



SYMCRAFT



SYMCRAFT PROJECT

Final Version
19.06.2026

D.2.4.1.

Pilot action 3

Partner responsible: IAGF – Institute for Applied Research for Skilled Crafts and Trades (PP08)

Main Author: Dr. Madeleine Block (IAGF) with inputs from SYMCRAFT project partners

Delivery Date: 19.06.2026

DISCLAIMER

The information and views set out in this report are those of the authors and contributing partners and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the following information.

Note on legal information and model agreements: The partner contributions and cooperation model elements summarised in this report and its annexes are non-binding tools for documentation, discussion and orientation. They do not constitute legal advice and do not replace independent legal, technical or regulatory assessment under the applicable national and EU legal framework. No binding cooperation agreement is reported as part of D.2.4.1.

DOCUMENT SHEET

Project Acronym	SYMCRAFT
Full title	Creative craft for industrial symbiosis in circular economies
Grant Agreement Number	CE0200732
Coordinator	T2i - technology transfer and innovation
Website	https://www.interreg-central.eu/projects/symcraft/
Deliverable number	D.2.4.1
Deliverable name	Pilot action n. 3 report
Lead Beneficiary	IAGF – Institute for Applied Research for Skilled Crafts and Trades
WP	WP2
Activity title	Activity 2.4 - Pilot Action n.3: Models of cooperation between industry and handicraft sector to reuse industrial waste
Type	Report
Dissemination level	Public
Delivery date	19.06.2026
Main Author	Dr. Madeleine Block (IAGF)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	3
1. PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT	4
2. METHODOLOGY	4
3. SECTOR-BASED WORKING GROUPS	5
4. DEVELOPMENT OF THE COOPERATION FRAMEWORK MODELS	6
5. LEGAL ASPECTS SURVEY AND PARTNER INPUT COLLECTION.....	6
6. ENGAGEMENT AND PARTNER CONTRIBUTIONS	7
7. IMPLEMENTATION, TESTING AND EVIDENCE	10
8. THE THREE COOPERATION MODELS	14
9. LEGAL AND CONTRACTUAL ASPECTS IDENTIFIED	15
10. CROSS-SECTOR LESSONS LEARNT	17
11. LINK TO PILOT ACTION N.1 AND PILOT ACTION N.2	18
12. CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS	18
ANNEXES	19

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Sector-based working groups under Pilot Action n.3	5
Table 2: Cleaned legal-aspects survey basis.....	6
Table 3: Overview of partner contributions to Pilot Action n.3	8
Table 4: Application Form requirements and response	10
Table 5: Testing activities	12
Table 6: Overview of the three sector-specific cooperation models	15
Table 7: Main legal and contractual aspects identified.....	16

1. PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT

This deliverable presents the consolidated results of SYMCRAFT Pilot Action n.3, dedicated to models of cooperation between industry and the handicraft sector for the reuse of industrial waste and residual materials. It documents how the project partners collected legal, contractual, organisational and sector-specific inputs, discussed the practical needs of industrial and craft actors, and developed, reviewed and practically tested three sector-specific Cooperation Framework Models for Agro-food, Textile and Wood & Furniture as non-binding orientation and drafting tools.

Pilot Action n.3 builds on the previous pilot work of SYMCRAFT. Pilot Action n.1 identified materials, reuse opportunities, prototypes and cooperation cases. Pilot Action n.2 developed the eco-business model perspective behind those cases. Pilot Action n.3 translates this technical and business-model experience into practical cooperation frameworks that can help companies, artisans, designers and intermediaries clarify their roles, responsibilities, material flows and next steps before any formal agreement is considered.

The report is intentionally written as a consolidated main report. Detailed partner evidence, regional inputs and the three Cooperation Framework Models are treated as Annexes. The main report therefore summarises the common methodology, sector structure, partner contributions, main findings and next steps without reproducing all partner contribution documents in full.

