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Introduction

As part of the WB- Austria Partnership Program for Strengthening Local Governments in South-Eastern-Europe countries and the ECA Sustainable Cities Initiatives the World Bank Social Development unit in ECA has developed a Social Sustainability Assessment framework that takes into consideration two dimensions of socially sustainable and inclusive urban development:

- **Social Accountability and Participation** to increase accountability in the delivery of services and programmes and empower urban marginalized and vulnerable groups to participate in their cities’ development; and

- Proactively addressing the challenges of **Marginalization** to identify the needs of socially excluded groups and associated inequalities.

The ECA SCI Social Sustainability Assessment seeks to contribute to increased knowledge and awareness of social accountability among local stakeholders including civil society, government officials and marginalized urban residents; and to strengthen integrity in public service delivery in five selected cities in the ECA region by increasing the demand for good governance, social accountability and civic participation.

The Institute for International Urban Development (I2UD) in Cambridge, Massachusetts and Co-PLAN Institute for Habitat Development in Tirana have assembled a team of local experts to carry out the research and fieldwork in their respective cities, namely Durrës (Albania), Prishtina (Kosovo), Skopje (FYROM), Banja Luka and Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina).

Phase 1 of the project, completed in September 2012, resulted in detailed profiles of each of the five the cities covering demographic, social, physical, economic, cultural, institutional and political issues. The results of this research are summarized in Section 1. The full report is available upon request. During this initial stage, the city teams also identified vulnerable groups to be the focus of the second phase of the Assessment. This selection was made on the basis of official information obtained from institutions responsible for the provision of various public services at a local level, findings from research studies made by international and national organizations, as well as other relevant documents (laws, provisions, local development strategies, etc.) and representatives from marginalized and vulnerable communities and NGOs consulted during the inception phase.

Phase 2 involved extensive fieldwork and consultation with community members and other stakeholders. Each city team carried out six Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and six In-Depth Interviews (IDIs). The FGDs were held with each vulnerable group, with men and women in different rooms for part of the discussion. The teams also conducted FGDs with NGOs. The questionnaires are available in an annex as a separate document. Focus group participants were recruited through a public call advertised via mailing lists and social networks and cooperation with local grassroots NGOs that work with the identified vulnerable communities. Each potential participant was asked to provide background information; this allowed the focus group organizer to bring together representative groups to account for specific characteristics such as age, economic status and municipality where they live.
In-Depth Interviews were carried out with at least two representatives of three of the following groups of stakeholders: local government structures, the business sector, and the NGO sector. The selection of the interviewees has been based on personal background of the interviewee (gender, ethnic identity, living and work location, etc), and professional background (employment history, civic engagement, etc.)

**Section 2** provides a summary overview of the issues raised during the FGDs and IDIs in Sarajevo. The summary is organized according to the three themes covered during the FGDs:
- Social inclusion in public services;
- Current levels of social accountability and participation; and
- Opportunities and constraints for social accountability and participation.

For Phase 3, a Participatory Scenario Development (PSD) Workshop was held in Sarajevo on December 13, 2012. The objectives of the PSD workshop were to:
- Raise awareness of the results of the previous two phases;
- Provide recommendations for the local government authorities, the wider civil society and intermediaries, i.e. NGOs, CBOs; and
- Map out solutions to reinforce socially sustainable city development and integrity in public services.

The workshop brought together stakeholders from multiple sectors and engaged them in identifying locally relevant pathways of autonomous and planned change (improvements) in the context of social accountability, sustainability and good governance.

The participants were encouraged to envision a future scenario for the introduction of various social accountability and social inclusion mechanisms. As a result, stakeholders developed a 'sense of ownership’ for the scenarios. Particular focus was placed on the use of ICT tools for drafting socially inclusive accountability initiatives. **Section 3** builds on the scenarios agreed on by the workshop participants, as well as their recommended detailed actions for implementation, and suggests three key interventions to set the City of Sarajevo on a Socially Accountable path.

Key considerations are also outlined in **section 4** regarding a number of issues and reflections from the PSD workshop that should be considered when designing and planning the proposed scenarios. A regional workshop will take place in Skopje, Macedonia in mid-March 2013 during which the five cities that were the subject of this Assessment will present and discuss with each other the results of the workshop and the proposed next steps.
1. City Profile

1.1. Introduction

As the capital, Sarajevo is the political and economic hub in Bosnia and Herzegovina (B&H), and the most developed and urbanized city in the. The 1990s conflict in Bosnia was followed by a lengthy recovery and reconstruction process and Sarajevo’s social, economic, and political life was strongly impacted by the conflict, otherwise, known as the longest city siege in the modern warfare history. Local governance, social inclusion and public accountability – issues at the focus of this research – still reflect the causes and consequences of the recent conflict.

One part of Sarajevo has been separated from the city and is now located in entity of Republika Srpska, while the rest of city is part of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FB&H). Both cities, Sarajevo and East-Sarajevo, incorporate smaller administrative units. The city of Sarajevo is part of Sarajevo Canton and the city-canton division is important to the understanding of governance, provision of public services and access to rights.

According to data of the Institute for Statistics of FB&H, the City of Sarajevo has around 310,571 inhabitants and Sarajevo Canton 440,744. This shows that, as a direct consequence of the war, Sarajevo lost around 100,000 inhabitants. Based on recent governmental research, around 1,350,000 B&H citizens emigrated, whilst the World Bank estimates are even larger, suggesting that 1,471,594 or 37.7% of the total B&H population lives abroad. There is no accurate estimate of the ethnic composition in Sarajevo; some argue that around 70% of population is Muslim, with only 10-15% Serbs, the remaining being Croats, whilst other estimates argue the percentage of Serbs is significantly higher.

1.2. Vulnerable Groups and Exclusion

The draft Social Inclusion Strategy of Bosnia and Herzegovina indicates that 41.5% of B&H population is poor or at risk of poverty. Similar data in the 2007 UNDP study on social inclusion in B&H suggests that 22% of the populace experiences some form of extreme exclusion and 47% are at risk of long-term social exclusion. Given that Sarajevo is the most developed region in the country, we cannot apply national data to municipalities in Sarajevo.

The segments of the population most vulnerable to social exclusion are predominantly the unemployed (particularly women and youth), poor families with several children, internally displaced people, the Roma community, returnees from minority ethnic groups, people with disabilities, and the elderly. Their vulnerability stems from income levels at the poverty line, their high risk of unemployment, and difficulty accessing public services and participating in political life and decision-making.

In July 2012, the Sarajevo Canton had 71,135 unemployed persons, of which 60.06% are unemployed women, 38.98% are first-time-job-seekers, 13.42% are demobilized soldiers, and approximately 5% are war invalids, families of killed soldiers, raped women, families of missing

---

1 The Constitution of B&H (Dayton Peace Agreement) only states that “Sarajevo is the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina.” Relation of the capital with other levels of government remains unclear.

