

Technical Progress and Summary Report

1 Information about the project

1.1 Name of organization	Lonjsko Polje Nature Park Public Institution
1.2 Title of the project	Restoration of feeding habitat near the Čigoč Village
1.3 Project duration	May 2017 – October 2017
1.4 Reference no. according to contract	HR – 17 – 485 – 36
1.5 Current Reporting period	Reporting period: 01/05/2017 – 30/10/2017



2 Technical Progress Report

Please make sure to consider the definitions of the underlined terms as specified in the Pogreška! Izvor reference nije pronađen.

2.1 Summary of the project developments in the reporting period

(max. 1.500 characters per reporting period)

In May 2017 Lonjsko Polje Nature Park Public Institution started with the preparation activities for the restoration of the Kratečko Pasture. Nature Protection conditions were not requested from the responsible Ministry especially for this project purposes, because it is in archive of the LPNPPI already from 2015. A Kratečko Pasture is a part of the Lonjsko Polje Common Pasture as an evacuation pasture for the cattle in a case of flood. In the process of establishment of the Lonjsko Polje Common Pasture a Ministry has define a nature protection conditions and one obligation of those conditions was to remove of invasive species from the pasture.

In May 2018 the LPNPPI and breeders from Kratečko had a meeting in order to define the obligations for each project participant – area to restore according to the type of tractors and intensity of overgrown pasture by invasive species. During the field trip priorities of restoration have been defined. All participants agreed to mulch the most overgrown areas of the pasture (pasture is 50 ha big, but mulching of 30 ha is ensured by this grant - all together – external 15 ha and locals and LPNPPI 15 ha). This field visit in May is also used to collect a data on the pasture situation that was used for better preparation of the call for the external service of the overgrown pasture restoration. After the process of collecting three offers, a contract has been signed with “Binjo” contractor from Ivanić Grad.

During the second meeting in August the Čigoč locals have been to informed on the project activities and dynamic of the implementation.

A main acitivity – mulching of overgrown pasture has been conducted from second half of August to beginning of September. “Binjo” external service revitalized 15 ha as it was contracted, Lonjsko Polje Nature Park public Service revitalized 7 ha, locals Mario Dobranić and Vlado Jurić mulched together 15 ha. A new electric fence around the pasture and clear well put in use by the locals. At the end of the project a cows and horses had an opportunity to graze on the pasture.

2.2 Please describe the activities implemented in the reporting period in relation to the expected results.



Activity A.1.

On 30th May 2017 Institution organized a meeting in the Kratečko field with the local breeders to define a dynamic of restoration. A 2nd meeting was organized in Čigoč in very beginning of August to inform the locals of Čigoč on the project aims and activities.

Activity A.2.

A Permission from the Ministry of Environment and Energy is in archive of the LPNPPI (annex 1.) since 2015. At the moment of the project application it is not checked that the permission already exists because the Kratečko pasture is part of the huge Lonjsko Polje Common Pasture. During a planning of A.2. activity we realized that the permission is given for all common pastures in LPNP and removal of invasive species are part of these obligations.

Activity A.3.

During the process of project application LPNPPI have asked for the three offers (just informal offers) and it was not enough time to really find out the most suitable machines and work for the pasture. After the project have been accepted the Institution took a more time to research the market and tried to find the best solution for the upcoming works and we realized that the offers we collected for the project application were not the best solution for us (a reason for this is described in 2.4. and 2.6.).

In the beginning of June 2017 a complete documentation according to the national law and LPNPPI Rules have been prepared and request for the offers sent to three addresses: "Binđo" d.o.o. Ivani Grad, "Kiki" from the Lonja Village and "Multigrad" from Donja Lomnica (evidences in annex 2). "Kiki" did not send an offer, "Binđo" sent an offer on 162.000 HRK and "Multigrad" on 163.500 HRK. Contract is signed with Binđo on 162.000 HRK (annex 3.).

In August 2018 Institution has asked for two offers for purchase of electric fence ("Miagra" and "Gumex-eco" but only one from Gumex-eco received.

Activity A.4.

Revitalization started on 21st August 2017 and finished on 2nd September 2017. External service revitalized 15 ha as it was contracted, Lonjsko Polje Nature Park public Service revitalized 7 ha, locals Mario Dobranić and Vlado Jurić mulched together 15 ha.

