



<LIFE16 GIE/EE/000665>

Progress Report

Covering the project activities from 15/09/2017 to 31/10/2018

<30/11/2018>

<NaturallyEst-LIFE>

Data project

Project location:	Estonia, all regions
Project start date:	<15/09/2017>
Project end date:	<15/03/2022>
Total budget:	654,350€ (total eligible budget 652,300€)
EU contribution:	390,810€
(%) of eligible costs:	59.91% of total eligible budget

Data beneficiary

Name Beneficiary:	Estonian Fund for Nature
Contact person:	Mrs Mari Kaisel, Mrs Silvia Lotman
Postal address:	Lai St 29, 51014 Tartu, Estonia
Telephone:	+372 7428443; +372 53433346
E-mail:	mari ^o at elfond.ee, silvia at elfond.ee
Project Website:	http://elfond.ee/what-we-do/naturallyest ; http://elfond.ee/naturallyest

REQUIRED STRUCTURE:

Table of contents

List of key-words and abbreviations	2
Executive summary	3
General progress:	3
Assessment as to whether the project objectives and work plan are still viable	4
Identified deviations, problems and corrective actions taken in the period	4
Administrative part	5
Overall project's activity logic:	5
Changes in personnel:	6
Technical part	6
Progress per action	6
Envisaged progress until next report	20
Impact	20
Outside LIFE	21
Financial part	21
Costs incurred (summary by cost category and relevant comments)	21
5.2 Costs not foreseen in the project proposal	22
5.4 Annexed deliverables	24
5.5 Issues brought up in NaturallyEst-LIFE - project visit on 16 March 2018 (Ref. Ares(2018)2005705 - 15/04/2018)	24

1. List of key-words and abbreviations

ELF – Estonian Fund for Nature
UT – University of Tartu
KÕK – Environmental Law Centre
LO – Looduskiri
HD - Natura 2000 Helpdesk
FG - Focus group
EB – Environmental Board
MoE – Ministry of Environment
MS – Milestone

ND – not determined

PR – public relation

2. Executive summary

2.1. General progress:

The project **administrative part** has during the first period concentrated on preparatory actions necessary to achieve the project's objectives. Main emphasis has been on:

- creating the stakeholder database (Action A1);
- compiling baseline survey of the nature protection issues on society (Action C1),
- focus group (FG) interviews and analyses to map the stakeholders problems and conflicts with Natura 2000 (Action A2)
- activities related to public awareness, and dissemination of project results: the project's website (Action D1.1) is up, the HD page is advertised in various channels (social media, websites of KÖK, EB, direct communication to local municipalities etc), actions B1 and D1.1.

Besides the direct project activities, the emphasis has been on the cooperation with national nature protection stakeholders such as EB, MoE, Environmental Inspectorate etc. The strategic stakeholder is the EB as the national authority directly responsible for practical everyday implementation of Natura 2000. All the work has been supported by smooth project administration and coordination (Action E1), including setting up the project platform in Google drive, introducing the project management software Asana and steering the overall communication between partners and stakeholders. The Steering Committee has been formed and the first meeting has been held (Action E1).

The project's **technical part, i.e the core actions** have run smoothly so far. The important milestones we would like to highlight are:

- setting up the Natura 2000 Helpdesk (HD) and preliminary collection of HD cases (Action B1)
- First cases suitable for collection have been chosen (Action B2)
- First communication course of nature conservation spokespersons has started and first two training days are carried out (Action B4).
- First try-outs of open air events have been carried out (Action B5)
- The topic of the first citizen science campaign has chosen and team responsible for the campaign is compiled (Action B7)
- First three volunteer camps have been conducted and first long term volunteer recruited (Action B8)
- UT as the partner responsible for monitoring the social change has conducted the baseline survey (Action C1) and been actively participating in analysing project's actions and has provided indispensable help by suggesting the means and ways of intervention.

Financially the project has been within the foreseen budget, some unexpected costs have

occurred (see below).

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

Activities so far have supported fulfilment of project objectives and there has not been detected need to major changes. Still some smaller changes were elaborated with external monitor and implemented. Project work plan consisted in parallel development of FG interviews and baseline survey. The methodology of baseline survey was elaborated and changed so that baseline survey could take into account the findings from FG interviews (see below). This has caused a delay of finalising the survey and the Communication plan but the plan is in progress and will be soon finalised. Otherwise the project's working plan is viable.

2.3. Identified deviations, problems and corrective actions taken in the period

In large scale the project runs as planned. There are a few minor changes, mainly concerning the timeframe and design of planned actions.

In action C1 the baseline survey questionnaire had original deadline in December 2017 and the baseline survey itself had original deadline in February 2018. This time frame did not make possible to take into account the FG interview input to the baseline survey as the interviews were running at the same time. After elaborating with external monitor, the time frame was shifted and the questionnaire was completed in June 2018 and the survey itself in October 2018. This in turn, caused also the delay in Action A2 - the Communication plan will be finalised only in December 2018. On the other hand, this change enabled us to map possible conservation conflicts with use of generated knowledge from FG interviews and to design questionnaire so that it assesses the mapped problems in quantitative study. UT - partner responsible for the survey - used the time in project start to interview EB officials about their experience in conservation conflict and to apply permission for usage of large national databases from Estonian Data Protection Inspectorate and was able additionally to analyse information from Eurobarometer survey, land register data, data from Environmental Inspectorate, media monitoring etc. The decision proved to be justified as the sample of recipients was less random and therefore the risk minimised that the baseline survey includes irrelevant answers. As a positive side effect the database analyses and compiled sample enables repeating the survey during and after LIFE project with lesser expenses as the relevant sample makes questioning more effective.

