	x	Industry/SME	x	Consulting	x	

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good		Excellent	x
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	--	-----------	---

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	x	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	x	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

The proposed methodology for gathering information on biomass potential is well developed and will be useful for any institutions in the field of RES.

**Advanced approach:**

Will offer possibility for a more efficient use of the available biomass resources.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

The correct assessment of RES and of the biomass potential especially is an essential stage in the exploitation of RES and their involving in the energy balance of the EC countries. From this point of view the biomass assessment harmonisation is very important.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Jozef Bodi

Country: Slovakia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

**Advanced approach:**

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Our company already operates 4 biogas plants and therefore it is important for us to have concrete data about the biomass potential. The access e.g. to the corn and the distances from the field to the biogas plant have impact on the whole economy of the project. Favourable local conditions have impact on the final investment decision as well.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Dr. Gerhard Pelzmann

Country: Austria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

I agree that harvesting of below-ground biomass is not realistic in a mountainous region, aside from the ecological point of view.

In Austria on forest areas there is no soil map available, neither local information of the annual increment and the total standing volume. They are only statistical data sets based on regional level.

**Advanced approach:**

It is necessary to use regional yield table due to different growing conditions. A collection of yield tables is given in Marschal, Julius (1975):“Hilfstafeln für die Forsteinrichtung”. 3.Auflage. Agrarverlag Wien. S 11 ff.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Wolfgang Jilek

Country: Austria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	X	Biomass (practice)		Biomass (theory and research)	X	Remote sensing		Other
Government/EU	X	Research/academic		Industry/SME		Consulting	X	

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor		Fair		Good	X	Very Good		Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	---	-----------	--	-----------	--

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	X	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	X	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

It is evident that the basic approach profits from the fact, that key elements can be generated in a relatively easy way and be used by countries, which have neither detailed data nor the possibility to create terrestrial information based on highly sophisticated software and technical equipment. The disadvantage is that especially if only a statistic approach is used and statistical figures are not sufficiently available, the results may be far away from reality. Since the project was focused on the Western Balkan countries this approach may be the right one, nevertheless, the framework and the situation of data is less advanced than in (at least some of) the Western Member states.

**Advanced approach:**

Based on terrestrial information on a high level and on advanced technical equipment the advanced approach may close the gap between statistical data and a highly reliable basis for energy strategies and long term planning. Local expert knowledge is supposed to support both ways of approach and can usually not be replaced by technical or other means.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Biomass is one of the available resources for the European Union, but it is not a sustainable resource if not managed perfectly. Thus, it is in the responsibility of politics and administration to draw a clear picture of what will be available on long term and to give detailed information what kind of biomass will be available, the volume and how it can be used in the future. Therefore an exact analysis of the potential and especially a methodology is needed, which opens the possibility to give comparable information while keeping the possibility of conducting more comprehensive studies on a local or

regional scale. The CEUBIOM project is very useful for that and can be the first step towards harmonized information about the biomass potential of the European Union.

**Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010.** Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Tomaz Prus

Country: Slovenia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

To complicate for actual situation assessment if forest service collects the data about “total standing volume” for relatively small areas as well as they determine for those areas appropriate yearly “harvestable biomass”. The forest service data are generally periodically revised. Implementation of proposed data (soils, topography,) might be useful for assessment of potential biomass production but than climatic data are missing. Generally from forest service detailed data of cut wood are available. Later the forest biomass residues are almost impossible to follow due to great number of resellers, exporters (no evidence within the EU), local processing, intermediate and end consumers (which are not always evidenced).

If taking into consideration presented methodology than my remark is that soils are very difficult to relate with forest biomass. Much easier is to go with forest stands (type) maps or maps showing forest plant communities (exp. Blechno-Fagetum ). Productivity (wood stock) of a forest stand can be than derived from average stand height (generally and briefly). In table 3 the soil typology is rather unsuitable.

**Advanced approach:**

LiDAR is a very efficient, high-tech tool. If you do not have data from forest service it might be helpful assessment tool. But even here you need participation of state and local forest service.

