LIFE Project Number

LIFE 11NAT/DK/894

Final Report
Covering the project activities from 04/06/2012 to 31/12/2018

Reporting Date

31/03/2019

LIFE+ PROJECT NAME or Acronym

Restoration of rare wet terrestrial habitat nature types of national priority in Southern Denmark
- RARE NATURE -

Data Project

Project location	Southern Denmark (Fyn and Jutland)
Project start date:	04.06.2012
Project end date:	31.12.2018
Total budget	4.415.172 €
EC contribution:	2.521.063 €
(%) of eligible costs	57,1

Data Beneficiary

Name Beneficiary	Faaborg-Midtfyn Municipality
Contact person	Mr Claus Paludan. After 31032019: Mr. Ole Tyrsted Jørgensen
Postal address	Tinghøj Alle 2, 5750 Ringe, Denmark
Telephone	+ 45 7253 2076
Fax:	+ 45 7253 0531
E-mail	cpalu@faaborgmidtfyn.dk. After 31032019: oltyj@fmk.dk
Project Website	www.life70.dk

Table of contents

1 List of abbreviations 3
2 Executive summary 4
2.1 Assessment as to whether the project objectives and work plan are still viable 4
2.2 Problems encountered 7
2.3 Changed SAC borders in Denmark 7
2.4 Technical changes and adjustments 7
3 Introduction 8
4 Administrative part 10
4.1 Description of project management 10
4.2 Previous reports and amendments 12
4.3 Answers to questions from the Commission 12
4.3 Organigram 15
4.4 Audit information 15
5 Technical part 16
5.1 Activities 16
5.1.1 Action A.1 – biological surveys and technical documentation 16
5.1.2 Action A.2 – authorization procedures 19
5.1.3 Action A.3 – Management plans 21
5.1.4 Action A.4 – Pilot project: management of project areas 22
5.1.5 Action A.5 – Action plan for fen orchid (*Liparis loeselii*) 23
5.1.6 Action B.1 – Economic compensation to landowners 25
5.1.7 Action C.1 – Vegetation clearings 28
5.1.8 Action C.2 – hydrological improvements 31
5.1.9 Action C.3 – Grazing facilities 34
5.1.10 Action C.4 – Recreational facilities 37
5.1.11 Action C.5 – Supervision 38
5.1.12 Action D.1 – Impact monitoring 39
5.1.13 Action D.2 – Socio-economic monitoring 43
5.1.17 Action F.3 – Monitoring 45
5.1.18 Action F.4 – Networking 47
5.1.18 Action F.5 – After LIFE conservation plan 48
5.2 Dissemination actions 49
5.2.1 Action E.1 – Website 49
5.2.2 Action E.2 – Layman's report 49
5.2.3 Action E.3 – Dissemination (Info-signs, leaflets) 49
5.2.4 Action E.4 – Workshops 50
5.2.5 Action E.5 – Public involvement 51
5.3 Evaluation of project implementation 53
5.4 Analysis of long-term benefits 56
6 Comments on the financial part 59
6.1 Summary of costs incurred 59
Accounting system 59
6.3 Summary of costs per action 60
7 Annexes 62
7.1 Administrative annexes 62
7.2 Technical annexes 62
8 Financial report and annexes 63

1 List of abbreviations

FMK = Faaborg-Midtfyn Municipality
NST = National Nature Agency Fyn
FVF = Bird Protection Foundation
KK = Kerteminde Municipality
NK = Nordfyns Municipality
OK = Odense Municipality
SK = Silkeborg Municipality
LK = Langeland Municipality
AK = Assens Municipality

CB = Coordinating beneficiary
AB = Associated beneficiary
GA = Grant Agreement
RDP = Rural Development Program

2 Executive summary

2.1 Assessment as to whether the project objectives and work plan are still viable

Background and project objectives

The LIFE Rare Nature project (LIFE11 NAT/DK/000894) project has been performed from 4th June 2012 until 31st December 2018. On a daily basis the project has been named LIFE70 due to the focus on natural habitat types denoted 7230, 7110 etc.

The project primarily targets restoration and expansion of Annex I natural habitat types raised bogs (7110*), calcareous fens (7210*), petrifying springs (7220*), alkaline fens (7230) and Northern Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix* (4010). The project also targets management of the Annex II species *Liparis loeselii* and *Triturus cristatus* and management of the Annex IV species *Rana dalmatina, R. arvalis*, and *Bufo calamita*.

The primary objective of the project was to contribute to obtain a favourable conservation status of the natural habitat types 7110*, 7210*, 7220*, 7230, and 4010. This has taken place by management of existing natural habitat types and by expanding the area for future potential development of these natural habitat types. A secondary objective was to support the populations of the amphibian species mentioned above and by preparing recommendations for the future management of the fen orchid (*L. loeselii*).

The total project area is 790 ha mainly situated within 11 Danish SAC's and distributed in 18 subproject areas involving 9 beneficiaries. Within this total project area the aim is to

- Clear shrubs and trees on 169 ha
- Restore hydrology on 226 ha
- Improve amphibian habitats
- Expand and improved grazing facilities on 340 ha
- Obtain landowner agreements on 383 ha
- Improve knowledge on *Liparis loeselii*
- Run public awareness campaigns
- Monitor biological and socio-economic indicators

There is an amendment to the Grant Agreement which was approved by the Commission in November 2018. The amendment took care of budgetary changes derived from agreed technical changes during the course of the project.

The coordinating beneficiary is the Faaborg-Midtfyn Municipality and the associated beneficiaries are the municipalities of Assens, Silkeborg, Langeland, Kerteminde, Odense, and Nordfyn as well as the The Foundation to the Protection of Birds and the Danish Nature Agency (local unit Fyn).

Results

Overall the project actions have been carried out as foreseen in the Grant Agreement with an amendment. Implementation of the 25 actions of the project has resulted in the following:

- Successful landowner agreements covering 439 ha. On private land the agreements must be obtained prior to making the management and conservation work. During the course of the project the landowner‘s interest in entering agreements for nature conservation increased in some of the sub-projects. All in all this resulted in additional 50 ha with agreements compared to the GA. With the landowner agreements it has

also been possible to modernize the property structure at some of the sub-projects giving rise to a less complicated property composition. This enables a more efficient management of the project areas in the future.

- 238 ha were cleared for unwanted vegetation (trees, shrubs and reed). This is 69 ha more than predicted in the GA. The clearings were performed by different methods ranging from traditional clearings of woody plants by machinery to burning of reed.
- The hydrology was improved on 208 ha. This is 16 ha less compared to the predictions in the GA. The hydrological improvements comprise substantial elevations of the groundwater table in raised bogs and improvements of the hydrology in calcareous fens, alkaline fens and petrifying springs in order to be able the manage these areas by grazing in the future. Hydrological improvements were also planned for the expansion of the area with wet heath land. However, hydrological surveys predict a negative influence on the existing wet heath land and therefor hydrological changes were not implemented at this site.
- Regarding improved habitats for amphibians we established 21 new ponds and 9 existing ponds were cleaned-up. The effort for amphibians is thereby larger than predicted in the GA.
- Grazing facilities are established to be able to keep the natural habitats light-open in the future and to support the potential for the development of additional areas with natural habitat types. The grazing facilities were improved on 454 ha (compared to 340 ha predicted in the GA). It is important to notice that the grazing facilities also include animals to keep the grazing going and equipment to be able to carry out a rational management by grazing. This for example includes two cattle trucks enabling a smooth transport of animals between sites with natural habitat types.
  Some of the grazing facilities have been financed by the rural development program giving rise to EU added value between various programs for nature conservation.
- Recreational facilities in the form of observation towers and extensive hiking trails as well as other minor installations to facilitate public access to the project sites.

Besides this the project also has resulted in the following:

- Information signs at each of the 18 sub-project sites. For 5 sites a leaflet is available.
- National and Nordic exchange of knowledge on the management and restoration of alkaline fens and active raised bogs (7110*). This was especially expressed in a co-operation with a Nordic Council project focusing on the management of alkaline fens in Scandinavia.
- A report on recommendations for the management of the Fen Orchid (*Liparis loeselii)* being a good indicator of alkaline fens in a favourable conservation status.
- A pilot project considering the opportunities for farmers to work with nature management as a realistic part of their overall agricultural activities.
- A management plan for each sub-project legally adopted into the Natura 2000 action plan 2016-2021. The management plans forms the basis for the After-Life Conservation Plan.
- Involvement of the general public by use of a high number of public events.
- A Laymans report and a website (www.LIFE70.dk) about the project. The final report and various reports are available on the website.

With the activities mentioned above the project' results are as follows considering the natural habitat types:

preserving and managing existing natural habitat types:

- 7110 - active raised bog: 47 ha
- 7230 - alkaline fens: 94 ha
- 7210 - Calcareous fens: 20 ha
- 7220 - Petrifying springs: 6 ha
- 4010 – wet heath: 15 ha

development of additional natural habitat types:

- 7110 - active raised bog: 33 ha
- 7230 - alkaline fens: 103 ha
- 7210 - Calcareous fens: 9 ha
- 7220 - Petrifying springs:2 ha
- 4010 – wet heath: 13 ha

A comprehensive monitoring program has been implemented to obtain documentation of the biological and socio-economic effects of the project.

The biological tends are clear for the raised bogs, where the peat-moss cover has increased indicating an improved peat accumulation. For the other natural habitat types the trend is more unclear, but the potential for achieving a better conservation status has improved. Also the habitats for amphibians have been improved.

Regarding the socio-economic effects several indicators have been analysed and the economic assets were calculated. The socio-economic report is available on the website.

Project economy

The project budget was 4.415.172 €.

Chapters in the Final Report

Chapter 3: Introduction. This chapter describes the project's aim regarding improvements of the conservation status of a number of natural habitat types and species.

Chapter 4: Administrative part. This chapter describes project phases and the organization of the project. This chapter also describes Grant Agreement with an amendment and addresses questions from the Commission during the project period.

Chapter 5: Technical part: In this chapter the project actions and associated results are described. Under each action deliverable products are listed. In this chapter also the long-term benefits are described together with the monitoring results and outcome indicators. The overall project progress is illustrated in a Gantt Chart.

Chapter 6: Comments on financial report. In this chapter the financial status and outcomes are described.

Chapter 7: Annexes. In this chapter annexes to the final report are listed together with an overview of deliverables and other material. All annexes are delivered to the Commission electronically.

Chapter 8: Financial report. In this chapter the account documents are reported.

2.2 Problems encountered

1,4 ha of petrifying springs (7220) could not be managed as foreseen. This is compensated by more extensive actions at other sites and for related natural habitat types (e.g., alkaline fens 7230) – e.g. in subproject 3 and 5.

To be able to oblige the landowners during the landowner negotiations minor deviations must be expected as compared to the LIFE application with respect to the exact project border and implementation (and extent) of the concrete management activities. This has already been mentioned in the previous progress reports and according to communication with the Commission (please sees section 2.4).

2.3 Changed SAC borders in Denmark

In 2017 and 2018 the Danish Ministry for Food and Environment initiated a process for altering the N-2000 borders. The alteration became valid in the autumn 2018 and the borders can be seen here: http://miljoegis.mim.dk/spatialmap?profile=natura2000-afgraensning-nov2018gaeldende. The changed borders affect some of the subprojects in this LIFE project positively because the SAC's have been enlarged. This is the case for subproject 1, 3, 4, and 5. Therefore less of the project's actions are actually outside N-2000 as compared to the LIFE application. At all other sites of the project the changed SAC borders has no influence on the specific sites.

2.4 Technical changes and adjustments

In the table below we have summarized approved technical changes according to previous communication with the Commission. In addition, where relevant, we have mentioned e-mail correspondence with the Commission in section 5.

Communication	**Action and issues – technical changes**
Letter 29012015	Action B1 – increased project area in subproject 3 at Arreskov Sø
Letter 29012015	Action D2 – purchase of person-counters
Letter 23012017	Action B1 – minor adjustments of land area targets
Letter 23012017	Action C4 – changed location of path
Letter 26072016	Action B1 – minor changes in connection to landowner negotiations and compensation at several sites
Letter 26072016	Action C1 – additional mowing action
Letter 26072016	Action C2 – over delivery of hydrological improvements
Letter 26072016	Action C3 – cattle truck
Letter 11012018	Action B1 – compensation changed at subproject 3, 6, 14
Letter 11012018	Action C3 – additional activities at subproject 11
Letter 11012018	Action C4 – additional public facilities

3 Introduction

The project primarily targets restoration and expansion of Annex I natural habitat types raised bogs (7110*), calcareous fens (7210*), petrifying springs (7220*), alkaline fens (7230) and Northern Atlantic wet heaths with *Erica tetralix* (4010). The project also targets management of the Annex II species *Liparis loeselii* and *Triturus cristatus* and management of the Annex IV species *Rana dalmatina, R. arvalis*, and *Bufo calamita*.

According to the original application the total project area is 790 ha mainly situated within 11 Danish SAC's and distributed in 18 subproject areas. A small part (56 ha) of the project area is situated outside the SAC's mainly to be able to restore natural hydrology in the pSCI's and to be able to manage the SAC's in a way to be able to achieve favourable conservation status of the habitat types.

According to a Danish national assessment the conservation status of raised bogs (7110*), alkaline fens (7230), and wet heaths (4010) is in the danger of further deterioration in the coming years. The Rare Nature project is therefore of outmost importance to be able to fulfil the N-2000 plans.

In the project the main activities are as follows divided into 25 individual actions:

- Clear shrubs and trees on 169 ha
- Restore hydrology on 226 ha
- Improve amphibian habitats
- Expand and improved grazing facilities on 340 ha
- Obtain landowner agreements on 383 ha
- Improve knowledge on *Liparis loeselii*
- Run public awareness campaigns
- Monitor biological and socio-economic indicators

These activities will end up in the following main results:

- Management of existing natural habitat types 7110*, 7230, 7210*, 7220*, 4010 (182 ha)
- Develop additional natural types 7110*, 7230, 7210*, 7220*, 4010 (160 ha)
- Purchase cattle to secure grazing
- 25 ponds for amphibians
- Action plan for *Liparis loeselii*
- Visitor facilities
- Networking

Below we have summarized the basic information for the 18 subprojects in the RARE NATURE project.

Subproject number	**Local project name**	**pSCI**	**Primary target: Natural habitat type**	**Project area hectare**	**Project owner**
	Overall project management				CB: FMK
1	Storelung	DK008X193	7110*	54,8	CB: FMK
2	Brændegård Sø	DK008X194	7230	23,1	CB: FMK
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	DK008X195	7230	110	CB: FMK
4	Svanninge Bakker	DK008X327	7230	10	AB: NST

Subproject number	Local project name	pSCI	Primary target: Natural habitat type	Project area hectare	Project owner
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	DK008X195	7230	24	AB: NST
6	Fjordmarken	DK008X075	7230	38	AB: NST
7	Ristinge Mose	DK008X201	7230	6	AB: NST
8	Fakkemose	DK008X201	7230, 7210*	21	AB: NST
9	Lundemose	DK008X201	7230, 7210*	11	AB: NST
10	Moser ved Gulstav	DK008X201	7210*	50	AB: FVF + NST
11	Urup Dam	DK008X187	7230	75	AB: KK
12	Sadelmagermose	DK008X185	7230	35	AB: KK
13	Enebærodde	DK008X075	4010	29	AB: NK
14	Lisbjergmose	DK008X184	7230	10	AB: NK
15	Odense Å	DK008X188	7230, 7220*	140	AB: OK
16	Stenholt Mose	DK00DY294	7110*	112,9	AB: SK
17	Piledybet	DK008X201	7230	26	AB: LK
18	Gravene	DK008X188	7230, 7220*	14	AB: AK

According to adjustments of the project area as described in PR #2, the project area of subproject 3 and 6 has been increased with 30 ha and 5,4 ha, respectively. In subproject 14 some changes of the project area was described in PR #2 and alternative areas were proposed to be included into the project. However, the landowner reluctance faded out during 2018, and the project was carried out as originally planned.

.

