



# MONITORING REPORT

TRANSPARENCY,  
PARTICIPATION,  
AND INSTITUTIONAL  
ACCOUNTABILITY IN  
MITROVICA SOUTH,  
MITROVICA NORTH,  
VUSHTRRI AND ZVEČAN

FEBRUARY 2026

ENG



Funded by  
the European Union



Sweden  
Sverige



# MONITORING REPORT

**TRANSPARENCY, PARTICIPATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN  
MITROVICA SOUTH, MITROVICA NORTH, VUSHTRRI AND ZVEČAN**

**FEBRUARY 2026**



## **COPYRIGHT © 2026. Reconciliation Empowering Communities (REC).**

Copyright © 2026. Reconciliation Empowering Communities (REC) reserves all rights and no part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, mechanical or electronic, including photocopying or any other storage and retrieval system material, without written permission of the publisher. The publication may only be reproduced or transmitted if it is used for non-commercial purposes. Whenever and whoever uses various quotations or materials of this publication is obliged to make clear the source from which it has obtained those quotations or materials used.

### **Author:**

Reconciliation Empowering Communities (REC)

For any evaluation, remark, criticism or suggestion, please contact us through the options provided below:

Adress: Str: Nexhip Dragaj No. 70,  
40 000 Mitrovicë/a, Kosovë/o.  
Tel.: +383 (0) 49 300 663  
E-mail: [rec.kosova@gmail.com](mailto:rec.kosova@gmail.com)  
Web: [www.rec-kosova.org](http://www.rec-kosova.org)

This report was published by Reconciliation Empowering Communities (REC) within the project “Transparency Talks”, funded by Kosova Democratic Institute - as part of the co-financing between the projects “Youth and Civil Society for Integrity”, funded by Sweden (Sida), and “Integrity Watch in the Western Balkans and Turkey”, funded by the European Union (EU). The content of this report is the sole responsibility of REC and does not necessarily reflect the views of KDI as a sub-grant provider, nor of the donors - Sweden and the EU.

## Contents

1. POLICY CONTEXT.....	3
2. MONITORING SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY.....	4
3. KEY FINDINGS AND COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT.....	5
3.1 SOUTH MITROVICA.....	5
3.2 NORTH MITROVICA.....	7
3.3 VUSHTRRI.....	9
3.4 ZVECAN.....	11
4. COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT.....	13
5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	16
6. BIBLIOGRAPHY / REFERENCES.....	18

# 1. Policy Context

Municipalities in Kosovo are the primary units of local self-government and are legally required to ensure transparency, accountability, and meaningful public participation in local decision-making. These obligations apply to policy formulation, budget planning, and the allocation of public funds, including municipal Calls for Proposals for Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). The legal framework is grounded in the Constitution of the Republic of Kosovo and operationalized through the Law on Local Self-Government, the Law on Access to Official Documents, and regulations governing public financing of NGOs.

The Law on Local Self-Government defines the roles of municipal assemblies and mayors and establishes participation mechanisms such as public consultations, public hearings, and the right of citizens and organized civil society to submit proposals and petitions. Public hearings are therefore a mandatory element of municipal governance. During the budget cycle, municipalities are required to present draft budgets and Medium-Term Budget Frameworks (MTBFs) and provide opportunities for citizen and CSO input prior to adoption.

Municipal CSO grant schemes represent a further extension of participatory governance into public spending decisions. Through public Calls for Proposals, municipalities invite CSOs to submit project proposals addressing local needs. Transparency obligations apply throughout the grant cycle, including call announcements, evaluation of proposals, publication of award decisions, and communication on contracting and implementation. These requirements are reinforced by the Law on Access to Official Documents, which obliges municipalities to publish or provide access to information related to public hearings, budget documents, CSO grant calls, and funding decisions. While public consultations and CSO grant schemes are standard features of local governance, their effectiveness in strengthening accountability depends on the consistency of documentation, feedback, and follow-up across municipalities.

## 2. Monitoring Scope and Methodology

This assessment is based on a structured documentary review of municipal practices during the 2025 budget cycle, public engagement processes, and municipal grant allocation procedures. The analysis focuses on publicly documented evidence of compliance with legal obligations related to budget public hearings, mandatory mayor–public meetings, language accessibility, and municipal Calls for Proposals for Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).

