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# Introduction

The Municipal Performance Report for 2020 presents results of work of municipalities in 19 fields of competence that are under the responsibility of municipalities, through 102 indicators out of the total of 119 indicators of the Municipal Performance Management System.

For 2020, the report summarizes 17 indicators less than for 2019, due to pandemic circumstances. The reduction of indicators was done in coordination with municipal officials, with whom, before the measurement process, a general assessment of measurement parameters was conducted, identifying the indicators affected by the pandemic and suspending 17 of them.

For the first time, data reporting and evaluation was performed through the Electronic Municipal Performance Management System. Access to this system was granted to all municipal reporting officials, performance coordinators, mayors and evaluation officials of the Ministry. In addition to reporting, the system provided the option of attaching reference documents to the reported data, as well as a communication process between the municipalities and the Ministry, leaving traces at each stage of data evaluation.

This report aims to reflect two main aspects of the work of municipalities:

1) The way of governing municipalities based on the legislation in force, and

2) Provision of service in quantitative and qualitative terms, when possible.

The data provided are used to see the development trends of municipalities from year to year, so that the following priorities are extended in support of less organized sectors. In addition, the results of the report are used as a self-monitoring tool for the work of the municipal administration, in order to increase capacity and reflect on the responsiveness of public officials. Furthermore, the report informs citizens about the reasonable expectations of provision of services by institutions and their local elected officials.

The report draws general conclusions on the level of achievements of municipalities and provides relevant recommendations for improving services based on applicable legal rules or required governing standards.

Unlike the previous year, 38 municipalities of the Republic of Kosovo have reported for 2020[[1]](#footnote-1).

# Legal basis for the performance report

MPMS is regulated by the Regulation of the Ministry of Local Government Administration No. 01/2020 on Municipal Performance Management System and Municipal Performance Grant Scheme.

The system is built on eight basic principles:

* The principle of legality;
* The principle of transparency;
* The principle of subsidiarity;
* The principle of merit;
* The principle of efficiency and effectiveness;
* The principle of validity;
* The principle of equality; and
* The principle of feasibility.

The regulation defines the right of the supervisory authority to request information which serve to measure and evaluate the performance of municipalities. The regulation defines the organizational structures of municipalities responsible to report to the MPMS.

# Purpose

Performance measurement is intended to carry out a systematic monitoring of events and activities of municipalities within the framework of certain indicators. The purpose of this measurement is to highlight the fields where utilities need support and advancement, as well as the fields where short, medium and long-term interventions should be oriented.

The data obtained help municipalities improve their planning and guide their priorities in the sectors needed for the coming years.

In fact, performance measurement aims to answer the following questions:

* How well have the municipalities performed?
* Whether the municipalities are achieving their goals?
* Whether the management processes are in accordance with the law?
* What should be the necessary actions to be taken in the future?

The system also serves the central authorities to plan and guide policies in sectors in need, according to realistic estimates, clear criteria, so that the distribution of investments is done fairly and objectively. In this regard, the purpose of the measurement also serves the needs of the Municipal Performance Grant, as the set of indicators of this grant is served with the data of the municipal performance report.

Therefore, both these processes, performance measurement and performance grant allocation, are aimed at improving the performance of the municipal administration in general, increasing the level of responsibility and accountability, as well as reflecting on better governance and quality services for citizens.

# Methodology

The Municipal Performance Management System (MPMS) is built by the MLGA in cooperation with international partners. MLGA has defined and standardized the methodology for preparation, collection, processing, verification and reporting of data to the MPMS.

Guidelines for data collection and reporting were provided through: training for municipal performance coordinators and reporting officers. In step with this, written instructions have been prepared by explaining in detail the entire scenario of the functioning of the MPMS.

**The performance measurement process was carried out through the following stages:**

1. **Functionalization of the electronic system for performance data management and holding trainings for all municipal officials;**
2. Identification of performance indicators affected by COVID-19;
3. **Opening of the call for reporting in municipalities;**
4. **Receipt of data reported by the municipality;**
5. **Initial data review and preliminary verification;**
6. **Submission of requests for additional documentation to municipalities;**
7. **Re-verification after municipalities send additional evidence;**
8. **Verification of data with direct participation in the field;**
9. **Issuance and communication of performance results in municipalities;**
10. **Closure of the grievance period;**
11. **Finalization of the report;**

Reporting and documenting data for MPMS was done in the Electronic System of MPMS by municipalities, following instructions/training organized by MLGA and DEMOS. The process of collecting, documenting and reporting data within various municipal institutions was coordinated by municipal performance coordinator. The reported data was authorized by mayors.

Prior to the finalization of the report by the MLGA, the processed data was sent to each municipality as an opportunity to correct and provide remarks/complaints.

**Data verification -** data quality assurance and verification was done through several methods:

* Documentation through monitoring of official websites;
* Review of official documents attached to the forms completed in the electronic system;
* Review of additional documents required for certain data in the re-verification process;
* Clarifications provided by the coordinators in the Electronic Performance System;
* Comparison of data with other official documents of public institutions;
* Comparison with other official reports of MLGA;
* For certain data, the responsible officials in the municipalities have been contacted directly.
* Field verification.

Field verification was done through a special commission established, by applying a special sample for this purpose. Field verification was done in accordance with the Methodology for ensuring the quality of MPMS data.

In this context, 15 municipalities with the highest performance and a number of indicators were selected, which were verifiable through this method. The coordinators have been informed about this process in advance, but by maintaining confidentiality for the indicators planned for monitoring.

Some of the data reported by Serb-majority municipalities, especially in the field of education and health, which did not correspond to provision of services under the positive legislation of the Republic of Kosovo, were declared null and a value of 0% of performance was applied.

The accuracy of the data presented in this report for which there was no field verification but whose objectivity was based on official documentation is the responsibility of the municipality.

## 

## Chapter I

## I. Performance of municipalities 2020 – General Part

# 1. Overview of municipal performance measurement

Local self-government in Kosovo marks more than two decades of its development in legal, organizational and functional terms. The first period begins in 2000 with the establishment of temporary self-governing institutions, to be consolidated in the long term in the second period after the declaration of independence, on the occasion of the entry into force of the Constitution and relevant legislation approved by the Assembly of the Republic of Kosovo. During these two periods, numerous changes have been made both in terms of the organization of local government, as well as in terms of functions and constitutional and legal authorizations of local self-government units. Basic and sectorial legislation has regulated the source competencies of municipalities with a wide range of authorizations for the provision of services to citizens. Law No. 03/L-040 on Local Self-Government has specifically defined the competencies of municipalities in many fields of local government, including: public services, local infrastructure, maintenance of roads and public spaces, public lighting, local economic development, urban and rural planning, land use and construction, drinking water supply, sewerage network, environmental protection, waste management, provision of pre-university education, primary healthcare, social welfare services, cultural activities, and many other issues expressly defined by law.

The large number of competencies has led municipalities to gradually organize and improve their management capacities for better, faster and more cost-effective services. Improving coordination, planning, implementation and accountability elements is a clear indication that local institutions are undergoing good governance reforms. Among the many aspects of improving governance to be emphasized is the reorganization of municipal administrative services and their concentration in one place through Citizens' Service Centres, reducing the cost of services through digitalization of the administration, improving human resource capacities, increasing level of own source revenues, investments in infrastructure, building a culture of communication with citizens and especially in the process of budget discussions, coordination and cooperation with civil society, increasing financial transparency and other important segments of public management.

Citizens' contact with the local administration is expressed on a daily basis. The data on the submitted requests show a large number of services provided by municipalities to citizens. The large volume of these requests made the administrative activity of the responsible bodies to be extremely dynamic, while the possibility of their implementation to bear its own financial weight. The complexity of the services provided by the municipalities and the expectations of the citizens for access to rights necessarily require the coordination of organizational planning systems, so that the efficiency of the services is as high as possible. Maintaining a coherent approach with all stakeholders in the early stages of policy drafting is a prerequisite for their compliance with legal standards and the effectiveness of governance. Through the active involvement of citizens in policy-making, municipalities will provide an appropriate, transparent and accountable environment, as well as avoid the practice of developing strategic documents without clear information and at unaffordable costs.

