



Valorising European Research for Innovation in Agriculture and Forestry

Title: Report of 4th case study meeting: *Ash workshop in Joensuu 23.3.2017*



Client: European Commission

Submitted by: Samuli Joensuu & Michael den Herder

The VALERIE project (Grant Agreement No.: FP7-KBBE-2013-7-613825-VALERIE) is funded as a coordination and support action under the 7th European Framework Programme. The views and opinions expressed in this report does not represent the official position of the European Commission and is entirely the responsibility of the authors.

Contact Details

Name of Contact: Samuli Joensuu

Address for Correspondence Tapio Ltd.
Maistraatinportti 4 a 3kr
00240 Helsinki, Finland

Contact Telephone:

Mobile: +358 405041043

Email: samuli.joensuu@tapio.fi



Name of Contact: Michael den Herder

Address for Correspondence European Forest Institute
Yliopistokatu 6
80100 Joensuu, Finland

Contact Telephone: +358 10 773 4343

Mobile: +358 50 440 0410

Email: Michael.denherder@efi.int



Contents

1	Introduction	<u>11</u>
1.1	<i>Aims</i>	<i><u>11</u></i>
1.2	<i>Stakeholders</i>	<i><u>11</u></i>
1.3	<i>Methods</i>	<i><u>32</u></i>
1.4	<i>Outcomes.....</i>	<i><u>33</u></i>
2	Interactive Ask.Valerie.....	<u>85</u>
2.1	<i>Method/exercise used.....</i>	<i><u>85</u></i>
2.2	<i>Outcomes.....</i>	<i><u>85</u></i>
3	Review and outcomes of the stakeholder workshop	<u>96</u>
3.1	<i>Method/exercise used.....</i>	<i><u>96</u></i>
3.2	<i>Outcomes.....</i>	<i><u>96</u></i>
4	Review meeting outcomes and future plan of the pilot project	<u>107</u>
4.1	<i>Method/exercise used.....</i>	<i><u>107</u></i>
4.2	<i>Outcomes.....</i>	<i><u>107</u></i>
5	Reflections.....	<u>118</u>
5.1	<i>Method/exercise used.....</i>	<i><u>118</u></i>
5.2	<i>Outcomes.....</i>	<i><u>118</u></i>
6	Appendix.....	<u>129</u>

1 Introduction

1.1 Aims

- To tell about Ask Valerie
- To tell about the ash pilot project
- To tell about the plans for the year 2017
- In the workshop to hear stakeholders' attitudes about the future: What kind of challenges are there relating to the use of wood ash?

The aims of the meeting were addressed in the beginning of the meeting by Pirjo Salminen and Samuli Joensuu (see the program of the meeting in the Appendix 6.2).

Mervi Matilainen and her group from Apila Group Ltd arranged a wonderful workshop for the stakeholders in the afternoon 23.3. Mervi and her group wrote the summary of the workshop (see the results from the Appendix 6.4).

1.2 Stakeholders

In the fourth Valerie case study meeting we had a very good variety of different stakeholders, because we organized wood ash seminar in the morning as a part of Valerie-meeting. The list of the stakeholder organisation who participated in the meeting:

1. Ash producers:

- Local energy cooperative from the community of Eno
- Local energy cooperative from the community of Juuka
- Local energy cooperative from the community of Nurmes
- Vapo NEW (Vapo Ltd has over 70 heating power stations in different kind of cities and communes in Finland)
-

2. Ash users/ forest owners:

- Ecolan Ltd. (previously FA Forest Ltd.) (Ecolan represents also the forest owners which are interested to use wood ash fertilizer in their forest, and thus they will participate in the pilot. The latest manufacturing plant of ash fertilizer was opened in Nokia in March 2017).



- OTSO Forest services Ltd
- UPM Kymmene – forest company
- The Finnish Forest Centre – represents private Finish forest owners
- Forest owner (one person)

3. Researchers and developers

- Apila Group Ltd. Apila Group organized the afternoon workshop
- LUKE (Natural Resources Institute Finland, previous METLA, Finnish Forest Research Institute). LUKE had a presentation about the effect of wood ash on the growth of trees. Samuli Joensuu from Tapio Ltd held the presentation within his own presentation.
- Aalto University NEW (Aalto University; Ari Serkkola, has a project where the business models for ash refinement are studied.) Valerie project has cooperation with the project.
- Helsinki University
- Karelia university of applied sciences NEW
- Mfibrils Ltd (a biotechnolpgy company in Joensuu) NEW

4. Decision makers

- The Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment (ELY)
- Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Pirjo Salminen, the officer from the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry had welcoming words in the seminar part of the meeting. In her welcoming words she brought regards from the Circular Economy meeting, day before our workshop in SITRA (The fund of the 50th anniversary of Finland's independence). She again described the importance of wood ash in the new fertilizing act which is under the preparation in EU. The target is to have common act for the organic fertilizer.

The full list about the stakeholder who participated in the meeting is in the Appendix 6.3.



