

# **Cross-Sectoral Dialogue as a Basis for Nature Protection in Bosnia and Herzegovina - Una National Park Case Study**

FINAL REPORT

Protected Areas for a Living Planet - Dinaric Arc Ecoregion project



FACULTY OF FORESTRY, UNIVERSITY OF SARAJEVO

(October 2011)

## CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION .....	4
2. AREA AND METHOD OF WORK .....	5
3. RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH .....	11
3.1. AN ANALYSIS OF SECTOR-SPECIFIC LEGISLATION .....	11
3.1.1. GENERAL PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO NATURE PROTECTION .....	12
3.1.2. REGULATORY MEASURES AND NATURE PROTECTION INSTRUMENTS .....	14
3.1.3. COMPETENCES OF INSTITUTIONS AND LEGAL BASIS FOR CROSS-SECTORAL COOPERATION IN NATURE PROTECTION .....	16
3.1.4. PROTECTION CATEGORIES .....	18
3.2. RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH INTO THE ATTITUDES OF STAKEHOLDERS IN Una NATIONAL PARK .....	19
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	36
USED SOURCES AND LITERATURE: .....	41
Annex I: The questionnaire for identification and qualitative research into the attitudes of the most important stakeholders in Una National Park .....	42
Annex II: List of stakeholder groups and date of interviews .....	45

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. List of acronyms of stakeholders .....	8
Table 2. Aggregate results of qualitative research into the attitudes of stakeholders in Una National Park.....	9
Table 3: Competences of individual institutions in proclamation of protected areas .....	16
Table 4. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Are you familiar with the initiative for the formation of Una National Park? .....	19
Table 5. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Do you know who launched the initiative for the formation of Una National Park? .....	20
Table 6. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Do you know which institution had a key role in the declaring of Una National Park? .....	21
Table 7. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Has your institution/organisation been involved in the formation of Una National Park? .....	22
Table 8. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Are you satisfied with the role that your institution/organisation had in the process of the formation of Una National Park? .....	22
Table 9. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Is your institution/organisation involved in the process of management of Una National Park? .....	23
Table 10. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Has there been sufficient cross-sectoral dialogue in the process of the formation of Una National Park? .....	28
Table 11. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Do you think that only one side has benefits of the cross-sectoral dialogue? .....	29
Table 12. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Do you communicate with other stakeholders with respect to Una National Park? .....	31
Table 13. Economic, environmental and sociological expectations of all stakeholders from Una National Park	34

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Dynamic social, political and economic changes in B&H in the last two decades, as well as the growing public awareness about the necessity of the protection of natural values, have resulted in launching of numerous initiatives for the formation of new protected areas and expansion of the already existing ones. This has also been contributed to by the fact that B&H is ranked at the very bottom of the European ranking list in terms of the protection of natural values and the percentage of the state territory under formal protection. According to 2008 data, the surface size of the protected areas in B&H accounts for approximately 2%, far below the level of the surrounding countries. On the other hand, strategic documents (B&H NEAP, 2003) envisage that by 2018 this percentage will reach 10% of B&H territory (Dalmatin et al., 2010). In the light of those endeavours, in 2008 the Una National Park was formed as the youngest national park and one of the three national parks in Bosnia-Herzegovina. This was an attempt at creating a legal framework for the protection of biological diversity and extraordinary natural and cultural and historical values, and creating appropriate development prerequisites, by fostering the forms of tourism and recreation appropriate for natural values and cultural heritage, upgrading of infrastructure and development of rural areas.

A lack of developed instruments of participatory planning and cross-sectoral dialogue in the formation and management of protected areas often generate cross-sectoral conflicts. Positive experiences of developed countries with respect to nature protection and management of protected areas undoubtedly indicate the significance of abiding by the principle of participation, involvement of all stakeholders and transparency in decision making. In the EU accession context B&H is expected to observe the said principles and develop corresponding mechanisms for the management of the protected areas in a sustainable manner. Given the complexity of Una National Park with regard to the presence of various stakeholders and diversity of their demands and expectations, WWF entrusted to the Faculty of Forestry of the University of Sarajevo the preparation of a study entitled "Study on Cross-sectoral dialogue as a basis for nature protection in Bosnia and Herzegovina - case study of Una National Park". This study is trying to point to the importance of the cross-sectoral dialogue and instigate the cross-sectoral dialogue between institutions in charge of management and all stakeholders having an interest with regard to Una National Park. In this respect, the study has the following objectives:

- assess the possibility for mutual harmonisation of sectoral legislation (laws on the protection of environment and nature, forests and waters),
- identify and clarify the roles of the competent institutions in the process of the formation and management of Una National Park,
- identify stakeholders and establish their relation and demands related to the formation and management of Una National Park,
- Enhance cross-sectoral dialogue as the basis for effective and efficient management of Una National Park.

An analysis of the cross-sectoral legislation and corresponding research (contacts with all stakeholders) were carried out in the period between July and September 2011. This report contains results obtained in the process of the collection and analysis of the obtained results, and also the recommendations to the competent cantonal and federal institutions for the improvement of the system of nature protection and management of the protected areas, based on the inclusion of all the stakeholders in the process of the formation and management of Una National Park.

The Project team of the Faculty of Forestry of the University of Sarajevo uses the opportunity to thank WWF for the confidence and for entrusting the preparation of this study. A special thanks goes to the representatives of all institutions and stakeholders who have significantly contributed to the quality of this study by their active participation and useful suggestions.

## 2. AREA AND METHOD OF WORK

Pursuant to the Una National Park Act (Official Gazette of FB&H, No. 44/08) on 29 May 2008 Una National Park was founded on the territory of the Municipality of Bihac, with the total surface size of 19,800 ha. Una National Park encompasses the area of the canyon segment of the upper course of the Una river upstream from Lohov, the area of the canyon segment of the lower course of the Unac river, from its mouth into the Una upstream from Drvarsko Polje, and the interspace between the Una and the Unac. The Act provides for the founding of (a) the areas of strict and special protection (13,500 ha), and areas of planned development (6,300 ha). With a view to the management, protection, improvement, utilisation and development of the National Park, the Government of the B&H Federation, on the basis of a special Decision (Official Gazette of FB&H, No. 71/08), established the public enterprise Javno preduzece Una National Park d.o.o. with the seat in Bihac.

The whole area of Una National Park belongs to the water basin of the Una river, which encompasses moderate-continental, perymountain and, in places, mountain types of climate. The geological composition of this area was a result of very complex endodynamic processes, with the creation of diverse formations of magmatic, sediment and metamorphous rocks. Particularly important are relief forms formed by sedimentation of tuff: calcareous barriers (the most numerous forms are 0.5 to 1 m high), travertine islands (developed in the vicinity of Martin Brod, Kulen Vakuf and Ripče), tectonic waterfalls near Martin Brod and Strbački Buk, caves (near Martin Brod) and travertine cones (Strbački Buk). The age of the youngest tuff formations in the vicinity of the spring of the Una has been estimated at approximately 3,000 years.

In the conditions of the aquatic and terrestrial environment very diverse flora and fauna have developed. The largest part of the surface of the National Park is covered by various types of forests, such as high forest communities of beech and fir with spruce (*Piceo-Abieti-Fagetum*), beech and fir forests (*Abieti-Fagetum-Illyricum*), in the canyon section there are the *Seslerio-Fagetum* and *Acer obtusati-Fagetum* communities, on more termophilous habitats develop communities of oak (*Quercetum petraea-cerris*) and Turkey oak (*Orno-Quercetum cerris*) forests, in the subalpine zone of this area develop birch communities (*Fagetum subalpinum*) and communities of mago pine (*Pinetum mugii*).

Environmental conditions have enabled development of more than 1,900 of plant species, which account for more than 50% of all known species in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Records include 177 official and 105 potentially medicinal, edible, vitamin-rich and aromatic plant species. In this area there are numerous rare plant species, such as: gentian (*Gentiana lutea*), spotted gentian (*Gentiana punctata*), edelweiss (*Leontopodium alpinum* Cass.), creeping pine (*Pinus mugo*), and the endemic Bosnian iris (*Iris reichenbachii* Heuffel var. *bosniaca*) growing at the southeast part of the mountain range of Osječenica. Earlier research identified 68 species of macroscopic invertebrates inhabiting tuff waterfalls (19 species belong to the *Trichoptera* group, 14 to the *Ephemeroptera* group, 36 species belong to the *Ephemeroptera*, *Plecoptera* and *Trichoptera* groups). The upper course of the Una river is inhabited by 12 fish species from 4 orders and 6 families, among which particularly significant are brown trout

(*Salmo trutta morpha fario*) and grayling (*Thymallus thymallus*). Rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) is an allochthonous species which inhabits the area and one of the park's objectives is to eradicate it in the NP Una area.

In the wider area of the upper course of the Una river 10 species of amphibians (*Amphibia*) from the orders of frogs (*Anura*) and salamanders (*Caudata*) were recorded, and 12 species of reptiles from the orders of turtles (*Chelonia*) and scaled reptiles (*Squamata*). According to the criteria of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) one species has the status of endangered species, namely European tree frog (*Hyla arborea*). It is important to mention that we can also find river crayfish and some species of river shell which shows remarkable biodiversity of the area. In the wider area of the course of the Una river more than 120 bird species have been recorded. Ornithofauna of this area is interesting because of the presence of specific rare and endangered species (heather cock (*Tetrao urogallus*)) and hazel grouse (*Tetrastes bonasia*) and because of a large number of singing birds. Among 60-odd present species of mammals inhabiting the area of the upper course of Una, 9 are *Insectivora*, 16 bats (*Chiroptera*), 13 carnivores (*Carnivora*), 3 are in the order of even-toed ungulates (*Arctiodactyla*), 17 rodents (*Rodentia*) and 1 is in the order of hares, rabbits and pikas (*Lagomorpha*). Among the mammals of the upper course of Una there are two endemic species: Martino's vole (*Dinaromys bogdanovi*) and the Alpine pine vole (*Microtus multiplex*).

The particular position of this space on the transit route towards the sea has brought it under the influence of many cultures in the past, hence there are rich archaeological sites, such as the remains of the medieval fortresses and sacral objects of various religions and cultures. Of medieval sites particularly important are the Greek (Ostrovica) Crkvina in Orasac, late medieval town of Rmanj (Martin Brod), medieval fortress of Crkvina (Careva Luka) and many tombstones. Particularly important among national monuments is the old Orthodox Rmanj Monastery (XV-XVI century) in Martin Brod, with remains of one of the oldest Orthodox original frescoes. There are also numerous monuments on the temporary list of the Commission for preservation of national monuments, the most important ones of which are the fortress of Hvala, Lohovska Brda-Grobljanska chapel of St. George, Ostrovac-Ostrovački town, pre-historic hill-fort, medieval and Ottoman town of Ripač, remains of the old town and fortress of Ripač, and the pile dwelling of the Middle Bronze and Iron Ages with remains of the ancient culture.

A particularly specific trait of this area is a close connection of the Una river, as a key phenomenon for the protection of natural values of this area, and the local population that has inhabited this area for centuries. The best proof of the recognition of the values the Una river by the local population is reflected in the fact that the initiative for the proclamation of Una National Park has originated to a great extent particularly from the people living in this area.

