

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

Semester: 2-10

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: 2-10  
 Programme Duration:  
 Official Starting Date:

- Participating UN Organizations:
- FAO
  - UNDP
  - UNEP
  - UNESCO
  - UNV
- Implementing Partners:
- FBiH Ministry of Ecology and Tourism
  - Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations, Council of Ministers BiH
  - RS Ministry for Spatial Planning, Construction and Ecology

## Budget Summary

Total Approved Budget	UNDP	
	UNEP	905000.0
	UNESCO	
	UNV	
	FAO	311969.0
	UNDP	847729.32
	UNEP	373474.64
	UNESCO	0.0
Total Amount of Transferred To Date	UNV	0.0
	FAO	116571.0
	UNDP	814703.44
	UNEP	279724.0
Total Budget Committed To Date	UNESCO	0.0
	UNV	0.0
	FAO	11539.0
	UNDP	448403.0
Total Budget Disbursed To Date	UNEP	215758.0
	UNESCO	0.0
	UNV	0.0
	FAO	8661.0

## 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 in 2010 for each programme as per following example:

Amount in thousands of US\$

Type	Donor	Total	For 2010	For 2011	For 2012
Parallel					
Cost Share					
Counterpart	173000	173000	173000	0	0

### 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.

## Direct Beneficiaries

	Men	Men from Ethnic Groups	Women	Women from Ethnic Groups	Boys	Girls	National Institutions	Local Institutions
Targeted Number	60	0	40	0	0	0	5	35
Reached Number	98	0	62	0	0	0	4	60
Targeted Reached % difference	-38	0	-22	0	0	0	1	-25
	163.33	0	155.0	0	0	0	80.0	171.43

## Indirect Beneficiaries

	Men	Men from Ethnic Groups	Women	Women from Ethnic Groups	Boys	Girls	National Institutions	Local Institutions
Targeted Number	60	0	40	0	0	0	14	20

Reached Number	64	0	23	0	0	0	30	35
Targeted - Reached	-4	0	17	0	0	0	-16	-15
% difference	106.67	0	57.5	0	0	0	214.29	175.0

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

Please provide a brief overall assessment (250 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

#### Progress in outcomes

Great progress has been made in this reporting period in all three JP Outcomes, such as the launching of the State of Environment Reporting (SoER) process, namely, initiated an important move forward when it comes to environmental cooperation and awareness at all levels of governance in Bosnia and Herzegovina, DNA establishment, starting of the LEAP development process, launching of the LEAP grants (6 LEAP grants), etc. Also, the previous reporting period was mostly devoted to preparatory work (research and visibility) for achieving these outcomes.

#### Progress in outputs

Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 are progressing well, all 30 municipalities to be supported by LEAP development have been selected, MoUs signed and the process actually started in November 2010. Municipal coordinators have been nominated, working groups are being established and the first kick off workshop for LEAP development process (participatory planning process methodology) is planned for January 27, 2011. Outputs 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 are progressing well also, first an open call for proposals for LEAP grants was conducted during summer/autumn of 2010 and 6 project proposals were selected and implementation has already begun. The total value of the grants is approximately 346,000 USD, with 50% being local governments' contributions (approximately 173,000 USD). Outputs 3.1 is progressing well and, apart from some technical requirements, is virtually completed. The Desk Review of Existing Legal-Institutional Framework for Environmental Protection is a pioneering publication currently being reviewed by all relevant stakeholders and is set for publication in early 2011. Output 3.3 is also advancing as planned. The State of Environment Reporting process was launched at the First Stakeholders Workshop held in October 2010 in Sarajevo. Forty-five representatives of state and Entity Ministries, public institutions, non-governmental organizations, academia and partnering UN agencies took part in the meeting, whose main objectives were to discuss the involvement of BiH in the State of Environment Reporting (SoER) process, receive feedback from participants on the proposed methodology and selection of data/indicators, as well as to identify data sources and agree on priorities for future actions. The meeting was followed by an additional e-discussion about the course which the process should take, and distribution of the identified set of indicators for the Report by theme, and a Data survey for the participants. As of 31 December 2010, more than 20 different state and Entity institutions have replied to the Data survey. Initial activities have been made regarding achievement of Output 3.5. When it comes to Output 3.6, several steps were taken for informing about policy development, such as the registration of the project website and creating a structure for an electronic network and a database of national and international experts.