Activity A.5.



In the process of project preparation, the agreements between the Institution and the breeders signed in order to ensure a maintenance of the pasture next 10 years. The agreements signed with Ivanka Jurić, Mario Dobranić, Vlado Dobranić and Ivan Dobranić. Miodrag and Ivan Dobranić have been responsible to set up a new electric fence that has been donated to the whole Kratečko team in Krapje by director Mr. Ivor Stanivuković. External service by "Peleti Bičanić" was in charge to clean the well and by this works all preconditions was done to use and maintain a clean pasture. Family farms Ivanka Jurić and Mario Dobranić signed the obligations to keep the 50 cows on the pasture the whole year in order to prevent a spreading of Amorpha again. This activity will be controlled by the Park's rangers the whole year.

Activity A.6.

Progress report sent in timeframe by 30 August 2017, final report sent by 30 October 2017.

2.3 Please describe the progress achieved in the reporting period in relation to the expected <u>results</u> (and, if appropriate, <u>objectives</u>) of the project.
--

Activity A.1.

The first meeting organized in order to define a dynamic of pasture restoration.

The second meeting organized in order to inform the locals from Čigoč was held in Community house in Čigoč in August and participants list and photos will be reported in the final report.

Activity A.2.

According to the Nature Protection Law it is obligatory for any activity in the nature park to obtain a Permission with nature protection conditions (annex 2).

Activity A.3.

A contract for the habitat restoration is signed, time, dynamic and divided parts of pasture for mulching for each tractor (LPNPPI, locals and Contractor) are agreed on the meeting in August. Offer for electric fence and well cleaning is also requested in August 2017.

Activity A.4.

37 ha of overgrown pasture by Amorpha fruticosa is cleaned.

Activity A.5.

Pasture is cleaned and fenced, well is in a function and cattle is on the pasture.

Activity A.6.

Progress and final report sent to EURONATUR by project deadlines.

2.4 What were main successes in the reporting period?

Activity A.1.

The main success was to find out an agreement to restore the pasture as an important feeding area for the storks. Although the main purposes for the locals were to restore the pasture for the cattle, a positive “consequences” and win-win situation is to ensure a more feeding habitat for the storks closed to village.

Activity A.2.

In order to protect biodiversity (in this project to protect a feeding area for storks) Ministry has prescribed the obligation for land-users of state land to maintain cleaned or restore overgrown common pasture.

Activity A.3.

A real success is a contract with 1,08 HRK/m² for mulching of amorphia completely to the soil without rest of 20 cm above the soil as it was proposed in the text of “Vodoprivreda” offer in application annex.

Activity A.4.

An altogether restoration of the pasture by the locals, institution and external service is very good moment to raise awareness for the maintaining a pasture cleaned in the future.

Activity A.5.

A cleaned pasture is suitable habitat for birds but for the cattle too. August, September and October are the months when the

Activity A.6.

Progress and final report successfully sent to EURONATUR

2.5 What were main setbacks and challenges in the reporting period?

Activity A.1.

The main setback in AT 1. is disagreement and distrust among the local breeders/people, therefore the agreement signed before the project start is shown a very good milestone. One can say that the cooperation with the Posavina people is challenge, but sometime it is very frustrated and can be hard to achieve the results.

Activity A.2.

No setbacks and challenges

Activity A.3.

No setbacks and challenges

Activity A.4.

No setbacks and challenges

Activity A.5.

No setbacks and challenges

Activity A.6.

No setbacks and challenges.

2.6 Please reflect on the project implementation so far and assess to what extent the objectives have been achieved. Please also describe which changes were necessary and why.

The main changes were to change the addresses to collect three offers for the mulching. The main objective of A.4. was to restore the more overgrown area on the pasture as much as possible within the project budget without use hard machine. But in the “Vodoprivreda” offer it was offered to mulch 20 cm above the soil with 1,00 HRK/m² plus more budget to remove 20 cm rest of *Amorpha* with hard machine – bagger. It was unacceptable and therefore we tried to find another offer with completely removal of *Amorpha fruticosa* from the pasture in one hand. So far, we had a several phone discussion on the procedure of removal *Amorpha* and it is resulted with another choice of the addresses for restoration offers.