1.3 Methods

The target for the seminar part of the stakeholder meeting was to get together more ash producers and users to the meeting. The meeting was held at the Metla house Käpy-seminar room on 23th of the March 2017. From 9.30 am to 13.00 pm we had wood ash seminar where we represented Valerie-project as a part of Circular economy together with different kind of presentations related to the wood ash:

1. A survey to the experiments of LUKE and other development projects for ash fertilization in forestry in Finland (Samuli Joensuu)
2. Ash fertilization and natural forestry. Researcher Birgitta Partanen told about the investigation in South Savo about the farms and landowners who aim to register their lands for organic forestry and collect natural mushrooms and berries for commercial aims. What does this mean for ash fertilization? Is it possible to fertilize the area by ash in forest areas which are registered as natural forestry land?
3. Michael den Herder demonstrated the website and functionality of ask-Valerie.eu. After his presentation we discussed about the use of the search engine in practise and made plans for the trial in next autumn.

After the lunch break Teuvo Hirvonen from Eno Energy demonstrated the activity of a small communal heating power station. How they have organized the circulation and wise use of ash in local energy power station in Eno?

Mauri Räsänen from The Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment (ELY) told about the Rural Development Program for Mainland Finland and the relating possibilities to fund the activity of the companies providing ash fertilization and the use of ash in earthworks.

We had also presentation about different kind of granulation methods to handle ash for fertilization (Mervi Matilainen) and presentation also about different kind of methods to spread the ash for forest fertilization (Mikko Räisänen).

We continued from 13- 16.00 pm with the ash workshop. Mervi Matilainen with her group from Apila Group Ltd arranged the workshop. The summary of the work shop is in the Appendix 6.4.

1.4 Outcomes

Question from the audience to **Pirjo Salminen**: In Finland the demand for cleanness of ash and the concentrations of heavy metal differ in field ash and ash fertiliser for forestry. Why? Salminen pointed out the differences so that we fertilize the fields more frequently (about one ash fertilization per 5 years) than the forests (about one ash fertilization per 40 to 60 years). That is why the field fertilizer must be cleaner.



The threshold values of for instance cadmium will not be raised in the new decree because of the Finnish climate and soil structure.

Question from the audience to **Samuli Joensuu**: Is it possible to use ash under the buildings? According to Mikko Räisänen (Ecolan Ltd) the use of ash is not allowed as a part of the construction under the buildings. Secondly was asked: Is it possible to use ash in every small gravel road in its construction? The new degree (MARA-degree) will allow the use of ash in forest roads and in private roads without environmental permit. If the limit level of the heavy metal concentration in the ash is sufficient, the material is allowed to use for that purpose. Further, the allowance is connected on that the construction of the road must have an officially accepted plan. The new MARA-degree in Finland comes into force in autumn 2017 after the EU-notification.

Birgitta Partanen pointed out that pure wood ash is allowed as fertilizer in the forests which are aiming to apply for an organic certificate. Forest owner can use the ash fertilizer produced in a commercial factory if the ash comes from wood tree ash. Also the owner is allowed use the ash produced in his own farm. Question to Birgitta Partanen: How long is the transition period in natural forestry areas of using forbidden materials? The answer is three years. It also was asked, what is the provenance of Finnish certificate for organic forestry and is it allowed to harvest in organic forestry areas? The provenance of the criterion is EU-legislation and the harvest is allowed.

Teuvo Hirvonen from Eno Energy told that the communal heating power station was established in 2000. The cooperative comprised 12 members in 2000. Today the number of members is 54. The organisation has ten years` experience of ash fertilization.

The entrepreneurship of heating has a positive image within the population in Eno and the surrounding communes. The benefits and the work live in the locality – it has positive effect in forestry, renewability, locality, the certainty of maintenance, the stability of costs compared to oil and CO₂ flux.

The quality of ash has been controlled the whole period; there is an informative label of ash produced in Eno Energy. We know where the tree raw-material comes. We also know where the trunks are limbed and covered.

Questions of the audience: How is the ash spread? “There are plenty of methods to spread the ash fertilized: by snow blower, by snowmobile, by shovel from sledge and by helicopter or by forest tractor. Because the amount of ash is so small, about 60 tons per year, it is not economical to granulate the ash for fertilization. All the material is “self granulated” in the storage.”

How do you get the tree raw-material? “We have outsourced the tree procurement. Turunen Ltd and some other smaller companies will buy the trees and chip the material”.



How much of the raw-material is green biomass (=biomass with leaves)? “The share of that material is about 10 percent. The share is so low because of the bigger concentration of heavy metals. Additionally, the heat of combustion of the material is quite low.”

Mauri Räsänen from The Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment (ELY) told about different kind of supports for enterprises in Finland for new innovations of the use of ash. The value of the investment must be between 10 000 to 2 million euros so that it would be illegible for support. The amount of the support depends on the type of the enterprise and the value of the activity. For instance, the support for the renewable energy is 20 % for the investment and the support for the new facility is 30 %.

A new enterprise which has been active for less than 3 years can get support for the establishment. The amount of the support is 5 000 to 35 000 euros. During the program period the whole amount of support may be for one enterprise 70 000 euros.

Mervi Matilainen from Apila Group Ltd told about the treatment possibilities of wood ash within the multipolar energy production in the North Karelia. An interview research about the ash production and use of it was done among the heating entrepreneurs in the North Karelia in 2016. The size of the heating power stations changed between 0,33 to 35 MWh and the amount of ash per year was 3 – 1000 tons. The ash material was mostly very clean and the ash suited very well as fertilizer.