4 Administrative part

4.1 Description of project management

The project management is taken care off in action F1 as follows:

- FMK is the coordinating beneficiary and has established a secretariat to support the project. The secretariat is composed of the project manager (Claus Paludan) and an economic controller (Hanne Longsted Larsen). Both have project experience from the LIFE project in Bøjden Nor (LIFE09 NAT/DK/000371) which is used in the present project. Until April 30th 2014 the chairman of the steering group was Svend Petersen, Head of Nature Department. Due to pensioning this role was taken over by Ole Tyrsted Jørgensen from 1st June 2014.

  The steering group at the end of the project period was composed of the following persons:

  Ole Tyrsted Jørgensen, Head, FMK
  Jakob Harrekilde, Forest supervisor, NST
  Kristian Dammand, Director, FVF
  Michael Timm, Head, KK
  Mette Petersen, Head Nature and Environment, NK
  Knud Søndergaard, Head, OK
  Morten Husfeldt Jespersen, Head of Section, SK
  Rikke Fink, Head, LK
  Annette Bæk, Head Nature and Environment, AK
  Claus Paludan, PM, FMK

- The project group take care of the day-to-day activities in the project. In most cases each of the nine beneficiaries has one or two representatives in the project group as follows:

  Claus Paludan, PM, FMK
  Kasper Nowack, FMK
  Karin Skovhus, FMK until 2016
  Heidi Vinther, FMK until 2015
  Annita Svendsen, NST (until 2015)
  Annette Strøm Jacobsen, NST (from 2015 an onwards)
  Søren Ring, FVF
  Martin K. Søkolm, KK
  Jakob Pedersen, NK
  Lars Sønderby, OK
  Bente Sørensen, SK
  Astrid Ejlersen, LK
  Ida Jelnes, AK
  Kim W. Knudsen, AK

As part of the project management, the activities described below have been carried out.
Steering group

- The steering group was established in the autumn 2012.
- 1st meeting was 25th October 2012.

- 2nd meeting was 12th December 2013. The steering group visited subproject 2.
- 3rd meeting took place 21st January 2014. Subproject 3 and 5 at Arreskov Sø were visited.
- 4th meeting was 16th March 2016 with an excursion to subproject 15 at Odense Å.
- 5th meeting was 5th April 2017 with an excursion to subproject 14 in Urup Dam.
- 6th meeting 5th October 2017.
- 7th meeting 4th May 2018.
- 8th (and final) meeting 20th November 2018 (together with project group).

Minutes are in annex 9a.

Project group

- The project group was established in August 2012
- 1st meeting was 13th August 2012. The meeting was held at Bøjden Nor (LIFE09/NAT/DK000371) to demonstrate an on-going LIFE project. The project group also met in December 2012. The main issue was to discuss administer.
- 2nd meeting on 31st October 2013.
- 3rd meeting on 5th March 2014.
- 4th meeting on 12th May 2014.
- 5th meeting on 7th October 2014.
- 6th meeting on 17th June 2015.
- 7th meeting on 25th November 2015.
- 8th meeting on 19th April 2016.
- 9th meeting on 18th January 2017.
- 10th meeting on 22nd September 2017.
- 11th meeting on 8th February 2018.
- 12th (and final) meeting 20th November 2018 (together with steering group).

Minutes are in annex 9b.

The PM visited all AB's in the autumn 2012 to give instructions about the administrative procedures. This includes:
- Timesheets. A timesheet has been developed based on the LIFE model timesheet.
- Principles for time registration based on the circular note (8 December 2010) from the Commission
- Account system. Based on the FMK account system for this LIFE project each AB has made a similar system. Each AB is responsible for their own account, but the CB keeps copies of all supporting account documents and makes an overall account for the entire project.
- Clear project identification on all invoices.
- Common Provisions.

In addition, these procedures have been discussed on-going through-out the project period on meetings with the steering and project group.

Meetings with the monitor team and the Commission

1) The project was presented to the EU technical (Pascal Collotte) and financial (Tommy Sejersen) desk officers on a meeting 21 September 2012.

2) Astrale monitoring team visited the project 29th January 2013, 5th March 2014, 17th June 2015.
3) The EU Commission technical desk officer Lazslo Becsy and Neemo monitor visited the project on 28th September 2016.
4) Neemo monitoring team visited the project 10th October 2017, 28th February 2019.

4.2 Previous reports and amendments

Within this project the following technical reports have been submitted to the Commission:

- Inception report 27th February 2013
- Progress Report 1st October 2014
- Midterm Report 31st March 2016
- Progress Report 31st October 2017

On 14th September 2018 we submitted an amendment for a budget modification based on the technical modifications described in the PR#2. The technical modifications were approved by the Commission in letter dated 11012018.

4.3 Answers to questions from the Commission

In the technical reports (IcR, PR#1, MtR, PR#2) various technical and some financial questions were answered. In some circumstances however, the Commission has asked for additional answers, and especially with regard to MtR, answers to the financial questions remains.

Overall we acknowledge, that the technical deliverables can be supplied electronically (cf. Commissions letter dated 23012017).

Commission letter dated 29012015
Financial question #5: In the PR#1 we argued for the legal co-operation between Langeland and Svendborg Municipality which I is stipulated according to https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=200969.
Our auditor has provided a statement (cf. ANNEX 1) that the agreement is in accordance with the national legislation.

Commission letter dated 15102015
Financial: The question concerns the classification of cattle. According to the comment, cattle purchased in the project is classified as durable goods which is evident from the financial report of KK – please also see comments to the Commissions letter dated 26072016 (question 26 and 27).

Commission letter dated 26072016
Financial #5: The question concerns subproject 1. Inclusion of small area of 2.4 ha is included into the project due to the fact that the improved hydrology was impossible to carry out without taking this area into consideration. Thus if this area couldn't be compensated the project would have failed in subproject 1. Although the area of 2.4 ha cannot develop into natural habitat types a declaration is registered on the area stating that the increased water table must be tolerated in a time unlimited manner. Please also see action B1 for the registered clause.

Financial # 13: The question concerns the financial reporting of the cattle-truck purchased in subproject 15. The truck is reported as durable goods in the financial report of OK.

Financial # 18: The question concerns exchange rates. In the financial reports the correct exchange rates are used.

Financial #19: The question concerns some incomplete transactions in the financial reports. The necessary corrections have been made in the financial reports of KK,LK, and FMK.

Financial #20: The question concerns supporting documentation for the personnel costs reported for [redacted].

In ANNEX 2 is the necessary documentation per person, including a detailed calculation of the annual personnel costs, documentation of the annual gross salary (December slip) and the annual report to the tax authorities, explanation of the social charges, calculation and documentation of the productive hours, copy of timesheets, copy of secondment letter.

In Annex 2 we have attached an example illustrating the principles of the calculation of the personnel costs for [redacted].

Financial #21: The comment concerns the registration of personnel costs for [redacted]. We have made the necessary corrections in the financial statement for LK (please see ANNEX 31).

Financial # 22: The question concerns the use of "Entreprenørgården" for clearings in subproject 16 in SK. We have made some clarifications to this question in PR#2 and in ANNEX 3 we have attached additional details on the selection procedure. The "Entreprenørgården" in the initial phase of the project was selected directly and within the SK organization.

In ANNEX 3 we have attached an explanation for the initial choice of "Entreprenørgården" and selection documents for HedeDanmark thereafter. The cost of the use of "Entreprenørgården" was comparable to the use of HedeDanmark and therefore we find that the selection procedure respects Article 27 of the Common Provisions.

Financial #23: The question concerns copy of a number of specific invoices. They are attached in ANNEX 4.

Financial #24: For the invoices mentioned in "Financial #23" the tender documentation, report on assessment and evaluation of tenders, proof of publication of procurement, offer of the selected subcontractor, and contract for the selected subcontractor are attached in ANNEX 5. It is noted, that according to the Danish procurement Act (https://www.retsinformation.dk/forms/r0710.aspx?id=175507) procurements under the threshold values can be performed as an analysis of the market (markedsanalyse in Danish) for the performance of the specific task and that the analysis may be performed either orally or in writing. The same applies to the contract.

Financial #25: The question concerns FMK costs related to “Intern drift”. The costs have been deleted from the financial statement.

Financial #26: The question concerns categorization of purchased cattle. As stated above purchased cattle are placed in the durable goods cost category.

Financial #27: The question concerns registration of purchased cattle. In ANNEX 6 is the document listing the inventory for cattle, catch folds etc. For the cattle the inventory also shows the individual animal register numbers (CHR).

Financial #28: The question concerns purchase documents and payment proof of land in subproject 11. This is attached in ANNEX 7. It is noted, that the purchase of land took place within a land consolidation procedure, which was performed by the national authority for agriculture (NaturErhvervstyrelsen).

Financial #29: The question concerns documentation for the land-lease in subproject 2 (FMK) and subproject # 15 (OK) related to two specific properties. The documents are attached in ANNEX 8.

Financial #30: The question concerns costs for clothing. The Commission finds these costs to have a character of overheads and the costs have been removed from the financial statements.

<u>Commission letter dated 11012018</u>
Comments to Action A3: in this action the management plans must be adopted to the N-2000 action plans to be legally operational. This is the case as explained in Action A3 below. We have attached website links where the appropriate N-2000 action plans are available.

Comments to Action A4: In the action for securing future management the report has now been updated with the appropriate logos (please see action A4 below).

Comments to Action B1: The comment concerns subproject 3, 6, and 14 and adjustment of the project border. For subproject 3 and 6 the described opportunities have been carried out during 2018. In subproject 14 the plan was to change the project border due to landowner problems. However, the original project border is still valid due to a last-minute breakthrough in the landowner negotiations.

Comments to Action C3: The comment concerns the reporting of the grazing facilities. The extent of the grazing facilities is reported in Action C3 (please see below).
At subproject 14 in Urup Dam the additional grazing facilities include 8 cattle, a catch fold, a cattle shelter, and a cattle truck. To be able to manage the Urup Dam area the extended activity also includes reinforcement (100 m) of an access road (Cf. PR #2).

Comment to Action C4: The comment concerns the possibility to improve the visitor facilities at subproject 10 in Gulstav Mose. A new bird observation tower was erected in 2018 and photos are available in ANNEX 9

4.3 Organigram

Below we have attached the organogram (in Danish) from the application. The organogram is still valid and is explained in more detail above.

Kommuner	**Projekt forvaltning Faaborg-Midtfyn Kommune**	
	Projektleder: Claus Paludan, FMK	
	Projekt styregruppe	
	Organisation	**Stilling**
	Faaborg-Midtfyn Kommune (FMK)	Afdelingsleder for natur
	Nordfyns Kommune (NM)	Afdelingsleder for natur
	Kerteminde Kommune (KM)	Afdelingsleder for natur
	Odense Kommune (OM)	Afdelingsleder for natur
	Langeland Kommune (LM)	Afdelingsleder for natur
	Assens Kommune (AM)	Afdelingsleder for natur
	Silkeborg Kommune (SM)	Afdelingsleder for natur
Naturstyrelsen	Naturstyrelsen Fyn (NST)	Skovrider
Fugleværnsfonden	Fugleværnsfonden (FVF)	Direktør

Projektgruppe
Lokale projektledere fra AB's
Samt CB's projektleder

4.4 Audit information

Our auditor is the BDO auditor (BDO Kommunernes Revision, Godkendt Revisionsselskab, Fælledvej 1, 5100 Odense C, CVR. Nr. 29 79 40 30). The NST account was audited by Rigsrevisionen and the audit declaration is part of the overall audit performed by BDO.

5 Technical part

5.1 Activities

Below we address the project progress action by action. It is important to notice, that the major means in this project are

- clearings
- improved hydrology
- grazing facilities

to be able to contribute to achieve a favourable conservation status of the species and natural habitat types targeted in this project.

Although some of the actions have been delayed during the course of the project all actions have been implemented to at least the extent which was foreseen in the application (with amendment and other technical changes) and within the budget (after amendment).

For each action we have made an overall description of the achieved results. This is followed by a detailed description of achieved results per site in a tabular manner.

5.1.1 Action A.1 – biological surveys and technical documentation

The purpose of this action was to provide biological surveys and technical documentation to form the basis for the construction works. Most of the surveys have been carried of be external consultants and therefore the task has been carried out according to each beneficiaries procurement rules. At a minimum the procurement is based on the standard national rules.

The biological reports were carried out in the beginning of the project period and were, where relevant, also used as the baseline biological monitoring in action F3.

On privately owned areas the technical surveys (associated tender documents for consultants and constructors) were typically prepared after obtaining agreements with the landowners in order to minimize the risk of revising the documents at a later stage. On areas owned by NST and FVF this consideration was unnecessary. The technical surveys have varying complexity and consist of simple notes (e.g. as a tender for the constructor) or extensive reports.

9 biological surveys were planned. In total 10 surveys were carried – cf. ANNEX 10 - out since a biological survey was performed also in subproject 18.

18 technical surveys were planned. The surveys are in ANNEX 11. ´The higher number compared to the application is due to the fact that in some cases the surveys were split into smaller tasks.

Overall, the expected results of this action have been achieved.

It is important to stress, that the technical documents differ in extent depending on the complexity of the specific tasks. Thus in complicated subprojects (e.g. subproject 1, action C2) detailed surveys were needed while in more simple subprojects (e.g. subproject 3, action C1) the task was solved with a short technical description. Furthermore it is important to stress that the extent of the tendering differs taking into consideration, that tendering can be

based on both oral and written communication. Under all circumstances, at a minimum notes are available for choosing of subcontractors.

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Activity performed Action A1
1	Storelung	Biological survey (2013), Aglaja Several technical reports: 1) Technical note for protection of building form elevated water table (2014), Rambøll A/S. 2) Technical report for membrane and pumping station (2014), Naturrådgivningen A/S based on several offers. 3) Detailed planning documents and procurement documents for the constructor (2016) concerning improved hydrology, Rambøll A/S based on several offers. 4) Detailed planning document for relocation of Rislebækken (Bangsgaard og Paludan ApS, 2017), although paid outside LIFE project. Tenders for the hydrological construction works based on procurement among 3 constructors and for grazing facilities and some of the ponds. Some of the minor construction works were carried out based on direct orders to be able to secure immediate action, best price, and skilled professionals. This is for example the case regarding ponds on the western fringe of the project area and for clearings.
2	Brændegård Sø	No biological survey due the initial status of the area as agricultural soils. Technical report: Detailed planning documents and procurement documents for the constructor (2014) concerning improved hydrology, Rambøll A/S based on three offers. Tender for the hydrological construction works and for grazing facilities based on lowest price.
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	Biological survey (2013), Aglaja Survey of the influence of clearings on birds in SPA, Erik Emhsen. The management actions were quite simple, and no technical surveys were necessary. Instead tasks described in tender documents. Tenders for grazing facilities, ponds and clearings. Selection based on lowest price.
4	Svanninge Bakker	No biological survey, but a baseline monitoring (cf. Action D1). A small survey and detailed planning for hydrological restoration of 7230 and 7220* (2017), Bangsgaard og Paludan ApS. A small survey of the management needs for amphibians in ponds (2016), Amphi Consult. Tender for the hydrological construction works and additional ponds.
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	No biological survey, but a baseline monitoring (cf. Action D1). Detailed planning documents and procurement documents for the constructor (2016) concerning improved hydrology, Rambøll A/S based on several offers. A small survey of the management needs for amphibians in ponds (2016), Amphi Consult. Tender among 3 constructors for the hydrological construction works.
6	Fjordmarken	No biological survey, but a baseline monitoring (cf. Action D1). A small technical survey (own staff) for possibilities for improved hydrology. Increased water table is not compatible with maintenance of grazing of 7230.
7	Ristinge Mose	No biological survey, but a baseline monitoring (cf. Action D1). No technical surveys due to simple management actions. Tender for clearings. Grazing facilities performed under the NST framework agreement.
8	Fakkemose	No biological survey, but a baseline monitoring (cf. Action D1). No technical surveys due to simple management actions. Tender for clearings and grazing facilities (including cattle bridge) and
9	Lundemose	No biological survey, but a baseline monitoring (cf. Action D1). No technical surveys due to simple management actions. Tender for clearings and grazing facilities.

