

Section I: Identification and JP Status

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

Semester: 2-11

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	2-11
Programme Duration	
Official Starting Date	
Participating UN Organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * FAO * UNDP * UNEP * UNESCO * UNV
Implementing Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 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	\$4,279,212.00
------	----------------

UNEP	\$907,738.00
UNESCO	
UNV	
FAO	\$312,913.00
Total	\$5,499,863.00

Total Amount of Transferred To Date

UNDP	\$3,005,155.00
UNEP	\$680,410.00
UNESCO	\$0.00
UNV	\$0.00
FAO	\$248,501.00
Total	\$3,934,066.00

Total Budget Committed To Date

UNDP	\$934,891.51
UNEP	\$32,281.00
UNESCO	\$50,888.07
UNV	\$0.00
FAO	\$85,000.00
Total	\$1,103,060.58

Total Budget Disbursed To Date

UNDP	\$1,939,781.52
UNEP	\$586,040.64
UNESCO	\$20,888.07
UNV	\$0.00
FAO	\$47,250.00
Total	\$2,593,960.23

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
Parallel	Local Communities	\$656,714.00	\$188,964.00	\$361,964.00	\$105,785.00
Parallel	USAID/3E project	\$302,000.00	\$0.00	\$167,000.00	\$135,000.00
Cost Share	Local Communities	\$280,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$0.00

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
Local coordinators	30	30	Local Institutions	Support With Environment Laws and Policies
Local Action Groups	150	588	Communities	Support With Environment Laws and Policies
Local participants	300	8,471	Communities	Support With Environment Laws and Policies

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)

1. All 30 Local Environmental Action Plans (LEAPs) are fully completed and started development of additional 7 LEAPs that were not originally envisioned by the programme.
2. First draft of State of the Environment is completed and succesfully implemented 2nd national workshop.
3. Successfully launched LEAP grants and Innovation grants with great response by other donnors and local communities with co-financing ratio at more than 50%

Progress in outcomes

Great progress has been made in this reporting period in all three JP Outcomes, such as the successful development of the State of Environment Reporting (SoER) process, Review of Legal and Institutional Framework of Environmental protection in BiH, DNA establishment, LEAP development process (which has finished completely in meeting our planned goals of 30 new municipalities, though we are now extending further to another 7 new municipalities), Implementation of the LEAP grants (5 LEAP grants – fully implemented; started implementation of 17 new projects supported through MCG funds), identification of Innovative grants process, development of SEAPs, development of comprehensive report "Addressing Natural Resource Management in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) Through the Local Environmental Action Planning (LEAP) Process" and Manual "LEAP methodology manual" etc.

Progress in outputs

The process of LEAP development has successfully been completed in all 30 initially-selected municipalities. The participatory approach of the process has enabled a large group of local stakeholders to become actively involved in LEAP development and having a voice in highlighting local environmental problems and identifying realistic solutions. The whole planning process was transparent and all interested members of local community had equal opportunity to participate, which obviously contributes greatly to strengthening local ownership of the LEAP. LEAPs are now in the adoption process by Municipal Assemblies, which is expected to be completed by the end of February 2012. Also, the Programme has identified 7 additional municipalities to be supported on LEAP development. So far, the MoUs have been signed, municipal LEAP work teams nominated and first training (for LEAP coordinators and team members) conducted. In these municipalities the programme is using a slightly different approach as these municipalities have all already completed UNDP's Integrated Local Development Strategy, which itself already assembled many of the pieces necessary for the completion of a LEAP document, a synergetic approach already found to be particularly efficient and successful in 2011.

In terms of the implementation of LEAP grants, the programme finalized first 5 projects in the 6 municipalities of Bratunac and Zivinice, Drinic, Tuzla, Prijedor and Gradiska. Also, 17 new MCG Agreements have already been signed, and implementation of the projects started in January 2012.

So far, 22 approved LEAP grants (5 completed and 17 new) are in value of 1,258,533.47 USD whereby the programme is providing 601,819.18 USD (47.80%) and Local communities provide 656,714.29 USD (52.20%).