The review covers the period January–December 2025, including consultations and decisions linked to the preparation and adoption of municipal budgets, Medium-Term Budget Frameworks (MTBFs), and CSO grant schemes. The assessment was conducted in four municipalities: Mitrovica South, Mitrovica North, Vushtrri, and Zvečan. For each municipality, three core areas of public engagement and accountability were examined:

- budget public hearings related to the annual budget and MTBF;
- mandatory mayor–public meetings, with a legal minimum of two meetings per year; and
- municipal Calls for Proposals for CSO grants, including announcement, evaluation, and award stages.

The analysis relies exclusively on publicly accessible and traceable municipal information, including official municipal websites, published announcements and calendars, draft budget and MTBF documents, minutes or summaries of hearings and meetings, public CSO calls, award decisions, and other formal communications. Only documentation that could be publicly verified was considered.

For budget public hearings and mayor–public meetings, the review assessed public announcements, availability of draft documents, confirmation of meetings, and evidence of follow-up or citizen interaction. For CSO grant schemes, the assessment examined the clarity of eligibility and evaluation criteria, publication of beneficiary lists and scores, communication of appeal mechanisms, and the availability of information on contracting or implementation stages.

Language accessibility was reviewed across all areas, with attention to bilingual publication in municipalities with mixed populations. Where documentation could not be identified on official municipal platforms, this is explicitly noted in the findings. The assessment reflects documented institutional practice and transparency and does not assess internal procedures that are not publicly accessible. While the absence of documentation does not necessarily indicate the absence of activity, it directly affects transparency, traceability, and public accountability.

## 3. Key Findings and Comparative Assessment

### 3.1 South Mitrovica

Mitrovica South demonstrates stronger documentation and procedural transparency than most municipalities reviewed, particularly in relation to budget public hearings and the publication of Calls for Proposals for CSO grants. Public announcements, draft documentation, and preliminary decisions are generally accessible, indicating a structured approach to consultation and grant allocation.

The primary gaps identified relate to institutional follow-up, specifically the absence of written responses to citizen and CSO proposals, incomplete public traceability of mandatory mayor–public meetings, and limited visibility of contracting and implementation stages for awarded CSO grants. These gaps affect accountability and the perceived effectiveness of participation and funding mechanisms, rather than the existence of consultation and grant instruments themselves.

#### Budget Public Hearings

Mitrovica South demonstrates a comparatively strong level of procedural compliance with legal requirements for public consultation during the 2025 budget cycle. Official municipal documentation confirms that budget public hearings were publicly announced in advance, conducted according to a defined schedule, and supported by the publication of draft budget materials.<sup>1</sup>

The municipality published an official timetable for budget hearings related to the preparation of the Medium-Term Budget Framework (2026–2028), specifying dates, locations, and target stakeholder groups. Public hearings were held across multiple thematic areas, allowing citizens to submit requests and proposals related to municipal spending priorities. An official report on budget hearings documents participation levels, sectoral categorization of citizen requests, and issues raised during consultations.

These elements indicate that budget hearings in Mitrovica South were not merely formal events, but structured consultations with documented input. The availability of both the hearing schedule and a consolidated report strengthens transparency and traceability compared to other municipalities assessed.

However, while citizen proposals were recorded and summarized, no publicly available documentation was identified explaining how these proposals were assessed or whether they were incorporated into the final adopted budget.<sup>2</sup> The absence of written municipal responses limits the ability of citizens to verify the impact of their participation on budgetary decisions.

<sup>1</sup> Municipality of Mitrovica South. Orari i dëgjimeve buxhetore me qytetarë për planifikimin e buxhetit për vitet 2026–2028.

<sup>2</sup> Municipality of Mitrovica South. Raport nga takimi i dytë publik i Kryetarit me qytetarë për vitin 2025.

## Mayor–Public Meetings

Documentation confirms that at least one public meeting between the Mayor and citizens was held during 2025. An official report from the second public meeting of the Mayor with citizens provides evidence of organization, agenda setting, and discussion of issues raised by participants.

While this documentation confirms partial compliance with legal obligations, publicly accessible records confirming two separate mayor–public meetings, one in each half of the year, were not clearly identifiable at the time of review. As noted during civil society interviews conducted for this assessment, the absence of consistent and publicly accessible records limits the ability of citizens and watchdog actors to verify whether the full legal requirement of two mayor–public meetings per year has been met and the absence of publicly documented responses to citizen proposals weakens accountability by preventing citizens from understanding how their input was considered and limiting their ability to assess whether public participation has a tangible influence on final decisions.<sup>3</sup> As a result, compliance with the minimum annual meeting requirement cannot be fully verified through publicly available documentation. This represents a traceability gap rather than definitive non-compliance.

