

# THE OPEN GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIP

**NATIONAL ACTION PLAN FOR ALBANIA**

**2020 - 2022**



***2020-2022 OGP Commitments***

***National Action Plan***

***Albania***

**Commitments**

In preparation of Albania’s 2020-2022 Open Government Partnership (OGP) Action Plan four policy areas were selected to be the thematic components of the upcoming action plan. Selected based on national and international recommendations for governance and public administration reform in Albania & and the four components are managed by POC in close collaboration with Lead Government Focal Points and centrally coordinated by the OGP Technical Secretariat.

*Figure 1: Thematic Components and Lead Focal Point Institutions*

Based on government strategies and priorities and feedback and ideas from stakeholder consultations ten strategic objectives representative nine reform commitments were chosen for Albania’s 2020-2022 OGP Action Plan. These commitments focus on increasing access to public services and increasing accountability through coordinated approaches to improve the quality and quantity of publically available information. Enabling frameworks and initiatives to promote civic participation and public trust underpin all commitments selected.
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**Component 1  
*Open Government in the Fight against Corruption***

***Why is anti-corruption a priority for Albania?***

Tackling corruption is one of the most important objectives of the Albanian government and has been identified by the European Union as one of the five key priorities for the country towards integration with the European Union.

Anti-corruption initiatives and polices underpin the inter-institutional reforms necessary for the improved functioning and efficiency of all public and private institutions. These anti-corruption initiatives and polices will increase the integrity, performance and accountability of institutions, and promoting accountable governance that facilitates equitable and just law enforcement and improved public services for all citizens as well as the implementation of the rights and obligations of citizens in property issues.

***Government efforts and progress***

Since 2015 the Albanian government has adopted and implemented government strategies to address corruption, of which the first two national action plans2015-2017 and 2018-2020 have been implemented. The third Anti-Corruption Action Plan 2020-2023, was approved by the Council of Ministers 1 July 2020 and builds on and strengthens the commitments and strategic objectives from the previous strategies with particular emphasis on enhancing integrity in public institutions to benefit the public interest.

To enhance accountability in the fight against corruption in 2017 the Albanian government established the role of National Coordinator against Corruption (NCAC) to the Ministry of Justice. The MoJ/NCAC oversees the preparation and development of policies, laws and by-laws specifically focused on anti-corruption and facilitates the coordination with stakeholders to collaborate in these processes. Having been designated to the role of NCAC the Ministry of Justice leads the inter-institutional commitment to improve public integrity and promote a culture and transparency and accountability for all civil servants and public officials across all levels of government, but particularly in the most vulnerable and corruption-sensitive sectors.

***Collaboration with civil society***

Active civic participation in governance processes is a necessity and a guarantee for maintaining the integrity of governance. The development of both of these anti-corruption mechanisms was done in close cooperation with civil society. The Ministry of Justice/NCAC collaborated with the Institute for Democracy and Mediation Albania[[1]](#footnote-2) (IDM) in co-drafting the “Integrity Risk Assessment Methodology’’ and the “Integrity Plan of the Ministry of Justice, 2020-2023’’, the co-creation process for the latter was guided by an open and consultative drafting process.

Within the framework implementing its good governance agenda the Ministry of Justice/NCAC has partnered with civil society organisations (CSOs) on campaigns to strengthen public education in the fight against corruption. In 2019, Albania held its first edition of the Week of Integrity, an initiative of the International Chamber of Commerce Netherlands, an awareness-raising campaign that focuses on the promotion of ethical behaviour, transparency, accountability, responsibilityin business. This Week of Integrity acted as a meeting point for the public sector, the private sector, academia, civil society organizations, international partners, students, central government and local government to promote ethical behaviour across all workplaces, including government and civil society organizations. This first edition was joined by 28 partners who presented on their initiatives to promote ethical behaviour, transparency, accountability and responsibility.

***Remaining challenges***

The ‘‘Addendum to the Second Compliance Report Albania’’ by the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) adopted in September 2020 concluded that Albania had implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner nine of the ten recommendations contained in the Fourth Round Evaluation Report. However, GRECO’s report emphasized that a vast judicial reform is still ongoing and encourages Albania to prioritize the completion of a comprehensive judicial reform process (regarding the appointment of judges and prosecutors/“magistrates”) in order to fight against corruption within the judiciary.

The implementation of corruption prevention mechanisms will be a continuing priority for Albania. The promotion and integration of anti-corruption reforms will require a significant shift in public administration culture. Developing and implementing integrity plans for all central administration institutions and their subordinates will require substantial political will and technical capacity and commitment within these institutions. Institutional resistance against integrity breaches will need to be strengthened and increased transparency and public access to official information and state activities will require commitment to the development and implementation of timely publication and reporting. Finally, the establishment and on-going administration of a Register of Beneficiary Owners will require substantial political commitment to the prevention of corruption through bribery and money laundry through mandatory transparency and traceability measures.