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 which will be of use to the governmental officials and other involved in the environmental sector in B&H. Output 3.3 is also advancing as planned. The State of Environment Reporting process was further improved at the Second Stakeholder Workshop held in September 2011 in Sarajevo. Sixty 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 first draft of the State of Environment Report for B&H, receive feedback from participants on the way forward in the process, and to identify state capacities for the continuation of the reporting obligations.

The gap analysis for development of a comprehensive environmental information system is also successfully conducted, in line with the first draft of the document "BiH Linking Existing Environmental Databases". Achievement of Output 3.5. is also progressing well and is closely connected with other outputs in the Objective 3. When it comes to Output 3.6, the project website is under construction and will serve as a unique platform for environmental information and sharing in B&H. The first draft of the BiH National and International Expert Database was completed during 2011.

Measures taken for the sustainability of the joint programme

All activities are carried out in close collaboration with all four government levels in Bosnia and Herzegovina, such as:

1. LEAPs developed in the way that Local Communities are provided by technical support and methodology for development of LEAP as strategic document. Leaders of the development of LEAPs were Local Communities, local government representatives, citizens, NGOs etc
2. State of the Environment Report is carried out in the same way, the government was provided by technical support but the same (government), development of ToR, collection of data, development of the document and endorsement of each step, etc.
3. Grant funding mechanisms (LEAP grants and Innovation grants) are developed in close collaboration with all 4 government levels in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Leap grants are awarded to communities that have developed LEAPs and action plans that identifies and addresses actions that lead to improved environmental and climate change situation in their communities. The focus of innovation grants is also developed in close collaboration with governments in Bosnia and Herzegovina and especially Local communities where pilot projects are implemented or will be implemented. The fact overall both funding windows (LEAP grants and Innovation grants) are more than 50% cofinanced by either local communities or other donors shows ownership and further sustainability of these actions.

Are there difficulties in the implementation?

UN agency Coordination
Joint Programme design

What are the causes of these difficulties?

N/A

Briefly describe the current difficulties the Joint Programme is facing

There is slight delay in programme implementation, that is mainly reflected through implementation of activities that are part of FAO programme component. However, FAO has made certain improvement in 2011 comparing to 2010. This improvement is mainly caused by hiring FAO local team leader and redefinition or clarification of some activities that were outdated. Still, delay is obvious and FAO is working in full power to overcome it, which will be shortly reflected by initiation of activity related to Abandoned Land etc.

Briefly describe the current external difficulties that delay implementation

N/A

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

FAO is working in full power to overcome it, which will be shortly reflected by initiation of activity related to Abandoned Land etc.

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 MDF-F JPs	0	5	Report on selection of municipalities Support in project team establishment (interview minutes) Selection of LEAP grants Selection of Innovative 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.	
Number of joint missions undertaken jointly by UN implementing agencies for MDG-F JPs		53	Field assessment reports.	In writing/ reports.

A part from the last reporting period when one particular activity has been coordinated among all 5 UN agencies – preparation of a field assessment questionnaire and selection criteria for potential LEAP municipalities, 4 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 and selection of Innovative grants between UNDP, UNESCO).

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

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 municipalities for LEAP development 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 and formulation of Innovative grants.

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

Actively engaged in the design and development of LEAPs, implementation of small grants for LEAP priority projects, 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

Design and development of LEAPs, 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 52 selected localities: children within schools, CSOs, men/women, 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?

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?

Focus groups discussions

Household surveys

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

Open forum meetings

Capacity building/trainings

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

Besides programmed activities, MDGF Environment and Climate Change Programme in Bosnia and Herzegovina managed to include one additional activity, development of Sustainable Energy Action Plans (SEAPs) in 5 new Local Communities (Municipalities). This is a great step forward in fighting climate change as the programme supports 5 out of 7 municipalities that have joined European Covenant of Mayors and commits to EU 20-20-20 targets. It is important to mention that these initiatives are fully voluntary as B&H communities are not obliged to join to this Covenant but it is rather done as a result of increased awarenes among municipalitis in the country. This initiative is very nicely linked to other programme activities, such as establishment of Designated National Authority (DNA) under Kyoto protocol, implementation of Innovation grants focused on Energy Efficiency etc.

