**Joint Programme Monitoring Report:**

**Environment and Climate Change Window**

**Section I: Identification and Joint Programme Status**

a. Joint Programme Identification and basic data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date of Submission:July 20, 2011Submitted by: Name: Sinisa RodicTitle: National Programme Manager and CoordinatorOrganization: UNDP CO Bosnia and HerzegovinaContact information: srodic@undp.ba |  | Country and Thematic WindowBosnia and HerzegovinaEnvironment and Climate Change |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| MDTF Atlas Project No: 00058000**Title:** “Mainstreaming environmental governance:Linking local and national action in Bosniaand Herzegovina” |  | Report Number: 1Reporting Period: January 1, 2011 – June 30, 2011**Programme Duration:** 36 months**Official starting date:**December 16, 2009 |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Participating UN OrganizationsUNDP, UNEP, UNESCO, UNV and FAO |  | **Implementing partners [[1]](#footnote-1)**Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations, Council of Ministers BiHRS Ministry for Spatial Planning, Construction and EcologyFBiH Ministry of Ecology and Tourism |
|  |  |  |

The financial information reported should include overhead, M&E and other associated costs.

|  |
| --- |
| **Budget Summary** |
| **Total Approved Joint Programme Budget**  | UNDP/ UNV/RC: 4126216.73 USDUNESCO: 156676.57 USDUNEP: 905000.66 USDFAO: 311969.02 USDTotal: 5449862.99 USD |
| **Total Amount of Transferred to date** | UNDP/UNV/RC/UNESCO: 2985155 USDUNEP: 680410 USDFAO: 248501 USDTotal: 3914066 USD |
| **Total Budget Committed to date** | UNDP/UNV/RC: 461000 USDUNESCO: 0 USDUNEP: 104030 USDFAO: 40145 USDTotal: 605175 USD |
| **Total Budget Disbursed to date** | UNDP/UNV/RC: 1288023 USDUNESCO: 0 USDUNEP: 351000 USDFAO: 27574 USDTotal: 1666597 USD |

**BENEFICIARIES**

**Direct Beneficiaries:** *“The individuals, groups, or organizations, targeted, that benefit, directly, from the development intervention”.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Men** | **Men from Ethnic Groups** | **Women** | **Women from Ethnic Groups** | **Boys** | **Girls** | **National Institutions** | **Local Institutions** |
| **Targeted number** | 67% (⅔) | N/A | 33% (⅓) | N/A | N/A | N/A | 5 | 35 |
| **Reached number** | 459 (63%) | N/A | 259 (37%) | N/A | N/A | N/A | 9 | 260 |
| **% difference** | -4% | N/A | +4% | N/A | N/A | N/A | +80% | +643% |

These direct beneficiaries reached (for both men and women) include representatives (municipal employees, local NGOs, utility companies, etc.) of those municipalities which were visited by the project team, and then selected for inclusion in this project; likewise the number of local institutions reached represent the respective organizations of the previously-mentioned representatives within the selected municipalities (NGOs, utility companies, hospitals, schools, etc.) that have participated in project activities. The direct national institutions include the 3 most-related ministries (at the national level and in each entity), as well as each entity’s environmental fund; furthermore a few entity-level agencies have been brought in by municipalities to consult them on local level work.

**Indirect Beneficiaries:** *“The individuals, groups, or organizations, not targeted, that benefit, indirectly, from the development intervention”*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Men** | **Men from Ethnic Groups** | **Women** | **Women from Ethnic Groups** | **Boys** | **Girls** | **National Institutions** | **Local Institutions** |
| **Targeted number** | 67% (⅔) | N/A | 33% (⅓) | N/A | N/A | N/A | 14 | 20 |
| **Reached number** | 56 (71%) | N/A | 23 (29%) | N/A | N/A | N/A | 30 | 35 |
| **% difference** | +4% | N/A | -4% | N/A | N/A | N/A | +114% | +75% |

These indirect beneficiaries reached (for both men and women) include representatives (municipal employees, local NGOs, utility companies, etc.) of those municipalities which were visited by the project team, but *not* selected for inclusion in this project; likewise the number of local institutions reached represent the respective organizations of the previously-mentioned representatives within the *non*-selected municipalities. The indirect national institutions include tangentially-related ministries at the national level and in each entity (water, agriculture, forestry, energy, mining, spatial planning, development, civil affairs, social services, labor, health, youth, etc.), as well as each entity’s association for municipalities, all of whom benefit indirectly from this project. Additionally it should be mentioned that indirect beneficiaries should include the entire population of all 40 municipalities included in various project activities (about 1.9 million people, roughly half the country’s entire population) who altogether represent an unknown mix of genders, ethnic groups, ages, etc.