No binding cooperation agreement is reported as part of D.2.4.1. This deliverable documents the development, review and practical testing of the three Cooperation Framework Models as non-binding model-agreement tools. Their possible case-specific formalisation or signature belongs to the later WP3 / Output 3.3 / D.3.1.3 validation and uptake phase, if individual parties decide to proceed.

2. METHODOLOGY

The methodology for Pilot Action n.3 was designed to ensure a common transnational approach while allowing sector-specific and national adaptations. It combined document analysis, partner input, survey work, stakeholder engagement, model drafting, partner review and consolidation of evidence through Annexes.

- Collection and analysis of legal, contractual, administrative and sectoral information relevant to the transfer and reuse of industrial residual materials.
- Use of a legal-aspects survey and partner networks to collect information from industrial actors, craft SMEs, artisans, designers, intermediaries and experts.
- Integration of experience from Pilot Action n.1 and Pilot Action n.2, including material flows, prototypes, feasibility considerations and Circular Eco-Business Model Canvas outputs.

- Work in three sector-based groups: Agro-food, Textile and Wood & Furniture.
- Development and adaptation of three Cooperation Framework Models reflecting the different material, safety, legal and cooperation needs of the sectors.
- Discussion, practical testing and review of the draft models through partner meetings, workshops, bilateral exchanges and stakeholder feedback.
- Collection of partner contributions in a common template to support comparability, auditability and integration into the final report and Annexes.

The methodology distinguishes between reviewed, discussed, practically tested and signed. This distinction is important because D.2.4.1 documents preparation, partner contribution, stakeholder feedback, practical testing/review and model development. It does not claim that the cooperation frameworks have already become binding contracts.

3. SECTOR-BASED WORKING GROUPS

Pilot Action n.3 was implemented through three sector-based groups. This structure reflects the SYMCRAFT project logic and the differences between agro-food, textile and wood/furniture residual materials. IAGF acted as responsible partner for D.2.4.1 and provided the common structure, drafting support and consolidation logic for the cooperation-model phase.

Table 1: Sector-based working groups under Pilot Action n.3

Sector	SYMCRAFT	Main focus
Agro-Food	PP05-WPRED; PP09-B&S; PP10-UIL	Agro-food residual materials, hygiene and storage questions, traceability, by-product/waste classification, non-food and regulated uses, and practical cooperation formats for small-scale actors.
Textile	PP03-JHK; PP04-SOPK; PP07-TPLJ; PP08-IAGF; PP11-TZH	Textile residual materials, sorting and quality, small and irregular material flows, design/IP/branding, product safety, and use by craft, design and creative actors.
Wood & Furniture	LP01-t2i; PP02-FCF; PP06-HAMAG-BICRO	Wood offcuts, veneer, panels, furniture components and mixed manufacturing residues, including quality, liability, logistics, material transfer and design-oriented reuse.

4. DEVELOPMENT OF THE COOPERATION FRAMEWORK MODELS

The three Cooperation Framework Models were developed as practical documents to support the organisation of cooperation between industrial material suppliers and handicraft or creative receivers. They were drafted as non-binding frameworks, not as final contracts. The approach responds to a recurring finding from partner contributions: many SMEs and artisans hesitate when cooperation is framed too early as a formal legal contract, but they benefit from a clear checklist that clarifies material description, legal status, responsibilities, costs, logistics and fallback procedures.

The models were informed by three main input streams: legal and contractual information provided by partners, legal-aspects survey input and stakeholder feedback, and partner review of draft models. Regular SYMCRAFT partner meetings were used as coordination and feedback channels when PA3, the legal-aspects survey, the GPT Tool or the draft models were discussed.

All three models use a common logic: a cooperation summary sheet, a non-binding framework text, and practical annexes or implementation sheets for material specification, legal-status clarification, delivery or batch checks and fallback handling. This modular structure is intended to keep the documents usable for SMEs and artisans while still making legal and operational risks visible.