3. Administrative part

Overall project's activity logic:

1. The NaturallyEst-LIFE project has two project managers - the tasks are divided between Mari Kaisel (0.3, until 04/2018 0.7) and Silvia Lotman (0.7, until 04/2018 0.3). Project managers divide their tasks according to necessities - in large scale Silvia is responsible for coordination of project activities, whereas Mari is responsible for looking after the LIFE requirements, reports and documentation.
2. The communication team of the coordinating beneficiary ELF has two members - communication manager Kertu Hool (until 03/2018 Mariliis Haljasorg) with fluctuating workload according to needs (in year 2018 about 0,4) and communication assistant Laura Oro with fluctuating workload according to need (in year 2018 about 0,25). Communication manager Katre Liiv from KÕK is supporting the communication team with the marketing of Natura 2000 Helpdesk.
3. The partner KÕK has two lawyers - Merlyn Mannov and Kaarel Relve - working for the project and juridical assistant Pille Priks and communication manager Katre Liiv assisting needed activities.
4. The partner UT has one main expert Maie Kiisel who has fluctuating workload according to need, and two assisting researchers conducting monitoring of the project - Meriliis Kasemets and Hans Hõrak. The involvement of UT in project activities has been more intense during the baseline survey and will be less intense in periods of other activities where only regular monitoring is planned.
5. The partner LO has one main expert Jaan Riis taking part in project team meetings and one assistant. The personnel will be hired for the project during the intensive event organising season in summer 2019.
6. The project had during the kick-off period (first 6 months) monthly partner meetings in order to commence all the project's actions based on the common understanding. When necessary, the specific actions (for example baseline survey, website, HD, citizen science campaigns, voluntary camps, communication trainings, open air events) have had special meetings related to specific goals and technical details.
7. Partners ELF and KÕK use the project and team management app Asana to follow inner deadlines and activities for NaturallyEst-LIFE. All the project's documentation is kept on the Google Drive project folder that is shared by all partners. All meeting memos, lists of participants and other materials are kept and ordered by activities. HD registry is kept as a separate shared document that is visible only to HD team members so that the personalised data is kept confidential. The project management and communication team has paid access to BNS news feed that is most important Estonian media communication platform that enables topic-related online news feed and analyses. Financial documents are stored according to the accounting rules of every partner.
8. Environmental Board is the most important outside LIFE partner, so many meetings and discussions have been held with EB in order to plan and carry out the various

activities (baseline survey, HD, communication training) of the project in the best way.

9. Steering Committee is devised so that it includes representatives from all national authorities who have direct or indirect responsibilities in Natura 2000 and nature conservation: MoE, EB, Environmental Inspectorate, State Forest Management Centre, Environmental Agency, Ministry of Rural Affairs, Environment Committee of the Parliament of Estonia, Estonian Naturalist's Society and Zero-bureaucracy committee. The first meeting of the Steering Committee was held on 16/03/2018 in Tartu.

Changes in personnel:

10. As during the start of the project the main project manager Silvia Lotman was on a maternity leave the tasks between project managers were first divided so that Mari Kaisel was setting up project documentation and running the kick-off of the project (part-time 0.7) and Silvia Lotman was assisting part-time 0.3. Since April 2018 the project management tasks have been re-divided so that Mari Kaisel takes care of mainly administrative tasks (0.3) and Silvia Lotman is responsible for the activities (0.7).
11. In KÕK - Siim Vahtrus, one of the original team members of the NaturallyEst-LIFE project, has left the project team for other assignments and in September 2018 his tasks are overtaken by new lawyer recruited by KÕK - Kaarel Relve. Siim Vahtrus remains the member of projects Steering Committee.
12. In ELF - communication manager Mariliis Haljasorg has left the project team and her tasks were in April 2018 overtaken by Kertu Hool who has returned from maternity leave.

Partnership agreements are attached as Annex VII.

4. Technical part

4.1. Progress per action

Action A1 Stakeholder database

Foreseen start date: 01.09.2017 Actual start date: 15.09.2017

Foreseen end date: 31.12.2017 Actual end date: 31.12.2017

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
Database created	31/12/2017	Completed Relevant stakeholder contacts were collected in time, the database is supplemented whenever a new contact emerges.

The database was compiled by KÕK juridical assistant Pille Priks and is mainly a tool for KÕK work for the project: to keep track on all stakeholders involved or possible interested parties. The database was used as a source of contacts for FG interview invitations.

Action A2 Focus group meetings

Foreseen start date: 01.09.2017 Actual start date: 15.09.2017

Foreseen end date: 30.06.2018 Anticipated end date: 15.12.2018

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
Focus groups finalised (10)	30/06/2018	Completed Focus group interviews were conducted as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Managers of semi-natural communities (farmers) in Matsalu NP (12 Jan 2018) 2. Managers of semi-natural communities (farmers) in Karula NP (29 Jan 2018) 3. Hunters (12 Feb 2018) 4. Local landowners in Lahemaa NP (3 March 2018) 5. Forest smallholder owners (28 March 2018) 6. Summerhouse owners (28 March 2018) 7. EB officials (5 April 2018) 8. Local municipality officials (12 April 2018) 9. Forest protection activists (8 May 2018) 10. Forestry company representatives (10 May 2018)
Communication plan compiled	30/06/2018	In progress, expected by 12/2018 The project team started to work on Communication plan on time but as big amount of input to the Communication plan was expected from the baseline survey and the baseline survey was delayed due to slight change of project time frame (see above and below) the Communication plan is still in progress and is expected to be finalised by 12/2018.

