



LIFE Project Number  
**LIFE05 NAT/DK/000150**

**PROGRESS REPORT No. 3**  
**Covering the project activities from 01.01.2008 to 31.12.2008**

Reporting Date  
**05 June 2009**

LIFE PROJECT NAME

**Restoration of raised bogs in Denmark with new methods.**

DATA PROJECT

<b>Project location</b>	7 different SCI areas in Denmark
<b>Project start date:</b>	10/01/2005
<b>Project end date:</b>	31/12/2009
<b>Total Project duration (in months)</b>	60 months
<b>Total budget</b>	€ 2.947.471
<b>EC contribution:</b>	€ 1.407.578
<b>(%) of total costs</b>	
<b>(%) of eligible costs</b>	

DATA BENEFICIARY

<b>Name Beneficiary</b>	Danish Forest and Nature Agency
<b>Contact person</b>	Mr. Jesper Stenild (Deputy Forest Officer)
<b>Postal address</b>	Vasevej 7, DK 8920 Randers NV
<b>Visit address</b>	Vasevej 7, DK 8920 Randers NV
<b>Telephone</b>	86 45 45 00 (+45)
<b>Fax:</b>	86 45 40 36 (+45 )
<b>E-mail</b>	kronjylland@sns.dk
<b>Project Website</b>	www.raisedbogs.dk



## **1. List of Contents and Annexes**

### **Section 2: Lists of (i) key-words and (ii) abbreviations (when appropriate)**

### **Section 3: Executive Summary**

### **Section 4: Technical development.**

#### A. Preparatory actions/management plan preparation.

Action A.1. Kick off workshop

Action A.2: Hydrological investigations.

Action A.3: Development of improved restoration methodology.

Action A.4: Introduction and testing of active re-vegetation methods.

#### B. Purchase/lease of land and/or rights.

Action B.1. Purchase of land/rights.

#### C. Non-recurring biotope management.

Action C.1: Restoration of hydrology.

Action C.2: Clearing of trees and shrubs.

#### D. Recurring biotope management.

Action D.1: Clearing of re-growth.

#### E. Public awareness and dissemination of information.

Action E.1: Mounting of map tables / information boards.

Action E.2: Governance: Co-operation with local communities, landowners and interest groups.

Action E.3: Facilities for visitors including boardwalks.

Action E.4: Best management guidelines for Danish bogs

Action E.5: Seminar on improved methods for raised bog restoration.

Action E.6: Production of a layman's report.

Action E.7: Project web site.

#### F. Overall project management

Action F.1: Project management and co-ordination

Action F.2: Effect monitoring

Action F.3: Participation in international workshops and international networking

Action F.4: After-LIFE Conservation Plan

### **Section 5: Problems encountered.**

### **Section 6: Financial issues.**

### **Section 7: Planned project progress**

### **Section 8: Annexes.**

Annex A\*: Report on introduction and testing of active re-vegetation methods.

Annex B\*: Report (mid-term) of the re-vegetation tests.

Annex C: Map from activities on site 20.

Annex D: Map from activities on site 250.

Annex E: Map from activities on site 88.

Annex F: Map from activities on site 103.

Annex G\*: Report from visit at Seitsemien National Park.

Annex H: Photos from the test of clearing of regrowth at site 20.

Annex I: Information board for site 20 (Reduced in size).

Annex J: Newspaper articles relating to the project.

\* In separate documents.

## **2. Lists of (i) key-words and (ii) abbreviations.**

### **Abbreviations**

DFNA: Danish Forest and Nature Agency.

SCI: Sites of Community Interest of the Natura 2000 network.

### 3. Executive Summary.

Project objective:

The main objective of the project is to contribute significantly to upholding of the coherence of the network of Danish Natura 2000 sites with 7110 \*Active raised bogs.

Main results to be achieved:

Restoration of the hydrology of 361 ha of bog habitats

Clearing of 270,7 ha of overgrowth with trees and scrubs

Establishment of conditions for 398 ha of active raised bog to develop from degraded raised bog.

Reduction of the negative impact from nutrient enrichment by elimination of dry deposition of atmospheric N at trees and scrubs through clearing of 270,7 ha

Development of cost efficient and adequate methodology for restoration of raised bogs in Denmark.

Dissemination of methodology and results of the project.

Key deliverables and outputs during the report period.