Do you have any ***overall comments*** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Not only the stump removal but also total removal of branches can be considered as a non ecological (sustainable) forest treatment. Rotten wood is an important chain in natural forest regeneration (even in production forests). Generally in all European countries forest service exists and they hold the forest biomass exploitation key. Forests are complicated systems especially in mountainous regions and from the total biomass are on long term available only a part, other way you endanger the whole system. Please have in mind that you need additional suggestions from the experts of forest science in the project.

Technically there are no remarks on both approaches if you include the forest service experts.

**Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010.** Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Orjeta Jaupaj

Country: Albania

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

**Advanced approach:**

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Andrea Hublin

Country: Croatia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

The main advantages are data harmonization and fast implementation, which is necessary for harmonization of the work process and collaboration on the national level.

**Advanced approach:**

Using of costly data could be constraint, but at the same time this data could provide more detailed information needed for assessments and developing comparable and compatible datasets which could be used for new projects and investigations.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Developing of national biomass action plan must be directed to the results of many projects and studies performed at the local, national, regional as well as global level. It is necessary to adjust national approach to the proposed Basic and Advanced approaches, considering the national circumstances. National Task Forces established in the framework of different projects could provide good basis for networking.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Andriana Kakanakova, member of BGBIOM

Country: Bulgaria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** Well known, offering possibility for collecting additional information in a way harmonized for all EU countries.

**Advanced approach:** Innovative, allowing visualisation of biomass-for-energy distribution on different levels and countries.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Useful and helpful for all kind of decision-makers in the field of biomass-for-energy in EU.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Dr Klaus Peter Zulka

Country: Austria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	x	Biomass (practice)		Biomass (theory and research)	x	Remote sensing		Other
Government/EU		Research/academic	x	Industry/SME		Consulting		

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	x	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	x	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	x	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

Biomass potential assessments are done for a variety of purposes. Assumption may vary widely depending on the particular question. Consequently, the possibilities for unification and standardisation of assessments may be limited. Though it may be desirable to have a basic standard methodology, different approaches may still be necessary for different problems to be solved.

At the center of the proposed methodology appear to be land cover classification maps. However, in most biomass potential assessments, very little is achieved with land cover maps, since, in most cases, they are not detailed enough and information on the vegetation composition cannot be derived from them. So the present approach requires local expert knowledge on many parameters. This seems to be a little contradictory: on the one hand, remote sensing could provide a cheap and standardised approach, on the other hand, ground truthing and local expert knowledge is necessary so in many respects that the advantages of a remote sensing approach may not be helpful in reality.

Things get even more complicated yet realistic once economic parameters are factored in. In Austria, for example, almost the complete forest biomass potential that could be used for bioenergy cannot be harvested in economical ways at present energy prices, so the potential is largely theoretical as long as the market conditions remain as they are. Incorporating economic parameters might be definitely beyond the scope of a baseline assessment, but it is very relevant for certain political decisions in the short run.

The same is true for biodiversity conservation. Excluding only protected areas is certainly a viable and necessary step, but there may remain many more areas that house protected species or rare plant communities and should therefore not be exploited at maximal rates. A biomass potential compatible with long-term biodiversity stability may thus be significantly lower than a biophysical potential even after deduction of protected areas.

Nevertheless, these limitations do not invalidate the approach in any way. It might be still useful to standardise some assessments steps as far as possible.

**Advanced approach:**

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Although arguments are convincing that harmonisation of assessment methods are useful, there appears to be no such thing as a biomass potential per se. Many published biomass potential figures appear too high because constraints have been overlooked or limitations have not been factored in. So one of the additional benefits of a European harmonisation effort could be that the concept of a “potential” itself comes under scrutiny.

**Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010.** Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Agency for Restructurisation and Modernisation of Agriculture (ARiMR)

Country: POLAND

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Very Good</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Very Good</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Very Good</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** The approach presented in this document concerns mainly estimation of biomass for energy purposes obtained from forests. The table of contents informs, that such an approach is also available for agricultural crops, which is of the main interest for the ARiMR Agency. The approach is based on two pillars: statistical data derived from terrestrial surveys and remote sensing based map giving spatial dimension to these data. Its effectiveness depends largely on data availability and model for assessment of biomass from agriculture. Information system on energy crops is still in development phase in Poland and model solutions for biomass assessment proposed in full document could be applied (if they fit the proposed input requirements, concerning expert knowledge). So publication of full version of document is indispensable for taking decision on implementation of the approach.

