

Kosovo*

Synthesis of the monitoring year 1 brief

COMPONENT 1: CONDUCTIVE ENVIRONMENT

Objective 1: An enabling legal and policy environment for the exercise of the rights of freedom, expression, assembly and association

Result 1.1.: All individuals and legal entities can express themselves freely, assemble peacefully and establish, join and participate in non-formal and/or registered organisations

| | |
|--|--|
| | The basic legislation for the establishment and operation of CSOs is in compliance with international standards, but its proper implementation is hampered by limited capacities of public institutions and lack of harmonisation with other laws and mechanisms relevant for the operation of CSOs. |
| | The legal framework allows all individuals and legal persons, without discrimination, to establish associations, foundations, political parties, religious organisations, employee organisations and trade unions |
| | The legal framework does not regulate the establishment of non-for-profit companies or endowments, although the latter is neither prohibited nor allowed explicitly. In practice, every individual and legal entity can form non-profit organizations, in exception on non-profit companies. |
| | Registration of CSOs is not mandatory; No one is sanctioned for not-registering their organisations, although proper operation of a non-registered organisation faces different administrative problems. There are very few non-registered organizations present in society and public life. |
| | Registration rules are clearly prescribed, no fee is required and response by the authorities is to be provided within 60 days. The legal framework allows for an appeal process, but no clear rules are prescribed and the same authority is mandated to establish an appeals commission. In the majority of cases, registration is accessible to all interested within the 60 days deadline, although few cases of subjective decisions, unlawful requirements or delays are reported. |
| | The legal framework does not prohibit networking among organisations in and outside of Kosovo without prior notification. Everyone can form and participate in networks and coalitions, in and outside Kosovo. |
| | An online registration system has become operational recently, but online registration is not common. |
| | The recently initiated process of amending the fiscal laws does not involve civil society representatives. |
| | The rules for dissolution and termination of CSOs are in line with the international law and based on objective criteria, with the exception of the provisions of the money laundering law and the secondary legislation adopted in September 2014 which provides the suspension of an NGO from an administrative unit of Government. |
| | The rules for establishment and procedure of the Committee for Distribution of remained Assets of the terminated CSO are not in place. |
| | The legal framework guarantees all citizens of the Republic of Kosovo the right to organise and participate in public gatherings, <u>but has no legal provision regarding the right of assembly of those who are not citizens of Republic of Kosovo. The legal framework indirectly implies that counter-</u> |

* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>assemblies are not allowed. Prior notification for public gatherings, except in those places where no additional security measures are needed, is required. When authorities lack to provide response in due time, the public gathering can take place without any restriction. Any restriction following the notification of public gatherings can be appealed by organisers in court through a fast-track procedure.</p> |
| | <p>The legal framework provides freedom of expression to all. Restrictions are limited to hate speech and are in line with international law and standards. Libel is not in the Penal Code. CSO representatives enjoy the right to freedom of expression. <u>There are few reported cases of encroachment on the right of freedom of expression for CSOs by public institutions, although there are a number of cases of encroachment of this right for journalists.</u> There are few reported cases of threats of CSO representatives for critical speech, and there are a number of reported threats to journalists from public officials or business representatives</p> |
| | <p>Public gatherings are usually organized in public squares, while other places are not common for organizing of public gatherings. CSOs do not report any restriction of their right of assembly. Counter-assemblies are not common. In general, media has full access to the assemblies.</p> |
| | <p>Only 24.2% of the surveyed CSOs report to have been involved in organizing assemblies, and none of them have reported any restriction. During 2014, only one case of police intervention has been reported.</p> |
| | <p>Police intervened during the protests organised by the student associations and supported by other CSOs, requesting the resignation of the Rector of the University of Pristina. Among the 33 arrested protesters, there were also civil society activists, including the director of a well-known CSO</p> |
| | <p>CSO representatives, including those from human rights and watch dog CSOs, in general enjoy the right to freedom of expression.</p> |
| | <p>The legal framework provides the possibility to communicate via and access any source of information including the Internet and ICT. The legal framework prohibits unjustified monitoring of communication channels, with the exception of monitoring based on a court decision or in an extraordinary situation for reasons of national security.</p> |
| | <p>There are no reported cases where any restriction is imposed on accessing any source of information to CSOs. There are few reported cases of monitoring of communication channels, although no evidence on justification is available. There are no reported cases of police harassment of members of social groups</p> |
| | <p>Internet penetration in Kosovo is 72.1 percent and the monthly price for an Internet connection is approximately 4.5 percent of the average monthly salary of the state budget. Most CSOs use social media to promote their work and civil society activists are free to receive and impart information through social media.</p> |

