



Local Transparency Index (LTI)

Results, conclusions and recommendations - summary

Transparency Serbia conducted in 2015, **first in a row** research, of evaluating and ranking **all cities, municipalities and city municipalities in Serbia**¹ on the basis of transparency criteria, **arranged in over 87 indicators**. Theoretically, awarded index could have been in range from 0 to 100, but in practice it is **between 11 and 74**.

Average score is 40, which is relatively low. Score over 50 have 32 municipalities; just eight of them have over 60, while one is scored over 70. Table with all indicators, scores and ranking is available at [web-site of TS](http://web-site-of-TS) or on interactive map: <http://transparentnost.org.rs/index.php/sr/istraivanja-o-korupciji/LTI>

No.	Best ranking municipalities:	Score	No.	Worst ranking municipalities:	Score
1.	Paraćin	74	141.	Koceljeva	16
2.	Indija	66	142.	Sečanj	15
3.	Bačka Topola	62	142.	Preševo	15
4.	Pančevo	61	144.	Bela Crkva	11
4.	Leskovac	61	144.	Smederevska Palanka	11
6.	Senta	60			
6.	Srbobran	60			
6.	Vranje	60			

¹ Municipalities from AP Kosovo & Metohija are not included in the research, as well as two municipalities that are last to be established - Vranjska Banja and Sevojno. Cities and municipalities, 145 of them, are ranked alongside, while 23 "city municipalities" are evaluated but not ranked, having in mind the fact that they do not dispose with the same authorities as "regular" municipalities, and that in practice various indicators cannot be implemented to certain "city municipalities".



It is important to mention that **indicators do not measure just complying to legal obligations** of municipalities, but **good practice as well**. Good practice indicators are set on the basis of comparative experiences. It is what Transparency – Serbia consider realistic to achieve and what may provide citizens reasonable level of transparency of their local governments' work.

Research, unfortunately, showed that large number cities and municipalities **didn't respect** even those obligations that are **already set in the law** (especially when there are no penalties). Just small number of **municipalities demonstrated additional level of transparency** in monitored categories, by publishing information beyond the legal minimum.

Oftentimes, we have encountered, through answers of cities and municipalities to our requests, explanations that some mechanisms are not being implemented or information published since *it is not their legal obligation*. On the other hand, it should be emphasized, that **fifteen municipalities during this project expressed their readiness to accept recommendations, guidelines and suggestions of TS, which some of them did straightaway**. Additional twenty cities and municipalities expressed their interest for participation in round tables organized by TS in previous two months.

Aside from **several positive examples**, general characteristics of municipal web-sites (more than half of indicators refers to these data) is that the amount of information on budget is insufficient, decisions of municipalities are hard to find and that not much of the information on appointing of directors of public enterprises and institutions is available. Especially disturbing is the fact that **Information Booklets are not updated**. These documents often **do not contain even basic information** regulated by the Law on Free Access to Information of Public Importance. That way, for example, amount of local officials' salaries is available in **less than half municipalities**. **More than third** municipalities published Information Booklets that are **not updated for more than six months**, although there is obligation to do so once a month.

Draft documents debated by the local assemblies are available **before adoption**, on web-pages of **less than 20 cities and municipalities**, and agenda of the next parliamentary sitting on web-pages of less than one quarter of municipalities. Adopted decisions are available at web-pages of 2/3 of municipalities. More than 30 municipalities **don't have their budgets published on web-pages**, and updated **data on budget execution have just over 10% of cities and municipalities**. Just ten municipalities have clearly posted **procedures and deadlines** for proceeding by cases in the premises of administration or in service centres.



Extract from recommendations that TS sent to cities and municipalities:

- Organizing of **special web-page on web-site, dedicated to activities of the assembly** (as well as activities of president/mayor and executive) with all relevant information - announcements for the next week with the agenda and materials (including minutes from the previous sitting), report from the sitting, with adopted decisions or links to Official Gazette where decision was published;
- Organizing of **special web-page „Budget“**, where, besides decision on budget and rebalances, **all other information and budget related documents will be presented**, including regular drafting of **citizens' guides through budget and publishing of monthly reports on budget implementation**; These data, including incomes and expenditures should be presented in “six figures” of economic classification; Data on effects of program budget should be also published
- Organizing of **public debates on budget**, with participation of civil representatives and experts, and not just budget beneficiaries. Debate on the budget is possible to organize in the early planning phase, when citizens can state their opinion on investment part of the budget through pools;
- Publishing of the **reports on public debate** (on the budget and on other acts that are being considered) - what observations and recommendations were stated and whether they were adopted or denied (and with what explanation);
- Special web-page dedicated to **public procurements that** publishes all information (tender documentation, changes, questions and answers, decisions on awarding), grouped by procurements, with available information on already implemented procurements from previous period;
- **Information on public tenders/call for proposals/grants** that are grouped alongside with the **tender results** (on the page public tenders); publishing of the reports on NGO/media project implementation financed by the municipality;
- **Information** on procedures and deadlines for proceedings that are **clearly posted in service centres**, or in the premises of the administration where there are no service centres; - Municipalities who record (video or audio) sittings of their assemblies, to **upload these recordings on their web-sites** (as part of the web-page dedicated to the activities of the assembly) and make it available to public;
- If the municipalities have technical and financial capabilities to establish mechanisms so that citizens could track **the status of their case** and to receive information on proceedings by complaints. If there are no technical and financial possibilities, TS recommends publishing of contact that citizens can use to obtain mentioned data;



- Municipalities should introduce regular practice of **citizens' pools** about their satisfaction with the work of municipality services. If they are unable to organize active public opinion researches, TS recommends determining of clear procedures for considering complaints from books/boxes dedicated to complaints and reporting on undertaken activities by stated complaints;
- Municipalities should organize their **Information Booklets** in compliance with the **Guidelines** for Creating and Publishing of Information Booklets, regulated by the Commissioner for Information of Public Importance and to update them in compliance with the Guidelines (at least once a month). Also, to publish, in compliance with the Guidelines, data on the **amount of officials' salaries**, data **on services provided by the municipality and deadlines for their providing**;
- Establishing of **special page dedicated to public enterprises**, public utility enterprises and public institutions. As part of this web-page, we recommend establishing of segment dedicated to work of the **Commission for Appointing of the Directors** of PE. TS recommends publishing of all documents related to appointing of the directors by the Commission. This especially refers to **minutes from the sittings** that would show how the candidates were scored, plans that were submitted and other documents on the basis of which scores and ranking were made. TS recommends publishing of plans of work on web-page dedicated to PE (or links), systematizations and data on number of employees (or links to these data on web-sites of PE);
- Municipalities should create **annual plans**, whether as a single document, or as part of the report for previous year;
- Publishing of **data on real estates** (business premises, apartments and other objects, construction land, agricultural land) that are in possession of municipalities, **with data on beneficiaries and amounts of rents** paid by beneficiaries, whether through application of the Property Directorate of the RS, or through special base of the municipality