|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Example of good practice** | **Battle for Sutjeska – initiative to oppose the decision to construct hydroelectric plants in a national park** |
| **Category** | **Local initiative** |
| **Organization** | **Centar za životnu sredinu (CZZS) – Environment Centre** |
| **Partners** | **WWF, Arbor Magna, Spasilački klub Wolf** |
| **Area of activity/location** | **Sutjeska National Park** |
| **Country** | **Bosnia and Herzegovina** |
| **National protection category (IUCN?)** | **National park, IUCN II** |
| Scope of implementation (local, national) | Local |
| **Time needed to achieve solution** | **2 years** |
| **Number of employees** | **1** |
| **Budget** | **50 000 BAM / 25 000 EUR** |
| Source of financing | EU financing, Pro Natura, WWF |
| More information | http://czzs.org/sutjeska/ |
| Contact person | Nataša Crnković |
| **Accomplishments (overview)** | **First civil initiative in Bosnia and Herzegovina (initiative to change the government decision and petition of signatures submitted to the national assembly) – the first such mobilization of people in BiH, with 6000 signatures (**[**priručnik o građanskim inicijativama**](http://nasprostor.org/prirucnik-o-gradanskim-inicijativama/) **– handbook on civil initiatives)**  **The issue of hydroelectric plants has been focused on the example of Sutjeska in BiH – 12 towns in which signatures were collected**  **267 announcements in the domestic and foreign media**   * **Motivation of local groups and associations to get involved and fight for their rights** * **1. establishment of the coalition to protect BiH rivers (over 23 societies)** * **2. launch of the initiative for 7 rivers in BiH (Ljuta, Neretva, Una, Ugar, Željeznica, Vrbas, Orlja) – 10 societies (ecological, fishing, sports, kayaking, hunting, humanitarian)** * **First court verdict won in which the court entered into the merits of the case.** * **EU Parliament passed the resolution for BiH and in one segment recommended that no hydroelectric plants be constructed in the Una and Sutjeska national parks, and that impact assessment studies should be conducted.** * **Current plans for construction of hydroelectric plants on the Sutjeska and Hrčavka Rivers halted.** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Problem/opportunity** |  |
| **Problem to be resolved** | **Possible construction of hydroelectric plants on the Sutjeska and Hrčavka Rivers**  **Poor inclusion of the local population in the activities in Sutjeska National Park** |
| **Opportunity to be taken** | **Conservation of a river in a national park** |
| **Planning** |  |
| Key requirements for success | Legal:  Aarhus Convention – access to information  Act on the Freedom of Access to Information  Act on Referendums and Civil Initiatives – creation of civil initiatives  Act on Environmental Protection – inclusion in permitting processes and debate on environmental impact studies |
|  | Institutional:  Support to the Institute for the Protection of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage  Support to the Faculty of Forestry |
|  | Internal capacities:  Lawyer, biologist, knowledge of EU integration processes, work with the media.  Many years of work experience, good knowledge of the area and opportunities, and the local population |
| How the idea came about | The planned hydroelectric plants would jeopardize the existence of the oldest national park in BiH, and the local population was not acting decisively, so we decided to take the initiative. |
| Was the idea part of a wider strategy? | Internal strategy of the CZZS |
| What is the role of partners? | WWF – media relations, advisory, finding funding, credibility  Arbor Magna – expert advice and good knowledge of the terrain and people  Spasilački klub Wolf – representatives of the local population and communications with the media |
| **Implementation** |  |
| **Key phases – from idea to realisation?** | * **mapping the problem (supporters and opponents)** * **analysing legal processes and possibilities** * **networking and inclusion of individuals, organisation, institutions (launching civil initiatives and collecting signatures)** * **demonstrations directed at decision-makers** * **commenting on impact assessment** * **filing lawsuits against the line ministry for its adoption of the impact assessment** * **ongoing advocacy towards decision-makers and key persons and organisations** * **ongoing work with the media** * **biological research of the Sutjeska and Hrčavka canyons** * **celebration** |
| How were partners involved? | Identification of partners having activities in the park. Agreement to work together and to plan activities. |
| How were local stakeholders selected? | The stakeholders approached us. |