2 This makes Bosnia and Herzegovina the second country in the world with largest number of emigrants in comparison to the total number of population.
persons, etc. Several studies argue that around 58.5% of labor-active young people are unemployed in B&H, which is almost four times higher than the average among EU countries.

These groups have high unemployment and inadequate access to the social welfare system, but also a high level of household debt, as many of these households have been taking bank and microcredit loans for years.\(^3\) This particularly applies to the elderly who are most frequently affected;\(^4\) a study suggests that “the average pensioner cannot make ends meet,” and that interviewed pensioners in Sarajevo mentioned hunger as an aspect of their poverty.\(^5\)

### 1.3. The use of ICT vis-à-vis social accountability

A 2011 study on the e-governance framework and practices of local governance revealed B&H lags behind other countries in the region. Despite legislative amendments between 2002-2007 allowing for e-governance development, additional adaptations are needed to enable further application of e-governance in municipalities and higher levels of governance.

In the case of Sarajevo, the canton, the city, and various municipalities have made numerous efforts of e-governance models, albeit elementary at times. The Government of Sarajevo Canton has an online presence and its website is connected to all other cantonal ministries and institutions.\(^6\) The websites provide information on the organizational structure of the Government, information on how to contact various offices, news and project information and newly adopted laws and decrees. Particularly relevant for public participation, is the fact that the Government and the Assembly publish agendas of their past and forthcoming meetings and sessions (with adopted and proposed legislation), and a link is incorporated on Public Hearings with calls for citizen participation. One of the best examples from within Sarajevo comes from the Municipality of Centar. As previous data has shown, this municipality is the most developed and advanced in Sarajevo and the whole country and that its e-governance stands out, when compared to other municipalities. The Centar municipality website\(^7\) is user friendly and information is divided according the needs of users (citizen or business/legal entity). Information on the municipality and on municipal administration is separated. Citizens can access and acquire all forms online. By entering their ID and name, citizens can check online whether birth, death, marriage, and other certificates are filed with the municipality. All requests forms are available online as well, and users can fill and print them from their computer. In case they need a certificate, they can simply fill in an online form and pick it up the next day from the municipal office. Information on various rights and how to obtain them is also available online, with contact information of the civil servant in charge of those matters. Via SMS or an open phone number, citizens can find out the status of their case in the municipal administration. In addition, information and documents on all municipal Council sessions, councilors, regulation, budget, allocated funds to NGOs, etc. is regularly posted online.

Similar practices are applied in the municipalities of Stari Grad, Novo Sarajevo, Novi Grad.

---

3. A recent study on microfinancing in B&H and its role in alleviating poverty reveals that even though microfinance may meet the varied and immediate needs of many people, it may not lift them out of poverty. Some clients may even get caught up in an increasing debt-burden cycle and slide further into poverty. A number of borrowers stated that they had been encouraged and facilitated to get many loans from same MCF; one of them admitted that he/she got more than 20 active loans from only one MCF. For more, see Hamad, Mohammad. “The Impact of Microcredit Programs in Alleviating Poverty and Restoring Livelihoods of the Targeted Populations in Bosnia And Herzegovina.” Journal of Economic and Social Studies 2.1., Spring 2012. [http://jecoss.com/jecoss/journalfinala_p69-p90.pdf](http://jecoss.com/jecoss/journalfinala_p69-p90.pdf)


5. Ibid.


7. [www.centar.ba](http://www.centar.ba)
1.4. **Local governance vis-à-vis social inclusion**

As indicated at the beginning of the report, the local governance structure in Sarajevo is quite complicated. The Law incorporates several public participation instruments that would allow citizens to request accountability at the local level, such as: the possibility to attend local council meetings, file official complaints, and obtain the yearly budget published in official gazettes. In addition to these, the Local Self-Governance Law includes three defined mechanisms for direct participation of citizens in decision-making at the local level: referendums, local citizen assemblies, citizens’ initiative, and other forms of direct citizen participation. Four municipalities in Sarajevo have developed and adopted their own development strategies. Furthermore, some of them created strategies and action plans for youth (Stari Grad, Novi Grad) and Gender Action Plans (Novi Grad). During their development stage, local governments consulted citizens on various issues and incorporated their opinions into the text.

Finally, social inclusion in local governance should take place through election of representatives from marginalized groups in municipal councils and appointment in public administration. Current figures reflect comparatively low level of women representation, as well as of youth and ethnic minorities. Insight into the local governance system in Sarajevo illustrates the complexity of local governance structures. All these – from cantonal to municipal – provide different public services to citizens. Although one would expect the provision of service to be closest to citizens – i.e. on the municipal level – this is not the case in Sarajevo, as the Canton has various authorities in local governance.

1.5. **Accessibility to Public Services**

A 2009 World Bank study on the quality of public services in B&H argues that accessibility to basic services for citizens is low, and that municipalities do not have the resources for necessary reforms. It should be noted, however, that the municipalities in Sarajevo still stand out in terms of provision of services when compared to others in the country. Nonetheless, marginalization due to limited access to services further increases the vulnerability of certain groups. A point in case is the Roma community and their lack of access to the civil registry, due to their failure to register their children at birth. Taking into account that Sarajevo has many Roma settlements within the city, the issue is relevant for Sarajevo local governance authorities as well. Similarly, poor families have restricted, if any, access to affordable housing. Efforts have been made by the Ministry of Housing Policy of Sarajevo Canton to solve housing problems through granting of low-interest loans, on a priority basis, to recognized citizens, educated individuals, war veterans and invalids and people with children. However, a considerable number of returnees have located in informal settlements, where problems of connectivity to the sewerage system, and water supply prevail.

The vulnerable groups identified above are all under threat of facing hunger. Health data for the whole Federation of B&H shows that 24.2% of Roma children are on border of

---


9 Kurbanova, Jahan et al. “Overview on vulnerability of food security in Bosnia and Herzegovina.”
undernourishment and 12.1% are severely undernourished; 50% of Roma babies (0-6 months) are chronically undernourished and at risk of various types of diseases that hinders their development. This is further aggravated by the fact that the provision of health services in Sarajevo is of low quality, despite the existing infrastructure. Medical equipment is accessible only in larger hospitals, and citizens must sometimes wait 3 to 6 months to get a scan or a test. In Sarajevo Canton, medical care statistics are depressing: there is 1 doctor per 1,137 patients, 1 dentist per 2,581 patients, and on 1 hospital bed for 178 patients. At the same time, corruption and bribery in public health are well-known and, even today, an openly accepted norm. The problem of marginalization and poverty has influenced an increase in crime and violence in the past several years, especially youth/underage crime. As far as social welfare is concerned, Sarajevo is no exception from what has been described as an “inefficient welfare system”, since rights and access are based on social categories (war veteran, civil victim of war, invalid, etc.) instead of needs. In this way, people will qualify for social welfare although they might not be in need for it.