With a view to assess the possibilities of mutual harmonisation of sectoral legislation, for purposes of the implementation of this study, by using a comparative method, the laws pertaining to the protection of environment and nature, protection of water and forests were analysed. A comparison of those laws was carried out by means of an analysis of the most significant provisions that regulate the issue of protection of nature and protected areas. Accordingly, the following aspects of the aforementioned laws were analysed:

- general provisions pertaining to nature protection,
- regulatory measures and nature protection instruments,

- competences of institutions and legal foundations of the cross-sectoral cooperation in nature protection,
- protection categories.

The analysis and synthesis method was used for the analysis of strategic and planning documents and the analysis of legislation directly pertaining to Una National Park (the Act on Nature Protection of the B&H Federation and the Act on the Proclamation of Una National Park). In the process of collection of primary data, analysis and interpretation of results and formulation of recommendations various research methods were used. By using adequate interviewing techniques (*in depth, face-to-face interview*) qualitative data were obtained about the involvement of the stakeholders in the process of formation and management of Una National Park, and also their involvement in the cross-sectoral dialogue process. In the selection of the respondents (among the stakeholders' representatives) included in the interviewing the exponential and non-discriminatory *snowball technique* was used. The initial meeting was held with the director of Una National Park, who suggested the stakeholders who in his opinion are relevant for the process of formation and management of Una National Park. The same procedure of nomination of relevant stakeholders was applied in interviewing of each new representative of individual stakeholders. Taking into consideration all nominated and contacted representatives of stakeholders, the final sample consisted of 25 respondents (Annex II contains the list of stakeholders and date of interviewing).

An appropriate questionnaire was designed for purpose of the implementation of a qualitative research in order to collect data about the attitudes of key stakeholders in terms of their awareness of the initiative about the formation of Una National Park, the stakeholders who were involved in the formation and management process, involvement of the stakeholders in the cross-sectoral dialogue and expected benefits from the formation and functioning of Una National Park. (Annex I). The questionnaire contained 28 questions divided into 5 groups: introductory questions, formation and management, stakeholders, cross-sectoral dialogue, and sociological, environmental and economic benefits. Surveys were carried out in the period between July and September 2011. For each question the representatives of stakeholders could express an affirmative, negative or indecisive attitude, and this was the basis for the formation of the Opponent-Advocate Matrix. The aggregate results of the qualitative research into the attitudes of stakeholders are presented in Table 2, while the acronyms for specific stakeholders (used in Table 2 and Opponent-Advocate Matrixes) are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. List of acronyms of stakeholders

<b>Public administration (JA)</b>	
FMOiT	Federal Ministry of Environment and Tourism
MGPUiZO	Ministry of Construction, Physical Planning and Environmental Protection of U-S Canton
MPViS	Ministry of Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry of U-S Canton
KUS	Cantonal Forestry Administration of U-S Canton
ZZKNB	Cultural Heritage Protection Institute Bihac
<b>Local administration (LA), Municipalities (O)</b>	
OB	Municipality of Bihac
<b>Community boards (MZ)</b>	
MB	Martin Brod
KV	Kulen Vakuf
O	Orasac
<b>Religious institutions (VI)</b>	
MR	Rmanj Monastery
<b>Private sector (PP)</b>	
RK	Riz Krajina
PDKV	Poljoprivredno dobro Kulen Vakuf (Kulen Vakuf farm)
UC	Una Consulting
PS	Pansion Saraj (Saraj boarding house)
SB	Sport Bijeli
<b>Public enterprises (JP)</b>	
NPU	Una National Park
USS	Unsko-sanske sume
<b>Non-governmental organisations (NVO)</b>	
USRUB	Sport Fishing Association Una-Bihac
TZ	Tourist Board of U-S Canton
LOB	Hunting organisation Bihac
US	Unski Smaragdi
PC	Plod centre
EKUS	Environmental Coalition of Una River Basin
PK	Chamber of Economy
RRA	Regional Development Agency



Table 2. Aggregate results of qualitative research into the attitudes of stakeholders in Una National Park

STAKE- HOLD.	JA					LA (O)	MZ			VI	PP					JP		NVO								
THE QUESTI ON	FMOiT	MGPUIZO	MPViS	KUS	ZZKNB	OB	MB	KV	O	MR	RK	PDKV	UC	PS	SB	NPU	USS	USRUB	TZ	LOB	US	PC	EKUS	PK	RRA	
I		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
II																										
III		+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	
IV	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
V		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	
VI	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	
VII	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+/-	
VIII		-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
IX		-	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+/-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+/-	
X																										
XI																										
XII																										
XIII																										
XIV																										
XV	+	+	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
XVI		-	+/-	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+/-	+/-	+	-	-	+/-	+	
XVII		+	-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	
XVIII		+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+/-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
XIX																										
XX																										
XXI	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
XXII																										
XXIII																										
XXIV																										
XXV																										
XXVI																										
XXVII																										
XXVIII																										

For (+)  
(-)

Indecisive (+/-)

Against

Short explanations/content of questions from Table 2 (the Questionnaire is provided in Annex I)

- I: Are you familiar with the initiative for the formation of Una National Park?
- II: How have you been informed about it?
- III: Do you know who launched this initiative?
- IV: Do you know which institution/s had the key role in the proclamation of Una National Park?
- V: Do you know which institution/s run(s) Una National Park?
- VI: Has your institution/organisation been involved in the formation of Una National Park?
- VII: Are you satisfied with the role that your institution/organisation has had in the process of the formation of Una National Park?
- VIII: Has your institution/organisation been involved in the process of management of Una National Park?
- IX: Are you satisfied with the role that your institution/organisation has had in the process of management of Una National Park?
- X: Please state the most important stakeholders related to Una National Park?
- XI: Please identify the stakeholders who have the greatest power with regard to Una National Park?
- XII: Please identify the stakeholders who have the greatest interest with regard to Una National Park?
- XIII: What is particularly the interest of your institution/organisation in respect of Una National Park?
- XIV: What do you imply under the term 'cross-sectoral dialogue' in respect of Una National Park?
- XV: Do you support the cross-sectoral dialogue as a principle in the management of Una National Park?
- XVI: Has there been sufficient cross-sectoral dialogue in the process of the formation of Una National Park?
- XVII: Are you satisfied with the role of your institution in the cross-sectoral dialogue in respect of Una National Park?
- XVIII: Do you think that the cross-sectoral dialogue benefits only one stakeholder, or all involved stakeholders?
- XIX: What benefits do you expect from the cross-sectoral dialogue and the future cooperation with other stakeholders in respect of Una National Park?
- XX: What are the minimum prerequisites for setting up of the cross-sectoral dialogue?
- XXI: Do you communicate with other stakeholders? If the response is YES, please state how?
- XXII: Can you identify institutions/factors that hinder the functioning of Una National Park?
- XXIII: Can you identify institutions/factors that facilitate the functioning of Una National Park?
- XXIV: What would you improve to enhance the cross-sectoral dialogue?
- XXV: Do you expect some economic benefits from the formation of Una National Park?
- XXVI: Do you expect some environmental benefits from the formation of Una National Park?
- XXVII: Do you expect some sociological benefits from the formation of Una National Park?
- XXVIII: Which three things would you suggest as the most significant ones for the improvement of the management of Una National Park?

### 3. RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

#### 3.1. AN ANALYSIS OF SECTOR-SPECIFIC LEGISLATION

18:30 Adequate sector-specific laws and mutual harmonisation of their provisions represent an important prerequisite for the initiation and successful implementation of the cross-sectoral dialogue in all activities and processes related to nature protection. In case when the cross-sectoral dialogue is promoted (or even prescribed) by corresponding laws, not only the legal basis for communication among all stakeholders has been provided, but also the mechanisms that it is started and realised. In that context it is necessary to assess the level of mutual harmonisation of sector-specific laws and analyse the possibilities for their improvement in order to avoid conflicts, whether the issue is unclear competences or specific questions of the protection of natural values defined in different ways.

The issues of nature protection and protected areas in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (hereinafter: FB&H) are dealt with by a number of general and sector-specific laws and subordinate legislation. To assess the possibilities of mutual harmonisation of sector-specific legislation dealing with the issued covered by this study, a comparative method analyses in greater detail the following laws:

- The Environmental Protection Act of FB&H („Official Gazette of FB&H“, 33/03),
- The Nature Protection Act of FB&H („Official Gazette of FB&H“, 33/03),
- The Una National Park Act („Official Gazette of FB&H“, 44/08),
- The Forests Act of FB&H („Official Gazette of FB&H“, 20/02),
- The Water Act of FB&H („Official Gazette of FB&H“, 70/06),
- The Regulation on Forests („Official Gazette of FB&H“, 83/09),
- The Regulation on Forests („Official Gazette of FB&H“, 26/10).

A comparison of laws was carried out by means of an analysis of the provisions regulating the issues of nature protection and protected areas. For purposes of this study the following aspect of the aforementioned laws were analysed:

- general provisions pertaining to nature protection,
- regulatory measures and instruments of nature protection,
- competences of the institutions and legal basis for the cross-sectoral cooperation in nature protection,
- protection categories.

Due to the fact that decisions of the Constitutional Court of FB&H stipulated that the Forests Act of FB&H from 2002 should be harmonised with the Act on the Principles of Local Self-government in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and that in that context the forestry sector in FB&H is currently legally regulated by Regulations on Forests from 2009 and 2010, for purposes of this study all available legal sources are analysed with a view to identify mutual similarities in the provisions regulating nature protection issues. An analysis of possible inconsistencies between the acts on forests and legislation on nature protection in FB&H indicates that there are difficulties in their implementation and points to the possibilities of their mutual harmonisation in order to prevent cross-sectoral conflicts and stimulating the cross-sectoral dialogue.

The competence for the proclamation of national parks as a specific category of protected areas has been entrusted to institutions at the level of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. With this in mind, and also in light of the fact that the Constitution of U-S

Canton provides for the compliance of cantonal laws with all laws adopted at the level of the Federation of B&H (Article 2 of the Constitution of the Una-Sana Canton, „Official Gazette of the Una-Sana Canton“, No. 1/04 and 11/04), it may be stated that the legislation at the level of the Canton is fully compliant with the relevant legislation at the level of FB&H.

### 3.1.1. GENERAL PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO NATURE PROTECTION

Since the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act of FB&H pertain to all forms of environment (air, water, soil, flora and fauna, areas, developed environment) and activities related to the utilisation of natural resources (Article 2), this Act respects the principle of integral approach in environmental protection, and thereby it constitutes a general law. In that context, the Act highlights the right to the environment as a constitutional right of each person, underscoring that it is: „(...) *an individual and collective duty to protect and improve the environment for the benefit of the current and future generations*“ (Article 3). The Environmental Protection Act does not encompass the issues of specific protection procedures, „(...) *special regulations regulate specific areas of protection*“ (Article 12). In accordance with this provision of the Environmental Protection Act, the Nature Protection Act of FB&H in its first Article specifies that this Act provides for clear procedures in regulating the conditions and manner of restoration, protection, conservation and sustainable development of landscape, natural areas, plants, animals and their habitats, minerals, fossils and other components of nature in the territory of the Federation of B&H, also regulating the competences of the bodies carrying out the activities and planning of nature protection, information system, supervision, financing of nature protection and penalties of misdemeanours of legal and natural persons.

