

## Local Self-government Transparency Index LTI 2017<sup>1</sup>

### Results, conclusions and recommendations - summary

#### Results

Transparency Serbia conducted **the second survey**, assessment and ranking of towns and municipalities in Serbia on the basis of criteria of transparency defined by **86 indicators**. After the first ranking (LTI 2015), presented in February 2016, which comprised all municipalities, towns and city municipalities, **this year's ranking contains a sample of 15 towns and municipalities**.

Their indices are as follows:

		LTI 2017	LTI 2015
1.	Pančevo	67	61
2.	Raška	62	57
3.	Vranje	62	60
4.	Leskovac	61	61
5.	Kraljevo	57	58
6.	Paraćin	56	74
7.	Novi Sad	48	38
8.	Niš	48	45
9.	Tutin	47	35
10.	Bujanovac	47	47
11.	Kragujevac	43	48
12.	Novi Pazar	39	36
13.	Beograd	34	36
14.	Jagodina	26	21
15.	Preševo	11	15

It should be noted that it is not correct to compare this year's placement with the placement in **LTI 2015**, since only 15 LSG have been ranked, in contrast to 145 in the last year.

The survey shows that there is certain improvement in most of municipalities. However, there is still considerable **room and need for improvement of transparency**. Namely,

---

<sup>1</sup>Transparency Serbia is implementing the project with the support of OSCE Serbia. All views and opinions are solely of Transparency Serbia and do not reflect the views of OSCE Serbia.

even towns that have been most favourably assessed in this cycle, attained the set standards only under two thirds of criteria, and the average score is under 50% of the maximum score **(47.2 out of 100)**.

Our experience from the meetings held in spring 2016 with the representatives of 20 towns and municipalities, and the round tables we held in October last year with representatives of six LSUs from the Raska and Pcinja Districts, the answers we received in both cycles of the survey and the situation analysis point to the conclusion that **political will continues to be a decisive factor for the improvement of transparency of towns and municipalities**. Only if there is the support of the local government officials, the employees will carry out measures that are the subject of the survey.

Also, towns and municipalities usually **do not exceed the scope of their mandatory duties, and quite often there is a violation of these duties or purely formal compliance**. By category, the best rankings are for the transparency of data on public procurement, followed by information brochures and free acces to information, while the situation is worst regarding public enterprises and institutions. Often, these do not comply with obligations provided under the Law on Public Entities, let alone higher standards of best practice, which we have also looked at within the LTI.

It should be noted that the indicators do not reflect only legal duties of towns and municipalities. The law and by-laws prescribe rules that should ensure certain level of transparency. LTI 2017 indicators seek for **practices which bring about a higher level of transparency**.

As very good and remarkable practices noticed in this cycle, we can underline electronic registers of administrative procedures in several LSU, which contain very clear information on the procedures, persons in charge, required documentation, information on mandatory fees, and on, what is significant but often overlooked – deadlines to deliver a service. Several LSU have the ability of online tracking of cases, or the “System 48” for response (or resolution) of community related issues. As interesting solutions, we point to specific web sites, such as of the Leskovac Service Centre, Novi Sad City Council, and a special web site containing a database of regulations (Kraljevo, although it seemed outdated at the moment, with last update from the end of 2015).