## Municipal Calls for Proposals for CSO Grants

The review of publicly available documentation confirms that Mitrovica South implemented multiple Calls for Proposals (CfPs) for CSO funding during 2025, covering distinct thematic areas including youth, culture, tourism, and environment. These calls were issued by different municipal directorates and explicitly referenced Regulation MF No. 04/2017 on public financing of NGOs, providing a clear legal basis for grant allocation.

Public calls were formally announced through official municipal channels and included detailed information on eligibility criteria, funding ceilings, application deadlines, and required documentation. Calls specified thematic priorities and clearly defined minimum and maximum grant amounts, indicating structured planning at the call-design stage.

In addition to calls for project funding, Mitrovica South also published open invitations for civil society representatives and experts to participate in evaluation commissions, introducing an additional transparency safeguard within the selection process.

Documentation confirms that preliminary lists of awarded CSOs were published for several calls, including those in the fields of tourism, environment, youth, and culture. These lists include the names of beneficiary organizations, project titles, and evaluation scores expressed in percentages, allowing public verification of ranking and comparative assessment.

The publication of preliminary results was accompanied by information on complaint mechanisms, including deadlines and responsible municipal bodies, in line with Regulation MF

---

<sup>3</sup> Edin Lahu, Interview conducted in the framework of this assessment (2026)

No. 04/2017. This strengthens procedural accountability and provides applicants with formal remedies.

While calls and preliminary results are well documented, final consolidated award decisions and implementation reporting (e.g. signed contracts, disbursement confirmation, or project completion summaries) were not consistently identified across all thematic calls. This limits full-cycle traceability from call publication to project implementation and results.

In addition to documented procedural disruptions, civil society representatives interviewed for this assessment reported delays between the publication of final award decisions and the signing of grant contracts. According to interviewed winning organizations, these delays affected the timely start of project implementation and created uncertainty regarding disbursement schedules. While the delays were not reflected in publicly available documentation, they highlight a gap between formal selection outcomes and operational execution, with implications for effectiveness and accountability in municipal grant management.<sup>4</sup>

### **Language Accessibility**

Public announcements, budget hearing schedules, and reports reviewed for Mitrovica South were primarily published in Albanian. No systematic bilingual publication of budget consultation materials or mayor public meeting documentation was identified for the reviewed period. While this does not invalidate the consultation process, it may limit accessibility for non-Albanian-speaking communities.

### **3.2 North Mitrovica**

Mitrovica North demonstrates partial procedural compliance with public consultation requirements, but weaker documentation and traceability than Mitrovica South. The primary gaps relate to limited publication of budget hearing outputs, the absence of publicly documented mayor–public meetings, and inconsistent bilingual communication. In addition, no publicly accessible information on municipal CSO grant schemes was identified.

These shortcomings reduce transparency and hinder external accountability by obscuring the link between citizen and CSO participation and decision-making outcomes. Without accessible follow-up documentation, it is not possible to assess whether public input influenced municipal actions, budgetary decisions, or funding allocations.

### **Budget Public Hearings**

Public documentation confirms that budget public hearings related to the 2026–2028 Medium-Term Budget Framework were formally announced and scheduled in Mitrovica North during

---

<sup>4</sup> Erhan Mujka, Interview conducted in the framework of this assessment (2026), civil society organization awarded municipal grants in Mitrovica South.

2025. An official municipal announcement published on 7 July 2025 invited citizens to participate in two public hearings as part of the budget planning process.<sup>5</sup>

The announcement specified dates, venues, and target groups, including a dedicated hearing for women, girls, and civil society representatives, followed by a public hearing open to all interested citizens. This indicates an effort to structure participation and address inclusiveness within the consultation process.

While the announcement demonstrates compliance with advance notification and participatory requirements, no publicly accessible consolidated report or published minutes documenting citizen inputs and municipal responses were identified at the time of review.

However, compared to Mitrovica South, the documentation trail is more limited. While announcements referring to hearings were identifiable, draft budget documents and supporting materials were not consistently archived in a centralized and easily accessible manner on official municipal platforms. No consolidated public report summarizing citizen inputs, participation levels, or key discussion points was identified at the time of review.

