**Fight against corruption – contribution of TransparencySerbia to the annual report of PrEUgovor (prEUnup)**

In overall, there were some improvements in the fight against corruption since September 2015, but these improvements are very far from what was planned by strategic acts and official program of the Government of Serbia. On the other hand, negative trends from the previous period continued, in particular when it comes to relation of the Government and the Parliament towards independent state organs, lack of implementation of national anti-corruption regulations with engagements that are related to inter-state agreements and lack of political will as a major factor that prevents reforms and implementation of existing legislation

Even if the **fight against corruption**was proclaimed in April 2014 as one of **Government’s priorities**, the little is done. The very program of the Government did not recognize all major problems and necessary measures to fight corruption. [[1]](#footnote-2).Greater problem is, however, the fact that plan was only partly implemented. While some of one-shot actions are done, although with delay, there is no systemic and sustainable change of attitude where needed (such as promises to organize public debates in the process of drafting regulations).

In regards to **legislative work**, major problems are failure to discuss potential corruption risks and anti-corruption effects of legislation, due to violation of public debate rules and absence of duty to analyse thoroughly such risks and insufficient consistency of legislative and planning system. The situation slightly changed since the Anti-corruption Agency commented such risks on its own initiative, thus triggering at least parliamentary and public debate before the adoption of problematic provisions.A**great deal of plans**, mostly in the Action Plan for implementation of Anticorruption Strategy (2013-2018), **remained unfulfilled**[[2]](#footnote-3).Therefore, although deadlines from the Action Plan expired, there is still no improvement of the Anticorruption Agency Law. The drafting has begunin March 2015, there was some progress in the working group after initial conflicts and obstructions, that are partly related to the Ministry of Justice/Anti-corruption Agency relations,but there are still disputes about some legal concepts. There was not even attempt to amend the Law on Financing of Political Activities as envisaged in the Action plan The Law on Lobbying, that was supposed to be adopted as well,not even a draft was published. Criminal Code was not amended, nor various laws regulating legislative procedure and work of Government and the Parliament, Law on free access to information and several law in the public finances area.

Coordination body of the Governement, established with the purpose to enhance fulfilment of duties meets rarely There is no information available about effects of that coordination. The meeting of January 25th 2016 even brought additional concern, as the vice-chair of the body, Minister of Justice[[3]](#footnote-4), claimed that Coordination body guides its work with AP for chapter 23 of negotiation, the document that exists as draft only (on the other hand, there is anti-corruption strategy adopted by the parliament and action plan adopted by the government of Serbia).

On the other hand, there were several adopted laws, that may have either positive or negative impact to the fight against corruption. The new General administrative procedure act, adopted in February 2016[[4]](#footnote-5), improved conflict of interest resolution rules and simplified communication between the public authorities and citizens, thus decreasing corruption risks[[5]](#footnote-6). The Law on civil servants in autonomous provinces and local self-governments[[6]](#footnote-7) introduced conflict of interest prevention, gift and additional employement reporting rules for this part of the public sector as well and recognized recommandations of the anti-corruption Agency, as a ground to resolve civil servants on post.

Parliament also passed systemic Law on salary system in the public sector and changes in the Law on judges, Law on public prosecutors, Law on High judicial council and Law on State prosecutorial council.Last two intoduced the presumption of transparency of HJC and SPC decision, i.e. duty to elaborate their decisions to publish annual report and to hold public sessionsl. Even if this is an improvement in comparison to the previous wording of laws, there is still no guarantee for transparency since HJC and SPC may envisate in their rulebooks unlimited number of exceptions[[7]](#footnote-8).

One of most problematic are for the potential corruption is urban planning and building. While there are some expected improvments in this area, through more easy way to obtain licence permits and other documents, there is also the Law on legalization of objects that raised suspicions of constitutionality[[8]](#footnote-9), preferable treatment of citizens and firms that violated the law in the past and huge economic interests that potentially influenced some legal provisions[[9]](#footnote-10).

The Law on public private partnership and concessions was amended. Flows in that law, that Anti-corruption Agency pointed out[[10]](#footnote-11) in July 2014 are not removed (this input is partly based on TS research on PPPs in Serbia)[[11]](#footnote-12). While some of the changes are useful, there are still problems such are insufficient oversight of PPPs, unclear status of Commission for PPPs, discretionary powers of public patners, lack of deadlines etc.

The new Law on Police, in force since February 2016, broght some important improvements, such are mandatory internal call for high posititions in police departments, greater powers of internal control sector (oversight of civil servants in the Ministry), declaration of assets and integrity tests for police officers.