The SYMCRAFT GPT Tool on Legal Elements and Cooperation Agreements was used as a supporting orientation instrument. It helped partners and users identify typical legal and contractual issues, prepare questions, and connect legal-information topics with the Cooperation Framework Models. The tool was shared through the project-specific link: <https://www.t2i.it/symcraft/login>. It is not legal advice and does not replace national or case-specific review.

5. LEGAL ASPECTS SURVEY AND PARTNER INPUT COLLECTION

The legal-aspects survey was used as one input channel for Pilot Action n.3. It collected information on cooperation needs, stakeholder roles, sector context and legal or contractual topics relevant to industry-craft cooperation. The cleaned dataset was used cautiously, because the export also contained incomplete and non-submitted attempts. The official basis for the consolidated analysis is therefore the set of fully submitted responses.

Table 2: Cleaned legal-aspects survey basis

Indicator	Number / scope	Use in report
Total rows in survey export	166	Raw export only; includes early dropouts and non-submitted attempts.

Indicator	Number / scope	Use in report
Fully submitted / cleaned responses	97	Official cleaned basis for general analysis.
Cleaned responses with explicit sector attribution	93	Official basis for sector-based tables without manual recoding.
Main sectors covered	Agro-food; Textile; Wood & Furniture	Sector analysis is based on explicit sector attribution.
Roles covered	Craft; Industry	The cleaned dataset covers both sides of potential cooperation.
Use in D.2.4.1	Supporting evidence only	Survey results were combined with interviews, workshops, bilateral consultations and partner contributions.

The survey confirms that cooperation frameworks must address both legal and practical questions. Key issues include product and work safety, ownership and possession of residual materials, confidentiality and business secrets, conformity with EU and national law, liability and warranty, logistics, intellectual property and design rights, pricing, payment conditions, disposal or take-back responsibilities, duration and termination, and dispute settlement. These topics were carried into the structure of the three Cooperation Framework Models.

The survey did not replace partner evidence. Several partner contributions, especially those based on workshops, interviews and concrete pilot cases, provided additional information beyond the survey dataset. For this reason, the report treats the survey as one input stream among several, not as the sole evidence base for D.2.4.1.

6. ENGAGEMENT AND PARTNER CONTRIBUTIONS

All project partners submitted contributions to Pilot Action n.3. Their inputs vary according to sector role, country context and available stakeholder evidence. The main contribution pathways were legal or national input, survey participation and dissemination, stakeholder contacts, model review, regular meeting input, cooperation cases, stakeholder feedback and practical testing/review.

Table 3: Overview of partner contributions to Pilot Action n.3

Partner	Country	Sector focus	Main contribution pathway	Status / evidence logic
LP01 t2i	Italy	Wood & Furniture; cross-sector	Wood & Furniture co-creation and stakeholder engagement; Italian legal input; review of iterative model versions; preparation of a concrete draft cooperation document as test case.	Model used as drafting and review basis; further validation, national legal adaptation and possible formalisation may continue under WP3.
PP02 FCF	Italy	Wood & Furniture; creative/cultural sector	Stakeholder engagement, Canvas sessions, review of model usability, clarification of responsibilities and simplification for SMEs and creative actors.	Framework considered useful as orientation and discussion tool; further validation under WP3.
PP03 JHK	Czech Republic	Textile; cross-sector	Waste Exchange workshop, bilateral consultations, Czech legal/regulatory input, survey feedback and internal review of model applicability.	Model useful as orientation tool, but formalisation may face hesitation among SMEs; trust-building and simplification needed.
PP04 SOPK	Slovakia	Textile	Textile co-creation workshop, bilateral interviews, Slovak waste/by-product input, bilingual template references, discussion with public and sector actors.	Non-binding framing reduces hesitation; national checks on by-product classification remain necessary.
PP05 WPRED	Hungary	Agro-food	Country-specific legal background, interviews with 17 actors, local co-creation workshop, transnational online workshop and feedback on model agreements and GPT Tool.	Simple flexible material transfer/cooperation agreement preferred; hygiene, traceability and legal status are central.
PP06 HAMAG-BICRO	Croatia	Wood & Furniture	Stakeholder engagement through pilot collaborations, legal-aspects survey distribution, co-creation workshop, factory visits and	Model broadly applicable as non-binding checklist; Croatian by-product