Three key milestones was supposed to be delivered during 2008

Product/milestone	Action no	Old deadline	New deadline
Report on testing of active re-vegetation methods	A.4	31/03/2007	31/08/2009
Seminar	E.5	30/09/2008	30/09/2009
Seminar report	E.5	30/11/2008	30/11/2009

#### Change of date for action A4 and E.5

In May 2007 The Commission was requested to accept a change of date for which action E5 (Seminar on improved methods for raised bog restoration) is to be held. Instead of holding the seminar in late September 2008 it was proposed to postpone it to late September 2009. The EU-Commission accepted the request in a letter dated 10<sup>th</sup> July 2007. It is not mentioned specific in the letter, but the seminar report is postponed corresponding to that.

In the midterm technical report there was asked for a postponement of action A.4. (Report on testing of active re-vegetation methods) until August 2009. This was accepted in the letter from the Commission responding on the mid-term rapport dated August 28 2008.

So even as there has been steady progress in 2008, none of the key milestones has been delivered during the report period.

Summary of section 4 – 7:

Section 4: Technical development.

The project progresses as stipulated on sites exclusively owned by the State.

The sites in private or mixed ownerships started to fall seriously behind schedule during 2008.

Those actions that are taking place, runs mostly as expected. Though the need for recurring management are significant greater than expected

Section 5: Problems encountered.

The problem on site 34 remained unsolved in 2008 and new problems emerged on site 88 and 103. The problem are mainly time related, and can be solved given time enough.

So a prolongation of the project will be needed and a modification request is needed.

The modification request is enclosed with this report

Section 6: Financial issues.

With only 50 % of the budget used with only one year left of the project, this is not satisfying, and reflects the setbacks encountered during late 2008, it also put emphasis on why a prolongation is needed. At the present the project are more in lack of time than funding.

Section 7: Planned project progress.

If a prolongation is not granted, we will continue to finish, as much actions as possible, within the project present time frame, fulfilling so many obligations as possible.

If the modification request is accepted, we will move on following the new timetable outlined in this.



#### **4. Technical development.**

##### **A. Preparatory actions/management plan preparation.**

###### Action A.1. Kick off workshop.

This action was finished in 2005

###### Action A.2: Hydrological investigations.

Even if the action are reported completed, experience until now has shown that there is a possibility that need for new investigations can arise, as we get more into the detailed planning at a site. In the report period there have been such activities at site 34 and 88.

###### Site 34:

The solution to the problem for reaching an agreement with a key private owner, as outlined in the mid-term report, was turned down by the local authorities. They would not accept the closed drainage tube to be lead through the bog. So further planning and investigations was made, and a project for legally forcing the owner to accept the tubing was drawn up by the private consultants. Facing this situation, the key private owner was (late 2008) ready to negotiate for an agreement. These negotiations called for further assessments and reports on the hydrology during 2008 and into 2009. See more under action B (Purchase/lease of land and/or rights) and under problems encountered (site 34).

###### Site 88:

The integrated groundwater model that was presented in June 2006 has been updated in spring 2008 with new data, and corrected for some minor, but influential false assumptions. As a result of this and other problems encountered a modification of the project are suggested in the modification request that is forwarded with this progress report.

###### Action A.3: Development of improved restoration methodology.

A contract was signed with Forest & Landscape Denmark (an independent centre at the Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University of Denmark (From 1. January 2007 part of the University of Copenhagen - designated the faculty of Life Science)) to carry out this action.

As it turned out there was a need not only to develop new methodology, but also to collect and make a comprehensive analysis of methodologies and experiences already gained in other projects in Europe.

This has been done in the report that was finished early in 2008, just slight behind schedule. The report, in Danish with an English summary is enclosed in Annex A.

The information analysed in the report revolves around systems used in the initial clearing of tree vegetation on bogs, as well as the clearing of natural regeneration on both mires and wetlands.

It has not been possible to develop satisfactory economic models on the operations involving initial clearing, due to the significant variation in terrain and standing volume per hectare on the studied sites. Conventional methods of clearing the vegetation are discussed and an entirely new system developed by a major Danish contractor

HedeDanmark, which includes an excavator operating from an island of steel plates, is described. This system has shown some promising results, being highly effective while only inflicting minimal impacts on the vegetation.