Result: 1.2. The policies and legal environment stimulate and facilitate volunteering and employment in CSOs

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>There are no statistics on the number of employees in the non-profit sector. 9% of CSOs stated that they do not have employees, 4% have one employee, 35% from 2-5 employees, and 51% over 6 employees.</p> |
| | <p>In 2013, only 3.1 percent of citizens volunteered for any civil society organisation or initiative, compared to 4.5 percent in 2011. This shows a decrease in the levels of voluntarism in Kosovo.</p> |
| | <p>32.67 percent of CSOs have the perception that volunteering in civil society is decreasing, compared to 19.8 percent who have the opposite perception.</p> |
| | <p>Six out of 10 of the surveyed CSOs (63%) point out that the legislation is not stimulating for the development of volunteerism and engagement of volunteers, while one in three of the surveyed CSOs (32%) believe that the legislation is stimulating.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | CSOs are treated in equal manner to other employers by law. CSOs have difficulties in implementing the provisions of the Labour Law on Maternity Leave, due to their specific nature of funding. The process of the amendment of the Labour Law, initiated by the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare in 2013, has been paused due to the institutional blockage of 2014. CSOs are not treated in state incentive programmes for employment. |
| | A policy document on regulation of Social Enterprises has been initiated by the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare and some CSOs have been invited to provide their comments on this process |
| | In general, no regular statistics on the number of employees in the non-profit sector exist. A general number of those who pay income tax from the non-profit sector is available upon request by the Kosovo Agency of Statistics, although no adequate categorization of full-time employees, part-time employees and external associates is available within this number |
| | Legislation stimulates volunteering only for youth, and registration of young volunteers is obligatory. |
| | There are very few incentives and state supported programmes for youth for the development and promotion of volunteering and the volunteering provisions on youth are not implemented. There are obligations for contractual relationships and protection for organised volunteering. |
| | A volunteering program by the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports has engaged 99 young volunteers over three years and provided them with certificates which serve to recognize this engagement as a work experience |
| | A limited number of grants and support for projects on volunteering is provided by the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports. Only 2.4% of the surveyed CSOs are aware of this support. |
| | A Working Group on Objective 4 (Volunteering) of the Government Strategy for cooperation with civil society has been established and is mandated to devise the policy options for improving the voluntary work in civil society sector |
| | Administrative procedures for host organisations of young volunteers are complicated and burdensome for CSOs. Thus volunteering takes place in other forms, mostly without any formal procedure. |

Result 1.3. National and/or local authorities have enabling policies and rules for grassroots organisations*.

| | |
|--|---|
| | Registration of CSOs is not mandatory. Registration rules are clearly prescribed. No fee is required and responses by the authorities must be provided within 60 days. In practice, every individual and legal entity can form non-profit organizations, in exception of non-profit companies. No one is sanctioned for not registering their organisations, although proper operation of non-registered organisations face different administrative problems. There are very few non-registered organisations present in society and public life. In majority of cases, registration is accessible to all interested within the 60 days deadline, although few cases of subjective decisions, unlawful requirements or delays are reported |
| | The already designed online registration system should be promoted and become fully operational |
| | The legal framework allows for an appeal process, but no clear rules are prescribed and the same authority is mandated to establish an appeals commission. |
| | The legal framework indirectly implies that counter-assemblies are not allowed. The legal framework requires prior notification for public gatherings, except in those places where no additional security measures are required like stadiums, city halls, etc. and/or closed premises. When no response is provided by authorities in due time, the public gathering can take place without any restriction |
| | The legal framework provides the possibility to communicate via and access any source of information, including the Internet and ICT. There are no reported cases of police harassment of members of social groups. |

Objective: 2. An enabling financial environment, which supports the sustainability of CSOs.