Partner	Country	Sector focus	Main contribution pathway	Status / evidence logic
			feedback on material transfer and supply arrangements.	classification and registration need adaptation.
PP07 TPLJ	Slovenia	Textile	Textile workshops, survey dissemination, Slovenian waste-management input, legal expert review, translation and testing of model and GPT Tool.	Non-binding status considered important; further discussion of possible cooperation models recommended.
PP09 B&S / PP10 UIL	Germany	Agro-food	Stakeholder engagement, workshops and bilateral exchanges; German and regional regulatory review; feedback on modular/checklist-based structure and practical use for small actors.	Regulatory requirements are a major barrier; modular non-binding framework supports preparation for further validation.
PP08 IAGF / PP11 TZH	Austria	All three models; Textile emphasis	Process lead; 18 Austrian structured interviews; online meetings on 24.03.2026 and 06.05.2026; GPT Tool development; drafting of the three models; internal IAGF/TZH review and TZH practical cross-check of selected model elements.	Model logic and selected elements tested through survey-supported consultations; two online meetings, partner-team review and TZH practice-based feedback; documentation consolidated retrospectively on the basis of available project records.

Company and stakeholder names are not used in the main report. Where partner contributions contain identifiable cases or company examples, these are treated as anonymised evidence for the consolidated analysis or remain in the respective partner Annexes according to confidentiality requirements.

Full evidence may include internal notes, workshop records, survey exports, annotated draft models, photos, company-specific material descriptions, screenshots or email exchanges.

Where such evidence contains confidential or personal data, it should remain stored internally and be referenced only in anonymised form.

7. IMPLEMENTATION, TESTING AND EVIDENCE

This section clarifies how the requirements of Activity 2.4 were addressed and how the cooperation-model work was implemented, reviewed and tested during the D.2.4.1 reporting period.

For the purpose of D.2.4.1, testing is understood as the practical verification of the model logic, usability, sector relevance and completeness of the non-binding Cooperation Framework Models. The testing activities focused on whether the models were understandable, practically useful and suitable as orientation and drafting tools for cooperation between industrial material suppliers and craft/artisan or SME-side users. Testing under D.2.4.1 did not require the signature of binding cooperation agreements.

Existing agreement models, cooperation practices and relevant legal or organisational elements were collected through partner contributions, legal and contractual input, review of existing cooperation approaches, workshops, bilateral consultations, survey-supported interviews and pilot-case feedback. The partnership did not mainly copy existing signed agreements, as fully reusable and shareable agreements were only available to a limited extent. Instead, the partners consolidated recurring practical, legal and organisational requirements into three sector-specific Cooperation Framework Models.

The planned interview and stakeholder-involvement logic was addressed at pilot-action level through combined partner activities. Documented examples include 18 Austrian survey-supported structured interviews conducted in December 2025, involving 6 industry-side and 12 craft/artisan-side respondents. Further documented examples include around 10 industrial and 10 craft actors involved by PP04-SOPK in Slovakia, and 17 actors interviewed by PP05-WPRED in Hungary, including 7 industrial actors and 10 SMEs/artisans. Additional stakeholder evidence is documented by the Czech, Slovenian, Italian, Croatian, German and Austrian partners through workshops, bilateral consultations, factory visits, pilot collaborations, survey-supported exchanges and model-review activities.

Table 4: Application Form requirements and response

AF / assessment question	How it is addressed
Collection of existing agreement models / practices	Partners collected cooperation practices, legal and contractual topics, draft elements, templates, pilot-case experiences and stakeholder requirements. Since fully reusable signed agreements were only available to a limited extent, the three models were developed as consolidated, non-binding Cooperation Framework Models rather than copied contract templates.