Most of the social inclusion problems mentioned in this report have been addressed by the media. The Centre for Investigative Journalism investigates comprehensively various public policy issues, from local to national and, in many instances, demands accountability. With the bloom of Internet portals, the coverage of stories has become more diversified and citizens actively comment and debate on various topics. TV and radio also offer possibilities for the coverage of stories from citizens’ point of view (TV less than radio). However, it should be noted that Croats, Roma and youth do not have as ready an access to the media as others, even when the issues covered are relevant to them, and others are often speaking on their behalf. The use of ICTs for civic action has significantly risen in past years. Facebook has been utilized for various campaigns, as well as online petition websites and YouTube (video sharing). As shown in this report, municipalities in Sarajevo actively use their websites for information sharing and service provision. Nevertheless, much data remains offline and is not easily accessible.
2. **Summary of Focus Group Discussions and In-Depth Interviews**

2.1. **Introduction**

The summary of the focus group discussions and the in-depth-interviews in Sarajevo are jointly presented. The Focus group interviews included representatives from six groups: youth, employed low income, unemployed, disabilities, ethnic minorities, and NGO representatives.

The IDIs were conducted with the following individuals:

1. Lejla Somun Krupalija, former councilor (2010-2012), Municipal Council, Municipality Center Sarajevo and project manager, Center for Human Rights at University of Sarajevo
2. Hazima Pecirep, head of Department for Integrated Local Development, Municipality Novi Grad Sarajevo
3. Zoran Ćatić, director of eFM Student Radio d.o.o.
4. Selma Bilić, IT engineer in mobile technologies, BH Telecom d.o.o.
5. Timur Gadžo, director of Institute for Information and Statistics of Sarajevo Canton
6. Dalibor Nedić, president of NGO “Young Aspirations.”

2.2. **Social Inclusion in Public Service Provision**

Public services were described as expensive by most focus group participants. Only pensioners and families of soldiers who died in the conflict have subsidies, while the unemployed do not. It is unclear who decides who gets benefits and how the decision is made. Although subsidies for water, electricity and heating exist for certain social categories, they are not sufficient to cover the costs. Furthermore, the eligibility for social welfare system benefits is base on certain categories (such as person with disability) and not on needs.

Participants attributed the severe economic situation and uncontrolled unemployment rates to corruption. The perception is that while there is funding available, government institutions do not use the funds efficiently and that most of it goes to paying the salaries of civil servants. They cited the example of the Public Water and Sewage Company in Sarajevo. Although Sarajevo has high quality water and many wells, every night citizens have disruptions and the system is shut off at midnight. The Water Company received EBRD credit to reconstruct the water system in the City; however, the perception is that the funds were not spent on system reconstructions but on salaries. Some of those interviewed in the focus groups noted that public companies have a large number of unnecessary employed workers. Corruption in hospitals and universities is also a concern. Ironically, it was noted that low-income citizens are excluded from basic services because they cannot afford the bribes.

Citizens expressed high dissatisfaction with the Sarajevo public transportation system provided by the Public Company “Gras”. Buses and trams are always packed and late. The ticketing system was described as unfair, as one has to pay the full ticket fee regardless of distance. Public transportation employees who check whether users buy tickets are described as unprofessional and even aggressive. Safety in public transportation is also of concern as many citizens have been robbed in trams and even physically attacked.
2.3. Existing Social Accountability Levels

2.3.1. Views on current state of affairs at the local level
From the comments and opinions of focus group participants and interviewees, it can be concluded that citizens regard municipal administration offices as the most effective and user-friendly, while the medical care, the public transportation and the whole communal system were evaluated as inefficient and abusive. Many citizens stated that they feel manipulated by all public companies that provide communal services, such as heating, gas, and water. “Although you can check how much you have to pay for your electricity bill on the website of Elektroprivreda, possibilities to pay that bill are scarce. Their payment offices are open only at 2-3 locations in the City, and work only from 8:00 until 13:00,” explained one lady.

2.3.2. Methods for obtaining information about public services
Most citizens described the media as a political tool of the different political parties. “Everybody knows which political party ‘owns’ which media,” stated one participant.

The Cantonal TV station (TVSA) was mentioned in one focus group as the station that broadcasts sessions of the Cantonal Assembly. Many citizens described these sessions as ‘boring’ but also useful and suggested that broadcasting such content could be done in a more creative way. In addition, sharing information on various public initiatives would be useful. It was noted that TV stations report mostly on events that already took place, but rarely on events or actions that one can join. eFM Radio recently developed a TV web project through to broadcast online the SIAeTV (Student Internet Activity Education TV). The Center for Civil Initiatives also recently started an online TV station. These new resources are open to citizens and NGOs suggestions and content they would like to broadcast.

Participants primarily gather information by asking their family members and friends; at information service booths at municipal administrative buildings; or through the Internet. Elderly citizens stated that they get from the media the information that relates to them, such as the date when they will receive their pension or changes in legislation. They also stated that given that much of the information on public service is online, this presents a problem for them since the majority cannot use computers.

Younger participants in focus groups noted that a significant source of information on public services for them is the Internet, primarily the open forums were citizens post information and discuss various issues. Websites of municipalities in Sarajevo were described as good but many were skeptical about whether the website information is updated regularly. “Information on a particular issue is difficult to find in one place, you have to ask several people, check different websites to find out everything you need” – was a usual reply in focus groups.

Several participants noted that information about meetings or other activities of their neighborhood communities (mjesne zajednice) are published on A4 paper formats that are glued to the walls at entrances in their apartment buildings. Even when ICTs are introduced into provision of public services, it is evident that people older residents have difficulties in using these new resources. In this way, education and promotion should accompany introduction of new services. The most marginalized groups, such as persons with disabilities and Roma, mostly use their associations as a source of information in order to find out what rights they have and how to exercise them.
2.3.3. **Methods for placing questions or complaints about public services**

Official complaint mechanism and administrative procedures are rarely used by citizens. They found them inefficient, as civil servants rarely get sanctioned in any way and that there are rarely any changes after the complaint is made. Particularly interesting is the fact that citizens cannot make an oral complaint by telephone, fax or email to their neighborhood communities (*mjesne zajednice*) in case they have a problem in their building or neighborhood that needs to be solved. Several citizens stated that they have been asked by a neighborhood representative to file a written complaint in person. This procedure is further complicated by the fact that most neighborhood communities (*mjesne zajednice*) are open from 9 to 16hrs, a time during which most people are at work or in school, if they are open at all.

2.4. **Opportunities and Constraints for Social Accountability**

2.4.1. **Perception/Awareness of/participation in SA activities**

Most participants in the focus groups were critical regarding the level of citizen involvement in the political and civic life of Sarajevo. They noted that the majority of citizens are quite passive. Although citizens may complain about inefficient public services, rarely do they proactively demand political accountability or use existing administrative complaint procedures. Not a single participant in the focus groups stated that he or she participated in the public consultations organized by municipalities or the Canton.