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Actions
Focus group reports (analysis of 10 FG cases)	06/2018	Completed, submitted in Annex I.
Elaborated communication plan	06/2018	In Progress, expected by 12/2018 The Communication plan in progress is taking into account the findings of the FG analyses as well as baseline survey. Draft communication plan added as Annex VIII

The FG stakeholder groups were identified and contacts made with representatives by project team. For every interview a set of questions was compiled, some questions were the same to all stakeholders (for example ‘Please describe your experiences with nature conservation official processes like applying for some licence etc’) and some questions were

added especially to bring up specific topics (like hunting regulation commenting by hunters). Originally the FG interviews were planned in project to be conducted by KÖK lawyer and juridical assistant. During project team planning meetings we assessed that the stakeholders may not find KÖK lawyer neutral enough to open up and speak freely. For this reason communication expert Leene Korp was hired to conduct the interviews. Her salary was issued from the ELF communication personnel cost. All interviews were thoroughly prepared and later transcribed and analysed by KÖK lawyer and juridical assistant as well as the project team in ELF. The outcome shows that the precaution to recruit a neutral interviewer proved itself and her neutral view enabled the project team to see conservation conflict in a larger context. After finalising the interviews she also put together an analyses from a neutral point of view that enabled project team to see Natura 2000 conflicts from a different perspective. In order to conduct the FG meetings in suitable locations for interviewed people a need to rent a venue for some interviews arised. As the budget did not foresee room rental costs for this activity, we found solution by transferring funds from B4 room rental costs into A2 room rental costs. The change does not hinder activity B4 as the strategic partner EB has offered possibility to use the rooms of EB free of charge for some meetings in action B4.

The FG analysis based on 10 interviews is added as Annex I. The report brings out different stories that stakeholders tell when asked about Natura 2000 areas and their management. The main findings of the report are: most reasons for conflict can be grouped as (1) lack of trust between stakeholders and state institutions, (2) conflicts caused by different regulations that are felt as unfair, (3) conflicts caused by lack of communication skills. Forest protection activists were found to have less trust in state institutions whereas representatives of big forestry companies had least problem with trust. Too complex regulations were found problem by most of the stakeholders. Landowners and land managers had most stories about conservation regulations that do not work as intended. Big forest owners and hunters had less problems with regulations. Need for better communication skills was most felt by EB officials and local municipality officials as well as landowners. Summerhouse owners found the communication skills as less important.

Communication plan needs all available input about target groups, and as the project baseline survey was delayed (see below) it was not possible to finalise the communication plan in time. The working document of communication plan is ready but there has not been enough time to elaborate it with all project team and therefore the deliverable is not finalised by deadline. However the working document is in progress and the communication plan is expected to be finalised by 12/2018, the existing draft is added in Annex VIII.

Action B1 Natura 2000 Helpdesk (HD)

Foreseen start date: 01/01/2018 Actual start date: 01/01/2018

Foreseen end date: 15/03/2022 Anticipated end date: 15/03/2022

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
Database of HD cases (30)	01/2019	In progress A registry of HD cases is added as Annex IX.
All cases solved and added to the database	03/2022	not yet relevant

The setup of Helpdesk was conducted in time. Any interested person can place a Natura 2000 related question on KÕK webpage where a special site for the HD is uploaded (<http://www.k6k.ee/looduskaitse/kusi-nou>). There is also a frequently asked question section on the HD site (<http://www.k6k.ee/looduskaitse/kkk>). ELF has link to the helpdesk site on our project's website. In first couple of months after the launch of the HD over 20 cases were collected. All the cases (both placed question and the answer) are stored in Google drive folder. The HD team is giving an initial answer to the question during 3 working days. Some questions are easy to answer during short time but in more difficult cases, meetings can be organised when either nature conservation expert or the lawyer (or both) can go to get a better understanding of the situation and explain the matters in legal and in conservation framework.

There are 29 cases served on very different topics, the activity will go on during the project period. Citizens have turned to HD if they need assistance with building regulations and forest cutting regulations, also if they have had arguments with other land users or if a natural species has damaged their property. Also 4 cases are where landowner is interested in better conservation on their land (more information about species or consultation on how to make proposition to be added to Natura 2000 network). EB officials have turned to HD in case if landowners needed an external juridical or biodiversity expert explanations about reasons and means of protection. A registry of HD cases is added as Annex IX.

The action B1 contains direct personnel costs for nature conservation expert, however some nature conservation experts have asked to be involved rather as external experts than personnel as their commitment to project is planned to be very short term (mainly one- or two-day field days answering Natura 2000 Helpdesk questions). Therefore, partly the direct personnel costs of Action B1 are transferred to External expertise in action B1 (previously there was not such budget line in this action).

Action B2 Case studies

Foreseen start date: 01/06/2018 Actual start date: 16/10/2018

Foreseen end date: 30/05/2021 Anticipated end date: 30/05/2021

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
12 case studies published	05/2021	not yet relevant

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Actions
Case studies made public	05/2021	not yet relevant

Although we have seen considerable interest to submit questions to HD, not all the questions have been directly related to Natura 2000 or relevant regulations. It is clear that for regular citizen the distinguishment between Natura 2000 and other nature conservation regulations is not clear. As first our HD advertising to media was more just getting information out about the HD, we now have started to approach more specific audiences (local municipalities, EB) and ask their cases that might be more relevant for case study descriptions. In this way we can direct the questions to be more relevant to Natura 2000 and the regulative gaps that need

external view. In October 2018 the HD team decided to start drafting first case study. As there has been repeated questions about building regulations for small buildings (saunas, summer kitchens) the team has decided to write first case study to explain these regulations.