AF / assessment question	How it is addressed
Interviews with 10 industrial and 10 handicraft SMEs	Austria documented 18 survey-supported structured interviews, including 6 industry-side and 12 craft/artisan-side respondents. Slovakia documented around 10 industrial and 10 craft actors. Hungary documented 17 interviewees, including 7 industrial actors and 10 SMEs/artisans. Other partners documented additional stakeholder consultations, workshops, bilateral exchanges and pilot-case feedback.
Testing of the three models with industries and artisans	The three sector models were tested, reviewed or discussed as non-binding model-agreement tools in their respective sector contexts. Testing focused on usability, model logic, sector relevance, material-transfer procedures, responsibility allocation, practical feasibility and the suitability of the models as orientation tools. It did not require signed agreements during D.2.4.1.
Number of industrial and handicraft SMEs and feedback collected	Quantified and qualitative evidence is documented by partner and sector. Some partners provided exact or approximate numbers; other evidence is anonymised and stored internally due to confidentiality.
Lessons learnt integrated into final models	Feedback led to the final structure of the models: modular and non-binding framework documents, material specification and legal-status sheets, delivery and fallback forms, responsibility clauses, sector-specific safety checks, simplified language and clear signposting that national and case-specific legal review is required before any binding use.

The quantified partner evidence includes 18 Austrian interview-based responses, around 20 Slovak industry/craft actors and 17 Hungarian interviewees. Other partners documented additional mixed stakeholder groups through workshops, bilateral consultations, factory visits

and model-review activities. Due to confidentiality and different reporting formats, some partner evidence is reported in anonymised or approximate form.

Evidence of testing activities by sector

The following table consolidates the testing, review and stakeholder feedback evidence documented by partners.

Table 5: Testing activities

Sector/ model	Documented testing, review and stakeholder- feedback activities	Stakeholder involvement	Feedback collected	How feedback informed the final model
Agro-food Cooperati on Frame- work Model	WPRED implemented the Hungarian Pilot Action n.3 process through interviews, country-specific legal input, a local co-creation workshop and a transnational online Agro-food workshop with German partners. German partners contributed through Agro-food stakeholder engagement, workshops, bilateral meetings and follow-up discussions.	WPRED documented 17 interviewed actors, including 7 industrial actors and 10 SMEs/artisans. German partners involved Agro-food and agricultural stakeholders through workshops, bilateral exchanges and follow-up discussions.	Stakeholders highlighted the need for simple and flexible cooperation or material-transfer agreements. Key issues included legal status of materials, hygiene, traceability, pre-treatment, logistics, liability, ownership transfer, price and cost allocation.	The Agro-food model includes stronger guidance on hygiene, storage, traceability, legal-status clarification, regulated uses, material specification and fallback procedures.
Textile Cooperati on Frame- work Model	SOPK contributed through a textile co-creation workshop, bilateral interviews and discussion of the Textile model. JHK contributed through the Waste Exchange workshop, bilateral consultations and Czech legal/regulatory input. TPLJ contributed through textile stakeholder engagement, survey dissemination, legal/environmental input and discussion of the cooperation model and GPT Tool. IAGF and TZH contributed through Austrian	SOPK documented around 10 industrial and 10 craft actors. JHK documented feedback from more than 20 Czech stakeholders. TPLJ documented approximately 12–15 stakeholders through textile cooperation workshops and additional meetings, company visits and co-creation activities. Austria documented 18 survey-supported	Feedback confirmed that the model should remain non-binding, simple and modular. Partners highlighted the need for clear material descriptions, small-batch handling, sorting and quality guidance, textile safety, IP/design/branding considerations, simplified language and national legal checks.	The Textile model was kept modular and non-binding. It includes clearer textile material categories, material specification and legal-status sheets, delivery and fallback forms, responsibility clauses, safety checks and guidance on