Commitments | Open Government in the Fight against Corruption | Commitment 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Commitment 1***  *Specific Objective:* **IntegrityPlans** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **January 2020 – December 2022** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Lead implementing agency/actor** | | | **National Coordinator against Corruption, Ministry of Justice** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Commitment Description** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **What is the public problem that the commitment will address?** | | | The potential abuse of entrusted power for personal benefit exposes all public institutions in all countries to the risks of corruption during the administration of their duties and responsibilities. Corruption weakens public trust in government, hampers legitimate economic activity, threatens public resources and income, and negatively impacts public administration and service delivery thus poses poises serious and far reaching risks to country development. In 2019, Albania was ranked 106/180 countries in Transparency International’s Corruptions Perceptions Index. Furthermore, according to the 2019Trust in Governance Opinion Poll of the 2500 Albanians surveyed 87% perceived petty corruption to be either widespread or vary widespread, meanwhile 85% perceived grand corruption to be either widespread or very widespread.  As such, addressing corruption in presents a significant challenge that requires measures throughout all levels of the public administration. Since 2017, the Ministry of Justice in its role as National Coordinator against Corruption has lead the government’s anti-corruption policy making efforts and the preparation of related laws and bylaws. As the lead responsible public institution for anticorruption the MoJ/National Coordinator against Corruption leads the inter-institutional commitment to ensure a higher performance and culture in the fight against corruption. This inter-institutional commitment focuses on the most vulnerable and corruption-sensitive sectors and strives to promote and ensure an impartial, honest and efficient public administration with civil servants and other public officials with high values, principles and integrity. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **What is the commitment?** | | | An integrity plan is essentially a risk management plan that focuses on the potential corruption risks an institution may face and consequently can be a powerful anti-corruption instrument. It identifies the primary areas of corruption risk for a particular organization and presents a strategy with concrete mitigation actions, measures and procedures in order to identify these risks and address them such that all levels of the institution operate with integrity. The success of an integrity plan depends both on the soundness of the methodology of its design – how suitable it is to the particular organization, how accountable it requires the individuals of the institution to be, the comprehensiveness of its scope – and its implementation and monitoring process.  This commitment establishes a framework for the development and implementation of integrity plans across the public administration. It focuses on establishing a methodology and the development and implementation of a leading integrity plan, through the Ministry of Justice, in order to promote not only increased integrity within the Ministry of Justice, but to also lead by example for line ministries and sub-ordinate institutions. The commitment prioritizes structured reporting frameworks and consultative and monitoring mechanisms that promote involvement of and accountability to citizens.  ***Objective:***  This commitment aims to strengthen the integrity framework across the public administration such that all government institutionsoperate with integrity and functionality, in order to prevent corruption both across the board and in their daily activities. The commitment expects that by the end of 2022, in accordance withInter-Sectoral Strategy against Corruption (ISAC) 2015-2023, all ministries and subordinate ministries will have drafted and begun implementing their integrity plan. The development and implementation of integrity plans that clearly define ethical obligations in the workplace across the public administration aims to build and maintain a work culture of ethical work practices.  ***Expected results:***   * Integrity plan guidance and integrity risk assessment methodology for the central government approved; * Ministry of Justice’s Integrity Plan is approved and implemented; * Integrity risk assessment conducted in Ministry of Justice subordinate institutions & integrity plans approved; * Integrity risk assessment conducted in line ministries& integrity plans approved. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **How will the commitment contribute to solving the public problem?** | | | In cooperation with the Albanian non-governmental governance think thank the Institute for Democracy and Mediation (IDM) the Ministry of Justice/NCAC has co-created and adopted the “Integrity Risk Assessment Methodology in Central Government Institutions” (***milestone 1; milestone 3***)a guide/methodology on how central administration institutions should assess integrity risk in order to initiate activities to maintain the integrity and performance of public administration employees, at the executive and political level. Workshops will familiarize Ministry of Justice employees with best practices and procedures and train them on the application of assessment frameworks and tools in order to strengthen their technical in identifying, assessing and addressing integrity risks (***milestone 2***). Through the same cooperation the “Ministry of Justice Integrity Plan 2020-2023” has been drafted through an open and consultative process (***milestone 4***).  A roundtable with public institutions will promote integrity plans and explain the mechanisms and methodology and using the Ministry of Justice’s Integrity Plan as a model document to line ministries and subordinate institutions (***milestone 5***). Following the consultative methodology developed by the Ministry of Justice subordinate institutions and all central pubic institutions (ministries) will each undergo their own integrity risk assessments to draft their own integrity plans in accordance with their respective areas of responsibility and specific risk factors (***milestone 6; milestone 7***). Once these plans have been approved, ensuring they meet all the guidelines specified in the methodology, an e-bulletin series will be produced to facilitate the transparency of the integrity plans and accountability to its implementation (***milestone 8***).  To ensure proper implementation of the integrity plans -- from risk identification to risk mitigation -- they will be accompanied by a comprehensive monitoring process that follows a structured monitoring and evaluation framework (***milestone 9***). Monitoring of the implementation of the Ministry of Justice’s Integrity Plan will be done in consultation with stakeholders and civil society organizations (CSOs) with feedback published and integrated such that the ministry is held accountable to the public as well as to internal systems (***milestone 10***). Evaluation reports will be regularly conducted and published in real to be available for public comment (***milestone 11***) to then produce and publish the resulting recommendations to improve the implementation process (***milestone 12***). This monitoring process will be applied to the implementation of the line ministries and subordinate institutions’ integrity plans once they have begun their implementation phase (***milestone 13***). | | | | | | | | | | |
| **OGP challenge affected by this measures** | | | Improve public services | | Increase efficient management of public  Resources | | Increase public integrity | | Increase corporate accountability | | | Create a safer community for citizens & civil society | |
| ☒ | | ☐ | | ☒ | | ☒ | | | ☐ | |
| **Why is this commitment relevant to OGP values?** | **Transparency & Access to Information** | | * *Does the idea disclose more information to the public?* * *Does the idea improve the quality of information disclosed to the public?* * *Does the idea improve accessibility of information to the public?* * *Does the idea enable the right to information?*   ☒Yes ☐No  All consultative meetings, round-tables and resulting reports and plans of each ministry and subordinate institutions’ integrity plan development process will be published and made publically available.  Annual monitoring reports on the implementation of integrity plans will be published for public consumption and will be accompanied withsupplementary detailed informationto facilitate citizens’ comprehension and understanding of the plans. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public Accountability** | | * *Does the idea create or improve rules, regulations, and mechanisms to publicly hold government officials answerable to their actions?* * *Does the idea make the government accountable to the public and not solely to internal systems?*   ☒Yes ☐No  Monitoring reports will track the progress of the initiative and the implementation of each institution’s integrity plan. These will be completed through public consultations and be published for public consumption in order to enable the ability for civil society and citizens to hold institutions answerable and accountable to the progress and achievement their plan’s stated commitments. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public & Civic Participation** | | * *Does the idea create or improve opportunities, or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions?* * *Does the idea create or improve the enabling environment for civil society?*   ☒Yes ☐No  The implementation of publically available integrity plans will help to promote public and civic engagement on several levels. These efforts aim to increase public trust not only in the institutions themselves, but towards the process. They work to address the disillusionment of civil society from participating in governance reforms.  Firstly, by requiring public institutions to consulate with the public in the design of their integrity plans the commitment will support co-ownership of the process.  Secondly, the publication of the plans and inclusion of supplementary information will foster accessibility and citizen awareness and comprehension of the planned reforms that will in turn make citizens more informed and consequently better positioned to hold the institutions accountable.  Finally, a collaborative monitoring framework will provide on-going opportunities for public accountability and civic contributions so that citizens can be assured that their contributions and concerns are taken under consideration and applied and therefore feel incentivized to participate and maintain engagement. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Technology & Innovation** | | * *Will technological innovation be used in with one of the other three OGP values to advance participation, transparency or accountability?*   ☒Yes☐No  Online publication of reports enable transparency in real time coupled with online opportunities for stakeholder consultation and feedback enable a greater number of citizens to provide participate and provide feedback. Additionally, the use of an e-bulletin will support transparency and accountability on the implementation of integrity plants. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestone Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestones** | | **Indicators** | | | | **Responsible  Institution / s** | | | | **New or Continued Idea** | **Timeframe** | | |
| Measurable & verifiable achievements to accomplish this objective | | Result Indicators | | Output Indicators | | Lead Responsible Institution | | Supporting / Coordinating Agencies / Institutions | | New or continued from 2018-  2020 OGP AP | Start Date | | End Date |
| ***Priority Measure 1:*** Integrity plans drafted and approved by central government institutions | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 1:***  Methodology document: Guidance / integrity risk assessment methodology for the central government drafted | | Central public administration institutions with better performance, accountability and transparency | | Manual (methodology) completed | | Ministry of Justice (MoJ) | | Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M I 2020 | | 6M I 2020 |
| ***Milestone 2:***  Strengthening the capacities of the MoJ technical staff on the identification of integrity risks | |  | | Workshops on the identification of work processes/Analysis and assessment of the intensity of integrity risks. | | MoJ | | CSOs | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M I 2020 | | 6M I 2020 |
| ***Milestone 3:***  Approval and Publication of the Integrity Risk Assessment Methodology for the central government. | |  | | Manual (methodology) approved | | MoJ | |  | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M II 2020 | | 6M II 2020 |
| ***Milestone 4:***  Drafting, consulting, approval and publication of the IP document of the MoJ. | |  | | Approval of MoJ IP document | | MoJ | |  | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M II 2020 | | 6M II 2020 |
| ***Milestone 5:***  Information and presentation mechanisms to MoJ and LM subordinate institutions, for the risk assessment process and presentation of the integrity guide | |  | | MoJ Integrity Plan promotion roundtable | | MoJ | | CSOs | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M II 2020 | | 6M II 2020 |
| ***Milestone 6:***  Integrity risk assessment in MoJ subordinate institutions according to the model developed in MoJ; Integrity plan drafted. | |  | | Integrity risk assessment in MoJ subordinate institutions & integrity plan drafted. | | MoJ subordinates | | MoJ | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M I 2021 | | 6M II 2021 |
| ***Milestone 7:***  Integrity risk assessment; drafting, approval of Integrity Plans by all central institutions (ministries). | |  | | Ministries have approved IPs | | Ministries | |  | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | Jan. 2022 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 8:***  Increased transparency by public administration institutions on IP (e-bulletin) | |  | | No. of bulletins produced / published (2021/2022) | | MoJ | |  | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M I 2021 | | 6M II 2022 |
| ***Priority Measure 2:*** Comprehensive analysis on the applicability of integrity plans in the Ministry of Justice and line ministries | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 9:***  Methodology document: instrument on monitoring Integrity Plans in central government institutions | |  | | Manual (methodology) monitoring/evaluation of IP implementation, conducted and approved | | MoJ | | CSOs | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M I 2021 | | 6M I 2021 |
| ***Milestone 10:***  Drafting and consulting the monitoring report on the implementation of the IP of MoJ with Stakeholders and CSOs | |  | | Stakeholder/CSO consultation calendar established & published.  Stakeholder consultations held.  Stakeholder feedback published & response integrated into the monitoring report. | | MoJ | | CSOs | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M II 2021 | | 6M II 2021 |
| ***Milestone 11:***  Evaluation report performed for the implementation of the IP of MoJ is performed every 1 year (2 internal reports/every 6 months) during the time of implementation of the plan | |  | | Evaluation reports conducted.  Evaluation reports published & publically available in real time.  Evaluation reports available for public feedback. | | MoJ | |  | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M II 2021 | | 6M II 2022 |
| ***Milestone 12:***  Preparation of recommendations based on the findings of the evaluation performed/added transparency to the given recommendations | |  | | No. of recommendations drafted for IPs.  Recommendations published in real time for public consumption. | | MoJ | |  | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M II 2021 | | 6M II 2022 |
| ***Milestone 13:***  Drafting and consulting the monitoring report on the implementation of the IP of MoJ subordinate with Stakeholders/CSOs through information meetings/workshops | |  | | Stakeholder/CSO consultation calendar established & published.  Stakeholder consultations held.  Stakeholder feedback published & response integrated into the monitoring report. | | MoJ | | CSOs | | ☐No  ☒Yes Integrity Plans | 6M II 2022 | | 6M II 2022 |
| **Contact Information** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name of responsible person from implementing agency** | | | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| **Title, Department** | | | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| **Email and Phone** | | | |  | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Actors Involved** | | **State actors involved** | |  | | | | | | | | | |

