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# Executive Summary

The municipality’s performance report is drafted pursuant to Annex 12, Item 7 of the Regulation No. 02/2011 on the Areas of Administrative Responsibility of the Office of the Prime Minister and Ministries, which describes the responsibilities of the MLGA regarding the supervision of municipal services quality.

The municipal performance management system is a primary mechanism applied to monitor the work of municipalities and assess the improvement trend throughout the years. Additionally, the data from the MPMS facilitates accounting, and gives early warnings with regard to the performance of the municipality and facilitates decision-making.

Local governments are responsible for numerous issues that affect the citizens’ lives in daily basis. That is why the MPMS monitors current performance against certain objectives and contractual liabilities, thus closely integrating the efforts of all organizational levels in the municipality.

During 2018, the MPMS has appraised the performance of 38 municipalities in the Republic of Kosovo in 18 municipal competencies, clustered into 14 fields and 77 indicators. This year, 36 out of 38 municipalities of the Republic of Kosovo have reported. With regard to the assessment of indicators, not all of the indicators in the first and second field have been assessed.

Details have been presented in Chapter II, sub-chapter 2.3.

The overall performance results for 2018 have shown an increased performance of 6.02% at country level when compared to 2017. The general performance of municipalities for 2018 is 60.54%. Out of the 36 municipalities that have reported, 24 of them have shown a high-level performance, namely 66.66%-100%, when expressed in percentage. A uniform performance is also observed in respective categories of the performance system: indicators, results and fields.

Out of 14 fields’ analysed, eight fields have high performance results and extend over the country’s average of 70.17-92.63%, and six fields have attained average results of 38.08% - 63.97% and none of the fields have low performance.

This makes us understand that municipalities are determined not only to improve the municipality’s administration and accountability, but also to ensure quality services to the communities they serve.

# Municipal Performance for 2018 – Introduction

## Introduction

The Municipal Performance Report (MPR) presents the results of the municipal performance, based on the data collected over one year and their review through individual reports submitted by the municipalities. Through this report, the MLGA underlines the importance of providing these services and in particular informs citizens about their reasonable expectations of services provision from local institutions.

It is under the authority of local institutions to set their work priorities for providing services to citizens and engaging relevant resources, in line with the findings and recommendations of this report. The report outlines the general conclusions on the municipal performance levels. Additionally, it provides relevant recommendations for improving performance based on the findings from municipal performance measurement.

## Purpose

Performance measurement is not only about collecting data related to a predetermined performance goal. Performance measurement is about drawing conclusions or recommendations to understand how a general work management system helps identify and prevent unsuccessful work, by helping the municipality to confirm the targeted achievements in delivering quality services based on the request of its citizens.

Performance measurement is an important tool of all quality management programs. Managers and supervisors who lead the efforts of an institution, have the responsibility to know how, where and when to take actions for necessary changes with regard to developing further the institution. These changes cannot be planned or implemented without reliable and relevant information, which would be used as grounds for possible changes to be made as well as for advancing the already well performing services.

MPMS mainly measures the quantitative aspects of service delivery and also MPR reports information on the amount of service delivered. Quantitative measurements are a tool to help us understand how sufficiently are the services provided and to manage in professional manner the improvement of municipal work. Unfortunately, at this stage of MPMS development, the quality of service delivery is measured only by a small number of indicators. MPMS currently is not designed to measure the baseline (standard) quantity and quality of services (how sufficient and how well are they provided by the municipality) instead it only measures the improvement trend of service delivery. Based on this, the performance measurement indicates:

* How well are the municipalities performing?
* Whether the municipalities are achieving their goals or not?
* Whether the management processes are in the right direction?
* What are the necessary improvements to be made?

## Measured Fields

Fields subject to municipal performance measurement through MPMS are as following:

1. Public administration services;
2. Municipal Transparency;
3. Human rights, social and family services;
4. Culture, youth and sports;
5. Disaster Management;
6. Spatial planning;
7. Public spaces;
8. Road infrastructure;
9. Municipal public transport;
10. Public parking;
11. Drinking water;
12. Sewage;
13. Waste management, and
14. Environmental protection.