**Advanced approach:** The advanced approach is based on using multisource remote sensing data for biomass assessment. Again, methodology is presented for estimating forest biomass, so it is hard to evaluate its usability for agriculture. Nevertheless, it is highly dependent on availability of remotely sensed images and processing technologies aimed at deriving biomass information. Operational use of these data / technologies is still not fully developed, so at present advanced approach could be applied as complementary to basic approach. Moreover, costs of applying advanced approach and timeliness of delivering biomass information should be carefully studied.

Do you have any ***overall comments*** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Krzysztof Będkowski Agriculture University of Warsaw – Forestry Dep

Country: Poland

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

For ecological reasons harvesting of below-ground biomass should be mentioned but excluded as a source of bioenergy.

**Advanced approach:**

It is important to much strongly underline that advanced approach do not necessarily leads to the same results of biomass as national statistics.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Some figures are illegible (fig. 2 and 4).

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: CONDREA Florentina

Country: Romania

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

As a general consideration, this basic approach is well organised, and it can be harmonised at European level, but also adapted, taking into account specific local conditions.

For applying this basic approach there is expertise in several institutions, not only research or consulting organisation, but also in governmental structures (Ministries, energy agencies).

**Advanced approach:**

In order to apply the advanced approach, which is very exhaustive, it will be necessary a financing from a Ministry or governmental agency, and a consortium of specialised institutions to cooperate.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

As in Romania updated data on biomass potential assessment is missing, adopting a harmonized methodology at European level would be an important step forward, and data obtained would be extremely useful for policy makers and investors.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Jan Svec

Country: Czech Republic

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

It is very well prepared. I agree with using of statistical data, because they are generally well available in many European countries.

It is good compromise between accuracy and simplicity.

**Advanced approach:**

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

No.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Lenka Metelkova

Country: Czech Republic

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

In my opinion, the issue is very well prepared, since it is a basic approach, processes/data are very well mapped.

**Advanced approach:**

There are very good examples for advanced approached. There are two alternatives – LiDAR work flow and SAR work flow.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

No other comments.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Maja Božičević Vrhovčak

Country: Croatia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)		Biomass (theory and research)		Remote sensing		Other
Government/EU		Research/academic		Industry/SME		Consulting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NGO

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

Well targeting the usual users’ needs.

**Advanced approach:**

Flexible enough to be adjusted to specific circumstances.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

/

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Hana Fratricova

Country: Slovakia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

In Slovakia there is not possible to determine according to the maps whether the yield of raw material/biomass from the agricultural land will be after the harvest used for energetic purposes or food processing (especially rape seed and corn). Therefore the potential of biomass form satellite maps GIS system is not very definite.

**Advanced approach:**

-

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

-

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Georgeta LIVANU – Ministry of Economy and Commerce

Country: Romania

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

Basic approach can be used for any assessment, as it is based especially on existing data, which are available at European and national level, in a satisfying measure.

**Advanced approach:**

For the Romanian Economy Ministry needs, in order to fundament the legal decision, the advanced approach will be the best option, in co-operation with specialized institutions.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

It will be necessary to be adopted an official European document for a harmonized methodology on biomass potential assessment.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: **Ioannis Eleftheriadis**

Country: **Greece**

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/Academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

The method looks easy to apply. Data used in this approach are easy to find. For some of them, like the land cover and elevation data, results are already available, this makes the method cheaper.

The determination of weights for parameters affecting the annual increment of growing stock is based on the expertise of local experts and not on a reliable method, so, this could create deviation between approaches made by different experts. The same could be happened with the evaluation of elevation data in the method.

In forest areas, site quality index (SQI) could be used in the method as more feasible to represent the productivity of the site. The estimation of SQI is based on scientific method and is not influenced by unstable parameters, like the experience of local experts.

There is a question about using data from EUROSTAT, in this approach, and not data collected by local experts.