Commitments | Open Government in the Fight against Corruption |Commitment 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Commitment 2 Specific Objective:* Beneficial Ownership Register** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **January 2020 – December 2022** | | | | **Lead implementing agency/actor** | | **Ministry of Finance and Economy** | | **Commitment Description** | | | | **What is the public problem that the commitment will address?** | A beneficial owner is the real person or real people who own, control or benefit from a legal entity, such as a company or organization. Criminals can use an ‘anonymous owner’ or a ‘nominee’ as owner of a company in order to secretly move, launder and spend money from criminal activity. Often these secret companies are used to pay or receive bribes or engage in other corrupt practices or to avoid taxes.  When open registries require legal entities to disclose the individuals who own or control the legal entity, through direct ownership or indirect ownership through shares for example, money is more easily traceable. Therefore, it becomes more difficult to use legal entities to hide the profits from corruption and crime and therefore, reduces the attractiveness and ease of engaging in such criminal activity.  In Albania only the Law no. 9917/2008 ‘‘On the prevention of money launderingand terrorist financing’’ has included explicit mention of beneficial ownership. The legal entities under the jurisdiction of this law are obligated to identify the beneficial owners of their customers; however, this data has not been recorded in a designated national register. Furthermore, under current legislation legal entities registered in the Republic of Albania are not obligated to identify and register data on their beneficial owners in a designated national register.Thus, there has lacked the legal framework necessary to require by law the disclosure and register of beneficial owners of legal entities. Furthermore, without the adequate establishment of procedures and manner of registration and storage of the beneficial ownership data or the punitive measures for non-registration of beneficial ownership, criminal activity and corrupt practices can more easily be hidden. | | | **What is the commitment?** | This commitment outlines the pathway to establishing a functioning central register of beneficial owners in order to reduce the opportunities for hiding corruption and criminal activity and its profits. Through the development, approval and implementation of the law “On the Register of Beneficial Owners” (the UBO Law) and by-laws that explicitly define beneficial ownership, outline the requirements of legal entities to report to the register and the rules and procedures for the register itself the commitment establishes the legislative basis necessary for an effective beneficial ownership register.  The implementation of the register of beneficial owners will consist of an electronic database held by the National Business Centre (NBC). All legal entities required to report and register their beneficial owner information will be obliged to submit information regarding their beneficial owners as outlines by the UBO Law or face financial sanctions for non-compliance.Thus, through this initiative, transparency regarding the real ownership and control of legal entities will be promoted and provided, as well as more data to which the public may have access.  ***Objective:***  The drafting of the law “On the Register of Beneficial Owners” and the accompanying by-laws through a consultative process with stakeholders aim to establish the manner and procedures of data registration for beneficial ownership that accounts for the technical and operational challenges of identifying beneficial owners in Albania. The implementation of the register through this framework aims to establish a system that promotes transparency, due diligence and ethical practices and severely reduces the opportunities for money laundering, bribery, tax evasion and other forms of corruption.  ***Expected results:***   * Approval of the draft law ‘Register of Beneficial Ownership’; * Drafting and approval of the bylaws: -“On determining the manner and procedures of data registration for beneficial ownership, as well as the notification from the competent state authorities and from the obligated subjects”; -“On determining the rules for the functioning of the Register of Beneficial Ownership, on the way of communication in electronic form and exchange of data between the National Business Center and responsible state bodies, as well as for the manner and terms of communication between the Register of Beneficial Ownership, the Trade Register and the Register of Non-Profit Organizations” * Implementation of the Law on the Register of Beneficial Ownership; * Creation of the Register of Beneficial Ownership by the end of 2021. | | | **How will the commitment contribute to solving the public problem?** | In order to meet the 'Beneficiary Ownership' objective, MoFE efforts have focused on adapting the necessary legal basis.The Law no. 112/2020 "On the register of beneficial ownership"(***milestone 1***), fulfils one of the recommendations of MONEYVAL. The law partially approximates Directive (EU) 2015/849 of the European Parliament and of the Council, dated 20 May 2015 on the prevention of the use of the financial system for the purposes of money laundering or terrorist financing, amending Regulation (EU) No 648/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Directive 2005/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Commission Directive 2006/70/EC.This law regulates the definition of the beneficial ownership; the obligated entities which must register the beneficial owners; the creation, functioning and administration of the Register of Beneficiary Ownership; the procedure and the manner of registration and storage of the registered data of the beneficial ownership as well as the punitive measures in case of non-registration of the beneficial ownership.  More specifically, this law applies to the reporting entities, legal entities registered in the Republic of Albania according to the provisions set in the law. The register will be set up and managed by the National Business Center and will be accessed only by the persons authorized to represent the reporting entity andby the competent state authorities. Any person wishing to obtain information from the register that is not freely accessible and public can only do so if they are able to prove that theyhave a legitimate legal interest in obtaining this information.  Another task derived by legislative base adaption is the drafting of bylaws, which will be realized with the financial and technical assistance of GIZ, specifically: the DCM “On determining the manner and procedures of data registration for beneficial ownership, as well as the notification from the competent state authorities and from the obligated subjects” (***milestone 2***) and the DCM “On determining the rules for the functioning of the Register of Beneficial Ownership, on the way of communication in electronic form and exchange of data between the National Business Center and responsible state bodies, as well as for the manner and terms of communication between the Register of Beneficiary Owners, the Trade Register and the Register of Non-Profit Organizations” (***milestone: 3***) , are in the drafting process.  Finally, the Ministry of Finance and Economy and the National Agency for the Information Society must establish the Register of Beneficial Ownership until 2021 (***milestone 4***). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **OGP challenge affected by this measures** | | | | Improve public services | | | Increase efficient management of public  resources | | Increase public integrity | | | Increase corporate accountability | | | Create a safer community for citizens & civil society | |
| ☒ | | | ☐ | | ☒ | | | ☒ | | | ☐ | |
| **Why is this commitment relevant to OGP values?** | **Transparency & Access to Information** | | | * *Does the idea disclose more information to the public?* * *Does the idea improve the quality of information disclosed to the public?* * *Does the idea improve accessibility of information to the public?* * *Does the idea enable the right to information?*   ☒Yes ☐No  The creation of the Register for Beneficial Ownership is foreseen to function as a state electronic database, in which the data of the beneficial ownership of the subjects obligated to report is registered, which collects in real time the data registered in the respective state registers, administered by the relevant state institutions, and serves as an official electronic archive, thus ensuring transparency in the field of beneficial owners. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public Accountability** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve rules, regulations, and mechanisms to publicly hold government officials answerable to their actions?* * *Does the idea make the government accountable to the public and not solely to internal systems?*   ☒Yes ☐No  By ensuring transparency in the field of beneficial ownership and the definition of the institutions in charge of data registration and their administration, as well as all other institutions responsible for fulfilling of the resulting legal obligations, aims to improve public accountability. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public & Civil Participation** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve opportunities, or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions?* * *Does the idea create or improve the enabling environment for civil society?*   ☐Yes ☒No  Any person may obtain information about the data recorded in the register, which is not freely accessible and public, only if he proves that he has a legitimate interest in obtaining this information. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Technology & Innovation** | | | * *Will technological innovation be used in with one of the other three OGP values to advance participation, transparency or accountability?*   ☒Yes ☐No  The use of an electronic register provides a means to ensure traceability and transparency and a verifiable record to hold public institutions responsible for fulfilling their obligations for the maintenance and continuous and accurate update of the register. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestone Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestones** | | | **Indicators** | | | | | **Responsible Institution / s** | | | | | **New or Continued Idea** | **Timeframe** | | |
| Measurable & verifiable achievements to accomplish this objective | | | Result Indicators | | | Output Indicators | | Lead Responsible Institution | | | Supporting / Coordinating Agencies / Institutions | | New or continued from 2018-  2020 OGP AP | Start Date | | End Date |
| ***Priority Measure 1:*** Approval of the draft law “Register of Beneficial Ownership” | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 1:***  Approval of the draft law “On the register of beneficial ownership” | | | Drafting, consulting with stakeholders and following the procedures of the approval of the draft law | | | No. of working group meetings.  Law approved | | Ministry of Finance and Economy (MoFE) | | Line Ministries | | | ☐No  ☒Yes Beneficiary Owners | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2020 |
| ***Priority Measure 2:*** Implementation of the Law on the Register of Beneficial Ownership | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 2:***  Drafting and approval of bylaw:  - DCM “On determining the manner and procedures of data registration for beneficial ownership, as well as the notification from the competent state authorities and from the obligated subjects” | | | Drafting, consulting with stakeholders and following the procedures of the approval of the draft law | | | Adopted bylaw | | MoFE | | | Line Ministries | | ☐No  ☒Yes Beneficiary Owners | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2021 |
| ***Milestone 3:***  Drafting and approval of bylaw:  DCM “On determining the rules for the functioning of the Register of Beneficial Ownership, on the way of communication in electronic form and exchange of data between the National Business Center and responsible state bodies, as well as for the manner and terms of communication between the Register of Beneficial Ownership, the Trade Register and the Register of Non-Profit Organizations” | | | Drafting, consulting with stakeholders and following the procedures of the approval of the draft law | | | Adopted bylaw | | MoFE | | | Line Ministries | | ☐No  ☒Yes Beneficiary Owners | Jan. 2021 | | Dec. 2021 |
| ***Milestone 4:***  Creation of the register of Beneficial Ownership. | | | Drafting, consulting with stakeholders and following the procedures of the approval of the draft law | | | Register of beneficial ownership created | | MoFE | | | NBC, Line Ministries | | ☐No  ☒Yes Beneficiary Owners | Jan. 2021 | | Dec. 2021 |
| **Contact Information** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name of responsible person from implementing agency** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Title, Department** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Email and Phone** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Actors Involved** | | **State actors involved** | | | ***Other government agencies involved:*** National Business Center | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Component 2  
*Digital Governance: Accessibility in Public Services***

***Why is digital governance a priority for Albania?***

In the modern globalized world, economic success and high quality of life are achieved in the countries that prioritize the utilization of technology towards the betterment of society through the expansion of knowledge and improvement of public services and their delivery. The development of the information society in Albania is a common objective across the public sector, academia, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society organizations (CSOs) and the private sector. Achieving this objective requires strong coordination and harmonization between all sectors and actors. Therefore, for a small country like Albania, the development of knowledge-based economy, efficient and effective public administration and the inclusion of all citizens in the organization of public life, are of special importance.

In Albania, Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) is increasingly being utilized as a tool that for the improved transformation of daily life, organization of work, economic markets through new business opportunities and models, civic participation and interaction with government and towards an increasingly open and transparent governance model. In this perspective, special attention is paid to facilitating open data in public administration in order to make the data and information sources created by the public administration easily accessible to society, thus creating a precondition for promoting new innovative ideas, services and products.

The utilization of technology and innovation can help to optimize the operational processes in public administration and increase its efficiency. The simplification of public service provision, through effective electronic services and the interaction of information systems is expected to promote economic growth through reductions administrative burden and costs for citizens and businesses and increasing the efficiency of public service institutions.

***Government efforts and progress***

Since 2013, the Government of Albania has pursued a groundbreaking reform that reinvents the way public administration delivers services to its citizens towards the provision of online public services and the complete digitalization of the administration's work processes. This reform takes a citizen-centric approach and relies heavily on innovation and the use of information technology (IT) to improve standards, procedures, and the organization of service delivery. The objective of the public service delivery reform was to create an administration that focused primarily on the needs of citizens, with particular attention to be paid to addressing accessibility needs of marginalized groups.

Albania, on its way to the information society, has made considerable progress having prioritized investments in centralized infrastructures which have enabled public service standardization, lower maintenance costs, increase the quality of public services andproducts as quality assurance processes are performed. Albania has been the first in its region to develop and implement a Governmental Interoperability Platform. This Governmental Interoperability Platform provides the basic architecture that enables the exchange of real-time data and information between public administration institutions in a secure and reliable manner. The interoperability platform has been a necessary step to simplify services that the state offers to citizens, businesses and public administration, as well as the reduction of the number of documents required from citizens or business to obtain public services.

Albania’s transformative progress has accelerated towards the digitalization of public services with the Government of Albania having prioritized the expansion of public service delivery to increasingly facilitate online delivery. The national electronic government portal, e-Albania, acts as a front-end point for government institutions to deliver their services and thus operates as a one stop single access point to citizens 24/7. The portal, which currently provides more than 750 e-services, is connected to the Government Interoperability Platform that is the underlying and core architecture allowing the interaction between 53 electronic systems of public institutions. The e-Albania portal enables citizens to have to remember just one portal link for finding public services online through an easily accessible interface that provides quality and fast e-services to citizens and businesses.

On the other hand, the government has also implemented multifunctional and centralized systems where each institution has its own module customized to their specific needs. Legacy systems have been upgraded in the past years and a lot of others have been newly developed. Significant investments have been made in digitalizing physical archives, improving physical and cloud infrastructures, developing dedicated platforms for circulating legally valid documents, equipping the relevant actors with an electronic seal or signature, etc.

In 2017, having recognized innovation as a key pillar of public service transformation, the Agency for the Delivery of Integrated Services Albania (ADISA) established an innovation lab. ADISALab was designed to be a network present in all entities within the public administration with the aim of enhancing the sustainability of service delivery reforms. Through capacity building and the promotion of best practices through set-up assistance, training, and mentoring. The lab looks to support the nec­essary change in the public sector’s institutional and management culture to promote the continuous improvement of public service delivery and the longevity of these improvements. The lab is focused on a user-centered approach and uses tools and processes that help to speed up the creation and development process.

Furthermore, ADISA has created new standards for application forms. As a result, 315 application forms for 35 institutions have been standardized to ensure a unified approach to service delivery in all state institutions. In addition, ADISA prepared user-friendly service passports for each administrative service to simplify and standardize information about them. The service information passports ensure that citizens have a standardized reference to everything that is required to apply for a service, including the documents that are needed, the fees that must be paid, and the deadlines for filing. Standardized and easy-to-understand information is now available to the public for more than 915 public services, with the remainder under preparation.

