

## Meeting Minutes: 3<sup>rd</sup> Steering Committee Meeting 6-9<sup>th</sup> of November, 2017, Toulouse, France

### Meeting Information

Meeting: 3 <sup>rd</sup> Steering Committee Meeting	Location: Poitiers and Toulouse, France (Pprime)
Initiated by: Peter Rutschmann	Date: 06.11.2017, 09.11.2017
Distribution: Steering Committee	Time: 08:00 – 12:00, 14:30 – 16:00

**Disclaimer:** This is a decision-making protocol where an overview of the main contents of the session and decisions are recorded. It is not a word-protocol and only essential points and highlights are recorded. Word-logging is made only based on concrete requests during the meetings. For this reason, all statements and questions of the participants are not automatically and fully recorded in the meeting minutes.

### List of attendees:

S/N	Last name	First name	Organization
1	Abo El Wafa	Hany	Technische Universität München
2	Albayrak	Ismail	ETHZ
3	Bean	Colin	University of Glasgow (EEAB)
4	Boavida	Isabel	IST-ID
5	Bussetini	Martina	Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale / Italian National Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (EEAB)
6	Cowx	Ian	UHULL
7	David	Laurent	CNRS - University of Poitiers
8	Fenz	Robert	
9	Harby	Atle	SINTEF Energy Research
8	Kampa	Eleftheria	ECOLOGIC INSTITUT gemeinnützige GmbH
9	Katopodis	Chris	Katopodis Ecohydraulics Ltd. (EEAB)
10	Pinheiro	Antonio	IST-ID
11	Rutschmann	Peter	Technische Universität München
12	Schneider	Matthias	SJE Ecohydraulic Engineering GmbH
13	Schwarzwälder	Kordula	Technische Universität München
14	Wolter	Christian	Forschungsverbund Berlin e. V.

**Agenda:**

1. Dissemination strategy
2. DSS and CIA tools
3. Sediment management and environmental flows in FITHydro (including reservoir sediment)
4. Innertkirchen (KWO)
5. GA3 and Review meeting location
6. Skype meeting 13th of November
7. Meeting related actions
8. WP internal reporting
9. Work packages linkages and “homogeneity”
10. Pan-European aspect
11. AMBER
12. Deliverables quality management system
13. Deliverables linkages (input and output)

Ad 1) Dissemination strategy

- The use of twitter in FIThydro should be more effective as it is a powerful tool to disseminate project activities
- CO should ask the PO about feedback on the dissemination strategy
- The idea of a TV broadcast would be explored by the CO
- The newsletter frequency would be set to at least once every year
- Project members should disseminate about FIThydro in different conferences and presentations by showing a one PPT slide informing about the key facts of FIThydro (partners, funding, objectives)
- The updated strategy including the results of the discussions during the GA will be sent to all partners until December. There is also a form for internal dissemination reporting to be prepared by WP6.

Action	Responsible	Date
Update the dissemination strategy (List of measures)	TUM (Kordula)	24.11.2017
Set up the dissemination reporting system	TUM (Kordula)	24.11.2017
Collect information from all partners for dissemination activities	TUM (Kordula)	30.11.2017

Ad 2) DSS and CIA tools

- For WP5 we need a task description from Ian, as one of the tasks is the DSS tool. It might be good to get such a description latest in January (Eleftheria)
- Ian Cowx and his team should send all WP leaders information about the interface definitions of the CIA and the DSS tools with all other WP's. (i.e.: What is needed from all WP leaders to feed into CIA and DSS and when).
- It is important to separate between DSS and CIA tools within the project, as the CIA is not that time-critical until now (Christian)

Action	Responsible	Date
Eleftheria to contact Ian and set a deadline to send this interface definitions and timeline (proposed deadline 15 <sup>th</sup> of January, 2018)	Eleftheria Kampa	01.12.2017
Send a task description and information about the needed contribution from all the workpackages	UHULL	??

Ad 3) Sediment management and Environmental flows in FIThydro (including Reservoir sedimentation)

- EEAB confirms the importance of the two topics (sediment management and Environmental flows)
- Progress should be made in the upcoming period to define the **methodology for sediment and environmental flow** management within FIThydro
- TUM will take responsibility for planning of the sediment issues, Atle, and Antonio for the e-flow planning.
- For both topics, the methodology and the connection to the test cases needs to be fixed as well as the question which level of detail is needed for exchange and exploitation. (Martina and Chris)
- There is a need to categorize the different HPP's (Existing HPP and new HPP)
- Sediment modelling would be difficult to implement at FIThydro

- The focus of sediment management should be on its effect on habitat and fish population
- The possibility of getting studies from EDF (France) on sediment management should be explored
- FITHydro partners who should deal with the sediment management topic are ETH, NTNU, TUM, CNRS and EEAB (Martina Bussetini)
- A common agreement should be reached on how we define Environmental flows at FITHydro (Atle Harby)

Action	Responsible	Date
Conduct a virtual meeting for discussing <b>Sediment management with the potentially involved parties</b>	TUM	30.11.2017
Conduct a virtual meeting for discussing <b>environmental flow with the potentially involved parties (Include Concept note sent from Atle)</b>	Atle/Antonio	30.11.2017