**Advanced approach:**

It is not clearly defined what the vegetation height model is. LiDAR data, that are not cheap to own, give the opportunity for further data mining that could be used in the advanced method (e.g. tree crown height, leaf area index).

Why GCP should be located using orthophotos and not GPS?

Remote sensing technologies do not use only satellite data. Data collected by sensors on carriers like aircrafts could be also used (e.g. hyperspectral sensors).

Do you have any ***overall comments*** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

The harmonisation of assessment estimating the biomass potential, based on remote sensing and terrestrial trials, should be based on methods used not only countries involved in the project. Reliable methodologies have been developed in other countries around the globe; some of them are too advanced. So, the advanced method, at least, should use all functions provided by other advanced approaches in order to improve the efficiency of data use and tools of remote sensing, as well as, to make the use of expensive data more profitable.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Irina Nikolova, Technical University, Plovdiv

Country: Bulgaria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** Well developed and well reflecting users’ requirements. Applicable for large group of small enterprises and decision makers.

**Advanced approach:** Much more innovative, offers possibility to visualise the distribution of biomass resources..

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

European bioenergy harmonization is rather important from point of view of community decision makers working for the substitution of fossil fuels with RES.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name : Jan Bocian - Research Innovation Group Sp. z o.o. Czestochowa

Country: Poland

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

The Expert knowledge is very important for the proper assessment and due to lack of the same level of the “state of the art in biomass resources” across Europe it can be difficult the comparison of the data.

**Advanced approach:**

More appropriate for the comparison the resources at the EU level in the context of policy and renewable energy use. Needed for proper assessment of the national action plan and it’s real potential in the area of biomass use for energy purpose.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

The main aspect of the biomass sustainable utilization are economical and ecological costs (as greenhouse gases emission in harvest, transport, processing and utilization). Develop of best available practices for the particular biomass resources as well as the local condition is very important for the new biomass action plan. There is a further need in the sustainability assessment of the biomass utilization. As the very important parameter for biomass resources use is the future the accessibility of the biomass resources is very important (local road, storage potential, resources stability in the time).

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Jauschnegg Horst

Country: Austria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	x	Biomass (practice)	x	Biomass (theory and research)		Remote sensing		Other
Government/EU		Research/academic		Industry/SME		Consulting		

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	x	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor		Fair		Good	x	Very Good		Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	---	-----------	--	-----------	--

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor		Fair		Good	x	Very Good		Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	---	-----------	--	-----------	--

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

**Advanced approach:**

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

European bioenergy assessment harmonisation is really important, to get an overview for each country, if there are enough bioenergy potentials to supply the planned biomass plants according the National Action Plans for RES. In my opinion a lot of EU Member States don't have a clear picture about biomass potentials and the declared needs within the NAP.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: GeoVille Environmental Services (S. Kleeschulte, M. Gregor)

Country: Luxembourg

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

The basic approach is rather straightforward and has only little advantage over the current approach based on statistical data alone. The larger the statistical units, the larger the advantage of the basic approach – then disaggregation towards land cover information has advantages.

**Advanced approach:**

The advanced approach is only presented for forest resources. The presented case (for forests) makes much sense and is based on a well developed concept.

Questionable (as not described) is the translation of the approach for other resources. The input parameter for agricultural biomass (classification of crops according to biomass content) is more challenging than the forest example. Especially when looking to the 85% accuracy target.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

The separation into a basic and advanced approach seems very adequate in view of the different user communities.

All in all, a good idea and concept which strongly depends on the availability of EO data and the quality of the EO data processing chain and results.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Leos Gal

Country: Czech Republic

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

The basic approach is based on statistical data. Big advantage is that data are generally available and applicable for every user and organisation. In this approach, many of important aspects are taken into account (protected areas, forest management plans etc.)

**Advanced approach:**

I am not specialist in the area of remote sensing, but it seems logically. This approach used more detailed data.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

I would like also see any examples of the advanced approach” workflow for agriculture biomass.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Lyudmil Kostadinov, Energy Efficiency Agency

Country: Bulgaria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** On the basis of communicated information from BGBIOM it can be concluded that the basic approach is well developed, easy for implementation and supplying enough information.