The granulating of ash can be done by own machinery or by ordered work. There are different kind of granulating machines. The granulation may happen in a machine where a culvert rotates all the time. Water is needed during the granulation process. There are plenty of variety in different kind of granulate machines. Also, mobile and movable granulation stations can be found.

A rotary plate is another kind of granulating system. Moist ash is fed to the 45° angle rotating plate and the rotation motion effects that material will granulate.

The most simple method for granulation of ash is “self hardening”. Ash is moistened and collected in mounds outside for months. Ash will granulate itself. The hardened material has to be crushed and handled by screen for former use as fertilizer. Small amount of ash can be handled by cement mixer.

One alternative is that several small heating energy power stations in North Karelia would have one common granulation machine. The machine could be mobile one in a container which circulates on every heating stations. The other alternative would be that the ash could be collected from every power station and carried to the granulation station situating near some power station or ash terminal.

There are 21 heating energy power stations in North Karelia whose ash is suitable for forest fertilization in forests certified as organic forestry.



Mikko Räisänen from Ecolan Ltd introduced the spreading systems of the ash fertilizer. Spreading by helicopter is the most popular manner get the ash fertilizer to the forests. About 60 to 70 % of the ash fertilizer is spread by helicopter. The benefit of helicopter spreading is that it is not bound on the season. The optimal size of the worksite would be about 10 hectares. The figures must be clear and broad enough for optimal spreading. Airplanes also have been tested but the results were not strict enough. The airfield demands also limit the use of airplanes.



Spreading of ash fertilizer from helicopter.



Loading of the spreading container.



Forest tractor with a container is also used for spreading ash fertilizer. The problem of this manner to spread the fertilizer is that the constancy of the spreading is due to the ash material. The fine material spreads near the spreading machine and the heavy large particles spread over 15 meters. The result is uneven spreading and there are places left where no ash fertilizer can be found.

A question of the audience: How harmful is it really if the result of the spreading is uneven because the trees have large roots? Räsänen answered that according to studies the nutrients will not proceed far away in the soil so the even spreading is really important for the good effect of fertilization.



The best time to spread ash fertilizer from forest tractor is in the winter. The spreading can be done in the winter because there are no harmful effects on waters of ash fertilization if the spreading happens far away enough from the water systems; ditches (5 meters), rivers and lakes (50 meters).



2 Interactive Ask.Valerie

2.1 Method/exercise used

Michael introduced the Ask-Valerie system in a slideshow, explaining the most important functionalities. The aim is that in addition to scientific papers, also more practical information about new innovations is distributed to the stakeholders. A popular and easy Ask Valerie search engine is the answer for this. It gives more practical answer than Google. In Ask Valerie it is not necessary to type the exact keyword, as the searching engine retrieves the results also from documents containing synonyms and related concepts. In Finland, wood ash fertilization case study is used for feeding information into Ask Valerie and to test if the system work properly.

You can write questions in natural language on the searching area. You can write in English, Finnish or in some other language. You can download the resulting documents on your own computer and save questions. The searching engine is will be publicly available by mid April 2017. The future development of the engine will probably continue under new projects in Horizon 2020 -program. The aim is to develop the engine constantly.

2.2 Outcomes

A question to Michael: Can anyone upload documents to the system and how is it controlled? Michael answered that anyone can upload documents and the action will be controlled but still there is plan for controlling and who is the controller. Also, was asked: Is it compulsory to register as a user? Michael answered that you can use the search tool without registering but the registering improves the search results and makes it easier to use the searching machine.



3 Review and outcomes of the stakeholder workshop

3.1 Method/exercise used

Mervi Matilainen with her group from Apila Group Ltd arranged the stakeholder workshop in the afternoon 23th of March.

There were three tables in the room and the participants were divided in three groups. The workshop was implemented by the “world café -method” organized by Apila Group Ltd.

Each three groups around the tables discussed about the main theme and the questions steered by the facilitator. The groups circulated in each three tables. A form was filled for all groups during the conversations and the results were combined. The summary of these conversations is the regional solution model.

3.2 Outcomes

The outcomes of the stakeholder workshop are described in the Appendix 6.4.



4 Review meeting outcomes and future plan of the pilot project

4.1 Method/exercise used

Pirjo Salminen lead the discussion about the pilot project and outcomes and future plans.

4.2 Outcomes

Next meetings

- The next stakeholder meeting will be arranged as a stakeholder field excursion from Joensuu to Kitee on 19th of May 2017. The program is to get to know the value chain – Bioenergy harvesting – energy/heating power station – ash granulation. The Invitation for the stakeholder excursion will be sent in April 2017.



5 Reflections

5.1 Method/exercise used

5.2 Outcomes

The stakeholders thought again that the meeting was valuable and well organized. The programme was interesting. The stakeholders liked the workshop and the open atmosphere with plenty of discussions.