In the procedure evaluating the technical equipment, a number of options for reducing the static ground pressure and / or stabilising the substrate are suggested.

With regard to the clearing of regeneration, several methods and their economic parameters are discussed. Special emphasis has been placed on mechanised solutions with tracked machines and low ground pressure. Their ability to operate intensively on sites that have recently been cleared of tree growth is crucially to ensure a fast follow up on vegetation control. Chipping on the bog with specially developed, tracked chippers, is not considered feasible given the high investment cost and modest performance of these machines.

On bogs where only sparse or scattered islands of vegetation need to be controlled, conventional methods using small machines are recommended – possibly with the assistance of larger, specialised forwarders fitted with appropriate wheel tracks in cases where the material should be removed from the site.

Finally, a number of recommendations are made on the initial clearing of vegetation and the clearing of regeneration on bogs in general.

#### Action A.4: Introduction and testing of active re-vegetation methods.

A contract was made in 2006 with RisagerConsult to carry out this action.

The action was started in May 2006, with establishment of a series of small test areas with different methods of re-vegetation trial areas on site 20.

In the midterm technical report there was asked for a postponement of this action and this was accepted in the letter from the Commission responding on the mid-term rapport dated August 28 2008.

A preliminary collection of data has been made in the late summer of 2008. A mid-term report (In Danish) on the results is enclosed in Annex B. If a prolongation is granted there will be a preliminary gathering and securing of data in the late summer of 2009 too.

## **B Purchase/lease of land and/or rights.**

### Site 88

In 2005 The Land Consolidation Division of the Directorate for Food, Fisheries and Agri Business (within The Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries) completed a preliminary investigation of property, ownership and attitude to the project among the owners who could be involved in a land consolidation.

Here there was an individual contact to all the owners of property in the potential area for a land consolidation. At the time two main conclusions as a result of the investigation was reached:

- A land consolidation supporting the LIFE project would have good possibilities for success, as the owners were positive.
- The price of land in the area had been raised dramatically since the start of the project, in October 2004 the price was 90.000 DKr (12.000 €) per hectare, in 2007 it has risen to 140.000 DKr (18.700 €) per hectare.

The hydrological investigations carried out under action A2 revealed that the need to buy land to secure a correct water level within the high priority private owned areas in the pSCI was 50 % lesser than foreseen in the application. That means that there was only need to buy or make contracts on 26 hectares in stead of 40 ha. Therefore it was estimated in 2007 that the cost of this action could be kept within the limits in the budget.

In the spring of 2008 an offer was send to the private owners in concern.

As indicated in the mid-term report the private owners declined the offer, meaning that land acquisition no longer is an option, making it difficult to reach the objectives at site 88. As a logical consequence of this, we have chosen to redefine the project, especially as the updated hydrological model (see section A.1 above) indicates some additional and greater benefits in trying to raise the water level in the north-east part of the site. This question is addressed in detail, in the modification request that is forwarded with this progress report.

Site 34.

As part of the struggle for come to an agreement with the key owner on site 34, purchase of rights, has come into play. At the present the owner has accepted all the projects activity on his property, to extensive the agricultural use on 9 ha, and to accept that those areas are transferred into SCI site 34, in trade for an economical compensation. This topic is likewise addressed in the modification request that is forwarded with this progress report.

## **C Non-recurring biotope management.**

### **Action C.1: Restoration of hydrology.**

Site 20 (St. Økssø):

In January 2008 the work of blocking of the last ditches (5.825 m) was finished. And by that the activity has been completed at this site.

Site 34 (Brandstrup Mose):

The activity on this site hasn't commenced yet.

Site 49 (Boestmose):

The activity has been completed at this site.

Site 88 (Kongens Mose):

Around 500 m of the 11.000 m ditches reported blocked in the interim rapport was actually blocked in January 2008, no more was completed in 2008. Annex E shows ditches blocked per. 31/12 2008.

Site 103 (Storelung):

The activity on this site hasn't commenced yet, the activity needs a permit from the Nature Conservancy Board. There have been applied for this as per June 24 2008, but a permit has at the present (may 6'th 2009) been granted – see section 5. (Problems encountered) for more details about this situation.

Site 104 (Nybo mose):

The activity has been completed at this site.