**Advanced approach:** Innovative tool for supporting faster and better elaboration of decisions about substitution of fossil fuels with available biomass.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Enlarging bioenergy use in European Union is vitally important. It will raise the energy independence of the Union.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: MARIA ANDRZEJEWSKA UNEP/GRID WARSZAWA

Country: POLAND

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

Approach based on available data has quite serious disadvantages while the comparison of broader are is considered. Availability of suggested data will differ among countries, but also at a country level there could be some limitations.

**Advanced approach:**

sounds like an excellent approach to develop an uniform set of data for the whole continent, but...as it's stated in the text, the methodology is based on a quite expensive approach, mainly due to the cost of input data. The advanced approach requires also involvement of a well prepared team of researchers, but could result with a really uniform calculations for a broader, multi-country coverage.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

The CEUBIOM project is an interesting approach supporting the EU policy introducing broader use of bioenergy. Proposal of developing a single harmonized approach for European biomass assessment for energy at the local/regional level is important and worth promoting.

The presented methodology, both basic and advanced approach have their advantages and disadvantages, but in both a special concern should be paid on areas covered by any form of nature protection (Natura 2000, national systems of protected areas, ecological corridors, etc.). Also the issue of ecosystem fragmentation, broadly discussed both at the European and country level should be considered. The final results of investigations developed within the CEUBIOM project should be also related to the ecosystem services approach (e.g. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005, Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Synthesis. Island Press, Washington).

**Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010.** Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Maya Stoyanova, BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

„Central Laboratory for Solar Energy and New Energy Sources“

Country: Bulgaria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** The approach consists of a large set of environmental and social criteria. Will be to help consumers in making decisions.

**Advanced approach:** Modern and innovative approach. The distribution of biomass resources is displayed, allowing for comparison.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Bioenergy provides mankind a clean and protect natural source of energy. It is one of the alternatives for the future replacement of conventional fuels with renewable energy sources in the United Europe.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: **Romanian Energy Regulatory Authority- ANRE - IRINA NICOLAU**

Country: ROMANIA

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	x	Biomass (practice)		Biomass (theory and research)		Remote sensing		Other
Government/EU		Research/academic		Industry/SME		Consulting		

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	x	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	x	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	x	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** Is it correct that the basic approach, the amount of biomass estimate to be made according to statistical data.

**Advanced approach:** Is it fair that the advanced approaches to use more detailed data and more sophisticated methods such as remote sensing and terrestrial information.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

For Romania, biomass is a promising energy source, both in terms of potential and in terms of use.

After processing statistical data, maps were made in the field regarding the energy potential of biomass in Romania, including the territorial distribution of energy values (TJ) expected to be achieved by recovering energy from biomass.

By analyzing the map with the geographical distribution of biomass resources, are found which are the most richest and poorest counties.

Under the CEUBIOM project there will be recommendations on how each country should evaluate the potential of biomass with regard to input data, the types of biomass, the area

covered, methods and assumptions used to create a database that is comparable across Europe.

**Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010.** Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Nikolay Kakanakov

Country: Bulgaria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

Give enough information for assessment of biomass-for-energy. Cost effective and uses existing data from geographical and agricultural investigation. Although it is more indirect approach, it can be made precise.

**Advanced approach:**

Too expensive and do not use existing data. Some of the remote sensing methods have more accuracy than needed. Difficult to understand and deploy. Different approaches use different data formats that are not fully compatible.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

The idea of harmonisation of biomass-for-energy data is more than needed. The harmonized assessments should be made easy-understanding, cost-effective and fast to deploy and use. In other case special programs should be started for gathering data using advanced approaches.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Robert Pasicko

Country: Croatia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u><i>Other (UNDP)</i></u>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b><i>Excellent</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b><i>Excellent</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b><i>Very Good</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

**Advanced approach:** *the biggest drawback here is lack of knowledge on remote sensing among biomass experts;*

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

*more real life examples would be needed in a form of case studies – described in a way that is easily understandable and later used within learning tool. Data classified in a table is not enough. Transition from academics to future users on this findings needs more attention.*

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Roman Sitko, PhD

Country: Slovakia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

Work flow of the approach is clear. It is relatively easy and realistic to fulfil that flow by up-to-date data for step not less than 5 years. The utilization of remote sensed data and GIS can significantly help to improve spatial dimension of biomass mapping.