1. **Joint Programme M&E framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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** |
| **JP Outcome 1.** Improved local level environmental planning**Output 1.**Improved local level environmental planning1.1 Effective local level participatory environmental planning mechanisms strengthened.1.2 Cross-cutting environmental governance methodology integrated into local participatory planning processes. (UNDP-led multi-agency approach).1.3 Strengthened capacity of 30 municipalities for environmental programming and planning (UNDP).1.4 Thirty (30) Local Environmental Action Plans defined and agreed by municipal stakeholders (UNDP). | 1.1 No. of local coordinators trained in facilitation of local environmental planning and programming process and LEAP formulation | 1.1: 0 | 1.1: 30 | 1.1: 23Conducted first two phases of LEAP processes in 23 municipalities (three phases left to be done until the end of Y2). In 7 municipalities ILDP previously supported by unified local planning methodology in BiH (miPRO) MoU’s signed in May 2011. Local coordinators nominated and first kick off workshop will be conducted in August 2011.  | MoU’s signed. Reports submitted. Training evaluation and reports.  | 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. |
| 1.2 No. of civil servants trained in environmental planning and programming for including LEAP into budgetary formulation processes | 1.2: 0 | 1.2: 90(3 per municipality) | 1.2: 0 (trainings for all 30 are planned for September 2011)1.2.1 Training needs assessment for 30 municipalities completed and training modules developed (trainings are planned for September 2011)1.2.3.1 FAO has made preparation of baseline study and review of needs assessment (review of UNEP activity 1.2.1.). This is joint activity also for 2.1.2. and 3.2.1, but with specific focus on each activities main objective. Here focusing on the needs for land use planning inf, 1.2.3.2 Support to collection of available environmental data, 1.2.3.3 Input on land use planning to local integrated dev. processes | Engagement of national consultant and Training needs assessment report finished in July 2011.Engagement of two national consultants for LEAP dev. Process. Final report to be done until October 2011. | Immediately after each training event participants will fill the evaluation sheets. Training provider complete training report after training. Engagement of two consultants (national and international). End of assignment report: "Addressing Natural Resource Management in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) Through the Local Environmental Action Planning (LEAP) Process"; Manual: "LEAP methodology manual" | 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. |
| 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: 183 (103 mails and 80 females) - introduction of LEAP goals and activities for LEAP development- environmental planning and methodology (DPSIR)- state of environment (preparation and presentation)- introduction of LEAP development process and preparation of promotion plan- assessment of environmental status and problems- identifications of pressures and status of air, water and soil and impact to human health- analyses of public opinion on state of local environment | Training evaluation and reports | 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. |
| 1.4.a) No. of LEAPs developed | 1.4.a): 30 | 1.4.a): 60 | 1.4.a): 0The process has started in November 2010 – to be finished until the end of Y2.  | Municipal Council decision on LEAP adoption done. | 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): 8 | 1.4.b): The process has started in January 2011, to be ended in January 2012.  | MoU’s with 6 mun. has signed. | 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 process |