6 Appendix

6.1 The invitation to the meeting

KUTSU TUHKATYÖPAJAAN

Aika: Torstaina 23.3.2017 klo 9.30—16.00

Paikka: Metla-talo (Yliopistokatu 6, Joensuu), Käpy-Sali

Puutuhkan käyttö kivennäismaiden lannoittamisessa - pilotti

Ask Valerie -hakukone osana puutuhkan hyötykäyttöä

Tervetuloa miettimään yhdessä mahdollisuuksia hyödyntää puutuhkaa metsätaloudessa. Työpaja liittyy käynnissä olevaan Puutuhka kivennäismaametsien lannoituksessa -tutkimus- ja pilotointihankkeeseen sekä EU Valerie -hankkeeseen. Hanke toteutetaan yhteistyössä Tapio Oy:n, Luken, SYKEN, Apila Group Oy:n ja Ecolan Oy:n kanssa. EU Valerie -hankkeessa on kehitetty Ask Valerie -hakukonetta maa- ja metsätalouden toimijoille. Valerie-hankkeessa Suomen osuutta vetää Tapio Oy yhteistyössä EFI:n kanssa. Tässä 'Puutuhkan käyttö kivennäismaa metsien lannoituksessa – pilotointi' hankkeessa kartoitetaan tuhkalannoituksen hyötyjä kivennäismailla sellaisenaan käytettynä ja yhdistettynä typpilannoitukseen. Tarkastelun kohteena on tuhkalannoituksen koko kierrätysketjun: tuhkan tuottajat, lannoitevalmistajat ja muut jatkojalostajat, kuljetusyritykset, lannoituksia tekevät toimijat ja muut metsäalan palveluntarjoajat sekä metsänomistajat ja metsien virkistyskäyttäjät.

Tuhkan hyvistä vaikutuksista puuston kasvuun erityisesti turvemaidella tiedetään jo paljon. Tuhkan käyttöä kivennäismaiden lannoituksessa testataan tässä hankkeessa. Työpajaan kutsutaan lämpölaitosten edustajia, metsätoimihenkilöitä, jotka suunnittelevat lannoitushankkeita sekä maanomistajia. Työpajan tavoitteena on löytää yhdessä keinoja hyödyntää tuhkaa mahdollisimman kustannustehokkaasti metsätaloudessa.

Tiiviillä alustuksilla pohjustetaan iltapäivän työpajaosuutta. Toivomme aktiivista keskustelua ja kehittämisideoita "lähituhkan" hyötykäytön kehittämiseksi.

Pyydämme ystävällisesti ilmoittautumistanne osoitteeseen samuli.joensuu@tapio.fi viimeistään 15.3.2017. Pyydämme ilmoittamaan samalla mahdollisista ruokavalioista ja allergioista.

Tervetuloa ja lisätietoja koko konsortion puolesta,

Samuli Joensuu
Projektipäällikkö
Tapio Oy
Maistraatinportti 4
00240 Helsinki
samuli.joensuu@tapio.fi



6.2 The programme of the 3rd Valerie-meeting

TUHKATYÖPAJA 23.3.2017

OHJELMA

Paikka: Metla-talo (Yliopistokatu 6, Joensuu), Käpy-Sali

- 9.30-10.00** Aloituskahvit
- 10.00-10.10** Tilaisuuden avaus
Neuvotteleva virkamies Pirjo Salminen Maa- ja metsätalousministeriö
- 10.10-10.30** Katsaus käynnissä oleviin tuhkaa koskeviin tutkimus- ja kehittämishankkeisiin
Prof. Hannu Ilvesniemi Luke ja vesiensuojelun asiantuntija Samuli Joensuu Tapio Oy
- 10.30-10.50** Luomumetsätalous ja tuhkalannoitus
Tutkija Birgitta Partanen Helsingin yliopisto
- 10.50-11.15** Ask Valerie -hakukoneen esittely
Michael den Herder EFI
- 11.15-12.00** Lounas
- 12.00-12.30** Enon Energia Osuuskunta -esittely
- 12.30-12.45** Maaseututoiminnan kehittämisen rahoitusmahdollisuudet
Mauri Räsänen ELY-keskus
- 12.45-13.00** Tuhkan käsittelymahdollisuudet
Mervi Matilainen Apila Group
- 13.00-13.15** Tuhkan levityslaitteet
Mikko Räisänen Ecolan Oy
- 13.15-15:00** World café-työpaja with fruits.
1. Tuhkalannoitus arkiseksi
2. Valmiudet verkostoitumiseen?
- 15:00—15:15** Tulosten koostaminen ja esittely (fasilitaattorit)



6.3. The List of the participants on the 23th of March 2017 in Joensuu Wood ash seminar and in the fourth Valerie -meeting

PUUTUHKATYÖPAJAN OSALLISTUJALISTA

23.3.2017

Nimi	Työnantaja	Sähköposti
Den Herder Michael	EFI	michael.denherder@efi.fi
Hirvonen Teuvo	Enon Energia Osuuskunta	teuvo.hirvonen@jns.fi
Joensuu Samuli	Tapio Oy	samuli.joensuu@tapio.fi
Julkunen Kalevi	landowner	kalevi.julkunen@hotmail.com
Kammonen Arto	Metsähallitus	arto.kammonen@metsa.fi
Kauhanen Taina	Nurmes	taina.kauhanen@hotmail.com
Kauppinen Jyri	UPM-Kymmene Oyj	jyri.kauppinen@upm.com
Kiviniemi Sakari	Rakeistus Oy	sakari.kiviniemi@rakeistus.fi
Kokkonen Anssi	Karelia Ammattikorkeakoulu Oy	anssi.kokkonen@karelia.fi
Kuittinen Simo	Otso Metsäpalvelut Oy	simo.kuittinen@otso.fi
Lindholm Tapio	Suomen ympäristökeskus	tapio.lindholm@ymparisto.fi
Matilainen Mervi	Apila Group Oy Ab	mervi.matilainen@apilagroup.fi
Merenheimo Tiia	Aalto-yliopisto	tiia.merenheimo@aalto.fi
Mikkonen Riitta	Vapaa toimittaja	riitta.mikkonen@live.fi
Mäentausta Olli	Mfibrils Oy	olli.maentausta@gmail.com