As a result, although hearings appear to have taken place, the absence of structured documentation limits transparency regarding the content of discussions and the substance of citizen input.

### **Mayor–Public Meetings**

Publicly accessible documentation confirming the organization of mandatory mayor–public meetings during 2025 was not clearly identifiable through official municipal web records reviewed for this assessment. No advance announcements, minutes, or summary reports were found confirming the holding of two separate meetings, one in each half of the year, as required by law.<sup>5</sup>

As noted during civil society interviews conducted for this assessment, the absence of publicly accessible records makes it difficult for citizens and oversight actors to verify whether the minimum legal requirement for mayor citizen engagement has been fulfilled.<sup>6</sup> This constitutes a traceability gap rather than definitive evidence of non-compliance.

### **Municipal Calls for Proposals for CSO Grants**

No publicly accessible documentation related to calls for proposals, selection decisions, or contract implementation for CSO grants was identified for Mitrovica North during the 2025 review period. In addition, civil society actors interviewed for this assessment reported limited visibility and awareness of municipal CSO grant schemes, and none of the interviewed

<sup>5</sup> Municipality of Mitrovica North. Njoftim për Degjimet Publike mbi Planifikimin Buxhetor 2026-2028: Ftohen qytetarët të kontribuojnë! Published 7 July 2025, official municipal website.

<sup>6</sup> Ines Aljevic, Civil society representative interview and monitoring observations conducted in the framework of this assessment (2025-2026).

organizations indicated having participated in or benefited from a municipally administered call for proposals during the reviewed period.

As a result, it was not possible to assess issues such as selection timelines, contract signature delays, or implementation challenges for CSO grants in Mitrovica North. This represents a significant transparency and traceability gap rather than evidence of non-implementation.

### **Language Accessibility**

Public announcements and available documentation related to budget hearings were primarily published in Albanian. Limited and inconsistent use of Serbian was observed in selected announcements, but no systematic mirrored publication of draft budgets, hearing documentation, or meeting summaries in both official local languages was identified. This limits accessibility for parts of the local population and may contribute to uneven participation.

### **3.3 Vushtrri**

Vushtrri represents a good case among the municipalities assessed in terms of procedural transparency, advance planning, and traceability of public engagement activities, including both budget consultations and municipal CSO grant schemes. Public calls, evaluation results, and preliminary award decisions are clearly documented, demonstrating a high level of openness at the selection stage.

The remaining gaps relate not to the existence or organization of consultations and grant processes, but to the institutionalization of feedback and follow-up mechanisms, particularly the lack of publicly documented responses to citizen and CSO proposals and limited visibility of contracting and implementation stages. Addressing these gaps would further strengthen accountability and close the participation–decision-making and funding loops.

### **Budget Public Hearings**

Vushtrri demonstrates a solid level of procedural planning and documentation in relation to budget public hearings. Official municipal decisions and calendars confirm that a detailed timetable for budget consultations was formally adopted and publicly issued in advance. The calendar specifies dates, times, locations, responsible municipal officials, and targeted stakeholder groups across multiple settlements and population groups.

The documented schedule shows that budget hearings were conducted systematically throughout the municipality, including meetings in rural settlements, urban areas, and thematic sessions with specific groups such as women, youth, sports communities, artists, businesses,

and farmers. This indicates a structured and inclusive consultation approach, going beyond a single central hearing.<sup>7</sup>

The calendar further establishes internal procedural safeguards, including obligations to prepare meeting minutes, record citizen requests and proposals, and submit signed documentation to the municipal Budget and Finance Directorate and the Municipal Assembly Secretariat. However, while the internal obligation to prepare and submit minutes is clearly documented, consolidated public reports summarizing citizen inputs and explicitly linking them to final budget decisions were not identified among publicly accessible materials at the time of review, this confirmed also by civil society via interviews for this assessment.<sup>8</sup>

### **Mayor–Public Meetings**

Publicly accessible documentation confirms that Vushtrri formally scheduled and announced mayor–public meetings during 2025. An official announcement issued by the Mayor’s Office confirms the organization of a public meeting with citizens, including a defined agenda, venue, and time. In addition, the municipality adopted a formal calendar for public meetings with citizens for 2025, outlining the temporal framework for engagement and reinforcing compliance with the legal requirement to hold regular mayor–citizen meetings.