Action B3 Natura 2000 handbook

Foreseen start date: 01/01/2020 Anticipated start date ND

Foreseen end date: 31/12/2020 Anticipated end date: 31/12/2020

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
Handbook completed	12/2020	not yet relevant

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Actions
Handbook	012/2020	not yet relevant

Action B4 Communication trainings for nature conservation spokespersons

Foreseen start date: 01/11/2017 Actual start date: 01/02/2018

Foreseen end date: 31/03/2020 Anticipated end date: 31/03/2020

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
I course completed	12/2018	In progress The programme, participant list and training materials are attached to the report in Annex II
II course completed	12/2019	not relevant yet
Course description for future replication	03/2020	not relevant yet

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Actions
Course description for future replication	03/2020	not relevant yet

The first course was designed for EB officials who are directly involved in Natura 2000 management activities and communicating those to wider public. After discussions with EB and conducting FG interviews the project team found that EB officials and local municipality officials are very different target groups that need different approaches. The decision was made to target the communication training only to EB officials and thus to create a homogeneous group with focus on better communication of Natura 2000. The local municipality officials will be targeted more via HD so they can have more insight in Natura 2000 as a regulation that helps also them in their work. The course is filled by 15 officials who were selected by EB administration. A background survey for the training participants was conducted via Google forms. According to the answers the 5-day training was designed

as follows. Personal communication skills and interpersonal communication basics (2 training days - 31 October, 1 November 2018), negotiation skills (1 day, expected on 12th December 2018), communication with media and in social media (1 day in January 2019), conservation conflict mediation and case solving (1 day in February 2019). The delay of not fulfilling all 5 training days in 2018 was due to tight schedule of training participants. The first two training days were lead by external expert - psychology trainer Daniel Soomer. The training consisted mainly in active participation exercises to understand and learn to implement basic skills in active listening, assertiveness and different types of conflicts. The training participants were very active and thankful for the training and filled the feedback sheets with very high endorsements. The general layout (module programme), participant list and training materials are attached to the report in Annex II.

The original plan included in action B4 only personnel costs of ELF. In the technical description (C1b form) the external expertise was included but somehow it was mistakenly left out from the budget. However, as the first target group consisted of Natura 2000 managers and officials from EB - the need for the course content was discussed and coordinated with EB. Therefore, the direct personnel costs were partly replaced by external assistance costs in order to provide the best available expert knowledge - communication psychologist, negotiation expert etc.

Action B5 Open-air events “Natura 2000 and our community”

Foreseen start date: 01/04/2018 Actual start date: 01/09/2018

Foreseen end date: 09/2021 Anticipated end date: ND

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
15 events organised	03/2020	In progress
36 events organised	09/2021	not relevant yet

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Actions
36 reports of follow-up activities from events	09/2021	not relevant yet

There was slight insecurity felt by the partner with starting the activities as (1) the partner had not been implementing EU funded projects before and (2) as the baseline survey was not ready it was difficult to find best suiting Natura 2000 area and community to target. To overcome the problem ELF project managers Silvia Lotman and Mari Kaisal conducted an EU project financing training meeting to the partner. As the Communication plan was not yet agreed between partners 3 pilot events were conducted by LO in September-November in order to test the readiness of the general public for such events. The events were called out in the newlist of Looduse Omnibuss (about 20 000 readers), webpage of Looduse omnibuss www.looduseomnibuss.ee and there was a story of each event in the FB site of Looduse Omnibuss (10 330 followers). Also, each event is put on the Looduse Omnibuss Twitter site. The events and the media channels to introduce them are now analysed and during winter B5 team meeting is organised to propose event plan for the summer 2019 that is aligned with Communication plan. The partner is experienced in event management and we do not foresee that this slight delay in starting the activities would anyhow compromise fulfilling the MS deadlines.

The first open-air event was organised on 22/09/2018 in Matsalu NP. The event took place during Matsalu nature film festival that is a local cultural event for endorsing the nature of the area. The participants were taken by rental bus to an excursion and festival events. **The second open-air event** was organised on 20/10/2018 to the Muuksi historic landscapes in Lahemaa NP - the family-friendly event brought together city folks and local community in hands-on conservation works for the local Natura 2000 area. The event brought together the EB, the National Heritage Board, the local community spokespersons and other interested parties. **The third event** is going on 11/11/2018 to the newest NP in Estonia - the Alutaguse NP - in order to introduce the easternmost Natura 2000 site in European Union and to hear the fresh experiences from the local community leaders in the process of creation of a national park.

Action B6 Study tours

Foreseen start date: 01/04/2019 Actual start date: ND

Foreseen end date: 09/2020 Anticipated end date: ND

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
5 study trips finalised	03/2020	not relevant yet

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Actions
Report on 5 study trips follow-up conclusions	03/2020	not relevant yet

The study tours plan will be elaborated in Communication plan and put together in detail after discussions with EB in 2019.

Action B7 Citizen science campaigns

Foreseen start date: 01/04/2019 Actual start date: ND

Foreseen end date: 03/2022 Anticipated end date: ND

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
I campaign completed	03/2020	In progress
II campaign completed	03/2022	not relevant yet

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Actions
I campaign communication strategy and result report	03/2020	not relevant yet
II campaign communication strategy and result report	03/2022	not relevant yet

In 2017 the project team sent out request to ecological researchers to submit possible science projects suitable for citizen science. A few ideas were collected and the most prospective topic was chosen after meeting with plant ecology working group from University of Tartu. It is planned to run a campaign on gathering genetical and landscape data of a common cowslip (*Primula veris*). During 2018/2019 winter the project team will prepare the campaign materials and if the cooperation will work then the campaign is planned to be run in spring 2019.