Nousiainen Mika	Suomen metsäkeskus	mika.nousiainen@metsakeskus.fi
Partanen Birgitta	Helsingin yliopisto	birgitta.partanen@helsinki.fi
Parviainen Paavo	Juuan kaukolämpö Oy	paavo.parviainen@juuka.fi
Pikkarainen Matti	Nurmeksen Lämpö Oy	matti.pikkarainen@nurmes.fi
Rasilainen Tiina	Apila Group Oy Ab	tiina.rasilainen@apilagroup.fi
Rinnepelto Pirjo	Apila Group Oy Ab	pirjo.rinnepelto@apilagroup.fi
Räsänen Mikko	Ecolan Oy	mikko.raisanen@ecolan.fi
Räsänen Mauri	Maaseuturahasto	mauri.rasanen@ely-keskus.fi
Saarinen Eeva	Vapo Oy	eeva.saarinen@vapo.fi
Salminen Pirjo	MMM	pirjo.salminen@mmm.fi
Äijälä Olli	Tapio Oy	olli.aijala@tapio.fi



6.4. The Summary of the Ash-Workshop in 23th of March 2017 in the fourth Valerie -meeting

Guidance for CSPs: collecting stakeholder views on barriers and enablers to innovation

Aims

- These questions/points (see table 1) are about barriers and enablers to implementing the innovations and/or solutions identified by the stakeholders in your case study.

Background

We would like to identify and explore barriers and enablers for innovation in practice. Often, this is framed as ‘barriers and enablers for the implementation of (technical) innovations developed by research’. The common hypothesis is that the ‘end users’ of such innovations just lack the knowledge (as a main barrier for uptake). From the WP3 perspective, we understand that the situation can be very different, and a range of e.g. economic, social and practical (and even legal) issues could be restricting innovation, individually or in combination with one another. This is of interest to VALERIE because we want to show that innovation is more than just using research outputs.

We would like to use examples from the WP3 case studies to understand what affects the uptake/acceptance of innovations because the cases contain a variety of ‘innovations’ (not only technical innovations provided by research, but also social and management innovations provided by peers or co-developed by stakeholders and advisors, for instance). As discussed in Toulouse, you could investigate this topic by having a discussion **in a meeting with a group of stakeholders, and/or also in interviews with individual stakeholders**. It will be important to have a range of views to avoid the risk of strong bias, if only a few people are included.

Instructions for CSPs

1. **Select one innovation per case and define it in general terms** (e.g. the use of wood ash for forest fertilization on mineral soils, or the use of cover crops in outdoor pig farming). The obvious choice is the innovation being trialled in your case, however you may want to broaden this to a more general set of innovations that might share the same sorts of barriers and opportunities (e.g. intercropping; field soil



assessment). The WP3 team will talk to you before the meeting and/or interviews, about this choice.

For group meetings, the selection/definition of which innovation to consider can be done with stakeholders as part of the meeting, whereas for interviews the CSPs will need to select and define the innovations in advance (in discussion with WP3 team). The key thing is that the **same innovation** is discussed with all the stakeholders consulted, in each CS.

2. **Identify the barriers and enablers for 'uptake' of the innovation.** The questions/issues (see table 1) are grouped into 6 key areas where we expect barriers and enablers to be identified. Please use these points under each area as a guide to your meetings/ interviews with stakeholders and technical experts.

We suggest you:

Use a Force Field Analysis (FFA) (a very simple exercise) to structure a group discussion or interview. This is a way of identifying and scoring barriers and enablers (see guidelines and worked example below) and provides a consistent output for all CSs. After this, check that you have covered the 6 main issues in the table: are the barriers/enablers related to specific categories? If some categories were not mentioned, check if this is right or did we simply forget/neglect this?

If you do not want to do FFA there are other options for collecting this information:

- a. Lead an open group discussion/interview based around the 6 categories and points in the table
- b. Start the discussion in a very open way: 'imagine that farmers (or forest owners) should start doing this [example of innovation]: what would encourage them to do it, and what would hinder them?' It could be helpful to use sticky notes to write down on two charts everything they can think of, and then discuss these collectively in a group. After this, then check what you have covered against the questions in the 6 main categories: are the barriers/enablers related to specific categories? If some categories were not mentioned, check if this is right or did we simply forget/neglect this?

Make sure that you note down the different stakeholders' separate views (e.g. as expressed by research, advisory, farmers/forest owners, supply chain, customers, government, NGOs, society etc).

NB In a group session, the discussion may tend to converge towards a common understanding, while interviews can diverge into very different views. Interviews could therefore require more intensive analysis by the CS leader to draw balanced or common conclusions.