These documents provide clear evidence of advance planning and public notification, strengthening traceability and transparency compared to other municipalities assessed. Nevertheless, while meetings were announced and held, no publicly available consolidated reports documenting citizen questions, mayoral responses, or follow-up actions were identified. The official notification for the mayor–public meeting was published in both Albanian and Serbian, reflecting compliance with language accessibility obligations for public communication.<sup>9</sup>

### **Calls for Proposals for CSO Grants**

Publicly available documentation confirms that Vushtrri issued multiple public calls for proposals for CSO and other legal persons during 2025, covering thematic areas including culture, youth, sport, health, and social welfare. The calls were formally announced by the municipal directorates responsible and published with clear eligibility criteria, thematic priorities, funding ceilings, application deadlines, and required documentation.

The calls explicitly refer to the applicable legal framework governing public financing of NGOs and define both minimum and maximum grant amounts, demonstrating a structured and rule-based approach to call design.

---

<sup>7</sup> Municipality of Vushtrri. Kalendari i Degjimeve Buxhetore 2025.

<sup>8</sup> Besnik Hoxha, Civil Society representative, interview conducted in the framework of this assessment (2026).

<sup>9</sup> Municipality of Vushtrri. Njoftim për organizimin e takimit të parë publik me qytetarë, 30.06.2025.

Vushtrri demonstrates better transparency at the selection stage. An official preliminary decision on the allocation of subsidies for culture, youth, and sport was published, including:

- a list of winning organizations,
- awarded amounts per beneficiary,
- evaluation scores (points),
- a list of rejected applications with corresponding scores,
- the total allocated budget,
- and the composition and signatures of the evaluation commission.

The publication of both awarded and rejected applications, together with scoring, represents good practice in comparative terms and allows external verification of selection outcomes. The preliminary decision also clearly informs applicants of their right to appeal within a defined deadline, strengthening procedural accountability.

While selection outcomes are transparently documented, publicly accessible information on subsequent contracting and implementation stages was not systematically identified. The reviewed documentation does not include confirmation of contract signature dates. The absence of publicly available information on contract finalization and project implementation limits traceability across the full grant cycle, despite transparency at the call and selection stages.

### **Language Accessibility**

Public documentation related to budget hearings and mayor–public meetings in Vushtrri demonstrates partial bilingual communication. Budget hearing calendars and related documentation were primarily published in Albanian. However, official notifications for mayor–public meetings were also made available in Serbian, indicating an effort to ensure accessibility for non-Albanian-speaking communities.

While this bilingual practice strengthens inclusiveness in the context of mayor–citizen engagement, mirrored bilingual publication was not consistently observed across all related documents, including draft budgets and CSOs Calls for Proposals consolidated reports. As a result, language accessibility remains uneven across different types of public participation mechanisms.

### **3.4. Zvečan**

Zvečan demonstrates the weakest level of documentation and traceability among the municipalities assessed. The primary issue identified is not the quality of consultations or grant processes—which cannot be evaluated—but the absence of publicly accessible evidence confirming that legally required public engagement mechanisms and CSO grant schemes were implemented. This lack of documentation significantly constrains transparency and undermines institutional accountability.

## **Budget Public Hearings**

A review of publicly accessible municipal channels did not identify clear or consolidated documentation confirming the organization of budget public hearings related to the 2025 budget cycle in Zvečan. At the time of review, no official announcements, hearing schedules, draft budget documents, or public reports summarizing budget consultations were found on the municipal website or other official municipal platforms.

As a result, it was not possible to verify whether budget public hearings were announced or held, nor to assess the scope, structure, or inclusiveness of any such consultations based on publicly available information. The absence of accessible documentation significantly limits transparency and prevents external verification of compliance with public consultation requirements.

## **Mayor–Public Meetings**

Similarly, no publicly accessible documentation was identified confirming the organization of mandatory mayor–public meetings during 2025. No advance announcements, calendars, minutes, or summary reports were found that would allow verification of whether one meeting was held in each half of the year, as required by law.

This lack of traceable documentation represents a substantial gap in transparency. Without publicly available records, citizens and civil society actors are unable to assess whether opportunities for direct engagement with the Mayor were provided or whether issues raised by citizens were addressed.