The Municipal Performance Management System (MPMS) is designed in such a way as to assess the level of achievements of municipalities, to see their strengths and weaknesses, so that from the information obtained, to pave the way for the development of clear and achievable objectives as well as balanced investments. From this point of view, since 2009, the MPMS has been expanded in terms of the number and types of services for which municipalities are competent under the law. Currently, the measurement extends to 19 fields of municipal competencies, with a total of 119 indicators and 340 data for each municipality. Elements of performance measurement express the set of rights and obligations that municipalities exercise in the service of citizens on the basis of legal competencies[[2]](#footnote-2). The indicators used provide considerable information on the level of services provided. The data obtained from this system provide clear indications to the municipal management and stakeholders about the interventions, the extension of priorities and the achievement of the intended objectives.

In 2020, the process of measuring municipal performance has been digitized, with the implementation of the Electronic Performance Management System, which is accessible to all reporting officials of municipalities and the ministry. The digitalization of this process gave concrete results in improving the quality of reporting, easier data tracking, better documentation and access for any stakeholder to be informed in real time about the level of services provided by municipalities.

# 2. Trends of performance of municipalities over the years

Measuring the performance of municipalities results in data that reflect the degree of compliance with service standards by municipalities. Over the years, the elements of performance measurement have changed as the number of indicators has been increasing. The purpose of expanding the fields and indicators was to measure as many possible services which are provided by local institutions. This increase is also due to the fact that municipalities have strengthened their capacity to use the performance system, increasing the quality of reported data. Overall analysis shows that some indicators have already reached a good standard of operation, which are a proof of the level of regularity within the target result. On the other hand, there are certain parameters for which municipalities are still at a low level of development, for which measurement indicators should be present in the long term.

In general, the data show that the level of provision of services and implementation of governance functions extends to the average level reflected from year to year. If we analyse the data of 2017 we will see a percentage at the level of 60.54% in 14 fields of evaluated performance. In the same fields, during 2018 there was an increase of 5.5%, or 66% in an overall level. However, in 2019, in 14 fields of measurement,[[3]](#footnote-3) municipalities showed a decrease of 1.76% of performance, 58.78% in an overall level. This is due to the change of some elements of performance measurement, the addition of indicators within the fields, as well as the increase of the quality of data documentation.

The most accurate comparisons can be made between the years 2019-2020, given that for these two years measurements have been made for 19 fields of competence. However, the state of the pandemic made the circumstances not the same, which affected municipalities' work intensity. For this reason, the measurement objectives for 2020 narrowed to 17 indicators less, as a result of Government measures for protection from the pandemic. This led to the application of 102 measurement indicators this year.

Even performance by fields of competence turns out to be almost the same in 2020 compared to 2019. While in 2019 performance by fields was expressed at 58.78%, in 2020 it results in 57.06%, or 1.72% lower. Unlike 2019 where 36 municipalities had reported, in 2020 all municipalities[[4]](#footnote-4) responded to reporting, but with a smaller number of indicators used due to the pandemic. The following is a graph comparing performance over the years:

**Fig.1.** *Performance of municipalities by years 2017-2020*
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From the above figure, we note that in contrast to 2017, where the percentage in 14 fields of municipal competencies was 60.5%, in 2018 municipalities marked progress of 5.5%, or 66% in total. The expansion of measurement fields made the overall average lower in 2019 by 7.22%, while by 1.72 % lower in 2020 compared to 2019.

# Results during 2020

In terms of data for 2020, the overall performance of municipalities in 19 fields with 102 measurement indicators is 57.06%, which means that municipalities, despite the pandemic, have managed to have almost the same consistency in providing services compared to previous years. However, the overall average is an indicator that municipalities need to expand their management capacities to improve services and governance according to their own competencies, especially in low-performance fields such as: gender equality, public transport, sewerage, parking, local economic development, spatial planning, health services, public spaces and infrastructure.

Due to non-reporting of data in a considerable number of fields, the results obtained are not complete in some municipalities such as: Zubin Potok (1.74%), North Mitrovica (2%), Klokot (21.65%), Zecan (15.06%), Novobërdë (15.99%), Leposavic (15.86%), Partesh (21.29%) dhe Gracanica (28.82%). Lack of data and poor quality of reporting in these municipalities not only does not sufficiently reflect the level of achievement within the measurement indicators, but also affects the results of the Performance Grant. This reflects the amount of funding that could be allocated to these municipalities if they reported on all indicators and if they met the other minimum criteria set out in the Rules of the Performance Grant.

The following is a figure with the achievements of municipalities in 19 fields of competencies for which performance is measured for 2020. The maximum performance according to the specific field is 80.07% (in water supply), while the lowest is expressed in the field of sewerage (with 40.18%). The grouping of fields is done according to the level of performance divided into three levels: high 66-81%, medium 46-66% and low <40%.

* MUNICIPAL RESPONSIVENESS
* EQUALITY IN EMPLOYMENT, SOCIAL AND FAMILY SERVICES
* ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE
* PUBLIC SPACES
* DISASTER MANAGEMENT
* ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
* PRIMARY HEALTH CARE
* PRE-UNIVERSITY EDUCATION
* SPATIAL PLANNING
* PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
* MUNICIPAL TRANSPARENCY
* CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORTS
* DRINKING WATER
* WASTE MANAGEMENT
* SEWERAGE
* PUBLIC PARKING LOTS
* PUBLIC TRANSPORT
* LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Maximum performance of fields

80.07 %

**Fig. 2** Categorization of fields by level of performance

Considering that the elements of the Municipal Performance Management System measure aspects beyond the provision of a public service, focusing also on procedures and legal aspects, the categorization of fields by level of achievement was therefore done by grouping them according to purpose of the construction of indicators, the similarities between them, the content and the type of field. Hence, their grouping was done by dividing them into:

1) Fields with indicators that measure good governance standards and

2) Fields with indicators that measure the provision of public services.

***1) Fields and indicators of good governance*** include mainly compliance with the standards of good governance, transparency of the work of municipal bodies, accountability, involvement of citizens, respect for procedural and legal aspects of municipalities, planning of activities in the field of local economic development, planning of property, employment criteria in accordance with legal regulations for communities, people with disabilities, gender representation, etc.

MUNICIPAL TRANSPARENCY

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

EQUALITY IN EMPLOYMENT, SOCIAL AND FAMILY SERVICES

MUNICIPAL RESPONSIVENESS

LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

GENDER REPRESENTATION

59,97 %

Mesatarja e përgjithshme

**Fig.3** Performance of municipalities in the fields of governance measurement during 2020

From the figure above we notice that within the governance indicators, the average is 59,11%. The field with the highest performance is *Municipal Transparency* with a total of 77.62%, while the lowest is *Gender Representation* with 34.88%.

The following is the difference of the overall average in the field of transparency between 2019-2020:

**Fig.4** *Comparisons between the years 2019/2020 in the field of transparency*

*Difference 4.34%*

Compared to 2019 when transparency was ranked in third place, in 2020 it is ranked first, with an increase of 4.34% in the overall level of results within the field indicators. Data in this field show an improvement in performance in some indicators, such as the publication of acts adopted in municipal assemblies on the websites of municipalities (82.28%), the publication of financial documents (73.42%), the level of access to public documents (93.20%); maintenance of official websites (70.72%); Publication of public procurement documents and contracts (83.60%); publication of the acts of the mayor on the official website (87.22%). The indicator for online broadcasting of municipal assembly meetings has resulted with unsatisfactory results in this field, with 50.23%.