Notes (in the condition of Slovak forestry):

There could be significant differences between forest area of a map derived from remote sensing data and the area matching to statistics of NAI and total standing volume and so the NAI will be not distributed properly. It could be helpful to work with remote sensed data inside of area utilized for NFI (forest land resources).

Some recommendation for LEK weights evaluation would be defined.

It'd be important not forget to incorporate accidental felling to the work flow (step 8) as an important constrain in case of big disasters (wind storm, fire etc.), which concentrate the felling in the damaged areas for a couple years.

**Advanced approach:**

The advanced approach utilizes modern and very progressive remote sensed data. LiDAR and SAR data are nowadays the most suitable remote sensed data for description of the forest structure.

Notes:

It is missing the information of expected accuracy for both alternative approaches. It would be easier to compare advantages and disadvantages between basic and advanced approaches.

There is not clear defined the measure of accuracy used in part of the user requirements. The range of

80 – 85 % seems to be the rate of qualitative feature, but I'd expect any measure of quantity for biomass assessment.

Do you have any ***overall comments*** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

No comments

**Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010.** Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Dr. Kvetoslava Šoltéssová, PhD.

Country: Slovakia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

**Advanced approach:**

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

No comment

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: VELCESCU Benone

Country: Romania

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

Utilization of statistical data regarding forestry land is a first step. For biomass for agriculture can be used statistical data regarding cultivated land, average production/ha and total production and then, agricultural waste can be calculated

**Advanced approach:**

For a detailed approach important costs are necessary, and implementing this methodology can be carried out together with a specialised institute.  
Applying this methodology in Romania can be done in a further period.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Implementing legal framework “Climate change& Energy”, with its three 20-20-20, assumes important financial efforts for every country in the world.  
Biomass is an important energy resource, but its utilisation should be done following sustainable criteria, which should be followed by member states, but also by other countries, which should join their effort to mitigation of greenhouse gases emissions.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Vladimir Stupavsky

Country: Czech Republic

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

This approach is quite simple method to calculate biomass potential. Every step is carefully described. The approach is based on statistical data, which are very well available in the Czech republic. It seems to be very useful method for calculate of biomass potential.

**Advanced approach:**

It is very sophisticated method and more accurate then basic approach.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

No other comments

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: WEZYK PIOTR - ProGea Consulting ; Agriculture University Krakow

Country: POLAND

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	SME

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

Seems to be very realistic to doo but need a detailed (forest inventory data) and standardised information from forest data bases (geometrical and descriptive) what is not so easy to reach (even between some countries in Europe – there are different definitions in forest inventory parameters and forest management). This basic approach based on the Aster Global DEM or SRTM cannot deliver very detailed information about the annual increment and spatial distribution of the biomass but probably sufficient for the regional scale. The very dynamic changes of the weather condition in Europe can influence very fast the forest and agricultural vegetation and due this also the precision of the biomass models. This basic approach can be used to control of the Kyoto protocol and the usage of the limits of CO2 production.

**Advanced approach:**

I prefer to use the detailed biomass models based on the advanced approach using the LiDAR and SAR technology. Also OBIA of VHRS images or digital airborne cameras can improved this approach. To cover whole country with ALS data is not realistic now for the meddle and east part of Europe (but it will take a place). Interesting data source for monitoring of biomass increment and forest succession on abandoned agricultural land could be a Satellite Laser Scanning like ICESat sensors (full waveform).

Do you have any ***overall comments*** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Yes,

It will be very good to have some kind of standard of forest parameters over the whole Europe and stop the political decisions of burning millions of cubic meter of wood to fulfil some rules of CO2 limits. In the practice not only branches but whole stems are burning in the power plants to arrive the percentage of the renewable recourses of energy. CEUBIOM could be the chance to find other energy sources like using the from agricultural production or wood from the areas where the forest succession start to grow on the abandoned areas which are sometimes burnt over the night to get EU subsidies to aforestation !

**Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010.** Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## *Feedback Form*

### CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Antonina Ilyinska, Ph.D.

Position: Scientist, The Institute of Botany

Country: Ukraine

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

***Overall Approach.*** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

***Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.*** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

***Workflow examples.*** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

***Basic approach: it looks good for ministries and committees***

***Advanced approach: it looks preferable for scientists and for long-term join projects because requires more time and data involvement***

Do you have any ***overall comments*** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Jordan Angelovski  
 Country: Macedonia  
 Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	X	Biomass (practice)		Biomass (theory and research)		Remote sensing		Other	
Government/EU		Research/academic		Industry/SME		Consulting			

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	X	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	X	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	X	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** It is very good for the indirect assessment of the above ground biomass potential that can be used in Macedonia.

**Advanced approach:** It is more expensive but more accurate approach. It requires more financial resources and considering the current financial situation it will have a limited use.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Raisa Burda, Sc.D.

Position: Professor, Deputy Director, Institute of Biotechnologies

Country: Ukraine

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** *the both approaches looks useful and informative and modern*

**Advanced approach:** *current usage of remote sensing data and GIS analyse is the advantage*

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Jana Jovanovska  
 Country: Macedonia  
 Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** Applicable approach for the indirect assessment of biomass in our country due to the low cost.

**Advanced approach:** Very expensive.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Excellent effort for the harmonized approach for European biomass assessment for energy, with special emphasis on South-Eastern European and Western Balkan countries. This was particularly needed for the Western Balkan countries where our country belongs too.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Ludmyla Kvashuk, Ph.D.

Position: Head of the Department, State Statistic Committee

Country: Ukraine

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	Statistics

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** *looks good*

**Advanced approach:** *good for many scientists*

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Mitko Karadelev

Country: Macedonia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** Excellent approach for the assessment of forest and agricultural biomass where we already have an existing (known) procedures

**Advanced approach:** Very expensive, it requires carrying out extensive remote sensing surveys.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Pavlo Kravets, Ph.D.

Position: Associate professor, National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, Department of Forestry Management

Country: Ukraine

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** *ok*

**Advanced approach:** *ok*

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

*Both descriptions were very informative for us. Our Department of Forestry Management will use it for lecturers and possibly for students of the National University.*

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Slobodanco Klimoski  
 Country: Macedonia  
 Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** Very good approach for the assessment of forest and agricultural biomass. As regarding to the forest biomass the use of forest management plans (including the maps) is essential. For the industry residues for energy use it has a limitation in our country as there is no statistical data available for this.

**Advanced approach:** Expensive, but more accurate as it requires carrying out extensive remote sensing surveys.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Grigoriy Kolomytsev

Position: Lecturer, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

Country: Ukraine

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** *good and useful outcome*

**Advanced approach:** *good modern outcome.*

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

***Thank you very much for both summaries, which are very helpful at level of Kyiv University scientists and lecturers (Biological Department).***

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Dusko Hristov

Country: Macedonia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** Applicable in our country based on existing data and methods.

**Advanced approach:** As regarding to the remote sensing methods for estimating forest biomass, finding an optimum combination of accuracy of measurements and the cost of the technology is often a major challenge. Remote sensing cannot be used effectively for below-ground biomass and deadwood.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Anna Kozlova, Ph.D.

Position: Scientist, Aerospace Research Center of the Earth (NASU)

Country: Ukraine

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** *good*

**Advanced approach:** *good; the usage of RS and GIS is the future for both approaches.*

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Angel Nikolaev, Black Sea Regional Energy Centre

Country: Bulgaria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:** The approach is very well justified. It is particularly useful when one disposes of limited time and budget.

**Advanced approach:** The approach is very well justified. It produces extremely high quality of results.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Biomass energy is the most important RES. Its potential assessment, using uniform methodology, is crucial for implementation of biomass energy utilization projects.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Mariya Minova, Ministry of Energy, Economic and Tourism

Country: Bulgaria

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

The basic approach is beneficial and definitely needful concerning requirements for reporting under Directive 2009/28/EO. Currently the some dates are not available. So the harmonisation of statistic methodologies and launch the raising date should be done in very short terns.

**Advanced approach:**

Useful approach but hard and expensive for implementation.