For the first time, citizens receive information in a well-structured and predictable manner. They can find instructions through several means: the in-person service windows, the ADISA website, the ADISA Mobile App, or the e-Albania online portal. In addition, ADISA has established a unique phone number 0800 0118 (free of charge) for citizens to obtain information on services. Before people even leave their homes, they can now get preliminary information about public services from that new national phone number.

In recognition of its significant progress in its public service transformation the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) recognized Albania in its latest "Overview of governance in the Western Balkans" highlighting Albania has a positive model for e-governance in the region. The report concluded that Albania had met all the e-government requirements for efficient governance due to the country’s application of digital services through the e-Albania unique portal.

***Collaboration with civil society***

The Albanian government is committed to work for a better, qualitative, open and transparent governance. With increasing public demands for a transparent and accountable government with more open communication with citizens and civil society in 2016 the Government of Albania with the National Agency for Information Society (NAIS) implemented the Electronic Register of Public Notifications and Consultations. Based on Law no. 119/2014 dated 18.09.2014 "On the Right to Information" and Law no. 146/2014 dated 30.10.2014 "On Public Notice and Consultation", NAIS has developed aplatform to serve as a consultation place among citizens and decision-making institutions in Albania. Each project legal act is published on the electronic register for public notification and consultation. This register serves as a focal point of consultation, and through this register provides access and provides the possibility of communication of all interested parties with the public body. This form assures and strengthens equality with regard to access to information and service, having specific attention and needs for specific individuals or groups.

In additional, in 2018 to further enable the Law no. 119/2014 dated 18.09.2014 "On the Right to Information" and the Law no. 146/2014 dated 30.10.2014 "On Notification and Public Consultation", developments towards the Open Data Portal began. Through its three main modules the Open Data Portal serves as an information window for the progress of the OGP project for Albania, as a consultation place among citizens and decision-making institutions in Albania, and as well as a unique source of publication of open government data. The Open Data portal is now operational and provides open data in the fields of health, treasury, budget, customs, education, business among others.

In order to increase collaboration with citizens and civil society the co-governance platform "Albania we want"[[2]](#footnote-3) was launched. The platform offers citizens and civil society the ability to provide real time feedback on current political and governance polices and reforms to facilitate more open communication between citizens and government institutions and promote co-governance. This platform enables citizens to select the institution they wish to provide feedback to in order to support a more citizen-centered governance model.

Additionally, ADISA has periodical meetings and focus groups with representatives of civil societyto promote continuous improvement in service delivery process, and to support the nec­essary change in the institutional and management culture.

***Remaining challenges***

So far, activities related to information and communication technology policies in Albania have been mainly focused on the development of ICT infrastructure and the creation of the necessary systems for the implementation of sectorial policies. However, in order to create a transparency-oriented society, more emphasis should be placed on the development of an inclusive and citizen-centered society and knowledge-based economy, as well as a transparent and efficient public administration.

