

institut alternativa

MONITORING REPORT: THE ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMITTEE

17 DECEMBER 2020 – 1 OCTOBER 2021

Publication:

Monitoring Report: The Anti-corruption Committee
(17 December 2020 – 1 October 2021)

Publisher:

Institute Alternative

Bulevar Džordža Vašingtona 57, Podgorica, Montenegro

Tel/fax: + 382 (0) 20 268 686

E-mail: info@institut-alternativa.org

For the publisher:

Stevo Muk

Editor:

Milena Muk

Authors:

Nikoleta Pavićević

Marko Sošić

Prepress and design:

Artbuk doo

Podgorica, October 2021



This Monitoring Report was prepared within the project "Parliamentary Oversight for Better Governance", implemented by the Institute Alternative and supported by the National Endowment for Democracy. The Report is the responsibility of its authors and does not reflect the views of the NED.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
The activities envisaged under the Anti-Corruption Committee's Work Plan for 2021 and the status of their implementation as of October 2021	6
The Anti-corruption Committee meetings in numbers: The most passive Committee of the 27th Parliament	7
The Committee's results on the basis of the three meetings: A modest plan followed by even more modest implementation	8
Reviews of reports	8
Legislative activity awaiting the set of anti-corruption laws.	9
Stagnation of the Committee's oversight role	9
Citizens' petitions concerning corruption waiting to be addressed	10
Lack of transparency in the work of the Committee: a result of the lack of administrative capacities	11
Conclusion	12
Recommendations	13
Sources	14

INTRODUCTION

According to its Rules of Procedure¹, the Parliament of Montenegro establishes committees as its working bodies; in addition to reviewing proposals and proposing acts, the committees are responsible for conducting parliamentary oversight. Since “parliamentary oversight is an essential feature of a system of checks and balances in a democracy”², it is vital that the committees’ work be focused on a comprehensive oversight of the executive. On the other hand, the committee’s legislative function is also critical, in particular in terms of supporting well-informed and evidence-based discussions on the proposed legislation.

The respective competences of the standing committees are provided in the Rules of Procedure of the Parliament, which define their course of action. The committees of the 27th convocation of the Parliament were established by the Decision on the election of Chairs and members of Standing Committees³ from 17 December 2020. As stipulated in the Decision, the Parliament has 14 standing committees, each composed of a Chair and 12 members.

The oversight mechanisms available to committee members include parliamentary (consultative and control) hearings and parliamentary inquiry. Over the past decade, MPs stepped up the use of these mechanisms; however, the impact remained questionable, given the absence of monitoring of the follow-up on recommendations and conclusions. This was noted also in the European Commission 2020 Report on Montenegro.⁴

At the start of the term of the 27th convocation of the Parliament, MPs initiated amendments to more than 50 articles of the Rules of Procedure aiming to eliminate ambiguities and reinforce the oversight role of the Parliament and its committees. The amendments facilitated a more frequent use of the “minority initiative” mechanism, whereby a committee decides on running a control hearing upon a motion tabled by one-third of its members. This mechanism now allows the committees to pass the decision on a hearing twice, rather than just once during an ordinary meeting, which was the case prior to the introduction of the amendments. This process helped strengthen parliamentary oversight exercised by the committee members from the ranks of the opposition. In addition, the Rules of Procedure provide that the conclusions that follow a hearing are to be proposed by the Chair, and their implementation, following adoption, are to be monitored by the committee. The Rules of Procedure oblige relevant ministers to take part in the work of the committee if they have been designated to represent the entity introducing the proposed act - this is a novelty compared to past practice.

1 Rules of Procedure of the Parliament of Montenegro (Official Gazette of MNE 65/21) of 22 July 2021.

2 Global Parliamentary Report 2017: Parliamentary oversight – Parliament’s power to hold the government to account, Inter-Parliamentary Union and United Nations Development Programme, available at: <https://bit.ly/3G3B9EC>

3 Decision on the Election of Chairs and Members of Standing Committees, of the 27th Convocation of the Parliament of Montenegro, 17 December 2020.