Most neighborhood communities (*mjesne zajednice*) were described as inactive. The majority of participants stated that they are not aware of whether a neighborhood community exists where they live, while others stated that most decisions in these communities are made behind closed doors. None of the focus group participants had participated in elections of their neighborhood community (*mjesna zajednica*) representatives. Some participants noted that citizens are not aware of the role and functions of these communities. They are unclear on how to get involved, aside from participating in some meetings that are by invitation only. However, most focus group participants found these communities as the most important element in civic participation. They stated that these communities should be more active and involve younger generations.

It is important to note that the perception of citizens towards NGOs is quite negative. They find that most NGOs exist only to apply for local and international funding. Citizens found that the majority of NGO projects are inefficient and not based on grassroots needs.

The only social accountability mechanism mentioned in the focus groups was the Center for Civic Initiatives website that monitors work of governmental institutions, but primarily of national level public institutions. However, information about this online resource was shared only in two focus groups, showing that most citizens are not aware of it or have not visited the website.

---

10 Author's comments: Municipalities Centar and Stari Grad actually have very interesting and interactive presentations of their neighborhood communities (*mjesne zajednice*). The Center has a interactive map with names of communities and if you click on your community, the name and contact information of representative of that neighborhood community. Evidently, most citizens are not proactive in finding such information or interested to get involved.
2.4.2. **Perceived obstacles to participation in decision making**

Although many young people expressed interest in being more socially active in non-governmental organizations, some focus group participants stated that they are not sure what kind of NGOs exist, what they do or how to get involved. It is evident that NGOs need to work more on their public outreach campaigns towards citizens, since mostly NGOs only focus their action towards governmental institutions.

Participants from the focus groups described the current level of ICT usage by municipal administrations and other local governance structures in Sarajevo as poor. Even when electronic databases have been developed and are used, malfunctions of the system are frequent. Some experts said that one of the reasons for the constant malfunctions is lack of maintenance procedures in addition to the fact that public tenders for development of these ICT solutions are won by companies that do not have the needed capacities.

One civil servant noted that many employees in the public administration are afraid of reforms because they fear they will lose their jobs. However, he explained, this is a misconception because the problem is not so much excessive number of workers but mismanagement of human resources. Although strategies and action plans are developed for the incorporation of social accountability programs within the local administration, they are usually not realistic; evaluation and monitoring mechanisms are not introduced; funds are not allocated to follow these strategies; and sanctions for misuse or mismanagement of funds are not in place. Oftentimes, local governance structure does not conduct any research or needs assessment prior to the formulation of developmental plans.

Many citizens noted that the complexity of the local governance structure in Sarajevo creates complications for them in exercising their rights, since people do not know the allocation of responsibilities among the municipality, the canton and the city administration. Many stated that when they need to acquire a legal document, that they are often sent to several offices located across town. The short period of validity of various documents is also a major nuisance.

Communication of civil servants towards citizens/users was described as poor and unprofessional. Several focus group participants shared experiences in which they personally or an acquaintance were treated unprofessionally by a civil servant. It seems that particularly the elderly, the Romas and people coming from rural areas experience such attitudes. Special assistance to citizens who need additional help to fill out forms or to understand various administrative procedures does not exist in municipal administration.

2.4.3. **Suggestions to improve SA**

Focus group participants and NGO representatives suggested that one solution to the lack of political accountability is the introduction of civic education in schools as part of the regular curriculum. This subject would educate young people about their rights (including labor rights, active and passive voting rights, etc) and their obligations as citizens.

More efficient use of social media, especially of Facebook, was identified as a potential solution for information sharing and civic activism. Although all municipalities have Facebook pages, they do not post information regularly or use them proactively. A positive example of use of Facebook for civic activism mentioned was the case of Irfan Čengić, a 19-year-old elected
councilor at the Municipal Council of Stari Grad, who uses his page to engage citizens on issues
on the agenda in the Council.

Municipal administrations have moved somewhat forward on accountability in the provision of
their services, as they have implemented standards. What is missing is a clearer definition of the
rights and obligations on both sides – service providers and service users – that would establish
transparent property relations and contractual obligations. Most public services are provided
without any contracts being defined or signed between citizens and public companies that
provide electricity, heating, or water. Furthermore, citizens do not have an alternative to cancel
certain services in the case that they are not satisfied, since these companies monopolize the
market.

Focus group participants suggested that public service companies should post a list with rights
and obligations for both users and providers outside their buildings. Several participants
proposed the introduction of e-newsletters that municipalities and other public service providers
could develop on a weekly or monthly basis. Citizens could subscribe and have them delivered
directly to their email addresses.

The participants also suggested that public databases used by the public administration become
centralized and more joined-up. They found that this ICT solution would tremendously speed up
administrative processes and lower costs. Other suggestions included the development of
software and database systems which would allow citizens to acquire and print out legal
documents from their home (such as birth and marriage certificates, etc).

As a solution to the problem of uncooperative public employees, many (even those who are
working as civil servants) proposed to introduce evaluation systems, with clear consequences
and sanctions for those who do not work professionally and with rewards for those that perform
well.

Agency Insert, a private company run by a blind software engineer, has been active in recent
years in the development of ICT solutions that assist blind people in civic engagement. For
example, the company developed software\textsuperscript{11} for blind persons, and other persons with
disabilities, to participate in elections and vote via the Internet or using a fixed phone line.
However, implementation of this system requires legislative changes of the Election Law.

\textsuperscript{11} \url{http://www.agencija-insert.page.tf/}
Photos from Focus Group Discussions
3. Scenario Development Workshop Outcomes and Recommendations

The Sarajevo Participatory Scenario Development Workshop took place in the form of a conference entitled "Local Governance in Service of Citizens: Strengthening Social Accountability in Sarajevo" on December 13th, 2012 gathering 74 participants in the morning sessions and around 50 participants in the working groups in the second part of the Conference. The event was co-hosted by the City of Sarajevo. Gathering local governance stakeholders from governmental institutions, businesses, media, and the non-governmental sector, the PSD Workshop in Sarajevo engaged them in discussing and appraising possible solutions that would increase the quality of public service provision and the level of public participation in decision-making processes on the local governance level in Sarajevo.

Mr. Alija Behmen, Mayor of Sarajevo, opened the Conference with short introductory speech emphasizing the need to define the status of Sarajevo as the capital city and to make clear separations of power between different local self-governance structures (municipalities, the City and the Canton Sarajevo). Lack of clear division of power between existing local governance structures in Sarajevo clearly hinders further development of public services and hinders public participation in decision making. Ms. Sabine Palmreuther, Sr. Operations Officer for Urban Practice from the World Bank Institute also addressed the participants and provided information about the work of her office and its partners on social accountability and social inclusion in the region.