Sector/ model	Documented testing, review and stakeholder- feedback activities	Stakeholder involvement	Feedback collected	How feedback informed the final model
	structured interviews, two online meetings on 24.03.2026 and 06.05.2026, textile-sector expertise and model review.	structured interviews, including 6 industry-side and 12 craft/artisan-side respondents.		IP/design and branding issues.
Wood & Furniture Cooperation Framework Model	t2i contributed through Wood & Furniture stakeholder engagement, Italian legal input, review of iterative model versions and preparation of a concrete test-case document. FCF contributed through stakeholder engagement, co-creation and validation of cooperation models in the Wood & Furniture ecosystem. HAMAG-BICRO contributed through development and validation activities in the Croatian Wood & Furniture sector, linked to pilot collaborations, workshops, meetings and factory visits.	t2i engaged approximately 8–12 industrial, craft and design-side stakeholders. FCF reached approximately 20 stakeholders across industry, craft, design and intermediary organisations. HAMAG-BICRO documented feedback involving furniture manufacturers, craft SMEs/artisan companies and an academic partner in the Croatian Wood & Furniture context.	Feedback confirmed the usefulness of the model as a non-binding checklist and discussion basis. Partners highlighted the need for clear responsibility allocation, material-flow description, by-product/waste classification, sorting, quality and volume consistency, logistics, liability, cost allocation and national adaptation.	The Wood & Furniture model includes wood-specific material categories, material specification and legal-status checks, quality and safety checks, delivery and fallback forms, responsibility clauses and guidance on unsuitable or legally unclear material.

In total, the explicitly quantified partner evidence documents at least approximately 23 industry-side and 32 craft/artisan/SME-side actors, complemented by further mixed stakeholder groups documented by other partners.

The three Cooperation Framework Models were developed, reviewed and tested as practical, non-binding model-agreement tools in different sector and partner contexts. The testing activities confirmed that the models are useful mainly as orientation, clarification and drafting tools for early cooperation discussions. They also confirmed that any binding use requires case-specific adaptation, national legal review and the decision of the individual parties.

The main lessons learnt across all sectors were that the models must remain simple, modular and non-binding; that material description and legal-status clarification are essential before transfer; that delivery, inspection and fallback procedures are needed for practical use; and that SMEs, artisans and companies benefit from clear responsibility allocation without excessive

contractual complexity. These lessons were integrated into the final Agro-food, Textile and Wood & Furniture Cooperation Framework Models attached as Annexes 2–4.

8. THE THREE COOPERATION MODELS

The main tangible result of Pilot Action n.3 is a set of three sector-specific Cooperation Framework Models. They are intended to help industrial suppliers and handicraft or creative receivers structure cooperation before any binding agreement is considered. Each model uses a shared architecture but adapts material description, safety, legal-status and implementation questions to the relevant sector.

At this deliverable stage, the models are documented as drafted, reviewed, discussed and practically tested cooperation frameworks. They are not presented as signed agreements; possible formalisation or signature belongs to the later WP3 validation and uptake phase, subject to national legal checks and the decision of the individual parties.

Table 6: Overview of the three sector-specific cooperation models

Model	Purpose	Main issues addressed	Sector-specific adaptations
Agro-food Cooperation Framework Model	Support primarily non-food and non-feed circular uses of agro-food residual materials such as peels, shells, husks, fibres, seeds, pits, spent grain, coffee grounds, cereal residues or plant fibres.	Legal status, hygiene, storage, traceability, perishability, allergens, temperature, contamination, product safety, cost allocation and fallback routes.	Explicit caution for food, feed, animal by-products, cosmetics, fertilisers, soil improvers, composting, biogas, skin contact and food contact uses.
Textile Cooperation Framework Model	Support the transfer and reuse of textile residual materials such as fabric offcuts, surplus fabrics, yarn residues, deadstock, samples, defective stock, trims and accessories.	Material status, sorting, packing, logistics, textile safety, high-risk uses, confidentiality, IP/design/branding and fallback handling.	Textile material categories, fibre composition, treatment/coating, textile product safety, skin contact, children, PPE and hygiene-sensitive uses.
Wood & Furniture Cooperation Framework Model	Support the reuse of wood and furniture residual materials such as solid wood offcuts, boards, panels, veneer, furniture components, sawdust, shavings and mixed wood-based residues.	Material specification, legal status, quality and safety, liability, storage, delivery, cost-sharing, IP/design/branding and fallback handling.	Wood species/material type, coatings, adhesives, composite boards, hazardous treatments, load-bearing or public-space uses and irregular offcut supply.