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Activity performed Action A1
10	Moser ved Gulstav	No biological survey, but a baseline monitoring (cf. Action D1). Technical surveys of the need for clearings (own staff) and description of necessary management of ponds (2016), Amphi Consult. Tender for clearings and grazing on FVF's property. Otherwise use of NST staff.
11	Urup Dam	Biological survey (2013), Aglaja (based on two offers). Detailed project and tendering documents for clearings and grazing facilities performed by own staff (2017). Construction works performed based on procurement among 4 constructors and based on lowest price.
12	Sadelmager-mose	Biological survey (2013), Amphi Consult for amphibians and vegetation. This was a direct supply because Amphi Consult has a detailed insight in the amphibian population at this site. Detailed project and tendering documents for clearings, grazing facilities, and ponds performed by own staff (2017). One tender performed for clearings and ponds and two tenders performed for grazing facilities. One tender for high water protection. Selection based on lowest price.
13	Enebærodde	Biological survey (2013), Aglaja. Hydrological survey performed in 2015 by Naturrådgivningen A/S based on tender among three consultants.
14	Lisbjergmose	Biological survey (2013), Aglaja. The management actions were quite simple, and no technical surveys were necessary. Instead tasks described in tender documents.
15	Odense Å	Biological survey (2013), Aglaja. Technical survey for improved hydrology (2015), Rambøll A/S. Technical survey for management with lime on fens (2017), Rambøll A/S. Detailed project and tendering documents for improved hydrology (2017), Rambøll A/S. A large number of tenders: Clearings (3), grazing facilities (10), surveys (3), recreational facilities (2), registration (1). In a few cases use of direct orders (small tasks, pressure of time etc.).
16	Stenholt Mose	Biological survey (2013), Riisager Consult. The consultant is specialized in raised bog monitoring. Three technical surveys for improved hydrology (2014 – 2015), Naturrådgivningen A/S. Detailed project and tendering documents for improved hydrology (Juni 2016), Naturrådgivningen A/S. Tenders for surveys and construction works. In a few cases use of direct orders to be able to use experienced manpower for special tasks (eg. Biological surveys, clearings).
17	Piledybet	Biological survey based on data from the National Nature database (DK's Miljøportal), performed by own staff. Technical survey for improved hydrology (2015), performed by Svendborg Municipality for LK.
18	Gravene	Biological survey (2013), Aglaja. The management actions were quite simple, and no technical surveys were necessary. Tender documents for clearings, hydrological improvements and grazing facilities.

The biological surveys perform a detailed up-to date knowledge about the current biological status of the subproject areas. The surveys also deliver valuable proposals for the future management to secure good conservation status of the natural habitat types and species targeted by the project.

5.1.2 Action A.2 – authorization procedures

This action focuses on authorization procedures to secure that the activities in each subproject are approved according to the present legislation. In most cases, this means that each subproject must be approved according to the nature protection act, the watercourse act, the planning act, the Aarhus Convention and eventually local conservation rules and the agricultural law. In general the Aarhus Convention has been taken care off in Action E5 with public meetings.

Legislative questions are typically clarified when the negotiations have been succeeded with the landowners. All subprojects have obtained the required permits as listed below. The entire authorization procedure was carried out without any complaints.

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Activity performed Action A2
1	Storelung	Conservation Act: 30072016 Planning Act: 6 permits from 2014 -2016 - ponds. Watercourse Act: 14072016 (main project), 09032017 (relocation of watercourse "Ravnsbækken") Nature protection Act: 14072016 (main project), 09032017 (relocation of watercourse "Ravnsbækken")
2	Brændegård Sø	EIA screening: 07062013 Watercourse Act: 10072013 Nature protection Act: 10072013 Conservation: 04062103
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	Conservation Act: 11062017, 14032014 - cattle shelter and ponds Nature protection Act §3: 10072017 – clearings and ponds Planning Act: 14082017 ponds Some of the management carried out with no permits because it is within the aim of the conservation.
4	Svanninge Bakker	Nature protection Act §3: 27042016 (ponds) and 11072016 (improved hydrology) Planning Act: 01062016 - ponds Permit Watercourse Act: 3008016 and 15092017 - improved hydrology
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	Nature protection Act §3: 08062016 Forest Act: 20042015 – clearings of forested fens Watercourse Act: 08062016 – improved hydrology Conservation Act: 02032015 – improved hydrology Planning Act: 08062015 - ponds Aarhus Convention meeting in 2014 together with subproject 3.
6	Fjordmarken	Nature protection Act §3 and §15: 08052016 and 15022017. Beach protection line: 28062017 – cattle passage Danish property assessment Agency: assessment of value of purchased area (5,4 ha).
7	Ristinge Mose	No authorisation needed.
8	Fakkemose	Danish Tax authorities: assessment of value of swapped area (10 ha). Watercourse Act and EIA screening: 09032017 – improved hydrology Planning Act: 12042018 - ponds
9	Lundemose	No authorisation needed.
10	Moser ved Gulstav	Nature protection Act: 13022017 – clean up ponds Planning Act:12032018 – bird observation platform Building Act: 21032018 - bird observation platform.
11	Urup Dam	Nature protection Act: 22012015 – burning of fens Planning Act: 18102013, 19022013, 09022017 – cattle shelters Building Act: 28012014, 10032017 - cattle shelters Watercourse Act: 09102018 – crossing of stream with cattle bridge
12	Sadelmager-mose	Planning Act: - cattle shelters Nature protection Act: 14012014, 30082018 - burning reed and ponds.

		Planning Act: 05122013 - cattle shelters Beach protection line: 03122013, 19102018 - cattle shelters and ponds Aarhus Convention: initiated 7th August 2014 as a public meeting together with subproject 11.
13	Enebærodde	Conservation Board authorisation to clearings etc. May 2013. No other permits necessary.
14	Lisbjergmose	Conservation Board authorisation to grazing, light traffic, and clearings (May 2013, August 2013). In 2016 permit from the Nature protection act to clearings.
15	Odense Å	Conservation: 29042016 – public shelter Planning Act: 06072016 – public shelter Building Act: 31082016 – public shelter Conservation: 24092017 – hydrological improvements Nature protection Act: 27072017 – hydrological improvements Watercourse Act: 27072017 – hydrological improvements
16	Stenholt Mose	Nature protection Act: 10062016 – archaeological protection line Watercourse Act: 14062016 - hydrological improvements EIA screening: 17062015 and 08062016
17	Piledybet	Watercourse Act: 28112018 - hydrological improvements
18	Gravene	Nature protection Act: august 2015 – clearings and ponds Planning Act: October 2015 - ponds Aarhus Convention: 27102015

5.1.3 Action A.3 – Management plans

The management plans have been prepared according to the description in the LIFE application.
The management plans has been added to the respective N-2000 actions plans to become legally operational. The links to the relevant N-2000 plans are show in the table below.

The management plans are attached in ANNEX 12.

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Link to N-2000 action plan with legal operational management plans
1	Storelung	https://www.fmk.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/By_Land_og_Kultur/Natur_og_Landskab/Natur/Storelung_DRIFTSPLAN.pdf.pdf
2	Brændegård Sø	https://www.fmk.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/By_Land_og_Kultur/Natur_og_Landskab/Natur/Brahetrolleborg_DRIFTSPLAN.pdf.pdf
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	https://www.fmk.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/By_Land_og_Kultur/Natur_og_Landskab/Natur/Arreskov_S%C3%B8_DRIFTSPLAN.pdf.pdf
4	Svanninge Bakker	https://www.fmk.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/By_Land_og_Kultur/Natur_og_Landskab/Natur/Svanninge_Bakker_Plejeplan.pdf.pdf
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	https://www.fmk.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/By_Land_og_Kultur/Natur_og_Landskab/Natur/Arreskov_S%C3%B8_Driftsplan_Plejplan.pdf.pdf
6	Fjordmarken	https://www.nordfynskommune.dk/Borger/Affald-og-miljoe/Natur-og-landskab/Natura-2000/Natura-2000-handleplaner-2016-2021
7	Ristinge Mose	http://www.langelandkommune.dk/~/media/Files/Administrationen/__Infrastruktur/Miljoe%20og%20energi/Natur/Plejeplan/4_Plejeplan%20for%20Ristinge%20Mose.pdf
8	Fakkemose	http://www.langelandkommune.dk/~/media/Files/Administrationen/__Infrastruktur/Miljoe%20og%20energi/Natur/Plejeplan/3_Plejeplan%20for%20Fakkemose%20og%20Lundemose.pdf
9	Lundemose	http://www.langelandkommune.dk/~/media/Files/Administrationen/__Infrastruktur/Miljoe%20og%20energi/Natur/Plejeplan/3_Plejeplan%20for%20Fakkemose%20og%20Lundemose.pdf
10	Moser ved Gulstav	http://www.langelandkommune.dk/~/media/Files/Administrationen/__Infrastruktur/Miljoe%20og%20energi/Natur/Plejeplan/2_Plejeplan%20for%20Gulstav%20Mose%20og%20andre%20moser.pdf
11	Urup Dam	https://kerteminde.dk/borger/miljoe-og-natur/natur/natura-2000/natura-2000-handleplaner-revideret-2018
12	Sadelmager-mose	https://kerteminde.dk/borger/miljoe-og-natur/natur/natura-2000/natura-2000-handleplaner-revideret-2018
13	Enebærodde	https://www.nordfynskommune.dk/~/media/Hjemmeside/Topmenu/Borger/Affald-og-miljoe/Natur-og-landskab/Natura2000/2016-2021/480_2017_115866_Natura_2000_handleplan_for_Aebeloe_mv.pdf?la=da
14	Lisbjergmose	https://www.nordfynskommune.dk/~/media/Hjemmeside/Topmenu/Borger/Affald-og-miljoe/Natur-og-landskab/Natura2000/2016-2021/odense_fjord/480_2017_49234_Natura_2000_handleplan_for_Odense_Fjord_2016_2021.pdf?la=da
15	Odense Å	https://www.odense.dk/politik/politikker-og-visioner/handlingsplaner
16	Stenholt Mose	https://silkeborg.dk/~/media/Borger/Natur/International-naturbeskyttelse/Natura-2000-handleplaner-april-2017/N228-Stenholt-Skov-og-Stenholt-Mose--handleplan-2016-til-21-ny-version-med-driftsplan.pdf?la=da
17	Piledybet	http://www.langelandkommune.dk/Borger/Affald_Natur_Miljoe/Natur/Natura2000
18	Gravene	https://www.assens.dk/vores-kommune/en-kommune-i-udvikling/miljoe-og-teknik/natura-2000-planer-2016-2021/n2000-handleplan-for-odense-aa-med-haagerup-aa-sallinge-aa-og-lindved-aa/

5.1.4 Action A.4 – Pilot project: management of project areas

With the aim to focus on possibilities as well as obstacles and improve cooperation between farmers and authorities concerning nature conservation, Life Rare Nature has taken the following initiatives:

Workshop and field trip May 28th 2014
Focus: Corporation between farmers and authorities concerning nature conservation – how do we help each other?

41 participants from Funen sectors working with grazing as nature management visited Randers Municipality to show and discuss how the authorities cooperate with private livestock holders in nature management and to improve the possibilities for a successful management.

Workshop and fieldtrip September 16th 2015
Focus: Corporation between farmers and authorities concerning nature conservation – shared management across property boundaries

35 participants from Funen sectors working with grazing as nature management visited "Skånemosen" a high valued nature area on Funen to show and discuss the obstacles and possibilities with shared management of nature areas.

Closing workshop May 8th 2017
Focus: Sustainable nature management Funen

Action A4 has been completed by a workshop with participation from other authorities, projects, farmers and researchers with the aim to make contact between the different partners, to make an overview on the different projects and to designate potential synergies between projects, actors and sectors.

Three reports has been produced in this action in the support of

- documentation for the workshop (2014 and 2015),

- documentation for the regional network (2017).

The reports are available in ANNEX 13.

As an example of improved local cooperation LIFE Rare Nature has initiated the development of a shared cattle truck – "the cow bus" for land owners/nature managers at the project area in Odense River basin (OK15).

5.1.5 Action A.5 – Action plan for fen orchid (*Liparis loeselii*)

The fen orchid is a small yellow-green orchid listed in Annex 2 of the Habitats Directive and is part of the designation basis in 12 Natura 2000 sites in Denmark including two on Fyn (no. 113 Urup Dam, Brabæk Mose, Birkende Mose and Illemose and no. 124 Helnæs Made and the sea west of). In spite of intensive management of fen orchid at the two sites on Fyn, large fluctuations in the species occurrence are seen, which in the long term can threaten the two occurrences of the species.
As part of LIFE Helnæs project and the present LIFE Rare Nature project, the Danish Nature Agency Fyn initiated a collaboration with Aarhus University and the University of Copenhagen to develop a more targeted management of the habitats for fen orchid. Base on this collaboration, a report has been prepared: "Management of alkaline fens – base on habitats for fen orchid" and it is attached as annex 14.
The report proposes several concrete management initiatives at Helnæs Made and at Urup Dam (subproject 11). The efforts are based on the latest research knowledge about fen orchid and its habitat requirements. The new research results are based on analyzing data from the national monitoring program NOVANA for natural habitat types and supplemented with data collected in 2013 from 8 sites where fen orchid occurs.
Based on the available data, two models have been prepared which illustrate which parameters have the greatest influence on the habitat quality for fen orchid. The models show that it is extremely important for the occurrence of fen orchid that the habitat has a low nutrient status. An optimal hydrology, a relatively high pH and good light conditions are also important parameters. In addition, a low nitrogen content in mosses (N in leaves) and a high N/P ratio of the mosses increase the probability for the occurrence of fen orchid. The limitation of plant-available phosphorus in the fen orchid habitats is caused by a high calcium content in the groundwater.
The models are used to assess the proportion of the sample plots in alkaline fens in the NOVANA program, which are suitable fen orchid habitats. Based on this, a list of the sites with the largest number of sample plots with a likelihood of fen orchid occurrence of more than 5% has been provided. The list provides a good starting point for a targeted search of the species and a targeted habitat management to promote fen orchid. The report also draws up a table that indicates the correlation between the main parameters that are important for fen orchid and the variables that can be influenced by the management. The connection can be used in the management of Danish alkaline fens in order to improve their suitability as a habitat for fen orchid.

For Helnæs Made and Urup Dam, an analysis has been made of their suitability as a habitat for fen orchid. The analysis was done in each of the sample plots in the NOVANA program and indicates weather the parameters of vegetation height and Ellenberg indicator values for light, humidity, pH and nutrition ratio (Ellenberg nutrition / Ellenberg pH) are optimal or less optimal for the species. Based on this analysis, specific recommendations have been drawn up for the management of Helnæs Made and Urup Dam in order to improve these sites as fen orchid habitats. The recommendations include proposal closing ditches on Helnæs Made and cutting off the impact of surface water in Urup Dam. In relation to LIFE Rare Nature the recommendations in relation to Urup Dam have been implemented.
Appropriate efforts appear in the Natura 2000 plan 2016-2021 Urup Dam, Brabæk Mose, Birkende Mose and Illemose:

1) In their legal administration and management, the authorities must address the measures for the specific Natura 2000 sites to obtain a sufficient protection of the designation basis.

2) The management focuses on obtaining a proper hydrology and management of light-open terrestrial natural habitat types.
3) The management focus on appropriate habitats for specific species.
4) The management focus on obtaining robust natural areas and connectivity by enlarging the light-open natural habitats.
5) The management focus on the realization of concrete hydrology projects mentioned in the Natura 2000 plan and which are financed by RDP and on-going LIFE projects.

5.1.6 Action B.1 – Economic compensation to landowners

The aim of this action is to obtain agreements with the private landowners through economic compensation. Approximately half of the project area is privately owned while the other half is owned by the state. On private areas the project has paid an economic compensation to the landowners to secure project participation, land use restrictions and management opportunities. Although the action was delayed during the project period the necessary agreements were obtained in every relevant site in order to be able to carry out the planned management actions.

The landowner agreements have been entered on permanent or time-limited (subproject 15) manner with compensation. In a few cases land was purchased (subproject 6, 11, 15), and the relevant areas have been registered in the EU land purchase database. Some landowners have entered agreements without compensation while a few landowners accepted the project activities in an oral manner.