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

The Draft of the document consists very useful information and reviews – base for formulation of appropriate measures in area of biomass statistic

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Tomislav Virkes

Country: Croatia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

***Overall Approach.*** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

***Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.*** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

***Workflow examples.*** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

***Basic approach:***

***Advanced approach:***

Do you have any ***overall comments*** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

**Feedback Form**  
**CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 "Report on harmonised approach". Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (please tick in the grey fields).

Name:

VELCESCU DENONE

Country:

ROMANIA

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
Government/EU	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the "core" part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this "core" part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

Utilizarea datelor statistice privind fondul forestier este un prim pas. Pbr. biomasă din agricultură se pot utiliza datele statistice privind suprafețele cultivate, produsele medii la ha și produsele totale și prin calcule se pot determina contribuțiile de la sectorul agricol.

Advanced approach:

Pentru abordarea detaliată sunt necesare costuri mari, iar implementarea meteorologiei se poate face prin-un institut specializat.  
 Aplicarea aerului meteorologiei în RO se poate face într-o etapă ulterioară

Do you have any overall comments on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Implementarea pachetului legislativ, "Clasa-Sunerie" cu cei trei 20-20-20, presupune eforturi financiare deosebite pentru toate statele lumii.  
 Biomasă este o sursă energetică regenerabilă importantă, dar utilizarea acesteia trebuie să se facă pe lângă un criteriu de durabilitate respectat de către statele membre UE cât mai ales de celelalte țări, care trebuie să-și unească eforturile pt. reducerea emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Peter Ševce

Country: Slovakia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	X	Biomass (practice)		Biomass (theory and research)		Remote sensing		Other
Government/EU		Research/academic		Industry/SME	X	Consulting		

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good		Excellent	X
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	--	-----------	---

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	X	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor		Fair		Good		Very Good	X	Excellent	
------	--	------	--	------	--	-----------	---	-----------	--

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

The description of the approach seems to be clear, but unfortunately we are not specialists on the biomass potential assessment and we cannot give you skilled answers.

**Advanced approach:**

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

From the point of view of a company using the predictions of the biomass potential for the RES generation planning projects it is important to have harmonised approach on the EU level for the comparison of respective countries. Therefore the idea of the project is excellent. Currently there are not comparable information about the potential and for investors it is difficult to allocate the financial resources to reflect the highest biomass potential. The local conditions between EU countries (and even within them) differ immensely.

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before 25 October 2010. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>

## **Feedback Form**

### **CEUBIOM approach to a harmonised methodology**

To download in word format: [www.ceubiom.org/feedback](http://www.ceubiom.org/feedback)

You have been provided a short summary of CEUBIOM Deliverable D4.3 “*Report on harmonised approach*”. Before finalising this Deliverable, we would like to request your comments and suggestions (*please tick in the grey fields*).

Name: Peter Albert

Country: Slovakia

Your background (you can select more than one):

Energy policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (practice)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Biomass (theory and research)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Remote sensing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
Government/EU	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Industry/SME	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Overall Approach.** The CEUBIOM Consortium proposes that the “core” part of national biomass assessments is carried out following a uniform methodology. Users can apply a broad range of additional ecological, environmental, and social criteria according to their own requirements, but only this “core” part is used for comparison and EU-level aggregation of data. How would you rate this overall approach?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Introduction, Objectives and user requirements.** How would you rate the clarity of the objectives and the appropriateness of the methodology in addressing the user requirements?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

**Workflow examples.** How would you rate the level of detail and the clarity of the processing steps?

Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	------	-------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Please give us your comments on the two approaches described in this document (free text, no limit on length).

**Basic approach:**

**Advanced approach:**

Do you have any **overall comments** on European bioenergy assessment harmonisation efforts (free text, no limit on the length)?

Please return this form to [coordinator@ceubiom.org](mailto:coordinator@ceubiom.org) before **25 October 2010**. Thank you!

To participate in the discussions please visit the CEUBIOM Discussion Platform at:

<http://ceubiom.acsys.it:8080/web/guest/home>

To participate in the e-learning programme please visit the CEUBIOM e-learning Course at:

<http://ceubiom.geonardo.com>