| 1.5 No. of participants actively participated in LEAPs development process | 1.5: 0 | 1.5: 300 | 1.5: 761 (488 males and 273 females)LEAP Coordinator, Working groups, companies for technical assistance, NGO’s, citizens through public hearings and media campaign are actively involved.  | Number of calls for participation per medium. Participant lists of local LEAP development forums/ meetings/ working groups sessions etc. | 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 services2.1 Improved management of environmental 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. | 2.1 No. of grants distributed for LEAP’s priority project implementation | 2.1: 0 | 2.1: 30 | 2.1: 5 | Micro Capital Grants 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 donors | 2.2: N/A | 2.2: 25% | 2.2: 50% | Micro Capital Grants with financial breakdown signed, financial and progress reports submitted showing financial contribution in minimum of 50%.  | 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 |
| 2.3 No. of projects implemented | 2.3: 0 | 2.3: 30 | 2.3: 0All 5 LEAP grants projects started in 2010 are on-going with estimated completion by August 2011. | Project Monitoring Reports, Annual Review Report | Field visits. | UNDP | Risk is unprofessionally implemented projects 🡪 to provide project management training to Grant-Holders |
| **JP Outcome 3.** Increased national environmental awareness and action, localizing and achieving MDGs**Output 3.** Increased national environmental awareness and action, localizing and achieving MDGs3.1 Documentation of the legal and institutional background for environmental governance at entity and state level. 3.2 Reliable 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.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. | 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: 13.1 Finalization of the Desk Review of Existing Legal-Institutional Framework.MOFTER’s organization-al structure examined.Organization of a stakeholder consultation on the Desk Review. | Report completed.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 established and No. of CDM projects;  | 3.2: No DNA, no CDM projects | 3.2: DNA fully functional, 10 CDM projects in operation | 3.2: Decision on DNA adopted by Entity and National Governments. Executive Board established. 3.2.1 FAO has prepared baseline study and review of needs assessment in collaboration with UNEP, 3.2.1.2 Review national environmental indicators in view of FAO’s mandate, 3.2.1.3 Producing new comprehensive indicator framework in collaboration with UNEP. | Project Monitoring Reports, Annual Review ReportsThe official correspondence between National Government and UNFCCC will be realized in the near future.  | National legal documents once a year, DNA website once a monthEngagement of two consultants (national and international). | UNDP | The risk is in lack of capacities to establish and operate DNA professionally 🡪 adequate training needs assessment and training of responsible authorities  |
| 3.3: State of the Environment Report;  | 3.3: 0 (no comprehensive state-level SoE) | 3.3: 1 | 3.3: Selection of relevant stakeholder from a number of state and Entity institutions, CSOs and academia. Successful organization of the First Bosnia and Herzegovina State of Environment Reporting (SoER) National Workshop in Sarajevo on 13-14 October 2010Identification of a set of Indicators by Theme and Data Survey documents Consultation with over 30 institutions for their contribution3.5Initiation of the analysis of the Capacity needs assessments for the Inter-entity Environmental Committee and MoFTER3.6Domain for the website registered The database and network of national and international experts is being built. | Report | Report | UNEP | No major risks identified |
| 3.4: No. of innovation grants provided and projects implemented;  | 3.4: 0 | 3.4: 10 | 3.4: 0 (during this reporting period programme team identified potential projects in collaboration with national and local stakeholders, other donors and organizations. It is planned to start implementation in second half of 2011) | 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 |