The overall end result of the action is shown in the table below. According to the proposal, landowner agreements must be obtained on 383 ha. In total we have entered agreements on app. 439 ha.

Subproject number	Local project name	Primary nature type	Project area hectare	Project owner	Action B1 Agreements achieved	Action B1 Proposal
					Hectare	Hectare
1	Storelung	7110*	54,8	CB: FMK	52,00	48,6
2	Brændegård Sø	7230	23,1	CB: FMK	25,5	23
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	7230	110	CB: FMK	140,7	73,5
4	Svanninge Bakker	7230	10	AB: NST	NA	NA
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	7230	24	AB: NST	NA	NA
6	Fjordmarken	7230	38	AB: NST	5,4	NA
7	Ristinge Mose	7230	6	AB: NST	NA	NA
8	Fakkemose	7230, 7210*	21	AB: NST	10	6
9	Lundemose	7230, 7210*	11	AB: NST	NA	NA
10	Moser ved Gulstav	7210*	50	AB: FVF + NST	NA	NA
11	Urup Dam	7230	75	AB: KK	51,29	3
12	Sadelmagermose	7230	35	AB: KK	0	20
13	Enebærodde	4010	29	AB: NK	28,8	0
14	Lisbjergmose	7230	10	AB: NK	4,8	10
15	Odense Å	7230, 7220*	140	AB: OK	26,81	86
16	Stenholt Mose	7110*	112,9	AB: SK	68	88
17	Piledybet	7230	26	AB: LK	14,9	14,9
18	Gravene	7230, 7220*	14	AB: AK	21,4	10
Total					439	389

A declaration stipulating future land use is part of every single landowner agreement, where compensation has been paid. The declaration contains at least the clause described in the

GA's Action B1. Landowner agreements and registered declarations are in ANNEX 15 together with a list of affected landowners in the most complicated projects.

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Activity performed Action B1
1	Storelung	Landowner agreements on 52,00 ha for restoration purposes. Of this 9,83 ha are agreements without economic compensation and 42,17 ha are with compensation. As part of the compensation we have arranged landswaps (by use of land surveyor GeoTeam) between several properties upon request from the landowners. In this way we have modernized the property structure which will support the future management towards 7110*. Part of the compensation was also to improve the management of areas bordering the raised bog. Thus in a few occasions compensation was obtained in the form of fencing or a small pond for amphibians. In several of the landowner agreements FMK is obliged to protect building, field lanes etc. from the increased water table within the project area. For 3 properties agreements have been entered to be able to install a pumping station for maintain the water level at existing buildings. The landowners have received compensation to accept this burden. 2,68 ha on the eastern fringe are without declaration for nature purposes. However, the landowner has accepted the increasing water table.
2	Brændegård Sø	1 landowner agreement on 25,5 ha. This is 2,5 ha more than foreseen in the application. The deviation is due to uncertainties in the land survey.
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	This FMK site is divided into 3 subsites (northern, central, southern). In the northern and central subsites compensation agreements have been entered for 96,67 ha. As part of these agreements is additional 8,53 ha, which are bank-areas close to the lake and land not in the land register. Compensation are not paid for these areas, but they are part of the managed land. In addition, agreements have been entered on 38,50 ha without compensation and these areas are located at the southern subsite and between the northern and central site. Through modernisation (by use of land surveyor GeoTeam) of the property structure the number of landowners has been reduced from 11 to 5 to support future management. In total 140,70 ha can be managed after entering landowner agreements. The deviation from the original proposal is described in PR#2 and in the accordance with agreed technical changes.
4	Svanninge Bakker	NA – owned by NST
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	NA – owned by NST
6	Fjordmarken	NA – owned by NST. However, as explained in PR#2 and the agreed technical changes 5,4 ha ([redacted]) has been purchased by NST. The deviation from the original proposal is described in PR#2 and in accordance with agreed technical changes.
7	Ristinge Mose	NA – owned by NST
8	Fakkemose	NST has adjusted the boundaries of its property by the exchange of land with a neighbour. In total 10 ha was swapped and is part of the managed area at Fakkemosen. Economic compensation is not part of the swap. A declaration has been registered on the entire project area and on 10 ha east of the project area. The purpose has been to secure supplementary grazing areas in buffer zones and in combination with the natural habitat areas in Fakkemosen.
9	Lundemose	NA – owned by NST
10	Moser ved Gulstav	NA – owned by NST
11	Urup Dam	The demand for compensation in this subproject appeared to be more wide-ranging than foreseen in the LIFE application. The background for this has been explained in earlier progress reports.

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Activity performed Action B1
		1) KK has purchased 11,73 ha. Of this 3 ha is the buffer zone, while 7,01 ha is located in the central part of Urup Dam and 1,72 ha in Brabæk Mose. In addition KK has purchased 3,05 ha (without LIFE funding) to be able to come through with the management actions. 10,01 ha out of the 11,73 ha were purchased as part of a land swap procedure in connection with a wetland restoration project west of Urup Dam. 2) Once and for all compensation on 3,46 ha in Brabæk Mose distributed on 2 properties. 3) Agreements on 21,98 ha without compensation (4 landowners) 4) Oral agreements on 11,07 ha. 5) An agreement with 2 landowners for use of access road ([redacted]) and establishment of a parking lot. In total agreements / land purchase have been entered for 51,29 ha.
12	Sadelmager-mose	A landowner agreement was foreseen in the LIFE application. However, the landowner has accepted the management actions in Sadelmagermosen without entering an agreement. However, acceptance was obtained very late for the ponds. The budget for compensation allocated to subproject 11.
13	Enebærodde	1 landowner agreement on 28,8 ha in 2015. No compensation because the project area is under a conservation declaration and therefore no registered clause.
14	Lisbjergmose	Landowner agreements with compensation has been obtained for 4,4 ha. For additional 5 ha oral agreements with no compensation have been obtained. However due to landowner reluctance these agreements were entered late (end of 2018) enabling project implementation. This subproject was part of the agreed technical changes (2018). However, the agreed technical changes were not fully implemented due to the success with the oral agreement in 2018.
15	Odense Å	Land owner agreements have been entered on 26,81 ha to obtain buffer zones. A part (4,9 ha) has been purchased by OK. The managed area is however much larger (77,65 ha). Accordingly no agreements were necessary on 50,84 ha due to the management rights in the conservation (https://www2.blst.dk/nfr/07954.01.pdf).
16	Stenholt Mose	Agreement obtained 15th May 2016 with the sole landowner at the project site. The agreement covers 68 ha. This is enough to be able to carry out the foreseen construction works.
17	Piledybet	11 landowner agreements with no compensation (either oral or in writing) covering 14,84 ha.
18	Gravene	5 landowner agreements covering 21,4 ha. However, compensation is only paid for areas to be cleared (app. 9 ha). At the small project area (north of Gravene) along Odense Å it was not possible to obtain an agreement due to landowner reluctance. .

Changes to the original project application

In some of the subprojects there is a deviation between the area actually compensated and the foreseen compensation area in the application. The overall reason for this deviation is that the landowners have local demands which mean that it is difficult to stick precisely to the areas foreseen in the LIFE application. In addition, new information (e.g. technical info) often appears during the negotiations and we have to handle this information in the agreements. In addition the deviation should be seen in relation to the agreed technical changes (2018). Finally the extent of the landowner agreements should be seen in relation to our ability to fulfil the proposed management objectives of the project.

5.1.7 Action C.1 – Vegetation clearings

Action C.1 is a concrete conservation action. According to the application it had to be implemented on 169 ha, but the actual clearing is 237 ha. The clearings are followed by other management initiatives in action C2 and C3.

The table below outlines the overall expected and actual results of this action.

Subproject number	Local project name	Primary nature type	Project area hectare	Project owner	Action C1 Achieved	Action C1 Proposal
1	Storelung	7110*	54,8	CB: FMK	14,6	12
2	Brændegård Sø	7230	23,1	CB: FMK	24,2	0
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	7230	110	CB: FMK	18,0	8
4	Svanninge Bakker	7230	10	AB: NST	5,6	5,6
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	7230	24	AB: NST	14,1	18
6	Fjordmarken	7230	38	AB: NST	8,0	2
7	Ristinge Mose	7230	6	AB: NST	6,3	6
8	Fakkemose	7230, 7210*	21	AB: NST	6,1	8
9	Lundemose	7230, 7210*	11	AB: NST	3,5	4
10	Moser ved Gulstav	7210*	50	AB: FVF + NST	1,5	6
11	Urup Dam	7230	75	AB: KK	17	10
12	Sadelmagermose	7230	35	AB: KK	12,5	10
13	Enebærodde	4010	29	AB: NK	34,9	17
14	Lisbjergmose	7230	10	AB: NK	6,4	4
15	Odense Å	7230, 7220*	140	AB: OK	4,9	2
16	Stenholt Mose	7110*	112,9	AB: SK	42	42
17	Piledybet	7230	26	AB: LK	9	4,9
18	Gravene	7230, 7220*	14	AB: AK	9,1	9,7
Total					238	169

The table below outlines the overall expected and actual results of this action.
In ANNEX 16 is a collection of pictures, maps and eventually additional descriptions of the clearing activities for some of the subprojects.

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Activity performed C1
1	Storelung	14,6 ha cleared for regrowning trees on the potential raised bog surface. Clearings performed manually by use of hand-tools or by the use of an ATV with cutter. Clearing performed 1-2 times per year throughout the project period, but with no

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Activity performed C1
		obvious difference in the regrowth. In the future less regrowth expected due to raised water table. A more detailed description in Annex 16.
2	Brændegård Sø	24,2 ha mowed in 2014 to reset (nutrient depletion) the area for development of alkaline fens (7230).
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	18 ha cleared from 2013 until 2018. Cleared areas are primarily forested fens, alkaline fens (7230), Molina meadows (6410) and coniferous plantations. Different clearing methods have been used depending on the specific areas. A more detailed description in Annex 16. The surplus area cleared compared to the application is due to the extended landowner interest at this subsite to participate in the project. This has enabled us to achieve more extended results than originally planned.
4	Svanninge Bakker	Clearings of alkaline fens (7230) on 2,0 ha and springs (7220) on 3,2 ha. 1 ha of springs cleared one additional time. 0,4 ha cleared at ponds. In total 5,6 ha cleared.
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	14,1 ha cleared to develop into alkaline fens (7230). Experiments with burning on a few areas. Pictures in Annex 16.
6	Fjordmarken	App. 2,0 ha of 7230 cleared in 2013 and 2014. Also clearing of 6,0 ha of dry grasslands in connection to the wet natural habitat types. Pictures in Annex 16.
7	Ristinge Mose	App. 6,3 ha cleared to benefit alkaline fens (7230). Pictures in Annex 16.
8	Fakkemose	App. 6,1 ha cleared to benefit alkaline fens (6230) and calcareous fens (7210). Pictures in Annex 16.
9	Lundemose	App. 3,5 ha cleared to benefit alkaline fens (6230) and calcareous fens (7210). Pictures in Annex 16.
10	Moser ved Gulstav	App. 1,5 ha cleared to benefit 7210* and distributed on NST and FVF areas. Pictures in Annex 16. The actual cleared area reduced compared to application. The reason is, that birds designated for SPA (Marsh harrier and Bittern) occur in the fens.
11	Urup Dam	App. 17 ha cleared to benefit alkaline fens (7230). Tall grass vegetation and tress cleared by the use of various methods. Pictures in Annex 16.
12	Sadelmager-mose	10 ha of primarily reeds burned several times. Additional 2,5 ha cleared for trees and shrub to benefit alkaline fens (7230).
13	Enebærodde	16,7 ha of dead forest and soft wood cleared: 9 ha by the landowner under the RDP (not charged to the project), and 7,7 ha by NK as part of LIFE. In addition, 18,2 ha cleared with braken ferns. Instead of wetter conditions (cf. action C2) clearings of ferns is considered an appropriate management method to support wet heath (4010).
14	Lisbjergmose	6,3 ha cleared. 3,4 was cleared in 2016 and 3 ha in 2018 (upon the oral agreement). Clearings to support alkaline fens (7230).
15	Odense Å	Clearance or thinning of trees on 4,9 ha. This is primary on the buffer zones outside N-2000 and was an extra service towards the landowners to prepare areas for grazing.
16	Stenholt Mose	Several clearings from 2012 until 2018 on 42 ha. The clearing demand has decreased during the project period and in 2017 and 2018 probably due to the elevated water table.
17	Piledybet	Clearance of 5 ha with trees and 4 ha with reed to benefit alkaline fens (7230). Some areas cleared several times.
18	Gravene	9,1 ha cleared to benefit alkaline fens (7230). Additional clearing on 1 ha.

The extension of clearings is above the application's aim. This is especially due to extended clearings in subproject 3, where the project area has been increased (cf. in accordance with agreed technical changes). In other subprojects, clearings have been introduced on extra areas (e.g. subproject 2 and 17) upon a concrete assessment to be able to fulfil the project's objectives towards the natural habitat types in the best possible way. In subproject 13, clearings have been a more important management action than wetter conditions (cf. action C2).

5.1.8 Action C.2 – hydrological improvements

According to the application, the aim is the improve the hydrology on 223 ha in 12 subprojects. In addition, the action also includes establishment or restoration of ponds for amphibians.

The table below outlines the overall expected and actual results of the hydrological improvements of this action.

Subproject number	Local project name	Primary nature type	Project area hectare	Project owner	Action C2 Achieved	Action C2 Proposal
					Hectare	Hectare
1	Storelung	7110*	54,8	CB: FMK	52,0	54,8
2	Brændegård Sø	7230	23,1	CB: FMK	25,5	23,1
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	7230	110	CB: FMK	19,0	8
4	Svanninge Bakker	7230	10	AB: NST	4,4	4
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	7230	24	AB: NST	13,4	4
6	Fjordmarken	7230	38	AB: NST	NA	0
7	Ristinge Mose	7230	6	AB: NST	NA	0
8	Fakkemose	7230, 7210*	21	AB: NST	0	17
9	Lundemose	7230, 7210*	11	AB: NST	NA	0
10	Moser ved Gulstav	7210*	50	AB: FVF + NST	0,6	2,5
11	Urup Dam	7230	75	AB: KK	NA	0
12	Sadelmagermose	7230	35	AB: KK	NA	0
13	Enebærodde	4010	29	AB: NK	0	20
14	Lisbjergmose	7230	10	AB: NK	NA	0
15	Odense Å	7230, 7220*	140	AB: OK	6,1	10
16	Stenholt Mose	7110*	112,9	AB: SK	63,7	60
17	Piledybet	7230	26	AB: LK	16	16
18	Gravene	7230, 7220*	14	AB: AK	7	7
Sum					208	226,4

In total this action also includes establishment of 15 new ponds and clean-up of 10 existing ponds to benefit amphibians.

In ANNEX 17 is a collection of pictures, maps and eventually additional descriptions of the hydrological activities for some of the subprojects. Further, most of the hydrological activities are described in the technical feasibility studies and the detailed planning documents (cf. action A1). Based on these studies small deviations between the actual concrete conservation work and that foreseen in the application must be expected.