The workshop agenda included a number of presentations covering a road map to more efficient provision of public services and role of local governance institutions on one side and the role of the civil society on the other; public participation in local decision-making processes; the role of local governance in creating a business friendly environment which should result in local economic development and subsequently higher employment; and an overview of best practices in using ICTs for social accountability. The importance of strategic planning which includes monitoring and evaluation activities in this instance was emphasized, along the role of strategic capital investments, the informatization and digitalization of data, the clear separation of powers between service providers, the introduction of standards into working procedures, the evaluation of public servants, and the development of efficient complaint procedures and internal auditing bodies.

Following the “good practices” presentations, 3 working groups were held after the break. Participants were divided into 3 groups - Efficient and Professional Public Services; Participation of Citizens and NGOs in Local Decision-Making Processes; and Local Self-Governance and Enabling Business Environment - based on their professional interests. These groups addressed the three cross-cutting issues identified for the workshop: information asymmetry, "one-size fits all" participatory programs, and malfunctioning feedback mechanisms.

A report of the presentations, issues raised, and all the scenarios that were developed during the workshop is available as a separate document. The following summary outlines the proposals considered the strongest and most realistic initiatives that could catalyze a wider social accountability push in the city of Sarajevo.
### 3.1. Efficient and Professional Public Services

#### 3.1.1. Identified problems and corresponding potential solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Identified Problems</th>
<th>Different Perspectives</th>
<th>Identified Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue A: Information Asymmetry</td>
<td>Local communities lack representatives with the necessary IT skills. Namely older staff that manage local communities lack good IT skills that would make local communities more accessible to citizens.</td>
<td>This problem was identified by participants coming from the NGO sector.</td>
<td>Hire and attract more young people to manage and participate in activities of their local communities (mjesne zajednice).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue B: &quot;One size fits all&quot; programs</td>
<td>Certain groups as the elderly and persons with disabilities will have a difficulty accessing the complaint system due to lack of access to Internet or a mobile phone.</td>
<td>NGOs representatives proposed that this could be solved through hiring young people who will work in local communities with marginalized groups primarily through providing assistance in filling forms, calling institutions, etc.</td>
<td>Provide working experience to young graduates through creating formal volunteer and internship opportunities at local communities. They would work with the elderly people in local communities through providing them assistance in accessing public services. On the other side, these young interns and volunteers can foster IT capacities of local communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participatory Scenario Development Workshop*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Identified Problems</th>
<th>Different Perspectives</th>
<th>Identified Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue C: Need for better feedback mechanisms</td>
<td>The current complaint systems and procedures are not followed through by public service providers mainly because the information is handled separately by the institution itself.</td>
<td>Only few municipalities have adopted certain standards in addressing citizens’ complaints and suggestions. During the development phase of this proposed solution, consultation with the expert community and civil society should be made in order to create community ownership of the process.</td>
<td>The proposed solution presents an e-complaint system that would be managed by the Center. In addition, use SMS for making formal complaints related to various public services. Advertise the phone number and the SMS complaint system widely to local communities and using popular public spaces (public service providers, shopping malls, hospitals, etc.) Use TV, radio and billboards to raise public awareness about the SMS and e-complaint systems. Complaint forms and evaluation surveys about quality of provision of public institutions should be available in their buildings were citizens could simply make a complaint and put it in a box that belongs to the Center that will collect and follow up on received complaints. Citizens should also be able to propose suggestions to public institutions through this system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue D: Potential ICT Solutions</td>
<td>Information on various public services is down on various websites.</td>
<td>This website of the Center (the solution) should be connected to all local communities, municipalities and public companies. Civic activists proposed to have the database available to the media and citizens.</td>
<td>The Center should be one-stop-shop where all information on local governance administration and public services will be available through Center’s website. The Center will also create and constantly update a compliant system database that would be used to analyze the most prevalent and reoccurring issues in order to address these later through submitting policy proposals to respective public institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.2. **Vision: (desired situation)**

**Improved information exchange and delivery between citizens and local governance structures and their units in Sarajevo.**

With the ultimate goal of higher satisfaction levels among citizens of public service delivery in Sarajevo, this group envisioned efficient exchange of information and delivery between citizens and the City, their municipalities and local communities, through a functioning complaint system that can drive the appropriate and necessary improvements in service delivery.

3.1.3. **Specific Proposal: A Network of Information Centers**

**WHAT**

Establish an **Information Center** that would be connected to a network of local information points within each local community office. This network would provide information regarding various local governance structures, rights, obligations, and services; and at the same time would gather information from citizens on various problems of communal interest. The City Administration could also host a Center that would act as the virtual nucleus where information will be posted onto the Center’s central database.

**HOW**

1. Analyze local communities’ needs and capacities as part of the planning process so as to ensure that established centers meet the needs of particular social groups; 2. Adopt the necessary policy and legal framework in the City and municipalities; 3. Create an e-complaint system that would be managed by the Information Center; 4. Create an SMS platform for making formal complaints related to various public services. Advertise the phone number and the SMS complaint system widely to local communities and using TV, radio and billboards in public spaces 5. Hire and attract more young people to manage and participate in activities of their local communities (mjesne zajednice); 6. Train staff that will be working at local information centers; 7. Make sure that complaint forms and evaluation surveys about quality of public institutions are available in their buildings along with submission boxes. Citizens should also be able to propose suggestions to public institutions through this system.

**WHO**

The City of Sarajevo, municipalities Stari Grad Sarajevo, Novo Sarajevo, Novi Grad Sarajevo and Center, including the local communities of each municipality.

**WHEN**

Two years.

**INDICATORS**

The number of established information centers; number of information requests and complaints received through the system; satisfaction of citizens with the system.
HOW MUCH Difficult to calculate at this point: the human resources are already available but need to be trained. Alternatively, younger people could be employed. The greatest cost would be the e-complaint system and the internal systems that connect the central Information Center with local communities.

