

## Section I: Identification and JP Status

### Mainstreaming environmental governance: linking local and national action in Bosnia and Herzegovina

#### Semester: 1-12

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Country                        | Bosnia and Herzegovina   |
| Thematic Window                | Environment and Climatic Change  |
| MDGF Atlas Project             |  |
| Program title                  | Mainstreaming environmental governance: linking local and national action in Bosnia and Herzegovina  |
| Report Number                  |  |
| Reporting Period               | 1-12   |
| Programme Duration             |  |
| Official Starting Date         |  |
| Participating UN Organizations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* FAO</li> <li>* UNDP</li> <li>* UNEP</li> <li>* UNESCO</li> <li>* UNV</li> </ul>   |
| Implementing Partners          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* FBiH Ministry of Ecology and Tourism</li> <li>* Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations, Council of Ministers BiH</li> <li>* RS Ministry for Spatial Planning, Construction and Ecology</li> </ul> |

#### Budget Summary

##### Total Approved Budget

|      |                |
|------|----------------|
| UNDP | \$4,279,212.00 |
|------|----------------|

|              |                       |
|--------------|-----------------------|
| UNEP         | \$907,738.00          |
| UNESCO       |                       |
| UNV          |                       |
| FAO          | \$312,913.00          |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>\$5,499,863.00</b> |

**Total Amount of Transferred To Date**

|              |                       |
|--------------|-----------------------|
| UNDP         | \$4,279,212.00        |
| UNEP         | \$907,738.00          |
| UNESCO       | \$0.00                |
| UNV          | \$0.00                |
| FAO          | \$312,913.00          |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>\$5,499,863.00</b> |

**Total Budget Committed To Date**

|              |               |
|--------------|---------------|
| UNDP         | \$0.00        |
| UNEP         | \$0.00        |
| UNESCO       | \$0.00        |
| UNV          | \$0.00        |
| FAO          | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>\$0.00</b> |

**Total Budget Disbursed To Date**

|              |               |
|--------------|---------------|
| UNDP         | \$0.00        |
| UNEP         | \$0.00        |
| UNESCO       | \$0.00        |
| UNV          | \$0.00        |
| FAO          | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>\$0.00</b> |

## Donors

As you can understand, one of the Goals of the MDG-F is to generate interest and attract funding from other donors. In order to be able to report on this goal in 2010, we would require you to advise us if there has been any complementary financing provided for each programme as per following example:

Please use the same format as in the previous section (budget summary) to report figures (example 50,000.11) for fifty thousand US dollars and eleven cents

| Type | Donor | Total | For 2010 | For 2011 | For 2012 |
|------|-------|-------|----------|----------|----------|
|------|-------|-------|----------|----------|----------|

## DEFINITIONS

1) PARALLEL FINANCING – refers to financing activities related to or complementary to the programme but whose funds are NOT channeled through Un agencies. Example: JAICA decides to finance 10 additional seminars to disseminate the objectives of the programme in additional communities.

2) COST SHARING – refers to financing that is channeled through one or more of the UN agencies executing a particular programme. Example: The Government of Italy gives UNESCO the equivalent of US \$ 200,000 to be spent on activities that expand the reach of planned activities and these funds are channeled through UNESCO.

3) COUNTERPART FUNDS - refers to funds provided by one or several government agencies (in kind or in cash) to expand the reach of the programme. These funds may or may not be channeled through a UN agency. Example: The Ministry of Water donates land to build a pilot 'village water treatment plant' The value of the contribution in kind or the amount of local currency contributed (if in cash) must be recalculated in US \$ and the resulting amount(s) is what is reported in the table above.

## Beneficiaries

| Beneficiary type | Targetted | Reached | Category of beneficiary | Type of service or goods delivered |
|------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
|------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|

## Section II: JP Progress

### 1 Narrative on progress, obstacles and contingency Measures

Please provide a brief overall assessment (1000 words) of the extent to which the joint programme components are progressing in relation to expected outcomes and outputs, as well as any measures taken for the sustainability of the joint programme during the reporting period. Please, provide examples if relevant. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions

#### **Plases describe three main achievements that the joint programme has had in this reporting period (max 100 words)**

- Completion of 37 Local Environmental Action Plans (LEAPs). It is important to note that programme planned to implement/develop 30 LEAPs but due to huge demand and programme savings, we managed to implement/develop 7 additional LEAPs.
- Completion of 5 Sustainable Energy Action Plans (SEAPs) in municipalities/cities that voluntarily but motivated by the programme joined EU Covenant of Mayors and therefore committed to EU targets 20-20-20.
- Upon successful establishment of Designated National Authority (DNA) two CDM projects already received "green light" from DNA for further development and potential implementation.