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	0

Laws

National	0
Local	0

Plans

National	0
Local	42

1.1.2 On Climate Change

Policies

National	1
Local	0

Laws

National	0
Local	0

Plan

National 0
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 will support 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 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

Comments: Please specify how indicator 1.1 addresses the selected sectors.

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 2,200,000
Urban N/A
Rural N/A

National Public Institutions

Total 5
Urban N/A
Rural N/A

Local Public Institutions

Total 42
Urban N/A
Rural N/A

Private Sector Institutions

Total 42
Urban N/A
Rural N/A

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

National Budget N/A

Total Local Budget(s) N/A

Comments

N/A

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 137

Private Sector Institutions

Total 43

NGO/CBO

Total 75

Civil Servants

Total 242

Women 67%

Men 33%

Citizens

Total 453

Women 67%

Men 33%

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

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

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

Adaptation
Mitigation

Public institutions

Total 14

Private Sector Institutions

Total 1

Civil Servants

Total 34

Women 8

Men 26

Citizens

Total 11

Women 6

Men 5

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

Adaptation
Mitigation

Capacity building
Equipment
Knowledge transfer

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

CO2 emissions captured through conservation N/A
CO2 emission reduction through the use of renewable energies N/A



CO2 emission reduction through the use of clean technologies

N/A

Expected Results (Outcomes & outputs)	Indicators	Baseline	Overall JP Expected target	Achievement of Target to date	Means of verification	Collection methods (with indicative time frame & frequency)	Responsibilities	Risks & assumptions
<p>JP Outcome 1. Improved local level environmental planning</p> <p>Output 1. Improved local level environmental planning</p> <p>1.1 Effective local level participatory environmental planning mechanisms strengthened.</p> <p>1.2 Cross-cutting environmental governance methodology integrated into local participatory planning processes. (UNDP-led multi-agency approach).</p> <p>1.3 Strengthened capacity of 30 municipalities for environmental programming and planning (UNDP).</p> <p>1.4 Thirty (30) Local Environmental Action Plans defined and agreed by municipal stakeholders (UNDP).</p>	<p>1.1 No. of local coordinators trained in facilitation of local environmental planning and programming process and LEAP formulation</p>	1.1: 0	1.1: 30	<p>1.1: 30</p> <p>All phases of the LEAP development process have been completed in 30 municipalities (official LEAP adoption by their Municipal Assemblies and the formal establishment of local M&E teams is ongoing). MoUs were signed in November 2011 for an additional 7 municipalities where UNDP's ILDP program had previously provided support through its unified local planning methodology in BiH (miPRO). Local LEAP coordinators have since been nominated and a workshop conducted in January 10, 2012.</p>	<p>LEAP final documents submitted. MoUs signed. Reports submitted. Training evaluation and reports.</p>	<p>Immediately after each training event participants will fill the evaluation sheets. Training provider complete training report after training.</p>	UNDP	<p>Evaluation sheets are not filled by participants → the requirement to have evaluation sheets and training report should be part of ToR of training provider.</p>
	<p>1.2 No. of civil servants trained in environmental planning and programming for including LEAP into budgetary</p>	1.2: 0	1.2: 90 (3 per municipality)	<p>1.2.1: 0</p> <p>Based on a training-needs assessment, a series of workshops for all 37 municipalities are under preparation, and the selection of 4 national consultants/trainers is ongoing, though ToRs have already been prepared. Trainings will be conducted in February/March 2012.</p>	<p>ToRs for trainers. Training evaluation and reports. Final report on Natural Resource Management.</p>	<p>Immediately after each training event participants will fill the evaluation sheets. Training provider complete training report after training.</p>	UNDP	<p>Evaluation sheets are not filled by participants → the requirement to have evaluation sheets and training report should be part of ToR of training provider.</p>

	formulation processes			1.2.3 Prepared Report: "Addressing Natural Resource Management in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) Through the Local Environmental Action Planning (LEAP) Process".				
	1.3 No. of members of Local Action Group trained in LEAP planning, implementation and/or Environment and Climate Change	1.3: 0	1.3: 150 (5 per municipality)	1.3: 588 Conducted two introductory trainings for the initial 30 municipalities, as well as CSOs, public/private companies and key local government stakeholders on LEAP development and implementation (January and August 2011). During the LEAP development process, all 30 Municipal LEAP Work Teams were trained on the following topics: - environmental planning and methodology; - introduction to the LEAP development process and preparation of promotional plans; - assessment of environmental status and problems; - state of environment (preparation and presentation through the DPSIR approach); - identification of pressures and the status of air/water/soil and their impact to human health/biodiversity; - analyses of public opinion on	Training evaluation and reports, lists of participants	Immediately after each training event participants will fill the evaluation sheets. Training provider complete training report after training.	UNDP	Evaluation sheets are not filled by participants → the requirement to have evaluation sheets and training report should be part of ToR of training provider.