4 Montenegro 2020 Report, the European Commission, Brussels, 06 October 2020.

Given the need for strengthening the oversight role of the Parliament and the major novelties introduced by the Rules of Procedure, this report aims to review the activities of the parliamentary committees, with a particular focus on their oversight and control functions. We focus on monitoring the work of five parliamentary committees⁵ whose remits correspond to the key programmatic areas covered by the Institute Alternative.

This Monitoring Report presents the findings stemming from the review of the work of the **Anti-Corruption Committee**, with a particular focus on the analysis of the effectiveness of its legislative and oversight functions. The Committee has an especially important role in overseeing the institutions responsible for the fight against organised crime and corruption. It performs its legislative function in those same areas, by discussing laws and monitoring their effectiveness and problems in their implementation. Lastly, the Committee also engages in direct communication with citizens, who file petitions to alert to cases of corruption. The specific feature of this Committee, along with the Committee for European Integration and Committee for Education, Science, Culture and Sport, is that it is chaired by an opposition MP⁶.

The findings of this analysis come as a result of the monitoring exercise that covered the work of the Committee from its establishment on 17 December 2020 until 1 October 2021 – its meetings, minutes from the meetings, Work Plan and other documents. In-depth interviews were conducted with the Committee Chair,⁷ Deputy Chair⁸ and Secretary⁹ to verify the obtained information. The interviews covered the pace and quality of the Committee's work as well as room for improvement.

This Report begins with an overview of the relevant quantitative indicators that can be used to measure the performance, followed by a review of the activities implemented under the Committees' Work Plan for 2021. The third section of the Report reviews the performance of the Committee's oversight function during the observed period, while the next section considers the Committee's performance in relation to citizens' petitions. The fifth section reflects on the degree of transparency and the administrative capacities of this working body. The final section presents the recommendations for improving the work of the Committee and its oversight of the executive, stemming from the findings of the analysis.

5 Security and Defence Committee, Anti-corruption Committee, Committee on Political System, Judiciary and Administration, Committee on Economy, Finance and Budget and Committee on Human Rights and Freedoms.

6 Daliborka Pejović (Chair), Dragan Bojović (Deputy Chair), Jovan Jole Vučurović, Maksim Vučinić, Vladan Raičević, Dragan Ivanović, Danilo Šaranović, Danijel Živković, Luid Škrelja, Miloš Nikolić, Nikola Rakočević and Fatmir Đeka (members)

7 Interview with Daliborka Pejović, Chair of the Anti-corruption Committee, held on 07 October 2021.

8 Interview with Dragan Bojović, Deputy Chair of the Anti-corruption Committee, held on 27 September 2021.

9 Interview with Vesna Peković, Secretary to the Anti-corruption Committee, held on 27 September 2021.

The activities envisaged under the Anti-Corruption Committee's Work Plan for 2021 and the status of their implementation as of October 2021:

PLANNED ACTIVITIES	STATUS
Review of the 2019 Performance Report of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption	IMPLEMENTED
Review of the 2020 Performance Report of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption	IMPLEMENTED
Review of quarterly performance reports of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption	PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED
Local elections in Nikšić and Herceg Novi– Article 62 of the Law on the Financing of Political Entities and Electoral Campaigns	IMPLEMENTED
Consultative and control hearings on further activities and plans for the suppression of corruption in high-risk areas (public procurement, privatisation, urban planning, education, health, local self-government and police)	NOT IMPLEMENTED
Review of the European Commission reports and non-papers concerning Chapters 23 and 24	NOT IMPLEMENTED
Review and follow-up on GRECO recommendations	IMPLEMENTED
Review of periodical reports delivered by the Supreme State Prosecutor and Chief Special Prosecutor and other state authorities' reports on the fight against corruption and organised crime (Ministry of Interior, National Security Agency, Police Directorate etc.) in accordance with applicable regulations	NOT IMPLEMENTED
Organise a discussion attended by the Deputy Prime Minister responsible for security and the fight against corruption and organised crime, as required	NOT IMPLEMENTED
Analysis and improvement of the legislation concerning the fight against corruption and organised crime (Law on Prevention of Corruption, Law on Lobbying etc.)	NOT IMPLEMENTED
The Anti-Corruption Committee delegation's cooperation with the parliaments and committees of other countries addressing the fight against corruption and organised crime and with the European Parliament	NOT IMPLEMENTED

