

COST Action E48: The Limits of Paper Recycling

Minutes of the Steering Committee Meeting

- Venue:** **COST Office**
149 av. Louise, Brussels
- Time:** Wednesday, 25 January 2006, 10:30 – 18:00 hrs
- Participants:** **Jan-Erik Levlin**
Harald Grossmann
Angeles Blanco
Francois Julien-Saint Armand
Arie Hooimeier
Gunter Siegel, Scientific Officer
(**Bold:** experts to be reimbursed)

1. Opening of the meeting

The meeting was opened by the chairman. A. Blanco will write the minutes.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda is adopted with the following additions:

- Questions for the secretariat: Contacts with other COST Actions, STSM new procedures and monitoring, CEPI participation.
- Review of WG's minutes
- Review of participant countries

3. Report from the COST Secretariat on actual matters, including Action budget 2006

The budget is very tight and will not be increased at the moment. For the first part of the year will not be money for STSM. It might be a recalculation of the budget in the 2nd part of the year.

The reason for a low budget for 2006 only 50.000€ is due to the figures from last year. The budget is usually related to the number of activities of previous years.

Contacts with other COST Actions: through the web-pages and through the COST secretary.

To include CEPI as a participant the procedure is complicate, therefore it is easier to invite them when necessary.



25 January 2006

4. The minutes from the recent Brussels meeting, both MC and WGs as well as the Activity report 2005

The MC minutes were approved with minor changes. It was approved that Mrs. Piroska Karolyi will be the reporter. It will be corrected and put it into the web-page. The participants of the MC is reviewed.

The minutes of WG1 were presented by A. Blanco and reviewed. It was agreed to up-dated the participants of WG1 including Elena Bobu, M. Jansson, R. Mckinney and J. Ringman in the WG1 list in the web-page. Participants of the task force will be reviewed.

The minutes of WG2 were presented by F.F.J. Saint Amand and reviewed. He will sent a questionnaire in February. The possibilities of using 100% recovered paper for SC papers should be assessed. Increasing deinking quality is covered in E-46 but the limits, e.g the yield, of its use is part of E-48. Yield and energy inputs an its evolution should be addressed in WG2. A questionnaire to get a better idea of the activities carried out at the different organizations will be distributed in February.

A. Hooimeijer summarized the minutes of WG3. Their main problem is that not many people is working in that area but everybody is interested in the results. Most of the work in done in the frame of EFORWOOD. The WG could focus on definition and assessing limits. A task force has been established to study a case model (T. Pajula, I. Ervasti, A. Hooimeijer and A. Blanco). It is planned to combine the meetings of WG3 with EFORWOOD or other meetings.

The activity report of 2005 has been reviewed.

All documents will be placed in the web-page. An e-mail will be distributed to all participants to remind them to look into the web-page for further information.

5. Planning the Action activities

The result of the Action should be to develop scenarios which describe the future use of recovered paper within the European paper industry in order to provide a better background for focused research activities in the filed (technical/technological + consumer behavior) as well as facilitate investment decisions or future company strategies concerning raw material markets.

- 1. Factors influencing recycling in different countries (Questionnaire → REPORT)**
Harald will fill in for Germany and send it to Francois → validation
Final questionnaire → all participants
Arie analysis → Presentation prepared by AH, HG, FSA and AB and presented during the meeting in Milan by Harald.

Questionnaire to know the factors that influence recycling in your country

COLLECTION

Describe the collection system in your country				
Define the effects of these issues on				
Availability Price Quality				
What of the following issues do you consider to be the main influence that may limit the competitiveness of paper recycling?	Why? What changes do you expect?			
Social				
Economical				
Technical				
Environmental				
Legislation				

Sorting Social Economical Technical Environmental Legislation		RP availability RP price RP quality
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------------

Recycling Social Economical Technical Environmental Legislation		RP availability RP price RP quality
Papermaking Social Economical Technical Environmental Legislation		RP availability RP price RP quality
Converting Social Economical Technical Environmental Legislation		RP availability RP price RP quality
Printing Social Economical Technical Environmental Legislation		RP availability RP price RP quality

2. **Actual limits of recycling (2005).** Limits are any situation that reduces the attractiveness of RP as raw material for paper industry:

REPORT/PRESENTATION

- Recovered paper availability
- Recovered paper quality
 - Recyclability of products: non-desirable materials
 - Deinkability
 -

3. **Predicting the quality of the future RP (experts speakers from different fields)**

- Future paper products and their quality
- Analysis of printing technologies/publishing
- Trends in converting
- Trends in packaging and retails
- Trends in domestic waste handling

Conference, stakeholders interactions,.... **REPORT/PRESENTATION**

4. **Model to predict the limits of paper recycling in Europe (e.g. from ECOTARGET Workshop, Isko Kajanto from KCL)**
5. **Critical factors for further growth of recycling (e.g. from Isko Kajanto)**
6. **Scenarios**
7. **What to do to extend the limits of paper recycling → Definition of R+D needs**

In order to achieve this aims we should have ready the following deliverables:
Promised concrete deliverables:

WG1:

Assessment of collection systems based on specific examples

- Influence of the collection system on quality and quantity of RP
Which is the best system according to the socio-economic conditions?. Different situations to be defined in the autumn meeting. For example:
 - Low population, large production of graphic papers and good infrastructure
 - High population, large production of GP and PG and good infrastructure
 - Low population, high production of GP and good infrastructure
 - High population, medium production and
 -
- Yield, quality (non-desirable components, composition (packaging, graphic,...))
- Characterisation of societal aspects
- Characterisation of the efficiency of the collection systems
- Attempt to correlate the efficiency of the collecting system- societal boundaries- market environment
- Drawing conclusions: scenarios for best suited collection systems

Assessment of sorting systems

- Characterisation of sorting systems (Incoming RM, sorting system, RP grades produced, quality of grades, yields, cost)
- Definition of situations (information from CEPI needed for defining the gaps on available data).

Identification of trends in paper products (external speakers) → development of RP quality → impact on recyclability: Collection of information

- Papermaking products:
 - Packaging trends: lower weight, RFI sensors, adhesives,....

25 January 2006

- Electronic sensors: Analysis of CEPI data + definition of further actions
- Stickies: Topic for a WG meeting. Exchange of information. Definition of remaining issues.
- Printing trends:
 - Deinkability: collaboration with COST Action E-46
 - Stickies
- Modelling: market trends (inputs from EFORWOOD)

Sustainable use of RP (inputs from EFORWOOD)

- Optimise RM use → products
- Needs of fibre up-grading and use of reinforced fibres
 - Refining for strength increase
- Wastes
- Circulation time/Velocity of RP
- Number of recycling cycles (data available in Germany, Hungary and Romania)

Tools for monitoring RP quality (inputs from ECOTARGET)

- Methodologies and procedure
- Sensors: (Presentation: Available sensors in the market)
 - moisture, unusable materials
 - ratio ONP/OM
- Models

WG2:

WG3: Knowledge transfer for EFORWOOD to the other partners.

DELIVERABLES: Basis for the development of the scenarios

What should be the concrete deliverables of the Action in terms of reports, publications etc?

- How to structure the Action activities towards the MoU and these deliverables?
 - The work was scheduled for the next year.
 - Creation of ad hoc Task Forces? We have 2.
 - How to develop activities between the meetings?
- How to manage the dual nature of our COST Action (FJSA)?
- Possibilities to create an Action Secretariat? No possibilities.
- Other questions?

6. Publication strategy in terms of

- Brochure and poster. OK
- Content of the web page. It has been up-dated. The new documents will be available in 2-3 weeks.