				<p>the state of local environment; -creation of a joint vision and the determination of strategic and operative goals; -Preparation of the Action plan; -Preparation of Project Proposals for Local Environmental Action Plan; -Preparation of an M&E Plan ;</p>				
1.4.a) No. of LEAPs developed	1.4.a): 60	1.4.a): 90	1.4.a): 90	<p>1.4.a): 90</p> <p>The process of LEAP development is finished in all of the initial 30 municipalities. The process of official adoption of the LEAP documents by their Municipal Assemblies is ongoing. In addition, the LEAP development process has been initiated in 7 (new) municipalities where ILDP previously supported them through their unified local planning methodology in BiH (miPRO). MoUs were signed in November 2011. Local coordinators nominated and an introductory workshop have since been conducted in January 2012.</p>	Municipal Council decision on LEAP adoption	Local legal acts on Municipal Council decisions, once a year	UNDP	LEAP development process will take longer time than planned → to agree the process, steps and deadlines from very beginning of the process
1.4.b) No. Of SEAPs developed	1.4.b): 2	1.4.b): 7	1.4.b): 3	<p>1.4.b): 3</p> <p>A total of 3 Sustainable Energy Action Plans (SEAPs) developed in the municipalities of Trebinje, Bijeljina and Tuzla. All three developed SEAPs are adopted by Municipal</p>	Municipal Council decision on SEAP adoption	Local legal acts on Municipal Council decisions, once a year	UNDP	SEAP development process will take longer time than planned → to agree the process, steps and deadlines from very beginning of the

				Assemblies. Remaining two are on going and will be completed by February 2012.				process
	1.5 No. of participants actively participated in LEAPs development process	1.5: 0	1.5: 300	1.5: 8471 790 participants at workshops/public presentations + pupils (involved through a competition: "Best painting on nature protection") . 7681 citizens were actively involved through answering a questionnaire on the state of the environment in local communities.	Number of calls for participation per medium Participant lists of local LEAP development forums	Archive of call for participation, advertisements in newspapers. Participants will register their participation in LEAP forums, after each event immediately.	UNDP	Low interest to participate in local environmental planning → to increase the interest via implementing small visible pilot projects.
JP Outcome 2. Enhanced management of environmental resources and delivery of environmental services Output 2. Enhanced management of environmental resources and delivery of environmental services 2.1 Improved management of environmental	2.1 No. of grants distributed for LEAP's priority project implementation	2.1: 0	2.1: 30	2.1: 22 A total of 22 LEAP grants have been distributed with minimum 50% of total value of the project contribution by Local Communities. 2.1.2. Preparation of RfP for „Abandoned Land“ on going.	MoUs/Contracts with municipalities/grant-holders signed	From archive of grant decision making Board, once a year	UNDP	Risk not to have MoUs/Contracts is very low, as this is the basis for grant transfer
	2.2 % of grant matching funds provided by municipalities/other	2.2: N/A	2.2: 25%	2.2: - 52.20% Total value of 22 LEAP grants distributed is 1,258,533.47 USD. Total amount provided by local communities is 656,714.29 USD or 52.20% and MDGF Env is 601,819.18 USD or 47.80 %.	Co-financing agreements signed	From archive of grant decision making Board, once a year	UNDP	Risk not to have co-financing agreements is very low, as this is the basis for grant transfer

