

REPORT

ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT

DEMONSTRATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION MEASURES IN NUTRIENTS RICH DRAINED ORGANIC SOILS IN BALTIC STATES AND FINLAND

WORK PACKAGE

STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS

(C.4)

ACTIONS

Deliverable title **Report on public communication with the main stakeholders groups**

Deliverable No C.4.2

Agreement No. LIFE18 CCM/LV/001158

Report No. 2024-C4/2

Type of report Final

Organizations Latvian State Forest Research Institute "Silava"



Report title	Report on public communication with the main stakeholders groups (C.4.2)
Work package	Strategies and action plans (C.4)
Authors	E. Konstantinova, I.Krūze, L. Bruniņa, A. Lazdiņš, Ainis Lagzdiņš, A. Nipers, A.Mancini.
Report No.	2024-C4/2
Type of report	Final
Place	Salaspils
Organization	Latvian State Forest Research Institute "Silava"
Contact information	Riga street 111, Salaspils, LV-2169 Phone: +37129183320 E-mail: ieva.licite@silava.lv Web address: www.silava.lv
Date	2024
Number of pages	7

LIFE OrgBalt compiled the first regional Baltic/Finnish GHG emission factors for managed nutrient-rich organic soils (current and former peatlands), which have been made available for the customary scientific review and further verification for national GHG inventories in the hemiboreal region in Finland and the Baltic countries. While the project analysed selected CCM measures for drained organic soils in agriculture and forestry and developed spatial models and tools, it also identified remaining knowledge gaps. To bridge the remaining limitations and fill the gaps, it is essential to continue GHG measurements and model development, as well as to broaden and complete the scope of the evaluated CCM measures in the after-LIFE-project period, notably by including rewetting and restoration of peatlands that are currently considered to be among the most recommended CCM measures on drained peatlands in the EU. In addition, the developed Simulation and PPC models still include limited macroeconomic considerations and lack an assessment of all environmental impacts. For all these reasons, these models should be used carefully in CCM strategy development for the identification of gaps in climate neutrality transition policy and funding frameworks and need further optimization for broader applicability as decision-making tools.

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Main objectives	4
Primary target audience:	4
Description of the main activities since the beginning of the project	4
Conclusion	6

Introduction

This report is based on the Initial report No. 2021-C4/2 Report on public communication with the main stakeholders groups. Similar to the initial report, this one is also kept as brief as possible to avoid overlapping with several other reports developed focusing on the development, usability, results of the model as well as organisation of the training workshops where models were presented:

- Report No. 2024-E2 Presentation and participants lists of the events (published on the Project website);
- Report No. 2024-C4/1 Proposal for PPC model and adopting of the Project results in Rural Development Plan;
- Report No. 2024-5/5 Final report on development of Framework for training sessions for individual stakeholders for application of the developed tool;
- Report No. 2024-C5/8 Developed Simulation tool applied in real life at least 5 times in partner countries (1 per country).

Main objectives

- Presentation of the final model and approval of the model at three different levels
 - Political level
 - International (project partners) level
 - Stakeholder level

Primary target audience:

- Ministries
- Partners
- Advisory / consulting organizations
- Landowners / managers
- Rural support services
- Farmers' and foresters' associations

Description of the main activities since the beginning of the project

After the completion of the model structure and the inclusions of the data for three first scenarios the model was presented in order to be approved by political

representatives, partners and stakeholders. Even more important the model was presented and explained and was shared with all partners and interested stakeholders in order to collect feedback so to adapt the model contents to users’ needs.

Two meetings were organized in 2021, one with the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Latvia and Latvian partners and stakeholders, and one with all project partners. Partners showed interest in the model, however asked to be able to test it so to fully understand its functionality and analyse concrete data, also to understand how the specificity of each country could be dealt with. Feedback was very important for the improvement of the model.

As the integration of all scenarios at that time was not completed yet, it was decided to postpone the meeting with all stakeholders until all scenarios would be fully integrated in the model so to be able to present more data and provide more testing opportunities to stakeholders.

Updates on the model development were included in agendas of the Project’s Progress report meetings and also Steering group meetings.

Project partners working on measurements and calculations of emission factors were involved in provision of modelled GHG emissions data for the 200 years (the longest period the PPC model provides calculations).

As the demonstration sites are located in Latvia and Finland, project partners from these countries were involved in final data verification to be included in the model.

The model was sent to partners for testing and feedback before organising training workshops about the model.

Model was presented to wide range of stakeholders in all partners’ countries during the meetings, dissemination events, training workshops and two rounds of national workshops. There were stakeholders from ministries, municipalities, agencies, and other governmental institutions, universities and other research institutions, different kinds of NGOs (including forest owners’ and farmers’ organisations) as well as companies totalling more than 500 stakeholders involved in these events.

Training workshops and second round national workshops are listed in the table below.



Event type	Date	Country
Training Workshop on PPC model	4.04.2024.	Latvia
Combined National and Training Workshop on Simulation model	8.04.2024. (10:00-12:00 EET)	Estonia
Training Workshop on PPC model	8.04.2024. (13:00-14:00)	Estonia
National Workshop	10.04.2024.	Latvia
Combined National and Training Workshop on PPC and Simulation models	12.04.2024.	Germany
Training Workshop on PPC model	17.04.2024.	Lithuania
Combined National and Training Workshop on Simulation model	19.04.2024.	Lithuania
Combined National and Training Workshop on PPC model	30.05.2024.	Finland
Training Workshop on Simulation and PPC model	19.08.2024.	Latvia

There were surveys provided to evaluate feedback from the workshops on the climate change mitigation measures, model functionality, needed improvement, any other potential suggestions. More information on this is included in the Report No. 2024-C5/8 (mentioned in the introduction).

Conclusion

Beside preparatory actions and other events, the developed models were extensively tested across two rounds of workshops that took place in all partner countries – Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia and Lithuania – with participation from over 500 stakeholders representing various sectors such as ministries, municipalities, agencies, universities, NGOs, and private companies.

Both models were disseminated to a wide array of organisations for testing and application. Specifically, the models were sent to stakeholders from numerous organizations including governmental agencies, research institutions, advisory or consultation services, and universities across all partner countries. Additionally, models were made accessible online (Simulation tool - <https://bioekonomika.lbtu.lv/orgbalt/>; The PPC model - https://www.orgbalt.eu/?page_id=2761) to broaden their reach and ensure their availability for wide range of stakeholders interested in sustainable land management and climate change mitigation.

The models provide a good insight and evaluation of the measures included in them both at the farm and national level. Though these models should be only considered as complementary tools providing indicative guidance on the costs and benefits of organic soil management choices under the assumptions and input data used in the algorithms (see model descriptive section and report on the models). They are not designed to be the only decision-support tools used.