#### Ad 4) Innertkirchen (KWO)

- FITHydro should make use of the publicly available data from France and Norway for the hydropeaking related work
- No work would be done at Innertkirchen due to the high cost they proposed and the impossibility to allocate the project funds for KWO
- Mathias Schneider (SJE) presented the GKI HPP on the Inn river as a candidate for hydropeaking work at FITHydro
- The SC agrees on GKI as a potential HPP where work of FITHydro would be done
- CO and Matthias Schneider would communicate with TIWAG (GKI HPP's operator) to prepare a letter of agreement that would be needed to start the work there
- The agreement between TIWAG and FITHydro should explicitly say that no financial constraints on FITHydro will be present

#### ad 5) GA3 and Review Meeting location

The third General Assembly was decided to take place in Zurich on June 25-27. The Review Meeting will take place on the 28<sup>th</sup> of June also in Zurich.

Attendance to the General Assembly will be compulsory for all partners. Attendance of the Review Meeting will be compulsory for representatives from certain FITHydro partners who will be informed about it in December.

The schedule will be as follows:

Date	Event
25-26.06.2018	General Assembly
27.06.2018 (Morning)	Excursion to Bannwil
27.06.2018 (Afternoon)	Excursion to Schiffmühle*
28.06.2018	Review meeting

**The periodic report has to be submitted on June 15<sup>th</sup> 2017**

\*For Schiffmühle we need to check, if some "actions" and activities there can be shown to the PO, for instance a survey.

#### ad 6) Skype meeting 13<sup>th</sup> of November

The planned WP leaders meeting on the 13<sup>th</sup> would not take place

#### ad 7) Meeting related actions

Action	Responsible	Date
GA Documentation (Presentations, photos, contact list, Dissemination notifications)	TUM (Hany)	17.11.2017

SC meeting minutes draft	TUM (Hany)	24.11.2017
GA Meeting minutes draft	TUM (Hany)	24.11.2017
CSMB Meeting Minutes Draft	Atle Harby	24.11.2017

ad 4) WP internal Reporting

- All WP leaders should report about the project activities for the M1-M12 period
- Content of the report would be:
  - Overview of activities
  - Resources
  - Concise yet informative
  - Use internal reports from partners
  - Use the information we gathered in the meeting
  - Use the WP detailed planning we have been working on during M1-M12
  - Fill in the updated PM's efforts per partner in each WP
  - Coordinator would send the WP reporting template to all WP leaders (done on 20.11.2017)
  - Deadline for WP internal reporting is 07.12.2017

ad 8) Work packages linkages and “homogeneity”

- CO will analyze the WP2 and WP3 detailed description and would have bilateral discussions with the WP leaders with the objective of finalizing a consistent and harmonized work description (that the work contributes to achieving the project's objectives, no work duplications in different tasks, having reasonable/balanced resources allocated to the different tasks).
- Some of the subtasks might need some balancing during this procedure as they have a very high load of PM compared to others (Atle).

Action	Responsible	Date
Conduct analysis to harmonize and streamline the research activities of WP 2 and WP3	TUM	24.11.2017
Bilateral discussions with WP leaders	TUM	30.11.2017

ad 9) Pan-European aspect)

- We need to interlink test cases and scientific partners more efficient than done so far. Atle as a CSMB Leader needs to be involved here.
- Other
- Atle Harby raised the issue of that the financial resources allocated for CSMB leader are not enough to conduct the work needed. A bilateral discussion between the CO and the CSMB leader need to take place
- The study design needs to be comparable from one test case to the other and needs to be harmonized. For instance telemetry studies should be all done in the same way (Chris, Martina and Colin agree on that)
- This task has to be done by the task leaders with a strong link to the CSMB Leader (Antonio, Eleftheria)

Action	Responsible	Date
Conduct a virtual meeting for discussing CSMB leaders responsibilities and the financial resources allocated.	TUM	30.11.2017

ad 10) AMBER

- A joint deliverable might not be a good idea as we would get highly dependent on the partners in

the Amber project then (Christian)

- Instead of such, we should focus on a common joint research approach.
- However it would be necessary to get an overview on the linkages between FITHydro and Amber and especially the deliverables. This link should be also shown to the public. (Martina)

Action	Responsible	Date
Plan a mid-January workshop in Brussels	TUM (Rutschmann)	

#### ad 11) Deliverables Quality management system

- Each deliverable should go through a review process:

Quality control	Content Review (Peer review)
Editing Language Format	The use of expertise within FITHydro 2 reviewers per deliverable

- Deliverables has to be reviewed by Co-leaders: Minimum requirement
- Deliverables should be sent to all WP members
- Selected deliverables might require a special review process (In these cases, Deliverable leaders will be contacted beforehand to suggest the required review process)
  - CO, CSMB, EEAB

#### ad 12) Deliverables linkages (input and output)

Each deliverable will have a section Adding links to related deliverables. **Input:** Referencing the former deliverable whose data/findings will be used and **output:** Linking future deliverable that will make use of the deliverable's finding/data/knowledge: Research outlook.