resources in 30 municipalities. 2.2 Priority actions identified in LEAPs addressed in 30 municipalities. 2.3 Improved environmental, energy, water and sanitation services in 40 municipalities for the poor.	donors							
	2.3 No. of projects implemented	2.3: 0	2.3: 30	2.3: 5 5 LEAP projects are fully implemented.	Project Monitoring Reports, Annual Review Report	Field visits, twice a year	UNDP	Risk is unprofessionally implemented projects → to provide project management training to Grant-Holders
	2.4 No. of developed and implemented preventive poverty risk systems	2.4: 0	2.4: 30	2.4: 0	Project Monitoring Reports, field reports	Field visits, twice a year	UNDP	Risk is that less attention has been paid to poverty prevention → to include poverty prevention requirements to ToR of service provider
JP Outcome 3. Increased national environmental awareness and action, localizing and achieving MDGs Output 3. Increased national environmental awareness and action, localizing and achieving MDGs 3.1 Documentation of the legal and institutional background for environmental governance at entity and state level. 3.2 Reliable	3.1: Use of Operational Environmental Information System	3.1: Rudimentary and disconnected data	3.1: Environmental Operational Environmental Information system is fully functional, continuously updated and actively used – 50 visits per day.	3.1: 0 Finalization of the Desk Review of Existing Legal-Institutional Framework. MOFTER's organization-al structure examined.	Environmental Information System Track Record, which includes user statistics e.g. number of users, size of databases, number of different projects using the database	From website logs on user statistics, once a month	UNEP	Summary of assumptions and risks for each result. The risk is that Information system is programmed without keeping user statistics → to include user statistics component to software development service provider.
	3.2: DNA	3.2: No	3.2:	3.2: DNA established and fully	Project	National legal	UNDP	The risk is in lack of

<p>environmental indicators (linked with poverty reduction) to inform entity and state policy development. 3.3 Increased public access to environmental information. 3.4 Expanded access to environmental finance.</p>	<p>established and No. of CDM projects;</p>	<p>DNA, no CDM projects</p>	<p>DNA fully functional, 10 CDM projects in operation</p>	<p>functional. A total of 2 CDM projects approved. 3.2.1 FAO has engaged two Indicator development consultants. These consultants are giving Input and proposing indicators in relation to the SOER chapters on Climate Change and Spatial Planning and Urban Development in BiH.</p>	<p>Monitoring Reports, Annual Review Reports</p>	<p>documents once a year, DNA website once a month</p>		<p>capacities to establish and operate DNA professionally → adequate training needs assessment and training of responsible authorities</p>
<p>3.5 Capacity development for greater implementation of environmental governance actions demonstrating innovation, poverty reduction and social inclusion approaches and addressing the achievement of MDG 6, 7 and 8 through improved service delivery. 3.6 Lessons and best practices from effective delivery documented and used to inform policy development.</p>	<p>3.3: State of the Environment Report;</p>	<p>3.3: 0 (no comprehensive state-level SoE)</p>	<p>3.3: 1</p>	<p>3.3: 0 Successful organization of the Second Bosnia and Herzegovina State of Environment Reporting (SoER) National Workshop in Sarajevo on 14-15 September 2011 Finalization of the First draft of the State of Environment Report The gap analysis for development of a comprehensive environmental information system Conducted First draft of the document "BiH Linking Existing Environmental Databases" finished 3.5: 0 Capacity needs assessments for the Inter-entity Environmental</p>	<p>Report</p>	<p>Report</p>	<p>UNEP</p>	<p>No major risks identified</p>

				<p>Committee and MoFTER undergoing</p> <p>3.6: 0 UNEP.ba website under development</p> <p>First draft of the BiH National and International Expert Database finished</p>				
	3.4: No. of innovation grants provided and projects implemented;	3.4: 0	3.4: 10	<p>3.4: 7</p> <p>So far 7 Innovation grants are approved and implementation on going out of which 1 is fully completed and 1 90% completed. Besides these 7 Innovation grants that are on-going additional 6 are approved and implementation is depending on a number of issues that are precondition for signing of MoUs and CSAs.</p>	Project Monitoring Reports, Annual Review Reports	National legal documents once a year	UNDP	Risk is unprofessionally prepared project proposals and inadequate criteria for project selection → providing training on project proposal and working out criteria of project selection in open participatory and transparent manner in close cooperation with key-stakeholders via consensus building process