## Structure and Target Audience

In respect to the essential findings from the municipal performance measurement for 2018, the information has been organized in four main chapters:

Chapter **one** provides background information on performance measurement for 2018 as well as on the fields subject to performance measurement.

Chapter **two** outlines the performance measurement methodology.

Chapter **three** outlines the performance results of 2018.

Chapter **Four** provides a summary of the findings and outlines the key recommendations.

**Annexes** provide more detailed information on performance results.

This document has been primarily drafted for all municipalities of the Republic of Kosovo, citizens and will be available to all other interested stakeholders. At the central level, this document will be of interest to all central institutions developing policies that affect municipalities, as well as for non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that deal with local governance and service delivery. This document can also be useful to international partners, who are considering of joining or aligning their grant schemes with the incentive fund.

# Municipal Performance for 2018 - Methodology

## 2.1 General aspects of performance measurement methodology

“Municipal Performance Management System - Measures to Improve" is the main reference document for conducting the municipal performance evaluation each calendar year. This document provides detailed guidance on the process of evaluating 18 municipal competencies, grouped into 14 fields and 77 performance indicators.

Measurement of municipal performance is carried out in order to monitor the work of municipalities in fields of good governance and service delivery. The evaluation results provide the information needed to facilitate the decision-making process in municipalities, motivate local government bodies to act responsibly and be accountable in the course of their work.

The indicators were evaluated for the reporting period from 01.01.2018 to 31.12.2018. Municipal officials responsible for reporting have submitted the data (which are based on official documents) to MLGA in accordance with the deadlines set out in "Regulation no. 02/2017 on the Municipal Performance Management System ". The data are further verified by DMPT officials at MLGA.

## 2.2 Municipal data reporting, documenting and verification process

Performance Evaluation Data for 2018, documented throughout the year, are collected by municipal officials responsible for reporting in the fields of MPMS, and are reported to Municipal Performance Coordinators (MPCs) no later than January 20 of the following year.

The accuracy of the data is then verified by the performance coordinator and approved by the Mayor. MPCs shall report electronically to MLGA until 15 February of the following year. DMPT officials shall verify the data and, in cases of non-conformity, return them to the municipalities with inquiries for clarifications. Next step is to continue with data processing, drawing results and preparing the final report.

During the process of data processing sent to the DMPT / MLGA for 2018, the DMPT officials have identified various types of errors, but they were corrected in cooperation with the chain involved in this process.

## 2.3 Limitations

2018 was the piloting year of the MPMS Electronic System. For this reason, during December, DMPT/MLGA with support from the DEMOS project have organized trainings for reporting officers and the MPC of the 38 municipalities of the Republic of Kosovo. Despite countless efforts by all stakeholders involved in this process, reporting through the electronic system has not been successful and municipalities have been notified to perform reporting through the previous system (excel). In order to ensure that all municipalities report, the MLGA has extended the reporting deadline for 15 working days. Despite the extension of the reporting deadline, not all municipalities reported data to MPMS for 2018. The municipalities of Zubin Potok and Leposavic failed to report. ***As a result, the average overall performance is calculated in relation to 36 municipalities***.

During 2018 were assessed 75 indicators. Two of the indicators (see below) have not been evaluated.

***Indicator 1.1.3 - Average time to review requests during the year*** was not taken into account in the calculation of overall performance at indicator level, because municipal officials have identified problems in reporting data for this indicator.

***Indicator 2.3.3 -% of the discussion of the Municipal Performance Report by the Municipal Assembly for the previous year***, was not taken into account in the calculation of overall performance at indicator level, because the ***Municipal Performance Report 2017*** was published at the end of May and a number of municipalities did not have the possibility to add it for discussion in its assembly session plan for June.

## 2.4 Municipal performance as a basis for allocation of incentive fund

Municipalities that have passed the overall performance threshold at the level of indicators over 66.66% are eligible for the incentive fund that is allocated by MLGA. The financial amount that the municipalities benefit from this fund depends on the performance achieved on the evaluated indicators.

# Performance of Municipalities for 2018 - Results

## General Characteristics of Municipalities Performance

The Municipal Performance Report brings important and useful information on the level of achievement by municipalities in their work during 2018. The report will, however, outline information reflecting the performance trend of the municipalities during 2017 and 2018.