#### **Progress in outcomes**

Considerable progress has been made during this reporting period in all three JP Outcomes. The LEAP development process has essentially been completed in all 37 municipalities – only a few Municipal Assemblies have yet to adopt their LEAPs – and already several have begun implementation of LEAP measures. Further LEAP training of municipalities has been conducted, the LEAP methodology manual has been updated to integrate JP experiences and draft reports of the current LEAP and legislation situation are being finalized by experts, and will later be published. Many of the 18 MCGs and 12 IGs have already been completed, while the rest are still on-going, without any significant problems to report. The DNA established last year is fully functional and already assessing potential CDM proposals.

#### **Progress in outputs**

UNDP has mobilized for the JP a very large number of actors at the local level in all 37 municipalities, representing hundreds of local level institutions, many of whom have been trained on a wide variety of environmental topics (planning, management, analysis, resources, budgeting...). These stakeholders all played a role, in varying degrees, to the development of their towns' LEAPs, and such local ownership will surely contribute to the planned activities being properly carried out. Already, many municipalities are implementing such measures, in some cases on their own, and in others through cooperation with the JP team and/or local NGOs on projects financed through the MCG and IG funding windows.

To a large degree, these grants have a strong energy-related focus (16 of the MCGs and all of the IGs), as it has been determined that 1) the energy sector has for too long been somewhat ignored/neglected by local-level stakeholders, and 2) that energy efficiency and/or renewable energy sources provide plentiful, cost-effective benefits for the local level (budgetary savings, less pollution, green jobs, poverty reduction, improved quality of life...) which should not be passed up. Meanwhile, the 5 SEAPs providing long-term planning perspectives, the CDM proposals being assessed by the DNA (so far 2 have been approved) and the nationwide EMIS system all provide further positive examples for the whole country to follow on the path towards truly sustainable development.

FAO determined, following a comprehensive assessment of UNDP's LEAP development process, that a complementary document would prove beneficial: "Addressing Natural Resource Management in Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H) through the LEAP development process". This document (to be translated into the local languages, printed and

delivered to the local-level authorities responsible for LEAPs) has identified gaps in terms of natural resource management and proposed suggestions to enhance future local environmental plans.

On the basis of that document, FAO has prepared a project focusing on abandoned land in B&H municipalities, which is currently on-going. The main objective of this project is to develop the capacity of four municipalities in B&H to prepare Action Plans and strategies for properly dealing with abandoned land - the participatory approach and planning methodology can be later replicated in other locations.

In addition, FAO consultants contributed to the development of B&H's national-level State of the Environment Report (SoER), particularly on the chapters related to climate change, spatial planning and urban development.

UNESCO contributions to the energy-efficiency renovation of Mostar's Spanish Square have been completed, and officially opened at a ceremony in March 2012. Similar EE renovation of Trebinje's Museum of Herzegovina is still ongoing - co-financing has been assured from the RS government and the subcontractor has been selected to start work soon. Finally, the restoration works of Vjetrenica Cave are currently still underway and completion expected by the end of the JP.

UNEP has made progress in terms of achieving output 3, as the State of Environment reporting process it is leading has entered the final stage with a third consultation with national stakeholders, with over 60 state, entity, academic and other institutions giving their recommendations for a more comprehensive, up-to-date and reliable document. A website has been established with a database of local environmental experts and a desk review of the Legal and Institutional Framework for Environmental Protection in B&H. A governmental needs assessment has been done, including the finalized Gap Analysis for a Comprehensive Environmental Information System in B&H, linked to existing environmental databases/information sources.

### **Measures taken for the sustainability of the joint programme**

The programme insisted on participatory methodology in almost all activities, from development of LEAP that involved whole community (local government, NGOs and citizens), through development of SEAP, State of the Environment Report and other. This approach provides best sustainability in terms of ownership of results and proper planning using bottom-up approach.