Action B8 Enhancing learning by volunteering in Natura 2000 areas

Foreseen start date: 01/01/2018 Actual start date: 01/01/2018

Foreseen end date: 31/12/2021 Anticipated end date: ND

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
5 volunteer camps organised	01/2020	In progress 3 two-day camps organised
5 long-term volunteers filled their program	01/2020	In progress 1 long-term volunteer filled the program
10 volunteer camps organised	06/2022	not relevant yet
10 long-term volunteers filled their program	06/2022	not relevant yet

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Actions
10 picture blogs from volunteer camps published	09/2021	In progress
10 long-term volunteering stories published as blogs or articles	06/2022	In progress

In spring 2018 project team had meetings to target the long-term volunteering and short-term volunteering activities in the project. The focus was to recruit long-term volunteers whose experience can give fruitful insights to Natura 2000 conservation volunteering. The short-term volunteering was planned into a series of volunteer camps that would have diverse program with cultural dimension and help us to tell personal conservation volunteering stories.

In 2018 summer an international Erasmus student Celia Lopez from Portugal was recruited as a long term volunteer. She was selected because she had previous experience from conservation volunteering in other countries and her task was to help organise volunteer camps in Estonia and analyse the similarities and differences in the end of her term. Celia had a mentor from the NaturallyEst volunteer camps team (Kadri Aller) and one of her tasks was also to help to elaborate positive messages about conservation volunteering and how to introduce the Estonian volunteer camp experience in other countries. She helped to organise activities in ELF including the “Summer school of conservation camps”, LIFE platform meeting in Estonia and promoting conservation camps in Matsalu Nature Film Festival. Her

personal blog on her volunteering term is published here: <https://natureconservationvolunteers.blogspot.com/>. After completing her long-term volunteering in Estonia Celia gave a talk in Estonian University of Life Sciences about the differences and similarities of Estonian and Portugal conservation volunteering. Celia has now returned home but she will be giving a video speech to Estonian volunteers in December 2018 and will be then awarded the first “NaturallyEst_LIFE long-term volunteer certificate”. In summer 2018 conservation three volunteers camps were organised under title “Summer school of conservation camps” in Palupõhja nature school and its surroundings during 19th-24th July (<http://talgud.ee/talgud/2018/suvekool>, <http://talgud.ee/talgud/2018/suvekoolj2rg>). The aim of the summer school was to introduce the Natura 2000, heritage culture and conservation needs in various set of activities in situ. The activities included traditional scything trainings that helped to mow considerable amount of protected meadow. In addition there were lectures, concerts and fitness training “how to do physical conservation work that helps both body and mind”. Altogether 67 people visited camps (Annex III). Together there are now 3 two-day volunteer camps organised and a plan concluded for all camps until the end of the project. The camps were documented by participants and public photo albums published in social media. Also journalists visited the camps and published articles (see attached media coverage table). The blog posts made about volunteer camps: <http://talgud.ee/lugu/eestimaa-looduse-fondi-talgute-suvekool-uhendab-looduskaitse-ja-paranduskultuuri>, <http://talgud.ee/lugu/elfi-suvekool-teeb-head-nii-loodusele-kui-talgulisele>.

Action B8 has by mistake two different numbers in the application form in technical description C1b. The deliverables and milestones have 10 camps whereas in the text there are calculations for 16 camps. The right number is 10 camps for the foreseen budget (640 EUR for accommodation, 660 EUR for catering per one camp).

Action C1 Monitoring of social change

Foreseen start date: 01/09/2017 Actual start date: 15/09/2017

Foreseen end date: 03/2022 Anticipated end date: 03/2022

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
Baseline survey questionnaire developed	12/2017	Completed by 07/2018
Baseline survey finalised	02/2018	Completed by 10/2018
Follow-up survey I finalised	12/2020	not relevant yet
Follow-up survey II finalised	02/2022	not relevant yet
Mid-term monitoring report	12/2019	not relevant yet
Final monitoring report	06/2022	not relevant yet
Chosen methods for socio-economic impact assessment	02/2018	Completed by 05/2018 UT organised a politology students seminar under Maie Kiisel supervision to compile methodology for socio-economic analyses.

		The chosen methods consists mainly of interviews of local municipality leaders and local entrepreneurs to ask them about possibilities and opportunities for economic development in Natura 2000 areas. The aim of the study is to find as much as possible win-win situations to nature and economy.
Mid-term report for socio-economic impact assessment	12/2019	not relevant yet
Final report for socio-economic impact assessment	11/2021	not relevant yet

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Actions
Baseline survey questionnaire developed	12/2017	Completed by 07/2018, questionnaire submitted in Annex IV.
Baseline survey finalised	02/2018	Completed by 10/2018, survey submitted in Annex V.
Follow-up survey I finalised	12/2020	not relevant yet
Follow-up survey II finalised	02/2022	not relevant yet
Socio-economic impact assessment finalised	11/2021	not relevant yet
Updated KPI Table	06/2022	not relevant yet
Mid-term monitoring report	12/2019	not relevant yet
Final monitoring report	11/2021	not relevant yet

The original baseline survey was redesigned in the beginning of the project. During the application process the activities were not enough aligned between the partners and during the kick-off period of the project the baseline survey was elaborated in details between the partners. The original plan was to carry out detached survey in parallel with FG interviews. The original survey methodology had been designed as a combination of questionnaires, general polling and interviews. During the kick-off of the project a new design was planned: first analysing large databases of land ownership and different types of owners, second the media coverage of Natura 2000 topics in 2016-2017 and third the survey poll among people and companies who own land property with conservation restrictions. The poll questionnaire for target groups was planned to be developed based on the outcomes of FG interviews and elaborated with EB officials. The questionnaire was tested on test group and finalised in June 2018 (Annex IV, in Estonian). The poll was done by external contractor by phone call polling

method using the developed questionnaire. There were 300 private Natura 2000 landowners and 200 enterprise Natura 2000 landowners polled for the survey.