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

#### Are there difficulties in the implementation?

UN agency Coordination  
Joint Programme design

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

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

The progress of the Joint Program is somewhat slower due to differences between agencies' starting dates in the project and a lack of coordination between them so far. To some extent, delay was caused by no real presence of FAO in the country, but by the end of reporting period, after the selection of a Local Consultant and the revision of Project documents (updating and harmonizing with the present situation), FAO has started with operative activities. There are also some communication issues which have not been solved over the previous reporting period and disagreements between agencies on how certain activities should be implemented due to a lack of clear provisions in the JP.

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

Elections held in the Country have somewhat slowed down any ongoing processes. Nevertheless, country representatives are responsive to any request coming from the agencies and the work can be completed on time. The presence in the country and coordination of all FAO activities, as well as the completion of FAO's project team is secured with the presence of a Local Consultant. The JP document was reviewed and updated to the current situation. All project activities have been revised and a new detailed work plan has been developed.

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

The idea of sharing regular reports by all agencies on a monthly basis to improve inter-agency communication has been accepted by all agencies and now is in a fine-tuning process. It was noticed that the Programme Manager had to devote considerably more time to aspects of inter-agency cooperation in order to overcome current difficulties.

## 2 Inter-Agency Coordination and Delivering as One

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

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

#### What types of coordination mechanisms

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

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

## 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?

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

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

Definif criteria, evaluation etc. The government at the State and Entity levels is fully involved in the MDG-F program. Besides their role in the PMC and NSC, the government has been involved in many program activities such as: creation of criteria for selection of 30 LEAP municipalities and the evaluation/selection of municipalities, active participation in State of Environment Reporting etc. The government has made significant efforts towards bringing about a decision on DNA establishment.

#### 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?

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

Policy/decision making

Management: other, specify

Actively engaged in design and development of LEAP, implementation of small grants for LEAP priority projects, etc.

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

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

Policy/decision making

Management: other, specify

Design and development of LEAP.

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

UN Agency

other, specify

Entity government building.

**Current situation**

**4 Communication and Advocacy**

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

**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

## Millenium Development Goals

Target 7.A: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources

JP Outcome	Beneficiaries	JP Indicator	Value
Improved local level environmental planning Enhanced management of environmental resources and delivery of environmental services Increased national environmental awareness and action, localizing and achieving MDGs	720000	# of LEAPs developed	

## Additional Narrative Comments

Please provide any relevant information and contributions of the programme to de MDGs, whether at national or local level. At this stage of program implementation, the JP team is not able to provide any concrete information about contributions of the program to the MDGs. During the inception phase and after the selection of municipalities, as well as the identification of other gaps, the JP team will focus on the collection of relevant information that contributes to the MDGs.

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

**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 0

Local 0

**Plans**

National 0  
Local 36

**1.1.2 On Climate Change****Policies**

National 1  
Local 0

**Laws**

National 0  
Local 0

**Plan**

National 0  
Local 36

**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 will support the design and development of 30 LEAPs and 6 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. Both, LEAPs and DNA 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**

Development of LEAPs, SEAPs and the establishment of a DNA focus on each sector. LEAP in particular is a very broad and strategic document that identifies and provides guidance for each sector in the field of environmental management and climate change at a local level and 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 1200000  
Urban N/A  
Rural N/A

**National Public Institutions**

Total 5  
Urban N/A  
Rural N/A

**Local Public Institutions**

Total 35  
Urban N/A  
Rural N/A

**Private Sector Institutions**

Total N/A  
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**

**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**

**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**

**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 0

**Private Sector Institutions**

Total 0

**NGO/CBO**

Total 0

**Civil Servants**

Total 0

Women 0

Men 0

**Citizens**

Total 0

Women 0

Men 0

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

Total 0

Women 0

Men 0

Ethnic groups 0

**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**

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?

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

**3.1 Number of Km2 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 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
Artificial terrestrial (pastoral land, arable land, etc.)	N/A

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

Atmospheric pollution

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

Health  
Vulnerability  
Improved livelihoods

**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