On grants level, projects/grants were identified in close coordination with municipalities, cantons and/or government who actively participated in designing, financing and implementation. For illustration, a total amount invested in Innovative grants and LEAP grants is just above 3 milUSD where 1.2 milUSD is provided by the programme and rest (1.8 mil USD by municipalities and other donors). The level of investment of municipalities (direct beneficiaries) is about 50% of total value of all grants which displays their commitment and sustainability of results.

### **Are there difficulties in the implementation?**

Joint Programme design

### **What are the causes of these difficulties?**

### **Briefly describe the current difficulties the Joint Programme is facing**

FAO began its activities with delay. In particular, part of activity 2.1.2. ("Abandoned Land") is linked to other activity 1.2.3., both could not be undertaken simultaneously. Activities related to the "Abandoned Land" project could commence only once the FAO document "Addressing Natural Resource Management in Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H) through the LEAP development process" was completed. Now that a no-cost extension of the JP has been approved, FAO is in position to successfully complete all planned activities.

**Briefly describe the current external difficulties that delay implementation**

**Explain the actions that are or will be taken to eliminate or mitigate the difficulties**

Through inception report many things have been solved and programme design improved. However, Programme Team still has to work with FAO to revise their component of the programme in order to make progress and contribute to successful implementation of the programme.

**2 Inter-Agency Coordination and Delivering as One**

**Is the joint programme still in line with the UNDAF?**

Yes true  
No false

**If not, does the joint programme fit the national strategies?**

Yes  
No

**What types of coordination mechanisms**

**Please provide the values for each category of the indicator table below**

| Indicators   | Base line | Current Value | Means of verification   | Collection methods     |
|--|-----------|---------------|---|------------------------|
| Number of managerial practices (financial, procurement, etc) implemented jointly by the UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs | 0         | 4             | Report on selection of municipalities<br>Support in project team establishment (interview minutes)<br>Selection of LEAP grants (evaluation minutes) | In writing/<br>reports |
| Number of joint analytical work (studies, diagnostic) undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs             | 0         | 1             | report  | in writing             |
| Number of joint missions undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs  | 0         | 53            | Field assessment report   | In writing/<br>reports |

*Preparation of a field assessment questionnaire and selection criteria for potential LEAP municipalities, 3 more activities have been coordinated among UN agencies (recruitment of UNEP and FAO national staff members as well as the evaluation of LEAP project proposals by UNDP and UNV).*

**3 Development Effectiveness: Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action**

**Are Government and other national implementation partners involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?**

Not involved false  
Slightly involved false  
Fairly involved false  
Fully involved true

**In what kind of decisions and activities is the government involved?**

Policy/decision making  
Management: budget  
Management: other, specify

*Defining criteria, evaluation etc.*

**Who leads and/or chair the PMC?**

RCO

**Number of meetings with PMC chair**

1

**Is civil society involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?**

Not involved false  
Slightly involved false  
Fairly involved false  
Fully involved true

**In what kind of decisions and activities is the civil society involved?**

Policy/decision making  
Management: service provision  
Management: other, specify

*Development of LEAPs, Implementation of Grants, Development of SoER, etc.*

**Are the citizens involved in the implementation of activities and the delivery of outputs?**

Not involved false  
Slightly involved false  
Fairly involved false  
Fully involved true

**In what kind of decisions and activities are the citizens involved?**

Policy/decision making  
Management: other, specify

*Development of LEAPs, Implementation of grants etc.*

**Where is the joint programme management unit seated?**

UN Agency  
other, specify

*Entity government.*

**Current situation**

## 4 Communication and Advocacy

**Has the JP articulated an advocacy & communication strategy that helps advance its policy objectives and development outcomes?**

Yes true  
No false

**Please provide a brief explanation of the objectives, key elements and target audience of this strategy**

Objectives: To insure that governments, partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders are adequately informed about progress on Program activities, but also bearing in mind that a general awareness needs to be raised with regard to environmental development (to build partnerships/networks, improve the capacity of media providers to deliver environmental messages - with full respect to gender sensitivity, increase the engagement of citizens and local communities in media message delivery - to stimulate community-based behavioral change, to produce and distribute awareness materials).