C. Joint Programme Results Framework with financial information

MDG-F ENV and CC	Annual Targets (lists of Output Annual Targets)	Activities	Total budget	Year			UN Agency	Responsible Party	Y 2 Disbursed	Y 2 Committed	Y2 %	
				Y 1	Y 2	Y 3						
Output 1: Strengthened capacity of municipalities and CSOs to manage and participate in long-term sustainable environmental planning and management processes	1.1 Effective local level participatory environmental planning mechanisms strengthened (UNDP, MDG indicator 30, 31 and 45).	1.1.1 Design, testing and choosing of context specific, poverty focused participatory planning method. Training of Municipal Coordinators in Implementation of Participatory Planning Methodology Publishing the guidelines on Participatory Planning Methodology Promotion of LEAP Methodology and Guidelines	643,507.92	368,322.76	67,420.70	207,764.46	UNDP/ UNV	UNDP	145,357.32	-	215.60	
	1.2 Cross-cutting environmental governance methodology integrated into local participatory planning processes.	1.2.1 Assessment of local environmental needs using participatory planning approaches	Establishing network of local development coordinators	279,035.77	152,629.20	69,317.23	43,389.00	UNEP	UNDP	58,400.00	-	84.25
		1.2.2 Assessment of local integrated good governance training needs. Training of civil servants on environmental mainstreaming to budgetary cycle Design of mentorship programme among municipalities Mentorship programme - exchange of experts, civil servants and leaders of NGO groups	209,406.72	86,632.83	47,401.00	-	UNDP/ UNV	UNDP	27,374.18	-	57.75	
		1.2.3 Support to data collection and input on land use planning to local integrated development processes	47,522.75	46,579.04	943.72	-	FAO	UNDP	-	-	-	
	1.3 Strengthened capacity of 30 municipalities for environmental programming and planning.	1.3.1 Develop selection criteria for environmental, social and poverty-reduction cost-benefit analysis Publishing the best case studies	61,535.89	61,535.89	-	-	UNEP	UNDP	-	-	-	
		1.3.2 Analysis of best practices on integrated assessment and planning. Training needs assessment of 30 municipalities Training for 30 municipalities (climate change adaptation, energy efficiency etc.) Organizing of Study Trip to neighboring countries on env management	152,243.52	49,376.72	63,290.50	-	UNDP	UNDP	23,667.21	-	37.39	
	1.4 Thirty (30) Local Environmental Action Plans defined and agreed by municipal stakeholders.	1.4.1 Developing LEAPs (UNDP) as part of local integrated planning process Development of Sustainable Energy Action Plans (SEAPs) in 6 municipalities Promotion events for LEAPs Promotion events for SEAPs	173,061.69	48,696.93	326,060.46	-	UNDP/ UNV	UNDP	128,118.00	-	39.29	
	Output 2: Secure understanding of the necessity of environmental resources in 30 municipalities and improved link between local communities and improved link between local communities	2.1 Improved management of environmental resources in 30 municipalities.	2.1.1 Implement key enhancements in the management of natural resources using multi-agency best-practices approaches Working with competent authorities for creation of long term natural resources management plans as part of local integrated development plans.	87,443.34	27,017.65	28,809.75	-	UNDP/ UNV	UNDP	6,355.41	-	22.06
			2.1.2 Assisting canton/entity authorities to update the databases of natural resources. Making databases of natural resources available for experts and public at municipal and canton level for integrated planning and appropriate implementation	184,669.46	24,420.90	95,836.82	64,411.74	FAO	UNDP	2,700.00	45,000.00	49.77
			2.1.3 Promote sustainable use of natural resources through the dissemination of the concept of green economy	17,336.49	-	-	12,336.00	UNEP	UNDP	-	-	-
2.2 Priority actions identified in LEAPs addressed in 30 municipalities.		2.2.1 Setting up criteria and awarding 30 grants ranging from 30,000 - 70,000 USD through LEAPs/ conduct monitoring Publishing best case studies after the implementation of priority actions	1,154,710.50	-	388,196.00	701,514.50	UNDP	UNDP	127,313.52	212,124.00	87.44	