Pursuant to Article 3 of the Nature Protection Act, in which it is specified that: „(...) *if the provisions of a special law provides for a lower level of the protection in comparison with the protection provided for by this Act, provisions of this Act shall apply*“, it can be concluded that the Nature Protection Act in the domain of nature protection has a priority over all other sector-specific (special) laws. For instance, the Water Act belongs to the category of special laws whose provisions regulate the manner of water management in the territory of FB&H and which include the protection and utilisation of water, protection from adverse effect of water, and also regulation of waterways and other water bodies. The Act regulates the water and public water estate, water facilities, legal persons and institutions competent for water management issues (Article 1). In a similar manner Article 1 of the Forests Act of FB&H from 2002 provides for the following: „(...) *conservation and protection of forests, strengthening their environmental functions, planning in forestry and forest management, economic functions, financing forest restoration and improvement in the territory of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina* (...)“, aimed at the conservation, improvement and utilisation of environmental, social and production functions of forest ecosystems. A specific characteristic of the Forests Act from 2002 and the Regulation on Forests from 2009 with respect to nature protection is reflected in Article 10 and Article 23, respectively, which specify the list of endangered species: „(...) *It shall be forbidden to cut, or uproot or damage in any way the trees of Serbian spruce (Picea omorika (Pančić) Purk.) common yew (Taxus baccata L.), Turkish hazel (Corylus colurna L.), mountain maple (Acer heldreichii Orph.), mountain pine (Pinus mugo Turra), green alder (Alnus viridis (Chaix) Lam. & DC.), whitebark pine (Pinus heldreichii) and hue (Petteria ramentacea (Sieber) Presl.), unless breeding and sanitary felling are required*“. Existence of such provisions atypical for forestry legislation may be explained by the fact that, although prescribed by the Nature

Protection Act of FB&H from 2003, the Red List for Bosnia and Herzegovina has not been officially established as yet. In the same Article of the Forests Act it is specified that: *„Pasture in forests and utilisation of secondary forest products shall not be allowed if it would jeopardise biodiversity, or species of flora and fauna protected pursuant to the nature protection regulations (...)“*.

In each of the analysed laws, protection and utilisation of nature is dealt with in the context of the observance of the sustainability principle. The sustainable development principle is defined pursuant to Article 5 of the Environmental Protection Act of FB&H as the conservation of natural treasure through the utilisation of renewable materials and water energy resources, in the quantity that will not exceed the ability of the natural system to replenish them. The principle of sustainability also implies maintaining of a certain degree of pollutants that will not exceed the capacities of air or water or lead to their absorption and processing, and also a continual conservation of biological diversity, human health, the quality of air, water and soil on the basis of established standards. Article 6 of the Nature Protection Act particularly defines the concepts of sustainable development and sustainable utilisation. Sustainable development is defined as *„A system of social and economic conditions and activities that protect wildlife species and artificial environment for the present and future generations, utilisation of natural resources in a cost-effective and appropriate way in terms of the conservation of ecosystem and ensuring the improvement of the quality of life and conservation of biological and cultural diversity in the long term from the aspect of the ecosystem as a whole“*. Sustainable utilisation is defined as: *„(...) utilisation of components of nature in the manner and to the extent which does not deplete their regenerative abilities or lead to a reduction of natural resources and biological diversity, therefore sustaining their innate potential to meet the requirements and needs of the present and future generations“*. Both definitions (irrespective of the fact that sustainable development has a more pronounced strategic and political context, while sustainable utilisation represents a more operative concept) have the objective to regulate legally the utilisation of natural resources in order to meet the requirements of the present-day generations, but also the needs of future ones.

The Water Act does not define explicitly the concept of sustainability, but in Article 2 (in which the purpose of this Act is stipulated) it also stipulates the *„provision of sustainable utilisation of water“* as one of the components of water management. The same concept is stated in Article 22, in which it is prescribed as one of the goals of water management taking into consideration also the following: *„(...) long-term protection of available water sources and their quality (...)“* and represents an integral part of the water management strategy which has to contain the goals and directions of a sustainable utilisation of water (Article 24).

The current Regulation on Forests does not explicitly define the sustainability concept, except for referring to it in the context of the financing of the protection and improvement of the status of the existing forests and raising new ones. Article 46 states that in order to realise the general interests and long-term goals based on the principles of management provided for by the Forestry Programme of the Federation, Cantonal forest development plans and forest management plans, financial resources will be provided for the said activities. The Forests Act from 2002, however, defines the continuity of forest management (Article 3) as maintenance and advancement of the long-term health and diversity of forests, with ensuring the economic, environmental, sociological and cultural functions of forests for the well-being of the present and future generations.

### 3.1.2. REGULATORY MEASURES AND NATURE PROTECTION INSTRUMENTS

Among the basic principles that the Environmental Protection Act of FB&H is based on, there are the principle of precaution and prevention (Article 6), the principle of integral approach of all policies whose objective is sustainable development of environment (Article 8) and the polluter pays principle in respect of the costs of control and prevention from pollution, holding the user responsible for all activities affecting the environment (Article 11). The Act also provides for the basic guidelines in the implementation of the procedures of the assessment of environmental impact for the users (Article 23) and bodies competent for physical planning (Article 51). The provisions regulating the system of environmental planning and strategies at all levels (Art. 45–52) provide for the harmonisation and integral approach to all strategies and programmes pertaining to the protection of water, nature, air and waste management, as well as the *„(...) areas that require special environmental protection instruments, and also the contents of such instruments“* (Article 47). The following are particularly important among those instruments: information and information collection systems (Article 22), permits (Article 28, 30, 36, 39), intervention (Article 83), inspection (Article 90-92) and environmental management system (Article 97).

As already mentioned, the Nature Protection Act of FB&H provides for measures for the provision of the basic conditions for the protection and sustainable development of nature. The Act provides for the preparation of the Federal Nature Protection Strategy, which includes: *„(...) long-term and medium-term tasks of the protection and conservation of protected species, minerals and areas“* (Article 18). The Nature Protection Act also provides that: *„(...) by a regulation of the Government of FB&H specific areas may be allocated for the European Programme NATURA 2000 with a view to inclusion into the international environmental network of the conservation of natural habitats and habitats species“* (Article 33). The Nature Protection Act stipulates that special regulations will regulate the manner and conditions of the protection of landscape (Article 21), and also the measures of management, technology, prohibitions and limitations in each area proclaimed a protected area (Art. 30-32). In that context, in Article 3 of the Act on „Una“ National Park it is envisaged that the formation of areas of strict and targeted protection intended for the attainment of: *„(...) protection of natural values, protection and conservation of natural development of eco-systems and natural processes without human intervention, conservation of unchanged natural areas, biodiversity, habitats of plant and animal species, enabling visits and recreation and educational and scientific activities in the volume and manner that affects the nature the least“*. In addition, the area of targeted development in Una National Park is intended for: *„(...) besides the conservation of nature, cultural features and farming landscape of the traditional tillage (...) to harmonised development of the activity of the population in the National Park, particularly in the area of agriculture and food production, forestry, local crafts and tourism“*. The Act also provides for the existence of zone A (where agriculture and forestry are allowed) and zone B (fishing, fish farming and rafting are allowed) in the area of strict and targeted protection. The Act has not provided in great detail for the manner of the implementation of permitted activities, and neither are regulated certain questions such as possibilities for organic agricultural production, utilisation of environmentally friendly fuels, specific ranger activities aimed at growing and protection etc.), and this will probably be regulated by special planning documents. Since in the Federation B&H there are no special laws (e.g., National Parks Act etc.) which would provide for more detailed measures, instruments and procedures for the protection in various categories of protected areas, “leaving” of those issues to special regulations at the level of concrete protected areas may bring about non-uniformity of the ways of the protection in the

areas with the same category of protection. In that respect it is also possible that difficulties related to effective and efficient management and monitoring will emerge, and this could result in inconsistent nature protection measures.

Efforts on the implementation of the basic protection measures prescribed by sectoral laws are made through sector-specific strategies and plans, continual monitoring of the impact of individual activities and envisaged control measures. The Forests Act from 2002 prohibits „(...) *pasture in forests and utilisation of secondary products provided this would put biodiversity, or protected species of flora and fauna at risk*“ (Article 10). An important instrument of protection provided for by this Act is monitoring of the health status of forests (Article 12). Obligatory is also an assessment of environmental impact for individual activities (e.g. deforestation, reforestation etc.) and also the control of seed and planting material for purpose of conservation of genetic diversity. Article 17 of this Act provides for the preparation of the Forestry Programme of the Federation B&H that defines the forestry policy with a view (among other things) to improve and conserve biodiversity of forest ecosystems. This is fully consistent with the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act, which provides for harmonisation and integral approach to the development of sector-specific strategies. In general, forestry legislation in FB&H is to a significant extent harmonised with the Nature Protection Act, in particular in the part of the provisions that pertain to the protection of forest ecosystems and conservation of biological diversity in them (Avdibegovic et al, 2006). Finally, Article 40 of the Forests Act from 2002 defined a possibility of existing of categories of forests with a special management regime.

The harmonisation of the activities in the water management sector with the sector of environmental protection and nature is reflected in Article 26 of the Water Act, where among basic measures for attainment of goals related to the protection and regulation of water and protection from adverse impact of water and utilisation of water the following measures are stated: „(...) *determined by regulations on environmental protection and nature protection that pertain to water and water-dependent eco-systems (...)*“. Mutual harmonisation of this Act with the Environmental Protection Act is also visible in Article 30 (Goals of the environmental protection in the water management plans). Besides, in Article 12 of the Water Act it is envisaged that it is prohibited to carry out any projects in water estate except for: „(...) *projects related to nature protection (...)*“. Like the Forests Act, The Water Act bases the application of protection measures on the existence of a sector strategy and plans providing for, among other things, continual monitoring. Article 24, which deals with the issues related to the preparation and content of water management strategy stipulates that: „(...) *The water management policy is determined by the water management strategy (...)*“. The water management strategy has to encompass the following as well: „(...) *objectives and directions of protection of water, protection from adverse effects of water and sustainable utilisation of water (...)*“. The Act also stipulates that water management plans (Article 25) have to contain the identification and maps of the protected areas, the map of the monitoring network and an overview of their results for protected areas as well.

The aforementioned provisions of the Water Act indicate a high level of harmonisation of general instruments for the protection of water resources (in this case it is the sector Strategy and Protection Plan) with the regulations regulating specific protected areas (in this case Una National Park).

### 3.1.3. COMPETENCES OF INSTITUTIONS AND LEGAL BASIS FOR CROSS-SECTORAL COOPERATION IN NATURE PROTECTION

To establish the necessary steps for the enhancement of cross-sectoral cooperation in the process of management of „Una” National Park, an analysis of competences of institutions and legal basis for cross-sectoral cooperation in nature protection was carried out.