3. **Collect detailed information** from your stakeholders, in these discussions. It is important to make **good (extensive) notes**. Be as specific as possible e.g. instead of 'farmers' say 'elderly farmers with a small farm' or 'large intensive farmers'; or rather than 'advisers' say 'commercial advisers or government advisers', or 'technical agronomic advisers' or 'representatives from the fertilizer companies', etc.. It is strongly recommended that you assign somebody at the meeting to make detailed notes, so that you can concentrate on facilitating and encouraging the discussion. Better still, you could tape-record the session.
4. **Write a report** using the 6 issues as the main headings (around 400 words per sub section)

Provide as much detail and explanation as you can, preferably with quotations, not just noting comments as bullet points (though bullet point lists can be useful for summarizing issues to the participants, during the discussion).



Discussion points for case study stakeholders - barriers and enablers to implementing the innovations

Written by: Apila Group Ltd. (Mervi Matilainen, Tiina Rasilainen and Pirjo Rinnepelto)

Case study: Wood ash as fertilizer in forests

Innovation: Business model to enhance the utilization:

An economical symbiosis is formed, consisting of (1) one **contractor** serving (2) a group of distributed small-scale energy generators (**Producers**), located close to each other. In addition, (3) forest management organization participates the symbiosis to provide adequate information of wood ash fertilization possibilities to the (4) forest owners, a fourth group of actors in the symbiosis.

The actual business model is created for the contractor. The contractor may be a present forest contractor that already delivers fuelwood for producers. In the business model, the contractor also provides service to granulate the ash formed in the energy production with a mobile granulator (loose ash) or with a screener crusher (self-hardened ash). If needed, the contractor also provides storage (big bags or silo), prepares informative labels and commercializes the granulated material. Contractor also has the equipment to spread the fertilizer to forest, and this can be done simultaneously with the forest/fuelwood harvesting.

Stakeholders/technical experts consulted (type and number; meeting/interview format):

Research facilities & consultancy	12, workshop
Den Herder Michael	EFI
Joensuu Samuli	Tapio Oy
Kokkonen Anssi	Karelia Ammattikorkeakoulu Oy
Lindholm Tapio	Suomen ympäristökeskus
Matilainen Mervi	Apila Group Oy Ab
Merenheimo Tiia	Aalto-yliopisto
Partanen Birgitta	Helsingin yliopisto
Rasilainen Tiina	Apila Group Oy Ab



Rinnepelto Pirjo	Apila Group Oy Ab
Räsänen Mauri	Maaseuturahasto
Salminen Pirjo	MMM
Äijälä Olli	Tapio Oy
Distributed energy generators	6, workshop
Hirvonen Teuvo	Enon Energia Oy
Kauhanen Taina	Nurmes
Kauppinen Jyri	UPM-Kymmene Oyj
Parviainen Paavo	Juuan kaukolämpö Oy
Pikkarainen Matti	Nurmeksen Lämpö Oy
Saarinen Eeva	Vapo Oy
Forest management	4, workshop
Kammonen Arto	Metsähallitus
Kuittinen Simo	Otso Metsäpalvelut Oy
Nousiainen Mika	Suomen metsäkeskus
Julkunen Kalevi	
Ash handling method producers	3, workshop
Kiviniemi Sakari	Rakeistus Oy
Mäentausta Olli	Mfibrils Oy
Räsänen Mikko	Ecolan Oy

1. Information

- *Awareness of the innovation*

The idea for the business model was refined in the workshop, during the negotiations with producers and other participating stakeholders. Most of the producers in North Karelia were familiar/presented this particular idea as solution for ash utilization: a common contractor with a mobile granulator who would travel from one producer to the other. The resulting business model was described in a public summary report of the workshop, delivered to all participating stakeholders.



- *Ease and cost of accessing relevant information*
Information concerning the business model is presented in a summary report of the workshop. This will be delivered to all participants, and may be published in public, too.
The information needed to implement the business model:
 - i) The apparatus needed: easily from internet without costs. The data was also presented during the seminar/workshop.
 - ii) The service provided: business model will be designed as an economical platform, creating a symbiosis network between the stakeholders. Information will be readily available to all participating actors during the contract negotiations.
- *Capacity to understand the potential value of the innovation*
The innovation is a symbiosis network of stakeholders, creating value for each of them. All the participating stakeholders were able to understand its benefits, and also willing to create a profitable model for the incoming contractor (not participating the workshop).
- *Effectiveness of advisory/ extension services to support farmer with the innovation*
The forest owners are aware of the possibilities to utilize ash as fertilizer, and relevant data is available through internet. On the other hand, the usage of ash is still very minimal, and during the workshop, also the possibilities to enhance the demand were considered.
Based on the negotiations, external services and advisory is required. This can be provided by forest management organizations, in cooperation with the contractor responsible for the actual work in forests. Information of the benefits should be delivered, and also the calculations of the actual needs of the soil for fertilizers. The selection of the fertilizer (ash plus boron or nitrogen) should also been done by professionals, e.g. existing forest management service providers.
- *Ability to collect sufficient information on the innovation, and to try it out on the farm*

Sufficient information can be collected from the networks of producers and forest owners.



Implementation of the business model can be piloted: An idea of local piloting arose by a university of applied sciences, together with a few producers. One known contractor will be contacted in near future.

- *How does this set of issues relate to the different positions/understandings of different groups of stakeholders?*

All the stakeholders participating the workshop found the solution relevant.