Furthermore, in improving public service delivery there exists the need to standardize requirements, unify application procedures, and establish the legal basis for reform. Finally, promoting public accountability and civic engagement and participation requires not only increased access to information and resources but also changing the mentality about public service delivery and raising citizens’ awareness of their rights as beneficiaries of public services.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Commitment 3***  *Specific Objective:* ***Development of e-government through provision of interactive electronic public services for citizens & businesses*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **January 2020 to December 2022** | | | | **Lead implementing agency/actor** | | **The National Agency for Information Society (NAIS)** | | **Commitment Description** | | | | **What is the public problem that the commitment will address?** | Efficient and effective public service delivery models are essential to not only meet the needs of citizens, but also to weaken the attractiveness of and opportunities for corruption. Accessing public services can impose significant administrative burdens on citizens and businesses if it requires them to personally navigate opaque, time consuming and complex bureaucratic systems with unclear, non-standardized, application requirements and processes.  When citizens and businesses rely on fact-to-face contact with administration officials amidst such complexities in an opaque system establishes the incentives and opportunities to increase corruption risk in public service delivery. Furthermore, the inefficiencies of these convoluted service delivery models squander government resources that could be otherwise channeled into public services.  Since 2014, on direction from the Prime Minister’s Office, Albania has been working towards transforming public service delivery towards an efficient and citizen-centric service delivery model. Promoting public accountability and civic engagement and participation requires not only increased access to information and resources but also changing the mentality about public service delivery and raising citizens’ awareness of their rights as beneficiaries of public services.  Developing a service delivery model that utilizes technology and online platforms to streamline bureaucracy in a transparent and standardized way the government of Albania has worked to increase the accessibility and accountability of public service delivery and build public trust in government services, but the effectiveness of this model will depend on the comprehensiveness of the transformation. | | | **What is the commitment?** | The national electronic government portal, e-Albania, acts as a front-end point for government institutions to deliver their services online. Operating as a one stop single access point to citizens 24/7 the portal, is connected to the Government Interoperability Platform that enables the interaction between 53 electronic systems of public institutions and applications for their public services.  This commitment expands the e-Albania portal in order to streamline the process for citizens and businesses to effectively and efficiently access public services. During a three phase process the portal will provide 95% or 1300 public service applications exclusively online. The public service applications and all their associated data and documentation, for both citizens and business will be made electronic and provided by public administration employees. Public administration employees will secure these documents on behalf of the citizen, either by downloading their e-sealed version from the e-Albania platform or by requesting them from the provisioning institution through a dedicated electronic system developed for this purpose. To support citizens and businesses in the transition to online modalities an awareness campaign will be also be implemented.  ***Objective***:  The expansion of the e-Albania portal aims to establish the framework and mechanisms necessary not only for increased efficiency and quality of public service delivery, but also for changing citizens’ mind-set towards electronic communication with public institutions. The transition to online applications aims to significantly reduce bureaucracy and administrative costs for citizens and businesses by relieving them from the burden of having to physically collect hard-copies of state documents as well as for the public administration through a more streamlined system.  ***Expected results:***   * Provide 95% of all public service applications electronically; * Increased citizen literacy regarding e-government tools; * Increased citizen engagement and increased public accountability by citizens; * Increasing transparency & quality of service delivery; * Reduction in service delivery costs; * Streamlined bureaucratic procedures; * Prevention of opportunities for corruption. | | | **How will the commitment contribute to solving the public problem?** | ***Expansion of public services on e-Albania***:  The e-Albania portal enables citizens to access online applications for services provided by the public administration acting as the digital gateway to facilitate service providers and beneficiaries’ access to information, electronic procedures and assistance for obtaining services. The e-Albania portal is designed with user-friendliness firmly in mind, allowing anyone, regardless of their level of digital literacy, to access online services through an adaptable and intuitive interface. According to the ‘Trust in Government’ opinion poll of the citizens who have used the e-services of e-Albania 94.6% found it functional and 80.1% found it easy to use. As a web-based standards-compliant system, the e-Albania portal is accessible from any device, including smart phones, televisions and digital kiosks in public locations.  The first stage of this commitment (***milestone 1***) will expand the public services available on the e-Albania portal to provide 95% of all public services electronically by the end of 2020. The National Agency for Information Society (NAIS), in collaboration with all public institutions have initiated a three phase plan to expand the online-only public service applications available on the e-Albania portal:   * First phase (January 2020): transitioning 472 applications of public services to online-only; * Second phase (in process): transitioning 395 public service applications; * Third phase (December 2020): transitioning 394 public service applications.   Having effectively centralized and standardized the applications for nearly all public services into the portal, this commitment will establish the portal as the public service hub, drastically reducing the time citizens and businesses need to spend seeking out and accessing public services and therefore, increasing citizen and business accessibility to obtain public services.  ***Increasing the accessibility of the e-Albania portal***:  According the ‘Trust in Government’ opinion poll more than 71% of citizens are aware of the e-Albania portal with over 53% reporting to have received electronic services through the portal. The second stage of the commitment (***milestone 2***) will focus on facilitating the implementation of the expanded portal and the creation of a citizen focused improvement mechanism. An awareness campaign, with accompanying explanatory materials, will aim to not only educate citizens on the applications and use of the portal so that they can make full use of the full range of services available, but also so that they have the information and material necessary to provide informed feedback. As such, this campaign will be accompanied with a feedback mechanism so that citizens will be able to provide informed feedback on the platform and contribute towards a citizen-focused continual improvement and accessibility of the platform.  ***Promoting public accountability:***  Centralizing public services into an electronic portal enables increased public accountability on three levels:   * First, an online electronic platform establishes traceability for actions service delivery actions and reduces the need for face-to-face contact between citizens and public administration employees lessening opportunities for corruption to take place or go unnoticed. * Second, public services on the platform must meet an established criteria and compliance with this criteria will be monitored by NAIS. Setting and enforcing an unified criteria across public institutions eliminates variations in administrative practices across institutions’ and remove ambiguity and consequently, not only promotes increased efficiency across the whole public administration, but also reduces the opportunities for corruption and mismanagement. * Third, the e-Albania platform is not only accountable to internal institutions, but also through outward facing mechanisms that enable civic participation towards its continual improvement. Assessments of the expansion of the e-Albania platform will be conducted in coordination with civil society (***milestone 1***) to ensure the portal is assessed not only according to the transparent and uniform established criteria, but also according to the needs of those using it. Through awareness campaign to capacitate citizens and businesses and its feedback mechanism (***milestone 2***), the expansion of the e-Albania platform promotes a citizen-centered culture and approach to the transformation of public services. An online format that eliminates in-person or physical feedback and guaranteed privacy protection for citizens aims to incentivize citizens to not only use the portal, but to provide feedback and recommendations, secure that their identity will be protected. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **OGP challenge affected by this measures** | | | | Improve public services | | | Increase efficient management of public  resources | | Increase public integrity | | Increase corporate accountability | | | Create a safer community for citizens & civil society | |
| ☒ | | | ☒ | | ☒ | | ☒ | | | ☒ | |
| **Why is this commitment relevant to OGP values?** | **Transparency & Access to Information** | | | * *Does the idea disclose more information to the public?* * *Does the idea improve the quality of information disclosed to the public?* * *Does the idea improve accessibility of information to the public?* * *Does the idea enable the right to information?*   ☒Yes ☐No  The expansion of the e-Albania portal will expand citizens’ online electronic access to applications to public services provided by the public administration. The portal provides access to::   1. Necessary information on the rights, obligations and rules for obtaining public services in the Republic of Albania; 2. Information regarding online and offline procedures to benefit public services, to enable users to exercise their rights and fulfill the obligations and rules of obtaining services in the Republic of Albania. 3. Relevant information and links for assistance in obtaining services, where citizens, businesses and employees of the administration can be directed in case of questions or uncertainties on the obligations, rules and procedures set out in letter a) and b) of this point.   Information on the e-Albanial platform is monitored by NAIS and service provider institutions so that it meets the following criteria:   1. To be easily usable, to enable users to easily find and understand information, as well as to easily identify which parts of it relate to their specific situation; 2. To be accurate and complete enough to include all the information that users need to know in order to exercise their rights in full compliance with the applicable rules and obligations; 3. Includes references, links to legal acts, technical specifications and instructions, where appropriate; 4. Include the name of the insitutionresponsible for the content of the information; 5. Includes contact details for any assistance or troubleshooting services, such as an email address, telephone number, an online application form or any other commonly used electronic means of communication that is most appropriate for the type of the service provided and for the target audience of this service; 6. Is well structured and presented, so that users can quickly find the information they need; 7. Is maintained with up to date;and 8. Is written in clear and simple language that isadapted to the needs of the target users.   NAIS and service provider institutions ensure that the information published on the e-Albania portal for each individual service, guarantees the necessary accessibility and transparency for stakeholders. Enabling the right to information is important in preventing corruption, as well as it aims to make more information available, ensure equal access to information in all sectors of the community and guarantee adequate protection for the privacy of individuals. Enabling every citizen to get acquainted with the information of public services through the e-Albania portal, guaranteed 24/7 at any time. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public Accountability** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve rules, regulations, and mechanisms to publicly hold government officials answerable to their actions?* * *Does the idea make the government accountable to the public and not solely to internal systems?*   ☒Yes ☐No  The e-Albania portal enables citizens and businesses to provide feedback and comments regarding public services. The e-Albania platform will be subject to assessment conducted with civil society making it accountable to citizens and an awareness campaign will promote awareness regarding how citizens can provide feedback. The portal also establishes traceability for actions service delivery actions as after completing the online application, the citizen is equipped with a unique number that enables them to track the status of their application, making the public institutions accountable for the processing of the application.  Additionally, public accountability is also promoted through a unified established criterion for public services on the platform that is monitored by NAIS that also reduces opportunities for corruption and mismanagement.  Electronic forms of feedback also enable traceability and promote the ability to track changes in perceptions over time, promoting greater accountability of public institutions to address citizens’ feedback and concerns. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public & Civic Participation** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve opportunities, or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions?* * *Does the idea create or improve the enabling environment for civil society?*   ☒Yes ☐No  The expansion of the e-Albania portal will enable more citizens to provide feedback on more public services. With their privacy protected, citizens can feel safe in providing honest feedback and recommendation. As such feedback is expected to increase which will then provide government with greater insights into how e-government services can be improved further and will help to build a citizen-centric culture to public service delivery. This wide-range community process builds trust and enables opportunities for public participation towards the improvement of services.  The government will thus have holistic and timely information into the citizens or businesses obtaining public services. This implies that there will be complete transparency as to what government services or benefits the citizens or businesses obtain based on their unique identification and ensuring interoperability between all government institutions.. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Technology & Innovation** | | | * *Will technological innovation be used in with one of the other three OGP values to advance participation, transparency or accountability?*   ☐Yes ☒No  Through technology and innovation, the e-Albania platform enables fundamental improvements to public service delivery by decreasing the number of accompanying documents required from citizens / businesses; as well as re-engineering the entire process of their delivery, in order to reduce the steps needed to obtain the service, digitalization of internal processes while reducing bureaucracy, costs and time for citizens.  Through the e-Albania portal citizens and businesses have to only access one resource for all public service delivery applications, as opposed to having to seek out several institutions. Through the online portal citizens and businesses can access real-time information, as well as express their opinion regardless of location or time, thus having better opportunities for their influence in decision-making, increasing transparency and giving of the public account by the relevant institutions.  The use of an online electronic platform also removes the need for human interaction in government-citizen service delivery and as such reduces opportunities for corruption and provides protection of privacy for citizens encouraging them to use the resources more freely and provide honest feedback. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestone Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestones** | | | **Indicators** | | | | | **Responsible**  **Institution / s** | | | | **New or Continued Idea** | **Timeframe** | | |
| Measurable & verifiable achievements to accomplish this objective | | | Result Indicators | | | Output Indicators | | Lead Responsible Institution | | Supporting / Coordinating Agencies / Institutions | | New or continued from 2018-  2020 OGP AP | Start Date | | End Date |
| ***Priority Measure 1:*** Expansion of e-Albania portal | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 1:***  Implementing new e-services on e-Albania portal | | | Expansion of public services available.  Assessment conducted in coordination with civil society to identify next areas of expansion/improvement. | | |  | | National Agency for Information Society (NAIS) | | Line Ministries and their dependent institutions, local government, independent institutions | | ☒No  ☐Yes | Jan. 2020 | | December 2022 |
| ***Milestone 2:***  Promotion of electronic services of the e-Albania portal | | | Awareness campaign.  Explanatory materials to educate citizens on use and applications of e-portal.  Feedback mechanism for citizen recommendations to improve accessibility. | | |  | | National Agency for Information Society (NAIS) | | Line Ministries and their dependent institutions, local government, independent institutions | | ☒No  ☐Yes | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| **Contact Information** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name of responsible person from implementing agency** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Title, Department** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Email and Phone** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Actors Involved** | | **State actors involved** | | | ***Other government agencies involved:*** Line Ministries and their dependent institutions, local government, independent institutions  ***Non-governmental agencies involved:*** Citizens/businesses/public administration employees | | | | | | | | | | |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Commitment 4***  *Specific Objective:* **Expansion and increased accessibility of the Open Data Portal to increase transparency** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **January 2020 – December 2022** | | | | **Lead implementing agency/actor** | | **The National Agency for Information Society (NAIS)** | | **Commitment Description** | | | | **What is the public problem that the commitment will address?** | Transparency and public accountability are mutually reinforcing principles of good governance and often also underpin public trust in government and consequently civic and public engagement and participation. As such addressing and improving the level of transparency across public institutions is particularly important.  According to the “Trust in Governance 2019” opinion poll of 2500 randomly selected Albanians, while a majority of the Albanian population is aware of the right to information law, most Albanian’s surveyed did not perceive central and local institutions to be transparent. Addressing this perception will require increased coordination, engagement and commitment from public institutions to operate with greater transparency and facilitate citizen access to government information and data.  Open data strengthens the governance of and trust in the public institutions, reinforces governments’ obligation to respect the rule of law, and provides a transparent and accountable foundation to improve decision-making and enhance the provision of public services. | | | **What is the commitment?** | An open data portals is a web-based interface that enables anyone to access, use and redistribute the data uploaded to it. Open data portals publish data that has the technical and legal characteristics that allow citizens, businesses, non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations, researchers and journalists to access datasets and metadata records of data sets, primarily in the form of numerical data, to use freely.  Albania’s Open Data Portal currently provides open data from several sectors – for example: health, treasury, customs, education, business – this commitment will improve scale up the volume and quality of open data available on the Government’s open data portal. A number of public bodies are actively engaged with the initiative but more engagement is required to bring other public bodies on board to make their data available as open data. Greater promotion of the portal amongst potential users is also required.This commitment will make available new data from additional public institutions, as well as develop strategies to improve citizens understanding of the use and application of the Open Data Portal and increase accessibility to citizens.  ***Objective***:  This commitment aims to improve access to information and strengthen transparency by expanding the amount of available data on the Government’s open data portal through increasing engagement and participation from public institutions towards making their data available as open data. The commitment aims to promote the use of open data to citizens and across the public administration to improve the flow of information across citizens and institutions to increase informed decision making and public accountability.  ***Expected results:***   * Expanded number of datasets accessible through the open data portal; * Promotion of new innovative ideas, services and products; * Increased awareness and usage of the open data by citizens and institutions; * Increased engagement of citizens and ability to hold to public institutions accountable. | | | **How will the commitment contribute to solving the public problem?** | Increasing number of data sets accessible through open data portal strengthens the governance of and trust in the public institutions, reinforces governments’ obligation to respect the rule of law, and provides a transparent and accountable foundation to improve decision-making and enhance the provision of public services. Ensuring that the data on the Open Data Portal meets the globally agreed norms for publishing open data - (i) open by default; ii) timely and comprehensive; iii) accessible and usable; iv) comparable and interoperable; v) facilitates citizen engagement – will help build a culture of openness within the public administration, reinforce government’s respect for the rule of law and consequently help build citizen trust in public institutions.  This commitment willmake available data and develop new ways of sharing government data (***milestone 1***) that had not been previously available to the public, thus increasing public institutions accountability to citizens. This increased transparency of government decisions and processes can help to promote accountability and enhance public debate. As Open Data Portals helps to improve the flow of information within and across public institutions the expansion of open data can also facilitate improve coordination and decision making within and across public institutions that will further promote public accountability and trust.  To ensure the portal’s expansion meets the objectives of the commitment an accessibility strategy and awareness campaign (***milestone 2***) will be designed and implemented so as to familiarize and educate citizens on the full range of applications of open data and explain how the portal can be used by citizens for these various applications. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **OGP challenge affected by this measures** | | | | Improve public services | | | Increase efficient management of public  resources | | Increase public integrity | | Increase corporate accountability | | | Create a safer community for citizens & civil society | |