**Total employed in municipal institutions**

**38417**

**Women employed in municipal institutions**

**19310**

**Total leadership positions in educational, health and cultural institutions**

**1619**

**Women in leadership positions in educational, health and cultural institutions**

**482**

**Political functions in the municipality**

**475**

**Women in political functions**

**135**

Municipal transparency is closely related to the field of ***​​municipal responsiveness***, which is assessed by the largest number of indicators within the MPMS. Unlike transparency indicators which are mainly oriented towards ensuring publicity for official activities and data, municipal responsiveness incorporates data that show the level of accountability of municipal bodies, as well as their activity for active involvement of citizens in decision-making. While municipalities stand well in terms of transparency indicators, the results of responsiveness show the need to strengthen the elements of accountability and greater citizen involvement. This field results with 60.67% of achievements, declining by 1.97% compared to 2019, when it was 62.64%. In addition, even in 2020, municipalities are not good at implementing the rules for minimum standards of public consultation (only 1.69%), which set out the principles, rules, procedures, deadlines, ways and means for conducting public consultations when drafting local projects or policies.

The difference between Transparency and Responsiveness

**TRANSPARENCY**

**RESPONSIVENESS**

77.62

**%**

60.67

%

Difference

**17%**

***Fig 5.*** *Difference between fields with similar indicators: Transparency and Responsiveness*

In 2020, municipalities have adapted strategies for holding public discussions with citizens due to pandemic measures, through the use of online communication platforms. Part of the meetings for draft acts, budget, or other policy documents were held in physical form but also online. Referring to the data on the number of public meetings, for the purposes of budget discussions, consultations with citizens were held in 26 municipalities[[5]](#footnote-5), with a total of 198 meetings held for budget and MTBF, or an average of 7 meetings per municipality. As a result, 88.95% of municipalities have managed to approve draft budgets in time in their assemblies. Despite the meetings held, the participation of citizens in the discussions has continued to be very low. Statistics show that 7151 citizens, or an average of 188 citizens per municipality, participated in the public discussions. Compared to 2019 when 27121 citizens participated in discussions during the year, the presence in 2020 has resulted in 19,970 participants less. Based on research in this field, the reasons for citizens' non-participation in public meetings, in addition to the pandemic, are mainly related to: the lack of proper planning of public consultations; lack of coordination and implementation of minimum standards of public consultation; failure to prepare reports on the results of public consultation where contributors are provided with information on whether or not their proposals were accepted; lack of a structured debate throughout the consultations; improper systematization of documents and basic information on online platforms, absence of political staff in public meetings, as well as non-use of alternative forms for obtaining views of localities.

27121  
**participants in public meetings**

7151 **participants**

2019

2020

In terms of accountability, 32 municipalities reported on the presence of their mayors at municipal assembly meetings. Out of 434 meetings held in 32 municipalities, their mayors participated in 273 meetings. Also, in the framework of the discussions held in the municipal assemblies for periodic financial reports, a total of 110 quarterly financial reports (or 72.37%) were discussed during this year, while the performance report for the previous year was discussed in only 10 municipalities, or 23.68% of municipalities.

On the other hand, higher work intensity was observed in the provision of ***administrative services***. The overall achievements of municipalities in this field in 2020 are 74.42%. This includes: 1) Review of cases in administrative procedure, 2) Their handling within the legal deadlines, and 3) Administrative services provided electronically. Estimated for two years (2019-2020), in this field, the municipalities had higher efficiency compared to other fields, so that from a total of 3,993,383 requests submitted by citizens or other entities, 3,841,271 of them were reviewed, or 96.19%. In 2020 municipalities received 516511 requests for review less than in 2019. Rapid technological development has created opportunities and posed the need to put back some of the traditional practices for provision of services and replace them with faster and effective tools through various electronic platforms. Many administrative services today can be provided online and without the need for the presence of citizens in the premises of public administration. The data obtained in the indicators of electronic services (including e-kiosks) show low results of using these opportunities, to a level of 32.78%, which includes services for: various certificates, invoices, permits and other administrative services. Although a considerable part of the video materials of the meetings of the assemblies are published on the official websites, their broadcasting is not always done in real time.

**2,158,438   
requests reviewed**

**1,682,833  
requests reviewed**

2019

2020

***Equality in employment, social and family services*** - Within this field were measured the actions of municipalities to provide social housing, as well as institutional care for vulnerable groups. Data were also collected on the employment of people with disabilities and the employment of members of non-majority communities based on their legal rights. Overall performance in this field is 65.23%. Referring to the data reported by 35 municipalities, out of a total of 38,417 employees in municipal institutions, 184 are people with disabilities, or 21.69% of the legal criteria. Law No. 03/L-019 on vocational ability, rehabilitation and employment of people with disabilities stipulates in its Article 12 that “every public institution shall have one person with disabilities employed in every 50 employees (or 2% of employees)”.

In addition, the reported data show 1437 employees from amongst non-majority communities, or 62.59% of the fulfilment of the criteria set out in the Law on Public Officials (Article 9), which requires the filling of jobs at the municipal level to be done in accordance with the percentage of the population of that municipality. Regarding data on family housing in municipalities, social housing was provided to 1406 families, while 51 families were reported to have left social housing and did not need such assistance. In the same year, municipalities reported having placed a total of 255 children in foster families.

Within the actions that ***affect the local economic development***, the municipalities have achieved a performance of 41.86%[[6]](#footnote-6). Only 9 municipalities have Local Economic Development Plans, while 44% of municipalities have prepared a list of properties that should be given for use in the following year. The level of updating the property tax register (standard for verification of 20% of properties) has been met at the level of 57.61%, while 42% was the reported level of collected property tax (no debts, interest, penalties).

***2) Fields with indicators for the provision of public services.***

Within these fields are indicators for different types of provision of services by municipalities, such as: waste management, water supply, environmental protection, sewerage, urban planning, cultural activities, education, health, road infrastructure, sidewalks, public lighting, maintenance of public spaces, maintenance of roads, bicycle paths, public parking, road marking, etc. From the following figure we see that within the public service indicators, the average achieved is 56.11%.

DRINKING WATER
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PUBLIC PARKING LOTS
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56.11%

56.11%

**Fig.6.** Performance of municipalities in the field of measuring public services during 2020

***Water supply*** is one of the competencies of municipalities defined by the Law on Local Self-Government. Specific legislation has regulated the issue of drinking water management more extensively, leaving a significant part of this field to the responsibility of central enterprises. Despite this, municipalities have not been deprived of this competence, as among the strategically important obligations, they have to plan and implement annual investments in the expansion of infrastructure and water supply network.[[7]](#footnote-7) Data on the ***extension of the water supply network*** in municipalities show that out of 437642 households, businesses and public institutions, 410739 of them are connected to the water supply network. In terms of the volume of planned activities in the field of drinking water supply, municipalities have reported on 129 projects, of which 116 were completed during 2020. In total indicators measured in this field, the results are reflected with 80.07% of achievements.

In terms of ***waste management***, the average of achievements in 2020 is expressed at the level of 64.72%, which shows a decrease in performance in the value of 3.64% compared to 2019, when this was 68.36%[[8]](#footnote-8). The overall decline is due to the smaller number of activities carried out, compared to planning. More specifically, 35.32% of the activities planned to be carried out in the reporting year have been implemented. On the other hand, about 77.85% of households are included in the waste collection system. The amount of waste disposal was reported to be 368,200,073.3 kg, or 169 kg of waste disposed per capita per year. The waste disposal rate is considered to have reached 51.79%, referring to the criterion obtained in relation to EU standards which is estimated to be 300 kg per person per year.

Based on the law on local self-government, municipalities are also competent in the field of local infrastructure, local economic development, environmental protection, disaster management, urban planning, municipal property, education and health. Data on ***road infrastructure*** show 76.04% of roads paved in municipalities that have provided accurate information, compared to 71% a year ago. According to the data of 34 municipalities, 720 km of roads were paved during 2020 alone, or 21.17 km per municipality. On the other hand, 58.76% of roads are maintained during summer, while 61.8% during winter. 20.69% of roads are with sidewalks, 38.75% with lighting, and 53% of roads are reported to be equipped with vertical and horizontal marking.

76.04%

**Roads paved in 36 municipalities**

58.76%

**Roads maintained during summer**

61.8%

**Winter   
maintenance**

53%

**Vertical and horizontal marking**

38.75%

**Local street lighting**

The surface area of the municipality's territory covered by detailed regulatory plans or zonal maps is at a level of 12.91%, in the 23 municipalities which provided data. In 90% of cases, the municipalities responded to the processing of construction permit applications (according to data from 31 municipalities). According to the data, about 64.52% of public spaces are regularly maintained, while 73% of them are with public lighting. Over 62.79% of settlements in the municipality are covered by local public transport. 1334 public parking lots were reported in municipalities with a total of 49266 parking spaces.