THE ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMITTEE MEETINGS IN NUMBERS: THE MOST PASSIVE COMMITTEE OF THE 27TH PARLIAMENT

Judging by the numbers, the Anti-corruption Committee was the most passive Committee in the 27th Parliament of Montenegro, as it held fewer meetings than any of the other 13 standing working bodies. Over the period of more than nine months following its establishment on 17 December 2020, the Committee held **three meetings** and discussed **12 points of the respective agendas**. Its members spent seven hours, or less than one working day in the three meetings; the longest meeting took **two hours and fifty minutes**.

On average, 80% of the Committee members took part in the three meetings mentioned above¹⁰, i.e. **nine MPs per meeting**. On average, 60% (3.6) of the Committee members from the ranks of the opposition took part in its work, including the Chair. During the meetings, the MPs nominated their substitutes (an option available to them under the Rules of Procedure) on four **occasions**.

No representatives of the executive were invited or took part in the work of the Committee, as no documents from their purview were discussed. On the other hand, **the Director and Council President of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption took part in all the three meetings held by the Committee**, to contribute to the review of the Agency's Performance Reports¹¹. The third meeting, which addressed the recommendations provided by the Council of Europe Group of States against Corruption (GRECO), involved representatives of the Council of Europe Office.

Broadcasting of the Committee meetings on the Parliament TV and YouTube channel contributed to greater transparency of its work and greater involvement of citizens, who were able to follow the live streams of the meetings gathering the MPs. "The most popular" Committee meeting was the first one, held on 7 April, which was viewed by **10,913** citizens on YouTube. The second meeting had 3,777, and the third one had **5,643** views.¹²

10 Regarding the consideration of the Report on the Work of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption for 2020 (First Session), the Report on the Work of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption for 2019 (Second Session) and the Report on the Work of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption for the first quarter of 2021 (Third Session)

11 Reviews of the Agency's Performance Reports for 2020 (**1st meeting**), 2019 (**2nd meeting**) and for the first quarter of 2021 (**3rd meeting**).

12 Parliament YouTube Channel, as of 12 October 2021

THE COMMITTEE'S RESULTS ON THE BASIS OF THE THREE MEETINGS: A MODEST PLAN FOLLOWED BY EVEN MORE MODEST IMPLEMENTATION

The Committee's Work Plan for 2021 was adopted as late as the fifth month of the year it referred to. It is summarized on a single page as 11 points that define the following: activities stemming from the systemic laws; monitoring of the financing of political entities and electoral campaigns; consideration of GRECO recommendations; analysis of the legislation from the purview of the Committee; cooperation with the parliaments and committees of other states as well as with the European Parliament, etc.

REVIEWS OF REPORTS

Since it commenced its activities within the 27th Parliament, the Committee reviewed the reports of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption for 2019¹³ and 2020¹⁴, but the reports were not endorsed by the majority in the Parliament. The Committee members from the ranks of the parties constituting the majority in the Parliament objected to the selective approach and susceptibility to political influence in the Agency's actions. On the other hand, the MPs did not propose any conclusions that would accompany the reports on the review of those documents and provide specific recommendations and contribute to the improved work of the Agency.