| ☒ | | | ☒ | | ☒ | | ☐ | | | ☒ | |
| **Why is this commitment relevant to OGP values?** | **Transparency & Access to Information** | | | * *Does the idea disclose more information to the public?* * *Does the idea improve the quality of information disclosed to the public?* * *Does the idea improve accessibility of information to the public?* * *Does the idea enable the right to information?*   ☒Yes ☐No  As the Open Data Portal centralizes publically available data in one place it increases the ease and simplicity for those wanting to access data and ensures accessibility of information to the public.  Scaling up the volume of open data available on the government’s Open Data Portal will greatly increase the public’s access to more information and data sets. As data on the Open Data Portal is published in a format that is easily searchable and can be downloaded to various formats it can be easily and effectively accessed by the widest range of users.  Open data helps improve the flow of information within and among governments, and make government decisions and processes more transparent.  Because open data allows users to compare and combine the connections among different datasets, tracing data across a number of programs and sectors users can identify if are any gaps or misleading information and provide subsequent feedback to the responsible institution therein promoting a system of accountability towards relevant and reliably accurate information.  As the portal prioritizes transparency and open data, the Open Data Portal enables Albanians’ legal right to information and through this transparency and improved information access will help increase trust in the government. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public Accountability** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve rules, regulations, and mechanisms to publicly hold government officials answerable to their actions?* * *Does the idea make the government accountable to the public and not solely to internal systems?*   ☒Yes ☐No  Open data, if timely, comprehensive, accessible, comparable and interoperable, has the capacity to provide citizens with the opportunity to better understand what officials and politicians are doing and what government actions and processes are taking place that as a result incentivizes public institutions to operate in an ethical and efficient manner.  Ensuring that the data uploaded to the Open Data portal is done so in an interoperable, follows agreed upon standards, and is comparable allows users to compare and combine different datasets. Increasing number of data sets accessible through open data portal has a multiplier effect whereby because open data allows users to compare and combine the connections among different datasets, tracing data across a number of programs and sectors users can identify if are any gaps or misleading information and provide subsequent feedback to the responsible institution therein promoting a system of accountability towards relevant and reliably accurate information and responsible decision making.  Open data reinforces governments’ obligation to respect the rule of law, and provides a transparent and accountable foundation to improve decision-making and enhance the provision of public services.  Open data can help improve the flow of information within and among governments, and make government decisions and processes more transparent. Increased transparency promotes accountability and good governance, enhances public debate, and helps combat corruption. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public & Civic Participation** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve opportunities, or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions?* * *Does the idea create or improve the enabling environment for civil society?*   ☒Yes ☐No  Open data strengthens the governance of and trust in the public institutions, reinforces governments’ obligation to respect the rule of law, and provides a transparent and accountable foundation to improve decision-making and enhance the provision of public services.  Open data encourages better development, implementation, and assessment of programs and policies to meet the needs of citizens, and enables civic participation and better informed engagement between governments and citizens. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Technology & Innovation** | | | * *Will technological innovation be used in with one of the other three OGP values to advance participation, transparency or accountability?*   ☒Yes ☐No  This commitment makes use of open data technologies and online capacities as the fundamental mechanisms to achieve all of its objectives. Open data provides the opportunity for information sharing and accountability in real time and enables a participatory approach to knowledge building and sharing. Open data presents opportunities to provide innovative, evidence-based policy solutions and support economic benefits and social development for all members of society. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestone Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestones** | | | **Indicators** | | | | | **Responsible**  **Institution / s** | | | | **New or Continued Idea** | **Timeframe** | | |
| Measurable & verifiable achievements to accomplish the objective | | | Result Indicators | | | Output Indicators | | Lead Responsible Institution | | Supporting / Coordinating Agencies / Institutions | | New or continued from 2018-  2020 OGP AP | Start Date | | End Date |
| ***Priority Measure 1:*** Expanding the context and accessibility of the Open Data Portal | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 1:***  Increasing the number of datasets accessible through the open data portal. | | | Datasets on portal cover all public institutions | | |  | | National Agency for Information Society (NAIS) | | Line Ministries; Subordinate institutions and their dependent institutions; local government, independent institutions | | ☒No  ☐Yes | Jan.  2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 2:***  Raising awareness and promoting usage through multiple communication channels. | | | Accessibility strategy designed to explain use of portal and increase accessibility to citizens.  Awareness campaigns conducted. | | |  | | National Agency for Information Society (NAIS) | | Line Ministries and their dependent institutions, local government, independent institutions | | ☒No  ☐Yes | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| **Contact Information** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name of responsible person from implementing agency** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Title, Department** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Email and Phone** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Actors Involved** | | **State actors involved** | | | ***Other government agencies involved:*** Line Ministries and their dependent institutions, local government, independent institutions  ***Non-governmental agencies involved:*** Citizens/businesses/public administration employees | | | | | | | | | | |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Commitment 5***  *Specific Objective:* **Improving the quality of public service delivery in ADISA Integrated Services Centers (ISC’s) and service counters** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **January 2020 – December 2022** | | | | **Lead implementing agency/actor** | | **Agency for the Delivery of Integrated Services Albania** | | **Commitment Description** | | | | **What is the public problem that the commitment will address?** | Since 2013, the Government of Albania has looked to reinvent public service delivery so as to better meet the needs of citizens, improve citizen satisfaction and improve accessibility to marginalized groups. The Agency for the Delivery of Integrated Services Albania (ADISA) is the institution behind the front office – back office separation in Albania’s public administration. It serves both as the “brain” behind the citizen-centric services and the “face” of those services. It is the brain that sets the standard design for and monitors the services across all relevant Government offices. It is also the public face of the services, which means that it establishes and manages customer care service windows in the ADISA Centers.  In the Integrated Service Centers (ISCs), ADISA provides front of office services for a number of central Government institutions, acting as a ‘one stop shop’ for public services that expands citizens and businesses’ fast, easy, and transparent access to public services. Queue management, welcoming premises where citizens are treated with respect, a complaint management system, and simplified procedures in service windows are some of the standards at each ADISA Center. Centers are also equipped with clear directions, parking facilities, waiting areas, chil¬dren’s playrooms, and ramps for people with disabilities.  Of the 2500 Albanians surveyed in the 2019 Trust in Governance Opinion Poll just 23.9% had visited an ADISA service window in 2019, but of those who did 70% were satisfied or very satisfied with the service delivery. In particular, of those aged 65 and older who had visited an ADISA service window 78.2% were satisfied or very satisfied with the service delivery. As such, there is a need to increase accessibility of high quality public service delivery, particularly to marginalized and vulnerable groups and in areas where public services are lacking.  As citizen satisfaction with public service delivery has been shown to be positively correlated with citizen trust in government and governance, in aiming to improve public service delivery ensuring the continuation and strengthening of efforts to gain and build this trust will be crucial. Increasing the opportunities for citizens to provide feedback on their public service delivery needs and challenges and integrating these into solutions will be necessary in order to increase accessibility of public services for all Albanians, but especially those from marginalized and vulnerable groups. | | | **What is the commitment?** | The functioning of ISCs and other service channels would not be complete without rigorous performance monitoring and assessment to help identify ways to constantly improve the activity of ISCs/service channels against objectives and targets.  This commitment establishes an inclusive strategy for the assessment of the quality and accessibility of public service delivery at ADISA ISCs that is centered on listening to the needs of citizens. It provides multiple opportunities and platforms for citizens to express their needs, opinions, circumstances and feedback and commits to a transparent process of incorporating citizen contributions towards improved public service delivery quality and accessibility.  As such this commitment will entail carrying out citizen surveys to monitor citizen satisfaction with public service delivery and the timeliness of these services, as well as focus groups. The results of these surveys and consultations will be integrated into performance monitoring assessments in order to identify ways to improve service delivery at ISCs and in general.  ***Objective:***  ADISA’s performance assessment of service channels aims at improving public service delivery to citizens, its accessibility and increasing the overall satisfaction of service users.By monitoring the quality of public service delivery at ISCs through on-going citizen satisfaction assessment mechanisms this commitment aims to improve public service by listening directly to the needs of citizens in order to increase accessibility of quality public service delivery.  ***Expected results:***   * Ensuring ISCs are accessible for all citizens including marginalized and vulnerable groups; * Varied mechanisms for continuous feedback from citizens on public service delivery that ensure all voices can be heard; * Improved service delivery that reflects needs of citizens; * Reduced application time at ADISA ISC; * Increased accountability of public service providers; * Increased citizen satisfaction; * Increased public trust that citizens’ needs are heard and addressed. | | | **How will the commitment contribute to solving the public problem?** | Improving the quality of public service delivery means taking account of the public service delivery needs of all citizens and incorporating those needs into tangible actions. This increased accessibility is only possible when public service providers offer citizens the opportunity to contribute to these changes.  This commitment establishes mechanisms for continuous feedback from citizens. Through citizen surveys of both citizen satisfaction with ISCs (***milestone 1***) and timeliness of the application processes at ISCs (***milestone 2***) citizens will be encouraged to provide honest feedback. The surveys will aim to identify strengths and weaknesses; set further objectives for improving the quality of service delivery; measure citizen satisfaction with information points, reception, accommodation, the application process; and feedback on improvements made by ADISA in ISCs. The results of which will provide public service providers with an overview of areas of strength and weakness in public service delivery. Focus groups will provide the opportunity for a greater depth of understanding of citizens’ specific needs and provide insights into potential areas for improvement, particularly from those from minority groups (***milestone 3***).  These feedback mechanisms will be part of a transparent assessment process that will include the publication of feedback and the inclusion of feedback into strategies for improvement. Maintaining an electronic record of feedback through an online database traceability and tracking of feedback results will support accountability to addressing citizens’ needs and provide a means of measuring improvement over time.  Finally, increased inclusivity will be a priority of the commitment and will underpin the feedback mechanisms to ensure all voices are provided the opportunity to be listened to and heard. Special attention will be paid to improving the accessibility of public services to meet the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups and to ensure their inclusion in the public service delivery process (***milestone 4***). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **OGP challenge affected by this measures** | | | | Improve public services | | | Increase efficient management of public  resources | | Increase public integrity | | | Increase corporate accountability | | Create a safer community for citizens & civil society | |
| ☒ | | | ☒ | | ☒ | | | ☐ | | ☒ | |
| **Why is this commitment relevant to OGP values?** | **Transparency & Access to Information** | | | * *Does the idea disclose more information to the public?* * *Does the idea improve the quality of information disclosed to the public?* * *Does the idea improve accessibility of information to the public?* * *Does the idea enable the right to information?*   ☒Yes ☐No  The citizen surveys and focus groups will be part of a transparent on-going assessment process of public service delivery. In particular this commitment will involve:   * Publication of results from citizen surveys will provide transparency on performance of public service delivery. * Standardized processes to ensure the integration of citizen feedback. * Citizen identities made anonymous so as to protect citizens’ right to privacy. * Publication of strategies developed towards the improvement of public service delivery and made available for public comment. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public Accountability** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve rules, regulations, and mechanisms to publicly hold government officials answerable to their actions?* * *Does the idea make the government accountable to the public and not solely to internal systems?*   ☒Yes ☐No  Tracking citizen satisfaction in consistent & standardized processes facilitates accountability of those institutions & agencies delivery those public services by making them more answerable to their objectives and towards improving their delivery. Specifically this commitment will create:   * Opportunities for citizen feedback promote accountability of public service delivery. * Feedback mechanisms – surveys, focus groups – will be conducted on an on-going basis to promote . * Maintenance of an electronic record of feedback through an online database traceability and standardized processes for tracking of feedback results will support accountability to addressing citizens’ needs and provide a means of measuring improvement over time. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public & Civic Participation** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve opportunities, or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions?* * *Does the idea create or improve the enabling environment for civil society?*   ☒Yes ☐No  In order to increase public and civic participation, ADISA has always been engaged with civil society by organizing focus groups and also including marginalized groups to accept and incorporate everyone’s needs. In this form it is possible to improve the opportunities for the public to inform or even to influence decisions. This commitment:   * Provides several different types of opportunities for citizens to provide feedback on public service delivery. * Feedback mechanisms – surveys, focus groups – will be conducted on an on-going basis to provide citizens with on-going opportunities to contribute feedback and ideas. * Focus groups will enable opportunities for citizens to provide in-depth feedback, ideas and contributions. * Focus groups will promote inclusivity of participation and will ensure the voices of marginalized and vulnerable groups are included and heard in order to make public service delivery more accessible; * Citizen feedback will be incorporated into improvement strategies. * Strategies will be published online and available for public comment and contribution. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Technology & Innovation** | | | * *Will technological innovation be used in with one of the other three OGP values to advance participation, transparency or accountability?*   ☒Yes ☐No   |  | | --- | | The use of electronic platforms and online resources will help ensure transparency of processes, public accountability towards improving public service delivery and enabling civic engagement and participation through:   * Electronic systems enable legitimate citizen feedback systems and increase accessibility for all citizens. * Online platforms and electronic databases ensure traceability and tracking of survey results. * Electronic databases of survey results will facilitate public accountability by providing a clear mechanism to track agencies progress in addressing citizens’ concerns, making them more answerable. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestone Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestones** | | | **Indicators** | | | | | **Responsible**  **Institution / s** | | | **New or Continued Idea** | | **Timeframe** | | |
| Measurable & verifiable achievements to accomplish this objective | | | Result Indicators | | | Output Indicators | | Lead Responsible Institution | | Supporting / Coordinating Agencies / Institutions | New or continued from 2018-  2020 OGP AP | | Start Date | | End Date |
| ***Priority Measure 1:*** Improving the quality of public service delivery in ADISA Integrated Services Centers (ISC’s) and service counters | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 1:***  Conducting citizen satisfaction surveys at ADISA ISC’s | | | Improved service delivery that reflects needs of citizens;  Increased accountability of public service providers; | | | Publication of citizen feedback results reports;  Citizen feedback incorporated into strategies for improvement;  Mechanism for continuous feedback from citizens on public service delivery;  Online platforms and electronic databases ensure traceability and tracking of feedback results. | | Agency for the Delivery of Integrated Services Albania (ADISA) | | Prime Minister’s Office | ☐No  ☒Yes  Public Services | | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 2:***  Conducting surveys to measure the application time at ADISA ISC’s. | | | Reduce application time at ADISA ISC | | | ADISA | | Prime Minister’s Office | ☐No  ☒Yes  Public Services | | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 3:***  Focus groups to identify the needs and areas of improvement | | | Increased citizen satisfaction & public trust that citizen needs heard & addressed. | | | ADISA | | Prime Minister’s Office | ☐No  ☒Yes  Public Services | | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 4:***  Increasing accessibility in ADISA ISC to include in the public service delivery process marginalized and vulnerable groups | | | Being inclusive in the public service delivery process | | |  | | ADISA | | Prime Minister’s Office | ☐No  ☒Yes  Public Services | | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| **Contact Information** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name of responsible person from implementing agency** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Title, Department** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Email and Phone** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Actors Involved** | | **State actors involved** | | | ***Other government agencies involved:***  ***Non-governmental agencies involved:*** UNDP; IDRA; Roma Active Albania; Down Syndrome Albania | | | | | | | | | | |