The table below outlines the overall expected and actual results of this action:

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Activity performed C2
1	Storelung	Hydrological improvements have raised water table on 52,0 ha to benefit raised bog (7110). App. 3 ha south of the projects area have been safeguarded from raised water table by installing a pump and a membrane. The hydrological improvements consist of: a) adjustments of the brook (Raunsbækken) to hold an increased water table (by introducing an obstacle) but with no surface water input to the raised bog surface. A large part of the brook re-profiled and relocated, b) mitigation work: pumping station, membrane, elevation of access roads, elevation of bridle path, adjustments of drain tubes, access points. Soil for improving the barrier between the brook and the raised bog area was obtained by establishing a couple of ponds along the eastern and western fringe of the project area (cf. detailed planning in Action A1). Another couple of ponds was established to comply with landowner wishes in the landowner negotiation process. In total 6 ponds were established, and 2 ponds was renovated. In addition the ponds will benefit *R. arvalis* and *R. dalmatina*.
2	Brændegård Sø	Hydrological improvements have raised the ground water table on 25,5 ha to benefit development of alkaline fens (7230) by: a) establishing an obstacle in the brook Silke Å, b) closing a pumping station, c) remodelling an access trail with a bridge, d) culvert a small brook to prevent eutrophication of project area by nutrient rich surface water.
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	A brook (500 m) and other small brooks restored to achieve an appropriate water level on app. 19 ha. This benefits management by grazing to promote development of alkaline fens (7230). By simple means we have achieved improved hydrology on additional 11 ha compared to the application. Establishment of 5 ponds (2018) which are 3 extra ponds compared to the application. This benefits *T. cristatus* and *R. dalmatina*
4	Svanninge Bakker	Hydrological improvements on 4,4 ha by cutting drains and redirecting the water flow to promote alkaline fens (7230). 1 pond established, and 4 ponds renovated to benefit *R. arvalis*, *T. cristatus*, and *R. dalmatina*.
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	A small brook (Rislebæk) restored to improve the hydrology and to allow better management by grazing. The area (13,4 ha) affected by improved hydrology is larger (9,4 ha) than foreseen in the application. 3 ponds established, and 1 pond renovated (2 less than in the application). The hydrological improvements were carried out in co-operation with a project under the Water Framework Directive to remove obstacles in Rislebæk for migrating animals. Thus, this is a good example of EU-added value between implementation of conservation work according to the Habitats Directive and the Water Framework Directive.
6	Fjordmarken	NA
7	Ristinge Mose	NA
8*	Fakkemose	Based on a technical assessment it is impossible to adjust the hydrology due to the risk of reducing the drainage of neighbouring areas. Therefore, hydrological improvements have not been carried out at this site besides establishment of 2 ponds to benefit *T. cristatus* and *R. arvalis*. These ponds substitute the planned new ponds at subproject 10. Instead of hydrological improvements an extended effort for obtaining a better grazing regime was implemented.
9	Lundemose	No activity planned.
10	Moser ved Gulstav	A pump has been renovated to secure a more stable water table to benefit alkaline fens (7230). The drainage systems in the site are old and lose their function by time and during the project period the free water table has increased with 0,6 ha in the calcareous fen (7210). Due to infrastructure and buildings any further increase in the water level is impossible. Thus, this action has resulted in 1,9 ha less with

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Activity performed C2
		improved hydrology as compared to the application. 3 ponds renovated as planned to benefit *R. arvalis*, *T. cristatus*, and *R. dalmatina*.
11	Urup Dam	NA
12	Sadelmager-mose	5 ponds established in 2018 as planned to benefit *B. calamita*.
13	Enebærodde	Based on the technical feasibility studies (cf. Action A1) the water table should not be raised as it will harm existing wet heath (4010). Therefore, hydrological management has not taken place.
14	Lisbjergmose	NA
15	Odense Å	The hydrology has been improved on 6,1 ha on petrifying springs (7220). The methods used are blocking of ditches, local ground modulation, and use of lime enriched gravel to increase the pH. The hydrology has been improved on 3,9 ha less than foreseen in the application. The technical feasibility studies however could not argue for additional hydrological management to reach 10 ha.
16	Stenholt Mose	The hydrology improved on 63,7 ha to benefit raised bog (7110*) on at least 60 ha as planned. The concrete conservation action is: a) membrane on 2100 m, b) blocking of 2 ditches, c) improve of a dike, d) 2 outlets (wells). The water table was increased in 2 steps during 2016 – 2018.
17	Piledybet	The hydrology has been improved as planned by elevating the run-off level in the ditch draining the project area. This will improve the hydrology during the summer by increasing the water table to benefit alkaline fens (7230).
18	Gravene	The hydrology has been improved on 7 ha as planned by restoring ditches to allow a water table favourable for grazing and management of alkaline fens (7230) and petrifying springs (7220). 2 ponds established as planned to benefit *R. arvalis*.

*: In the application (action C2) this project has been named subproject 7 which is incorrect. Correct number is "8".

In total the hydrology has been improved on 208 ha which is 18 ha less than predicted in the application. The primary reason is that in subproject 8 the hydrology cannot be improved without disturbing the drainage of neighbouring areas, which is illegal. In subproject 13 hydrological management cannot be recommended in relation to the existing natural habitat type of wet heath (4010). In these subprojects the management of the natural habitat types therefore must take place solely by clearings (action C1) and/or grazing (action C3).

The project has resulted in 21 new ponds and 9 renovated ponds for amphibians. Compared to the application's objective this is a better result.

5.1.9 Action C.3 – Grazing facilities

According to the application grazing facilities will be established on 340 ha in 15 subprojects. Overall, the action took place from 2014 until 2018. The action is partly a follow-up action with respect to action C1 to maintain the cleared areas light-open.

In total grazing facilities were established on 454 ha as explained below. In ANNEX 18 is a collection of pictures and maps to demonstrate the grazing facilities.

Subproject number	Local project name	Primary nature type	Project area hectare	Project owner	Action C3 Achieved	Action C3 Proposal
					Hectare	Hectare
1	Storelung	7110*	54,8	CB: FMK	17,1	0
2	Brændegård Sø	7230	23,1	CB: FMK	24,6	23
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	7230	110	CB: FMK	144	73
4	Svanninge Bakker	7230	10	AB: NST	10	10
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	7230	24	AB: NST	32	22
6	Fjordmarken	7230	38	AB: NST	35,8	38
7	Ristinge Mose	7230	6	AB: NST	6,6	6
8	Fakkemose	7230, 7210*	21	AB: NST	23	14
9	Lundemose	7230, 7210*	11	AB: NST	6,2	8
10	Moser ved Gulstav	7210*	50	AB: FVF + NST	7,7	9
11	Urup Dam	7230	75	AB: KK	13,5	13
12	Sadelmagermose	7230	35	AB: KK	33,5	10
13	Enebærodde	4010	29	AB: NK	0	0
14	Lisbjergmose	7230	10	AB: NK	9,4	10
15	Odense Å	7230, 7220*	140	AB: OK	77,6	80
16	Stenholt Mose	7110*	112,9	AB: SK	NA	0
17	Piledybet	7230	26	AB: LK	9,6	11
18	Gravene	7230, 7220*	14	AB: AK	17,6	13
Sum					454	340

The details of this action are as follows:

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Activity performed C3
1	Storelung	No activity planned. In a few cases grazing facilities was included in the landowner agreements and because it was necessary to relocate fences during the construction works. The grazed areas surround the raised bog and make an important bufferzone between the raised bog and the agricultural fields. Most of the fenced areas are within the project area according to the LIFE application. The grazing facilities also include 2 gates.

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Activity performed C3
2	Brændegård Sø	Entire project area fenced (24,6 ha – 2200 m) as planned including one simple cattle bridge for crossing Silke Å and a power supply for the fence. No catch fold necessary
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	According to the agreed technical changes.Action C3 is more extensive at this site as compared to the application. Within the 3 FMK subsites 144 ha have been fenced including fences for folds. 105,2 ha are fenced with LIFE funding and 38,5 ha fenced using RDP funds or municipality funds. In total 18000 m of fence (6000 m in application). Drinking facilities (one pond and one stationary drinking place), 1 cattle shelter, 1 corral, 2 power points (including power supply), and 2 feed racks. The facilities have been installed in co-operation with the farmers to be able to fulfill the needs for a successful management by grazing. This should also be seen in the light of the modernization of the property structure (cf. Action B1).
4	Svanninge Bakker	5,5 ha fenced (1300 m of fence) to establish new grazing folds. In addition, 3200 m of fence to renovate existing folds. In total grazing improved on 10 ha. Also 2 passages and 2 drinking facilities to comply with the farmer's requirements, although it is beyond the application.
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	New 10 ha in grazing with new fences and grazing improved om 22 ha. In app. 4500 m of fence. App. 790 m of old fences removed to improve folds. In addition, 4 gates and 4 cattle passages at Rislebæk. This is to comply with the farmer's requirements, although it is beyond the application.
6	Fjordmarken	Grazing of 35,8 ha using 4500 m of fence. Includes 2 gates and drinking facility. The fenced area includes the area which was introduced in accordance with agreed technical changes.
7	Ristinge Mose	6,6 ha fenced (1420 m) including 2 gates.
8*	Fakkemose	Grazing is now possible on 23 ha (3400 m). Fencing cost covered by RDP. A cattle bridge and drinking facilities established within this project. The fencing includes the swapped area to promote the grazing of the wet areas of the fen.
9	Lundemose	6,2 ha in grazing by using 2600 m of fence and 1 gate. 560 m of old fence removed. In addition, 1 drinking facility to comply with the farmer's requirements, although it is beyond the application.
10	Moser ved Gulstav	Grazing improved on 7,7 ha using 980 m of fence to improve folds. 600 m of old fences removed. Also 4 gates.
11	Urup Dam	Grazing facilities established for 13.5 ha with app. 7000 m of fence. In addition, purchase of 13 cattle (two animal loan agreements in annex 18), 1 cattle truck (agreement in annex 18), 4 corrals, 1 mobile corral, 5 drinking supplies, and 4 cattle shelters. The grazing facilities should be seen considering the agreed technical changes and to comply with the farmer's requirements.
12	Sadelmager-mose	Grazing facilities installed on 33,5 ha with app. 9400 m of fence (including folds). In addition, purchase of 5 cattle (animal loan agreement in annex 18. 3 animals died during the project period), 2 cattle shelters, 2 drinking supplies. Compared to the application several more hectares have been fenced in order to manage the alkaline fens (7230).
13	Enebærodde	No activity planned.
14	Lisbjergmose	9,3 ha fenced (1668 m) including 3 passages. The planned drinking facility and the catch fold were not necessary to install.
15	Odense Å	In total 77,6 ha were fenced on 160000 m. In addition, 1drinking supply, 6 power supplies, 1 cattle passage, and 6 gates. As a supplementary action 1 cattle truck and one portable corral was purchased and it is administered by landowners.
16	Stenholt Mose	No activity planned.
17	Piledybet	Fencing (1900 m and app. 9,6 ha) and 8 gates as planned in the application to benefit alkaline fens (7230) and coastal fixed dunes (2130). This is a little bit less than in the application.
18	Gravene	17,6 ha fenced to improve alkaline fens (7230) and petrifying springs (7220) equivalent to app. 5000 m of fence. In addition, 1 gate as planned.

The extension of the grazing facilities is above the application's aim and the grazing facilities on the 452 ha include:

- 85368 m of fence (60350 in application),
- 2 cattle trucks (2 according to correspondence with the Commission 26072016, 11012018),
- 10 cattle passages at small ditches and brooks (3 in application),
- 28 gates (22 in application)
- 16 drinking supplies (8 in application),
- 7 corrals (10 in application),
- 8 power supplies (3 in application)

Especially in subproject 3 and 5 larger areas have been managed by grazing as compared to the application and should be seen in the light of the agreed technical changes. Thus, at lake Arreskov Sø the project has been able to take care of the potential for managing much larger areas than foreseen in the application which in turn will benefit alkaline fens (7230) to a larger extent than originally expected. Instead of 3-4 separate grazing folds it is now possible to operate grazing in one continuous area of 140 ha.
In subproject 1 grazing facilities was not part of the application. However, to be able to meet the landowner demands for entering the project agreements, FMK also offered grazing solutions at this site.

5.1.10 Action C.4 – Recreational facilities

In this action recreational facilities consist of four individual simple trails according to the application. During the project several adjustments have been made to this action as described in communication with the Commission. The main results are as follows (pictures in ANNEX 19, where the logos on the installations can be seen):

1. In subproject 1 a trail of 986 m (partly board-walk) enters the project area from the south and runs into the central part of the raised bog. In an After-LIFE perspective FMK will erect information signs along the trail.

2. In subproject 11 a simple trail of 2455 m enters the project from a parking lot and runs circular around the central part of the project site. To be able to pass the wettest part of the alkaline fen a board walk was established (57 m). Table-bench sets placed at 2 locations for the public. Finally, a small parking lot with a short access road was established in the eastern part of the project area.

3. The trail in subproject 12 was not established. Instead a longer trail was established in subproject 11 (cf. Commission letter 23012017).

4. In subproject 15 a simple trail of 1126 m enters the central part of the project area at Kratholm. As part of this an information shelter was erected close to the school at Kratholm and in addition table-bench sets were placed at two locations. At one location a small bridge was established to cross a small brook.

In total this action resulted in 4567 m of simple trails, 4 table-bench sets, 2 parking lots, 1 information shelter and 2 short board-walks.

5.1.11 Action C.5 – Supervision

In some subprojects the beneficiaries controlled the constructors while in other subprojects, the beneficiaries used external assistance for the control together with own staff. External consultants were used to control and supervise the construction works in subproject 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 (bird observation tower), and 16.

5.1.12 Action D.1 – Impact monitoring

The aim of this action is to describe how the nature assets and the conservation status of the natural habitat types change due to the implementation of the management actions. This requires *ex ante ("pre)* and *ex post ("now")* biological monitoring which was carried out in action F3 and action A1. To some extent, we also have used existing data from the national survey program (NOVANA).

In this action Ellenberg values are used to evaluate the effect of the management actions except for subproject 16 (see below). Thus, in subproject 16 the evaluation is based on a different survey method than in the other projects and therefore the data are not comparable. In subproject 2, where former agricultural soils have been extensified for developing alkaline fens (7230), the botanical development is expected to be limited within the life-time of the project.

The overall report is in ANNEX 20. The *ex ante* reports are in ANNEX 10 (Action A1) and the ex pots reports in ANNEX 21a (action F3).

For several reasons, it has been chosen to pool data in the comparison of Ellenberg values. The primary reason is that the larger the data set, the less importance is "noise", i.e. data differing for one reason or another.

Since the management actions were implemented during a long time-span (1-5 years) among the various subprojects, the Ellenberg comparison will not necessarily show anything, since changes in the vegetation composition usually take longer. Therefore, as far as possible, data is merged, to be able to see trends in the development of the vegetation.

The use of the Ellenberg values is a relatively robust expression of the vegetation, as all species are included with a weighting of the five parameters. To give a real expression of the natural conditions of the sites also remnants of possible forest floor flora (where clearing has taken place), or rudal species that have established themselves after a clearing, are also included in the calculations on an equal basis with species typical of the natural habitat types.

Wet heath (4010)
Based on 3 analysis points from Enebær Odde. Several parameters have virtually identical "pre" and "now" data. There has been a slight increase in Ellenberg light (L) and a corresponding decline in Ellenberg nitrogen (N).

The Ellenberg salinity (S) is relatively high and reveals the coastal location of this site.

Conservation status
Although wood plants have been cleared on larger areas to promote wet heath (4010), the potential for development of additional areas seems to be rather limited. Similarly, changing the hydrological conditions on the heathland is not considered to be favorable for existing areas of wet heath (4010) or to increase the area of the natural habitat type.

On the other hand, it is certain that extensive grazing and the control of braken ferns as well as clearing of wood plants will in the long term ensure both the conservation status and promote the relatively small areas of the natural habitat type of Enebærodde.

Active raised bog (7110) and degraded raised bog (7120)
Two analysis points are included in the comparison from Storelung. Even though very few vascular plants are included in the vegetation and that the analyzed points were also light-open, when "pre" data were collected, relatively large changes are seen in the Ellenberg light and Ellenberg moisture. Likewise, a slight decrease in Ellenberg nitrogen (N) is seen. These changes are positive trends for the development of the site in a more favorable direction.

Incidentally, the markedly low values for the Ellenberg pH (R) and Ellenberg nitrogen must be noted, which is consistent with the fact that this is an ombrogen natural habitat type.

At Stenholt Mose (subproject 16) another method (line inspection) was used to do the biological evaluation of the management actions. The Ellenberg values cannot be calculated based on these data. The general picture is however, that the birch cover has declined and that the Sphagnum cover has increased indicating a positive development of the raised bog (7110).

Conservation status
In both bogs, an improvement in the conservation status of the natural habitat types active raised bog (7110) and degrade raised bog (7120) is immediately seen.