Within the ***field of culture, youth and sports***, the activities planned by the municipalities in the field were not included in the measurement in 2020 due to restrictive measures for protection from the pandemic, but the evaluation was extended only to the spaces for sports activities. Based on data reported by municipalities, 106136.76 m2 of sports spaces were added during 2020, or an average of 2793 m2 per municipality.

106136 m2

New sports spaces   
gjatë vitit 2020

***The field of pre-university education*** collects numerous indicators on the competencies of municipalities in creating conditions for education and training of students, priorities set in this sector through budget planning, level of planning and implementation of classes, student results, technical and hygiene conditions in schools, equipment of classrooms with work tools, digitalization of schools, security aspects, criteria for qualification and licensing of teachers, overcrowding in classrooms, school spaces, etc. In this field, municipalities have shown a performance of 67.81%. Starting from the pre-primary level, the data show very low inclusion of children in kindergartens, especially in rural areas, due to the lack of investment in these areas. Viewed according to the measurement criterion of 1 kindergarten per 10 thousand inhabitants, the data show only 0.61% of achievement of this criterion. In the reporting year, the data provide an undesirable overview regarding the fulfilment of the required conditions for infrastructure, equipment and tools in pre-university education institutions. Data on these aspects indicate a level of 57.49%, which includes: tools of physical education halls, cabinets, laboratories, consumables, libraries, ordinary school furniture, electrical equipment, projectors, electronic boards, etc. For all these, municipalities receive funds from the regular public budget, either through a specific grant for education, or through budget appropriations from the category of own source revenues. In this regard, in addition to the specific grant for education which municipalities receive each year, from the part of the own source revenue budget of 2020, municipalities have allocated 9,888,622.00 euros for investments in this sector. Regarding school spaces, the average at country level is 18 m2 per student in rural and urban areas. Municipalities reported 61% of schools equipped with ICT cabinets. Also, the data show that 50.81% of schools are equipped with energy efficiency measures, and in 27 municipalities it was reported that 75.92% of schools are accompanied by security measures (fences or cameras). Of the total number of teachers at the level of pre-university education in the municipality, according to ISCEC levels 02, 1, 2, and 3, the percentage of those who are equipped with a license according to AI 05/2017 MEST is 72% (according to data from 27 municipalities). The calculated constant of 26 students per 1 teacher according to the administrative instruction of MEST is 57.07%. Regarding the filling of vacancies in education with regular competition, according to valid data of 24 municipalities, performance is 94.31% in relation to planning. The average pass rate (12th grade) for municipalities that have provided valid data is 68.89%.

In the field of ***primary health***, data were provided on infrastructure and facilities intended for primary health, sufficient resources and staff, as well as the provision of services by the municipal level. According to data reported by municipalities, this field has generally a low level of performance, with 55.96% of achievements.

Based on the data provided, 41.78% of primary health care facilities are equipped with the necessary tools according to the administrative instruction of the MoH on laboratory services. In 24 municipalities with valid data, the level of compliance with the ratio of one family medicine specialist and 2 nurses per 2000 inhabitants according to the criteria set by the MoH is 73.56%. For this sector, municipalities have allocated from the own source revenue budget about 5.05% compared to the specific Grant for Health allocated from the general budget. In 29 municipalities that have reported on the number of visits to primary health centres, 6,907,890.00 medical visits of patients to these institutions have been registered, or an average of 3.8 visits per capita per year.

In terms of ***disaster management***, this field measures the planning, organization and management of the organized system of the municipality to respond to phenomena caused by uncontrolled powers and other powers. The field has only one result and two indicators, which mainly assess the implementation of the plan for protection from natural disasters, as well as the level of responses of municipal institutions to cases presented in this field. The overall performance in this field is 51.60%.

## Chapter II

## II. Special part - Performance of municipalities 2020

# 1. Results of municipalities by fields

Performance measurement in 2020 focused on reflecting the achievements of 38 municipalities. The request for reporting was answered by all municipalities[[9]](#footnote-9), although the level of invalidity of the data was quite pronounced in the municipalities of Zubin Potok, Kllokot, Zvecan, Novobërda, Leposaviq, Partesh and Gracanica. The following is a comparative graph of fields grouped by performance:

The level of provision of services and compliance with governance standards varies from municipality to municipality, depending on the field of competence being measured. The level of performance can be influenced by many factors, such as: priorities set by the municipality within the fields for which the measurement is done, manner and quality of work planning, implementation in relation to planning, implementation in relation to certain opportunities and obstacles, capacities and resources, complexity of issues, quality of reporting data to the MPMS, as well as other relevant factors.

Below is a figure with the categorization of municipalities by the level of performance as follows:

**12**  
 municipalities

Maximum performance achieved per municipality

72.89%

**15**   
municipalities

6 municipalities

5 municipalities

**Fig 7.** Categorization of municipalities by the level of performance of indicators

The figure above shows 15 municipalities with high performance of 60-74%, 12 municipalities with medium performance between 40-60%, 5 municipalities with low performance 20-40% and 6 municipalities with performance lower than 20% . Referring to the characteristics of municipalities, high achievement is mainly dominated by medium-sized municipalities.

Details of the achievements of the municipalities by the respective fields and indicators are presented in the following sections of this report.

**Explanation:** In the following sections of the report, the calculation of the final result of the measurement fields takes into account the value 0 for the data of which have been declared invalid. This is done because misreporting is also considered poor performance, which should affect the final result of municipalities that did not provide data. This is also reflected in the comparisons between municipalities as well as the evaluations made for the purposes of the Performance Grant.

## Field1: Public Administrative Services

This field consists of four indicators, which include public administrative services (PAS) and the efficiency of municipal bodies in reviewing the requests of citizens, natural and legal persons, for issues related to their competencies which pass through the Citizens' Service Centre. At the same time, this field measures the readiness of municipalities to provide administrative services online or through e-kiosk.

Compared to 19 other fields, in 2020 this field ranks second in terms of performance, with an overall level of 74.42%.

Fig. 8. Performance indicators in the field of administrative services

The data show that the municipalities have largely reviewed the administrative requests that have been submitted to them. During 2020, 1,738,436 requests for review were submitted to municipalities, of which 1,682,833 requests were reviewed. The average handling of requests per municipality is 44,285 requests. These include requests for various municipal permits, civil status documents, requests for access to information, civic requests for funding and addressing to the responsible bodies of the municipality.

Referring to the performance by municipalities in this field, the highest percentage in meeting the indicators is in the Municipality of Vushtrri with 89.9%, while the lowest in the municipalities of Gracanica and Zvecan. The municipalities of Zubin Potok, North Mitrovica, Kllokot and Partesh did not provide data for this field, and thus the performance was calculated at 0%, and which also reflects in the overall average for the field.

Figure 9. Comparison of municipal performance in the field of administrative services

## Field 2 – Municipal Transparency

In this field, 7 indicators have been applied with 26 data which provide information for the publication of acts, plans, budget, website criteria, access to public documents, publicity of assembly sessions, etc.

The overall performance achieved is 77.62%, unlike the previous year when it was 72.93%. In terms of performance by indicators, the highest percentage is in allowing citizens access to official documents, expressed by 93.20.

**Figure 10** Performance indicators in the field of transparency

From the above figure it can be seen that the indicator for online broadcasting of assembly meetings is at the level of 50.23%, which also affects the overall reduction of performance in this field. The eight measured criteria for the municipal website appear to have been met at the level of 70.72%, while the acts of the municipal assembly were published at a level of 82.28%. The data show a positive trend in the publication of acts of general character approved by mayors.

Also, municipalities have mainly been efficient in publishing the municipal budget and expenditure reports, however, there is inconsistency in the format of the budget and financial reports published by municipalities. It appears that almost all municipalities have the annual public procurement plan, while only eight of them have not published any report on the implementation of this plan.