**Component 3  
*Access, Transparency and Accountability in Justice***

***Why is access to justice a priority for Albania?***

As a principle, the rule of law maintains that in a democratic society all persons, institutions, and entities are equally accountable to the same laws and that the processes governing justice enforcement are clear, fair and independently adjudicated. Consequently, access to justice is considered an important and fundamental right for all citizens and a necessity of a fair and just society.

***Government efforts, progress and collaboration with civil society***

Addressing and preventing these challenges, with a special focus on the most vulnerable groups, has become an important priority for the Albanian government. The introduction of state-guaranteed legal aid has been an important step towards addressing these barriers and facilitating citizens’ access to justice.

Projects and initiatives of justice focused non-profit organizations (NGOs), with the support of international partners, have played an important role in legal education to the public. In cooperation with the Open Society Foundation for Albania (OSFA)[[3]](#footnote-4) the Ministry of Justice’s Directorate of Free Legal Aid has established state guaranteed legal aid. Through this initiative, citizens who do not have the financial means to pay a private lawyer and who seek to exercise their civil, political, and economic rights through the implementation of justice procedures, civil or criminal, can access free legal aid. Citizens can access legal advice, guidance and assistance towards drafting the necessary documentation, as well as representation before public administration bodies. An online platform has further increased the accessibility of these services and enabled the continued provision of legal aid services when the physical legal aid centers had to close as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. This platform has maintained the opportunity for citizens to seek and receive legal advice and support, both generally and in legal matters pertaining to the pandemic, and has been utilized by a considerable number of citizens.

Furthermore, each city has the opportunity to seek secondary legal aid or consult with the normative acts in force, the right and obligation of the subjects of law and the methods for exercising the direction of the judicial and extrajudicial process, providing assistance in drafting and compiling documentation necessary for state administration.

To holistically improve the justice system the Albanian government has prioritized the design and implementation of series of cross-cutting strategies to provide the structural basis required to facilitate meaningful and lasting justice reform towards a more open, transparent and accountable justice system. Improving access to justice is one of the key components within the Cross-cutting Justice Strategy (CIS), the Cross-cutting Anti-Corruption Strategy (ISCC), the Juvenile Justice Strategy (SDM), and the Legal Education Strategy Public Sector (SELP).

***Remaining challenges***

Many challenges still remain towards improving access to justice in Albania. Citizen trust in the justice system and doubtful attitudes towards its reform poise particular challenges. Ensuring that citizens have access to justice is predicated on the transparency and accountability of the systems, institutions and procedures responsible for the administration of justice.Specifically, improving the integrity and the professional and technical competency of justice institutions and all actors within the justice system (judges, prosecutors, lawyers, notaries, bailiffs, mediators) towards alignment with European standards will facilitate a more competent and accountable system. Inadequate and insufficient resources (budgetary, structural, and technical) have limited access to justice.