The Environmental Protection Act stipulates that the Federal Ministry of Physical Planning and Environment is competent for environmental protection issues, with the proviso that there is a division of competences between the Federal Ministry and competent cantonal ministries. At this point it should be stressed that in the current organisation of the Federal Government there are two Ministries, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism and the Ministry of Physical Planning. Pursuant to Article 40 of this Act, the Federal Ministry and the cantonal Ministry are competent for: *„(...) protection of environment, preventing and eliminating environmental hazards and damage, restoration and gradual improvement of the state of the environment, identifying of priority tasks for environmental protection; setting up of legal, economic and technical measures in the interest of environmental protection; the development, conservation and functioning of the system that serves as a basis for obtaining and processing of data on measuring, monitoring, control, assessment of the state of environment, and providing information on possible environmental impacts; adoption of financial regulations in the sphere of environmental protection and cooperation with the other entity“*. The cantonal ministries are competent for the analysis and assessment of the state of environment and activities for its protection, and also for issuing permits for utilisation of environment from their competences, setting up and management of the environmental information system with information about the environment in the canton, organising the activities whose aim is preventing or reducing adverse consequences for the environment and carrying out supervision over implementing of cantonal laws and other cantonal regulations from the area of environmental protection (Article 43).

According to the Nature Protection Act of FB&H, the activities of nature protection are in the remit of the Federal Ministry of Physical Planning and Environment. Since this Act directly deals with the issues of nature protection, and thereby the issues of protected areas, Table 3 presents the competences of the institutions with respect to the proclamation of specific categories of protected areas (Article 30).

Table 3: Competences of individual institutions in proclamation of protected areas

<b>Categories of Protected Areas</b>	<b>Proposal for Proclamation</b>	<b>Adoption of Proclamation Act</b>
Protected natural area	Competent Federal Ministry	Parliament of the Federation of B&H
Protected natural area in the territory of both entities	Competent entity ministries	Entity legislation bodies
National park	Competent Federal Ministry	Parliament of the Federation of B&H
Protected landscape	Competent Cantonal Ministry	Cantonal legislation bodies
Protected landscape in the territory of two or more cantons	Competent Federal Ministry	Parliament of the Federation of B&H
Monument of nature	Competent Cantonal	Cantonal of legislation



	Ministry	bodies
Monument of nature in the territory of two or more cantons	Competent Federal Ministry	Parliament of the Federation of B&H

The Nature Protection Act of FB&H stipulates that the federal inspector of the competent Ministry carries out the control of compliance and issuance of approval for the activities in the protected areas with the provisions of this Act and the act on declaring a concrete protected area. In carrying out of inspection control, the inspector, among other things, controls: „(...) *the implementation of the nature protection measures in the protected natural areas and national parks (...)*” (Article 41).

The Environmental Protection Act prescribes the necessity of the cooperation at the inter-entity level through the existence of an Inter-entity Environmental Body and Inter-entity Environmental Protection Plan (Article 46).

In Article 4 of the Nature Protection Act it is stated that the prescribed measures, among other things, will ensure setting up of an inter-entity and international cooperation in the domain of nature protection. Although cross-sectoral cooperation is not explicitly provided for, in Article 7 of this Act it is stipulated that: „(...) *all legal or natural persons and also other organisations are obliged protect nature in such a way that they cooperate in the prevention of the activities that can put nature at risk or inflict damage on it...*”.

The provision on forests, among numerous competences of the Federal Forests Administration, provides for the preparation and issuance of opinions for the proclamation of protected forests and special purpose forests (Article 43). At the same time, the same competences are also provided to cantonal forestry administrations (Article 44). The Forests Act from 2002 provides that: „(...) *The Federal administration and cantonal administrations shall not manage state forests and forest land that the Government of the Federation proclaims protected forests or special purpose forests, provided that those forests are transferred to another legal person for management*” (Article 48). Article 20 of the Forests Act from 2002 stipulates that forest management plans have to be harmonised with physical plans, water resource management plans, hunting management plans, plans of management of specific mineral raw materials and records kept in the Institute for Protection of Cultural and Historical and Natural Heritage. The obligations of the harmonisation of forest management plans with other sector-specific plans, management plans and records are in the competences of cantonal forestry administrations. As regards the issue of the inter-entity cooperation, the Forests Act from 2002 envisioned that the general part of the entity forestry programmes would be harmonised at the level of Bosnia and Herzegovina and comprise unified standards for permanent forest management, which will serve for certifying of the management of forest resources in B&H (Article 18). The same Act also provided for the cantonal forest development plans to be based on the same standards for the whole country, and this will be accomplished by inter-entity cooperation, taking into consideration the common concept and definition of international organisations.

Article 21 of the Water Act provides that the water management is transferred into the competence of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Federation of B&H, cantons, cities and municipalities, and also that the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry prepares a proposal of a water management strategy with the consent of the Federal Ministry competent for environment (Article 24). The same Article stipulates that the water

management strategy is an integral part of the environmental protection strategy, and this indicates the existence of a high level of the cross-sectoral cooperation that is necessary for the realisation of the provisions of this Act. With respect to inter-entity cooperation, Article 24 of the Water Act stipulates that: „(...) *The Federal Ministry shall be obliged to set up and ensure coordination of all activities with the Ministry of the Republic of Srpska competent for waters in order to ensure the adoption of a unified water management strategy for the whole of Bosnia and Herzegovina (...)*“.

### 3.1.4. PROTECTION CATEGORIES

Categorisation of protected areas prescribed by The Nature Protection Act of FB&H is, generally speaking, harmonised with IUCN categorisation system, which provides for six categories. The Nature Protection Act in Article 25 classifies protected areas into the following categories:

- protected natural areas established for scientific purposes or for purpose of the protection of wilderness,
- national parks established for purpose of ecosystems conservation and recreation,
- natural monuments established for purpose of conservation of specific natural features,
- protected landscape/seascape established for purpose of landscape/seascape conservation and recreation.

As already mentioned, the Forests Act from 2002 and the Regulation on Forests provide for separation of forest with special management regime (protective forests and special purpose forests). Article 40 stipulates that, among others, the following may be proclaimed special purpose forests:

- forest or its parts with a special cultural, historic, environmental and natural importance, national parks, park forests, nature and hunting reserves,
- forests and forest land of importance for protection of biodiversity and natural habitats of flora, fauna and other organisms,
- forests of special scientific and educational importance,
- forests of special importance for air purification, water supply and water quality,
- forests intended for holiday resorts, vacationing, general education, recreation, tourism, health resorts and other types of spas etc.

In terms of the categorisation of the protection of water resources, Article 65 of the Water Act of FB&H from 2006 provides for the possibility of proclamation of protected areas with various purposes of protection: „(...) *areas intended for utilisation of drinking water, areas intended for the protection of economically important aquatic species, surface water bodies intended for recreation including the areas designated for bathing, areas subject to eutrofication and areas vulnerable to nitrates, areas intended for the protection of habitats of plant and animal species or aquatic species in which maintenance or improvement of water state is a significant condition for their survival and reproduction.*“ Article 77 of this Act stipulates that those areas are established in accordance with the regulations on environmental protection and nature protection. Since Article 3 of the Act on Una National Park provides for the formation of the areas of strict and special protection, among other things, to: „(...) *enable visits and recreation and educational and scientific activities in the volume and in the manner which has the lowest influence on nature*“, it is important to mention that the Water Act also declares Water bodies for recreational purposes (Article 72). In addition, the Water Act specifies the categories of surface waters on the basis of the importance that they have for

water management. The Una river also belongs to category I on the Sava river water basin (Article 5).

### 3.2. RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH INTO THE ATTITUDES OF STAKEHOLDERS IN Una NATIONAL PARK

As already mentioned, on the basis of qualitative research and the application of an appropriate questionnaire data about the attitudes of key stakeholders about various aspects of the functioning of Una National Park were collected, with special focus on their involvement into the cross-sectoral dialogue process. In this chapter attitudes/responses of the representatives of stakeholders to the questions from the questionnaire are presented in the form of an Opponent-Advocate Matrix and analysed (Annex I).

Table 4. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Are you familiar with the initiative for the formation of Una National Park?

INSTITUTION	DA	INDECISIVE	NE
Public administration	MGPUiZO MPViS KUS ZZKNB		
Local administration	OB		
Community boards	MB KV O		
Religious institutions	MR		
Private entrepreneurs	RK PDKV UC PS SB		
Public enterprises	NPU USS		
Non-governmental organisations	USRUB TZ LOB US PC EKUS PK RRA		

It can be seen from the above Table that all the stakeholders are familiar with the initiative on the establishment of Una National Park. The process of the formation of Una National Park itself received media coverage, so that even the stakeholders who were not directly or indirectly involved in the process of formation had a chance to learn about it.

When it comes to the manner of the informing of the stakeholders about the formation of Una National Park, three categories may be identified, while some stakeholders obtained information from a number of sources. The first category includes stakeholders who were

directly consulted and involved in the process of formation (the Ministry of Construction, Physical Planning and Environmental Protection of U-S Canton, the Municipality of Bihac, Riz Krajina, Una Consulting, Sport Bijeli, JP Una National Park, Sport Fishing Association Una-Bihac, Hunting Organisation Bihac, EKUS and Unski Smaragdi). According to the claims of the representatives of NGO Unski Smaragdi, this organisation was also an initiator of the idea on formal protection of the Una river, back in 1964. The second category includes those stakeholders who were informed by mass media about the formation of Una National Park (the cantonal Ministry of Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry, the community board of Martin Brod, Rmanj Monastery, SPD Unsko-Sanske Sume, the Tourist Board, Hunting Organisation Bihac, PLOD Centar, the Regional Development Agency and the Chamber of Commerce of U-S Canton). The third category includes the stakeholders who were informed through various workshops organised as accompanying activities in the process of the formation of the National Park (the Kulen Vakuf farm, Pansion Saraj (Saraj boarding house), PLOD Centar, and the community boards of Martin Brod and Kulen Vakuf).

Table 5. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Do you know who launched the initiative for the formation of Una National Park?

INSTITUTION	YES	INDECISIVE	NO
Public administration	MGPUiZO		MPViS KUS ZZKNB
Local administration	OB		
Community boards			MB KV O
Religious institutions			MR
Private entrepreneurs	UC  SB		RK PDKV  PS
Public enterprises	NPU		USS
Non-governmental organisations	USRUB  LOB US PC EKUS PK		TZ     RRA

At first sight, representatives of stakeholders had a divided opinion with respect to this question. Some of the institutions and stakeholders (especially from the forestry sector and community boards) do not know who launched the initiative for the formation of Una National Park. On the other hand, institutions who by nature of their work had to be actively involved in the process of the formation of Una National Park (the competent cantonal Ministry, the Municipality of Bihac, JP Una National Park), as expected, gave a positive response to this question. A positive response of most of the representatives of non-

governmental organisations indicates a high level of their information and involvement into the process of the formation of the National Park. A high division of representatives of stakeholders arises from different perceiving of the question itself. Some of them thought that it is correct to respond that the first person to launch the initiative for the protection of this area was Mr. Bosko Marjanovic, the founder of NGO "Unski Smaragdi". Responses of another group of respondents (who gave "negative" responses) pertained to the institutions that initiated the formal establishment of Una National Park (representatives of executive legislative authorities at the municipal and cantonal level).

Table 6. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Do you know which institution had a key role in the declaring of Una National Park?

INSTITUTION	YES	INDECISIVE	NO
Public administration	FMOiT MGPUiZO MPViS KUS		ZZKNB
Local administration	OB		
Community boards	MB KV O		
Religious institutions			MR
Private entrepreneurs	RK PDKV UC		PS SB
Public enterprises	NPU USS		
Non-governmental organisations	USRUB TZ LOB US PC EKUS PK RRA		

Most of the representatives of contacted stakeholders know that the Government and Parliament of the Federation of B&H had a key role in declaring of Una National Park (the proclamation of those categories of protected areas, pursuant to the Nature Protection Act, is in the competence of federal institutions). Exceptions were the representatives of Rmanj Monastery, the Institute for Protection Cultural Heritage Bihac and some individual private entrepreneurs.