Result: 2.1. Easy to meet financial rules for CSO, which are proportionate to their turnover and non-commercial activities

| | |
|--|--|
| | 83% of the surveyed CSOs evaluate the accounting and bookkeeping rules positively – as clear and understandable |
| | 71% of the surveyed CSOs claim that these rules are easy to implement |
| | Only PBOs with an income of more than 100,000 EUR should submit an external audit report. The legal framework for custom tax exemptions is not clear and PBOs are not treated in a standard manner |
| | The legal framework for financial reporting of CSOs is identical to private companies and does not take into account the size and type and scope of activities of CSOs. The sanctions for financial reporting on taxes are identical to private companies and same proportionality is applied also to CSOs. More than half of CSOs consider financial reporting requirements not in line with the specific nature of CSOs. Sanctions for CSOs are not common and no evidence of un-proportionate sanction has been collected |
| | The money laundering regulations have lower/stricter reporting thresholds for CSOs in comparison to other entities and are considered burdensome for daily operation of CSOs. The sanctions on breaches of money laundering regulations are not proportionate to the extent of the breach and they are not in line with the provisions of the Law on Freedom of Association in NGOs on dissolution of NGOs. |
| | Majority of CSOs report that they had no visits from tax authorities during 2014. Only one of the surveyed CSOs reported “surprise visits” by tax authorities during 2014, and one other CSO reported that excessive inspection was undertaken by the tax authorities within an announced visit. |
| | The legal framework allows CSOs to engage in economic activities, but In practice, few CSOs engage in economic activities. 17.1% of the surveyed CSOs report that they are engaging in economic activities and 4.9% that face administrative difficulties while engaging in economic activities. CSOs are not familiar with obligations and limitations on economic activities and no legal advice is available. |
| | The legal framework allows CSOs to receive foreign funding, as well as funding from individuals, corporations and other sources, although money laundering limits the amounts of receipt and disbursement without prior authorization No restrictions on receiving foreign funding have been reported, with the exception of the money laundering law limitations and burdensome procedures |
| | VAT exemption is provided based on the type of donor and different procedures are applied. Some procedures for exemption are burdensome and difficult to implement. The period on which certain foreign funds are exempted from VAT ended in 31 st of December 2014 and its extension has still not been adopted by the Kosovo Assembly |
| | Custom tax exemption is provided mostly based on the type of donor, and most of the procedures for exemption are burdensome and difficult to implement. For custom exemptions based on the types of donors, the competence has been fully transferred to the Kosovo Customs and no “purchase order for relief” should be issued by the Kosovo Tax Administration |
| | There are no practices found of endowments established or operating in Kosovo. |

Result: 2.2. Donations are stimulated with adequate legislation and regulations

| | |
|--|---|
| | The law provides tax deductions for individual and corporate donations to CSOs of up to five percent if the donations are for humanitarian, health, educational, religious, scientific, cultural, environmental protection or sports purposes. |
| | The eligible recipients of donations include NGOs, which are granted public benefit status under the framework regulation and any other non-commercial organisation that directly performs activities in the public interest and not-for-profit in the above mentioned areas. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | This tax benefit is provided only for a selected number of publicly beneficial activities. Thus it is not coherent with the public benefit status, which is set in the basic NGO Law. |
| | The legal requirements and conditions for receiving deductible donations are clear, but they include only a few publicly beneficial activities. There is a procedure to claim tax deductions, although it is used in rare cases. |
| | Few CSOs have received individual or corporate donations, and tax deductions are not the main motivation for those donations. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is not a widespread concept among private companies in Kosovo and the rare cases of CSR are mostly initiated on an individual basis without any state policy. CSR is promoted neither by state nor by the business sector or by CSOs. |

Result: 2.3. Financial (e.g. tax or in-kind) benefits are available

| | |
|--|--|
| | The law provides tax-free treatment for all grants and donations supporting not-for-profit activity of CSOs. The law provides tax benefits for related economic activities of CSOs up to a “reasonable level of income”. |
| | There are no explicit legal provisions for the treatment of passive investments of CSOs. There are no legal provisions for establishment and operation of endowments. |
| | There are no reported direct or indirect taxes on grants. In general, tax benefits for economic activities of CSOs are effective, although there are difficulties in reporting due to reporting procedures, which are not specific to CSO work |
| | Passive investments of CSOs are not common and only one of the surveyed CSOs has reported to generate income from passive investments. There are no endowments established or operating in Kosovo. |