In Storelung (subproject 1), the bog emerges from a survey in 2018 in more favorable natural conditions, which is supported by trends in the development of the Ellenberg values. The peat mosses were in good growth, there was a lot of water in the bog (despite an extreme dry summer), and the growth of reed seems to be reduced compared to earlier.

In all transects in Stenholt Mose (subproject 16), there is an increase in the coverage of peat mosses. For several transects, this was significant. High coverage of peat mosses indicates good natural conditions.

In both raised bogs, the life project has created the conditions for improving the conservation status of the habitat natural type active raised bog (7110) and degraded raised bog (7120). Improving the conservation status is primarily linked to the improved hydrological conditions. Clearing of wood plants and continuous care of regrowth also contributes to improving the conditions for achieving a favorable conservation status of the habitats.

Calcareous Fen (7210)
For this habitat, most of the data originates from Gulstav Mose (7 test fields – subproject 10) as well as a few test fields from Piledybet, Fakkemosen and Lundemose (subproject 17, 8, 9).

The Ellenberg comparison shows a marked increase of more than one unit for Ellenberg humidity. This is probably an effect of the hydrological measures that have been taken in Gulstav Mose for the benefit of the habitat natural type. Minor increases are seen in the other parameters. Higher Ellenberg pH and Ellenberg N are not positive for the habitat natural type, but it requires a longer time series to determine if it is a stable trend.

Both sites have a coastal location, which is reflected in a relatively high Ellenberg salinity.

Conservation status

For this habitat natural type, the most important prerequisite for favorable conservation status is that there is plenty of water present. It can be acidic or basic, but typically poor in nutrients. *Cladium mariscus* is often seen in competition with other reeds that thrive under more nutritious conditions. The natural habitat type is - unlike many other light-open habitats - not dependent on grazing and can withstand a considerable degree of overgrowth with wood plants, which, however, can eventually shade the species.

In three of four project sites, the water level has been raised before or during the life project, which is considered to be very favorable for the habitat natural type calcareous fen (7210). The improvement of the conservation status consists partly of an increased area with the habitat natural type and an improvement of the state of existing mapped distributions.

Petrifying springs (7220)

Most data (12 analysis points) originate from Odense Å (subproject 15), while less data is from Gravene (subproject 18) and Svanninge Bakker (subproject 4). Although the analysis points along Odense Å are from the same overall location, great variation is seen between the sample fields on the different parameters. The greatest variation between the analysis points is seen for light, humidity and nitrogen. The primary action along Odense Å has been the grazing of areas that were already more or less open to light and hydrological interventions. The Ellenberg comparison shows an increase for all parameters for 2018 data compared to pre-data. Thus, there is a tendency for the areas with springs to become more light-open and humid, and contain species that thrive at higher pH and amounts of available N.

Conservation status

Characteristic of the petrifying springs (7220) is the leaching of groundwater. It can be with different pH and content of minerals, but it is common that the upwelling water gather to small stream (springs). Typically, the natural habitat type is seen at the foot of hills and slopes, but it can also occur elsewhere in the landscape. It can be light-open or wooded; the latter typically in the form of the natural habitat type alluvial forests (91E0).

Due to the wet character of the natural habitat type it is often the first areas to become wooded after grazing has ceased, although the hydrological conditions will be intact.

Common to the life actions at the petrifying springs (7220) is that light-open conditions are restored by clearing and / or by grazing. The hydrology is generally considered to be intact and good, but the management by grazing has generally been too extensive or lacking. However, the implemented actions have already resulted in improvements of the conservation status during due to expanded and more intensive grazing, lower vegetation cover, more light-open conditions, greater coverage of mosses, and visibly leaching water.

Alkaline fens (7230)

For the comparison of alkaline fens, data from 50 analysis points are sampled from 8 sites, where Urup Dam (subproject 11) and Arreskov Sø (subproject 3 and 5) with respectively 14 and 15 points weigh relatively much. At these two subprojects, clearings have been made at many locations and forested or scrubbed locations have become light-open and grazed. The same is true of the Gravene (subproject 18). Other subprojects are predominantly included with locations where garzing has been re-introduced, eventually following burning.

For the alkaline fens there is a great variation between the individual analysis points for the Ellenberg values. Noteworthy is the large variation in Ellenberg N at subproject 3 and 5, which can be attributed to the difference in lime impact and thickness of the peat layer thickness. Both parameters vary greatly around Arreskov Lake.

By comparing the "pre" and "now" data for the average Ellenberg values, roughly the same image is seen as for petrifying springs (7220): an increase for all parameters of 2018 data compared to pre-data.

Thus, there is also a tendency for the alkaline fens to have become more light-open and humid and contain species that thrive at higher pH and higher amounts of available N. Increased availability of N is expected in a period after clearings due to decomposition of dead roots.

Conservation status

The prerequisites for favorable conservation status in alkaline fens (7230) are in many ways like the conditions for a favorable conservation status of petrifying springs (7220) by having an ample supply of nutrient-poor, alkaline groundwater and light-open conditions.

The actions are highly believed to contribute to preserving and improving the conservation status of existing alkaline fens (7230) by the improved hydrology and improved grazing. Clearing of overgrown alkaline fens (7230) and with subsequent grazing creates the basis for increasing the area of the natural habitat type, as well as addressing fragmentation.

Improving the conditions of existing alkaline fens (7230) and expanding the potential area for this natural habitat type contributes greatly to a more favorable conservation status.

5.1.13 Action D.2 – Socio-economic monitoring

The description of the socio-economic impact of the project will be based on a number of investigations in some of the subprojects. Some of the investigations require on-going measurement throughout the project period. Reporting of the socio-economic monitoring is due in 2018. As explained below we will present a separate ES report.

In this project we use the following Socio-Economic (ES) indicators:

1. Real estate prices
2. Number of visitors
3. Acceptance and understanding from locals regarding the added value of the project areas
4. Demand for experience in relation to nature in the project areas
5. Publicity of the projects
6. Clearing and cost effectiveness

According to the e-mail correspondence between FMK, the monitor and the Commission in May 2017we argued that it is difficult to analyse data collected from these indicators. Instead it was agreed (e-mail 2nd May 2017) to enter an agreement with an external consultant to analyse the ES-data. Following this decision NST entered an agreement with the consultant Ramboll who has a special ES group. As part of the agreement Ramboll holds 33 % of the costs as Ramboll consider this as a kind of a development project.

The ES report is in ANNEX 21. Overall the following ecosystem services have been analysed:

1. Crop production – loss of farmland
2. Livestock production – grazing cattle
3. Wild animals – hunting
4. Climate regulation – CO2 emission / C sequestration
5. Recreative / physical use of nature areas – visitor counts
6. Education – use of areas by schools
7. Existential value of natural heritage – preference study

A summary of the ES findings is in chapter 5 of the report.

The original ES indicator #3 concerning local understanding of the project was illuminated using questionnaires at several occasions – e.g. at public meeting and by posting the questionnaires at the local tourist offices. Examples of the questionnaires are in ANNEX 21 and the resultant replies are part of the ES report. In general the questionnaires at the local tourist office had little or no response while some answers were collected at the public meetings.

The original ES indicator #5 concerns press coverage (cf. the website: https://life70blog.wordpress.com/om-life70/mediedaekning/).

The original ES indicator #6 (of the GA) concerns cost effective clearings and only apply to subproject 1 in Storelung. Various strategies have been attempted for the clearing of birch regrowth. Thus the clearings have been made once or twice a year and at different times. Different methods have also been used for the cutting *per se* (depth beneath the peat surface with the use of blade). The challenge seems to be that cut birch shoot several new branches even when cut to depth (pictures in ANNEX 21).

The pilot cutting project don't show any unambiguous results related to the clearing frequency, clearing time, and methodology and it is estimated that external factors such as seasonal specific precipitation (water level) and amount of N deposition are the factors that have the greatest influence on the regrowth in Storelung. In contrast Stenholt Mose (subproject 16) has shown clear results that could be related to mowing time, number of mowings and mowing methodology. This is probably due to the fact that Stenholt Mose has a significantly better hydrology which mitigates the regrowth.

Following seasons with heavy precipitation also the regrowth in Storelung seems to be reduced and therefore it is expected that the increased water level in Storelung will have a positive influence on mitigating the regrowth. Based on the hydrological management actions we expect to see the full effect of the raised water level in 2019.

5.1.17 Action F.3 – Monitoring

The monitoring was performed at two levels.

Monitoring level 1 was on-going trough out the project period and is based on documentation such as photos, air photos, maps, and deliverables. These data has been collected during the entire project and are presented in the annexes (see section 7) for each of the subprojects and for the various actions.

Monitoring level 2 is biological monitoring with regard to vegetation and amphibians. The second level is connected to the activities in Action A1 and D1 as mentioned above.

The baseline biological monitoring was performed primarily in 2013. In each subproject the baseline monitoring used uses existing data from the national monitoring program (NOVANA) or additional monitoring was performed (as part of Action A1). With regard to the vegetation the aim was to collect data to be able to do the Ellenberg analysis as reported in Action D1. The ex post monitoring reports are available in ANNEX 21a.

I 7 subprojects (3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 18) ponds were established or renovated as planned to benefit amphibians. In addition supplementary ponds were established in subproject 1. The ponds in subproject 3, 8, 10, and 12 were established in the autumn 2018 and therefore *ex post* monitoring of amphibians was meaningless to carry out within the project period and immediately after the construction works. The *ex post* monitoring of ponds in the remaining subprojects (1, 4, 5, 18) are reported in the table below.

Sub-project number	**Subproject name**	**Action F.3 Achieved**
1	Storelung	Monitoring level 2: vegetation *ex ante* (in combination with Action A1) and *ex post*. In the new ponds
2	Brændegård Sø	Monitoring level 2: No *ex ante* vegetation monitoring because project site rotated areas. Ex post vegetation monitoring as part of the management plan in Action A4.
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	Monitoring level 2: vegetation *ex ante* (in combination with Action A1) and amphibians. *Ex post* vegetation monitoring. Amphibians not monitored due to the late construction of ponds.
4	Svanninge Bakker	Monitoring level 2: *ex ante* vegetation based on NOVANA. *Ex post* vegetation monitoring. *Ex ante* and *ex post* amphibian monitoring. *T. cristatus* is assessed to benefit from the 5 ponds being part of this LIFE while *R. dalmatina* will benefit from 4 ponds. However, the larvae stages were not detected in the ponds during the *ex post* monitoring in 2018 (probably due to drought). *R. arvalis* not recognized in the ponds.
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	Monitoring level 2: *ex ante* vegetation based on NOVANA. *Ex post* vegetation monitoring. *Ex ante* and *ex post* amphibian monitoring. *T. cristatus* is assessed to benefit from 3 out of 5 ponds being part of this LIFE while *R. dalmatina* will benefit from 5 ponds. However, the larvae stages were not detected in the ponds during the *ex post* monitoring in 2018 (probably due to drought).
6	Fjordmarken	Monitoring level 2: *ex ante* vegetation based on NOVANA data. *Ex post* vegetation monitoring.
7	Ristinge Mose	Monitoring level 2: *ex ante* vegetation based on NOVANA data. *Ex post* vegetation monitoring.
8	Fakkemose	Monitoring level 2: *ex ante* vegetation based on NOVANA data. *Ex post* vegetation monitoring. Amphibians not monitored *ex post* because of the newly constructed ponds.

9	Lundemose	Monitoring level 2: *ex ante* vegetation based on NOVANA data. *Ex post* vegetation monitoring.
10	Moser ved Gulstav	Monitoring level 2: *ex ante* vegetation based on NOVANA data. *Ex post* vegetation monitoring. Amphibians not monitored *ex post* because of the very late clean- up of the ponds.
11	Urup Dam	Monitoring level 2: vegetation *ex ante* (in combination with Action A1) and *ex post*.
12	Sadelmager-mose	Monitoring level 2: vegetation *ex ante* (in combination with Action A1) and *ex post*. Amphibians *ex ante* monitored in October 2013 but no *ex post* monitoring due to the late construction of the ponds.
13	Enebærodde	Monitoring level 2: vegetation *ex ante* (in combination with Action A1) and *ex post*.
14	Lisbjergmose	Monitoring level 2: vegetation *ex ante* (in combination with Action A1) and *ex post*.
15	Odense Å	Monitoring level 2: vegetation *ex ante* (in combination with Action A1) and *ex post*.
16	Stenholt Mose	Monitoring level 2: vegetation *ex ante* (in combination with Action A1) and *ex post*. The monitoring method (line inspection) used in this project is different from the one used in the other subprojects.
17	Piledybet	Monitoring level 2: vegetation *ex ante* (in combination with Action A1) and *ex post*.
18	Gravene	Monitoring level 2: vegetation *ex ante* (in combination with Action A1) and *ex post*. *R. arvalis* will benefit from new ponds together with other amphibians.

5.1.18 Action F.4 – Networking

Networking has been performed at three levels during the entire project period:

1) Knowledge exchange with other Danish LIFE projects working with raised bogs. We visited LIFE10/NAT/DK/000102 (Lille Vildmose) on 3rd April 2014 together with other (and coming) Danish raised bog projects. The 3rd December 2014 Silkeborg Municipality attended the demonstration of clearing methods in Sølsted Mose (LIFE Smooth).

2) Participation by the PM in the yearly LIFE platform meetings between Swedish, Finish and Danish projects. In 2013, the PM participated in the meeting in Sweden 24th – 26th September and in 2014 in the meeting in Finland 11th-13th June. In the Finnish meeting, a number of the project AB's also participated in order to become more familiar with the LIFE programme and its administrative procedures. The PM and one more person from FMK participated in the platform meeting in Denmark on 15th to 17th September 2015. The PM and Kasper Nowach (FMK) attended the platform meeting in Örebro, Sweden in April 2017. In 2016 no platform meeting was arranged, and the PM did not attend the 2018 meeting. However, the meeting was attended by Lars Sønderby (OK) and Martin Søholm (KK).

3) In 2013 OK and KK participated in a Platform meeting in France focusing on the use of RDP for management of natural habitat types in N-2000 areas.

4) In 2013 two persons from FMK participated in networking with LIFE07 NAT/UK/948 on the management of alkaline fens.

5) The exchange of knowledge with the Swedish "LIFE to ad(d)mire (LIFE08 NAT/S/000268)" was reported in MtR and the report is available in ANNEX 23. The follow up action under the Nordic Council reported in 2016 and the report is available in ANNEX 22.
   In addition, the LIFE project was presented on a national conference in 2016 about cooperation between municipalities in connection to common tasks such as N-2000 management.
   Furthermore, [redacted] participated in an excursion about management of grasslands (habitat directive annex 1 nature types) in Rumania. The excursion was very valuable in relation to action A4 about sustainable management of extensive grasslands. The excursion was organized by the local agricultural board (Centrovice) on Fyn and the excursion report is available in ANNEX 23.

6) In 2018 KK and FMK participated in a follow-up excursion to Norway in relation to the Nordic Council project (cf. excursion material in ANNEX 23a).

5.1.18 Action F.5 – After LIFE conservation plan

The After-LIFE conservation plan is attached in ANNEX 24 in a Danish and English version. The After-LIFE plan is based on the management plans (cf. Action A4).

5.2 Dissemination actions

5.2.1 Action E.1 – Website

During 2017 we reorganized our website into a new format and on another platform. The website can easily be updated by each partner.

The website address is: https://life70blog.wordpress.com/.

The previous website had 20084 visitors from 2012 until 2017. On the revised website the number of visitors so far is 9088. The website will be active in 5 years after project termination and the deliverables from the project will be available on the website together with the technical final report.

5.2.2 Action E.2 – Layman's report

The Layman's report in English and Danish is attached in ANNEX 25. Please notice, that we have used the acronym "LIFE70" instead of "LIFE Rare Nature".

5.2.3 Action E.3 – Dissemination (Info-signs, leaflets)

Overall, this dissemination activity concerns information signs in all of the subprojects (except subproject 8), leaflets in 4 subprojects, and a bird observation tower in subproject 5 and 10 (according to agreed technical changes), and an info-shelter at subproject 15 (correspondence with the Commission (13th October 2015)).

During the construction works temporary and simple info-signs were erected in the project areas.