1. Joint Programme Results Framework with financial information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **JP output: 1.1**  |
| **Programme****Outputs** | **Activity** | **YEAR** | **UN AGENCY** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **Estimated Implementation Progress** |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** |  | **NATIONAL/LOCAL** | **Total amount****Planned for the JP**  | **Estimated Total amount** **Committed** | **Estimated Total** **Amount****Disbursed** | **Estimated** **% Delivery rate of budget** |
| **Output 1. Strengthened capacity of municipalities and CSOs to manage and participate in long-term sustainable environmental planning and management process** | 1.1 Effective local level participatory environmental planning mechanisms strengthened. | 388322 | 67420.70 | 121409.33 | UNDPUNV | UNDP | 643,507.92 | 0 | 159118.37 | 236% |
| 1.2 Cross-cutting environmental governance methodology integrated into local participatory planning processes  | 285841 | 47401 | 117325.13 | UNEPUNVFAOUNDP | UNDP | 535,019.67 | 26000 | 1529.31 | 58% |
| 1.2.1 Assessment of local environmental needs using participatory planning approaches | - | 69317.23 | 57089.34 | UNEP | UNDP |  | 0 | 0 | % |
| 1.2.3 Support to data collection and input on land use planning to local integrated development processes. | - | 943.72 | - | FAO | UNDP |  | 0 | 0 | % |
| 1.3 Strengthened capacity of 30 municipalities for environmental programming and planning.  | 110911 | 63290.82 | - | UNEPUNVUNDP | UNDP | 213,778.60 | 0 | 11548.55 | 18% |
| 1.4 Thirty (30) Local Environmental Action Plans defined and agreed by municipal stakeholders. | 48696 | 326060.46 | 54867.58 | UNVUNDP | UNDP | 173,061.69 | 0 | 28048.22 | 86% |
| **Output 2. Secured understanding of the necessity of sustainable management of natural resources within local communities and improved link between-en local and state/e-entity level policies** | 2.1 Improved management of environmental resources in 30 municipalities. | 51437 | 28809.75 | 3606.58 | UNVUNEPUNDPFAO | UNDP | 290,388.72 | 0 | 2598.88 | 90% |
| 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 | - | 95836.82 | 64411 | FAO | UNDP |  | 40145 | 18913 | 61% |
| 2.1.3 Promoting sustainable use of natural resources. |  |  | 17336.49 | UNEP | UNDP |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 Priority actions identified in LEAPs addressed in 30 municipalities. | - | 388196.09 | 18636.50 | UNDP | UNDP | 1,154,710.50 | 0 | 70223.69 | 18% |
| 2.3 Improved environmental, energy, water and sanitation services in 30 municipalities for the poor. | 51874 | 55435.19 | 158198.57 | UNVUNESCOUNDP | UNDP | 156,676.57 | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| **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. | 52644 | 25928.77 | 21639  | UNEP | UNDP | 100,212,85 | 4000 | 8847 | 49% |
| 3.2 Reliable environmental indicators (linked with poverty reduction) to inform entity and state policy development | 45570 | 35149 | - | UNEPFAO | UNDP | 80,720.53 | 30100 | 3270 | 94% |
| 3.3 Increased public access to environmental information. | 37744 | 103141 | 65364.17 | UNEP | UNDP | 243,349.57 | 0 | 88124 | 85% |
| 3.4 Expanded access to environmental finance. | 54962 | 1022064 | 522946.44 | UNDP | UNDP | 1,102,695.05 | 435000 | 7238.43 | 43% |
| 3.5 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. | 10819 | 30349 | 30349 | UNEP | UNDP | 71,518.57 | 30000 |  | 98% |
| 3.6 Lessons and best practices from effective delivery documented and used to inform policy development. | 58100 | 78198.57 | 35550 | UNEP | UNDP | 134,749.19 | 35000 | 35000 | 89% |
|  | Management (UNDP) | 118290 | 101175.47 | 205564.36 |  | 346,500.66 | 0 | 82422.88 | 81% |
| Monitoring and Evaluation (UN RC BIH) | 29318.85 | 31016.45 | 38494.37 |  | 92,639.90 | 0 | 11704.91 | 37% |
|  | MDG F Communications | 12626 | 18352.95 | 33008.14 |  | 54,749 | 0 | 9034.08 | 49% |
|  | **Total** | **1337714.67** | **2576291** | **1565796** |  | **5,499,862.99** | **600245** | **537621.32** | **44%** |