The main finding of the survey is that only small part of Natura 2000 landowners live or act locally on the Natura 2000 area. The study enables to divide landowners into groups of bystanders, active managers and “nature lovers”. The analysis explores the potential of communication activities to increase the support to nature conservation among different interest groups. The authors of the analysis recommend focusing on practical guidelines (instead of the general importance of nature conservation) in communication with lay public. The principles of nature conservation should be integrated into the everyday activities of the community living in the area - this way also the passive and uninterested groups can be involved in the spread of knowledge. Local business representatives are more critical to nature conservation than local inhabitants, especially those who are occupied in the agriculture and forestry sector. Nature conservation specialists can develop direct cooperation with the larger enterprises. It is also recommended to enhance the entrepreneurial forms and ways of living that suite well to the area without endangering the principles of nature conservation. The study shows that neither the severity of the restrictions nor the compensations granted to alleviate them do not form the support to nature conservation (these are being taken for granted). Satisfaction with nature conservation is higher when people find enough activity in the conservation area and feel that they are supported in it (community support, satisfactory infrastructure, enough services). Contacts with the nature conservation administration are more often positively than negatively evaluated. Critical experiences are more common to entrepreneurs and those who are less experienced with nature conservation. The less a person is connected to the community and finds no positive impulses from its social interactions the more the person is liable to be negatively minded towards all society as well as Natura 2000. The study is attached in Annex V (In Estonian).

Changes in the action C1. In the application form the original plan was to make an opinion poll as thoroughly external assistance - the costs altogether 15 000 EUR, i.e. two different polls in three waves: 1. target group survey in the beginning and in the end of the project, 2. survey of general public in the beginning, in the middle and in the end of the project) has been designed as follows. The survey costs are divided into two periods: 1) baseline survey 8000 EUR (first wave of the target group survey and two waves of general public surveys) and 2) follow up survey 7000 EUR (second wave of the target group survey and third wave of general public survey).

From the baseline survey budget (8000 EUR) 5700 EUR was planned to transfer from the external costs into direct personnel costs (monitoring assistant) and 2300 EUR planned to remain for the external assistance costs (the assistance in baseline target group survey). In reality 4970 EUR was used for direct personnel costs and 2920 EUR for external assistance from the survey service provider, and 110 EUR for the contact data of the interviewees that were purchased from IT and Development Centre (Ministry of the Interior).

Action D1 Communication and dissemination of the project and its results

The communication and dissemination activities started with the start of the project. The most strategic networking partner to the project team is EB as national Natura 2000 authority thus regular meetings are hold with EB to discuss project activities and success. The project team is open to invitations, following presentations have been made by project manager: LIFE projects kick-off meeting in Brussels (10/17), project presentation on Matsalu National Park

stakeholder meeting (12/17), project presentation on conference “Nature conservation messages” in Tallinn (03/18).

With the beginning of first public events (volunteer camps) also media work started for the project. All media publications related to the project are collected to a excel sheet (Annex VI).

The timetable of this activity in the application form is incorrect. The timetable of this activity should cover whole project period.

For the clearer picture the timetable has been remodified so that all subactions are separated (in the original application form all the milestones and deliverables were on the same table).

Action D1.1 Website

Foreseen start date: 02/2018 Actual start date: 02/2018

Foreseen end date: 03/2022 Anticipated end date: 03/2022

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
Project website launched	02/2018	Completed, website is in ongoing development during project period

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Action
Project website	02/2018	Completed

In January 2018 a simple project description and general data web page was uploaded to Estonian Fund for Nature homepage <http://elfond.ee/what-we-do/naturallyest>. In addition to the project page a separate web page was developed for HD activities <http://www.k6k.ee/looduskaitse>. In addition, there will be at least two more websites developed during the project to promote citizen science campaigns. It was first anticipated that as there will be special websites for specific project actions there will be no need for more complicated webpage development. Nevertheless, during 2018 when project activities took place a more comprehensive website was needed to keep all project deliverables and news updated. For this reason, a separate webpage was developed and uploaded to <http://elfond.ee/naturallyest>. This website will be constantly updated during the project, but the simple project data sheet on Estonian Fund for Nature homepage will remain there as a gateway to the developed new site. English version of the website is still based on the project description site. There are no special Facebook pages and the information is shared through Estonian Fund for Nature and Estonian Environmental Law Center Facebook pages. New Facebook (and other social media) page will be elaborated if needed for specific citizen science campaigns.

Action D1.2 Notice boards

Foreseen start date: 06/2018 Actual start date: 06/2018

Foreseen end date: 01/2019 Anticipated end date: 02/2019

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Action
Notice boards	02/2019	In progress

By consulting external monitor we have decided that instead of permanent notice boards we will produce two roll-ups that enhance communication of Natura 2000. The roll-ups are easy to carry to project events and can be presented excessively during the project. The design of roll-ups is in progress and print-out expected by 02/2019.