Some competition between stakeholders may arise: the novel business model will capture a market share from present ash fertilizer producers and service providers (both participating the workshop). On the other hand, the present service has not filled the needs of the producers, and only fair competition can profit the economy of the small-scale energy production. Co-operation with the existing actors is also possible.

It was assumed, that the contractor will come outside the stakeholder groups participating the workshop. It is crucial, that the stakeholders willing to participate the symbiotic model are accepted, and vice versa.

2. Economic considerations

- *What are the costs versus the benefits of using the innovation?*

Present expenses related to the utilization of ash are relatively low, since smaller amounts of ash can be utilized in various ways. Yet, handling, storage, logistics and manwork/equipment needed to spread the ash cause unwanted costs, and a new solution is required to ease the bureaucracy and enhance the utilization of ash as fertilizer.

For the contractor taking the responsibility of the actual business, investment costs are moderate, and public funding is possible for business development. The cost of the service for the producers and utilizers depends on the actual costs of the contractor: logistics and manwork. While refining the final business plan and economic symbiosis, the costs have to be settled in order to satisfy the demands of each participant. As a result, paying to the contractor for treating the ash, will only have a minor effect on the costs of producers.

Forest owners will benefit for the business model, since the ash is planned to be spread simultaneously with other forest management operations, saving time.



The ecological benefit: Granulated ash is a valuable fertilizer that can be used instead of artificial fertilizers. Utilizing ash as a fertilizer is a part of circular economy in wood production, and it also helps to compensate the CO₂ emissions of wood burning.

- *Will the innovation make the SH more competitive?*

Currently, the ash from heat production is a problem for some producers. Loose ash is expensive to store and to transport, and even if it is utilized as a fertilizer, its spreading is difficult and slow. A contractor who granulates the ash, stores it and spreads it in forests at appropriate time, eases the work of producers and saves their time for other duties.

It is proven that wood ash enhances the forest growth, so using it as a fertilizer in forests will be beneficial to forest owners. It is supposed that the price of ash fertilizer will be competitive when compared to other fertilizers.

A thesis titled *The effect of circulating nutrients of ash to the cost structure of distributed energy production* will be prepared during 2017 by one of the cooperators in Puutuhka -project (Mervi Matilainen, Apila Group Ltd.).

- *Are there costs preventing its uptake? Explain what the costs are (e.g. new machinery, more labour) and how do they differ for different SHs?*

The service will become too expensive for the stakeholders in symbiosis, if the direct (actual) costs concerning the workload of contractor are too high. The costs have to be calculated and negotiated beforehand to minimize the risk.

- *Are there economic risks involved in using the innovation? Explain what the risks are (e.g. uncertain effect on yield/quality, volatile markets, loss of contract) and how they differ for different SHs(e.g. different levels of resilience between farms)*

The services should be priced in such a way that they are not too expensive for the producers but will still make the business profitable for



the contractor. While the business model is based on economical symbiosis of certain group of actors, major risks are i) producers leaving the symbiosis, and ii) the market of the final product remaining too small.

In addition, the quality of the ash always depends on the quality of fuelwood. If the product cannot be accepted as fertilizer, other possible utilization possibilities has to be found, and additional costs for this has to be covered.

- *Are there any economic incentives for the innovation?*

Costs of storage and treating of loose ash are lowered.

Price of granulated ash as forest fertilizer should be competitive with other applicable fertilizers; spreading costs of the fertilizer could be lowered.

Due to the enhanced growth of forest, indirect economic benefits are possible.

New business possibility will benefit the contractor, by creating a sustained platform for operations and a known group of customers.

- *How do these economic incentives relate to different groups of stakeholders?*

Lowered cost of the ash fertilizer (as spread) will benefit the forest owners; additional indirect benefits are possible as forest growth is enhanced.

The costs for producers are lowered; indirect effect can possibly be seen in the energy price.

3. Technical/ agronomic

- *Does the innovation work in the bio-physical context/farming system? Is it compatible?*

The innovation fits well in forest economy, as the inorganic nutrients removed during harvesting, are returned to forests. The business model is planned to fit to the present network of forest management operations and energy production, and no additional actors (subcontractors) are needed.



- *How difficult is the innovation? Are there agronomic/technical risks involved?*

The business model utilizes only existing technology. Wood ash is proven to have a beneficial effect on forest growth. No agronomic or technical risks are expected.

- *Does the innovation require extra skills, knowledge, education, training? For the advisors and/or for the farmers? Will farmers need to learn it from a trusted source? – consider whom*

The contractor has to learn to use the granulator, but the device is simple and does not require any special skills from a person who is used to use e.g. agricultural or forestry machines. Also the devices that are used to spread the granulated ash in forests are simple and easy to learn.

The producers do not need any new skills.

Additional services (delivered by forest management organizations) for the forest owners were described earlier.

- *Do the SHs have sufficient levels of scientific understanding/ technical competence to make full use of the innovation?*

Yes. No special skills or higher scientific understanding are needed.

- *How does this relate to different groups of stakeholders?*

The contractor has the responsibility to learn to use the granulator and to spread granulated ash correctly and effectively. Producers need not to learn any new skills.

4. Social

- *Do SH personal motivations and values prevent uptake?*

No. Loose ash causes problems to producers, and it is expected that the value of the innovation will be well understood.



