



Project No. 018385
INTARESE
Integrated Assessment of Health Risks of Environmental Stressors in Europe

Integrated Project
Thematic Priority

D44.2 2nd INTARESE Workshop - Toolbox

Due date of deliverable: November 2007
Actual submission date: November 2007

Start Date of Project: 1 November 2005

Duration: 60 Months

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable:

Revision: Final

Project co-funded by the European Commission with the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	X
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

Meeting Minutes

WP 4.1 Training meeting – INTARESE

Prague, 20 November 2007

The aim of the WP 4.1 training meeting was to present the proposals for the toolbox design elaborated by WP 4.1 to the consortium and receive feedback. A decision on if the proposal is accepted and further suggestions for enhancement were sought. SP 1, 2 and 3 were asked what they can provide as content for the toolbox. Feedback is listed below.

User interface:

- In general accepted

Guidebook & Resource Centre:

- It was regarded as important to guarantee a flexible structure / format of the information that is included in the Guidebook and Resource Centre.
- Heading of the guidebook/toolbox web pages should be changed (not INTARESE, but more general).
- Hints at the top level would be useful if the information sought is contained in the toolbox or if it is external.
- It is important to get the balance right between general and detailed guidance.
- It should somehow be ensured, that the parts of the toolbox fit together.

Collaborative Workspace:

A number of participants were sceptical on whether such a workspace would be practicable or used:

- a discussion in the Collaborative Workspace might be inefficient (time frame; amount of time; the involvement of everyone), at least only a limited number of assumptions should be discussed.
- the added value of the Collaborative Workspace compared to a content management system was not clearly identified.
- If in a complex assessment many participants start discussing all aspects, the number of arguments gets too high and the overview would get lost.
- The rigid rules to be obeyed during the discussion might not be accepted by stakeholders, in addition the conclusion/ decision to be made by the moderator after each discussion (accepted/rejected) might not be accepted.
- Stakeholders that are not able or willing to use the internet as means of communication would be excluded from the discussion.
- Risk assessors might want to have the discussion on their own server (Project web page).

Other comments:

- A moderator must exist and he needs to have the overview, direct the discussions, avoid misuse and guarantee that the discussion is kept in the boundaries of the assessment.
- Possibility of password protection is required and given. The internal discussion (among team members) should be kept separately from the discussion with stake holders.

Tools:

- It was stressed that a coherence of the tools is very important. Maybe an issue for SP 5?
- SP 3: difficult to come to firm opinions without testing the tools
- SP 3: framework seems too rigid
- Include s.th. like the MNP tool "fill in now" / "fill in later" and flag not-filled-in parts of the assessment.
- Different input data formats including distributions should be possible.

DALY-tool:

- the DALY-tool should also contain a life table model?

Monetary valuation tool:

- discounting possibilities, benefit transfer might be included.
- Also, a Guidebook entry for discounting and benefit transfer is required.

Spatial mapping tool:

- overlapping functionality between excel & GeoDa (box plots etc)

Uncertainty tools:

- MNP tool: it would be very helpful if the first layer of information could be translated to other languages as many people are not firm with the English terms
-
- Maybe Aguila can be integrated with other tools; maybe it could not only use but calculate the data.

Analysis tool:

- Not clear to everyone what this is. Needs more explanation.

Additional tools (tools, that the consortium asked for):

- project planning tool
- a tool that can analyse texts about how simple the text can be understood
- means to deal with legal framework (reason for doing the assessment)
- Tool for meta-analysis-help. There is a free tool available.
- help on quantitative uncertainty calculation, e.g. probability distributions, Monte Carlo.

What WPs can provide for the toolbox:

- SP 1: Provide content of the Guidebook
- SP 2: Provide information for the Guidebook
- SP 2: Provide (meta)data to tools & resources
- SP 2: uncertainty framework: to what extent can SP 2 use the toolbox? can they provide something like the MNP tool? (quality assessment of data)
- SP 3: Provide worked examples: not clear yet, in which form (as a report or as small pieces showing the usage of a method, or both)

General issues:

- The fate of the toolbox after the project's end needs to be thought about. Maybe follow-up projects, groups of volunteer partners of INTARESE or more official bodies like EEA.
- We need explicit criteria what is in the toolbox and what not.
- Due to time and budget constraints we will only partly be able to extract relevant information from external sources to present in the Resource Centre.

WP 4.2 implications

- We will have a first meeting in January with the core group (USTUTT, RIVM, NILU, KTL, INERIS and IC) to develop more detailed plans how to implement the toolbox, e.g. give guidance to other WPs what to integrate into the Guidebook and Resource Centre. We will also explore existing systems to help this.
- Partners from the core group will get into contact with the relevant partners from other WPs (partners of WP 4.2 or outside) to agree on the detailed content which the WPs will deliver to the guidebook and resource centre.