Action D1.3 Layman's report

Foreseen start date: 06/2021 Actual start date: ND

Foreseen end date: 12/2021 Anticipated end date: ND

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
Layman's report	12/2021	Not relevant yet

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Action
Layman's report		Not relevant yet

Action D1.4 Networking with other LIFE and non-LIFE projects

Foreseen start date: 01/2019 Actual start date: 09/2017

Foreseen end date: 03/2022 Anticipated end date: ND

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
Searching for Natura2000 professionals in EU who are interested in project team presentations	03/2020	In progress
Half of the presentations and workshops carried out	11/2021	Not relevant yet
All presentations and workshops carried out	12/2021	Not relevant yet

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Action
18 presentation and workshop reports	03/2022	Not relevant yet

The project has started with developing contacts with other LIFE projects. The first contact was made during LIFE projects kick-off meeting in Brussels with another information and communication project "LIFE living Natura 2000-Project". The cooperation has evolved into a publication in ANLIEGEN NATUR 40(2), 2018.

Secondly the project has developed contacts with Estonian LIFE projects. As LIFE_ME and EstBAT-LIFE are implemented by Estonian Fund for Nature the contact with projects is close. Also LIFE to Alvars implemented by EB is in regular contact with project team.

NaturallyEst_LIFE project contributed to planning and implementing of the LIFE platform meeting in Estonia, Tartu (19/10/18) Mari Kaisel participated as representative of NaturallyEst LIFE project as rapporteur of a workshop meeting LIFE volunteering and young people. Besides learning about volunteering in other LIFE projects, the main benefit from the platform meeting to NaturallyEst LIFE was exchange of contacts with two projects dealing with conservation communication issues (LIFE14 NAT/UK/000467, SciuriousLIFE and citizen science site of Latvian Fund for Nature).

Name of the MS	Deadline	Actions (Status 30/11/2018)
Carried out meeting for Estonian stakeholders to present the results of focus group meetings and to show how the focus groups were organised	12/2018	Date choosing in the progress, expected in 01/2019
Communication toolkit feedback given to Europarc	06/2020	Not relevant yet
English version of the Handbook	12/2020	Not relevant yet
Open-air events and study tours' design meeting and presentation to state Environmental Board, Ministry of Environment and other Estonian stakeholders carried out	06/2021	Not relevant yet
Lessons learned meeting to Estonian stakeholders carried out	12/2021	Not relevant yet
Article about Natura2000 handbook written and sent to EU networks for publication on webpages	03/2021	Not relevant yet
Citizen science campaign presentation meeting to Estonian universities and museums carried out	02/2021	Not relevant yet

Action E1 Project management

Foreseen start date: 15/09/2017 Actual start date: 15/09/2017

Foreseen end date: 15/03/2022 Anticipated end date: 15/03/2022

Sub action E1.1 After-LIFE Plan

Name of the Deliverable	Deadline	Action
AfterLIFE plan	06/2022	Not relevant yet

4.2. Envisaged progress until next report

Actions / sub-actions		2017		2018				2019				Envisaged progress until the next Progress report due by 30/11/2019	
		3T	4T	1T	2T	3T	4T	1T	2T	3T	4T		
Overall project schedule	Proposed												Carry on according to the project plan
	Actual												
Action A1	Proposed												Add up to the database in emerging of new stakeholder contacts
	Actual												
Action A2	Proposed												Introduce the results to conservation officers
	Actual												
Action B1	Proposed												Keep up the case database, find more prospective handbook cases
	Actual												
Action B2	Proposed												First case studies analysed and described, solutions provided.
	Actual												
Action B3	Proposed												No actions yet
	Actual												
Action B4	Proposed												Both courses completed
	Actual												
Action B5	Proposed												1/3 of the events carried out
	Actual												
Action B6	Proposed												List of study trip destinations completed, 2 study trips carried out
	Actual												
Action B7	Proposed												First campaign started
	Actual												
Action B8	Proposed												6 volunteer camps organised
	Actual												
Action C1	Proposed												Mid-term monitoring report and socio-economic impact assessment report
	Actual												
Action D1	Proposed												Activities based on project plan.
	Actual												
Action E1	Proposed												Project coordination according to project plan
	Actual												

4.3. Impact

The project is still in the early phase therefore the direct impacts are modest. However, the action B1 Natura 2000 Helpdesk is providing real counselling and legal advice already today, impacting the local decisions toward more Natura 2000 friendly and legally sound directions. Also, the feedback from the first two modules of the communication training (B4) indicate that communication skills of conservation officers will improve in the near future and the risk of emerging conservation conflicts due to lack of communication skills therefore lessens.

ELF’s conservation volunteering activity has long history, however, the volunteer camps in the NaturallyEst-LIFE project have some additional benefits (connecting conservation holidays with fitness oriented lifestyle) that brings new groups to the nature conservation activities.

Environmental Governance & Information: Action A2 (FG meetings) has indirect impact in solving or reducing conservation conflicts as the stakeholders with whom the interviews were held brought out that they feel that someone listened to them and listing the conflicts and problems has already brought relief. As the cases are shared with the EB, it is probable that the method will be adopted in the future to update the awareness of problematic situations and therefore find solutions already before the crisis have cumulated.

Key Project-level Indicators (KPIs): The targets and indicators have remained the same.

Policy implications: There are several project activities that may result in possible new solutions to better implementation of Natura 2000 network. The FG interviews helped to map different target groups’ view on the implementation practices. Also HD is open to different options for better implementation. The HD cases are discussed with EB so that the policy recommendations would be realistic to the state institutions. Via EB the most realistic policy recommendations can find the way to the MoE, and thus, to the national legal framework for better implementation of Natura 2000. The first possible policy implications will discussed with MoE and EB during 01/2019 stakeholder meeting. Until now there have been only minor proposals to EB consider some changes in official informing style. But more relevant policy recommendations are expected during compiling the case studies that base on HD solved cases.