However, political influence of the minister is still possible, in appointment of officials in the operative work, in the delegation of internal control jobs. Furthermore, there are three control units within the police. New anti-corruption provisions are not sufficiently developed, and too much is left to be regulated through the by-laws[[12]](#footnote-13).

Law on investments raised many comments and reactions. The Ministry of Economy didn’t want to open public debate about final version of the draft, and public only indirectly found out (from Anti-corruption Agency comments) for intention to severly limit right ot access information about contracts with investors. This was particularly problematic, since such contracts are frequently hidden and proof to be questionable from the public interest perspective. After public reactions of Commissioner of infomration, ACA, Transparency Serbia and others, the most problematic provision was removed in the parliamentary procedure, but many other, that were „bellow the radar“ of limited public oversight remained, thus leaving the room for discretionary decision making process, corruption[[13]](#footnote-14). Government of Serbia and ministar of economy are free to regulate throgh by-laws what investment may be of „special importance“ and in which way direct investments will be attracted.

„**Professionalization of managing public enterprises**“, one of major government goals, although is obligatory by the law for three years already, still hasn’t been implemented. Legal mechanism for election of directors and members of supervisory committees of public enterprises has flaws. But even such mechanism is not being implemented. Merely in several republic enterprises competitions for election of directors are finalized, in other enterprises for almost three years nobody decided on applications, while in some there were no competitions announced at all (in cases where high party officials are holding seats).. Government continued to keep most of directors in „acting“ position. Instead of implementation of existing accountability mechanisms the quality of directors’ work is discussed in arbitrery manner or through irrelevant arguments, by politicans and media. The most of public sector reforms did not tackled public enterprises. In the absence of full implementation, due to lack of political will[[14]](#footnote-15), the Law was changed. Ministry of economy failed to organize mandatory public debate in that regards, but there were some consultations, in particular with international financial institutions. The new Law rectified some weaknesses, e.g by making mandatory the best candidate to be selected after public competition and not any of three. However, the law kept transitory provisions that would enable party control over public enterprise to continue and prevent their full proffesionalization, in unlimited period of time[[15]](#footnote-16).

Public sector and political advertisement rules in Serbia are neither consistent nor sufficient. As a consequence, public resources are wasted and political influence in media achieved through discretionary financijng or discrimination of media. These problems were identified in the 2011 Media strategy and Anti-corruption Council report, they became part of political priorites in 2012, but without solution. Government failed to fully resolve that problem in the media legislation reform (2012/2014) and in the Law on public procurement. Similarly, new Law on advertisement focused on the commercial advertising only, thus leaving these problems still open[[16]](#footnote-17).

Implementation of the Law on whistleblower protection begun in June 2015, but there is no evidence that number of reported corruption cases increased significantly. Lawstill has numerous loopholes identified during public debate[[17]](#footnote-18).Implementationof the new **media regulations**, introduced some beneficial effects. Some problems, identified during adoption process[[18]](#footnote-19) were demonstrated in practice, in unclear competition provisions for financing of public interest programs, but also there were examples of direct violation of the law in distribution of public funds[[19]](#footnote-20). .Measures for transparency of media ownership didn't bring any essential progress,therefore, there are still no reliable information on the ownership of leading printed media, while privatization of local electronic media and later allocation of budget funds to them initiated new suspicions to hidden political influences.

While laws envisaged by strategic acts were not prepared, top government officials several times announced that soon, Serbia will have “Law on investigation of property origin”. Adoption of that document is not defined in any of Serbian strategic acts. The debate about that act was never opened in the public.[[20]](#footnote-21) In April 2016, minister of justice again announced that the law is “almost finished”.

Action Plan for Chapter 23 of negotiations with EUis ”accepted by the European Commission” and, according to the news, all member states except Croatia accepted to open negotiations[[21]](#footnote-22). Preparation process was consultative, but great number of argumented remarks was not accepted. Due to thatsome important matters were not included at all (such are corruption risks in inter-state agreements, certain measures and activities were not sufficientlyelaborated (such as failure of Government to provide and ensure access to information), and there are problems with deadlines (too long, different from those in Anticorruption Action plan, already expired in 2015) and planned assets as well. However, the biggest potential problem lies in insufficiently ambitious or insufficiently elaborated indicatorsof success. There is a real danger of not taking advantage of the association process to create sustainable anti-corruption system in Serbia, but also of using success indicators for political conditioning instead of being based on accomplishing of clearly established objectives. Another concern related to the EU integration and cooperation with other international institutions is the fact that ministries are reluctant to make any changes in draft legislation after having “positive opinion” from European Commission, IMF, Council of Europe etc. Even more, proposals of Serbian stakeholders are sometimes opposed on the basis of **alleged** compliance with EU rules, and not real directives, Such was the case of alleged compliance with EU rules in the case where minister of economy denied access to information even after mandatory decision of Commissioner for information and opinion of Ombudsman[[22]](#footnote-23).