On the basis of the Institute Alternative (IA) suggestions, the Committee included in its Work Plan review of quarterly reports on the work of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption, since it is the lead committee for that Agency. That was a departure from the earlier practice, where the Committee reviewed only the annual report. Still, although the MPs reviewed the first 2021 quarterly report in the third meeting of the Committee,¹⁵ the review of the second quarterly report,¹⁶ which was prepared in August, was delayed. Furthermore, reviews of numerous other documents envisaged by the Work Plan were kept on hold. For instance, the most recent published European Commission Non-paper on the state of play regarding Chapters 23 and 24¹⁷ from May 2021 was still waiting to be reviewed by the Committee, more than four months after its publication.

Upon proposal of the Deputy Chair of the Committee, the Work Plan envisaged also: the reviews of the periodical reports of the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office and Special Prosecutor's Office, but also of the reports of the Ministry of Interior, National Security Agency

13 The second meeting of the Anti-corruption Committee, held on 12 May 2021, available at: <https://bit.ly/3IXHKIP>

14 The first meeting of the Anti-corruption Committee, held on 07 April 2021, available at: <https://bit.ly/3IXHKIP>

15 The third meeting of the Anti-corruption Committee, held on 28 July 2021, available at: <https://bit.ly/3IXHKIP>

16 The second quarterly report on the implementation of the Agency's Work Plan for 2021 (01 April – 30 June 2021), Agency for Prevention of Corruption, August 2021, available at: <https://bit.ly/3AYPCchw>

17 *Nezvanični radni dokument Evropske komisije (non-paper) o stanju u poglavljima 23 i 24 za Crnu Goru*, 28 May 2021, Brussels, available at: <https://bit.ly/3E0eqrc>

and Police Directorate on the fight against corruption and organised crime, organisation of a discussion that would involve Deputy Prime Minister, and analysis of the legislative provisions pertaining to the fight against corruption. However, none of these activities were included in the Committee's agenda by October 2021.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY AWAITING THE SET OF ANTI-CORRUPTION LAWS

The Work Plan envisages also a review of the legislation pertaining to the fight against corruption and organised crime, but the Committee did not carry out any legislative activities. The Committee Chair stated that the Committee was designated as the lead committee for a relatively small number of laws and that the Parliament Secretariat had a role in designating the lead committees for some specific laws. Given that situation, she highlighted the possibility for the Anti-corruption Committee to review, in the capacity of the lead committee, the Law on Prevention of Corruption, Law on the Financing of Political Parties, Law on Lobbying and the announced Law on the Origin of Assets, planned for adoption under the Government Work Programme for 2021.¹⁸

STAGNATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S OVERSIGHT ROLE

Neither the opposition MPs nor the ones from the parliamentary majority tabled any initiatives that would strengthen the Committee's oversight role. During the period in question, the Committee did not hold any **parliamentary hearings**, although its Work Plan for 2021 envisaged control and consultative hearings on further activities and plans for the suppression of corruption in high-risk areas such as public procurement, privatisation, urban planning, education, health, local self-government and the police. The opposition MPs **did not exercise the right to table a "minority initiative"**, enabling a decision on control hearing to be passed at the request of one-third of the members.

During the term of the previous Parliament, the Anti-corruption Committee was prevented from performing its oversight role, as state prosecutors refused to attend control or consultative hearings or to deliver specific performance reports; they claimed that there was no legal basis for that. This year's amendments to the Law on the State Prosecution Service¹⁹ stipulated the duty of the Supreme State Prosecutor and Chief Special Prosecutor to take part in the meetings when summoned by the Parliament, inquiry Committee or the Parliament's working bodies competent for the judiciary, anti-corruption, security and immunity-related issues. However, despite this option being in place, the MPs did not initiate any such hearings by October 2021.

18 Interview with Daliborka Pejović, Chair of the Anti-corruption Committee, held on 07 October 2021.

19 Law on the State Prosecution Service (Official Gazette of Montenegro 011/15 of 12 March 2015, 042/15 of 29 July 2015, 080/17 of 01 December 2017, 010/18 of 16 February 2018, 076/20 of 28 July 2020, 059/21 of 04 June 2021).