## **Municipal Calls for Proposals for CSO Grants**

No publicly accessible documentation related to calls for proposals, selection procedures, award decisions, or contract implementation for CSO grants was identified for Zvečan during the 2025 review period. Official municipal platforms did not provide information on the existence, scope, or outcomes of any CSO grant schemes.

In addition, civil society actors interviewed for this assessment reported no awareness of publicly announced municipal calls for CSO funding in Zvečan during 2025, and none of the interviewed organizations indicated having applied for or received municipal grant support. Consequently, it was not possible to assess issues such as evaluation processes, contract signature timelines, or implementation challenges. This absence of information constitutes a significant transparency and traceability gap rather than evidence of non-implementation.

## **Language Accessibility**

Due to the absence of publicly accessible documentation on budget hearings and mayor–public meetings, it was not possible to assess language accessibility practices in Zvečan. The lack of published materials prevents evaluation of whether information was made available in relevant official local languages.

The absence of publicly documented consultation processes and mayor–public meetings weaken accountability by obscuring both the existence and the quality of citizen engagement mechanisms. Without accessible announcements, records, or follow-up documentation, there is no verifiable link between public participation requirements and municipal decision-making practices<sup>10</sup>.

## 4. Comparative Assessment

The comparative assessment highlights significant variation in documentation quality and institutional transparency across municipalities. Vushtrri demonstrates strong procedural compliance and traceability across all assessed dimensions. Mitrovica South shows solid performance in budget consultations but weaker documentation of mayor–public meetings. Mitrovica North demonstrates partial compliance with budget consultation requirements but limited transparency in outcomes and executive engagement. Zvečan exhibits substantial documentation gaps that prevent verification of compliance with public participation obligations.

Table 1 Comparative Assessment of Public Participation and Transparency (2025)

INDICATOR	MITROVICA SOUTH	MITROVICA NORTH	VUSHTRRI	ZVEČAN
 BUDGET HEARINGS ANNOUNCED	✓	✓	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 BUDGET HEARINGS HELD (CONFIRMED)	✓	ANNOUNCED (OUTCOMES NOT DOCUMENTED)	✓	? NOT VERIFIABLE
 DRAFT BUDGET / MTBF PUBLISHED	✓	NOT CLEARLY DOCUMENTED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 MINUTES / REPORTS PUBLISHED (BUDGET HEARINGS)	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED	PARTIAL / INTERNAL	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 WRITTEN RESPONSES TO CITIZEN PROPOSALS	✗	✗	✗	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 MAYOR–PUBLIC MEETING (1ST HALF OF YEAR)	DOCUMENTED (1 MEETING)	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 MAYOR–PUBLIC MEETING (2ND HALF OF YEAR)	DOCUMENTED (1 MEETING)	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 ADVANCE ANNOUNCEMENT OF MAYOR MEETINGS	✗ LIMITED	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 LANGUAGE ACCESSIBILITY (BUDGET)	ALBANIAN	ALBANIAN	ALBANIAN	NOT ASSESSABLE
 LANGUAGE ACCESSIBILITY (MAYOR MEETINGS)	ALBANIAN	LIMITED BILINGUAL	ALBANIAN & SERBIAN	NOT ASSESSABLE
 OVERALL DOCUMENTATION TRACEABILITY	MODERATE	LOW–MODERATE	STRONG	VERY WEAK

<sup>10</sup> Ines Aljevic, Civil society representative interview conducted in the framework of this assessment (2025 - 2026).

Vushtrri demonstrates that public participation requirements can be implemented in a structured and transparent manner. Advance calendars for budget hearings, documented mayor–public meetings, and clear public announcements allow citizens and oversight actors to verify when and how engagement takes place. The availability of schedules, reports, and bilingual notifications for mayor–public meetings strengthen institutional credibility and public trust.

Mitrovica South also shows elements of good practice through advance announcements and published reports on budget hearings, confirming that consultations were conducted and citizen inputs recorded.

## GOOD PRACTICE

- Advance calendars for budget hearings
- Documented mayor–public meetings
  - Published schedules and reports
- Bilingual notifications (mayor meetings)

Examples: Vushtrri, Mitrovica South

## RISK

- Participation limited to announcements
  - No written responses to citizens
- Weak documentation of outcomes
  - Meetings not traceable online

Examples: Mitrovica North, Zvečan

Figure 1 Good practise vs. Risks

Across several municipalities, public engagement risks remain procedural rather than substantive. In Mitrovica South and Mitrovica North, the absence of publicly documented responses to citizen proposals weakens accountability by obscuring how participation influences final decisions. In Mitrovica North, limited documentation of outcomes further constrains transparency.