3.2. Participation of Citizens and NGOs in Local Decision-Making Processes

3.2.1. Identified problems and corresponding potential solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue A: Information Asymmetry</th>
<th>Municipalities, local communities and the City need to be more proactive in including citizens in decision-making processes. Information on public participation mechanisms are not posted on the municipal websites nor calls for participations are issued regularly or in most cases, at all.</th>
<th>Ensure that proposed public budget should follow these annual consultation plans, as their implementation will require certain costs. Ensure that a civil servant or the PR office in municipalities are given charge in managing and organizing public participation opportunities.</th>
<th>Develop sector strategies and annual action plans that will serve the civil servants to develop annual citizen consultation plans. These should follow adoption of various legislation and policy options relevant to the citizens. These annual consultation plans should be presented to the public as early as possible. Use local communities in organizing at least 3 annual extensive consultations on the most important policy issues. Make municipal mayors, councilors, and representatives of local communities more accessible to citizens through organizing open days, regular meetings and sessions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue B: &quot;One size fits all&quot; Programs</td>
<td>Particularly persons with disabilities and elderly have difficulty accessing decision makers. Youth is particularly passive and untrusting to decision-making processes.</td>
<td>Grant annual fixed budget for this purpose to local communities.</td>
<td>Revitalize local communities and organize regular consultations, civic initiatives and debates with citizens through developing cooperation between management of local communities and NGOs and associations working with people with disabilities and other marginalized groups. Then, forward received citizen input to municipalities. Introduce education on citizens’ rights and obligations in primary and secondary education. As part of this education, organize in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue C: Need for better feedback mechanisms</td>
<td>Identified Problems</td>
<td>Different Perspectives</td>
<td>Identified Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens are passive in being themselves more proactive and participating in existing decision-making processes.</td>
<td>Citizens view current public participation systems as formal procedures through which it is not possible to make a relevant impact on decisions because received comments and suggestions are not taken seriously. Exchange information and good practices, between local communities and especially with successful local communities (regular meetings, etc).</td>
<td>In order to foster public participation in local decision-making procedures and build trust in proposed public participation mechanisms, TV, radio and other media need to broadcast several public consultation sessions. Thus, cooperation with media in this respect is important. Public participation mechanisms need to ensure meaningful use of received citizen input through developing monitoring and evaluation activities of public consultations and through creating administrative barriers for adopting certain regulation without consultation procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Issue D: Potential ICT solutions | Information on public participation mechanisms are not posted on the municipal websites nor calls for participations are issued regularly or in most cases, at all. | Information on rules of public participation and ongoing calls has to be visibly displayed on all municipalities’ websites as well as of local communities. Develop and apply various forms of online consultations, activism and social media to motivate citizens to participate in local decision-making (e-voting, online survey, e-consultations, etc.) |

### 3.2.2. **Vision: (desired situation)**

**Increased public participation in local decision-making procedures through revitalization of local communities.**

Through increased and effective participation of citizens in local decision-making procedures, citizens under this scenario are envisioned to “have a say” in local politics and governance. This would result in local policies that are based on the actual needs and interests of citizens, especially those belonging to vulnerable groups, better positioning the municipalities and public companies to provide better and more efficient services to citizens.
1.1.1. **Specific Proposal: Revitalizing Local Communities**

**WHAT**

A set of formal procedures was envisaged along several non-formal activities that should foster and revitalize the local communities in decision-making. Foremost, local decrees should be developed that provide a clear framework and guidelines on decision-making processes in neighborhoods. From there, municipalities need to include in their annual budget support for such activities. Finally, local communities must cooperate with NGOs through on joint local projects (public consultations, civic initiatives, partnerships, etc). Particularly important in this instance would be cooperation with associations that gather persons with disabilities and conducting sessions in local neighborhoods that would map problems of people with disabilities. All these processes should be accompanied by ICTs solutions (website presentations, posting information on web portals, use social media, etc.).

**HOW**

1. Municipalities should develop sector strategies and annual action plans that include annual citizen consultation plans. These should follow adoption of various legislation and policy options relevant to the citizens. These should be presented to the public in a timely manner and lead to adoption of various policy options relevant to citizens.

2. Municipalities should ensure that their proposed public budget follows these annual consultation plans, as their implementation will require certain costs for organization in local communities.

3. Organize through the Local Communities at least three annual extensive consultations on the most important policy issues. Organize regular civic consultation activities through cooperation between local communities and NGOs working with marginalized groups. Then, forward citizen input to municipalities.

4. In order to foster public participation in local decision-making procedures and build trust in proposed public participation mechanisms, TV, radio and other media need to broadcast several public consultation sessions. Thus, cooperation with media in this respect is important.

5. Ensure meaningful use of received citizen input through monitoring and evaluation activities of public consultations. Additionally, administrative triggers must prevent adoption of certain regulations without consultations.

6. The rules of public participation have to be visibly displayed on all municipality and local community websites. 7. Alongside offline consultations, develop and apply various forms of online consultations, activism and social media (e-voting, online survey, e-consultations, etc.) either through municipalities or local communities.

**WHO**

Municipalities Stari Grad Sarajevo, Novo Sarajevo, Novi Grad Sarajevo and Center, including the local communities of each municipality.

**WHEN**

1 year

**INDICATORS**

Number of public participation events held or tools used; number and social background of citizens who participated in consultations; amount of and
extent to which citizen input was used in formulating policy options; efficiency of the system.

**HOW MUCH** 15 – 20,000 USD.

### 3.3. Local Self-Governance and Enabling Business Environment

#### 3.3.1. Identified problems and corresponding potential solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Identified Problems</th>
<th>Different Perspectives</th>
<th>Identified Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue A: Information Asymmetry</td>
<td>Municipalities do not offer special support to social entrepreneurs and companies employing persons with disabilities. Information on various funds companies can access are not published regularly and transparently.</td>
<td>Civil servants in the working group emphasized the need to formalize any proposed solution as this will create an obligation for local governance institutions to fulfill promises in MoUs or Rulebooks. Great number of decision-makers in this respect. Need to ensure support from different stakeholders (councilors, mayor, the administration).</td>
<td>Develop a public fund that would support social entrepreneurs and small companies employing persons with disabilities. Aside the public funds, municipalities can grant access to training, registration assistance and administrative taxes cuts to these small businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue B: &quot;One size fits all&quot; programs</td>
<td>Marginalized groups and small entrepreneurs do not have access to assistance and financial funds to start small businesses from municipalities.</td>
<td>Ensure that project beneficiaries are the true beneficiaries of selected companies and their projects that will be funded (insist on reporting, monitoring and evaluation standards). Recognize certain sectors and needs as funding priorities. Certain community problems could be solved through development of public-private partnerships between social entrepreneurs and municipalities (the Fund and/or public tenders).</td>
<td>Before call for application is issued every year or bi-annually, funding priorities will be determined based on prior analysis of citizens’ needs (feasibility studies and consultations). Use spaces local communities possess to promote the Fund, its beneficiaries and success stories. In monitoring committees include representatives from NGOs. Associations of persons with disabilities proposed to conduct analysis of how many people with disabilities are employed by municipalities and public companies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Identified Problems</th>
<th>Different Perspectives</th>
<th>Identified Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue C: Need for better feedback mechanisms</td>
<td>When municipalities display various opportunities for persons and companies, the information is not displayed or shared transparently.</td>
<td>Municipal Rulebook on the Fund needs to be issued, with clear rules, timelines, responsibilities including the monitoring and evaluation committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue D: Potential ICT solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information on the call, the application itself as all other documents need to be displayed visibly on municipal websites.</td>
<td>e-registration of small companies. Municipalities could promote Fund beneficiaries and success stories on their websites as well as through developing TV, radio and new media content. Publish online guidebooks for starting small businesses, the application for the Fund, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2. **Vision: (desired situation)**

**Improve municipal support of local economic development.**
Participants felt the municipality is not doing enough to foster economic development, and that the currently dire economic situation affects vulnerable groups the most as they have insufficient safety nets and entrepreneurship opportunities. Under this scenario, Sarajevo municipalities develop and grow economically, with reduced unemployment, and special employment and entrepreneurship support to vulnerable groups, especially people with disabilities.