Result 2.4.: Government support to CSOs is available and provided in a transparent, accountable, fair and non-discriminatory manner

| | |
|--|--|
| | Public funds for Civil Society were raised from eight percent in 2011 to 20.5 percent in 2013. Out of 20.5 percent of public funds, 9.1 percent are provided by central institutions and 11.4 percent by local institutions. |
| | The Government does not have any clear data on funds available for the civil society. |
| | There is no law or national policy or document that regulates state support for CSOs. There is no national level mechanism for the distribution of public funds to CSOs. Public funds for CSOs are not clearly planned within the state budget. Funding is not planned and predictable and the budget amount for CSOs is impossible to identify and while it is available, it does not respond to the needs of the CSO sector. |
| | There are legal provisions on the possibility for directing lottery funds to different social categories, human rights issues, culture and sports, but no procedure exists. No information for collection or disbursement of lottery funds exists. |
| | There are no procedures for CSOs participation in the public funding cycle and CSOs do not participate in the public funding cycle. |
| | The Council for implementation of the Government Strategy for cooperation with civil society has included the identification of the model for public of CSOs as one of the priorities for 2015 |
| | No government body has a mandate to distribute and monitor the distribution of state funding. |
| | There is no specific procedure for distribution of public funding to CSOs. There are no standard selection criteria and different state institutions use different selection criteria. There are no standards or procedure for their programming, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. |
| | The approach of public institutions does not contribute towards financial viability of CSOs. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | There is no specific procedure for distribution of public funding to CSOs. There are no standard selection criteria and different state institutions use different selection criteria. The only CSO specific procedures on addressing the conflict of interest are related to CSOs with public officials as Board members vis-à-vis state funding. |
| | Information on procedures and funded projects are publicly available only in rare cases. State bodies have no harmonised procedure that they apply. There is no sufficient information to assess and report the application requirements. Most of the decisions on tenders are not transparent and no information on fairness and conflict of interest is available. |
| | Only a small portion of public funding is distributed in a transparent manner based on an open competition between eligible applicants. |
| | There are no specific procedures and measures for ensuring accountability, monitoring and evaluation of public funds to CSOs, with the exception of the general provisions of the Public Procurement Law and Public Finances Management and Accountability. There are no specific sanctions for CSOs that misuse funds, with the exception of the general provisions of the Public Procurement Law and Public Finances Management and Accountability |
| | Monitoring visits from contracting authorities of public funding are not commonly reported and, when they happen, there are no standardised procedures for follow-up for such visits. As no specific legal provisions exist, the sanctions for misuse of public funds by CSOs are identical to all other legal entities, thus do not take into account the proportionality of the sanction with regard to size and type of CSO. Being disbursed in ad hoc and non-standardised manner, there is no information that any evaluation for public funds for CSOs has been carried out. |
| | The law allows municipalities to allocate immovable property to CSOs. There are very general criteria and no clearly prescribed process for non-financial support to CSOs. There are a number of CSOs that use non-financial support from municipalities |
| | There are no reports of unequal treatment of CSOs compared to other actors. |
| | Non-financial support is mostly granted to CSOs representing vulnerable groups and youth organisations There are few reported cases of critical CSOs benefiting from short-term or ad hoc non-financial support. .14% of CSOs have reported to be provided with ownership or long-term usage of municipal property/offices. 24.49% of CSOs have reported free usage of public facilities for their specific activities. |
| | General legislation allows CSOs to provide services in various areas, and specific legislation allows CSOs to provide social services and there are no legal barriers to CSOs that provide social services to receive public funding, while CSOs providing other services which fall under general public procurement law, there are hidden barriers. |
| | There are no additional legal requirements for CSOs in comparison to other service providers, although the general requirements are not in line with specific nature of work of CSOs, in exception of social service provision where specific nature of work of CSOs is part of the legislation There are hidden legal barriers in general legislation that, in some cases, prevents CSOs to be eligible for service provision contracts, for example, the requirement for business registration certificate |
| | There are few CSOs, which are able to obtain contracts, mostly in social services and areas where no other service providers exist. CSOs are included only in some stages of developing and providing services. Registration and licensing is required for all social services, and the procedure for obtaining that is the same as other service providers. |
| | Based on a number of structural and professional standards set recently, licensing of individuals has been initiated, while licensing of CSOs that provide social and family services is due to start during 2015 |
| | The decentralization of social services has been agreed between central and local governments, but no concrete results have been reported from this process |
| | Legislation obliges state institutions to provide annual funds to CSOs that provide social services. CSOs can sign annual contracts for provision of social services. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | The decentralization of social services has been agreed between central and local governments, but no concrete results have been reported from this process |
| | Some CSOs providing social services receive public funding for services provided CSOs, in most of the cases, do not receive sufficient funds to cover the services they provide, while institutional costs in general are not covered Many times there are delays in payments and funding is not flexible with regard to quality of services |
| | The law does not include a clear and transparent procedure through which the funding for social services is distributed. Legal provisions on funding criteria are determined on a yearly basis through specific administrative instructions. Some social services are contracted to CSOs, while there are few other types of services contracted to CSOs In practice, in most cases of social services provision by CSOs, selection criterion is based on best value based on quality, technical expertise and financial assessment of contenders In some cases, competitions on social service provision by CSOs, are not considered in line with the selection criteria |
| | There are general provisions on addressing the conflict of interests. There is a right to appeal against the competition results. |
| | CSOs that provide social services consider that state officials have sufficient technical capacities to organize the procedures, while lack the full understanding of the concept of service provision by CSOs |
| | There is a legal basis for monitoring the spending of CSOs that provide social services. There are no quality standards or monitoring procedures for social service provision by CSOs, and drafting of a legal basis is on the process. In practice, there are field visits and inspections, which are notified in advance. Field visits and inspections are performed on a regular basis, mostly with regards to spending verification and technical aspects of service provision. The quality, effects and impacts of services provided are not evaluated. |