Although a possible parliamentary hearing of the representatives of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption concerning the initiative launched by NGO MANS to dismiss the Agency' Director for failing to comply with the Administrative Court judgments was announced during the third Committee meeting, **the MPs did not vote on the initiative nor was it officially included in the agenda.**

In the view of the Deputy Chair of the Committee, the key reason for less initiative for control and consultative hearings was the boycott, first by the opposition DPS and then by the DF. Although the DF was taking part in the work of the Committee at the time of the interview, the Deputy Chair thought that discontent with the political relations within the Government was spilling over and affecting the pace of work of the Committee and the involvement and initiative of the MPs from a share of the parliamentary majority.²⁰

CITIZENS' PETITIONS CONCERNING CORRUPTION WAITING TO BE ADDRESSED

According to the Parliament's Rules of Procedure, the Anti-corruption Committee reviews citizens' petitions and refers them to the competent authorities. During the second meeting of the Committee²¹, held in mid-May 2021, the Chair of the Committee stated that the Committee had received five petitions and was planning to review them; however, the MPs did not address those petitions during either the second or the third Committee meeting.

The Chair of the Committee thought that, unlike the previous one, this Parliament stepped up the reviews of the initiatives tabled by physical and legal persons in the form of petitions alerting to identified instances of corruption in the system, but that time was needed to review them and potentially organise hearings in connection with them.

Nine years following its establishment as a standing working body of the Parliament²², the Anti-corruption Committee has not set up a system for reviewing the petitions; therefore, it is the Committee itself that decides on the methodology and deadlines for reviewing them.

"We have decided to introduce two steps, where the petitions will first be reviewed by the MPs, in the Committee, and then we assess the degree of suspicion of potential corruption. Following such initial filtering, the requests will be forwarded to the Agency, which would then ask the institutions in question to state their positions and present information. The

20 Interview with Dragan Bojović, Deputy Committee Chair, 27 September 2021.

21 The second meeting of the Anti-corruption Committee, held on 12 May 2021, available at: <https://bit.ly/3IXHKIP>

22 Rules of Procedure of the Parliament of Montenegro, Article 38 (Official Gazette of RMNE 51/06 of 4 August 2006, 66/06 of 3 November 2006, Official Gazette of Montenegro 88/09 of 31 December 2009, 80/10 of 31 December 2010, 39/11 of 4 August 2011, 25/12 of 11 May 2012);

information related to the cases that would merit a public hearing will then be sent back to the Committee,” said the Committee Chair.

In the meantime, on the basis of our previous recommendations and the criticism presented by the European Commission in its reports, the Parliament attempted to institutionalise the review of petitions.²³ Citizens have access to the form for the submission of petitions, and it is stated that the Parliamentary Service will deliver the response to the petitioner within 15 days. Still, if the response cannot be provided by the Service and instead falls within the remit of the committee, the Service will forward it to the relevant working body of the Parliament, to be processed and responded to. However, the procedure and the deadlines for the committees to review citizens’ petitions and respond to them have not been defined.

LACK OF TRANSPARENCY IN THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE: A RESULT OF THE LACK OF ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITIES

Almost six months after its initial meeting, the Anti-corruption Committee did **not publish on the Parliament’s website any of the minutes from the three meetings it held**. Other materials accompanying the acts reviewed in meetings were not posted on the Parliament’s website either, such as the reports on the review of the Performance Reports of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption. The section of the website devoted to the Anti-corruption Committee included only a single document, namely the Committee’s Work Plan for 2021.

In addition to drafting the minutes, the Secretariat to the Anti-corruption Committee performs the duties related to the preparation of meetings, development of reports, assisting the Chair, Deputy Chair and members in the performance of their functions, studying the materials being addressed by this working body - including the EU law and regulatory impact assessment, expert opinions on the issues being debated in the Parliament, development of briefing notes and analyses and research, assisting in the performance of the oversight role and other activities.²⁴ Although the Rulebook envisages four positions, **the Secretariat currently consists only of the Committee Secretary**.