Site 250 (Svanemosen):

Two unknown dense system of small ditches that was revealed during the clearing of plantation in 2007 has been blocked in 2008. They was very similar to the systems at site 20, covered an area of about 12 hectares and as it turned out, it had a length of 12.000 m. So a total of 12.910 m ditches have been blocked in 2008. See Annex D.

#### Action C.2: Clearing of trees and shrubs.

Site 20 (St. Økssø):

The activity has been completed at this site.

Site 34 (Brandstrup Mose):

No activities in the report period.

Site 49 (Boestmose):

The activity has been completed at this site.

Site 88 (Kongens Mose):

By a misunderstanding all clearings planned for the area owned by the State was reported completed in the mid-term report. But there still remains clearing of ca. 20 ha. If the modification request is accepted additional clearing will be needed.

Site 103 (Storelung):

13,5 ha has been cleared during 2008, 1,6 ha dense forest and 11,9 ha more open encroachment.

Site 104 (Nybo mose):

The activity has been completed at this site.

Site 250 (Svanemosen):

The activity has been completed at this site.

#### **D Recurring biotope management.**

Action D.1: Clearing of re-growth.

This action is a follow up on action C.2,

Clearing of re-growth are not planned beforehand, but depends on the actually situation on the areas which has been cleared of trees under action C.2.

Site 20 (St. Økssø):

5.3 ha have been cleared for dense regrowth of mainly birch (betula).

And then there have been established two fences for grazing, 29 ha. all in all.

Within the fences there have been build small “animal passages” – two over each ditch, to prevent the grazing animals from damaging the dams in the ditches.

The purpose is to test how well grazing is able to control the encroachment of birch without damaging the growth of sphagnum.

The area has been grazed through the summer with a herd of 60-70 South African Boer goats. So far the results have been promising, and the grazing is followed closely by biologists from DFNA.

In light of the massive re-growth we have experienced, a small scale test of conventional cutting with different intervals has been implemented: 1 time each third year, 1 time a year, 2 times a year and 3 times a year. Photos of the result so far can be seen in Annex H, the outcome will result in recommendations in the best practise folder.

Site 34 (Brandstrup Mose):

No activities in the report period.

Site 49 (Boestmose):

25,5 ha have been cleared for scattered re-growth of birch.

Site 88 (Kongens Mose):

77 ha have been cleared for very scattered re-growth of birch.

Site 103 (Storelung):

No activities in the report period.

Site 104 (Nybo mose):

No activities in the report period.

Site 250 (Svanemosen):

16,3 ha have been cleared for a rather dense re-growth of birch.

Generally the re-growth and encroachment of birch and other light-demanding and fast growing species are even a greater problem than anticipated before the project started. So a greater effort has to be put into this action, as it is underline in the modification request.

The local managers are trying to deal with it in various ways, and several minor tests of methods have been in play, and will be a part of the discussion on the seminar and the successful ones will be incorporated in the best practise handbook.

## **E Public awareness and dissemination of information.**

### **Action E.1: Mounting of map tables / information boards.**

In 2008 the board for site 20 (St. Økssø) has been finished and erected, a reduced copy of the board can be seen in Annex I.

The boards for site 103 will be finished in 2009, and the one for site 34 will be made during 2009, and erected as soon as the constructions work on the site permit it.

### **Action E.2: Governance: Co-operation with local communities, landowners and interest groups.**

Site 20:

The site is a very well visited area with around 75.000 visitors per year. There have been 5 tours with 253 participants

Site 34:



There has been established a special board to follow the project, the board consists of members elected among individuals who own land within the project area. There has been no contact with the board in 2008, due to the problems with a key stakeholder mentioned elsewhere in the report. There have been no guided tours on the site. It is the intention that with the project finally gaining momentum, the management plan shall be presented for the local community at an open meeting, and after this meeting there will be a guide tour on the site.

Site 49:

There has been held one guided tour of the area in 2008.

Site 88:

The site was one of the excursion sites during the LIFE Platform Meeting in 2008 (37 participants). In November the site was visited by representatives from the municipality of Vejen, which is planning for a restoration project on a raised bog (SCI no. 75 Vejen Mose).

Site 103:

There has been three tours at the site two with local NGO's and one with a board of local NGO's advising the municipality on topics of nature and outdoor recreation. There were 40 participants at the three tours.

Site 104:

There are no public access to the area, and as the owner are not interested in presenting the area to the public, there has not, and will not be held any guided tours on this site, nor will there be made or erected any information board. The only information and dissemination on this site will be through the project homepage.