All municipalities of the Republic of Kosovo have been included in the municipal performance measurement in 2018. Out of the 38 municipalities, in total, 36 municipalities reported their performance data at MLGA. The performance measurement of municipalities with revised MPMS has produced important information on the (general and specific) performance of municipalities for 2018. Information on the overall performance of municipalities is classified into three levels of performance reflection: at the field level, at the outcome level and indicator level. Reflection of information for these three levels is useful for making strategic decisions and designing priority policies for developments in local self-government (LSG).

## 3.2 Overall performance by fields

The fields are the highest level of information reflection, in terms of the municipalities' performance level, but are not the reference point for allocation of incentive fund.

The Municipal Performance Management System (MPMS) measures the municipalities' performance in 18 own-competencies, clustered into 14 relevant fields.

The general analysis indicates that the overall performance of municipalities at country level is 60.54%. This is 6.32% higher than the performance of the municipalities for 2017[[1]](#footnote-1).

The fields with the highest achievement at country level are:

Table 1: Fields with the highest achievement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Field | Average of all municipalities in % for 2018 | Average of all municipalities in% for 2017 |
| Public administration services | 92.63 | 91.68 |
| Waste management | 83.31 | 77.87 |

Out of 14 fields’ analysed, eight fields have high performance outcomes and extend over the country’s average of 70.17-92.63%, and six fields have attained average results of 38.08% - 63.97% and none of the fields have low performance.

It is of utmost importance that almost all basic services fields fall under the group of fields with a high-level performance, such as:

Table 2: MPMS fields by level of performance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Fields with a high level of performance (66,66% - 100%)*** | | |
| Fields | Average at country level in % for 2018 | Average at country level in % for 2017 |
| Public Administration Services | 92,63 | 91,68 |
| Waste management | 83,31 | 77,87 |
| Disaster management | 82,30 | 77,57 |
| Public spaces | 76,82 | 60,66 |
| Drinking water | 76,36 | 72,31 |
| Culture, youth and sport | 75,03 | 65,65 |
| Municipal transparency | 76,23 | 61,65 |
| Public transport | 70,17 | 59,98 |
| ***Fields with a moderate level of performance (33.33% - 66.65%)*** | | |
| Environment protection | 63.97 | 58,49 |
| Sewerage | 55,44 | 46,45 |
| Road infrastructure | 52.35 | 47,54 |
| Spatial Planning | 48,31 | NKD |
| Human rights, social and family services | 45,25 | 36,66 |
| Public parking | 38,08 | 30,47 |

Although the field “Human rights, social and family services” has marked an increase compared to the previous year, the average in this field during 2018 was ***45.25%***. The addressing of this field should be considered a priority by the municipalities’ management in the course of future planning.

It is important to emphasise that during 2018 none of the assessed fields have resulted to be with a low-level of performance.

The only field to mark a decline compared to the previous year is “Spatial Planning”. The officials of DMPT have considered that such decline in performance has come due to the correction and uniform reporting manner by all officials responsible for this area, compared to 2017.

The graph below visually presents the municipalities’ achievements in 14 PMS fields (first graph), and the comparison of performance at field level for two years (second graph).

The comparison of municipality’s performance at field level 2017 and 2018 reflects the level of performance for these two years. This comparison makes us understand that municipalities have made progress in all fields. This shows that municipalities have approached the delivery of municipal service with great dedication.

## Overall performance by results

The results are short-term or long-term achievements that municipalities aim to achieve in each of the 14 fields of MPMS. This means that the performance of municipalities is measured with the level of achievement of results. For each field, it is assigned a corresponding number of results. MPMS in total consists of 27 results. The result indicates that the service is provided in the appropriate amount or relevant quality that is planned and that directly affects the lives of the citizens. The results bring useful information on the municipalities’ performance level. The indicators of each result of MPMS informs about the level of achievements in the relevant fields by the municipalities.