**SECTION II: Joint Programme Progress**

1. Narrative on progress, obstacles and contingency measures

**Progress in outcomes:**

Great progress has been made in this reporting period in all three JP Outcomes, such as thedevelopment 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 is approximately 60% completed), Implementation of the LEAP grants (5 LEAP grants – 90% completed), 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**:

In terms of LEAP development, the programme mobilized large number of stakeholders on local level in all 23 municipalities in which LEAP development process started last year. Municipal coordinators for LEAP development are appointed, working groups established and the process is more than half way through to be completed. There are no major obstacles in this process. For another 7 municipalities (total 30) the programme has started development of LEAP in late June 2011 and will be completed by the end of the year like in first 23. In these municipalities the programme is using slightly different approach as in these municipalities UNDP has completed Integrated Local Development Strategy that required just part of the process in order to develop LEAP document.

In terms of implementation of LEAP grants, the programme is in final phase of completion of first 5 projects in the municipalities of Drinic, Tuzla, Prijedor, Gradiska and Bratunac-Zivinice.

Also, the programme has agreed on the approach for implementation of Innovative grants that will focus on Energy Efficiency in Public sector buildings. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, energy is significantly wasted, especially in the sector of public buildings which have enormous bills for heating, ventilation, lighting, etc. Some of the main rationale for using this approach is:

* Energy efficiency is the most cost effective and has the biggest return on investment out of all environmental protection measures – directly contribution of Programme to “linking between achieving environment and poverty related MDGs”
* Local communities will be supported by programme in identification of their needs, preparation and implementation of projects - full project management cycle… and in that way their absorption capacities will be increased, effectively preparing them for the future EU funding opportunities -– directly contribution of Programme to “increasing national absorption capacities”
* Energy efficiency is the area with the biggest potential for attracting other Donor co-financing for the programme activities – which is yet another explicit requirement of the Programme Document, to which the proposed new approach directly responds

Taking into consideration all above mentioned, the programme has identified several projects to be funded through this programme and a large number of potential projects that will be selected in next couple of months. First two projects to be funded through this programme are: Mechanical engineering faculty in Sarajevo and Kindergarten in the municipality of Gradiska. Both are focusing on reduction of energy consumption, reduction of GHG emissions and economic benefits for the community. Both projects are co-financed (Kindergarten by the Pogramme, USAID and Local Government; Mechanical engineering faculty by the Programme, the faculty, USAID and Cantonal Government).

As contribution to LEAP development, FAO has created comprehensive report "Addressing Natural Resource Management in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) Through the Local Environmental Action Planning (LEAP) Process" and Manual “LEAP methodology manual". The idea was to analyze and review existing LEAPs and to make recommendations, particularly in relation to natural resource management and more comprehensive inclusion of other FAO’s points of interests in LEAPs. The idea was to prepare additional documents that could be used as supplements to existing methodology for LEAP development. These documents are identifying some gaps and adjustments that could be made, as well as highlighting some differences between LEAPs. In addition, report Identifies bottlenecks and deficiencies of data collection in municipalities, evaluates feasibility of data acquisition and reporting, reliability and relevance of information, regularity of reporting and further processing of data. On the basis of this review and experience elsewhere (FAO engaged international consultant), feasible solutions and improvements for data collection have been proposed.

Moreover, with two consultants, FAO is engaged in review of existing national environmental indicators. This activity is preparation to drafting the BiH State of the Environment Report (SOER). FAO consultants will be work in areas of special interest for FAO. At the moment, chapters in focus of activities include Climate Change Chapter and Spatial Planning and Urban Development in BiH.

As a part of UNESCO activities, a total of 12 Experts from Bosnia and Herzegovina attended the International Conference on Energy Efficiency in Cultural heritage organized by UNDP , Dubrovnik 4 – 6 April 2011. Furthermore, 4 experts (from the institute for protection of cultural heritage of Federation BiH and Republic Srpska) attended specialized trainings in Zagreb on energy efficiency topics. Within the general framework of creation adequate management mechanisms of Popovo Polje , focused activities on improving protection and management of Vjetrenica Cave are being undertaken.

Also, a part of successful implementation of State of the Environment report, UNEP has completed important and very demanding process of completion of Review of the Legal and Institutional Framework of Environmental Protection in BiH. The report is completed and written in all local languages as well as in English.

**Are there difficulties in the implementation? What are the causes of these difficulties? Please check the most suitable option**

b.

[ ]  UN agency Coordination

[ ]  Coordination with Government

[ ]  Coordination within the Government (s)

[ ]  Administrative (Procurement, etc) /Financial (management of funds, availability, budget revision, etc)

[ ]  Management: 1. Activity and output management 2. Governance/Decision making (PMC/NSC) 4. Accountability

[x]  Joint Programme design

c.

[ ]  External to the Joint Programme (risks and assumptions, elections, natural disaster, social unrest, etc

[ ]  Other. Please specify:

1. Please, briefly describe (250 words) the current difficulties the Joint Programme is facing. Refer only to progress in relation to the planned in the Joint Program Document. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

Main difficulty in the implementation of Joint Programme currently is implementation of the component that FAO is responsible for. The FAO had rather slow start in the Project, with low percent of allocated budget used in the first year and just some preparation activities have been done. With the engagement of Local Consultant at the beginning of this calendar year, FAO team started to work in full capacity with having local person committed to the project. During the year FAO has finally engaged 4 more short-term consultants. Activity 1.2.3. is almost completed and FAO team has started to work on activity 3.2.1. This is a significant improvement in comparison with the first year of JP, but even more efforts need to be invested in future.