Zvečan presents the highest risk case. The absence of publicly accessible documentation on budget hearings and mayor–public meetings prevent verification of compliance with legal obligations and undermines citizens’ ability to engage meaningfully.

Where public engagement is planned, documented, and archived, participation strengthens transparency and trust. Where documentation is missing or incomplete, participation risks becoming symbolic, limiting accountability and weakening democratic governance.

Table 2 Comparative Assessment of Municipal CSO Grant Schemes (2025)

INDICATOR	MITROVICA SOUTH	MITROVICA NORTH	VUSHTRRI	ZVEČAN
 PUBLIC CALL PUBLISHED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 CLEAR ELIGIBILITY & CRITERIA	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 EVALUATION PROCESS PUBLIC	PARTIAL	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 PRELIMINARY AWARD DECISION PUBLISHED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 SCORES / RANKING DISCLOSED	PARTIAL	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 BENEFICIARY LIST PUBLIC	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 APPEAL MECHANISM COMMUNICATED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED	✓	✗ NOT IDENTIFIED
 CONTRACT SIGNATURE INFORMATION PUBLIC	✗	✗ NOT ASSESSABLE	✗	✗ NOT ASSESSABLE
 IMPLEMENTATION / DISBURSEMENT REPORTING	✗	✗ NOT ASSESSABLE	✗	✗ NOT ASSESSABLE
 LANGUAGE ACCESSIBILITY	ALBANIAN	✗ NOT ASSESSABLE	ALBANIAN	✗ NOT ASSESSABLE
 OVERALL TRACEABILITY	MODERATE	WEAK	STRONG	VERY WEAK

Vushtrri demonstrates better performance in managing CSO grant schemes, particularly in the transparency of calls, evaluation processes, and publication of award decisions. Mitrovica South shows solid procedural compliance at the call stage but weaker traceability beyond selection. In contrast, the absence of publicly accessible documentation in Mitrovica North and Zvečan prevents verification of compliance and significantly limits accountability.

## 5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The 2025 monitoring of public participation and municipal accountability mechanisms across Mitrovica South, Mitrovica North, Vushtrri, and Zvečan demonstrates that the legal framework for transparency and citizen engagement is largely in place, but its practical implementation remains uneven. Budget public hearings, mayor–public meetings, and CSO grant schemes are formally foreseen as core instruments for participatory local governance; however, their effectiveness depends not only on their organization, but on the quality of documentation, follow-up, and public traceability.

The assessment shows that procedural compliance does not automatically translate into accountability. In several municipalities, public hearings and grant calls are announced and conducted, yet the absence of structured feedback explaining how citizen and CSO inputs influence decisions weakens the substantive value of participation. Where documentation ends at the point of consultation or selection, participation risks becoming a symbolic exercise rather than a mechanism for democratic oversight.

Vushtrri stands out as a comparatively better case, particularly in the transparent organization of budget hearings, mayor–public meetings, and CSO grant selection processes. The availability of advance calendars, published decisions, evaluation scores, and bilingual communication demonstrates that higher standards of transparency and traceability are achievable within the existing legal framework. Mitrovica South also demonstrates solid practice in the organization and documentation of budget consultations and CSO grant calls, though gaps remain in the traceability of mayor–public meetings and in the documentation of contract implementation for awarded grants.

In contrast, Mitrovica North and Zvečan present significant transparency gaps. The limited availability of publicly accessible documentation on public meetings, institutional responses to citizen input, and CSO grant schemes prevents verification of compliance and constrains external oversight. In these contexts, the absence of information—rather than evidence of non-implementation emerges as the primary accountability challenge.

Across all municipalities assessed, a common structural issue persists: the lack of publicly documented feedback and follow-through, both in response to citizen proposals raised during consultations and to CSO project applications submitted through municipal grant schemes. This gap weakens trust, reduces incentives for meaningful participation, and limits the ability of citizens and civil society to hold local institutions accountable for the use of public resources.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The table below summarizes priority actions required to move from procedural compliance toward meaningful participation and accountability in municipal governance.