3.3.3. **Specific Proposal: Public fund for social entrepreneurship**

**WHAT** Establishment a public fund that supports social entrepreneurs and small companies employing persons with disabilities. Aside from public funding, municipalities can grant access to training, registration assistance and administrative taxes cuts to these small businesses.

**HOW** 1. Before calls for applications are issued every year or bi-annually, funding priorities will be determined based on prior analysis of citizens’ needs (feasibility studies and consultations). 2. A Municipal Rulebook on the Fund needs to be issued, with clear rules, timelines, and responsibilities including the monitoring and evaluation process. 3. Publish online guidebooks for starting small businesses, applying to the Fund, etc. 4. These funds should be clearly earmarked, with information and preparation support widely disseminated both online and offline. 5. Promote the Fund, beneficiaries, and
success stories in public spaces as well as through TV, radio and new media content. Several control/complaint mechanisms were also proposed, such as appointment of different selection and monitoring committees that should include representatives from the civil society and employers’ associations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>Selected municipalities in Sarajevo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHEN</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATORS</td>
<td>Number of supported projects; number and type of persons with disability that were employed through the project(s); number of social entrepreneurs supported through the projects; public visibility of allocated funds, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW MUCH</td>
<td>The pilot project could be implemented in one to two municipalities with a budget of 15 to 20,000 USD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Key Considerations for Next Steps**

- Participants believe that implementation of proposed social accountability or social inclusion scenarios will depend on the decision of the political leadership in Sarajevo local governance institutions. Civil servants and civil society activists are supportive of necessary reforms. In this way, the political leadership should be involved in potential implementation of proposed scenarios. A good way forward would be to form partnerships and formalize them through signing MoUs.

- Many of participants find that the first step is informatization and digitalization of local data, such as municipal registrars, the police and judicial databases, the land property database, and the data of centers for social affairs and employment institutes. Furthermore, these databases should be harmonized and connected, so that civil servants do not have to retrieve required data from a person or a company (to bring documents to provide his/her status or similar), but directly from its institutions’ database system.

- There is lack of reliable data. Institutions do not have strong capacities in capturing and efficiently recording local micro data for policy analysis and decision-making. Lack of exchange of information is evident between different local institutions and especially with those from different levels of power (cantonal, entity).

- The unclear jurisdictions of municipalities, the City and the Canton are negatively affecting the quality of local self-governance in Sarajevo, both the public service provision and the public participation in decision-making. Several participants stated that local administration is large and relies on the public budget to finance it. The first step in solving this problem is to adopt the cantonal law on local self-governance.

- One participant noted that before the war, local governance in Sarajevo and the whole country had quite extensive self-governance responsibilities and many good administrative solutions. In this way, he proposed those solutions again, such as the Center for information, which was part of the pre-war Sarajevo local governance system.

- Local communities have a great potential for extensive civic participation in local decision-making processes. However, certain jurisdictions and more financial resources need to become returned and allocated to local communities to create necessary preconditions for revitalizing this local governance mechanism.
Annex 1: Social Sustainability Index

Concept note
The objective is to assist the municipalities, civic groups and NGOs to develop indicators that gage progress towards increasing social accountability and access to services by marginalized communities or vulnerable groups.

Based on the three-phase process undertaken by the project teams in the five municipalities--Municipal Profile, Focus Group Discussions and Participatory Scenario Workshops-- the study team intends to outline parameters for selecting (a) indicators that could be tailored to each municipality; and (b) indicators that can be applied across all the municipalities. The indicators should reflect the priority issues within each municipality and how key actors involved in the Participatory Scenario Workshops can use these indicators to further action.

Assumptions
The preference is to identify indicators and any possible index deriving from these indicators that are in the domain or competency of the local authorities. This means that the indicator measures activities that the municipality can influence through its policies, programs and specific projects or by designated representatives of civil society such as intermediary NGOs or community-based organizations.

The selection of indicators should reflect the ‘four pillars’ of social accountability as outlined in the study methodology, these include:

a) Participation—defined as implementing mechanisms that enable citizens to become part of the decision-making process.

b) Transparency—defined as making city stakeholder information and operations publicly available and useful.

c) Feedback (Response) — defined as ensuring citizen-government communication goes in both directions, that expressed citizen needs are matched with responsive action.

d) Monitoring — defined as the ability to track performance and evaluate effectiveness.\(^\text{12}\)

Participation and Transparency are the primary focus when selecting indicators with Feedback and Monitoring combined as feedback mechanisms. The index also needs to capture the role of different stakeholders in strengthening each pillar. The responsibility and opportunities of promoting city accountability acknowledges the role played by the local authorities, citizens, and intermediaries (NGOs, CBOs, businesses).

---

\(^\text{12}\) Adapted from Social Accountability in Palestinian Local Governance and Service Provision
Framing the Index

Within this framework of the ‘four pillars’ that has guided the Assessment's process, it is suggested that the index is organized around the five suggested dimensions outlined below. The choices of questions to address within each pillar reflect the issues that arose across the five municipalities during the course of the assessment.

1. **Participation - Opportunities**: an indicator of the local government’s openness to citizen engagement and inputs into decisions that affect them. Measures could include the city's provision of various forms of consultation such as open door days and interactive Q/A sections of the website, as well as measures of democracy such as publicly elected city councils.

2. **Participation - Engagement**: as a complement to opportunities that are available, this indicator takes into account, the level of initiative taken by citizens, individually or in representative groups, to take part in civic life. An important indicator is the degree to which local councils are representative of the community (in particular marginalized groups). Measures of attendance to city-sponsored participatory activities and use of the interactive city website features are also descriptive of citizen self-driven involvement.

3. **Transparency - Information Availability**: the disclosure of information related to local decisions. In particular, budgets, plans and formal proceedings should be made available to the public. Both virtual and physical sources - information centers and the city website, for example - are necessary components of a transparent local government.

4. **Transparency - Information Access**: the city's readiness to make productive use of open government data. The use of communication methods that reach multiple sectors of society, ICT capabilities, and the production and publication of clear documents that present city processes and functions in an accessible way are steps towards ensuring socially-inclusive accountability.

5. **Feedback**: the effectiveness of two-way communication between citizens and their local governments. The reach of redress mechanisms, the response rate to complaints, and the existence and acceptance of evaluation and monitoring ensure that accountability practices result in positive change.
A cross cutting theme within these five dimensions is the use of information technologies.