1. Please, briefly describe (250 words) the current external difficulties (not caused by the joint programme) that delay implementation. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

Please, briefly explain (250 words) the actions that are or will be taken to eliminate or mitigate the difficulties (internal and external referred B+C) described in the previous **text boxes b and c**. Try to be specific in your answer.

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.

1. Inter-Agency Coordination and Delivering as One
* Is the Joint Programme still in line with the UNDAF? Please check the relevant answer

[x] Yes [ ] No

* If not, does the Joint Programme fit into the national strategies?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

If not, please explain:

What types of coordination mechanisms and decisions have been taken to ensure joint delivery?

Are different joint programmes in the country coordinating among themselves? Please reflect on these questions above and add any other relevant comments and examples if you consider it necessary:

Please provide the values for each category of the indicator table described 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 MDG-F JPs. | 0 | 4 | Report on selection of municipalitiesSupport 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/ reports |

Please provide additional information to substantiate the indicators value (150 words). Try to describe qualitative and quantitative facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

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).

1. Development Effectiveness: Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action

**Ownership**: Partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies, and strategies and co-ordinate development actions

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

[ ]  Not involved

[ ] Slightly involved

[ ] Fairly involved

[x] Fully involved

**In what kind of decisions and activities is the government involved? Please check the relevant answer**

[x]  Policy/decision making

[x]  Management: [x]  budget [ ]  procurement [ ]  service provision [x]  other, specify: defining 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 and how many times have they met?**

Institution leading and/or chairing the PMC \_\_\_\_\_\_\_RCO\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Number of meetings. 1

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

[ ]  Not involved

[ ] Slightly involved

[ ] Fairly involved

[x] Fully involved

**In what kind of decisions and activities is the civil society involved? Please check the relevant answer**

[x]  Policy/decision making

[ ]  Management: [ ]  budget [ ]  procurement [x]  service provision [x]  other, specify: Actively engaged in design and development of LEAP, implementation of small grants for LEAP priority projects, etc.

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

[ ]  Not involved

[ ] Slightly involved

[ ] Fairly involved

[x] Fully involved

**In what kind of decisions and activities are citizens involved? Please check the relevant answer**

[x]  Policy/decision making

[ ]  Management: [ ]  budget [ ]  procurement [ ]  service provision [x]  other, specify: Design and development of LEAPs, etc.

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

[ ]  National Government [ ]  Local Government [x]  UN Agency [ ]  By itself [x]  other, specify: Entity government

Based on your previous answers, briefly describe the current situation of the government, civil society, private sector and citizens in relation of ownership, alignment and mutual accountability of the joint programmes, please, provide some examples. Try to describe facts avoiding interpretations or personal opinions.

1. 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, if relevant, please attach (max. 250 words).

[x]  Yes [ ] No

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?

[x]  Increased awareness on MDG related issues amongst citizens and governments

[x]  Increased dialogue among citizens, civil society, local national government in relation to

 development policy and practice

[x]  New/adopted policy and legislation that advance MDGs and related goals

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

[x]  Key moments/events of social mobilization that highlight issues

[x]  Media outreach and advocacy

[ ]  Others (use box below)

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? Please explain.

[ ]  Faith-based organizations   Number

[ ]  Social networks/coalitions   Number

[ ]  Local citizen groups               Number

[ ]  Private sector Number

[ ]  Academic institutions Number

[x]  Media groups and journalist Number 16

[ ]  Others (use box below) Number

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

[x]  Use of local communication mediums such as radio, theatre groups, newpapers, etc

[ ]  Open forum meetings

[ ]  Capacity building/trainings

[ ]  Others

**Section III: Millennium Development Goals**

1. **Millennium Development Goals**

The MDG-F main objective is to contribute to progress to the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals worldwide. This subsection aims to capture data and information on the joint programmes contribution to 1 or more Millennium Development Goals and targets.