*The results presented help the technical level leaders to have a quick understanding of the needs for relevant actions, with a priority in improving the performance of municipalities.*

The achievement of municipal performance at result level is the same as that of the fields. The level of results achieved for 2018 is captured through internal standards, comparison of achievements with the country's average and comparison between the results and indicators expressed in percentage (%), m2 and kg per capita. The achieved performance for 2016 will be the baseline (reference point) to understand the performance progress or stagnation trend in the future.

The achievement of results is in full compliance with the achievements of relevant fields, but with a wider range for high-performance results. Out of 27 results, 18 results or approximately 66.66% of them are in the level of achievements between 92.63%-66.85%. This indicates a sustainable result.

The average of the highest performance results are as in the table below:

Table 3: Performance in outcome level

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Municipal performance by results - High level from 66.66 % - 100%*** | | | |
| Result [[2]](#footnote-2) | % | Result | % |
| Provision of services according to citizens’ requests | 92.63 | Capacity building for sports activities | 80.00 |
| Provision of citizens’ access to public documents | 87.40 | Sufficient space for a healthy environment | 76.82 |
| Ensuring the participation of citizens in decision-making | 86.65 | Providing equal treatment in human resources management | 76.82 |
| Sustainable provision of waste collection | 86.47 | Ensuring accountability and compliance with legal deadlines | 76.22 |
| Supply of citizens with drinking water according to standards | 86.05 | Planned municipal construction | 74.88 |
| Protection of citizens and their property from disasters | 82.30 | Inclusion of all citizens in the drinking water system | 72.26 |
| Inclusion of all citizens in the waste collection process | 80.15 | Sustainable supply of drinking water | 70.77 |
| Planned municipal construction | 74.88 | Provision of local public transport | 70.17 |
| Inclusion of all citizens in the sewage system | 79.17 | Increasing the number of cultural, youth and sports activities | 70.05 |
|  |  | Paving roads and their maintenance | 66.85 |
| ***Municipal performance by results - Medium level from 33.33 % - 66.65%*** | | | |
| Creating a clean and healthy environment | 63.97 | Provision of social and family services | 37.71 |
| Spaces for parking of motor vehicles | 38.08 | Provision of anticorruption measures in municipal administration | 37.5 |
| Providing security to citizens in the street | 37.85 |  |  |
| ***Municipal performance by results - Low level from 0% - 33.33%*** | | | |
| Wastewater treatment | 31.70 | Ensuring equality and protection against discrimination | 21.21 |
| Sustainable municipal planning | 21.38 |  |  |

The chart below shows the municipalities achievements in 26[[3]](#footnote-3) results.

In contrary to other results, “Waste disposal” is expressed with kilogram per capita. The average performance with regard to this result during 2018 was 202.06 kg. /per capita. Large quantity of waste disposal in kg/per capita indicates the level of inclusion of the settlements in the waste management service.

The average performance by results for all the municipalities for 2018 is 65.58%.

* 18 results had high performance achievement from 66.66% - 100%;
* 5 results had medium achievement, from 33.33% - 66.65%
* 3 results had low achievement, from 0% - 33.32%

Two of the low level performance results: Sustainable municipal planning and Ensuring equality and protection against discrimination, need to be addressed with a high-priority.

## Overall performance by indicators

Performance at indicator level is in full compliance with the performance of results and relevant fields.

Indicator performance lies on three achievement levels: high, medium and low.

### 3.4.1 Performance indicators – high level of achievement

The majority of indicators showed high performance. 44 out of 75 evaluated indicators, or about 58% of them belong to high level achievements.

The level of the 44 indicators values, ranging from 67.31% - 98.57%, indicates there was maximum and sustainable achievement in these indicators.

The chart below shows the achievements of high level achievement indicators.

### 3.4.2 Performance indicators – medium level achievement

17 out of 75 evaluated indicators, or about 23% of them, belong to the medium level achievements. The scope of 17 indicator values in the range of 35.53 – 66.21% shows a medium and sustainable achievement of these indicators.

Municipalities should establish mechanisms for improving these indicators, as a considerable number of them are on the threshold of the medium level.

The chart below presents the medium level indicator achievements.

### 3.4.3 Performance indicators – low level of achievement

11 indicators or about 15% of them belong to low achievement level. The extent of 11 indicator values in the range of 0.52% - 32.56 %, shows a low and unstable achievement of these indicators. The municipalities need to approach the improvement of these indicators more seriously.