Figure 21 Comparison of municipal performance in the field of transparency

The figure above shows 12 municipalities which have shown performance between 90-100% in the field of transparency, including Lipjan (100%), Rahovec (99.38%), Junik (97.09%), Vushtrri (96.06%), Gjakova (93.22%), Gllogoc (93.23%), Kaçanik (92%) etc. There are 4 municipalities that do not yet use official websites as an official source of information.

## Field 3 – Municipal Responsiveness

Municipal responsiveness is included as a new field in the MPMS and has a total of 22 indicators. This field has an overall performance of 59.62%. Within this field, we note the high performance of municipalities in taking legal action to suspend officials for whom there has been an indictment in connection with acts of abuse of office. Municipalities have also shown positive performance in discussing draft budgets and the medium-term expenditure framework. According to the data, 280 meetings with citizens were held in 36 municipalities for the draft budget, or an average of 8 meetings per municipality. The following is a list of indicators in this field by percentage:

Figure 12. Performance indicators in the field of municipal responsiveness

From the data of the above figure it appears that most of the municipalities have not drafted and therefore have not submitted to the municipal assembly the annual integrity plan. A low level of discussion of the Internal Auditor's report and action plan for addressing the recommendations in the municipal assemblies was also seen. Despite the legal obligation of municipalities to discuss the performance report for the previous year in the municipal assembly, the provision of the relevant regulation has been respected at the level of 23.68%. While the new provision of the administrative instruction on the minimum standards of public consultation at the local level to publish the reports with the results of the public consultation processes, through which the citizens would receive answers for addressing of their proposals by the responsible bodies of the municipality, has not yet started to be implemented. Citizen participation in public consultations is quite low despite the standard of MPMS of 3% of the population of the municipality, which is met at 16.45%. Municipalities have reported that 7151 citizens have participated in public consultation processes, or 188 citizens have been consulted per municipality. Of course there are some municipalities such as Skenderaj, Kamenica, Lipjan, South Mitrovica and Prizren, where participation has been more pronounced in relation to the population of these municipalities. Regarding the level of implementation of the procurement plan, based on the amount spent against the planned amount, the performance results in 88.06%.

Figure 13 Comparison of the performance of municipalities in the field of responsiveness

The highest performance in the indicators of this field was achieved by the municipalities of Skenderaj (86.90%), Gllogoc (81.85%) and Lipjan (78.20%). The municipalities of Kaçanik (78.13%), Rahovec (71.98%), Shtime (70.91%) and Obiliq (70.69%) are also at a high level. In contrast, the municipalities of North Mitrovica, Zubin Potok and Shterpca have a lower performance. The level of performance in this field was also affected by the non-reporting of all data on indicators by the municipalities in question.

**Field 4 - Equality in Employment, Social and Family Services**

This field of two results and four indicators covers the representation of different groups in municipal employment, as well as the social services of the most vulnerable groups in municipalities. Within employment, indicators measure the level of employment of persons with disabilities in municipal institutions, as well as the percentage of inclusion of non-majority communities. The overall performance in this field is 65.23%.

*Figure 14 Performance indicators in the field of Equality in Employment, Social and Family Services*

According to the data, the level of fulfilment of the quota for employees with special needs is low, referring to the criteria set out in Law No. 05/L-051 on protection from discrimination. Below are the achievements for each municipality within this field:

*Figure 15 Comparison of performance of municipalities in the field of Equality in Employment, Social and Family Services*

**Field 5 –** Culture, Youth and Sports

Within this field, municipal cultural, youth and sports activities are measured, as one of the own competencies of municipalities. The field also covers services provided by municipalities related to culture, youth and sports, including sports spaces.

This field measures performance by comparing it to the number of inhabitants for reasons of being more balanced towards municipalities with many inhabitants and those with fewer inhabitants. This field has an overall performance of 67.99%.

In 2020, 106136.76 m2 were added, or an average of 2793 m2 per municipality

*Figure 16. Performance indicators in the field of culture*

The achievements for each municipality within this field are as follows:

*Figure 17 Comparative data between municipalities in the field of culture*

**Field 6 – Disaster management**

This field measures the planning, organization and management of the organized system of the municipality to respond to phenomena caused by uncontrolled powers and other powers. The field has only one result and two indicators, which mainly assess the implementation of the plan for protection from natural disasters, as well as the level of responses of municipal institutions to cases presented in this field. Overall performance in this field is 51.60%.

*Figure 183 Performance indicators in the field of disaster management*

According to the data, the interventions of municipal institutions to disasters turn out to be at a level of 51.60%. Expressed in numbers, in 33 municipalities having reported for this indicator, out of 9718 reported disasters, the responsible municipal teams have intervened in 9429 of them. Also, only 7 municipalities turn out to have had a municipal disaster management plan, which envisaged 193 planned actions, while 150 implemented %[[10]](#footnote-10).

*Figure 19. Comparative data between municipalities in the field of natural and other disaster management*

**Field 7 – Spatial Planning**

This field measures municipal spatial development through spatial planning instruments, but also the level of municipal construction planning. This field has an overall performance of 46.22%.

*Figure 20. Performance indicators in the field of spatial planning*

The surface area of the territory of the municipality covered by detailed regulatory plans is 12.91%. Regarding construction permits, out of 3028 applications submitted for construction permits, 90.17% of them were reviewed in time by municipalities. Based on the data, new buildings for which construction permits were issued were inspected at a rate of 81.89%. Of the total number of newly inspected facilities, 73% were reported to be equipped with construction permits.

*Figure 21 Comparative data between municipalities in the field of spatial planning*
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**Field 8 – Public Spaces**

This field measures public spaces which are of interest to citizens, managed by municipalities and which affect the quality and standard of living of citizens. Overall performance according to data provided by municipalities is 51.27%. According to the Law on Local Self-Government, municipalities are, among others, competent to provide and maintain parks and public spaces.

*Figure 22. Performance indicators in the field of public spaces*

In addition to the level of green spaces per capita, this field also measures the area of public spaces which are regularly maintained by municipalities, as well as the number of public spaces that have public lighting.

*Figure 23 Comparative data between municipalities in the field of public spaces*

Based on the data, about 64.52% of public spaces are regularly maintained, while 73.90% of public spaces have also public lighting.

**Field 9 – Road Infrastructure**

This field measures municipal roads and related ancillary infrastructure that are under the competence of the municipality. This field has been completed with new indicators to promote a modern road infrastructure with sidewalks, lighting and marking as well as bicycle path. Overall performance is estimated to be 49%.

What made the overall performance not be so high is the inclusion of the new indicator for roads in urban areas with bicycle paths, as well as the ratio between local roads with sidewalks and public lighting. Municipal field-level performance is presented as follows:

Figure 24 Performance indicators in the field of road infrastructure

*Figure 25 Comparative data between municipalities in the field of road infrastructure*

**Field 10 – Public transportation**

This field measures the provision of public transport for the citizens of the municipality. This field has an overall performance of 44.89%.

*Figure 26. Performance indicators in the field of public transportation*

Within this field we notice an above-average performance for two indicators. According to the data, out of total of 1287 settlements of 34 municipalities that have reported, 994 of them are included in the local public transport, while the marked stops for public transport vehicles remain at the level 60.38%.

The following is the performance of the field in percentage for each of the municipalities of Kosovo:

.

*Figure 27 Comparative data between municipalities in the field of public transportation*

**Field 11 – Public Parking lots**

Public parking spaces are publicly and privately owned places, with a certain number of parking spaces, built to the required standards and set for parking of motor vehicles. Furthermore, this field measures the number of parking lots in the municipality and the number of parking spaces against vehicles registered in the municipality, as well as how many taxi parking spaces are against the number of licensed taxis and how many public parking lots have spaces reserved for people with special needs. Field-level performance is 40.54%.

*Figure 28 Performance indicators in the field of parking lots*

The number of parking lots at Kosovo level in 31 municipalities which have reported is 1340, with a total of 49 266 parking spaces, in relation to 392 218[[11]](#footnote-11) vehicles registered in the reporting municipalities. Compared to the number of registered vehicles, municipalities with parking spaces cover 25.45%. The rate of parking spaces intended for taxis registered in municipalities is 66.80%. Regarding the number of parking spaces for people with disabilities, only 56.80% of parking lots have such places marked.