Although this is a relatively „young“, recently established company, most of the representatives of contacted stakeholders know that JP Una National Park is competent for management of Una National Park. Although in discussions with the director of this enterprise it was established that JP Una National Park undertakes activities on informing of all stakeholders, representatives of Rmanj Monastery are an exception here as well. Given the specificity of this institution, in the future more intensive activities should be undertaken with

a view to inform the representatives of Rmanj Monastery about the activities of JP Una National Park and they should be documented.

Table 7 presents the responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Has your institution/organisation been involved in the formation of Una National Park? On the basis of received responses it can be seen that some institutions (particularly in the forestry sector, community boards, tourist board of U-S Canton etc.) and the stakeholders were not fully involved in the process of the formation of Una National Park. Surely, involvement of those institutions into initial activities on the formation of Una National Park would generate an additional quality of the whole process. Since the forests spread on a large part of the National Park and since this area, until the proclamation of Una National Park, had been managed by JP SPD Unsko-Sanske Forests, this particularly relates to the representatives of the forestry sector. Table 7 does not present the position of JP Una National Park because the enterprise was not even established at that period.

Table 7. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Has your institution/organisation been involved in the formation of Una National Park?

INSTITUTION	YES	INDECISIVE	NO
Public administration	FMOiT MGPUiZO  KUS ZZKNB		MPViS
Local administration	OB		
Community boards	O		MB KV
Religious institutions			MR
Private entrepreneurs	RK  UC  SB		PDKV  PS
Public enterprises			USS
Non-governmental organisations	USRUB  LOB US PC EKUS PK		TZ     RRA

Table 8. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Are you satisfied with the role that your institution/organisation had in the process of the formation of Una National Park?

INSTITUTION	YES	INDECISIVE	NO
Public administration	FMOiT MGPUiZO		MPViS KUS

	ZZKNB	
Local administration		OB
Community boards	KV	MB O
Religious institutions		MR
Private entrepreneurs	RK PDKV UC	PS SB
Public enterprises		USS
Non-governmental organisations	USRUB  LOB US PC EKUS PK  RRA	TZ

It can be seen from the Table above that opinions of the representatives of stakeholders with respect to this question are divided. Although it was involved in the process of the formation of Una National Park, the Municipality of Bihac is not fully satisfied with its role in the initial phase of the formation of the National Park. The reason for this specified was that they did not have influence on the appointment of the Acting Director, whose seat was in Sarajevo, and that for this reason the complete process of formation was slowed down. With the appointment of the Director of JP Una National Park the situation was changed, the representative of the Municipality of Bihac does not have significant objections related to this question, and the municipality provides various kinds of support to the functioning of JP Una National Park (office space, a motor vehicle etc.). Other stakeholders stated different reasons for their dissatisfaction, mainly insufficient level of information. Although a large part of surface area that the National Park is situated in used to be under the competence of JP SPD Unsko-Sanske Sume with respect to management, a representative of the enterprise is not satisfied with the role of the enterprise, due to lack of information about the activities in the formation of Una National Park.

Table 9. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Is your institution/organisation involved in the process of management of Una National Park?

INSTITUTION	YES	INDECISIVE	NO
Public administration			MGPUiZO MPViS KUS
Local administration	ZZKNB OB		
Community boards			MB KV O
Religious institutions			MR
Private entrepreneurs			RK PDKV

	UC PS SB
Public enterprises	NPU USS
Non-governmental organisations	USRUB TZ LOB US PC EKUS PK RRA

Although the management of Una National Park was entrusted to JP Una National Park, it can be seen from the Table above that the majority of contacted stakeholders is not appropriately involved in the process of management. Exceptions are the Municipality of Bihac (because the biggest percentage of the surface area of the National Park is in the territory of this municipality) and the Institute for Protection of Cultural Heritage Bihac, which is in charge of the protection of cultural and historical heritage in the area of the National Park. Taking into consideration that JP Una National Park was established only recently, it is difficult even to expect greater involvement of other stakeholders in the process of management. Certain time is required to set up the necessary organisational structure and engage the necessary human resources in JP Una National Park. At the moment the Director is the only employee in this enterprise. Stakeholders expect to be involved in the process of management in the forthcoming period. It would be useful if JP Una National Park would start regular informing of all stakeholders about its activities and gradually include them in the management process, in accordance with their real possibilities and the management plan. Through contacts with the representatives of the stakeholders one gets an impression that at this moment most of them would be satisfied with regular information about the activities planned to be carried out in the process of management of Una National Park. There are also stakeholders that are not satisfied with such a situation (the Ministry of Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry of U-S Canton, JP SPD Unsko-Sanske Sume), who also believe that their involvement (in cooperation with JP Una National Park) would result in a better quality of the management of the National Park. Taking into consideration the resources (staffing and material) that JP SPD Unsko-Sanske Forests has available in the field, such suggestions may be considered justified. In general, it is fair to say that it may be well too early to make conclusions about meeting of the expectations of all stakeholders when it comes to their role and involvement in the process of management of JP Una National Park.

Responses of respondents related to identification and assessment of power and interest of the most important stakeholders are shown in the form of the Power-Interest Matrix. Since Una National Park is situated in the area of the Municipality of Bihac, it is logical that the Municipality Bihac and Government of U-S Canton as representatives of legislative and executive authorities at the municipal and cantonal levels, have the role “of key players“, i.e., stakeholders with the greatest power and a big interest in the business environment of the enterprise JP Una National Park. The Municipality of Bihac and the Government of U-S Canton see Una National Park as a significant development opportunity. The “key players“ group definitely includes the Ministry of Construction, Physical Planning and Environmental Protection of U-S Canton and Government of the Federation of B&H as the umbrella institution competent for the proclamation of Una National Park. In order to improve cross-



sectoral dialogue and cooperation with all stakeholders, for stakeholders with explicit power and interest JP Una National Park should apply the strategy of “full satisfaction of their interests“. In case of stakeholders who have a relatively big power and less explicit interest (business system of forestry and public forestry administration), “keep satisfied“ strategy should be applied. Having in mind the actual staffing and technical potentials possessed by JP SPD Unsko-Sanske Sume, such a strategy of JP Una National Park, in terms of strengthening of partnership relations with the forestry enterprise seems fully justifiable and mutually beneficial. For stakeholders with a big interest, but a relatively small power (community boards, various non-governmental organisations, private entrepreneurs etc.) it is best to use the “keep informed“ strategy, although depending on various circumstances this strategy is sometimes not sufficient to satisfy all their interests and expectations. In case that some of those stakeholders “become stronger“, it would be necessary to revisit the strategy of JP Una National Park towards them. In case of stakeholders with low power and weak interest, JP Una National Park in the process of communication and strengthening of the cross-sectoral dialogue should apply the "minimal engagement" strategy with continual monitoring of the change of both parameters shown in the Power-Interest Matrix.

Power-Interest Matrix

		POWER	
		Small	Big
ITERES	Big	<p>Community boards</p> <p>Tourist Board of U-S Canton Unski Smaragdi</p> <p>Fishing Association Bihac Private entrepreneurs</p> <p>Farmers</p> <p>PLOD Centar</p> <p>Institute for Protection of Cult. Heritage Bihac</p> <p>Federal Ministry of Energy and Mining</p> <p>Hunting Association Bihac Chamb. of Commerce of U-S Canton Rmanj Monastery</p>	<p>Municipality of Bihac Gov. of U-S Canton</p> <p>Ministry of Construction, Physical Planning and Env. Protection of U-S Canton Gov. of Federation of B&amp;H</p> <p>JP SPD Unsko-Sanske Sume</p>
	Small	<p>Una consulting</p> <p>Cantonal Forest Administration</p>	

It should be stressed that in the context of this study, the Power-Interest Matrix was used exclusively in order to define an adequate strategy that JP Una National Park should apply towards different stakeholders, in order to strengthen and foster cross-sectoral dialogue. The presence of a relatively large number of powerful stakeholders in a business environment of JP Una National Park makes its functioning significantly more complex and points to the necessity of their involvement in the process of management of the National Park, and/or satisfying their interests by applying the concept of cross-sectoral dialogue as one of the guiding principles in the management of protected areas.

Various stakeholder groups have various interests when it comes to Una National Park. The Federal Ministry of Environment and Tourism sees its interests primarily in increasing the percentage of the protected areas in the Federation of B&H, the protection of biodiversity and planning management of this area. The Ministry of Construction, Physical Planning and Environmental Protection of U-S Canton states as the main interest preventing of all forms of unlawful activities, whereas the cantonal Ministry of Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry is primarily interests in a precise regulation of the competences of management of natural resources among different institutions. JP Una National Park expects the realisation of the objectives of the management of the National Park provided for by law in the shortest time period, creation of a recognisable tourist brand, positioning of the National Park as a recognisable tourist destination in the domestic and foreign markets, and achievement of economic effects and attaining of economic self-sustainability. The Tourist Board also stresses the importance of the promotion of natural and cultural and historical values of the National Park as its interest. The common interest of the representatives of local communities (the Municipality of Bihac and the community board) is reflected in the improvement of the living standards (new jobs, stopping of the migration of youth from the rural environment to the city, development of infrastructure etc.) through the National Park's taking hold and development of various kinds of tourism in the shortest possible time frame. The interests of the representatives of Rmanj Monastery are similar as they expect that this institution will be appropriately involved into the complete tourist offer of Una National Park. PLOD centar as a development organisation sees its interest in the improvement of the living standards through the implementation of the development projects and inter-governmental cooperation in the sphere of nature protection, whereas the Chamber of Commerce of U-S Canton and the Regional Development Agency specify job creation and economic development of the Municipality of Bihac and of U-S Canton as their interests with respect to Una National Park. The private sector is interested in the development of business in accordance with strategic documents, the legal framework and with full respect for the transparency principle in the utilisation of the natural values of this area. The interest of Una Consulting and EKUS is reflected in cooperation with Una National Park and realisation of common development projects. Non-governmental organisations and associations of citizens are interested in raising environmental awareness, education in the nature (in particular children and youth), protection of natural values and their utilisation in accordance with planning documents and legal provisions. JP SPD Unsko-Sanske Sume see their interest in cooperation with JP National Park Una, through engagement of their building operations and construction of infrastructure. In this manner the forestry company wants by an active role in the protection of this area enhance its own business image and present itself as a socially responsible company.

In general, it can be concluded that the interests of various stakeholder groups are numerous and different, but that the functioning of the National Park represents a common link for all identified interests. The diversity of interests implies the inevitability of the application of the

participatory planning concept, participation and cross-sectoral dialogue. Obviously, it is in everybody's best interest that the National Park starts functioning in full capacity as soon as possible, and that, in addition to ensuring the protection of natural values, it also becomes one of the key factors of development of U-S Canton.