Site 250:

The local society of nature lovers "Skovtrolden" [www.skovtrolden-vamdrup.dk](http://www.skovtrolden-vamdrup.dk) is still frequently arranging guided tours on the site, both for the general public and after order from special groups. In addition to this they hold lectures about the area and the restoration project. (9 guided tours with 244 participants and 8 lectures with 191 participants have been held in 2008).

The local project leader (Claus Simonsen) is a regular guest in a regional broadcast "Ud i naturen" (Out in Nature) which are transmitted every fortnight, here the progress of the project has been followed frequently.

A dragonfly enthusiast has made a homepage (in English) about the dragonflies on the site, and the positive effects of the project.

[http://home1.stofanet.dk/erland\\_refling/odo\\_svanemosen\\_uk.htm](http://home1.stofanet.dk/erland_refling/odo_svanemosen_uk.htm)

He had made the impressive observation of 32 different species of dragonflies (odonates) at the location.

Action E.3: Facilities for visitors including boardwalks.

No actions in this report period.

Action E.4: Best management guidelines for Danish bogs

No actions planned in this report period.

Action E.5: Seminar on improved methods for raised bog restoration.

No actions planned in this report period.

Action E.6: Production of a layman's report.

No actions planned in this report period.

Action E.7: Project web site.

The homepage is normally updated regularly. Due to a major reorganisation of the DFNA homepage in the spring of 2009, the homepage is at the present in need for updates.

**F Overall project management.**

Action F.1: Project management and co-ordination.

Due to the decommissioning of the counties and their ceasing of being partners, the organisation was revised in the approved project modification of September 2006.

In 2006 the DFNA decided to close down the State Forrest District of Haderslev. The responsibility for the project at site 250 was transferred to the State Forrest District of Randbøl, and so was the local project leader. The local project leader at Lindet State Forest District was changed in 2007, after her maternity leave she has left the DFNA, and has now been permanently replaced by the former local project leader.

Effective from January 1'st 2008 the DFNA has implemented new designations and names for the State Forrest Districts. The change does not affect the tasks of the regional offices.

**Organigram valid January 1'st 2009.**

Danish Forest and Nature Agency	<b>Project Management</b> <b>Danish Forest and Nature Agency</b> Project manager: Jesper Stenild M.Sc. in Forestry (Regional Office Kronjylland (Site 34, Brandstrup Mose)).	
	<b>Project working group</b>	
	Organisation	Name
	Regional Office Wadden Sea (Site 88, Kongens Mose)	Helle Kold Jespersen M.Sc. in Forestry. Local Project leader.
	Regional Office Trekantsområdet (Site 250, Svanemosen)	Claus Simonsen Forest Engineer. Local Project leader.
	Regional Office Mid Jutland (Site 49, Ndr. og Sdr. Boestmose)	Otto Buus. Forest Engineer. Local Project leader.
	Regional Office Himmerland (Site 20, St. Økssø)	Søren Kjær. M.Sc. in Forestry. Local Project leader.
	Regional Office Funen (Site 103 Storelung and Site 104 Nybo Mose)	Annita Svendsen M.Sc. in Biology. Local Project leader.
<b>Operational level: Danish Forest and Nature Agency, Regional Offices.</b>		

During the project working groups visit in Finland (see F.3), the group took the opportunity to discuss several aspects of the project.



Besides that there have been several bilateral meetings between the project leader and the local project leaders.

Action F.2: Effect Monitoring.

14\* automatic water level loggers have been installed on the sites managed by the former counties (34, 88, 103, 104 and 250). The main effort in 2008 has been to collect and secure the data from the loggers, a task that has been successful.

Use of external assistance will be needed to process and interpret the data, the cost for that is included in the revised budget in the modification request.

\*In earlier reports wrongly reported at 16.

Action F.3: Participation in international workshops and international networking.

The project working group has, together with a few others working on the project, had a very successful visit to Finland (Seitsemien National park). The main topics of the visit were visitor's facilities and restoration of hydrology, but also management of national parks and SCI areas was discussed. And we will here again send our thanks to our Finnish hosts who had arranged a solid and highly enlightening program. A report of the visit (in Danish) is enclosed in Annex G.

Action F.4: After-LIFE Conservation Plan.