The following is the achievements of municipalities in this field in percentage.

*Figure 29 Comparative data between municipalities in the field of public parking lots*

**Field 12 - Drinking water**

This field measures the provision or supply of citizens and businesses with drinking water as well as the implementation of municipal projects for drinking water. This field has an overall performance of 80.07, compared to 73.10% in 2019.

*Figure 30 Performance indicators in the field of drinking water at country level*

The following is the performance of the field in percentage for each of the municipalities of Kosovo:
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*Figure 31 Comparative data between municipalities in the field of drinking water*

According to the figure above, we notice that 6 municipalities have reported the extension of the drinking water network to 100% of households, public institutions and businesses, while 5 municipalities did not provide valid data.

**Field 13 – Sewerage**

This field measures the inclusion of households, businesses and institutions in the sewerage system as well as the implementation of municipal projects for the sewerage network. Also, this indicator measures the inclusion of municipal settlements in the wastewater treatment network as one of the most important factors in the environment, living conditions and public health. This field has an overall performance of 40.18[[12]](#footnote-12)%, unlike in 2019 when it was 36.51%.

*Figure 32 Performance indicators in the field of sewerage*

According to the data, about 74.19% of households, public institutions and businesses are declared that they are included in the sewerage system, unlike 71.42% in 2019. On the other hand, the implementation of activities from the plan for construction and maintenance of the sewerage system is reported to be at 86.54%, unlike 74.64% in 2019. For the wastewater treatment indicator, due to suspension of indicator, the value 0% was applied to all municipalities in order to fairly reflect the results in the field.

J.

*Figure 33 Comparative data between municipalities in the field of sewerage*

**Field 14 – Waste Management**

This field measures the collection and disposal of waste in the municipality as well as the collection of revenues from invoices issued for waste management. This field has an overall performance of 64.72%.

*Figure 344 Performance Indicators in the field of waste management*

The large quantity of waste disposal in kg per capita potentially indicates higher performance, but not always. The more waste is disposed of, it is an assumption that indicates less waste in the living environment, but this usually does not happen, because not all waste produced by the respective households is still collected and disposed of. Data reported in 2019 by municipalities show that households with access to waste collection are at the rate of 77.85%. According to the data of Kosovo Environmental Protection Agency (KEPA) in the Waste Management Report published in 2018, the coverage of households with this service is at the rate of 57.7%. The rate of collection of funds from waste collection turns out to be 80.04%, similar to the KEPA report for 2018. The waste generation amount in the European Union is 300 kg per capita, so, when compared to the quantity of waste disposal in Kosovo, the average of this quantity is estimated to have reached the rate of 51.79%.

J.

*Figure 35 Comparative data between municipalities in the field of waste management*

**Field 15 – Environmental Protection**

This field measures the actions of the respective municipality for the protection and preservation of the natural and living (urban and rural) by municipalities from damage, degradation or pollution as a result of human activity or natural impact. This field has an overall performance of 54.78%.

*Figure 36 Comparative data in the field of environment*

The implementation of the environmental action plan turns out to have reached the level of 19.32%[[13]](#footnote-13). The issued environmental permits were at the rate of 78.48% whereas the new buildings that have implemented the municipal environmental permit are at a very low rate of 66.55%.

*Figure 37 Comparative data in the field of environment*

**Field 16 – Gender Representation**

Gender representation is now more widely measured in this field, including the access of both genders to social and economic development programs, as well as to municipal activities. Also, the indicators measure the degree of representation of both genders in local institutions, bodies of municipal assemblies, etc. Despite the progress of municipalities over the years in ensuring equal representation in the bodies of assemblies and in municipal committees, the data for certain indicators minimize the percentage in this field making it quite low, 34.88%. The figure of gender representation according to the indicators is presented as follows:

*Figure 37 % of indicators in the field of equal gender representation[[14]](#footnote-14)*

Based on the data reported by 33 municipalities, the level of female employees in municipal institutions is 100% in relation to the criterion of 50x50[[15]](#footnote-15). Also, 49% of municipalities proved to have drafted the plan for gender equality. In regards to political positions, out of 475 positions within the municipal executive in 32 municipalities[[16]](#footnote-16), 135 are women, or 56.84% of the legal criterion. The percentage of representation in the bodies of municipal assemblies is 91.96% of the criterion of 50x50. Based on the data on the representation of women in leading positions in educational, health and cultural/sports institutions, out of 1619 leading positions, 475 of them are led by women, or 59.54% of the fulfilment of the legal criterion.

Gender representation in local councils is extremely low and the vast majority of municipalities do not have any women leading these councils. This is also taking into account that 12 municipalities have not reported to have established the local councils. Gender representation in the names of municipal streets is extremely low as well as the registration of property in the name of a woman or both genders (husband or brothers and sisters).

*Figure 38 Comparisons by municipalities in the field of gender equality*

Gender responsive budgeting and spending turns out to be done by just over half of the municipalities. However, there is a great need for training in this regard and as well the will of municipalities to understand the importance of this issue. Gender equality in employment, subsidy and entrepreneurship programs is at a rate of 47.48%.

**Field 17 - Pre-University Education**

This field aims at results in spaces for kindergartens and schools equipped with internet cabinets, energy efficiency measures, recruitment of educational staff, teacher licensing, concretization tools, school equipment with teaching aids, ICT cabinets, as well as school safety conditions. This field has the overall performance at the level of 67.81%. In general, in education indicators, the data reported by municipalities have not been complete, so the percentages obtained may represent a relative value of accuracy.

*Figure 39 % of indicators in the field of pre-university education at country level*
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*Figure 40 Comparisons by municipalities in the field of pre-university education*

**Field 18 – Primary Health Care**

This field measures the infrastructure and spaces intended for primary health care, sufficient resources and staff, as well as the provision of services by the municipal level. According to data reported by municipalities, this field has a low level of performance in general, or 55.96%. The following is a figure with % of performance according to indicators in this field:

*Figure 41 % of indicators in the field of primary health care*

The following is the performance of field in percentage for each of the municipalities of Kosovo:

*Figure 42 Comparisons by municipalities in the field of primary health care*

**Field 19 – Local Economic Development**

This field measures the activities planned and implemented for the development of economic activity at the local level by mobilizing municipal properties, and regular updating of the taxpayer register as well as collection of property tax at a high rate. This field has an overall performance of 41.86%.

*Figure 5 % of indicators in the field of local economic development*
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*Figure 44 Comparisons by municipalities in the field of local economic development*

Conclusions and recommendations

The municipal performance evaluation for 2020 brings out numerous findings for 19 fields of municipal competencies. The conclusions of this report highlight a large number of issues that need to be addressed and treated as priority by local government bodies. In this part of the report, some of the conclusions and recommendations with the greatest weight in the advancement of municipal services are singled out. The report concludes as follows:

1. The evaluation of the performance of municipalities for 2020 has been made for 38 municipalities. Some of the data reported by Serb-majority municipalities in the field of education and health, that did not correspond with the provision of services based on the positive legislation of the Republic of Kosovo, have been marked as void and a value of 0% of performance was applied. Performance measurement and evaluation is a legal obligation applied to all municipalities, thus municipalities must respond to the requests for information in accordance with the Law on Local Self-Government and the Regulation on the Municipal Performance Management System.
2. Municipalities should pay attention to all data presented for reporting, so that the values obtained represent the most objective performance evaluation for each indicator. Documentation of data is a necessary condition. When preparing data and information, municipalities should prepare a file for each field.
3. The quality assurance process has identified a number of inaccurate data, which in many cases have been declared invalid, except when they have been documented. The quality of reporting should be increased in the future, so that reporting is fair, accurate, and objective, and also presents the most realistic state of performance of municipalities.
4. Performance is categorized into two groups of indicators that reflect the actions of municipalities in terms of good governance and provision of services. Within the group of governance indicators, Municipal transparency ranks first, although the indicator for reflecting the outcomes of public consultations needs to be taken seriously by local authorities. Only two municipalities have started drafting these reports (South Mitrovica and Podujeva). Reports of public consultation processes should be compiled to promote citizen participation in policy-making and to obtain their opinion on public issues.
5. The presence of citizens in public consultations has continued to be low. Municipalities should use effective techniques and tools to promote citizen participation in decision-making processes.
6. Municipalities of: North Mitrovica, Leposaviq, Zveçan and Zubin Potok do not use their official websites. No official information, report or document has been published on their websites. Other municipalities, such as Deçan, Shtërpca, Fushë Kosova, Junik, Obiliq, Partesh, Podujeva and Ranillug, must adapt and supplement the information in accordance with the criteria set out under the sub-legal acts. Furthermore, information should be placed in appropriate menus, to make it easier to access. The publication of documents should be done according to specific menus (applications) for certain materials.
7. Low performance has been shown in the field of gender representation. Municipalities need to take action to increase the number of women in decision-making, political and local council positions. Planning and financial documents also need to be improved based on the gender element.
8. A number of the municipalities have started the online application of administrative services, and performance in this segment need to be improved, to increase efficiency in services and at the lowest possible cost. These services should be applied in all municipalities and for a greater number of services, including online application for construction permits, environmental permits, property tax payments, or utility invoices etc.
9. Only 12% of the municipalities substantiated to have discussed the integrity plan in the Municipal Assembly, 20.69% the internal auditor's report and 23.68% the Municipal Performance Report for the previous year. These plans and reports should become routine discussion points each year in municipal assemblies in order to strengthen the level of responsibility and accountability of the executive to the assembly and the citizens.
10. Data on equality in employment and social services show that municipal directorates should make efforts to include all categories in need in the employment policies. Efficiency should also be increased in the assessment of families in social housing, so that social housing facilities are used by families in need and there is a full review of the submitted requests;
11. Spatial planning requires more extensive treatment to regulate all necessary surfaces with detailed regulatory plans or zonal maps. The data show a very low scale of these plans which are extremely important for the regulation of the municipality;
12. Road infrastructure must be completed, both in terms of asphalting roads and with ancillary infrastructure including sidewalks and public lighting. Municipalities should increase the quality of data on the level of asphalting of roads, sidewalks, their lighting, and especially on data on bicycle paths. Also, better planning is needed in the summer and winter maintenance of local roads, so as to have a full extension of this service.
13. 4.62% of data on bicycle paths in urban areas is a value that shows that municipalities should work on advancing road infrastructure through the creation of bicycle paths.
14. Although the indicator for wastewater treatment was not measured in 2020, the data of 2019 show that inter-institutional coordination should be provided to ensure wastewater treatment in parallel with the expansion of the sewerage network. Wastewater treatment is extremely low, given the high cost of this service. Municipalities should also consider the possibilities of other financial resources for the establishment of plants, in order to avoid numerous environmental problems and to protect public health.
15. The quantity of waste disposal in Kosovo municipalities is lower compared to the European Union average (300 kg per capita in a year), therefore more efficient management by publicly-owned enterprises and other operators should be provided to increase the capacity for waste collection and disposal in legal landfills.
16. During the budget planning process, municipalities should compile and formulate the section of gender-responsive budgeting according to legal criteria. Local policies need to assess gender impact so that financial resources are allocated proportionately to both genders. Greater promotion of gender policies in local councils is required. Municipalities need to develop gender equality plans. The criterion of gender equality should be strengthened even within the appointed political positions, as well as to promote the right to the registration of ownership in both genders which remains at a very low value.
17. Municipalities should start investing in nurseries/kindergartens in rural areas where needed, due to the importance of these institutions in the early childhood development of children.
18. Municipal education directorates should plan for schools to meet the requirements of ancillary infrastructure, energy efficiency measures, as well as to be equipped with cabinets with internet to a greater extent. The creation of school spaces especially in urban areas requires special treatment to eliminate teaching in more shifts and to apply all-day learning. Even in the field of education, it is necessary to increase the quality of reporting and data accuracy.
19. The standard of one family doctor and two nurses per 2000 inhabitants should be achieved to a greater extent in compliance with the legal criteria.
20. Formal planning for local economic development should be expanded to municipalities. Municipalities should draft Local Economic Development Plans. Reporting on the implementation of such plans should be a topic of discussion in municipal assemblies, so that activities in this field can be more easily implemented and prioritized according to the demands of the majority.