All stakeholders have a similar perception of the notion of the cross-sectoral dialogue. It mainly implies harmonisation of interests, coordination, interaction, dialogue, respect and cooperation between various sectors and stakeholders and public-private partnership, with respecting the principle of transparency, continual communication and full information of all stakeholders in the process of planning, decision-making, implementation and monitoring of all activities implemented in Una National Park. In that respect all contacted representatives of stakeholders fully support the cross-sectoral dialogue as a principle in the management of Una National Park, and believe that its full implementation is one of the most important prerequisites for effective and efficient functioning of Una National Park.

Opinions of the representatives of the stakeholders about whether there was sufficient cross-sectoral dialogue during the formation of Una National Park (Table 10) are divided. The respondents who gave a positive response to this question explain their opinion by claims that there were sufficient discussions and organised workshops with the topic of the formation of the National Park, and that anyone who wanted to obtain sufficient information and be involved in the process of cross-sectoral dialogue could do so. Opposing opinions are argued by claims that the process of formation of the National Park (particularly in the initial stages) was accompanied by a lack of timely information, decision-making at the federal level, and modest promotional activities, resulting in weak interest and non-involvement of individual stakeholders from the process of the formation of Una National Park. With respect to the unified position of all stakeholders about the importance of the cross-sectoral dialogue, it is necessary to undertake all measures and activities for full implementation of this principle in the process of management of Una National Park.

Table 10. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Has there been sufficient cross-sectoral dialogue in the process of the formation of Una National Park?

INSTITUTION	YES	INDECISIVE	NO
Public administration	MPViS ZZKNB		MGPUiZO KUS
Local administration			OB
Community boards	KV O		MB
Religious institutions			MR
Private entrepreneurs	RK PS		PDKV UC SB
Public enterprises	NPU		USS
Non-governmental organisations	USRUB	TZ LOB	

	US	PC EKUS
	RRA	PK

Logically, stakeholders who are not satisfied with the role they had in the cross-sectoral dialogue in relation to Una National Park believe that they should be involved in it and that thus they can contribute to better functioning of the National Park. An issue was raised as to the capacities of individual stakeholders to engage into active participation in this process, or whether in the current situation their expectations would be fulfilled through continual information about the activities implemented in the National Park. In that respect one should also observe the attitudes of the representatives of the stakeholders regarding whether only one side benefits from the cross-sectoral dialogue (most frequently the initiator of the cross-sectoral dialogue) or all the stakeholders.

Table 11. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Do you think that only one side has benefits of the cross-sectoral dialogue?

INSTITUTION	YES	INDECISIVE	NO
Public administration	MGPUiZO		MPViS KUS ZZKNB
Local administration			OB
Community boards			MB KV O
Religious institutions	MR		
Private entrepreneurs		RK	PDKV UC PS SB
Public enterprises			NPU USS
Non-governmental organisations			USRUB TZ LOB US PC EKUS PK RRA

Most respondents think that all the involved stakeholders benefit from the cross-sectoral dialogue, although the benefit is not the same for all. Such positions are completely logical because the expectations of the stakeholders from the cross-sectoral dialogue are greatly dependent on the variety of their interests, and on their real power and demands.

Expectations of the representatives of the stakeholders from the dialogue and the future collaboration with other stakeholders are numerous and diverse. The Federal Ministry of Environment and Tourism expects JP Una National Park to start operating in full capacity, as

well as certain financial benefits. The Ministry of Construction, Physical Planning and Environmental Protection of U-S Canton expects synchronisation of activities of all stakeholders and materialisation of goals for which the National Park was formed. The Ministry of Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry of U-S Canton expects agreed solutions with respect to the management of Una National Park and harmonisation of cross-sectoral laws. The Chamber of Commerce and the Municipality of Bihac expect from the cooperation of all stakeholders economic development at all levels and better quality of management of National Park. The representatives of local communities (Martin Brod, Kulen Vakuf and Orasac) through cooperation with the National Park expect improvement of living standards and better respect for the interests of the local population. The representative of Rmanj Monastery highlights that through the dialogue and future cooperation with other stakeholders, the protection of interests of all sides concerning the National Park should be ensured. The representatives of the stakeholders from the ranks of private entrepreneurs expect from the cooperation of all stakeholders, on the basis of law and planning documents, development in the area of Una National Park, growth of business and spatial delineation of business activities to minimise conflicts among various stakeholders. It is important to stress that both JP Una National Park and JP SPD Unsko-Sanske Sume expect from the dialogue and future cooperation the creation of partnership relations and engagement of technical capacities of forestry companies in the National Park, in the sense of upgrading of the infrastructure. The representatives of the non-governmental sector expect a benefit for all stakeholders on the basis of balanced development of the National Park, development of appropriate promotional programmes, employment of new professional staff, increasing of the number of visitors, realisation of educational and scientific projects and increasing of the transparency in the operation of JP Una National Park. EKUS expects from the dialogue and cooperation of all stakeholders sustainable development, stronger inclusion of the academic community into the activities of the National Park and respecting of the demands of the local population in the decision-making process.

In view of the recognition of the importance of the cross-sectoral dialogue concept by all the stakeholders, it was necessary to identify minimum prerequisites for becoming of this concept a reality. Stakeholders' representatives have reached a high degree of consensus regarding this issue and have mentioned the following prerequisites: full staffing of JP Una National Park, formation of a coordination, cross-sectoral advisory body, development of training programmes for all stakeholders, urgent adoption of planning documents, harmonisation of interests through continual communication and contacts among all stakeholders, a developed information dissemination system and involvement of the media in order to ensure the required level of transparency of all activities regarding the management of the National Park. As regards the proposals for the enhancement of the cross-sectoral dialogue, they are to a greater extent identical to the aforementioned minimal prerequisites for its becoming a reality, with the particularly highlighted need for the formation of a coordination cross-sectoral advisory body, which would provide assistance to JP Una National Park and which would comprise representatives of all stakeholders. Also stressed was the need for cooperation and equal representation of interests of all stakeholders (particularly local communities) aimed at decentralisation of adoption of decisions. Most respondents agree that the improvement of the cross-sectoral dialogue requires a consistent adherence to the Una National Park Act and adoption of the physical planning documents, so that all the stakeholders would know what the opportunities are, but also what the limitations are with respect to various activities in the National Park. Creation of partnership relations between the public and private sectors was mentioned as one of the key elements for the enhancement of the cross-sectoral dialogue, which would enable mobilisation of private

capital and ideas in the legally stipulated framework of the management of the National Park as a public good. In light of this the stakeholders also identified the need for creating of a subsidising system and a special fund for rural development and financing of the activities in the National Park. The prerequisites for all of the above are staffing and providing technical equipment for JP Una National Park and existence of a true readiness of all stakeholders for agreement and compromise on the principles of mutual respect, cooperativeness and tolerance.

Communication is the basic prerequisite for dialogue. Table 12 shows that the majority of the stakeholders communicate with other stakeholders when it comes to Una National Park. Besides, respondents stated that communication is necessary for all stakeholders to be informed in a timely manner and involved in the process of management of Una National Park. In light of previous responses (particularly the ones related to the current level of involvement into the management process and assessment of the quality of the cross-sectoral dialogue) it can be concluded that there is communication (mostly informal) among the stakeholders, but that significant improvements are necessary in terms of the institutionalising of the communication process and instruments. The development of the system of continual communicating and informing of all stakeholders is definitely one of the key tasks from the domain of the activities in JP Una National Park.

Table 12. Responses of the representatives of the stakeholders to the question: Do you communicate with other stakeholders with respect to Una National Park?

INSTITUTION	YES	INDECISIVE	NO
Public administration	FMOiT MGPUiZO MPViS KUS ZZKNB PK		
Local administration	OB		
Community boards	KV O		MB
Religious institutions	MR		
Private entrepreneurs	RK PDKV UC PS SB		
Public enterprises	NPU	USS	
Non-governmental organisations	USRUB TZ LOB US PC EKUS PK RRA		

Una National Park and the entity running it was founded only several years ago. No doubt, this is a very ambitious project, which exceeds institutional capacities in certain aspects, and

even the legislative and planning framework of nature protection at all levels of authority in the Federation of B&H. On the other hand, there is an unquestionable enthusiasm of competent bodies and readiness of all interest groups to make joint efforts aimed at contributing to fully functioning capacities of Una National Park. In this respect they tried through contacts with representatives of all stakeholders to identify institutions and factors that aggravate or facilitate functioning of the National Park. Generally speaking, no insurmountable limitations for the functioning of Una National Park were identified, and those which did exist in the early steps of the formation of the National Park were eliminated, or are being resolved gradually. The best verification of the above statement is the relationship between the local population and the formation of the National Park. From scepticism, and even to a point opposing to the formation of the National Park, due to fear that traditional life style will be significantly impeded (e.g. agriculture and animal husbandry), the awareness of the local population evolved so much so that now they see the National Park as an opportunity for development, employment and improvement of the quality of living in general. The prerequisite for the realisation of so ambitious expectations of local population definitely was the enhancement of communication and organising of various educational programmes. However, there are also certain factors that aggravate the functioning of the National Park in full capacity. This is primarily the lack of corresponding physical planning documents. The non-existence of a valid spatial plan of the areas of special importance for the Federation of B&H for the catchment area of the Una river and Una National Park management plan are significant limiting factors. Such a situation, in combination with complex and slow administrative procedures, hinders the development of private initiatives, which is best reflected in the problems accompanying the issuance of concessions, construction permits etc. It can be expected that the activities of the Government of the Federation of B&H on the adoption of designation of surface area in physical plan will result in positive developments in resolving of those problems. In addition, provisions of specific laws (e.g., provisions of the Act on Tourist and Catering Activity, which eliminates the possibility of registration of supplementary activities) significantly impede the functioning of the National Park. The shortage of funds (from public and private sources) and non-development of infrastructure are serious limiting factors for the development of the National Park. In that respect it would be necessary, besides other things, to make additional efforts on nominating projects and mobilisation of resources from EU funds. A good example of such an approach are the initiatives for trans-boundary cooperation between National Parks Una and "Plitvička jezera". The aforementioned problem of lack of staffing of JP Una National Park regarding the necessary staff and equipment is definitely a problem that requires urgent resolving. The professional competence and motivation of the person at the head of Una National Park is unquestionable, but this itself is not sufficient for successful operations of the National Park. With respect to this issue the respondents also mentioned the need for advancement of full and continual communication and information of all stakeholders about the activities in the National Park. Generally speaking, institutions that hinder the functioning of Una National Park are not identified through contacts with representatives of all stakeholders. On the contrary, many institutions, each in its own way, invest maximum efforts to bring the National Park to life as soon and as fully as possible. This is particularly the case with the Government of U-S Canton, the Municipality of Bihać, the local population, non-governmental organisations for nature protection, local development agencies and, definitely, the management of JP Una National Park.

The diversity of interests and expectations of the stakeholders with regard to Una National Park is large. In terms of the economic and sociological expectations of contacted stakeholders, they are mostly reduced to the general economic development of the complete



U-S Canton, through the increase in employment of the local population, job creation, higher revenue from tourism and accompanying activities (including the private sector), launching of projects of the development of local communities, trans-border and national cooperation between protected areas and self-sustainability of the National Park. It is expected that in this manner increased budget outturn would result in investments into infrastructure and improving of general living conditions in the area of U-S Canton. In the long run, this would result in stopping of processes of migration from rural to urban areas, return of refugees and displaced persons, improving of the socio-demographic picture of this area and increasing environmental awareness of the population. When it comes to environmental expectations of the contacted representatives of stakeholders, they are very clear and undivided and are reflected in the need for protection of nature and human environment, especially the Una river. To give a comprehensive overview, Table 13 presents the economic, environmental and sociological expectations of all stakeholders included in the study.