| **How were stakeholders included?** | **Networking with ecological associations in BiH, collection of 6000 signatures in 12 cities, calls for protests.** |
| Which vulnerable groups were included, and how? | The elderly population living in the park area were not consulted and were provided the opportunity to express their opinions. |
| **Did you inform (local) stakeholders of their right to information?** | **The entire process influenced the informing of the public and activation of societies to demand their rights.**  **Both experts and the local population were invited to make their comments at public debates.**  **Opinions of the local population were heard for the first time.** |
| Which communication activities were carried out and which channels were used? | Press conferences, meetings, initiation of public debates, news announcements, TV, radio, news, social networks, protests, petitions.  International and national work. |
| How were activities to reduce and mitigate climate change included in your work? | One of the arguments for contesting the studies was the impacts of climate change on water quantities, i.e. loss of water could limit access to water as a resource. |
| Challenges during implementation: | Administrative:  Lack of support from Sutjeska National Park  Lack of practice in establishing civil initiatives |
|  | With stakeholders:  Explaining the issues of hydroelectric plants to the local community |
| **Changes** |  |
| **How were negative impacts on nature reduced?** | **The existing state and quality of habitat in the Sutjeska and Hrčavka canyons have been preserved.** |
| Positive economic (E) and social (S) changes: | **Public sector (local, national)**  **S: more positive position of authorities (local and national) on the need to conserve the river** |
|  | **Private sector:**  **E: increased revenues and jobs**  **S: increased numbers of tourists following promotional campaigns of Sutjeska.** |
|  | **Protected area manager:**  **E: increased revenues from ticket sales and accommodations**  **S: promotion of Sutjeska National Park, establishment of the cooperation council** |
|  | **Civil society:**  **S: activating societies to demand their rights and their networking; a range of initiatives for 7 other rivers; creation of a coalition for the protection of BiH rivers (over 23 societies)** |
|  | **Local population:**  **E: revenues through accommodation and sales of local products**  **S: awareness of the values of Sutjeska, their voice has been heard through the campaign, representatives in the cooperation council** |
| **Replication and recommendations** |  |
| **Which key items were important for replication?** | * **Dedication** * **Inclusion of a wide range of partners** * **Monitoring deadlines and timely reactions in legal processes** * **Presentation of the case at the international level** * **Targeted countering of the decision using multiple tools** |
| What would you do differently (and **recommend** to others)? | Greater inclusion of the local population in media activities, and inclusion of representatives of the expert public for discussions with decision-makers.  Not all comments were made during the public debate on the impact assessment, as some were kept for the legal proceedings.  We recommend that a male and a female attend the meetings. |
| **What is key for project sustainability?** | * **Local population as the key actors who can receive timely information.** * **Local community recognition of the significance and benefits of protected areas.** * **Perseverance and regular monitoring of legislation.** * **Ongoing explanations as to the value of the river and nature.** |
| What are your recommendations for policy improvement? | Amendments to the National Parks Act, to prohibit the construction of hydroelectric plants in national parks.  Halting the process of issuing new concessions for the construction of hydroelectric plants. |
| What are your interests for which you would like to learn about examples of good practice? | Good use of renewable energy sources – application (installations).  Practical examples of the use of renewable energy sources (panels in the local community).  Use of rivers in a sustainable manner to ensure that both the manager and local community have revenues and benefits. |
| **Expectations** |  |
| What are your expectations of nature for people? | Actively involvement in the Cooperation Council of Sutjeska National Park.  Application for projects that would enable the sustainable management and development of Sutjeska National Park. |
| What are your expectations from WWF? | Continued support to Sutjeska National Park in the future.  Greater support in preventing the construction of hydroelectric plants in BiH.  Strengthening capacity of lawyers in the field of environmental law. |