2.3 Improved environmental, energy, water and sanitation services in 30 municipalities for the poor.		2.3.1 Build capacities for implementing poverty focused actions for biodiversity protections, clean energy, water supply and sanitation proposals (UNDP). Nat Poverty Mapping Environmental campaign	262,253.02	51,934.81	55,435.20	63,215.59	UNDP/ UNESCO	UNDP	50,888.07	20,888.07	129.48	
Output 3: Strengthened capacity of state to manage local socio-economic development and engage key national partners - capacity of government in designing and implementing public investment budget strengthened.		3.1 Documentation of the legal and institutional background for environmental governance at entity and state level.	3.1.1 Conduct desk review of existing legal - institutional framework. Produce road map for MoFTER's organizational structure Organize high level validation workshop and advocacy campaign	100,212.85	52,644.58	25,928.77	18,640.00	UNEP/ MoFTER, Entity Env. Ministries & Inter-entity Env. Committee	UNDP	19,000.00	3,000.00	84.85
	3.2 Reliable environmental indicators (linked with poverty reduction) to inform entity and state policy	3.2.1 Reviewing existing national environmental indicators and produce new comprehensive framework; Produce comprehensive new indicator framework including data sources	80,720.53	45,570.79	35,149.74	-	FAO/ MoFTER, Entity Env. Ministries	UNDP	5,551.00	30,000.00	101.14	
	3.3 Increased public access to environmental information.	3.3.1 Identify gaps (particular emphasis on environment-poverty linkages). Link, modify and update existing environmental databases/ information sources in accordance with indicator framework Conduct gap analysis for comprehensive environmental information system Stakeholder workshop on content and priorities for pilot State of the Environment Report Select drafting team and advisory committee for SoE Draft State of the Environment Report Launch and disseminate report Advocacy campaign on information access Develop rights based guidelines for improved access to environmental information.	243,349.57	37,744.70	103,141.45	92,363.00	UNEP	UNDP	72,719.00	25,281.00	95.02	
	3.4 Expanded access to environmental finance.	3.4.1 Develop implementation strategy for Kyoto Protocol Analyse and identify options for the CDM institutional and legal framework Assist in the establishment of the Designated National Authority (DNA) Conduct training workshop on CDM programme/project cycle. Distribute fund for Innovative grants Monitoring of innovative grants implementation	1,102,695.05	54,962.80	1,022,064.00	62,205.10	UNDP/ MoFTER, Entity Env. Ministries & Inter-entity Env. Committee	UNDP	445,822.31	722,772.00	114.34	
3.5 Greater implementation of environmental governance actions demonstrating innovation, poverty reduction and social inclusion approaches and addressing the achievement of MDG	3.5.1 Develop capacity needs assessment for MoFTER, the Inter-entity Env. Committee and entity Environmental Ministries. Develop capacity building strategy for MoFTER on priority areas such as environmental monitoring and reporting, MEA obligations, mainstreaming etc. Conduct regional exposure visits/study tours for MoFTER and members of the inter - entity Environment Committee.	71,518.56	10,819.75	30,349.41	28,050.00	UNEP/ MoFTER, Entity Env. Ministries & Inter-entity Env. Committee	UNDP	28,349.00	-	93.41		
3.6 Lessons and best practices from effective delivery documented and used to inform policy development.	3.6.1 Establish project web site Develop electronic network linking municipalities and national authorities. Forming the database and network of national and international experts, who are able to answer to all requests from local stakeholders on priority issues. Produce lessons learned notes capturing experiences and challenges from innovation projects Develop sectoral guidelines for the delivery of environmental services.	134,749.19	58,100.52	78,198.57	32,550.00	UNEP/ MoFTER, Entity Env. Ministries & Inter-entity Env. Committee	UNDP	34,098.00	4,000.00	48.72		
MDG-F ENV and CC	Management		337,501.72	118,290.76	101,175.41	163,035.81	UNDP	UNDP	144,886.99	-	143.20	
	M&E		101,639.90	42,494.05	22,271.87	36,873.98	RCO	UNDP	27,547.00	-	123.69	
	Communication		54,748.56	-	15,301.00	39,447.56	UNDP	UNDP	15,610.27	-	102.02	
			5,499,863.00	1,337,774.68	2,576,291.60	1,565,796.74			1,363,757.28	1,063,065.07	94.20 %	