Changing relations, CSOs and government

Objective 3: Civil society and public institutions work in partnership through dialogue and cooperation based on willingness, trust and mutual acknowledgment around common interests

Result: 3.1. Public institutions recognise the importance of CSOs in improving good governance through CSO inclusion in decision-making processes

| | |
|--|--|
| | 28% of surveyed CSOs were consulted in the process of the preparation of specific laws; 20% on actions plan on the local level; 19% on strategies on the national level; 17% on strategies on the local level; 12% on IPA programming of EU financial support; 11% on policy documents; and 11% on action plans on the national level. |
| | A Government Strategy for cooperation with civil society was adopted in July 2013, and has started with its implementation only by the end of 2014 The Governmental Strategy envisages continuous monitoring and periodic evaluation and revision. Monitoring system is planned to be established during 2015 and a revision of the Strategy is planned to take place by the end of 2015. The Governmental Strategy has been based on data collected mostly by CSOs |
| | The Governmental Strategy for Cooperation with Civil Society includes strategic objectives and measures, as well as a specific action plan with allocation of responsibilities The responsible bodies for implementation of this Strategy have been functionalized only by the end of 2014 and its implementation is expected to be initiated only by 2015. A detailed Action Plan for 2015 has been adopted by the Council for implementation of the Strategy. |
| | The Ministry of Finance has allocated the budget for implementation of this Strategy (137,960 EUR for four years) |