2.7 Please reflect on the project implementation so far and assess to what extent the objectives have been achieved. Please also describe which changes were necessary and why.

2.8 Lessons learned and their relevance for your work.

2.9 Remarks on financial management

Please describe major changes and why they were necessary.

The budget for staff costs was 1700€, but you spent 3749.74 €, i.e. 220 % of the approved budget. Slightly exceeding the budget would be no problem, but this is more than double.

The reason for 220% (instead of 1700€ it is spent 3749.74 €) costs over the budget for the staff costs is in a fact that during the project development we did not take into account a time for the purchase of gas for the tractors of the Institution and the locals and transporting every day from Novska to Kratečko. Also, it is not taken into account the time need for the everyday monitoring, photography and supervising.

2.10 Outlook on the next reporting period

Please outline the main activities and challenges for the next reporting period.

3 Technical Summary Report

3.1 General summary of project implementation in the entire project period

The project implementation is based on the application that was focused on the pasture revitalization in the Kratečko village, near the Čigoč village – European Stork Village. The nearby pasture was very important feeding area for the storks from the surrounding villages but unfortunately, from past few years it is overgrown by the invasive species – *Amorpha fruticosa*. Actually, the pasture has been restored some 7-8 years ago and it is used as an evacuation pasture for the cattle when the big common pastures complexes in retention area are flooded. But, these situations were very rare in the past years, and pasture became again covered by invasive species and unacceptable as feeding area for the storks.

Therefore, this project have been focused on the revitalization by mulching the amorpha. One important milestone of the project preparation is to ensure the agreements between the LPNPPI and breeders from Kratečko by which it is ensured to maintain the pasture cleaned after the project implementation.

The main activity was to revitalize the pasture by external expert, locals and Lonjsko Polje Nature Park Public Institution's tractors. In order to involve the locals from the Čigoč and Kratečko villages in the project activities it was necessary to organize a meetings.

Therefore, a field visit of pasture has been organized in May to get a clear picture where and when is possible to mulch, what parts of the area are the priorities, and 2nd meeting in August before the starting with revitalization. The meetings are used to collect a data on the pasture situation that was used for better preparation of the call for the external service of the overgrown pasture restoration (May) and to define which part will be revitalized by whom (August). After the process of collecting three offers, a contract signed with "Binjo" contractor from Ivanić Grad.

Revitalization started on 21st August 2017 and finished on 2nd September 2017. External service revitalized 15 ha as it was contracted, Lonjsko Polje Nature Park public Service revitalized 7 ha, locals Mario Dobranić and Vlado Jurić mulched together 15 ha. Almost whole pasture is cleaned form the *Amorpha fruticosa*, some 10 ha without *Amorpha fruticosa* remained non-mulched. Miodrag and Ivan Dobranić have been responsible to set up a new electric fence that has been donated to the whole Kratečko team in Krapje by director Mr. Ivor Stanivuković. External service by "Peleti Bičanić" was in charge to clean the well and by this works all preconditions was done to use and maintain a clean pasture.

3.2 Outputs of the project

Please list the main products of the project, e.g. workshops held, documents, policy papers, public relation material and describe how they were used.

Activity A.1.

Reporting period 1: 01/05/2017 – 30/10/2017

1. Meeting with locals in Čigoč, 30th May 2017
2. Meeting with locals in Kratečko, 02nd August 2017

Activity A.2.

Reporting period 1: 01/05/2017 – 30/10/2017

1. Permission from the Ministry of Environment and Energy is in archive of the LPNPPI (annex 1.) since 2015. At the moment of the project application it is not checked that Kratečko pasture is part of the huge Lonjsko Polje Common Pasture. During a planning of A.2. activity we realized that the permission is given for all common pastures in LPNP and removal of invasive species ar part of these obligations.

Activity A.3.

Reporting period 1: 01/05/2017 – 30/10/2017

1. Contract is signed with “Binđo” on 162.000 HRK (annex 3.)
2. Offer for the electric fence from Gumex–eco (annex 4.)

Activity A.4.

Reporting period 1: 01/05/2017 – 30/10/2017

1. 37 ha revitalized pasture
2. Press release on the pasture revitalization for the LPNPPI web site is published <http://www.pp-lonjsko-polje.hr/new/hrvatski/novosti.html#2017-26>
3. Photo documentation

Activity A.5.