Annex: % of indicators by fields

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Public Administrative Services | 1.1.1 | Administrative requests reviewed during the year | 93.94 |
| 1.1.2 | Administrative requests reviewed within legal deadlines | 96.54 |
| 1.1.4 | Administrative services provided electronically by the municipality | 32.78 |
| Municipal Transparency | 2.1.1 | Assembly meetings made public and broadcast live online | 50.23 |
| 2.1.2 | Level of citizens' access to public documents | 93.20 |
| 2.1.3 | Fulfilment of the criteria of the official website of the municipality | 70.72 |
| 2.1.4 | Publication of acts, adopted by the municipal assembly, on the official website of the municipality | 82.28 |
| 2.1.5 | Publication of acts of general character, adopted by the mayor, on the official website of the municipality | 87.22 |
| 2.2.1 | Publication of documents for budget planning and expenditure | 73.42 |
| 2.2.2 | Publication of public procurement documents and contracts | 83.60 |
| Municipal Responsiveness | 3.1.1 | Publication of announcements for holding 2 public meetings | 55.15 |
| 3.1.2 | Citizen's participation in public consultations | 16.45 |
| 3.1.3 | Municipal acts and local policy documents consulted with the public | 70.38 |
| 3.1.4 | Public hearings on MTBF and municipal budget | 53.23 |
| 3.1.5 | Publication of reports on public consultation processes | 1.69 |
| 3.2.1 | Timely approval of the annual municipal draft budget | 88.95 |
| 3.2.2 | Discussions on quarterly budget reports by the Municipal Assembly | 72.37 |
| 3.2.3 | Discussion on municipal performance report by the municipal assembly for the previous year | 23.68 |
| 3.2.4 | Discussion of the external auditor's report and action plan for addressing the recommendations in the Municipal Assembly | 69.74 |
| 3.2.5 | Discussion of the internal auditor's report and action plan in the Municipal Assembly | 20.69 |
| 3.2.6 | MA meetings with the participation of the mayor | 65.18 |
| 3.3.1 | Level of implementation of the procurement plan | 88.06 |
| 3.3.2 | Level of payments processed within the legal deadline of 30 days | 68.39 |
| 3.3.3 | Level of addressing the recommendations of the National Audit Office | 23.74 |
| 3.4.1 | Reporting of the annual plan of the integrity plan before the Municipal Assembly | 12.12 |
| 3.4.2 | Suspended municipal officials in relation to charges filed against them | 96.00 |
| 3.5.1 | Implementation of the scheme for the distribution of job evaluations for civil servants | 80.30 |
| 3.5.3 | Specific service contracts are in line with the legal framework | 95.32 |
| Equality in Employment, Social and Family Services | 4.1.1 | Employees with disabilities in municipal institutions | 21.69 |
| 4.1.2 | Employees from amongst non-majority communities | 62.59 |
| 4.2.1 | Families in need which were provided with housing and then conditions were created for them to leave social housing | 78.92 |
| 4.2.2 | Children in need of housing provided with family housing | 97.72 |
| Culture, Youth and Sport | 5.1.1 | Space for sports activities per capita | 74.12 |
| Disaster Management | 6.1.1 | Level of implementation of the municipal disaster management plan | 8.06 |
| 6.1.2 | Disaster protection interventions | 95.14 |
| Spatial Planning | 7.1.1 | Surface area of the municipality covered by (detailed) regulatory plans | 12.91 |
| 7.2.1 | Applications for construction permits reviewed | 90.17 |
| 7.2.2 | New buildings inspected | 81.98 |
| 7.2.3 | New facilities with construction permits | 66.47 |
| Public Spaces | 8.1.1 | Area of public green spaces in m2 per capita | 15.41 |
| 8.1.2 | The area of regularly maintained public spaces | 64.52 |
| 8.1.3 | Public spaces equipped with public lighting | 73.90 |
| Road Infrastructure | 9.1.1 | Local roads paved | 76.04 |
| 9.1.2 | Local roads maintained during the summer season | 58.76 |
| 9.1.3 | Local roads maintained during the winter season | 61.79 |
| 9.2.1 | Length of local roads equipped with sidewalks | 20.69 |
| 9.2.2 | Length of local roads equipped with public lighting | 38.75 |
| 9.2.3 | Length of local roads equipped with vertical and horizontal marking | 53.00 |
| 9.2.4 | Roads in the urban area with bicycle path | 4.62 |
| 9.2.5 | Local roads re-asphalted | 78.32 |
| Public Transport | 10.1.1 | Implementation of the municipal plan for local public transport | 2.63 |
| 10.1.2 | Settlements covered with local public transport | 62.79 |
| 10.1.3 | Marked stops for public transport vehicles | 69.26 |
| Public Parking lots | 11.1.1 | Number of parking lots for parking motor vehicles | 25.45 |
| 11.1.2 | Parking spaces for motor vehicles in the territory of the municipality | 13.11 |
| 11.1.3 | Parking spaces intended for taxis | 66.80 |
| 11.1.4 | Number of parking lots with parking spaces reserved for people with disabilities | 56.80 |
| Drinking Water | 12.1.1 | Implementation of the plan for construction and maintenance of the water supply system | 84.44 |
| 12.1.2 | Households, public institutions and business units covered with the drinking water system | 75.70 |
| Sewerage | 13.1.1 | Implementation of the plan for construction and maintenance of the sewerage system | 86.54 |
| 13.1.2 | Households, public institutions and business units included in the sewerage system | 74.19 |
| Waste Management | 14.1.1 | Implementation of the municipal waste management plan | 35.32 |
| 14.1.2 | Households that have access to the waste collection system | 77.85 |
| 14.2.1 | Implementation of waste collection schedule | 91.52 |
| 14.2.2 | Collection of funds for waste collection | 80.04 |
| 14.3.1 | Quantity of waste disposal in kilograms per capita | 51.79 |
| Environmental Protection | 15.1.1 | Implementation of the local environmental action plan | 19.32 |
| 15.1.2 | Municipal environmental permits issued | 78.48 |
| 15.1.3 | New buildings that have implemented the municipal environmental permit | 66.55 |
| Gender Representation | 16.1.1 | Women employed in municipal institutions/administration | 100.00 |
| 16.1.2 | Women in leadership positions in educational, health and cultural/sports institutions | 59.54 |
| 16.1.3 | Women appointed to political positions in the municipality | 56.84 |
| 16.1.4 | Gender equality among members of municipal committees | 91.96 |
| 16.1.5 | Gender equality in the composition of local councils | 10.11 |
| 16.2.1 | Gender-responsive budgeting and spending | 45.31 |
| 16.2.2 | Gender equality in budgeting women's employment and entrepreneurship | 47.48 |
| 16.2.4 | Municipal plan for gender equality | 48.68 |
| 16.3.1 | Gender equality in street names | 9.85 |
| 16.3.2 | Registration of ownership in the name of both spouses | 2.14 |
| Pre-University Education | 17.1.1 | Nurseries and kindergartens in rural areas per 10000 inhabitants | 0.61 |
| 17.1.2 | m2 of space per student - urban and rural | 54.29 |
| 17.1.3 | Schools equipped with ICT cabinet | 61.39 |
| 17.1.4 | Schools with energy efficiency measures | 50.81 |
| 17.1.5 | Security in pre-university education institutions | 75.92 |
| 17.1.6 | Fulfilment of the required conditions with infrastructure, equipment and tools in pre-university education institutions | 57.49 |
| 17.2.1 | Teachers who meet the criteria for a licensed qualification | 72.03 |
| 17.2.2 | Level of compliance with the student -teacher ratio at urban and rural level | 57.07 |
| 17.2.3 | Filling of the budget for education from own source revenues | 18.07 |
| 17.2.4 | Filling vacancies in education with regular competition | 94.00 |
| 17.3.5 | Passing rate in the state Matura exam - 12th grade (disaggregated by gender) | 68.89 |
| 17.3.7 | School dropout (inverse rate) | 97.44 |
| Primary Health Care | 18.1.1 | m2 of PHC spaces per 10000 inhabitants | 67.85 |
| 18.1.2 | PHC facilities that are equipped according to the administrative instruction and laboratory services | 41.78 |
| 18.2.1 | Level of compliance with the ratio of 1 family doctor and 2 nurses per 2000 inhabitants | 73.56 |
| 18.2.2 | Percentage of the budget for primary health care supported by municipalities from own source revenues | 5.05 |
| 18.3.1 | Number of patient visits to primary health care per capita | 39.22 |
| 18.3.2 | Children involved in the immunization program | 83.90 |
| 18.3.3 | Provision of specific health care for women and children | 98.15 |
| Local Economic Development | 19.1.1 | Local economic development plan | 23.68 |
| 19.1.2 | Preparation and publication of the list of municipal properties planned for allocation for use | 44.12 |
| 19.1.3 | Level of updating the property tax register | 57.61 |
| 19.1.4 | Level of collection of property tax invoice (without debts, interest, penalties) | 42.01 |

%

1. The data reported by the Municipality of North Mitrovica are placed in the Electronic System without the signature/authorization of the mayor. In this regard, a written confirmation was requested from the Mayor, who did not respond, and as a result the data for this municipality were declared invalid. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Regulation No. 01/2020 on the Municipal Performance Management System, Article 5.1.1 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Excluding 5 additional fields added to the MPMS review. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Mamusha, Dragash. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The municipalities that did not report of holding public meetings on budget and MTB are: Deçan, Kamenica, Kllokot, Malisheva, Mamusha, Novoberda, Ranillug, Shterpca, Zubin Potok, Zvecan, Leposavic and North Mitrovica. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This low % was affected by the lack of Local Economic Development Plans, which is one of the indicators in this field, met in only 9 municipalities. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. In fields such as water supply and waste management, measurement components are limited to those actions which relate to the exclusive competencies of municipalities. Indicators do not measure qualitative aspects of these services, but are mainly limited to the extension of the service. So, it is not measured How many citizens have drinking water, but Whether this service is provided to all entities. Water supply currently contains indicators that measure the level of planning and implementation of municipal projects in this field as well as the extension of the drinking water system to households, public institutions and businesses, but not the collection of funds which belongs to the regional water companies that are owned by the central level. The same has been done with waste management, knowing that the mere extension of this service does not sum up the success of the whole field. In the future, this field should be expanded with quality management indicators, which may include waste separation at source, disposal for all types of waste and their processing (recycling). Considering that waste management is a mixed competence between the local and central level, at this stage, measurement and evaluation is limited to the level of implementation of the municipal plan for waste management, extension of the waste collection system by households, implementation of waste collection schedule, level of collection of funds for waste collection and amount of waste disposal. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Although the data of North Mitrovica were reported in the Electronic Performance System by the coordinator of this municipality, the same were not authorized by the mayor. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The total value of 51.60% was affected by the value of 0% calculated for municipalities that did not provide data. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Municipalities of Dragash, Mamusha, Partesh, Shterpca, Zubin Potok, and Leposaviq did not provide information on the number of public parking lots. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The low rate of wastewater treatment affected the total %. This field is quite specific and full achievements can be considered only in cases when wastewater management is followed by their treatment through treatment plants. In 2019, this field was declared invalid, because accurate data was not provided, making the data to be considered null. Even in those municipalities where the commissioning of wastewater treatment systems or plants was reported, the data were not fully reported regarding the number of settlements included in the treatment plant systems. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Most municipalities did not prove to have drafted a Local Environmental Protection Plan. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The 50% level is considered a full achievement of representation based on the Law on Gender Equality. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The following municipalities did not provide data: North Mitrovica, Zubin Potok, Shterpca, Novoberda, Kllokot. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Data were not provided by: North Mitrovica, Leposaviq, Zubin Potok, Shterpca, Novoberda, Kllokot. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)