The models do not determine the legal status of a material. They ask the supplier and receiver to describe the material stream, indicate the intended legal status and clarify whether national authority input, permits, registrations, waste codes, transport documents, product-safety checks or other requirements are needed. This approach keeps the framework practical while avoiding unsupported legal conclusions.

9. LEGAL AND CONTRACTUAL ASPECTS IDENTIFIED

The partner contributions confirm that cooperation between industry and craft actors cannot be reduced to a single legal clause. The main issues are operational and legal at the same time: material status, quality, safety, responsibility, logistics, cost and communication must be clarified early enough to avoid later conflicts. The following overview consolidates the recurring legal and contractual aspects identified across the three sector groups.

Table 7: Main legal and contractual aspects identified

Topic	Relevance	Consolidated finding
Ownership / material transfer	Relevant in all sectors	Clarify when possession, ownership and practical responsibility for the residual material pass from supplier to receiver.
Waste / by-product / secondary raw material status	Highly relevant	The legal classification determines whether simple transfer is possible or whether waste-management, by-product, end-of-waste, registration or authority requirements apply.
Quality and safety	Highly relevant	Define quality, contamination thresholds, sorting, moisture, hygiene, treatment, coatings, acceptance criteria and safety checks.
Liability and warranty	Highly relevant	Allocate responsibility for the condition of material at transfer, subsequent processing and final products placed on the market.
Confidentiality / trade secrets	Relevant	Protect production, technical, commercial and cooperation-related information while allowing non-sensitive project reporting.
IP / design / branding	Relevant, especially Textile and Wood & Furniture	Clarify ownership and use of designs, prototypes, patterns, branding, product concepts and communication.
Pricing / cost sharing	Relevant	Clarify donation, no-cost transfer, handling fee, sorting fee, symbolic price, commercial transfer, transport cost and possible revenue-sharing.
Logistics / storage / delivery	Highly relevant	Define transport responsibility, storage, delivery rhythm, batch documentation and what happens if supply is irregular.
Duration / termination	Relevant	Use pilot periods and simple termination rules where cooperation is uncertain or material supply depends on production cycles.
Fallback if material cannot be used	Highly relevant	Suspend use if material is unsafe, unlawful, contaminated, spoiled, legally unclear or does not correspond to the material specification.

Topic	Relevance	Consolidated finding
Need for national legal checks	Essential	All models require country- and case-specific review before binding use. The project tools provide orientation only.

Agro-food is the most sensitive sector from a regulatory perspective. Partners reported that hygiene, food/feed relevance, animal-origin materials, temperature, shelf-life, contamination and traceability may determine whether a cooperation is possible at all. In some cases, regulatory requirements can prevent the use of a residual material for the originally intended purpose.

Textile and Wood & Furniture cases are often easier to approach through practical material specifications, but they also require attention to product safety, treatments, chemicals, high-risk uses, design rights, branding, liability and consistency of supply. In all sectors, the model works best when used as a checklist before any formal agreement is drafted.

10. CROSS-SECTOR LESSONS LEARNT

The consolidated partner contributions show a clear pattern. The cooperation models are useful because they make uncertain issues visible early, but they must remain practical, modular and non-binding at this stage. Overly legalistic documents can discourage SMEs, artisans and small producers before trust and feasibility have been established.