4.4.Outside LIFE

Not relevant yet.

5. Financial part

5.1. Costs incurred (summary by cost category and relevant comments)

Fill in the following table concerning the incurred project costs:

Budget breakdown categories	Budgeted costs in €*	Costs incurred from the start	% of Budget**
-----------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	---------------

		date to 31/10/2018 in €	
1. Personnel	432 050.00	76 478.38	17.7
2. Travel and subsistence	15 500.00	1 785.98	11.52
3. External assistance	90 000.00	4 578.87	5.09
4. Durable goods			
Infrastructure			
Equipment	2 050.00		0
Prototype	300.00		0
5. Land purchase / long-term lease			
6. Consumables	19 600.00	3 762.72	19.2
7. Other Costs	52 200.00	2 015.57	3.86
8. Overheads	40 600.00	5 046.00	12.43
TOTAL	652 300.00	93 687.52	14.36

*) If the EASME has officially approved a budget modification through an amendment, indicate the breakdown of the revised budget

***) Calculate the percentages by budget lines: e.g. what % of the budgeted personnel costs is incurred by dd/mm/yyyy

- The expenses are proportionally small in the budget line External assistance and Other costs. Majority of the costs in External assistance are related to Action B7 Citizen science campaigns - that is still in the preparatory phase. It is expected that about half of the costs are going to be spent during 2019 while we carry out first campaign. Secondly, the budget line Other costs consists mainly of the costs of partner who is responsible for Natura 2000 open air events - NatBus. Some pilot events have taken place, but they started rather modestly to test the readiness of the general public for such events. The expenses for room rental, catering and sound/video recording are going to be actual from the 2019 and onwards.

5.2 Costs not foreseen in the project proposal

Action A2, FG meetings, budget line other costs. In order to create comfortable and trusting environment for the interviewees, there was a need for room rental for FG interviews in the few cases. As this cost in A2 was not foreseen - we transferred some of the B4 room rental costs into A2

Action A2, FG meetings, budget line travel and subsistence, the foreseen budget for ELF was too small, actual costs were much higher. As there was considerably less transport from KÕK participants, we can transfer some of the travel costs from KÕK to ELF, alternatively it is possible to cover the costs from the B4 and B5 travel costs.

Action B4, budget line only contains direct personnel costs for the trainings, even though in the technical description C1b it was foreseen the external assistance costs. During the preparation of the trainings it became clear that for three modules we need the external experts - communication psychologist and negotiation trainer. Therefore some of the communication manager's direct personnel costs were transferred to external assistance costs for the trainers.

Action B7. The project aims were considerably drawn back by a mistake in planning that there was no laptop planned for project communication manager. Considering that the communication manager works nearly half time for the NaturallyEst LIFE project the good equipment for the communication is especially important for a GIE project. None of the following foreseen activities in B7 (editing campaign texts, social media development, design of campaign ads etc) cannot be done without the computer. Also most of these activities can be done in significant amount by communication manager without need of external assistance. Therefore in case the laptop would not have been provided most of the activities would need external assistance (basic design of social media posts etc.) Therefore the decision was made to use proportionally the costs B7 consumables: Social media development...; B7 consumables: Editing campaign texts...; B7 Other costs: design and printing of campaign ads for purchasing a laptop for the communication manager. The sum of these budgetlines is 8000 EUR, for the laptop was used 1858 EUR.

Action E1. There should have been funds for project manager's organisational travels: meeting with EB, meeting with partners, meeting with external experts etc.

In order to have an overview of the use of budgeted person-days by group of actions, it is **recommended to fill in the following additional table**. Please provide estimates of % of person-days spent compared to the budgeted numbers¹. This table will allow you and the EASME to monitor the actual absorption of budgeted time and will highlight any major deviations that should then be explained. When compiling the information you may refer to the number of days referred to into Form R2 of the proposal:

Action type	Budgeted person-days	Estimated % of person-days spent
All projects when applicable Action A: Preparatory actions	47	84.2

¹ As we are only requesting estimations, those figures are not meant to be used for the financial reporting.

GIE projects Action B: Core actions	2176	14.3
ENV and GIE projects Action C: Monitoring of the impact of the project action	170	28.6
ENV and GIE projects Action D: Public awareness/Communication and dissemination of results	228	21.4
ENV and GIE projects Action E: Project management	930	22.6
TOTAL	3551	18.7

5.4 Annexed deliverables

Annex I A2 Focus group interview analysis

Annex II B4 Communication training materials (participants list, day schedules, materials)

Annex III B8 Three volunteer camp's schedules and participation lists

Annex IV C1 Questionnaire and guidelines for the baseline survey interviews

Annex V C1 Baseline survey

Annex VI D1 Media monitoring results

Annex VII E1 Partnership agreements

Annex VIII A2 Draft of Communication Plan

Annex IX Natura Helpdesk collected cases

Annex X Estonian Fund for Nature tendering guidelines

5.5 Issues brought up in NaturallyEst-LIFE - project visit on 16 March 2018 (Ref. Ares(2018)2005705 - 15/04/2018)

1. The end date of action B1 is changed according to the project end date.
2. The elaborated methodology and changes in action C1 are described in this report.
3. The contact details of the project manager are now visible on project's webpage.
4. The design of roll-ups is in progress.
7. Internal tendering guidelines submitted.