23 *Predstavke*, the Parliament of Montenegro website, available at: <https://bit.ly/3DZCHh6>

24 Rulebook on the organisation and systematisation of the Service of the Parliament of Montenegro, 29 July 2021, available at: <https://bit.ly/30Dkfwl>

CONCLUSION:

The Anti-corruption Committee is the least active parliamentary working body in Montenegro, a country with a concerning degree of corruption in many areas. During the observed period, the Committee²⁵ did not make use of the control mechanisms available to it to substantially improve the fight against corruption and organised crime.

Although the 2021 amendments to the Law on the State Prosecution Service expanded the list of those to be "held to account" at the request of the Committee and included also the Supreme State Prosecutor and Chief Special Prosecutor, none of the Committee members, either from the ranks of the parliamentary majority or the opposition, initiated a single control or consultative hearing.

There were no discussions on the findings of the European Commission Non-paper on the state of play regarding Chapters 23 and 24 for Montenegro, a document of particular importance, given that the Committee was set up following the launch of the negotiations with the European Union precisely as a body with a special focus on the fight against corruption, which had been alerted to.

Discussions on the quarterly performance reports of the Agency for Prevention of Corruption represented a welcome novelty in the work of the Committee during the observed period, which departed from the earlier practice of considering only the annual reports. Still, the work of the Committee focused exclusively on the Agency and did not consider the reports of the Supreme State Prosecution Office and Special Prosecution Office or reports on the fight against corruption and organised crime of other authorities, such as the Ministry of Interior, National Security Agency or Police Directorate.

Review of the petitions that citizens may submit to the Parliament and the Committee was only partially institutionalised on the basis of our earlier recommendations. Although the Parliament Service is required to deliver the response to the petitioner within 15 days, the deadlines for the petitions that fall within the remit of the working bodies themselves were not defined, so the petitions submitted to the Anti-corruption Committee during 2021 remained on hold for five months.

Given the foregoing, the poor implementation of the Committee's Work Plan comes as no surprise: more than one-half of the activities planned for 2021 still have to be included in the Committee's agenda. Recommendations for improving the work of the Committee are presented below; they refer in particular to the stepping up of its oversight and legislative roles and enhancing the transparency of its work.

25 From the establishment of the Committee during the term of the 27th Parliament (17 December) to 1 October 2021.

RECOMMENDATIONS

01

The Anti-corruption Committee should perform its oversight role by holding control hearings within its purview in line with Article 75 (7) of the Rules of Procedure of the Parliament of Montenegro, which allows for decisions on control hearings to be made upon request of one-third of the Committee's members;

02

Consultative hearings should be initiated concerning further activities and plans for the suppression of corruption in high-risk areas, namely in public procurement, privatisation, urban planning, education, health, local self-government and the police;

03

The Committee's legislative function should be strengthened by having the Committee review, either independently or in joint meetings with the lead committees, the proposals for laws that are of importance for the overall fight against corruption;

04

Transparency of the work of the Committee should be enhanced by timely publication of the minutes from its meetings, materials on the agenda and Committee reports on the reviewed reports and other materials, as well as citizens' petitions, provided that any personal data contained them is properly protected;

05

The procedure for the Committee's review of citizens' petitions should be defined by a specific rulebook that would define the process of reviewing, publication of petitions, publication of the responses provided by the relevant authorities, and deadlines for a committee to include a petition in the agenda if it falls within its purview.