No actions planned in this report period.

## 5. Problems encountered

### Site 34.

As mentioned in the first two progress reports a serious problem emerged in 2005. A high voltage cable on wooden masts crosses the site. Normally this should not have caused any problems, as the site is protected by a conservation order from 1984, which should have secured all parts with economical interests in the area a proper compensation. But the power company (hereafter EnergiMidt) claims that they never has been informed about the conservation order, and never had got any compensation. This disagreement could lead to the project falling behind schedule, to increased costs and in the uttermost worst case that the project on site 34 cannot be completed. During 2006 there was an intern clarification about the legal issues of this disagreement. On that background the county of Viborg and the project manager together began negotiations with the power company in the spring. It was agreed that a technical report on the ways of securing the masts has to be done. The county of Viborg agreed to pay for this report. The report was finished in September and was the basis for a meeting with EnergiMidt, November 10. At that meeting it was clear that the costs of securing the masts could be very close to the cost of making an underground cable leading the power line south of the SCI area. It was therefore decided that the consultant should present at estimating of the costs for such a project. This estimate was expected to be finished in December 2006, but was first ready at the end of January 2007.

The DFNA succeeded in finding financing to secure the masts inside the SCI area – the cost was estimated to 1 mill. DKK (135.000 €). In the spring 2007 DFNA offered this sum as a grant for EnergiMidt, if they preferred to establish a new under-ground cable round past the SCI area. This offer was accepted by EnergiMidt, who are at the moment are making the preparations for that work, which - if it stays on schedule - will be finished during this year (2008). It must be mentioned that the total cost of this underground cable are estimated to 2½- 3 mill DKK (335.000 – 400.000 €).

The decommissioning of the counties has caused another problem at site 34.

As a result of the hydrological investigation in 2005 a closed drainage tube north of the site, must be established in order to prevent nutrient enriched water from entering the bog and secure the farmland areas north of the site. The county of Viborg worked with that topic most of 2006. But the work progress was very slow, partly to resistance from two of the landowners. As a result Viborg County didn't manage to finish this part of the work before it was decommissioned. The work was continued by DFNA by the project manager at DFNA regional office Kronjylland. The negotiations, especially with one key owner of land, took place over a prolonged time, but ended early in 2008 with a negative result.

During the redesign of the project due to this result, it became clear, that the most important alternative solutions – to lead drainage water through the bog in the closed drainage tube – could not be accepted by the authorities. So further planning and investigations was made, and a project for legally forcing the owner to accept the tubing was drawn up by the private consultants. Facing this situation, the key private owner was (late 2008) again ready to negotiate for an agreement. But around New Year those talks seemed to be at a dead end too. Trying to get out of this deadlocked position the DFNA approached the owner with a renewed offer, this time containing an economic compensation on the condition that 9 ha agricultural land should be designated permanent grassland, that use of fertiliser and pesticides and new drainage should not longer be al-

lowed. Additionally it should be possible to transfer those 9 ha into the SCI area 34. As the ability to crop those areas due to effect of the project, seemed to be the owners main concern, and that he know could be compensated for that, has made him willing to accept this offer.

This agreement will remove the main obstacles for the project at site 34, and the project will now move on as fast as possible. But it is crystal clear, that it has no chance to finish within the project present schedule

And as it was hinted in the mid-term report a modification request asking for a prolongation will follow with this report. In this application the situation and prospects for the project at site 34 will be explained in further details.

#### Site 88.

Action B was planned to take place on site 88 and 34 (the one of site 34 insignificant compares to site 88) As stated in earlier reports the price of land has raised in the area, and the planned action has been raised from 2.9 mill DKr (395.000 €) to 4.7 mill DKr (630.000 €). As stated earlier too, the hydrological investigations under action A.2 revealed that the need to buy land to secure a correct water level within the high priority areas in the SCI is 50 % lesser than foreseen in the budget. Making it possible to keep the cost of this action within the budget. Due to the decommissioning of the counties the negotiation with the owners of selling or making contracts for accepting a higher water level has been very much behind schedule. Unfortunately the DFNA regional office was not able to proceed until winter 2007-08, and an offer was send to the private owners in spring 2008. In the last response from the owners they finally declined the offer during the summer of 2008.

