



Northern Periphery Programme Project - Deer Management

1st Coordination meeting,

**Rica Hell Hotel,
Stjordal, Trondheim, Norway.
8-9th November 1999**

Objectives. To discuss and agree the Norwegian element of "DEER", establishing a work plan, milestones and budget detail.

Present. Jerry Laker (Project Administrator)(JL), Joar Bergin (Lead Partner) (JB) (Skogeierforeninga Nord), Erik BJORÅ (Norges Skogeierforbund) (EB), Per Arne Løvhaugen (Skogeierforeninga Nord). As EB had brought the project partners together, established a collaboration and worked out the first NPP-proposal, EB participated as advisor.

Outline of discussions

a. Agreement on Project Steering Committee

It was agreed that the project steering committee should comprise Joar Bergin, John Milne, Dick Youngson and Jerry Laker. The "Reference group" referred to in the proposal will be set up now that the project has begun.

b. Role of Norwegian partner

To undertake sub-tasks 1-4, and to assist, where appropriate in the organisation of the planned meetings. The four sub-tasks are components of a pilot project for a system to improve the evaluation of winter damage to forest trees by elk (for the purposes of this project, it is agreed that "deer" in the project title applies to all wild cervids present in the Northern Periphery area). JB has a project description, in Norwegian, and will translate it, and pass it on to JL as soon as possible, with revised forward planning chart and budget

Previous attempts to improve the objectivity of the setting of hunting quota have failed, mainly as a result of the excessive cost of data collection. A woodland grazing model has been developed at the University of Ås, and the current project aims to simplify the input parameters so that field data can be collected by land owners. Data collection by forest owners will be implemented by forest owners from 1 May 2000. Collection methodology, database structure and data transfer system need to be fully in place by then.

The use of Internet for data transfer from farmers was discussed. An estimated 5-10% of forest owners and most of the co-operatives (200 – 2500 HA) have a connection to the Internet, and this could be a cost-effective and suitably innovative method to improve the efficiency of data transfer. As MLURI has experience in this area, JL agreed to investigate appropriate data handling software options for an internet-based system.

It was agreed that the first scientific meeting within DEER should be used to evaluate the project methodology before implementation. It was proposed to hold this meeting in Steinkjer, 100km north of Trondheim, during Feb/Mar 2000 to allow time for any revisions to be made to the system arising from the meeting.

c. Meetings and conferences

The first Scientific workshop outlined above will evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed methodology for assessing winter damage, highlight shortcomings, and suggest improvements. The Steering committee will be present, and have a sub-meeting to discuss preparation of the first 6-monthly report (deadline March 2000).

The Norwegian Delegate Meeting will form part of the implementation of the project - informing and training the participating forest owners. It will take place in May 2000. Working papers, and a brief summary in English, to be published on the Internet.

Currently Skogeierforeninga Nord does not currently have an Internet presence (though they have email), but plans to have a home page set up during 2000. It was agreed that a page for DEER should be established at MLURI, that can subsequently be relocated to Skogeierforeninga Nord, at an appropriate time.

DEER has funds to hold an international conference to disseminate the results of the project, and draw together contributions from throughout the NP region and other Baltic states on integrated cervid/ forest management. It was agreed that this meeting should be held in Sept 2001 in Steinkjer. A draft programme will be agreed by the steering committee by September 2000. As the conference is to be held near the end of the project, speakers will be asked to present paper by June 2001 to allow time for preparation of the proceedings, which will be distributed at the meeting.

d. Financial planning

It was thought that in general the budget agreed with NPP was acceptable. EB drew attention to Section 25 of the proposal, which indicates that while the Deer Commission receives NPP funding at a rate of 48.1 %, Skogeierforeninga Nord receives NPP funding at a rate of only 42.1 % of total expenditure (column 3 as a proportion of column 7). JL pointed out that the figures are calculated on a 50:50 split between Norway and Scotland. EB felt that that was not totally fair, but that as the difference amounts to approximately 5000 Euros, the total amount budgeted for SN is almost double that of DC, and as the budget has already been agreed with NPP, EB's advise to SN was to accept this.

The 3 tables of financial information give insufficient detail on a partner by partner basis to allow individual partner budgets to be agreed. In particular, it was felt to be difficult to identify the amount of money available from NPP that can go towards the pilot project, as distinct from that required for meetings and publications. It was agreed that Table 23 could be broken down to show the division of funding between the three partners.