The key elements focus on ensuring effective and efficient: 1. Internal (conducted between all the UN agencies and domestic institutions which are represented within the PMC, as well as with local counterparts involved in LEAP process); 2. External communication (conducted by all UN agencies implementing the program, responsible domestic bodies and implementing partners towards the general population and (external) interested groups/parties); and 3. Advocating for change (focus on using communication to influence the shaping of decisions towards the achievement of MDGs).

The target audience is divided as follows:

1. Primary audience:

1.1. Designated state, entity and cantonal ministries and municipal administrative departments in charge of the environment (at different administrative levels);

1.2. General audience within the 30 selected localities: children within schools, CSOs, men/woman, young/old, majority/minority population and members of different social classes and with different access to media outlets;

- 1.3. Organizations and institutions with a specific focus on women and socially-excluded groups;
- 1.4. Civil society organizations at the local level and countrywide;
- 1.5. The media, electronic and print (local, regional and national).

2. Secondary audience:

- 2.1. Groups according to age, gender, ethnicity and/or social class with an aim to increase the general awareness of the public and motivate interest groups;
- 2.2. Educational institutions' staff and pupils;
- 2.3. Environmental organizations, local and regional.

**What concrete gains are the advocacy and communication efforts outlined in the JP and/or national strategy contributing towards achieving?**

Increased awareness on MDG related issues amongst citizens and governments

Increased dialogue among citizens, civil society, local national government in relation to development policy and practice

New/adopted policy and legislation that advance MDGs and related goals

Establishment and/or liaison with social networks to advance MDGs and related goals

Key moments/events of social mobilization that highlight issues

Media outreach and advocacy

**What is the number and type of partnerships that have been established amongst different sectors of society to promote the achievement of the MDGs and related goals?**

Faith-based organizations

Social networks/coalitions

Local citizen groups

Private sector

Academic institutions

Media groups and journalist 16

Other

**What outreach activities do the programme implement to ensure that local citizens have adequate access to information on the programme and opportunities to actively participate?**

Use of local communication mediums such radio, theatre groups, newspapers



## **Section III: Millenium Development Goals**

### **Millenium Development Goals**

#### **Additional Narrative Comments**

**Please provide any relevant information and contributions of the programme to de MDGs, whether at national or local level**

**Please provide other comments you would like to communicate to the MDG-F Secretariat**

## Section IV: General Thematic Indicators

### 1 Environmental and Climate Change policy development and mainstreaming

#### 1.1 Number of sectors or mainstreaming laws, policies or plans supported by the joint programme

##### 1.1.1 On Environmental Management

###### Policies

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| National | 1 |
| Local    |   |

###### Laws

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| National |  |
| Local    |  |

###### Plans

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| National |    |
| Local    | 42 |

##### 1.1.2 On Climate Change

###### Policies

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| National | 1 |
| Local    |   |

###### Laws

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| National |  |
| Local    |  |

**Plan**

National

Local 42

**1.2 Please briefly provide some contextual information on the law, policy or plan and the country/municipality where it is (or will be) implemented**

Plans – The Program supported the design and development of 37 LEAPs and 5 SEAPs in BiH.

Policies – The Program supported the establishment of a Designated National Authority (DNA) in Bosnia and Herzegovina and will support National capacity building for the implementation of DNA and CDM implementation.

LEAPs, SEAPs and DNA each support Environmental Management and Climate Change.

**1.3 Sector in which the law(s), policy(ies) or plan(s) is/are focused**

Nature conservation

Water management

Sanitation

Sustainable management of natural resources

Climate change: adaptation

Climate change: mitigation

**Comments**

The development of LEAPs and SEAPs, and the establishment of a DNA, focus on each sector. LEAPs in particular are very broad, strategic documents that identify and provide guidance for each sector in the field of environmental management and climate change at a local level, while SEAPs focus on climate change issues, in particular energy use, reduction of GHGs, renewable energy sources, etc.