Unfortunately, in preparation of mostof draft laws, Prime minister’s promise stated in his expose was not accomplished: „we will allow the business, civil society and other interested parties to participate in all phases of legal acts, from concept laws, drafts and to preparation of by-law acts“. Rules on **public debates were not improved**, in such manner to envisage mandatory discussion on concept laws and by-law acts. Number of draft laws, strategies and by-laws that are subjected to public debates is however larger than in previous years[[23]](#footnote-24), but the obligatory debates were not organized in many instances, including laws important to fight corruption[[24]](#footnote-25).Not even organizing of public debate is a guarantee that the problems will be recognized. In the case of the Law on Investments, only after the public debateprovision that undermines legal system unity in the area of access to information was inserted into the Draft, and was not removed even after warnings of Anti-corruption Agency, Commissioner for Information and others, all the way before draft reached the Assembly[[25]](#footnote-26).

In April 2014 Prime minister announced establishing of „**striking teams** for prosecution of organized crime and corruption“, whose legal nature was not explained. In May 2015, Draft Strategy of financial investigations that mentions „striking groups“ for investigating larger corruption cases was presented[[26]](#footnote-27).Legal basis for establishing of such bodies will be announced changes of the Law on Organization and Jurisdiction of State Organs in Curbing of Organized Crime and Corruption from September 2015. Although draft of this act has some loopholes, it could be expected that its adoption will bring positive effects, through financial investigations and greater specialization of prosecution and other organs[[27]](#footnote-28).However, there is no information available about the outcome of that public debate – the changes were not even proposed to the Parliament. There are still no comprehensive data on what was determined related to the 24 2002-2012 reports of Government’s anti-corruption Council. Similarly, there is no information on the basis of which one may conclude that the Government begun to systemically discuss Council’s reports published after 2012.

In Prime minister’s expose (e. g. unlike 2012 and Anti-corruption Strategy from 2013), **relation between Government and decisions and recommendations of independent state organs was not even mentioned**. In past twelve months, the situation worsened. While adoption of parliamentary conclusions on annual reports of independent organs in 2014 hasn’t brought any changes in practice[[28]](#footnote-29).Government ignored obligation to report National Assembly in six months deadline on undertaken measures, and National Assembly hasn’t initiated matter of Government’s accountability for it. In the 2015, parliamentary committees adopted “weaker” conclusions, and Parliament as a whole didn’t even discuss it. Parliament failed to elect two missing members of Anti-corruption Agency’s Board (proposed by non-political bodies), thus effectively exposing Agency to the higher political influence and at least obstructing its work. Similarly, the majority of parliamentarians even violated the rules in order to prevent election of independent candidate in the Regulatory body for electronic media[[29]](#footnote-30).

Prime minister’s expose contained plans for rationalization of public sector, finalization of reconstruction of enterprises, decrease of budget deficit and grey economy, introducing of e-government and decreasing deadlines for issuing of permits. While there was some progress in these areas, that may be relevant for fight against corruption as well, there were no visible changes in regards to „decreased number of employees in public sector… especially of those that are appointed with the help and influence of political parties“ and implementation of functional analysis that should precede it.

Expectations that the status of **civil servants on posts**will be finally organized in accordance with the Law of civil servants did not fulfil. Government continued toappointed “acting servants” to positions in many instances and did not yet awarded posts on the basis of competitive recruitment.

There was no substantial and systemic progress in the area of transparency of public authorities, while there are small improvements, usually coming with new legislation (i.e publishing of certain information on web-pages is almost the rule in every new law). In March 2016, the Government seemingly changed its practice of ignoring the Law on free access to information and responded almost at once to the dozens of requests for information to Transparency Serbia and other requestors, following their lawsuits and decisions of the Administrative court.[[30]](#footnote-31) However, there is no in place practice to publish imoprtant documents, such as international agreements related to the dealing with huge public resources, neither proactively, nor to request. So, some important annexes of Air Serbia contract, Belgrade Waterfront[[31]](#footnote-32) arrangement and Smederevo Stilmil management are not available. The latest example is most striking one, since the access was denied to the control state body as well[[32]](#footnote-33) - Commissioner for information of public importance[[33]](#footnote-34).

