

## VIDEOCONFERENCE CONCLUSIONS

<b>Title</b>	<b>Meeting with EFI Director Marc Palahi and Professor Goran Berndes, Chalmers University of Technology</b>
<b>Date</b>	24-06-2021
<b>Participants</b>	Ext : Marc Palahi, Goran Berndes COM: Stefano Grassi, Laure Chapuis,
	<b>Ares initial request : <a href="https://ares.ec.europa.eu/ares/initial-request/20213330780">20213330780</a></b>
<b>Issues raised &amp; follow-up</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marc Palahi: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General reflection: Unprecedented policy situation in Europe: impacts on climate change more drastic than ever, while at the same time: unprecedented opportunities for the forest sector; renewable and circular bio-based solutions to replace fossils.</li> <li>- Challenge: forests are not resilient to climate change; we will need to foster biodiversity and help forests adapt to climate change (active forest management)</li> <li>- Biodiversity challenge for Europe: we cannot produce both woods for different products and protect biodiversity.</li> <li>- Bioenergy and biodiversity are not opposing to each other – there are many ways to promote both simultaneously, when bioenergy can even be good for biodiversity.</li> <li>- JRC report: he questioned why only environmental impacts were addressed -90% of the scenarios were not realistic at all.</li> <li>- 50% of the wood used for bioenergy is coming from residues and the other half is divided between forest residues (e.g. brunches) and specific forest for bioenergy (e.g. thinning).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Goran Berndesthe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If we focus on bioenergy, it may seem like it is a third-land use category, which evolves in parallel with conventional agriculture and forestry. In reality, bioenergy expansion has expressed itself as an adjustment in agriculture and forestry.</li> <li>- How the forest management responses influences the carbon stocks: a very common characterisation of the forest sector resource is that if the forest sector will need more biomass → less carbon stocks in the forest. <b>But, in reality</b> depending on the geographic area, this could increase demand for carbon in the forest (incentives to extend forest areas or add new forests)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Laure Chapuis: Bioenergy should not become a new land use: This dynamic is there, but what we see in the discussion is to try to avoid specific plantation for bioenergy. Is it an issue that is really problematic in reality? There is this perception in the public</li> <li>• Stefano Grassi: what are the risks and threats for forests and biodiversity?</li> <li>• Goran Berndesthe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are a lot of scientific studies that suggest that removing everything from the forest is not good</li> <li>- Avoid the intensive biomass extraction approach – clear cuts in some context are not good</li> <li>- There should not be an intensive push for reforestation – this might lead into potential use of agricultural areas</li> </ul> </li> </ul>