## Overall performance by municipalities

Indicators represent the main calculation and information grounds for the Results achievement level. Indicators provide sufficient information to allow municipalities and other stakeholders to measure or evaluate their performance in providing services in the respective fields. MPMS has a total of 77 indicators, which have been measured and are part of this report.

***Indicator 1.1.3 – Average time for case processing during the year***, was not taken into consideration when calculating the overall performance at indicator level, because municipal officers have identified issues in data reporting for these indicators.

***Indicator 2.3.3 - % of the discussion of the Municipal Performance Report by the Municipal Assembly for the previous year***, was not considered during the calculation of overall performance at indicator level, because the ***Municipal performance report 2017*** was published by the end of May and a number of municipalities were unable to add it to the agenda of the Municipal Assembly for discussions purposes before June.

The values of each indicator have been elaborated in the framework of graphical presentation.

### 3.5.1 Overall performance achievements by municipalities

For 2018, Municipalities have achieved an overall performance of 66.04% at indicator level. The ranking of municipalities according to their achievement begins with the municipality of Zveçan (lowest achievement 33.94%) and ends with the municipality of Junik (highest achievement 88.14%). Although the Municipality of Junik is a new municipality, this indicates that the size of the municipality does not matter, but the extent of its commitment to proper economic and administrative development. Out of 36 municipalities, the majority of them 24, showed a medium level of performance and lie on both sides of Kosovo’s average of 66.04%. This indicates a uniform performance, without major differences from one municipality to another. A uniform performance achievement is also observed by the relevant performance system categories: indicators; outcomes and related fields. In 2018, there is an increase of overall performance at country level of 6.02 % higher than in 2017, at indicator level.

Based on the overall classification, high performance has shown: a small municipality (Junik), 6 large municipalities (Gjilan, Prishtina, Ferizaj, Peja, Prizren and Mitrovica) and three medium municipalities (Fushë Kosova, Istogu, Suhareka ). Pristina as the capital is ranked seventeenth. Two northern municipalities of the country (Leposavic and Zubin Potok) did not report the data to the MPMS and as such were not included in the performance report for 2018. The average overall performance at the country level is calculated in relation to 36 municipalities.

# Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the data presented in this report, we conclude that all municipalities have taken the issue of increasing performance very seriously, and with that, improving governance and service delivery for citizens. This is also evidenced with the increase of municipalities’ performance by 6.02% compared to 2017.

The following recommendations apply to all state institutions, municipalities, donors, civil society organizations and stakeholder involved in the field of local self-government:

* Functionalization of the electronic data processing and reporting system for appraising municipal performance.
* In order for the process not to experience stagnation, it is recommended that municipalities assign this task to a long-term official.
* Considering that the system is auditable, data documentation should be of a high level.
* Allocate human and financial resources to increase the performance level of indicators that show poor performance.
* Develop indicators to measure the quality of service delivery in the future.
* Municipalities should establish mechanisms to improve indicators with moderate level of accomplishment, considering the fact that a considerable number of them (17 out of 75 estimated indicators, or approximate 23%) are in the threshold of the moderate level. The 17 indicators extending in the range of 35.53 - 66.21% indicate a moderate and stable achievement for these indicators.
* Municipalities need to take a more serious approach toward the improvement of indicators with a low level of accomplishment, as it is known that 11 indicators or approximately 15% fall under the level of poor accomplishment. The 11 indicators extending in the range of 0.52 - 32.56% indicate a poor and not a very stable accomplishment for these indicators.
* Allocate financial and human resources, sufficient expertise in the fields where municipalities experience stagnation in performance.
* Continue with the successful municipal performance in addressing citizens' requests, reviewing, and delivery of services as required.
* Increase the number of girls and women in decision-making positions in municipalities.
* Increase the number of people with disabilities in municipal institutions.

1. Municipal performance at the field's level during 2017 was 60.54%. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The "Waste Disposal" result is not shown in the table because it is measured per kilogram per capita and is not expressed in percentage. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The "Waste Disposal" result is not shown in the graph because it is measured per kilogram per capita and is not expressed in percentage. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)