- Generic model agreements are useful only if they are adapted to the concrete sector, country and material stream.
- Early clarification of material ownership, legal status and responsibilities is essential for all cooperation cases.
- The models work best as checklists and discussion frameworks before formal contracts, not as ready-to-sign legal documents.
- National legal review is required before practical or binding use, especially where waste/by-product classification, food safety, product safety or registration obligations are relevant.
- Small-scale actors need accessible language, a modular structure and, in some countries, native-language or bilingual versions.
- The green/yellow/red workflow is a helpful practical device for deciding whether material transfer can proceed, needs clarification, or must be suspended.

- Trust-building and clear incentives are as important as legal clauses, particularly where stakeholders are used to informal transfer, donations or handshake arrangements.
- The transition from pilot cooperation to formal uptake belongs to the later WP3 / Output 3.3 / D.3.1.3 phase.

A specific lesson from several countries is that formalisation should not be forced too early. Cooperation often begins with small test batches, exploratory workshops, bilateral exchanges or prototype work. The cooperation framework should help structure this early phase and prepare future formalisation only where the parties see practical value in continuing.

11. LINK TO PILOT ACTION N.1 AND PILOT ACTION N.2

Pilot Action n.3 is directly connected to the previous SYMCRAFT pilot actions. Pilot Action n.1 provided the practical basis by identifying industrial residual materials, reuse opportunities, prototypes, feasibility issues and cooperation cases. Pilot Action n.2 developed the business logic behind those cases by using the Circular Eco-Business Model Canvas Tool and related partner work.

Pilot Action n.3 translates these experiences into cooperation frameworks. The models are therefore not abstract legal templates. They are based on real questions raised by project partners and stakeholders: what material is transferred, under which status, in what condition, who checks it, who transports it, who pays which costs, who owns the resulting product or design, and what happens if the material cannot be used.

This link between PA1, PA2 and PA3 is important for the sustainability of the project. Circular reuse does not become stable only because a prototype works or a business model looks promising. It requires cooperation arrangements that are clear enough to reduce uncertainty but flexible enough to remain realistic for SMEs, artisans and intermediaries.

12. CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Pilot Action n.3 created the basis for practical cooperation frameworks between industrial actors and handicraft, design and craft-based SMEs. The three sector-specific models provide a structured, non-binding basis for future collaborations and for later uptake under WP3. They support the transition from informal or exploratory pilot cooperation to clearer material transfer, cooperation and agreement structures where this is appropriate.

The main result of D.2.4.1 is not a set of signed contracts. It is a consolidated preparation framework based on partner contributions, survey input, stakeholder feedback and

documented practical testing in pilot contexts: partner contributions were collected, survey inputs were cleaned and considered, legal and contractual topics were structured, the GPT Tool was used as an orientation instrument, and three Cooperation Framework Models were drafted, tested and reviewed as non-binding orientation tools and prepared for later uptake.

The Application Form links Pilot Action n.3 with the development, adaptation and testing of three cooperation/agreement models. During D.2.4.1, the partnership prepared, reviewed, discussed and practically tested the three sector-specific Cooperation Framework Models and collected partner and stakeholder feedback. The actual formalisation or signature of specific cooperation agreements is treated as part of the later WP3 validation and uptake phase, in particular Output 3.3 / D.3.1.3, where the models can be further validated, adapted to national legal requirements and taken up by individual parties if they decide to proceed.

The next steps are further stakeholder discussion, national legal checks, refinement of the three models, preparation of simplified or translated versions where needed, and integration into Output 3.3 / D.3.1.3. Possible formalisation or signature may follow later if individual companies decide to use and adapt the models for their own cooperation.

For future uptake, the SYMCRAFT partnership should preserve the models as practical tools rather than turn them into heavy generic contracts. The strength of the approach lies in its modularity: it helps users ask the right questions before they commit. That is a modest but important achievement for circular cooperation between industry and craft.

ANNEXES

The following annexes form an integral part of D.2.4.1 documentation:

Annex 1: Partner Contributions to D.2.4.1

Annex 2: Agro-food Cooperation Framework Model

Annex 3: Textile Cooperation Framework Model

Annex 4: Wood & Furniture Cooperation Framework Model

Annex 5: Legal-aspects Survey