- *Do cultural aspects (e.g. traditional ways of doing things, accepted behaviours, habitual attitudes) prevent uptake? For example farmers say ‘we’ve always done it this way – why change now?’*

The heat producers have been waiting for a new way to treat their ashes.

Only smaller distributed energy producers have stated, that they have a working system, and no need for new solution.

Using ash as fertilizer in forest has a long tradition in Finland.

- *Are there supportive social networks, peer support if SH want to learn about or uptake up the innovation?*

The results of the workshop are available. The R&D facilities participating the workshop can be contacted for more information. There are also companies and contractors who granulate and/or spread the granulated ash in small scale, and they are willing to share their information and experience, if needed. Also some of the producers have experience on spreading their ashes.

- *How does this relate to different groups of stakeholders?*

The economical symbiosis should be created between producers, contractor and forest management organizations. All the data needed can be collected and utilized within this group of stakeholders.

The symbiosis supports the contractor when he is starting his operation. The producers benefit if the operation starts smoothly and without problems.

5. Institutional

- *Are there policy measures (subsidies, regulations, controls) that prevent or enable the use of the innovation? What are these?*

The production and quality of wood ash used as a forest fertilizer is regulated. Producers are responsible for product acceptance.

Ashes from different producers need to be analyzed separately before commercialization, and they cannot be mixed if the requirements are not filled.



In general, pure wood ash usually fits well in these limits, and offsets can be avoided by controlling the quality of the fuelwood.

- *Is the advisory/extension service (or supply chain support) equipped to support SHs with new innovations? For example are they well trained, competent, innovative, well resourced, reasonability priced or the opposite?*

The analyses of the ash will be performed by accredited laboratories.

Advisory services may be needed if the contractor applies economic support for purchasing the devices and starting the business. The funding parties are generally open to new innovations and aware of new technical solutions.

Services for the forest owners are readily available (forest management organizations) but still some lobbying is to be done to accelerate the selling of the solution.

- *How does this relate to different groups of stakeholders?*
Currently, the ash producers have taken care of analyzing their ashes, and that is not expected to change.

The contractor may need to be in contact with funding parties to be able to start the business. The contractor needs to know that the ash he gets will be qualified to be used as a fertilizer.

The forest management organizations should be notified of the expectations.

6. Market/supply chain issues

- *In what way will using the innovation impact upon retailer/processor contracts and conditions, food assurance scheme requirements or the prices or market shares potentially available to producers?*



The suitable contractor is already a cooperator, fuelwood provider, with producers. If there are other fuelwood providers acting with the producers of the symbiosis, some negotiations are to be carried out to solve possible overlapping. Subcontracting is possible.

Currently, the producers have spread their ashes in their own forests by themselves, or given the ashes to forest owners for free or for a small fee. While building up the business, contracts will be made between the contractor and producers for treating the ashes, and also between the contractor and forest owners for selling and spreading the granulated ash.

The innovation has no impact on food assurance schemes.

As the granulated wood ash is not very expensive, it is not expected to have an effect on the price of fuelwood sold for the producers. If the granulated ash is used instead of artificial fertilizers, the market share of artificial products will shrink.

- *Does the supply chain (and specific actors within the chain) support innovation by farmers/foresters and if not, how does it discourage innovation and why?*

The supply chain is expected to be mostly supportive. Some actors may try to question the benefits of wood ash as a forest fertilizer to prevent it to replace artificial fertilizers.

- *How do these aspects relate to different actors in specific supply chains?*

Other fuelwood providers may be against the new business, if their contracts with the producers are in a risk to be finished/altered.



Forest owners and producers are supposed to support the innovation, as it is beneficial for them: forest owners get ecologic fertilizer that is proven to enhance forest growth, and producers get rid of their ashes.

Producers and sellers of artificial fertilizers may be against the innovation, as it is expected to reduce the need of artificial products.



Force Field Analysis (FFA)

FFA helps you think about barriers and enablers for implementing an innovation.

- To carry out a FFA describe your innovation in the middle of a piece of paper or whiteboard
- Then list all the enablers (opportunities) on the left side and all the barriers in a column on the right side
- Score each factor and add up the scores for each column.
- Draw this as an output diagram (see example below)
- You can then evaluate the most significant enablers and barriers and think about how these can be supported or overcome
- Check that you have covered against the points in the 6 main categories (in table): are the barriers/enablers related to specific categories? If some categories were not mentioned, check if this is right or did we simply forget/neglect this?



Force Field analysis worksheet

			Innovation: Business model for economical symbiosis to utilize ash as fertilizer.			
Enabler	Score				Barrier	Score
1. Information						
Awareness	5					
Availability	4					
Understanding	5					
Effectiveness of services	4					
Piloting ability	4					
Stakeholders	3					
2. Economic						
Cost versus benefit	4					
Competitiveness	4					
Low costs	4					
Risks						2
Incentives	3					
Stakeholders	3					
3. Technical						
Compatibility	5					
Easiness	4					
Skills needed	3					1
Enough competence	3					1
Stakeholders	3					
4. Social						
Motivation	3					
Culture	4					
Social networks	2					
Stakeholders	3					
5. Institutional						
Policy					2	
Support needed	2					
Stakeholders	2					
6. Market/supply chain						
Present contracts					2	
Support from the supply chain	2					
Reflect to actors					2	



Force Field Analysis output diagram for Finland ash fertilizer use: Worked Example