That means it will be difficult to meet the objectives for restoring hydrology on this site. In the modification request that is forwarded with this progress report, we will suggest a solution that makes it possible to reach the objectives within the budget, presuming that a prolongation is granted.

#### Site 103:

Since the last report problems has emerged at this site. As mentioned under action C.1. The raise of the water level in the bog needs a permit from The Nature Conservancy Board. There have been applied for a permit as per June 24 2008. After asking all the owners for their opinion, the Board returned January 6'th 2009 asking for DFNA's opinion, as two of the owners had objections against the change in water level. April 14'th the board held a meeting on the site, but at the present there has been no decision yet. When the decision finally is made the complainants can chose to bring the case to the "Nature Conservancy Board of Appeal", and even if the decision of the Board of Appeal is final, it will put a severe pressure on the timetable of the project, and it will be questionable if we can manage to fulfil the obligations for action C.1 on this site within the time limit of the project.

Furthermore a new complication cropped up at the meeting on April 14'th. The municipality of Faaborg-Midtfyn, who will be the authority with responsibility for the site in the future were participating in this meeting. During the meeting they expressed the

standpoint that it is possible, that the raise in water level will need a permit according to the Watercourse Act. This will probably be decided within 2 - 4 weeks.

This is an entirely new situation, and have not been foreseen in the project application, if indeed the municipality (who are the authority in the field) decides that such a permit is needed, it will be even more questionable if we can manage to meet the obligations for action C.1 on this site within the time limit of the project. In that case only a prolongation will make it possible for us to reach the objective.

And we are already running late, as the State Environmental Center just have decided that an environmental impact assessment screening is needed (a screening that will decide if a regular EIA procedure is needed or not).

**A modification request is needed.**

Based on the situations described above, the DFNA has decided make a modification request, asking for one year prolongation of the project, and a restructure of the budget. The modification request is enclosed with this report.

## 6. Financial issues

### Project Costs Incurred

Budget category	Total cost according to the Commission's decision*	Total costs incurred from the start date to 31. December 2008	%
Personnel	€ 859.509	€ 469.589,87	<b>55 %</b>
Travel	€ 36.913	€ 15.426,71	<b>42 %</b>
External assistance	€ 1.032.057	€ 742.175,43	<b>72 %</b>
Durable goods - Infrastructure	€ 26.918	€ 11.089,15	<b>41 %</b>
Durable goods - Equipment	€ 36.474	€ 14.764,92	<b>40 %</b>
Durables goods - Prototypes	€ -	€ 0,00	<b>0 %</b>
Land/rights purchase/lease	€ 398.708	€ 0,00	<b>0 %</b>
Consumable material	€ 370.099	€ 139.868,13	<b>38 %</b>
Other direct costs	€ 22.746	€ 4.787,66	<b>21 %</b>
Overheads	€ 164.047	€ 97.839,13	<b>60 %</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	€ 2.947.471	€ 1.495.541,00	<b>51 %</b>
Direct revenues	€ 132.316	€ 181.447	<b>137 %</b>

#### \* In accordance with the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment, November 15<sup>th</sup> 2006

With only 50 % of the budget used with only one year left of the project, this is not satisfying, and reflects the setbacks encountered during late 2008, it also put emphasis on why a prolongation is needed. At the present the project are more in lack of time than funding.

There has been an income of 181.446,57 € from sale of timber and chips from action C.2 since the project start.

As the decommissioning of the Danish counties was effective from January 1, 2007, an audit has been made for each of the former partner's involvement in the project. This audit is done according to principles in the standard audit report in the LIFE toolbox.

## 7. Planned project progress

If the modification request and a prolongation are not granted, we will continue to finish, as much actions as possible, within the project present time frame, fulfilling so many obligations as possible.

If the modification request is accepted, we will move on following the new timetable outlined in this.

## 8. Annexes

Annex A: Report on introduction and testing of active re-vegetation methods.\*

Annex B: Report (mid-term) of the re-vegetation tests.\*

Annex C: Map from activities on site 20.

Annex D: Map from activities on site 250.

Annex E: Map from activities on site 88.

Annex F: Map from activities on site 103.

Annex G: Report from visit at Seitseminen National Park.\*

Annex H: Photos from the test of clearing of regrowth at site 20.

Annex I: Information board for site 20 (Reduced in size)

Annex J: Newspaper articles relating to the project.

\* In separate documents.