For this purpose the Secretariat has developed a matrix where you should link your joint programme outcomes to 1 or more Millennium Development Goals and Targets. This matrix should be interpreted from left to right. As a first step you should reflect on the contributions that each of the JP outcomes is making to one or more MDGs. Once this linked is established, it needs to be further developed by connecting each joint programme outcome to one or more MDG targets. As a third step you should estimate the number of beneficiaries the JP is reaching in each of the specifics outcomes. Finally you should select the most suitable indicators from your joint programme’s M&E framework as a measure of the Millennium targets selected. Please, refer to the example provided below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MDG 7** | **Joint Programme Outcome 1** | **MDG Target 7.A** | **# Beneficiaries reached**  | **MDG Indicators** | **JP Indicator** |
| **Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability** | Improved local level environmental planningEnhanced management of environmental resources and delivery of environmental servicesIncreased national environmental awareness and action, localizing and achieving MDGs | Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources    | Approximately 720,000 citizens will be reached (among 30 selected local communities) | 1. Proportion of land area covered by forest
2. CO2 emissions, total, per capita and per $1 GDP (PPP)
3. Consumption of ozone-depleting substances
4. Proportion of fish stocks within safe biological limits
 | # of LEAPs developed |
| **Joint Programme Outcome 2** | **MDG Target 7 B** |  | Indicator  | JP Target |
|  | Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation |  | 1. Proportion of population using an improved drinking water source
2. Proportion of population using an improved sanitation facility
 |  |
| **Joint Programme Outcome 3** | **MDG Target 7 C** |  | Indicator  | JP Target |
|  | Does not apply |  |  |  |

**Additional Narrative comments**

Please provide any relevant information and contributions of the programme to the 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. After completion of LEAP development, SEAP development as well as completion of small grants, the programme will have necessary information (measurable) to show contribution of the programme to the MDGs.

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

Section 4: General Thematic Indicators

1. **Environmental and Climate Change policy development and mainstreaming**

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. **Number of sectors or mainstreaming laws, policies or plans supported by the joint programme:**  [x]  Applies [ ]  Does not apply, if so move to section 2
 |
| [x]  On Environmental Management | [x]  On Climate Change |
| [x]  Policies [ ]  Laws [x]  Plans  | No. National 1 No. National       No. National       |  No. Local        No. Local        No. Local 36 | [x]  Policies [ ]  Laws [x]  Plan  | No. National 1 No. National        No. National       |  No. Local        No. Local        No. Local 36 |
| * 1. **Please briefly provide some contextual information on the law, policy or plan and the country/municipality where it is (or will be) implemented** (base line, stage of development and approval, potential impact of the policy):

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

**[x]** Nature conservation**[x]** Water management**[x]** Sanitation**[x]** Sustainable management of natural resources **[x]** Climate Change: **[x]** Adaptation **[x]** Mitigation [ ]  Other , please specify:       | **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. **Number of citizens and/or institutions that the law(s), policy(ies) or plan(s)**  **directly affects**
 |
| [x]  Citizens  [x]  National Public Institutions  [x]  Local Public Institutions  [x]  Private Sector Institutions  | Total No. 1.200.000 Total No. 5 Total No 35 Total No. 36  | No. Urban N/A No. Urban N/A No. Urban N/A No. Urban       | No. Rural N/ANo. Urban N/A No. Rural N/A  No. Rural       |

**1. Environmental and Climate Change policy development and mainstreaming**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * 1. **[[2]](#footnote-2)Government budget allocated to environmental issues[[3]](#footnote-3)** before the implementation of the Joint Programme

Nationalbudget:       $ USDTotal Local budget (s) :       $ USD *(in localities of intervention of the JP)* | **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. **% variation in government budget allocated to environmental policies** or programmes from the beginning of the joint programme to present time:

National budget:      % Overall       % Triggered by the Joint Programme  | **Comments****N/A** |
|  Local budget:      % Overall        % Triggered by the Joint Programme |  |
| * 1. **Government budget allocated to Climate Change** before the implementation of the Joint Programme

Nationalbudget:       $ USDTotal Local budget (s) :       $ USD *(in localities of intervention of the JP)* | **Comments****N/A** |
| * 1. **% variation in government budget allocated to Climate Change** from the beginning of the Joint programme to present time:

National budget:      % Overall       % Triggered by the Joint Programme  | **Comments****N/A** |
|  Local budget:      % Overall        % Triggered by the Joint Programme |