There were no changes in**Law on Public Procurements,** after those suddenly made in summer of 2015[[34]](#footnote-35).Results of implementation of existing anticorruption provisions from this Law are very limited, due to weakness of certain provisions, and even more due to limited supervisory capacities, primarily of the Public Procurement Office. Besides, not even the Strategy for Promotion of Public Procurement System and short term action plan identifies all important problems in this area[[35]](#footnote-36).

Large loopholes are evident in implementation of rules on **awarding state aid[[36]](#footnote-37)**, in regards to scope of existing regulations, control mechanisms, and consistency in implementation of existing regulations. While the “state aid control” is the formal one in most of instances, there are the cases where it come obvious that there was no control at all. Such was the case with the contract that awarded state aid to the company Mei Ta, where the subsidy contract refers to the State aid commission decision, issued three months later[[37]](#footnote-38).

In the area of **repression, government** tried to demonstrate willingness to fight corruption through arresting actions mostly, like in the previous years. The new thing is however the concept of arresting huge number of individuals, within the one police action and in the one day, without any visible link between arrested people and criminal offences they are suspected for. The idea behind such actions is promotional one. First such case happened just before the new 2016. [[38]](#footnote-39) Some of alleged abuses in these case were even 10 years old. Arresting announcements again appeared in tabloid newspapers. It was minister who appeared on the press conference to speak about this action of the police. An official from the police criminal directorate later that date stated „that there were complicated investigations with time needed to collect evidence neccesary for further prosecutors’ acting“ and that „the timing of arresting is decided in order to send, on the basis of EU Comission and Governmnet of Serbia recommandations, a preventive massage to the directors of public enterprises and local goverments, and to the representatives of private enterprises working with public bodies to comply with the law and that everything will be fine.“That might be a signal of misinterpreted EC remark about lack of track record in cases of high level corruption.

Second case of „mass arresting“ occured in March 2016, during the election campaign[[39]](#footnote-40). Again, it was minister who reported the results of action (now even in „technical mandate“). Similarly, alleged corruption cases were not interrelated. It is notable that in those recent cases alleged abuses of the office and other criminal offences were not accompanied by bribery of officials. This might be related to the lack of evidence. However, there is no political will in place to introduce in the Criminal code „illicit enrichment“ from UNCAC, althouth there was such an idea in the anti-corruption strategy, and the deadline for changes expired in December 2014. On the other hand, draft action plan for the chapter 23 envisages only analyses and consideration of various options, that should be done in the first half of 2016.

While there were occasional announcements of individual ministers about reporting of corruption, there was no campaign that would encourage citizens to do so. The Law on whistleblowing brought little change in that regards. Public prosecutors, who are in charge for criminal investigations of corruption and other crime did even less, showing insufficient interest for the publically available information that indicates corruption.

In this period **there were no final convictions** in high level corruption cases, nor visible final decisions for punishing of the Anticorruption Agency Law or the Law on Financing of Political Activities violation. Some criminal procedures that were previously initiated are still in progress.In some instances, cases with no eleements of corruption are presented in the public (in the political context mostly) as a symbol of corruption surpression[[40]](#footnote-41). Agency initiated several procedures for violation of rules on conflict of interest against current ministers.State Audit Institution conducted its first audits of political subjects (3 most powerful political parties). New election process begun in the spring of 2016, with no clear outcome of investigations of alleged abuses and vote buying that happened on 2012 elections.

There were significant changes in the law enforcement bodies, all of them controversial. In December 2015, government resolved director of the police, who was also in charge for criminal police department. The decision was made as a retirement, but it was not clear when it became mandatory for director Veljovic to be retired. Furthermore, it was unclear why the same government appointed the person that has to be retired in a 2,5 years to the 5 years term in 2013[[41]](#footnote-42). The selection process of new organized crime prosecutor was also at least controversial. The winning candidate, former attorney in law, Mladen Nenadic, was significantly higher scored in the testing for more demanding office and is allegedly close to the rulling party.[[42]](#footnote-43) State prosecutorial council left too much space for further government intervention in the process of proposing of candidates for public prosecutor officies and they were in final elected from the list by the parliament (SPC could have decrease the level of such political influence by providing list with the scores). In the organized crime department of Belgrade higher court there were significant changes as well – one of most experienced judges, Vladimir Vucinic, resigned from the post, after suffering pressure of the court president and not being protected by the High judicial council.[[43]](#footnote-44)

Generally speaking, trends from previous years in regards to repressive anticorruption activities continued – small increase in number of discovered and initiated cases. There is no practice of publishing these data regularly, and registers of various organs still remain incomparable and not sufficiently informative.
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