The simplest form can be the selection of 25 indicators/issues organized into the five dimensions measured only using a 1/0 format (1: yes, 0: no), giving each dimension (or sub-index) a score of 0 to 5. This index, using yes or no responses, provides an easy to use measure of the effectiveness of existing social accountability practices and identifies areas that can benefit from improvement. It is important to note that the index does not intend to measure each city against an ideal. Rather, it was designed to compare cities with a common history and some shared characteristics. The format allows for the index to grow as do the cities and their social accountably practices. Although in their current form they are somewhat tied to the evaluator's judgment of the availability and functionality of social accountability tools, these measures can be made more complex and precise over time.

The present index can be a valuable tool throughout a social assessment process. Firstly, given the lack of city and community-level data, this format provides an alternative way to assess social accountability levels. Secondly, the specific indicators and definitions can be adapted to each city or target group and used during the Focus Group Discussions and In-Depth Interviews and the responses averaged to gauge the key social accountability issues. The results can then be used during the Scenario Development Workshop as a diagnostic tool to help the participants identify opportunities and challenges. In this way, the index becomes an integrated component of the Assessment process.

Furthermore, the index provides a monitoring tool that can be applied by a city’s stakeholders to regularly evaluate progress over time. City authorities, or intermediaries such as universities, can potentially carry out an annual update of the index independently, thus building a track record of the city’s work on social accountability. All cities highlighted the need for monitoring social accountability activities. The yearly index results can become a powerful tool in recognizing the efforts of city stakeholders every year and motivating all actors to contribute to strengthening social accountability in their city.

The tables below contain the proposed 5 indicators for each dimension.
Index Results for Sarajevo

Note: Because of the complex governance system, some questions received both a yes and a no to account for variations among Municipalities and the fact that the City Administration does not have real jurisdictions on most policy issues. For the purposes of the analysis, these cases with both 0 and 1 values were given a 0.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation - Opportunities</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>yes = 1</th>
<th>no = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the city hold consultation meetings with the public?</td>
<td>Face-to-face interaction with city leaders was considered valuable in an environment plagued by bureaucratic blocks. These consultation meetings could be anything from open door mayor days to public hearings.</td>
<td>1 and 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are there elected neighborhood councils or equivalent structures?</td>
<td>Local Community Council, Local Administrative Units, etc. were widely recognized as key intermediaries, yet not currently operating to meet this potential. Public election of members could make them more accountable to their constituents and lead to more efficient councils.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the city administration present municipal budgets to neighborhoods as part of the formal fiscal preparation cycle?</td>
<td>The city should have an adopted mechanism to obtain citizen input on budget allocations in relation to service provision, infrastructure and neighborhood facilities. Making presentations to neighborhood councils and community groups provides opportunities for gathering neighborhood priorities that are not often possible in larger Council public hearings.</td>
<td>1 and 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are vulnerable groups consulted when devising strategic policy documents?</td>
<td>To determine whether marginalized groups are part of the city’s decision-making process for city-wide policies such as the City Development Strategy.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the city have a program to engage with CSOs when reaching out to vulnerable groups?</td>
<td>To assess the city-intermediary relationship in working to increase visibility and outreach to these groups to vulnerable groups. “City” meaning the municipality or other local authority.</td>
<td>1 and 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participation -Opportunities total score** 2.5/5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation -Engagement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>yes = 1</th>
<th>no = 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are minorities or vulnerable communities represented in the current city council?</td>
<td>Within multi-ethnic context of the ECA region, to gage the level of diversity and participation of minority community on the city council.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are NGOs actively engaged in representing the interest of vulnerable groups?</td>
<td>To determine whether vulnerable groups have a go-to organization to provide support as well as pursue their interests in the public arena.</td>
<td>1 and 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are neighborhood councils (or similar structures) effectively linking the citizens to the city (or municipality)?</td>
<td>To evaluate the degree to which citizens consider their interests taken into account in neighborhood level governance/projects.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there youth-based outreach programs for civic engagement?</td>
<td>To determine the level of engagement and civic education of the youth as a strategic cohort.</td>
<td>1 and 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Is the website considered to be a reliable source of information?**

   To measure the effectiveness of the city’s main ICT portal/communication channel. 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Participation - Engagement total score</strong></th>
<th>1/5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transparency - Info Availability</strong></th>
<th><strong>Rationale</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are citizens given sufficient notice about upcoming city council meetings?</td>
<td>To determine whether city council meetings are open not only in theory but also in practice, since a common finding was that citizens cannot attend meetings because they find out about them too late. 1 and 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are municipal council decisions posted online in a timely manner?</td>
<td>To determine whether the outcomes of council meetings are made available even to those who cannot attend. 1 and 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are city budgets available online?</td>
<td>Budget transparency as part of open government practices. 1 and 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the municipality have an open data policy?</td>
<td>Meant to gage how open the municipality is to making data public from different sectoral programs (such as schools, hospitals) 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are CSOs required to have open data practices?</td>
<td>To determine whether there are transparency stipulations for intermediaries. 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transparency - info availability total score</strong></th>
<th>1.5/5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transparency - Information Access</strong></th>
<th><strong>Rationale</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there an active information desk available for citizen information?</td>
<td>Other common suggestions during the field activities: a physical information booth with helpful staff to help citizens find the information they need without having to navigate complex city administration structures. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there a document (charter) outlining the responsibilities of both government and citizens that is publicly accessible?</td>
<td>Citizen charters have been a successful tool for eliminating information asymmetries and misunderstandings. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the municipality provide support to citizens regarding access or navigation of its ICT tools?</td>
<td>To maximize the impact of using ICTs, citizens should be able to manage at a basic level the technology from the user end, thus addressing the digital divide. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there ICT training opportunities for public employees?</td>
<td>To maximize the impact of e-government and other such tools, government employees should be able to manage at a basic level the technology. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the city utilize the various forms of media to disseminate information?</td>
<td>Throughout the workshops, solutions included using the available slots in TV, radio and print media to disseminate city information. Local governments should take advantage of this possibility given that citizens embrace the media option. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transparency - Access total score</strong></th>
<th>3/5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback/Monitoring</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the time limit for grievance response abided by?</td>
<td>The effectiveness of grievance redress mechanisms depends on a mandatory response time that is satisfactory to the users and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do grievance/complaint systems use multiple types of technology?</td>
<td>ICTs can be very valuable in extending engagement opportunities, but there need to be a set of options to accommodate the varying levels of technology access among groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there a system for tracking the responsiveness to grievances of various departments/service providers?</td>
<td>To determine whether the departments responsible for redress mechanisms are functioning effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there an annual citizen service satisfaction survey?</td>
<td>Regular evaluations of city-wide or specific department's functioning in terms of service provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the city website updated regularly?</td>
<td>To determine whether the city website can be part of a fluid communication system, information needs to be kept relevant, especially the Frequently Asked Questions section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feedback/monitoring total score** 0/5

**Visualization:**

![Social Accountability Index - Sarajevo](image_url)
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