Reporting period 1: 01/05/2017 – 30/10/2017

1. Photo documentation

3.3 Outcomes of the project

Please describe the immediate observed effects of the project in relation to direct threats and factors leading to direct threats.

1. Agreement signed between LPNPPI and the locals for the next 10 years are some kind of guarantee to maintain the pasture cleaned by holding the 50 cows on the pasture whole year
2. Restored and cleaned of the invasive species pasture is suitable feeding habitat for the storks and birds
3. Restored and cleaned of the invasive species pasture is acceptable place for the evacuation of cattle from the flooded zones

3.4 Impact of the project

Please explain how the project has changed the problems addressed in this project in relation to the conservation targets. Please also explain the state before and after project implementation in relation to the goals you formulated.

Revitalization of the pasture has aim to clean the pasture of the brush (*Amorpha fruticosa*) and to ensure a feeding area for the storks. It is known that the storks in Lonjsko Polje like to feed on the place where the cattle graze.

Before the project start a whole pasture has been overgrown by the invasive species, but now the pasture is cleaned with 50 cows that maintain the vegetation. The stork are from August in Africa, but next year it could be monitored how the pasture is used as a feeding habitat for birds.

3.5 Outlook

Please outline how you will make use of the outputs and outcomes of the project in the future and how you will continue to address the issues of the project.

Almost 2.000 meadows and pastures around the Lonjsko Polje villages are partially or completely covered by the invasive species. It is one of the reason of decreasing the stork pairs number in Lonjsko polje. Habitat restoration and insurance of enough number of cattle is basic precondition of the favorable habitat for stork feeding and successful nesting.

Terminology

Please make sure to use of the following definitions in your application (based on the Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation¹):

Activity	A specific action or set of tasks undertaken by project staff and/or partners to reach one or more objectives. Sometimes called an action, intervention, response, or strategic action.
Conservation Target	An element of biodiversity at a project site, which can be a species, habitat, or ecological system that a project has chosen to focus on. All targets at a site should collectively represent the biodiversity of concern at the site.
Direct Threats	Primarily human actions that immediately degrade one or more conservation targets.
Factors	A generic term for an element of a conceptual model including direct and indirect threats, opportunities, and associated stakeholders. It is often advantageous to use this generic term since many factors – for example tourism – could be both a threat and an opportunity. Also known as root causes or drivers.
Goal	A formal statement detailing a desired impact of a project, such as the desired future status of a target in the long-term. A good goal meets the criteria of being linked to targets, impact oriented, measurable, time limited, and specific.
Impact	The desired future state of a conservation target.
Objective	Objectives are formal statements of the outcomes or intermediate results and desired changes that you believe are necessary to attain your goals. Objectives specify the desired changes in direct and indirect threats and opportunities that you would like to achieve in the short and medium term. A good objective meets the criteria of being results oriented, measurable, time limited, specific, and practical. Indicators
Outcome	The desired future state of a threat or opportunity factor.
Result	The desired future state of a target or factor. Results include impacts which are linked to targets and outcomes which are linked to threats and opportunities.

¹ <http://cmp-openstandards.org/>



4 Reporting Guidelines

- 1) Technical progress reports (chapter 2) are to be delivered in one document in a consecutive manner.
- 2) The technical summary report (chapter 3) is to be delivered only once, at project end.
- 3) Reports are to be structured according to objectives, results, and activities defined in the project plan.
(Example: see chapter "2) Technical progress report", sub-chapter "2.2 Please describe the activities implemented in the reporting period in relation to the expected results".)
- 4) If applicable:
Meetings reported need to be indicated by place and date. Persons reported need to be indicated by name and position.
- 5) Supporting documents/ Annexes to the report:
 - a. Files, submitted together with the report, are to be indicated by a consecutive number and a short term.
(Example: "Annex 01_Map of PAs in AL")
 - b. Files are to be named in English.
 - c. Reference to relevant annexes is to be made in the text.
(Example: "... of protected areas in Albania (Annex 1).")
 - d. In case date of document preparation/issuing is not indicated in the document itself, add date to the file name.
 - e. Maps: Titles and legends need to be in English.