The corresponding deliverables are attached in ANNEX 26 and the achieved results are summarized below:

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Action E.3 Achieved
1	Storelung	1 permanent info-sign and a leaflet. In application 2 info-signs but since there is only one public access point only 1 info-sign is needed.
2	Brændegård Sø	1 permanent info-sign.
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	1 permanent info-sign and a leaflet.
4	Svanninge Bakker	1 permanent info-sign.
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	1 permanent info-sign (erected at 3 locations), a bird observation tower and an access trail (177 m).
6	Fjordmarken	1 permanent info-sign.
7	Ristinge Mose	1 permanent info-sign.
8	Fakkemose	1 permanent info-sign located at the nearby Langelandsfortet.
9	Lundemose	1 permanent info-sign.
10	Moser ved Gulstav	2 permanent info-sign. In addition, 1 info-sign outside the project area and paid by FVF without LIFE funds. Renovation of bird observation platform (cf. ANNEX 9 and agreed technical changes).
11	Urup Dam	1 permanent info-sign (erected at 5 locations) and a leaflet (in DE, DK, UK languages).

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Action E.3 Achieved
12	Sadelmager-mose	1 permanent info-sign and a leaflet (in DE, DK, UK languages).
13	Enebærodde	1 permanent info-shelter and a leaflet.
14	Lisbjergmose	1 permanent info-sign.
15	Odense Å	To increase the interest in the project a movie (Danish and English) is available about the project on our website and on you-tube: https://youtu.be/20zsh-_Z9k0 (Danish) , https://youtu.be/yANEMz61KSU (English). At the information shelter 1 permanent info-sign (size A1) and info-signs on fences (at strategic locations) informing about the grazing and nature conservation.
16	Stenholt Mose	1 permanent info-sign.
17	Piledybet	1 permanent info-sign (at 2 locations).
18	Gravene	1 permanent info-sign.

Compared to the application the over-all project results are as follows:

- 25 info-signs (23 in application)
- 5 leaflets (4 in application)
- 1 video (no video in application)
- 2 bird observation platforms (1 in application)

5.2.4 Action E.4 – Workshops

In this action two workshops were scheduled. Overall, the workshops have been carried out as planned and the deliverables are in ANNEX 27.

The kick-off workshop was held in December 2012 according to the time schedule. A short workshop report including an agenda and list of participants is available on the website and in ANNEX 27.

The final seminar was arranged 3rd – 4th December 2018 with almost 100 participants with an indoor conference and an excursion. The final seminar program, list of attendants and presentations area available in ANNEX 27a (deliverable) and on the projects website (https://life70blog.wordpress.com/2018/12/06/oplaeg-paa-life70-slutseminaret-den-3-og-4-december-2018/).

5.2.5 Action E.5 – Public involvement

This action concerns public involvement in all subprojects (except subproject 18) in relation to public meetings, guided excursions and reference groups. The aim was to obtain involvement in the project from the broader local population and not only from the landowners.

The achieved results of this action are listed below, and relevant documentation is in ANNEX 28. The inquiry among the landowners has in general not been carried out. The reason is that the beneficiaries and the landowners had a close co-operation during the implementation of the project and therefor an inquiry seems unnecessary. The construction works was implemented very well and in co-operation with the landowners.

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Action E.5 Achieved
1	Storelung	Two public meetings /field excursions (June 2012 and Oct. 2014) (30 persons). Reference group established in Oct. 2014 and involved on a regularly basis. A Municipality Green Board excursion in May 2017 (20 persons). Excursion with researchers and the Danish Society for the Conservation of Nature in June 2018 (15 persons).
2	Brændegård Sø	Two excursions: 24th April 2013 and 19th June 2014. 40 participants.
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	3 public meeting; June 2012 (120 persons), October 2014 (85 persons), June 2017 (200 persons). A reference group with 14 members. Involved on a regularly basis. A Municipality Green Board excursion in May 2015 (25 persons). As part of the project "SEGES: knowledge and function" 3 excursions in June and August 2017 and in May 2018. Excursion with the local board of Øster Hæsinge in May 2018 (40 persons). Excursion with the University of Copenhagen in July 2018 (48 persons) and August 2018 (80 persons). Excursion on the "Cattle day" in May 2018 (150 persons).
4	Svanninge Bakker	On 18th August 2013 and 4th May 2014 public "scythe grass". 27 participants. On 9th October 2014 meeting with student form the "Forest School". 18 participants. On 7th June and 16th August 2015 public "scythe grass". 25 participants.
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	A public meeting on 26th June 2014 together with subproject 3. 75 participants. On 24th June 2014excursion with farmers. 40 participants. On 19th August 2015 meeting with students from the "SDU University". 22 participants. On 2nd June 2017 public meeting (200 persons)
6	Fjordmarken	Excursion with NGO's on 20th March 2018 (5 participants).
7	Ristinge Mose	Public meeting / excursion arranged together with subproject 17. Also a NGO excursion (few participants).
8	Fakkemose	Excursion not arranged because it is a very inaccessible site.
9	Lundemose	No excursion arranged.
10	Moser ved Gulstav	4 guided excursions on 6th April, 4th May, 1st June, and 15th June 2014. 60 participants. In August 2015 a bio-blitz with mapping of hundredths of species. The Bio-blitz was broadcasted on national radio. In 2015 four public guided excursions. In the period from 2015 – 2018 several public tours arranged by FVF's ranger. Overall, many more tours have been arranged compared to the application.
11	Urup Dam	Public excursion on 7th August 2014 (80 participants). Pictures from the tour posted on the website 25th June 2015 field excursion for the Green Board (NGO's, municipality, Nature Agency). 27th August 2015 field excursion for KK employees. 9th October 2015 field excursion for nature managers in Mariagerfjord Municipality.

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Action E.5 Achieved
		Other excursions with interest groups: Botanical Society, The Danish Society for Conservation of Nature, Nature network on Fyn and others. Two reference groups: One for landowners and one for the farmers grazing the project area. The project site has frequently been exposed by the press (newspaper and TV) (cf. website and Action D2).
12	Sadelmager-Mose	Public excursion on 7th August 2014. The reference group was not established because the site only holds 1 landowner. Also, excursion with the Botanical Society and other interest groups.
13	Enebærodde	No activity.
14	Lisbjergmose	One public meeting / excursion on 14th June 2014. 13 participants.
15	Odense Å	Public meeting and excursion on 13th May 2013. Landowner board established. A guided excursion in September 2015 (for municipalities and agricultural advisors). In October 2015 excursion for the public. Several excursions for the municipality's Green Board. Excursion for the local school.
16	Stenholt Mose	Public meeting on 6th August 2013 (75 participants) and guided excursion on 27th August 2014 (25 participants), 29th August 2017 (4 participants), 28th May 2018 (60 participants) and 16th August 2018 (30 participants). The municipality's Green Board constituted the reference group. The group visited the project site on an excursion 13th September 2017.
17	Piledybet	Several public meetings and guided tours in the field: 31st May 2013, 13th July 2013, 12th September 2015, 16th September 2016, 24th September 2016, 21st July 2018, 20th October 2018 (in total 225 participants). At several occasions the inquiry was performed among the participants (cf. action D2).
18	Gravene	NA.

Overall the expected results of this action were 27 public meetings or guided excursions as well as 6 reference groups. In total 800 persons were expected be targeted in this action.

The action has resulted in:

- 34 arrangements for the public involving app. 900 persons.
- 6 reference groups with app. 50 persons.
- A large number of organized field trips for NGO interest groups, universities, farmers organizations etc.
- Involvement of the Green Board of many of the involved municipalities.

Overall far more activities have been implemented than foreseen in the proposal and therefore the project has been exposed more to the general public than foreseen.

5.3 Evaluation of project implementation

In relation to the obtained final results, we have compared this against the objectives. In the table below, this is summarized for each subproject regarding the B and C (1-3) actions. We consider implementation of these actions to be the most important for the overall project success.

The landowner agreements in action B1 are based on voluntary agreements between the landowner and the authority. This methodology is a general practice in Danish nature projects working on private areas. Although this was a time-consuming practice and it was difficult to fulfil the time plan we have, however fulfilled the planned activities.

Sub-project number	**Subproject name**	**Results achieved compared to objectives**	**Evaluation of obtained results for the natural habitat types**
1	Storelung	Action B1: 52 ha (goal 48,6 ha) Action C1: 14,6 ha (goal 12 ha) Action C2: 52 ha (goal 54,8 ha) Action C3: NA	The planned landowner agreements were obtained to be able to manage 12 ha of active raised bog (7110) and with a potential to develop additional 8 ha of active raised bog (7110). Surrounded by an extensified buffer zone with increased groundwater level. Project objectives achieved. To be able to meet the landowner's requests for the future land use in the buffer zone some areas were fenced and prepared for grazing (cf. action C3). In addition, some ponds were established. Overall this will add to the obtained results for the raised bog.
2	Brændegård Sø	Action B1: 25,5 ha (goal 23,5 ha) Action C1: 0 ha (goal 0 ha) Action C2: 24,6 ha (goal 23,1ha) Action C3: 24,6 ha (goal 23,1 ha)	Project objectives achieved, and former agricultural areas prepared for the development of up to 23 ha of alkaline fens (7230) through improved hydrology and management by grazing.
3	Arreskov Sø, FMK	Action B1: 97 ha (goal 73,5 ha) + 47 ha without compensation Action C1: 18 ha (goal 8 ha) Action C2: 19 ha (goal 8 ha) Action C3: 144 ha (goal 73 ha)	Project objectives achieved with a large surplus in accordance with the agreed technical changes. 8 ha of existing alkaline fens (7230) managed and with a potential to develop more than 26 ha of additional alkaline fens (7230). In the surrounding buffer zones also a potential for development of other natural habitat types such as Molinia meadows (6410) and dry grassland (6210). Some of the results obtained by using grazing schemes under the RDP giving EU added value to the project. 5 ponds established to benefit the conservation status of *T. cristatus* and *R. dalmatina.*
4	Svanninge Bakker	Action B1: NA Action C1: 5,6 (goal 5,6 ha) Action C2: 4,4 ha (goal 4 ha)	Project objectives achieved in order to be able to manage 1 ha of existing alkaline fen (7230) and with a potential to develop additional 6 ha with alkaline fen (7230) and 3 ha with calcareous fens (7210).

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Results achieved compared to objectives	Evaluation of obtained results for the natural habitat types
		Action C3: 10 (goal 10 ha)	1 new pond and 4 ponds renovated to improve the conservation status of *T. cristatus, R. dalmatina,*and *R. arvalis.*
5	Arreskov Sø, NST	Action B1: NA Action C1: 14,1 ha (goal 18 ha) Action C2: 13,4 ha (goal 4 ha) Action C3: 32 ha (goal 22 ha)	Project objectives achieved regarding management by improved hydrology and grazing. Although less areas were cleared compared to the application it is sufficient to be able to manage 6,5 ha of existing alkaline fens (7230) and with a potential to develop additional 22 ha thereby fulfilling the objectives of the application. 3 new ponds and 1 pond renovated to improve the conservation status of *T. cristatus* and *R. dalmatina*.
6	Fjordmarken	Action B1: NA Action C1: 8 ha (goal 2 ha) Action C2: NA Action C3: 35,8 ha (goal 38 ha)	Although the grazed area is a little bit small than foreseen in the application the management actions with clearings and grazing facilities are sufficient to be able to manage 5,6 ha of existing alkaline fens (7230) and to potential develop additional 5 ha thereby fulfilling the objectives of the application. In addition, 2 ha of salt meadow (1330) and dry grassland (6210) benefits from the project.
7	Ristinge Mose	Action B1: NA Action C1: 6,3 ha (goal 6 ha) Action C2: NA Action C3: 6,6 (goal 6 ha)	Project objectives achieved to benefit the conservation status of 2 ha of existing alkaline fens (7230) and with a potential to develop additional 4 ha of alkaline fens (7230).
8	Fakkemose	Action B1: 0 ha (6 ha) Action C1: 6,1 ha (goal 9 ha) Action C2: 0 ha (goal 17 ha) Action C3: 23 ha (goal 14 ha)	The objective regarding improved hydrology could not be fulfilled due a negative impact of neighbouring areas. Instead the prerequisite for better grazing opportunists were considered and the management of the fen now includes to surrounding buffer zone making the management by grazing much more efficient. Due to this effort the 5,4 ha of existing calcareous fens (7210) is in a positive development and there is a potential for developing additional 6 ha of this natural habitat type. 2 new ponds to benefit *T. cristatus* and *R. arvalis*. Some of the results obtained by using grazing schemes under the RDP giving EU added value to the project.
9	Lundemose	Action B1: NA Action C1: 3,5 ha (goal 4 ha) Action C2: NA Action C3: 6,2 ha (goal 8 ha)	Although, the extent of the performed management is a little less than foreseen in the application it is still expected that 4 ha of existing alkaline fens (7230) benefits from the project with a potential to develop 4 ha of calcareous fens (7210).
10	Moser ved Gulstav	Action B1: NA Action C1: 1,5 ha (goal 6 ha) Action C2: 0,6 ha (goal 2,5 ha) Action C3: 7,7 ha (goal 9 ha)	The management initiatives are less profound than foreseen in the application due to various reasons (considering bird species in the SPA, protection of infrastructure from raised water table etc.). However, the management actions seem to benefit alkaline fens (7230) on 2 ha and calcareous fens (7210) on 8 ha.
11	Urup Dam	Action B1: 18,2 ha (goal 3 ha)	Project objectives achieved although the area compensation is more extended than foreseen in the

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Results achieved compared to objectives	Evaluation of obtained results for the natural habitat types
		Action C1: 17 ha (goal 10 ha) Action C2: NA Action C3: 13,5 ha (goal 13 ha)	application. In combination with ongoing management the LIFE management activities result in improving the conservation status of 20 ha of existing alkaline fens (7230) and the potential for developing additional 1 ha.
12	Sadelmager-mose	Action B1: 0 ha (goal 20 ha) Action C1: 12,5 ha (goal 10 ha) Action C2: NA Action C3: 33,5 ha (goal 10 ha)	The management of this site has been performed without any written agreement with the landowner who accepted the management initiatives voluntarily. Especially the grazing facilities are more extensive than foreseen giving good opportunities to manage 10 ha and 0,6 ha of alkaline fens (7230) and calcareous fens (7210) respectively, and with the potential to develop additional 5 ha with alkaline fens (7230). This is in line with the LIFE application. 5 ponds to benefit *B. calamita*.
13	Enebærodde	Action B1: 28,8 ha (goal 0 ha) Action C1: 34,9 ha (goal 17 ha) Action C2: 0 ha (20 ha) Action C3: NA	A written agreement was entered with the sole landowner although not strictly necessary because of the conservation act for the site. Hydrological improvements were not considered to be an appropriate management activity for existing wet heath (4010) and instead the natural habitat type has been managed by excessive clearings (partly by use of an RDP scheme). This will benefit 15 ha of existing wet heath (4010) and increase the potential to develop additional 10 ha of this natural habitat type. This is in line with the LIFE application.
14	Lisbjergmose	Action B1: 4,8 ha (goal 10 ha) Action C1: 6,4 ha (goal 4 ha) Action C2: NA Action C3: 9,4 ha (goal 10 ha)	Although landowner agreements were hard to obtain the management by clearings and grazing was almost carried out as planned. Therefore, the project will benefit 6 ha of existing alkaline fens (7230) and with the potential to develop additional 4 ha. This is in line with the LIFE application.
15	Odense Å	Action B1: 26,3 ha (goal 86,3ha) Action C1: 4,9 ha (goal 2 ha) Action C2: 6,1 ha (goal 10 ha) Action C3: 77,6 ha (goal 80 ha)	Landowner agreements with compensation were only needed in the buffer zone. In the river valley the conservation act determines the possibilities for management actions (without compensation). By clearings, hydrological improvements and grazing facilities the existing alkaline fens (7230) (9 ha) and petrifying springs (7220) (3 ha) will benefit from the project and there is a potential to develop additional 5 ha and 2 ha, respectively. This is in line with the LIFE application.
16	Stenholt Mose	Action B1: 68 ha (goal 88 ha) Action C1: 42 ha (goal 42 ha) Action C2: 63,7 ha (goal 60 ha) Action C3: NA	With the landowner agreement it became possible to increase the water table as foreseen which benefits 35 ha of existing active raised bog (7110) with a potential to develop additional 25 ha. This is in line with the LIFE application.
17	Piledybet	Action B1: 14,9 ha (goal 14,9 ha) Action C1: 9 ha (goal 4,9 ha)	Landowner agreements obtained without compensation and the management actions are in line with the LIFE application. This means that the project benefits 15 ha of exiting alkaline fens (7230) and 1 ha of existing

Sub-project number	Subproject name	Results achieved compared to objectives	Evaluation of obtained results for the natural habitat types
		Action C2: 16 ha (goal 16 ha) Action C3: 9,6 ha (goal 11 ha)	calcareous fens (7210) as planned in the LIFE application.
18	Gravene	Action B1: 21,4 ha (goal 10 ha) Action C1: 9,1 ha (goal 9,7 ha) Action C2: 7 ha (goal 7 ha) Action C3: 17,6 ha (goal 13 ha)	Although more extensive landowner agreements were needed the project was implemented as scheduled at this site benefitting alkaline fens (7230 – 4,7 ha) and petrifying springs (7220 – 1,5 ha) and with a potential to develop additional 3 ha of alkaline fens (7230). 2 ponds for the benefit of *R. arvalis*. Due to landowner reluctance the project could not be implemented on 3 ha along Odense Å. Therefore 1,4 ha of petrifying springs could not be managed as foreseen.