Table 13. Economic, environmental and sociological expectations of all stakeholders from Una National Park

	<b>Economic</b>	<b>Environmental</b>	<b>Sociological</b>
FMOiT	Self-sustainability of Una NP	All	Job creation and employment of local population
MGPUiZO	Employment in the area of tourism	Nature protection and human environment	Change of social map of this area and return of refugees
MPViS	Job creation, development of forgotten crafts	Nature protection	Higher living standards, development of tourism, promotion of natural beauties of USK
KUS	Increasing of revenues from tourism and promotion of Una NP	Nature protection	Employment of local population and development of USK
ZZKNB	Self-sustainability of Una NP	Nature protection	Employment, conservation of cultural goods, branding
OB	Employment, indirect revenue into the budget of the Municipality of Bihac, projects of development of local communities	Nature protection and development of „green“ economy	Higher living standards, return of refugees, stopping of migration processes, enhancement of trans-border cooperation
MB	Job creation and employment of local population	Nature protection	Higher living standards, stopping of migration processes
KV	Higher living standards and job creation	Conservation of the Una river	Employment of population, stopping of migration processes
O	Self-sustainability of Una NP and indirect benefit for MZ	Nature protection	Employment of local population
MR	-	Nature protection	-
RK	Profitable business operations of private enterprises in Una NP	Conservation of the Una river	Higher living standards, return of refugees, stopping of migration processes through employment of local population
PDKV	Employment of population and improvement of infrastructure	Nature protection and human environment	Higher living standards and return of population
UC	Employment of population and higher living standards	Protection of the Una river, tuff and biodiversity	Enhancement of cooperation and overall satisfaction of people, stopping of migration
PS	Development of tourism, economic benefits and receiving incentives	Nature protection	Higher living standards
SB	Development of tourism, employment and improved infrastructure in NP	Protection of nature, particularly of tuff	Employment of population, return of refugees, development of area, preventing of leaving of youth and trans-border cooperation
NPU	Overall economic benefit, development of tourism, increased investments and employment of local population	Protection of nature and human environment	Higher living standards, knowledge transfer and tourist offer in cooperation with other NP (trans-border and domestic cooperation)
USS	Engagement of building operations of enterprises	Nature protection and sustainable management	Fulfilment of recreational needs of the population and return of refugees
USRUB	Overall economic benefit and sustainable utilisation of resources	Raising environmental awareness	Employment of local population and development of Una NP
TZ	Employment of local population and development of USK	Protection of nature and human environment	Higher living standards and stopping of migration processes
LOB	Development of hunting tourism and possibility of selling	Protection of flora and fauna	Employment of population and higher living standards

	of souvenirs		
US	Employment of local population	Protection of nature and human environment	Raising environmental awareness of youth and healthier society
PC	Economic development of USK, development of tourism, employment	Protection of nature and human environment	Higher living standards and stopping of migration processes
EKUS	Upgrading of infrastructure, development of tourism and agriculture (branding of food products)	Protection of nature and human environment, research and monitoring of the state of biodiversity, introducing of environmental standards	Employment of local population, stopping of migration processes, development of rural space, promotion of natural beauties of USK
PK	Increasing budget revenues	Nature protection	Employment of local population
RRA	Employment of population, development of tourism, building of infrastructure	Protection of nature and human environment	Raising environmental awareness of local population and visitors

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The social and political community puts before institutions engaging in management of protected areas ever increasingly expressed demands in terms of socially responsible management, contribution to the development of rural areas and protection of natural ecosystems. The complexness of changeable demands of human society towards nature has caused the development of the generally acceptable doctrine of sustainable development which implies environment friendly, cost-effective and sociologically responsible management of natural resources. Changeable demands of the society in relation to natural resources, setting up and strengthening of the cross-sectoral dialogue, as well as political mobilisation of new stakeholders are only some of the factors that have led to the appearance of the concept of natural resources management, known as "*Environmental Governance*". Unlike the hierarchical approach, in which decisions are made in the spirit of traditional technocratic-planning logic, "top-down", the "*Environmental Governance*" concept implies making restrictions for state institutions in the utilisation of classical command-and-control instruments, promoting the coordination and harmonisation of activities of all actors and cooperation among governmental and non-governmental organisations. The "*Environmental Governance*" concept was developed as a result of mutual interactions of all stakeholders and as such cannot be reduced to only one or a group of actors. Success of this concept is based in particular on the synergy between traditional actors of the nature protection policy and stakeholders within the civil society, which, instead of competing with each others, act together and create a specific management model for protected areas. In designing of institutional arrangements and realisation of the "*Environmental Governance*" concept, decentralisation processes are very significant (i.e., devolution of powers from the central government level to lower political, administrative and territorial levels), and creation of the so-called "political networks" through various forms of partnership between civil society, private and public sectors.

The complexness of the management of natural resources in the area of U-S Canton is conditioned by the impact of various sector-specific policies and existence of a large number of stakeholders. The results of this study show that this complexness is particularly explicit in the case of Una National Park. Interests of various groups are many, but it is more than obvious that Una National Park represents their common denominator. Diversity of those interests implies the inevitability of the application of participatory planning and cross-sectoral dialogue, as constituent elements of the "*Environmental Governance*" concept. In this particular case, the "*Environmental Governance*" concept implies a high level of cooperation and dialogue between public institutions (the Government and competent line Ministries, public administration, JP Una National Park) and the civil society (non-governmental organisations, general public, local community). In such complex conditions, all stakeholders, and especially the public and citizens, demand that they be involved in the process of planning and implementing of the policy of development and management of natural resources. In that respect, strategic decisions related to the management of Una National Park should be based on the principles of participation, involvement and transparency, with full application of the concept of cross-sectoral dialogue between all stakeholders. In the context of this study the cross-sectoral dialogue implies the interaction among stakeholders (the public, private and civil sectors) characterised by dialogue, cooperation and assuming the responsibility in order to attain common positions about the management of Una National Park. The results accomplished in this study enable formulating of the following recommendations addressed to various institutions and stakeholders:

1. All stakeholders, no doubt, support the **cross-sectoral dialogue as one of the key principles in the functioning of Una National Park** and have a high level of agreement regarding its understanding. Most stakeholders support becoming of the National Park a reality in full capacity and in it recognises a chance for development of the whole U-S Canton and improvement of the quality of living of the local population. In that respect, strengthening of the cross-sectoral dialogue represents the **interest of all stakeholders**.
2. When it comes to the **level of the involvement in the process of formation and management**, some stakeholders have provided certain comments, which were more explicit in the initial phases of the formation of the National Park. The most frequent criticism was addressed to the tardiness in the formation of institutions for management, and also the lack of information about the activities related to Una National Park. As the process of the formation and starting operating of the National Park was advancing, the cross-sectoral dialogue was becoming more intensive, with the tendency of permanent improvement. It is understandable that the setting up of the overall system of information of all stakeholders is limited by current staffing and organisational limitations of JP Una National Park, however, tackling of this problem requires more attention in the forthcoming period. It is necessary to **ensure institutionalisation of the process of information and communication** between JP Una National Park and other stakeholders, the more so because there is an impression that the majority of the stakeholders who are not satisfied with their involvement in the cross-sectoral dialogue process would change their attitude if they were continually and in a timely manner informed about the activities regarding Una National Park. In the selection and implementation of an appropriate strategy of communicating with individual stakeholders, it is necessary for **JP Una National Park to have a lead role**, and to consider interest and power the two governing properties of each stakeholder.
3. In terms of the improvement of communication and creating the prerequisites for the implementation of the cross-sectoral dialogue, it is recommended that **a coordination, advisory body be formed, which would gather representatives of all stakeholders**. Such a body would surely contribute to harmonisation of diverse interests through permanent contacts among all stakeholders and ensure the desired level of transparency, but it also represented a sort of a forum for generating of new ideas regarding Una National Park. It would be logical if **the initiative for formation of such a body would originate from JP Una National Park**, as a competent managing institution. Such an initiative should be supported by **all stakeholders**. Of course, a prerequisite for that is removal of the aforementioned organisational limitations experienced by JP Una National Park and its staff recruitment in accordance with the organisational structure and job systematisation.
4. Technical limitations of JP Una National Park, whose removal requires significant financial resources, could be overcome soonest by **creating partnership relationships with the already existing and new private enterprises**, which link their activity to the activities and space within the National Park. In that respect it would be necessary to identify private enterprises – engines of economic development and **organise them in a single cluster**, so that in close cooperation with JP Una National Park, an integral, unique, recognisable and branded tourist product would be created. Logically, **besides JP Una National Park**, it is specifically **private entrepreneurs** who have the biggest interest in the formation of public-private partnership, who are organised within the cantonal Chamber of Commerce or some other institution through which they may articulate their interests.

5. **Formation of a dedicated fund for rural development and financing of small and medium businesses** would give a significant impetus to the activities permitted under the spatial planning documents (tourism, rafting, fishery, organic food production, cottage industry etc.). The much-needed investment into upgrading of infrastructure (primarily into communications networks, but also recreational infrastructure and equipment/fittings) and enrichment of tourist offer, might be ensured by nominating of attractive and competitive projects which would be financed from domestic and foreign sources. In view of the already launched initiatives for trans-border cooperation, there are realistic presumptions for mobilisation of such earmarked funds (e.g. IPA). The key role in the formation of a dedicated fund should be played by **local, cantonal and federal levels of executive power, and development agencies at the local level.**
6. Mobilisation of private capital and creating of an ambience for encouraging of entrepreneurial spirit should be preceded by the **adoption of appropriate physical-planning documents and consistent observance of the Act on Una National Park, which is in the remit of competent Ministries.** On this basis it would be possible to design an adequate system of concessions and subsidies, and opening of new jobs in rural areas could be expected.
7. To create an adequate legal framework for fostering cross-sectoral dialogue, it is necessary to also propose certain measures for **enhancement and mutual harmonisation of sectoral legislation pertaining to nature protection and management of protected areas.** As already stated, legislation at the level of the Canton is fully compliant with the relevant legislation at the level of the Federation of B&H, so that the said recommendations pertain mainly to cross-sectoral, and to a lesser extent to inter-entity and international harmonisation. In general, there is an evident high level of compliance among sectoral laws at the level of the Federation of B&H. This is not surprising in light of the fact that the set of laws dealing with the nature protection and environment issues was adopted at the same time, more precisely, immediately after the adoption of the Forests Act from 2002. For legislation dealing with the forestry and water sectors it can be said that they indicate to a considerable extent the obligation of cross-sectoral cooperation. Unlike the sectoral laws, the Nature Protection Act and the Environmental Protection Act, as well as general laws, also contain provisions that regulate the inter-entity cooperation aspect. General guidelines of nature protection in the Federation of B&H are sufficiently elaborated in the framework of the Environmental Protection Act and the Nature Protection Act. However, lack of development or non-functionality of institutions for consistent application of sectoral legislation, causes not only problems in setting up and implementation of the cross-sectoral dialogue, but frequently the very implementation of the said general guidelines is brought into question. A good example is the legislation in the forestry sector of the Federation of B&H. Dysfunctional organisation of the public forestry service, unclear regulation of the ownership rights, management of forest resources and frequent amendments (and even repealing) of Forests Act of the Federation of B&H, have lead to the point when the application of general guidelines of nature protection in individual forest management areas are at the very least disputable. The Forests Act from 2002 (which was repealed pursuant to the decision of the Constitutional Court of the Federation of B&H) to a considerable extent contained provisions that rendered it compatible with general principles mentioned in the Environmental Protection Act of FB&H (precaution, prevention, integral approach of all policies etc.). It can be expected that the new Forests Act will also honour these principles and propose such an