| | |
|--|---|
| | The measures within the Governmental Strategy for Cooperation with Civil Society have been developed jointly with CSOs. There were many CSOs from different areas of interest that participated in the phase of development of the Governmental Strategy for Cooperation with Civil Society |
| | A Declaration for cooperation between the Kosovo Assembly and civil society has been adopted in early 2014, and the content of this declaration has been developed in cooperation with CSOs active at the Assembly level. Due to the absence of the Assembly during the major part of 2014, the Declaration for cooperation between the Kosovo Assembly and civil society has not produced any result still. A joint group with civil society is expected to be established during 2015 for designing specific activities for implementation of this Declaration. |
| | Existing legislation does not explicitly oblige public institutions to proactively publish draft laws and policies, while it obliges them to publish adopted laws and policies. Public institutions actively publish only adopted laws and policies, while draft laws are not published proactively. |
| | There are clear legal procedures and mechanisms for access to public information and documents. The law contains clearly prescribes monetary sanctions for civil servants and institutions breaching the legal requirements on access to public information. There are no reports that cases of violations of the law have been sanctioned. Public institutions do not answer regularly within the deadline to the requests for access to public information, and written explanation on the reasons for refusal are very rare |
| | Existing legislation allows, but does not oblige, public institutions to invite CSO representatives to decision-making or advisory bodies. There are no selection mechanisms or standard guidelines of representatives from civil society. Some advisory bodies use tailor-made selection mechanism for representation from civil society Few decision-making and advisory bodies have selected CSO representatives through an open selection process, such as the Council for implementation of the Government Strategy for cooperation with civil society |
| | There are a number of decision-making and advisory bodies on different issues which include CSO representatives. CSO representatives in these bodies generally are free to present and defend their positions, without being sanctioned. CSOs participating in decision-making and advisory bodies generally are free to use alternative ways of advocacy which are not in line with the position of the respective body |
| | The Office for Good Governance within the Office of the Prime Minister has the mandate to facilitate cooperation between government and civil society During 2014, the Office for Good Governance has recruited two officers to be engaged primarily in tasks related to implementation of the Strategy. It is still to be assessed whether this will create the sufficient capacities to serve as a fully-functional secretariat of the Council and complete all the tasks in implementation of the Strategy. |
| | A Council for implementation of the Government Strategy for cooperation with civil society was established in 2014. Out of 29 members of this Council, 15 of them are civil society representatives. 14 of them are elected through open and democratic procedure while one is appointed by the Civikos Platform |
| | The Rules of Procedures of the Council oblige this body to consider all initiatives and comments received from CSOs, while there are other provisions which ensure a full participation of civil society in the work of the Council. 61.5% of the surveyed CSOs declare that they did not cooperate with OGG while 33.3% of the surveyed CSOs declare to have participated in the information sessions or consultative meetings organised by OGG. Activities related to the implementation of the Strategy always involve and are consulted with CSOs |
| | A senior officer for cooperation with donors and civil society is part of the Secretariat of the Assembly. The senior officer for cooperation with donors and civil society of the Assembly of Kosovo has still not produced any significant improvement in the relations of civil society and the Assembly. 70% of the surveyed CSOs declare that they do not have any cooperation or have not heard for the civil society officer within the Assembly, with the rest declaring cooperation at different levels and forms. |
| | The Rules of Procedures of Government require public consultations for all draft policies and laws, Minimum Standards for Public Consultation are expected to be adopted during 2015. Public |

| | |
|--|--|
| | institutions, in particular ministries, invite CSOs to provide written comments on draft laws and policies in many cases, although rarely at an early stages. CSOs are not provided with adequate information on the content of draft documents, and the usual time to respond to Ministerial invitations within fifteen working days. Written feedback on the results of consultations is provided or made publicly available on rare cases |
| | The Law on Local Self-Government provides instruments for citizen participation at the local, decision-making level. Most of the municipalities do not involve civil society on a regular basis and many of the existing legal instruments are not properly functionalised. |
| | Although part of the Government Strategy for cooperation with civil society, so no educational programs/trainings for civil servants on CSO involvement have been initiated to the date. Similarly, Kosovo Institute for Public Administration has no training modules on public consultation or cooperation with civil society. |
| | With exception of general offices/officers for cooperation in the Government and Assembly, line ministries and other public institutions have no internal regulations, which require for specific units/officers to coordinate, monitor and report CSO involvement in their work There are no units/officers coordinating and monitoring public consultations |
| | Although there are no official data, most of the surveyed CSOs think that few civil servants in charge of drafting public policies have successfully completed any educational program/training on CSO involvement |
| | 73% of surveyed CSOs claim to have had adequate access to information |
| | 73% of surveyed CSOs had enough time to make comments while participating in the consultation processes |
| | 18% of the surveyed CSOs did not have their comments and suggestions taken into account at all; 7% claim that all of their comments and suggestions were taken into account during consultations; while 55% state that only some of their comments and suggestions were acknowledged and taken into account during consultations. |
| | One in five of the surveyed CSOs (21%) received detailed feedback from the consultation processes; while 52% of CSOs claim not to have received any feedback at all or that results of the consultations were not published at all. |
| | Six out of 10 of the surveyed CSOs (62%) claim to be aware of the current structures and mechanisms for dialogue and cooperation with state institutions and 36% believe that these mechanisms only exist pro-forma while only 26% of the surveyed CSOs believe that these mechanisms are useful. |
| | Six out of 10 of the surveyed CSOs (62%) claim to be aware of the current structures and mechanisms for dialogue and cooperation with local institutions and 36% believe that these mechanisms only exist pro-forma while only 26% find that these mechanisms are useful. |