By implementation of the management actions the conservation status of the key natural habitat types has been improved as foreseen in the LIFE application by improving the hydrology and by establishing (clearings) and maintaining (grazing and supplementary clearings) more light-open conditions. This has affected 180 ha of the natural habitat types as follows:

- 7110 - active raised bog: 47 ha
- 7230 - alkaline fens: 94 ha
- 7210 - Calcareous fens: 20 ha
- 7220 - Petrifying springs: 6 ha
- 4010 – wet heath: 15 ha

In addition, the management activities will improve the potential for developing additional 160 ha of the key natural habitat types in the future as foreseen in the application as follows:

- 7110 - active raised bog: 33 ha
- 7230 - alkaline fens: 103 ha
- 7210 - Calcareous fens: 9 ha
- 7220 - Petrifying springs:2 ha
- 4010 – wet heath: 13 ha

Amphibian species will benefit from new ponds and renovation of ponds and the project thereby supports the species' conservation status.

Another important result of the project is the dissemination of the results and the N-2000 network by a large number of public arrangements, info-signs, leaflets etc. together with a website and the layman's report.

5.4 Analysis of long-term benefits

Environmental benefits

The project supports the following EU policies and ads to EU values:

A) The Biodiversity Strategy 2020 in relation to protection of species and biotopes, protection and restoration of vulnerable ecosystems, and to stop the loss of biodiversity.

This occurs by preserving and managing existing natural habitat types:

- 7110 - active raised bog: 47 ha
- 7230 - alkaline fens: 94 ha
- 7210 - Calcareous fens: 20 ha
- 7220 - Petrifying springs: 6 ha
- 4010 – wet heath: 15 ha

Further the project enables development of additional natural habitat types:

- 7110 - active raised bog: 33 ha
- 7230 - alkaline fens: 103 ha
- 7210 - Calcareous fens: 9 ha
- 7220 - Petrifying springs:2 ha
- 4010 – wet heath: 13 ha

This markedly increases the possibilities for achieving a favourable conservation status of the natural habitat types in the SAC's of this project. In some of the SCA's (e.g. subproject 1 and 3) our effort will affect almost the entire SAC and make a substantial contribution to honour the biological measures of the specific N-2000 plan.

In addition, the project favours a number of amphibians (Annex II and IV) by improving their habitats and by making additional habitats.

B) The Waterframework Directive in relation to counteract decomposition of peat and reduced releases of nutrients to the aquatic environment.

This also occurs by extensivation of agricultural areas (app. 100 ha) in the project and by converting these areas to nature. Based on Dansih leaching models for nitrate runoff this will reduce the yearly loss of nitrogen to the aquatic environment with 4,7 tons N.

C) The Bio Economic Strategy 2020 by supporting sustainable use of natural resources. In this project this occurs through a multi-functional use of natural areas, e.g. by improving the natural values and at the same time improving a sustainable production of meat.

D) The climate and energy policy by decreasing releases of greenhouse gases. At all project sites an increased peat accumulation is expected at the soil surface and in particular in the raised bogs areas. This will add to carbon storage and counteract greenhouse warming.

<u>Long-term benefits and sustainability</u>

a) Long-term / qualitative environmental benefits
Substantial areas have been improved by clearings and grazing facilities. We have chosen sustainable and long-lasting solutions to make sure that the management will have an effect also in the years after termination of the project. The need for future management is described in individual management plans for each subproject and in a more over-all manner in the After-LIFE Conservation Plan.

b) Long-term / qualitative economic benefits

Due to the improved management by grazing the future management costs to clearings will be reduced. The farmers will be able to have an income from meat production on areas previously overgrown by woody plants. This concept has been developed in action A.4 and should be seen in the perspective of the LIFE IP "Natureman" where focus is on the farmer for making a sustainable business for nature management by grazing. Also, in FMK other initiatives have been initiated to improve the conditions for a "near nature" meat production and these initiatives were built on the experiences from Action A4. In addition, the improved hydrological state of the raised bogs (7110) will result in savings due to a reduced clearing demand.

c) Long-term / qualitative social benefits
The management of project areas by grazing supports local farmers. The results of Action A.4 support development of a business model for the marketing and sale of "nature" meat which also should be seen in a health perspective. In addition, several initiatives (tracks, observation towers etc.) have been taken to improve recreational opportunities and at the same time promote the N-2000 network.

d) Continuation of the project actions by the beneficiary or by other stakeholders.
The need for continuation of the projects is described in the specific management plans (Action A.3) for each subproject and in the After-LIFE plan.

Replicability, demonstration, transferability, cooperation
Our focus on management of alkaline fens has inspired other Danish municipalities to start another LIFE project (LIFE Rigkilde) also focusing on alkaline fen management. Our ideas have also been transferred to a broader Scandinavian perspective in the Nordic Council alkaline fens project. Further the ideas funded in action A4 is elaborated further in the LIFE IP "Natureman".

Best Practice lessons
In our project, hydrological management is a key management tool at some of the projects sites. In the raised bogs (subproject 1 and 16) the key action has been to elevate the water table to the peat surface. However, in the alkaline fens, hydrological management must be studied in more detail and in some sites; a decreased water table may be the right solution in order to be able to manage the site by grazing.

Another important lesson is the benefit of modernizing the property structure to support large grazing units. When the grazing units become larger, it becomes easier for the farmer to plan and carry out the appropriate management.

Innovation and demonstration value
Our LIFE project is a best practice project and the level of innovation is not high. However, in action A.4 we consider new ways to obtain a sustainable management of alkaline fens by making nature management an ordinary farming practice and by making nature management a sustainable business case for farmers.

Long term indicators of the project success
We will elaborate on this at the online indicator's website upon request. The outcome indicators are shown in ANNEX 29 together with a Gantt Chart.

6 Comments on the financial part

The account information presented in this report is based on the final financial report. The Financial reports are in section 8.

6.1 Summary of costs incurred

The costs incurred are compared to the budget in the amendment of September 13th 2018 in the table below. Compared to the budget the total cost of the project shows an additional consumption of 600.600 € equivalent to 14 %. This overspend will be covered by the beneficiaries.

Budget breakdown categories	Total cost in €	Costs incurred from the start to end in €	Total costs compared to budget (%)
1. Personnel	742.323	910.823	+ 23
2. Travel and subsistence	21.220	29.079	+ 37
3. External assistance	2.043.696	2.396.925	+ 17
4. Durable goods			
Infrastructure			
Equipment	33.627	49.586	+ 47
Prototype			
5. Land purchase / long-term lease	1.307.315	1.358.856	+ 4
6. Consumables	22.216	22.222	0
7. Other Costs	41.477	45.983	11
8. Overheads	203.298	201.193	0
TOTAL	4.415.172	5.014.668	+12

The quantitative overspend has especially occurred in the personnel and external assistance cost categories, with an overspent of 168.500 € (23 %) and 353.229 (36 %) respectively.

The overspent in the travel cost category is 36 % but below 30.000 €.

The overspent in the durable cost category is 47 % but below 30.000 €.

In the land purchase cost category the overspent is 52.010 € equivalent to 4 %.

In the cost categories of consumables and other costs there are only small deviations to the budget and below 30.000 €.

Accounting system

The CB and the AB's have made individual account systems. In the systems, expenses can be tracked on the main cost categories and on subprojects. It is also possible to track expenses per action per subproject.

The CB (FMK) has made the overall account and the AB's have made the local accounts. The CB has collected copy of supporting documents related to the account and each beneficiary is responsible for storing all supporting documents in their files. The beneficiaries have described briefly how costs are approved and it is ensured that invoices contain a clear reference to the LIFE+ project. The Neemo monitoring team has received copies (Progress report) of the charts of accounts used by each partner.

6.3 Summary of costs per action

In the table below, we have made a chart of the total costs per action and compered these costs to the budget. Our most important comments are as follows:

- Action A1 and F3 have be carried out in common in most subprojects and the biological survey contributes to the ex-ante monitoring. This has enabled the project to be more cost effective in these two actions.
- The work with authorisation applications in Action A2 was less time consuming than foreseen in the budget.
- Also, the work with the management plan in Action A4 for "nature grazing" was less time consuming than foreseen whereas more resources have been spent on the management plans in Action A3.
- Action A5 has a substantial overspent. This is because the personnel cost is in action F1 in the budget (please see GA, F1).
- In Action B1 there is an overspent of 17 % equivalent to 228.477 €. The land-lease / land purchase *per se* shows however an overspent of only 4 % (52.010 €) and the remaining overspend is attributed to personnel costs related to landowner negotiations and external assistance to registration and to modernize the property structures.
- In action C1 the incurred clearing costs are quite low compared to the budget although the total cleared area is much larger (238 ha) compared to the GA (169 ha). Thus, the clearings have been performed very cost effective.
- In Action C2 the incurred costs for hydrological improvements is substantial higher than foreseen in the budget. This is especially related to subproject 1, where the hydrological improvements turned out to be more complicated than foreseen I the GA.
- Also, the costs in Action C3 are substantial higher than foreseen in the budget. This is especially attributed to the subproject 3, where the project area was increased (cf. agreed technical changes) with an increasing demand for grazing facilities. Overall the need for grazing facilities has been underestimated in the GA and the total grazed area is much larger (452 ha) than compared to the GA (340 ha).
- The monitoring actions in D1 and D2 are due to the purchase of person counters to measure the number of visitors in some of the subprojects and due to the SE analysis made by Ramboll A/S. Personnel costs for the biological monitoring are in Action F3.
- Except for the Action E2 the incurred costs for E actions are lower than foreseen in the budget and in general the E actions have been performed more cost effective than foreseen.
- In action F4 there is a substantial overspent. This is because the personnel cost in the budget is in action F1 (please see GA, F1).

Action	Budget €	Total costs €	Total costs compared to budget (%)
A1 - Udbud og teknisk dokumentation	158.195	127.159	-20
A2 - Myndighedsbehandling	18.439	9.347	-49
A3 - Driftsplan	75.555	39.671	-47
A4 - Driftssikring af projektområder	13.499	25.864	92
A5 - Actionplan for mygblomst	100	17.166	> 100
B1 - Lodsejerkompensation	136.5076	1.593.533	17
C1 - Anlæg rydninger	922.526	737.465	-20
C2 - Anlæg hydrologi	398.373	610.565	53
C3 - Anlæg græsningsfaciliteter	437.035	770.250	77
C4 - Anlæg rekreative faciliteter	51.199	132.370	159
C5 - Tilsyn	96.621	51.004	-47
D1 - Impact monitoring	1.047	7.535	> 100
D2 - Socio-economic monitoring	1.047	28.919	> 100
E1 - Hjemmeside	23.289	11.929	-49
E2 - Lægmandsrapport	13.530	23.922	77
E3 - Formidling	126.723	69.320	-45
E4 - Workshop	25.518	26.421	3
E5 - Involvering af offentligheden	27.631	11.689	-58
F1 - Projektsekretariat	320.731	361.061	13
F2 - Revision	8.218	10.123	-37
F3 - Overvågning	114.504	39.377	-66
F4 - Networking	13.018	108.765	> 100
F5 - After LIFE conservation plan	0	0	0
Total *	4.211.174	4.813.475	12

*excluding OH

Co-financer

In 2013, the project obtained economic support from The Villum Foundation equivalent to 671.141 € - cf. amendment dated 13th September 2018. Due to the Danish VAT rules the beneficiary must pay 17% VAT leaving 564.000 € to the project.

Although the co-financer contributes substantially to the project, we still meet the 102 % rule.

The Villum Foundation releases their contribution in eight rates. In the financial form "Funding" we have included all rates (both paid and expected).

7 Annexes

7.1 Administrative annexes

Partnership agreements delivered in the IcR.

7.2 Technical annexes

Annexes marked with red are deliverables.

ANNEX #	Annex description
1	Statement from auditor concerning co-operation between Langeland and Svendborg Municipality.
2	Documentation of personnel cost calculation
3	Documentation for choosing "Entreprenørgården" in subproject 16
4	Documentation: specific invoices
5	Documentation: specific tenders, offers, subcontracts etc.
6	Documentation: registration of cattle
7	Documentation: purchase documents, registration etc. – subproject 11
8	Documentation: lease of land, registration of clause, payment – subproject 2 and 15
9	Documentation: improved visitor facilities – subproject 10
9a	Minutes – steering group meetings
9b	Minutes – project group meetings
10	Biological reports – Action A1
11	Technical reports – Action A1
12	Management plans – Action A3
13	Management of project areas – Action A4
14	Fen Orchis report – Action A5
15	Landowner agreements and proof of registration of clause – Action B1
16	Documentation of clearings – Action C1
17	Documentation of hydrological improvements – Action C2
18	Documentation of grazing facilities – Action C3
19	Documentation of recreational facilities – Action C4
20	*Post ante* monitoring reports and overall monitoring report – Action D1 and Action F3
21	Socio-economic monitoring - Action D2
21	Ex post monitoring reports – ACTION F3
22	Report on management of alkaline fens from Nordic Council – Action F4
23	Report on management of dry grasslands – Action F4
23a	Excursion report
24	After-LIFE Conservation Plan – Action F5
25	Layman's report – Action E2
26	Info-signs and leaflets – Action E3
26a	Final seminar report
27	Workshop reports – Action E4
28	Documentation of public involvement – Action E5
29	Output indicators and Gantt Chart

8 Financial report and annexes

Consolidated Cost Statement for the project signed by coordinating beneficiary

Annex 30: Consolidated Cost Statement (in paper) for the project signed by Faaborg-Midtfyn Municipality.

Financial Statement of the Individual Beneficiaries

Annex 31: Financial statements from
- Faaborg-Midtfyn Municipality
- Kerteminde Municipality
- Assens Municipality
- Langeland Municipality
- Nordfyns Municipality
- Silkeborg Municipality
- Odense Municipality
- The Foundation to the Protection of Birds
- Danish Nature Agency – local unit Fyn

Individual cost statement signed (in paper) by all beneficiaries

Annex 32: Financial statements from
- Faaborg-Midtfyn Municipality
- Kerteminde Municipality
- Assens Municipality
- Langeland Municipality
- Nordfyns Municipality
- Silkeborg Municipality
- Odense Municipality
- The Foundation to the Protection of Birds
- Danish Nature Agency – local unit Fyn

Payment Request signed by coordinating beneficiary

Annex 33: Payment Request (in paper) signed by Faaborg-Midtfyn Municipality.

Beneficiary's Certificate signed by beneficiaries

Annex 34: Beneficiaries certificate (in paper) for Nature projects signed by:
- Kerteminde Municipality
- Odense Municipality
- The Foundation to the Protection of Birds
- Danish Nature Agency – local unit Fyn

Auditors report

Annex 35