It was found to be complicated to agree a simple method of financial management for concertation activities, such as the meetings and conference, on the basis of the budgets detailed in the proposal. A distinction was therefore drawn between money earmarked for actions by the partners (Expenditure Types 1-4) - i.e. the Norwegian pilot project (Sub-tasks 1-4) and Deer Commission actions (Subtasks 5-7), and concertation activities (Expenditure types 5 and 6). It was agreed that money budgeted to Expenditure Types 5 and 6 could be held on trust for the other partners by MLURI. This money will be used by MLURI directly for the organisation of the meetings, and for publications, and can be paid on a 100% basis to the partners, if they supply appropriate invoices for expenses incurred by the partners, for example in organisation of meetings. A suitable claims form will be produced by JL to accompany these claims.

The remaining Expenditure Types 1-4, budgeted in Table 23 represent then a *minimum* amount of NPP funding available to the partners. Table 1 shows a breakdown of the budget by partner and category.

NPP funding is calculated at 48.1 % and 42.1 % for the Deer Commission and Skogeierforeninga Nord, respectively, the balance of the NPP portion (83.6 kEuro) for 5 and 6 administrated by MLURI.

The NPP contribution to DC and SN will be paid in 4 equal instalments, corresponding to the quarterly reporting periods for the project (provided at least sufficient invoices have been supplied by that partner to cover the amount claimed). The partners will supply all invoices relevant to Expenditure types 1-4, together with an appropriate accounting document, to accompany the interim reports (delivered to weeks prior to reporting dates in March and September).

In the case of Norway, Skogeierforeninga Nord will receive 13,160 Euro each reporting period. During the course of the project, invoices, time sheets etc. will be presented totalling at least 237.7 kEuros (see proposal, Table 25).

Table 1 Breakdown of costs by partner and category of expenditure (euros)¹

Expenditure type	SN			DC			MLURI			TOTAL
	Non-EC	NPP	Total	Non-EC	NPP	Total	Non-EC	NPP	Total	
1. Studies	46.3	33.7	80	3.1	2.9	6	-	-	-	86
2. Staff	15.6	11.4	27	14.0	13.0	27	-	26.0	26	80
3. T & S	9.8	7.2	17	5.7	5.3	11	-	10.0	10	38
4. General Costs	0.6	0.4	1	0.5	0.5	1	-	3.0	3	5
5. Promotion/ Publicity	17.4	12.6	30	14	13	27	-	3.0	3	60
6. Meetings	48.1	34.9	83	25	23	48	-	-	-	131
TOTAL	138.8	100.2	238.2	62.3	57.7	120	-	42.1	42	400

The budget will be reviewed at the 2nd coordination meeting in September 2000. Any excess funds held by MLURI for sub-tasks 5 and 6 to be divided between the partners on a pro-rata basis (33% to DC, 66% to SN²). These funds will need to be matched by private/public funding, as shown in 1/2-yearly financial reports.

e. Timetable of activities.

November 1999	Begin action on pilot project
Feb/Mar 2000	Hold Scientific workshop / 2 nd Coordination meeting
May 2000	Hold Norwegian delegate meeting
September 2000	Hold 3 rd Coordination meeting (Scotland)
March 2001	Hold 4 th Coordination meeting
September 2001	Hold Conference on Integrated Deer and Forest Management, Norway/ Final Coordination meeting.
October 2001	End of project.

Actions including Scottish partner to be included following discussions at a forthcoming meeting.

f. Linkages with other NPP projects.

The two projects cited in section 13, both having relevance to sustainable resource management were felt to have some potential relevance to the DEER project. It was thought that consultation with both projects will be useful for preparation of publications and internet pages in a style that will serve to underscore linkages between NPP projects.

g. Monitoring and reporting.

¹ Notes: 1. Under Promotion/publicity and meetings, the EC funds for partners SN and DS are earmarked for the printing of publications and for the costs of organising conferences. These will be allocated to MLURI for agreed spending for these purposes. The Non-EC costs for these items can be used for legitimate expenditure, including staff costs by the partners.

² This split derived from Table 25 - Column 7/(400-42.1) * 100.

NPP requires reports to be presented every 6 months, in March and September. The Steering Committee will meet prior to each of these reports to discuss progress, and highlight any actual or potential problems as they develop. As far as possible, these meetings will coincide with other workshops/ conference to be held within the DEER project. Written progress reports including individual national accounts will be presented by each of the partners at these meetings. The team members are responsible for monitoring and auditing the costs of the work related to their respective countries.