SOURCES:

- Global Parliamentary Report 2017: Parliamentary oversight – Parliament's power to hold government to account, Inter-Parliamentary Union and United Nations Development Programme, available at: <https://bit.ly/3G3B9EC>
- Montenegro 2020 Report, European Commission, Brussels, 06 October 2020
- European Commission Non-paper on the state of play regarding Chapters 23 and 24 for Montenegro, 28 May 2021, Brussels, available at: <https://bit.ly/3E0eqrc>
- Decision on the election of the chairs and members of the standing committees of the 27th Parliament of Montenegro, Parliament of Montenegro, 17 December 2020
- 2021 Work Plan of the Anti-corruption Committee, available at: <https://bit.ly/3lXHKIP>
- Rules of Procedure of the Parliament of Montenegro (Official Gazette of MNE 65/21) of 22 July 2021
- Rulebook on the organisation and job systematisation of the Service of the Parliament of Montenegro, 29 July 2021, available at: <https://bit.ly/30Dkfwl>
- Law on the State Prosecution Service (Official Gazette of Montenegro 011/15 of 12 March 2015, 042/15 of 29 July 2015, 080/17 of 01 December 2017, 010/18 of 16 February 2018, 076/20 of 28 July 2020, 059/21 of 04 June 2021)

WEB:

- Parliament of Montenegro website: <https://www.skupstina.me/>
- Recording of the **First Meeting** of the Anti-corruption Committee (Parliament YouTube Channel): <https://bit.ly/2Z8syQh>
- Recording of the **Second Meeting** of the Anti-Corruption Committee (Parliament YouTube Channel): <https://bit.ly/2ZgktZY>
- Recording of the **Third Meeting** of the Anti-Corruption Committee (Parliament YouTube Channel): <https://bit.ly/3n8lxWF>

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS:

- **Daliborka Pejović**, Chair of the Anti-Corruption Committee, 07 October 2021
- **Dragan Bojović**, Deputy Chair of the Anti-Corruption Committee, 27 September 2021
- **Vesna Peković**, Secretary to the of the Anti-Corruption Committee, 27 September 2021

ABOUT INSTITUTE ALTERNATIVE

Institute Alternative (IA) is a non-governmental organisation, established in September 2007 by a group of citizens with experience in civil society, public administration and business sector.

Our mission is to contribute to strengthening of democracy and good governance through and policy analysis as well as monitoring of public institutions performance.

Our objectives are to increase the quality of work, accountability and transparency, efficiency of public institutions and public officials; to encourage open, public, constructive and well-argument discussions on important policy issues; raising public awareness about important policy issues, strengthening the capacity of all sectors in the state and society for the development of public policies.

The values we follow in our work are dedication to our mission, independence, constant learning, networking, cooperation and teamwork.

We function as a think tank or a research centre, focusing on the overarching areas of good governance, transparency and accountability. The areas of our work and influence are structured around the following five main programmes: public administration; accountable public finance; parliamentary programme; security and defence, and social policy.

On the basis of our five programmes, we monitor the process of accession negotiations with the EU, actively participating in working groups Public procurement (5), Judiciary and Fundamental rights (23) and Financial control (32). Our flagship project is the Public Policy School, which is organized since 2012, and in 2018 we organized the first Open Budget School.

So far we cooperated with over 40 organisations within regional networks in the Western Balkans and with over 100 organisations in Montenegro. Institute is actively engaged in regional networks: Think for Europe (TEN), Pointpulse, SELDI, WeBER, UNCAC Coalition, Global BTAP, PASOS and The Southeast Europe Coalition on Whistleblower Protection.

The results of our research are summarised in 129 studies, reports and analyses, and the decisionmakers were addressed 1036 recommendations. Over four thousand times we communicated our proposals and recommendation to the media for better quality public policies.

We started three internet pages. My town is a pioneer endeavour of visualisation of budgetary data of local self-administrations. My Administration followed, which serves as an address for all those citizens that have encountered a problem when interacting with public administration and its service delivery system. The newest internet portal, My Money, provided national budget data visualisation.

Institute Alternative regularly publishes information about finances, projects and donors that support the work of the organisation. For this reason, the Institute have five-stars rating third year in a row, according to a survey conducted by the international non-profit organisation Transparify, which evaluates transparency for over 200 research centers.

President of the Managing Board is Stevo Muk, and our organisation currently has ten members.

www.institut-alternativa.org

www.mojgrad.me

www.mojauprava.me

www.mojnovac.me