**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**  [ ]  Applies [x]  Does not apply f so move to section 2.4  |
| Total of the area managed in Km2.        |
|  **By habitat[[4]](#footnote-4):** **[ ]** tropical forest **[ ]**  Temperateforest[ ]  Savannah [ ]  Shrub land [ ]  Grassland  | Km2       Km2       Km2      Km2      Km2       | [ ]  Wetlands [ ]  Rocky areas[ ]  Desert [ ]  Sea/oceans [ ]  Artificial terrestrial(pastoral land, arable land, etc) | Km2      Km2      Km2      Km2      Km2      Km2       |
| **2.2 Number of institutions, civil servants and citizens trained by the JP to take informed decisions on environmental issues** (excluding climate change): |
|  [ ]  Does not apply [ ]  Public Institutions  [ ]  Private Sector Institutions  [ ]  NGO/CBO’s  [ ]  Civil servants [ ]  Citizens  | Total No.       Total No.       Total No.       Total No.        Total No.        |  Women       Women        | Men      Men       |
| **2.3. Number of citizens supported by the JP that have organised themselves to effectively participate in natural resource management initiatives:** [ ]  Applies[ ]  Does not apply |
|  Total No.        | No. Women        | No. Men        | Ethnic groups       |

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

|  |
| --- |
| **2.4. Number of successful environmental service payment mechanisms that have been promoted by the JP :** [x]  Does not apply  |
| Total No.        | No. Of beneficiaries:       | Sectors of application:**[ ]** Forest protection[ ]  Water resources Management[ ]  Pollution | Financing source:**[ ]** MDGF[ ]  Public Fund[ ]  NGO[ ]  International Organization[ ]  Others: |
| **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?** |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.1 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:** [x]  Applies [ ]  Does not apply**3. Climate change adaptation and mitigation, and development of institutional capacities** |
| **[ ]** Tropical Forest Km2     **[ ]**  TemperateForest Km2     [ ]  Savannah Km2      [ ]  Shrub land Km2      | [ ]  Grassland Km2     [ ]  Wetlands Km2      [ ]  Rocky AreasKm2     [ ]  Desert Km2     [ ]  Artificial terrestrial(pastoral land, arable land, etc) Km2      |
| **3.2 Adaptation measures supported by JP that are addressing the following climate change issues:** [x]  Applies [ ]  Does not apply |
|  **[ ]** Land degradation **[ ]**  Soil fertility decrease [ ]  Atmospheric pollution | [ ]  Change in native species dynamics [ ]  Wildfire [ ]  Drought, Storms/flooding  | [ ]  Alteration of rain patterns, [ ]  Sea levels rise[ ]  Acidification  |
| **3.3 Based on available data, what kind of improvements on the population’s wellbeing have been achieved through JP supported adaptation measures?[[5]](#footnote-5):** |
|  [ ]  Health [ ]  Vulnerability (in terms of natural disasters) [ ]  Improved livelihoods [ ]  Others        |
| **3.4 Number of individuals and institutions with improved capacities to adapt to climate change or mitigate it**: [x]  Applies [ ]  Does not apply  |
|  [ ]  Adaptation  [ ]  Mitigation |  [ ]  Public Institutions  [ ] Private Sector Institutions [ ]  Civil servants [ ]  Citizens  | Total No.       Total No.       Total No.      Total No.        | Women       Women        | Men       Men       |
| **3.5 Interventions funded by the JP to improve capacities of individuals and institutions to adapt to Climate Change or mitigate it**: [ ]  Does not apply   [x]  Adaptation [x]  Mitigation [x]  Capacity building [x]  Equipment [x]  Knowledge transfer |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.6 Number of clean development mechanism projects registered to mitigate climate change:** [ ]  Does not apply  |
|  [ ]  CO2 Emissions captured through conservation Total Number        [ ]  CO2  Emission reduction through the use of Renewable Energies Total Number        [ ]  CO2 Emission reduction through the use of clean technologies Total Number        |

**Note: Section 3 applies but currently no data is available. Data will be collected during the programme implementation and reported along with next reports.**

1. Please list all the partners actually working in the joint’s programme implementation, NGOs, Universities, etc [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For indicators 1.5, 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 the Secretariat acknowledges the potential difficulties to obtain the information requested. Therefore, if not available, please provide the best available estimate. The information requested refers to the budgetary year in which the monitoring report falls [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Environmental issues should refer to budget allocated to natural resource management and conservation [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. IUCN categories [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. This indicator requires the use of baseline information from which a variation can be observed. If this data is not available the Secretariat recommends collecting it in order to complete this impact indicator for next reporting period. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)