**1.4 Number of citizens and/or institutions that the law(s), policy(ies) or plan(s) directly affects**

All the public management and legal/institutional arrangements serve to the whole nation. Therefore all the efforts within the Joint Programme on laws, strategies, policies and plans will directly affect the whole population of the Country

**Citizens**

|       |           |
|-------|-----------|
| Total | 1,628,900 |
| Urban | n/a       |
| Rural | n/a       |

**National Public Institutions**

|       |     |
|-------|-----|
| Total | 5   |
| Urban | n/a |
| Rural | n/a |

**Local Public Institutions**

|       |     |
|-------|-----|
| Total | 41  |
| Urban | n/a |
| Rural | n/a |

**Private Sector Institutions**

|       |     |
|-------|-----|
| Total | 41  |
| Urban | n/a |
| Rural | n/a |

## 1.5 Government budget allocated to environmental issues before the implementation of the Joint Programme

National Budget

Total Local Budget(s)

**Comments**

Currently the JP team is not able to report on this indicator due to the fact that municipalities are still not selected. After the selection of municipalities (localities), the JP team will report on this indicator.

## 1.6 % variation in government budget allocated to environmental policies or programmes

**National Budget**

% Overall n/a

% Triggered by the joint programme n/a

**Local Budget**

% Overall n/a  
% Triggered by the Joint Programme n/a

**Comments**

n/a

**1.7 Government budget allocated to Climate Change before the implementation of the Joint Programme**

National budget n/a

Total Local Budget(s) n/a

**Comments**

n/a

**1.8 % variation in government budget allocated to Climate Change from the beginning of the Joint programme to present time**

**National Budget**

% Overall n/a  
% Triggered by the Joint Programme n/a

**Local Budget**

% Overall n/a  
% Triggered by the Joint Programme n/a

**Comments**

n/a

**2 Institutional capacities for environmental management developed and civil society participation increased**

## 2.1 Number of km2 of land newly managed by a natural resource plan supported by the Joint Programme

Total of the area managed in Km2      n/a

### By habitat (Km2)

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| Tropical forest        | n/a |
| Temperature forest     | n/a |
| Savannah               | n/a |
| Shrub land             | n/a |
| Grassland              | n/a |
| Wetlands               | n/a |
| Rocky areas            | n/a |
| Desert                 | n/a |
| Sea/oceans             | n/a |
| Artificial terrestrial | n/a |

## 2.2 Number of institutions, civil servants and citizens trained by the JP to take informed decisions on environmental issues (excluding climate change)

### Public institutions

Total      n/a

### Private Sector Institutions

Total      n/a

### NGO/CBO

Total      n/a

### Civil Servants

Total      n/a

Women      n/a

Men      n/a

**Citizens**

Total n/a  
Women n/a  
Men n/a

**2.3 Number of citizens supported by the JP that have organised themselves to effectively participate in natural resource management initiatives**

Total n/a  
Women n/a  
Men n/a  
Ethnic groups n/a

**2.4 Number of successful environmental service payment mechanisms that have been promoted by the JP**

Total n/a  
No. of beneficiaries n/a

**Sectors of application**

**Financing source**

n/a

**2.5 Has the JP had an impact on the development of national and local policies or regulations that recognize schemes of Payment for Ecosystem Services as an environmental management tool, How?**

n/a

### **3 Climate change adaptation and mitigation and development of institutional capacities**

#### **3.1 Number of Km<sup>2</sup> and type of habitat covered by mechanisms and/or actions to adapt to climate change (implemented with the support of the joint programme)**

The geographical unit that can be used for this question is "River Basin" in the context of MDGF 1680 Joint Programme, and the surface area of Seyhan River Basin is 20,600 km<sup>2</sup>

Tropical Forest  
Temperature Forest  
Savannah  
Shrub land  
Grassland  
Wetlands  
Rocky Areas  
Desert  
Artificial terrestrial (pastoral land, arable land, etc.)

#### **3.2 Adaptation measures supported by JP that are addressing the following climate change issues**

#### **3.3 Based on available data, what kind of improvements on the population's wellbeing have been achieved through JP supported adaptation measures?**

#### **3.4 Number of individuals and institutions with improved capacities to adapt to climate change or mitigate it**

**Public institutions**

Total

**Private Sector Institutions**

Total

**Civil Servants**

Total

Women

Men

**Citizens**

Total

Women

Men

**3.5 Interventions funded by the JP to improve capacities of individuals and institutions to adapt to Climate Change or mitigate it**

**3.6 Number of clean development mechanism projects registered to mitigate climate change**

CO2 emissions captured through conservation

CO2 emission reduction through the use of renewable energies

CO2 emission reduction through the use of clean technologies