Table 3 Key Recommendations to Strengthen Transparency and Accountability

<b>Area</b>	<b>Identified Gap</b>	<b>Recommended Action</b>	<b>Responsible Level</b>
<b>Feedback &amp; Accountability</b>	Citizen and CSO input not followed by written responses	Introduce a standard requirement to publish short written summaries explaining how citizen and CSO proposals were assessed and whether they were integrated into final decisions or funding allocations	Municipal executives
<b>Documentation &amp; Archiving</b>	Fragmented or missing public records across participation and grants	Establish a dedicated online archive covering public hearings, mayor–public meetings, CSO calls for proposals, award decisions, and implementation status	Municipal administrations
<b>Mayor–Public Meetings</b>	Limited traceability of mandatory meetings	Ensure at least two mayor–public meetings per year are publicly announced, documented, and archived, with summaries reflecting both citizen and CSO inputs	Mayors' offices
<b>CSO Grant Transparency</b>	Limited visibility of evaluation, contracting, and implementation stages	Publish evaluation criteria, preliminary and final beneficiary lists with scores and amounts, and indicative timelines for contract signature and project start	Municipal administrations
<b>Language Accessibility</b>	Inconsistent bilingual publication	Systematically publish announcements, consultation materials, and CSO grant documentation in all official local languages	Municipal administrations
<b>Monitoring &amp; Oversight</b>	Weak external verification and follow-up	Enable civil society organizations and oversight actors to access participation and CSO grant records through standardized publication and archiving practices	Municipalities / CSOs

## 6. Bibliography / References

1. Republic of Kosovo. (2008). Constitution of the Republic of Kosovo. <https://gzk.rks-gov.net>
2. Republic of Kosovo. (2008). Law No. 03/L-040 on local self-government. <https://gzk.rks-gov.net>
3. Republic of Kosovo. (2016). Law No. 05/L-063 on public financial management and accountability. <https://gzk.rks-gov.net>
4. Republic of Kosovo. (2019). Law No. 06/L-081 on access to public documents. <https://gzk.rks-gov.net>
5. Ministry of Finance, Labour and Transfers. (2018). Administrative Instruction (MFPT) No. 01/2018 on municipal budget planning and execution. <https://mf.rks-gov.net>
6. Municipality of Mitrovica South. (2025). Draft and approved municipal budget for fiscal year 2025.
7. Municipality of Mitrovica North. (2025). Draft and approved municipal budget for fiscal year 2025.
8. Municipality of Vushtrri. (2025). Draft and approved municipal budget for fiscal year 2025.
9. Municipalities of Mitrovica South, Mitrovica North, & Vushtrri. (n.d.). Municipal statutes and rules of procedure.
10. Municipal official websites and public information portals. (2025). Public notices and minutes of budget public hearings.
11. Public Procurement Regulatory Commission. (2024–2025). Municipal procurement plans and contract award notices. <https://e-prokurimi.rks-gov.net>
12. Municipality of Mitrovica South. (2025, January). Public call for sports projects for NGOs. Directorate for Culture, Youth and Sport.
13. Municipality of Mitrovica South. (2025, April–May). Preliminary list of beneficiary NGOs – Tourism and environment.
14. Municipality of Mitrovica South. (2025, June). Preliminary list of beneficiary NGOs – Youth sector.
15. Municipality of Mitrovica South. (2025, March). Announcement on cancellation of public call for NGO financing.
16. Municipality of Mitrovica South. (2025, April–May). Call for civil society representatives to evaluation commissions.
17. Municipality of Vushtrri. (2025, March). Public call for financing projects of legal persons/NGOs in culture, youth and sport.
18. Municipality of Vushtrri. (2025, May 28). Preliminary decision on the allocation of subsidies for culture, youth and sport – Public call 2025.
19. Municipality of Vushtrri. (2025, September). Public call for financing projects of legal persons/NGOs in health and social welfare.
20. Council of Europe. (2018). Guidelines on civil participation in political decision-making.
21. International Budget Partnership. (2018). Principles of public participation in fiscal policy.
22. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2015). Principles of budgetary governance. OECD Publishing.
23. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). Open government and citizen participation in the budget process. OECD Publishing.
24. World Bank. (2017). Public participation in budgeting and fiscal transparency. World Bank Group.
25. Direct monitoring of budget public hearings conducted in Mitrovica South, Mitrovica North, and Vushtrri municipalities. (2025).
26. Interviews with citizens, civil society representatives. (2025).



[www.rec-kosova.org](http://www.rec-kosova.org)