CSOs Capacities

Objective 4.: Capable, transparent and accountable CSOs

Result 4.1.: CSOs' internal governance structures are transparent and accountable to members/constituents/beneficiaries

| | |
|--|---|
| | One in four of the surveyed CSOs believe that the majority of CSOs in Kosovo are in compliance with the prescribed rules, including consultations with the employed and volunteers when making decisions. |
| | 35% of the surveyed CSOs claim that decisions in their organisation are mainly made in compliance with the prescribed rules, including consultations with the employed and volunteers. |
| | 78% of the surveyed CSOs state that there is, by internal acts defined an obligation to inform their members, stakeholders or broader public about the results of their work. |

Result 4.2.: CSOs are able to communicate the results of their activities to the public

| | |
|--|---|
| | Of the surveyed general population, 70% have the most confidence in the police; six out of 10 have confidence in the media and 46% have confidence in NGOs |
| | Of the surveyed general population, the least confidence is in the parliament at 31%; the government at 30% and political parties at 24%. |
| | Of the surveyed population, 67% believe that the police are trying to solve the country's problems; followed by the media at 58% and NGOs at 47%. Those who are seen as least trying to solve the country's problems are: the parliament at 30%; the government at 31% and political parties at 27%. |
| | Six out of 10 of the surveyed CSOs (58%) think that they are not present enough in public because there is insufficient interest of the media in Kosovo to report on CSO activities; while 37% hold responsible the CSOs because of the insufficient (or inadequate) CSO activity in terms of increasing their presence in public (which represents the lowest percentage in the region, except for Serbia) |
| | The surveyed general population perceives the most important topic areas are education, 40%, employment, 37% and safety at 36%. The least important topic areas are culture and arts, 26%; ecology, 25% and animal protection at 33%. It is interesting that some of the areas that are less important are perceived to have more active CSOs and vice versa. For example employment and safety are perceived to have less active CSOs (top three important areas) compared to rights of women and human rights which are perceived to have more active CSOs and are yet not the most important topic areas. So, there are some discrepancies in the areas that are perceived to be most important and the areas in which the CSOs are more or less active. |
| | The surveyed general population perceives that the CSOs are most active in the areas of education, 56%; rights of women, 52%; and human rights at 50%. They are perceived to be least active in animal protection, 33%; ecology, 37% and rural development 38%. Again, there are some discrepancies between areas of importance and how this corresponds or not to the perceived activity level. |
| | The surveyed CSOs perceive the most important topic areas to be: employment, 57%; safety, 55% and education 54%. The least important topic areas are: animal protection and fight against corruption at 18%; rural development at 29% and ecology at 36%. These topic areas mainly match the surveyed general population's perceptions. |
| | The surveyed CSOs perceive that the most active topic areas are rights for women, 77%; human rights, 71% and education, 71%. The least active areas are: animal protection, 37%; rural development, 45%; and ecology, 47%. There are greater discrepancies here in terms of active areas corresponding to important ones. For example, except for education. The top two important areas are perceived to be less active in comparison to less important topic areas, like rights of women (the most active area). Similarly, the topic area tied for least important, fight again corruption is seen to be more active than the top two most important topic areas. |

Result 4.3.: CSOs are transparent about their programme activities and financial management

| | |
|--|--|
| | 32% of the surveyed CSOs point out that the statue of the organisation in which they are engaged is not accessible to the public, while 41% claim that they have their statue which is accessible on their website |
| | Three out of 10 of the surveyed CSOs (29%) have their Code of Conduct accessible on their Web site; one out of three CSOs (32%) claim that they do not have a Code of Conduct, while another 15% have one, but it is not accessible to the public. |
| | Surveyed CSOs believe that 65% of the NGO sector do not publish or make publicly available their annual work program report. |
| | 32% of the surveyed CSOs admit that the organisation in which they are engaged does not have an annual program statement of work which is accessible to the public in any way. |
| | Surveyed CSOs believe that a significant number of CSOs, 69%, do not publish their financial |

| | |
|--|---|
| | statements |
| | 43% of the surveyed CSOs openly admit that they do not publish their financial statements |
| | Surveyed CSOs believe that a significant number of CSOs, 72%, do not publish their audited financial statements |
| | 48% of the surveyed CSOs openly admit that they do not publish their audited financial statements. |