organisation of the forestry sector which will ensure sustainable management of forest resources and nature protection. In the new Forests Act it would be necessary, in the context of forests with a special management regime (protective forests and special purpose forests) to include the category "high conservation value forest" (HCVF), as a forest of exceptional values in terms of the protection and conservation of biodiversity, landscape and sociological and cultural values. In that way in forest management plans management measures that would preserve the attributes of "high conservation value forest" could be envisaged. Since in the Forests Act from 2002 it was explicitly stated that: „(...) *Federal administration and cantonal administration shall not manage state forests and forest land that the Government of the Federation proclaims protective forests or special purpose forests provided that those forests were transferred for management to another legal person.*“ (Article 48), separation of "high conservation value forests" would by no means be in collision with the protection measures that would be stipulated by the Nature Protection Act. When it comes to forests with a special management regime, i.e., competence over their proclamation, there is a serious collision between the Forests Act from 2002 and the Nature Protection Act. The Forests Act prescribed that special purpose forests (which include National Parks as well) would be proclaimed by cantonal institutions, whereas the Nature Protection Act prescribes that the proclamation of National Parks (as protected areas category II) is in the competence of the Federation of B&H. On the other hand, forests of special scientific and educational importance, according to the Forests Act are proclaimed by federal institutions, while the same forests (Monument of nature as protected areas category III) according to the Nature Protection Act is proclaimed by cantonal institutions. When it comes to the categorisation of protected areas, the Nature Protection Act should be completely harmonised with IUCN categorisation (the existing four categories should be expanded to six). Finally, provisions of individual laws that are not analysed in this study (e.g., provisions of the Act on Tourist and Catering Activity which abrogates the possibility to register supplementary activities) make the functioning of the National Park more difficult. Mutual harmonisation of all laws pertaining to nature protection would minimise the possibility of emergence of cross-sectoral conflicts. In that respect it would be useful to establish a body for cross-sectoral cooperation at the competent Federal Ministry. In any case, improvement and mutual harmonisation of sectoral legislation are activities in the remit of the **competent line ministries, primarily the Ministry of Environment and Tourism and Ministry of Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry.**

8. Given the complexness of the considered issues, and also limitations arising from modest institutional and staffing capacities for the management of the National Park Una on the principles of cross-sectoral dialogue, it would be necessary to organise a **consistent set of corresponding education programmes and training sessions**, both for the employees of JP Una National Park and for all other stakeholders. A significant role in the realisation of those educational programmes might be the ones of various **education and scientific institutions, development agencies and employees of other protected areas, both from B&H and from abroad.**

Results obtained in this study might be used for determining of the guidelines defining a consistent policy of management of Una National Park, from the aspect of the cross-sectoral dialogue. Involvement of all stakeholders, and in particular the public, into the process of planning and management of natural resources in Una National Park would result in the enhancement of the transparency and increasing of the degree of satisfaction of all

stakeholders. The results of this study may also serve as the basis for continual monitoring and analysis of the dynamic of the demands of the society in relation to natural resources in order to attain a sustainable natural resources management, in the manner and scope that ensures conservation of natural potentials for meeting the current and future environmental, economic, sociological needs of the population. It is necessary to stress that setting up and development of cross-sectoral dialogue requires political will of key actors, which has to be accompanied by appropriate institutional solutions, harmonisation and improvement of legislation and adoption of physical planning documents related to Una National Park. Cross-sectoral dialogue is a long-term process which, besides time, also requires significant investments of human and material resources. The complexity of the cross-sectoral dialogue is reflected in the fact that the process of the dialogue itself is equally important, maybe even more important, than their ultimate results. Finally, it should be pointed out that there is no universal cross-sectoral dialogue model and that cross-sectoral dialogue in Una National Park should honour the specific features of the concrete area and express the demands of all stakeholders.



## LITERATURE

- Avdibegovic, M. 2002: Forest and Environmental Legislation in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Forstwissenschaftliche Beiträge der Professur Forstpolitik und Forstökonomie der ETH Zürich, Vol. 26.
- Avdibegovic, M., Krilasevic, E., Selmanagic, A. 2006: Collision between Regulations in Forest Laws and Environment Related Legislation in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Legal Aspects of European Forest Sustainable Development. Proceedings of the VIII International Symposium, IUFRO 6.13.00, Department of Forest Law, Faculty of Forestry, Istanbul University.
- Dalmatin, M., Cukteras, M., Adzaip, Z., Arapovic, A. 2010: Zasticena područja i okolisne politike u Bosni i Hercegovini, Centar civilnih inicijativa, Tuzla.
- Federal Ministry of Physical Planning and Environment, 2005: Una National Park Feasibility Study (summary), Elektroprojekt Zagreb.
- Federalno ministarstvo okolisa i turizma, 2006: Plan upravljanja za Nacionalni park Una (nacrt), Bosna-S Sarajevo i Elektroprojekt Zagreb.
- NEAP BiH, Akcioni plan za zastitu okolisa BiH, 2003.
- Sluzbene novine Federacije BiH, broj 20/23: Zakon o sumama Federacije BiH (Official Gazette of the Federation of B&H, No. 20/23: The Forests Act of the Federation of B&H).
- Sluzbene novine Federacije BiH, broj 26/10: Uredba o sumama Federacije BiH (Official Gazette of the Federation of B&H, No. 26/10: The Regulation on Forests of the Federation of B&H).
- Sluzbene novine Federacije BiH, broj 33/03: Zakon o zastiti okolisa Federacije BiH (Official Gazette of the Federation of B&H, No. 33/03: The Environmental Protection Act of FB&H).
- Sluzbene novine Federacije BiH, broj 33/03: Zakon o zastiti prirode Federacije BiH (Official Gazette of the Federation of B&H, No. 33/03: The Nature Protection Act of FB&H).
- Sluzbene novine Federacije BiH, broj 44/08: Zakon o Nacionalnom parku Una (Official Gazette of the Federation of B&H, No. 44/08: The Una National Park Act).
- Sluzbene novine Federacije BiH, broj 70/06: Zakon o vodama (Official Gazette of the Federation of B&H, No. 70/06: The Water Act).
- Sluzbene novine Federacije BiH, broj 71/08: Odluka o osnivanju Javnog preduzeca Nacionalni park Una (Official Gazette of the Federation of B&H, No. 71/08: The Decision on the Establishment of Public Enterprise Una National Park).
- Sluzbene novine Federacije BiH, broj 83/09: Uredba o sumama Federacije BiH (Official Gazette of the Federation of B&H, No. 83/09: The Regulation on Forests of the Federation of B&H).
- Sluzbeni glasnik Unsko-sanskog kantona, broj 1/04 i 11/04: Ustav Unsko-sanskog kantona (Official Journal of the Una-Sana Canton, Nos. 1/04 and 11/04: The Constitution of the Una-Sana Canton).

## Annex I: The questionnaire for identification and qualitative research into the attitudes of the most important stakeholders in Una National Park

University of Sarajevo  
Faculty of Forestry Sarajevo

General information: The objective of the research is the identification of key stakeholders and their involvement in the process the of formation and management of Una National Park. Respondents' responses will be used only for scientific research purposes.

### THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of institution/organisation	
Name and family name of respondent	
Title of respondent (position/duty)	
Date	
Place	
Beginning of interview	
End of interview	
Number of questionnaire	

### INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS

1. Are you familiar with the initiative for the formation of Una NP?
2. How have you been informed about it?
3. Do you know who launched this initiative?
4. Do you know which institution/s had the key role in proclamation of Una NP?
5. Do you know which institution/s run(s) Una National Park?

### FORMATION AND MANAGEMENT OF UNA NP

6. Has your institution/organisation been involved in the formation of Una NP? If yes, how have you contributed to the formation of Una NP?
7. Are you satisfied with the role that your institution/organisation has had in the process of the formation of Una NP?
8. Has your institution/organisation been involved in the process of management of Una NP? If yes, how?
9. Are you satisfied with the role that your institution/organisation has had in the process of management of Una NP?

## STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

10. Please state the most important stakeholders related to Una NP?
11. In your opinion, can you identify the stakeholders who have the greatest power with regard to Una NP?
12. In your opinion, can you identify the stakeholders who have the greatest interest with regard to Una NP?
13. What is particularly the interest of your institution/organisation in respect of Una National Park?

## CROSS-SECTORAL DIALOGUE

14. What do you imply under the term 'cross-sectoral dialogue' in respect of Una NP?
15. Do you support the cross-sectoral dialogue as a principle in the management of Una NP?
16. Has there been sufficient cross-sectoral dialogue in the process of the formation of Una NP?
17. Are you satisfied with the role of your institution in the cross-sectoral dialogue in respect of Una NP?
18. Do you think that the cross-sectoral dialogue benefits only one stakeholder, or all involved stakeholders?
19. What benefits do you expect from the cross-sectoral dialogue and the future cooperation with other stakeholders in respect of Una NP?
20. If you know, please state the minimum prerequisites for setting up of the cross-sectoral dialogue?
21. Do you communicate with other stakeholders? If the response is YES, please state how you communicate with other stakeholders?
22. Can you identify institutions/factors that hinder the functioning of Una NP? If yes, why and how?
23. Can you identify institutions/factors that facilitate the functioning of Una NP? If yes, why and how?
24. What would you improve to enhance the cross-sectoral dialogue?

## SOCIOLOGICAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC BENEFITS

25. Do you expect some economic benefits from the formation of Una NP? If yes, please state which ones?
26. Do you expect some environmental benefits from the formation of Una NP? If yes, please state which ones?
27. Do you expect some sociological benefits from the formation of Una NP? If yes, please state which ones?
28. Which three things would you suggest as the most significant ones for the improvement of the management of Una NP? Please explain?

1.

2.

3.

Additional comments:

Thank you for your time!

Annex II: List of stakeholder groups and date of interviews

STAKEHOLDER GROUPS	INSTITUTION/ORGANISATION	DATE
Public administration (JA)	FMOiT MGPUiZO MPViS KUS ZZKNB	9 September 2011 22 July 2011 22 July 2011 24 August 2011 24 August 2011
Local administration (LA) (Municipalities (O))	OB	20 July 2011
Community boards (MZ)	MB KV O	21 July 2011 21 July 2011 23 August 2011
Religious institutions	MR	21 July 2011
Private entrepreneurs	RK PDKV UC PS SB	21 July 2011 21 July 2011 22 July 2011 21 July 2011 20 July 2011
Public enterprises (JP)	NPU USS	20 July 2011 22 July 2011
Non-governmental organisations (NVO)	USRUB TZ LOB US PC EKUS PK RRA	20 July 2011 21 July 2011 20 July 2011 20 July 2011 20 July 2011 7 September 2011 23 August 2011 10 September 2011