Result 4.4.: CSOs monitor and evaluate the results and impact of their work

| | |
|--|---|
| | Three out of 10 of the surveyed CSOs openly claim that the project assessments are done only pro forma, while 69% claim that the projects are evaluated for the purpose of establishing the efficiency and drawing lessons for further projects |
| | 36% of the surveyed CSOs use the services of external evaluators when they evaluate the performance of their projects (which is among the highest in the region) |
| | One out of five, of the surveyed CSOs (20%) state that they do not have an established system for performance evaluation for the realization of conducted projects |

Objective 5.: Effective CSOs

Result 5.1.: CSO activities are guided by strategic long-term organisational planning

| | |
|--|---|
| | 15% of the surveyed CSOs use external evaluators for the evaluation of employees' performance |
| | 28% of the surveyed CSOs do not evaluate the performance of employees in their organisation. |
| | 57% of the surveyed CSOs possess the plan for the development of human resources aimed at attracting and keeping talented associates (with the exception of Albania if the highest % in the region); one in five CSOs say that they don't have this plan; while representatives of one in four (23%) claim to be preparing this plan currently. For those with a plan, only 4% claim to not be able to keep talented associates, while those without 45% are not able to keep talented associates. One in five of the surveyed CSOs (11%) with a plan claim that they fail to attract new associates, while 31% of those without a plan claim to not be able to attract new people. |
| | 85% of the surveyed CSOs say that their organisations succeed in attracting new human resources and 84% in keeping talented associates. |
| | 12% of the surveyed CSOs use external evaluators for the evaluation of the implementation of the strategic plan |
| | Four out of 10, of the surveyed CSOs (41%) do not evaluate the implementation of the organisation's strategic plan |

Result 5.2.: CSOs use research and other forms of evidence to underpin their activities

| | |
|--|--|
| | 75% of the surveyed CSOs use research results and analysis in public advocacy activities; 44% point out that they use research results and analysis very often; one in four organisations (24%) rarely use this source of information for advocacy activities |
| | 10% of the CSOs spontaneously state that information is not available; 10% state that information is missing on target groups and on beneficiaries of services of the CSOs; 8% of the surveyed CSOs state that information is missing for all areas they are active in |
| | 43% of the surveyed CSOs use the official data of national statistical offices, ministries; 22% conduct studies; 16% use international institutions such as the World Bank, UNICEF, EBRD, 10% use academic studies and 1% order studies |

Result 5.3.: CSOs regularly network within and outside country borders and make use of coalition-building for increased impact in campaigning and advocacy

| | |
|--|---|
| | 48% of surveyed CSOs state that their organisation is not a member of any international network. Surveyed CSOs which belong to at least one international network are active in 1.86 international CSO networks. |
| | 37% of the surveyed CSOs say that they are not members of any national CSO network. Surveyed CSOs which belong to at least one national network are active in 2.32 national CSO networks. |
| | 35% of the surveyed CSOs state that their organisation is not a member of any local network. The surveyed CSOs who do belong to at least one local network are active in 2.69 local CSO networks on average. |
| | Almost two thirds (63%) of surveyed CSOs believe that CSO networks are somewhat or very efficient; while 8% find networks very useful and 16% state that CSO networks are of no use. |
| | Surveyed CSOs single out the opportunity for exchanging experiences and knowledge (29%) as a major advantage of belonging to CSO networks; 14% the opportunity to access and exchange information and 13% the mutual support and assistance |

Objective 6.: Financially sustainable CSOs

Result 6.1.: Fund-raising activities are rooted in CSOs' long-term strategic plans and the core mission of the organisation

| | |
|--|--|
| | Surveyed CSOs believe that more than four fifths (83%) of organisations in the NGO sector mainly adapt to the donors' priorities and collect means for other activities not in line with their strategic plan |
| | 41% of the surveyed CSOs state that their organisation is personally engaged in mainly adapting to the donors' priorities and collecting means for other activities not in line with their strategic plan. 44% of CSOs at least declaratively conduct activities focused on collecting funds in line with the organisations' strategic plan. |

Result 6.2.: CSO have a diversified funding base, including membership fees, corporate/individual giving and social entrepreneurship

| | |
|--|---|
| | On average, Kosovo CSOs have less than two sources of income (1.9) |
| | For surveyed CSOs, the most common source of income were: 38% foreign sources; 37% local administration; 29% government, ministries, state administration bodies; 24% EU funds; 22% members; private companies 16% ; citizens 14% and state-owned companies at 8% |