Addressing this lack of capacity in collaboration with and through contributions from civil society, academia and all other stakeholders will be crucial in addressing citizen distrust and a key determinant of lasting justice reform. Through stakeholder consultations, emphasis was placed towards increasing the involvement of civil society in the consultation and decision-making process for justice reforms. Stakeholders also highlighted the need to accelerate justice reforms and in particular, improve the independence and impartially of the justice system. Strengthening the system of transparency, efficiency and impartiality in Albanian courts, by improving the quality of representation in the trial and increasing the capacity of civil society to monitor and address these issues as well as increase the transparency and accessibility of public information will have a positive impact on this process.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Commitment 6***  *Specific Objective:* **Access to justice is guaranteed and in accordance with national laws, as well as European standards and best practices.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **January 2020 – December 2022** | | | | **Lead implementing agency/actor** | | **Ministry of Justice** | | **Commitment Description** | | | | **What is the public problem that the commitment will address?** | Over the years citizens in Albania have faced significant structural and financial barriers to accessing justice including limited legal capability, limited access to legal counsel/advice, lengthy timeframes for resolutions and perceived lack of fairness in resolution. According to the 2018 Survey of the World Justice Project[[4]](#footnote-5), of Albanian citizens that have experienced a legal problem in the previous two years only 18% were able to access help and reported obtaining information, 48% did not know where to get advice and information, 38% said it was difficult or nearly impossible to find the money require to solve the problem and 52% did not feel the process followed was fair. Furthermore, resolutions to legal problems took on average over 2 years (28 months) to resolve. | | | **What is the commitment?** | This commitment will establish a directorate dedicated to improving citizens’ access to quality legal resources state guaranteed legal aid resources. The establishment of a free legal aid directorate will be accompanied by structured multi-stakeholder and inter-institutional cooperation to continuously improve legal professional capacities, accountability and legal aid delivery in order to guaranteed citizens access to justice that is aligned with European standards and internationally recognized best practices.  ***Objective***:   * Develop the necessary environment that enables and ensures citizens to be able to effectively achieve the quality support of justice they need to fully resolve their legal problems; * Inter-institutional cooperation between governmental and non-governmental institutions increases competency and accountability in the legal sector; * Citizens’ awareness of the legal system and legal aid resources available to them is improved.   ***Expected results:***   * Directorate of Free Legal Aid established to provide legal guidance and assistance to citizens lacking the resources to pay for legal support; * Improved inter-institutional cooperation and collaboration between the MoJ, legal clinics, the National Chamber of Mediators (DHKN), the Albanian Bar Association, NGOs and CSOs through the establishment of cooperation frameworks and inter-institutional forums; * Strengthened capacity of justice professional through development of systems for oh-going training and examinations for legal professionals and legal aid service providers, in collaboration with universities and other experts; * Inter-institutional forum established to continuously improve delivery of legal aid; * Increased citizen awareness and access to meditation services and support; * Increased transparency and accountability among mediators through publically available electronic records of actions. | | | **How will the commitment contribute to solving the public problem?** | Efforts to increase citizen’s to access to justice have been an on-going focus of judicial reform efforts in Albania and of increasing priority. By establishing a dedicated directorate to state-guaranteed legal aid (***milestone 1***)the Albanian government not only aims to expand access to justice, but also accountability towards its objective of ensuring equal access to justice for all citizens. Through this initiative, citizens who do not have the financial means to pay a private lawyer and who seek to exercise their civil, political, and economic rights through the implementation of justice procedures, civil or criminal, can access free legal aid. Citizens can access legal advice, guidance and assistance towards drafting the necessary documentation, as well as representation before public administration bodies both in person and through an online platform.  In order to facilitate guaranteed access to justice this commitment focuses on developing the enabling environment necessary to ensure citizens are able to efficiently access the quality justice support they need to fully resolve their legal problems.  In particular, the commitment looks to strengthen the cooperation between governmental and non-governmental institutions with relevant interests and expertise. The establishment of a cooperation framework with regular technical meetings will increase collaboration between the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and relevant public institutions with civil society and legal aid providers (***milestone 3***). Meanwhile a dedicated inter-institutional forum for legal aid provides an on-going platform for all stakeholders to contribute to the improve of legal aid delivery such that it integrates the justice needs of all citizens, with particular attention to the needs of those in marginalized groups (***milestone 4***).  A coordinated approach is taken so that the challenges of improving access are identified and innovative solutions can be development and implemented as most effectively and efficiently possible. Technical capacity building, through continuous trainings and examinations for justice professionals and legal aid service providers, in collaboration with universities and other experts, will be targeted to develop the specialized skillsets necessary to ensure that the specific needs of citizens requiring justice support are met.Mandatory training modules for employees of Legal Aid Service centres will be developed Working in cooperation with the Albanian Bar Association (ADB), the Albanian School of Public Administration (ASPA) and donors (***milestone 2***).  To establish mediation procedures as an alternative mechanism for citizens to resolve legal problems, increased cooperation between the Ministry of Justice and the National Chamber of Mediators (DHKN) will be established (***milestone 5***) and the professional capacities of mediators will be strengthened through collaboration between the Ministry of Justice and the National Chamber of Mediators towards the development of regulations and curriculums for trainings and examinations for intermediaries (***milestone 6***).  Finally, the commitment will expand citizen awareness of the use of mediation services to resolve legal problems legal system through public awareness campaigns(***milestone 7***) as well as increase transparency and accountability on the actions of mediators through an electronic database implemented by the DHKN (***milestone 8***). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **OGP challenge affected by this measures** | | | | Improve public services | | | | Increase efficient management of public  resources | | Increase public integrity | | Increase corporate accountability | | | Create a safer community for citizens & civil society | |
| ☒ | | | | ☒ | | ☒ | | ☒ | | | ☒ | |
| **Why is this commitment relevant to OGP values?** | **Transparency & Access to Information** | | | * *Does the idea disclose more information to the public?* * *Does the idea improve the quality of information disclosed to the public?* * *Does the idea improve accessibility of information to the public?* * *Does the idea enable the right to information?*   ☒Yes ☐No  Transparency and access of citizens to information is considered one of the main points, as the flow of electronic service is intended to be fully accessible by citizens.   * Establishment of simple & non-bureaucratic mechanisms for citizens to access legal guidance & assistance; * Online publication of all documents relating to all aspects of action plan (e.g. training requirements, services available, outcomes from forum meetings); * Campaign to raise public awareness on legal system, resolving legal problems & legal aid resources available; * Training to ensure legal aid professionals provide sufficient information/guidance to citizens * Electronic database of meditation activities | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public Accountability** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve rules, regulations, and mechanisms to publicly hold government officials answerable to their actions?* * *Does the idea make the government accountable to the public and not solely to internal systems?*   ☒Yes ☐No   * Standardized training modules, curriculum & examinations for legal aid providers; * Publically accessible database of mediation activities; * Inter-institutional cooperation & forum between government institutions & NGOs & CSOs ensures platform for answerability and accountability to citizens; * All independent institutions included are independent & regulated by law. * Institution of independence of mention in the Action Plan (High Judicial Council, School of Magistrates, High Council of Prosecution, academia are institutions / entities of independence and tire calculation are regulated by law. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public & Civic Participation** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve opportunities, or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions?* * *Does the idea create or improve the enabling environment for civil society?*   ☒Yes ☐No   * Implementation of measures subject to monitoring whereby stakeholders can request complete information * Adoption of platforms where citizens can give their impressions / opinions regarding the functioning of the Action Plan measures * Inter-institutional cooperation & forums between government institutions & NGOs & CSOs enables civil society to co-establish measures to improve legal aid delivery & co-implement * Adoption of platforms where citizens can give feedback on the implementation of Action Plan measures   The implementation of the measures will be part of the monitoring where stakeholders can request complete information. There is room for improvement in relation to the adoption of platforms where citizens can give their impressions / opinions regarding the functioning of the Action Plan measures. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Technology & Innovation** | | | * *Will technological innovation be used in with one of the other three OGP values to advance participation, transparency or accountability?*   ☒Yes ☐No   * Uses online platforms to support citizens access to legal resources & information & guidance; * Uses electronic databases to enable public accountability & transparency relating to meditation activities; * Online publication of all activities, programs & relating documents to facilitate transparency, participation & accountability | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestone Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestones** | | | **Indicators** | | | | | | **Responsible**  **Institution / s** | | | | **New or Continued Idea** | **Timeframe** | | |
| Measurable and verifiable achievements to accomplish this measure | | | Result Indicators | | Output Indicators | | | | Lead Responsible Institution | | Supporting / Coordinating Agencies / Institutions | | New or continued from 2018-  2020 OGP AP | Start Date | | End Date |
| ***Priority Measure 1:*** Legal aid is offered in an efficient and effective form which provides citizens in need, full access to such service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 1:***  The primary and secondary legal aid system is fully functional and provides equal access to justice for citizens across the country (human resources, primary legal aid offices and appropriate tools, technical capacity, etc.).  Directorate of Free Legal Aid is established with the mission of ensuring equal access of all individuals to the justice system through the provision of legal aid guaranteed by the state. | | | Directorate of Free Legal Aid is established, in accordance with the legislation in force.  Directorate is staffed adequately with sufficient capacity to guarantee the ability to provide the services required by citizens. | | | |  | | Ministry of Justice: Directorate of Free Legal Aid | | National Agency for Information Society (for electronic service) | | ☐No  ☐Yes (which one?) | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2021 |
| ***Milestone 2:***  Strengthening and capacity building through appropriate training for free legal aid service providers throughout country.  This includes cooperation with the Albanian Bar Association (ADB) for training of lawyers providing services and cooperation with ASPA and donors for training at legal aid service centers for students of Law Clinics and authorized NGOs so that employees gain more in-depth knowledge regarding the system of free legal aid. | | | First module of mandatory training of employees of the Primary Legal Aid Service Centers developed | | | |  | | Ministry of Justice: Directorate of Free Legal Aid | | The National Chamber of Mediators (DHKA); School of Magistrates (for training), Albanian School of Public Administration ASPA), Donors (United Nations Development Program, Euralius) | | ☐No  ☐Yes (which one?) | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2021 |
| ***Milestone 3:***  Strengthening inter-institutional cooperation between the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and public institutions, as well as with national and international institutions / civil society organizations.  Cooperation framework established to strengthen access to justice (cooperation with Courts; Prosecution Offices; Donors; free legal aid service providers: Law Clinics at HEIs; Primary Legal Aid Service Centers; Authorized Non-Profit Organizations and Secondary Legal Aid Lawyers). | | | Cooperation framework established.  Regular technical meetings held with relevant institutions and civil society actors to identify necessary measures to be taken and identify roles and responsibilities. | | | |  | | Ministry of Justice: Directorate of Free Legal Aid | | Courts; Prosecutions; Law Clinics; Primary legal aid service centers; Authorized Non-Profit Organizations and National Chamber of Advocates (DHS) | | ☐No  ☐Yes (which one?) | Jul. 2021 | | Dec. 2021 |
| ***Milestone 4:***  Establishment of the Inter-Institutional Forum for legal aid guaranteed by the state with the technical secretariat in the Directorate of Free Legal Aid.  This forum will provide an opportunity for all stakeholders involved in the process to exchange views / suggestions on how the legal aid delivery process can be improved.  The forum will be institutionally set up and there will be regular periodic meetings | | | Establishment of forum.  Forum consists of public and non-governmental organizations and citizens.  Calendar for meetings for the forum established. | | | |  | | Ministry of Justice: Directorate of Free Legal Aid | | Law Clinics; Primary legal aid service centers; Authorized Non-Profit Organizations and the National Chamber of Advocates; courts; prosecutions; | | ☐No  ☐Yes (which one?) | Jan. 2021 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Priority Measure 2:*** Mediation procedure as an alternative solution mechanism, functional in practice not only in law, is efficient, and issues are resolved with the full consent and agreement of the parties | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 5:***  Increase cooperation between the Ministry of Justice and the National Chamber of Mediators (DHKN). | | | Framework for cooperation and coordination between the Ministry of Justice and the National Chamber of Mediators (DHKN) established. | | | |  | | Ministry of Justice; The National Chamber of Mediators (DHKA) | |  | |  | Jan. 2021 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 6:***  Increasing and improving the professional capacities of intermediaries through the organization of initial continuous trainings, as well as training of trainers.  This initiative will be a collaboration between the Ministry of Justice, together with the National Chamber of Mediators, | | | Consultation tables held regarding relevant By-Laws.  Regulations and curriculum for trainings and examination methods for testing mediating candidates determined.  Training calendar determined and implemented. | | | |  | | Ministry of Justice; The National Chamber of Mediators (DHKA) | | School of Magistrates; National Chamber of Advocates (for trainings) | |  | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2021 |
| ***Milestone 7:***  Organizing awareness campaigns for the mediation service in the country.  In order to raise public awareness, the National Chamber of Mediators will organize awareness campaigns in order to inform the public on how to resolve various legal issues through mediation. | | | Awareness campaign topics selected in coordination with contributions and collaboration with civil society partners.  Awareness campaigns organized. | | | |  | | The National Chamber of Mediators (DHKA) | |  | |  | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2021 |
| ***Milestone 8:***  The National Chamber of Mediators will create an electronic database in order to record every mediator who exercises his activity in this field, also within the access of every interested citizen but also transparency. | | | Design of electronic databases.  Commissioning and use of the database. | | | |  | | The National Chamber of Mediators (DHKA) | |  | |  | Jan. 2021 | | Dec. 2021 |
| **Contact Information** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name of responsible person from implementing agency** | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Title, Department** | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Email and Phone** | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Actors Involved** | | **State actors involved** | | | | ***Other government agencies involved:*** Dependent Institutions (Directorate of Free Legal Aid)  ***Non-governmental agencies involved:*** Civil Society Organizations; Faculty of Law, University of Tirana | | | | | | | | | | |

Commitments | Access, Transparency and Accountability in Justice | Commitment 7

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Commitment 7***  *Specific Objective:* **The Ministry of Justice website is fully functional with timely, easily understandable, accessible information​ and the appropriate capacities developed to ensure transparency and accountability for the citizens** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **January 2020 – December 2022** | | | | **Lead implementing agency/actor** | | **Ministry of Justice** | | **Commitment Description** | | | | **What is the public problem that the commitment will address?** | Access to justice not only includes providing citizens with legal resources, but also ensuring that the legal system is fair and equal. Justice reform is one of the key priorities of the Albanian government; however, citizen perceptions regarding the implementation of these reforms present a significant challenge. According to the “Trust in Governance 2019” opinion poll of 2500 randomly selected Albanians, while over half of citizens (52.7%) believe justice reforms will have a positive impact, only 31.5% believe the reforms are being implemented properly (48.5% believe they are not and 20% do not know). Improving the transparency of the Ministry of Justice and its subordinate institutions enables these institutions to be accountable to citizens and carry responsibility of the fulfillment of their designated duties, responsibilities and commitments in both their daily work and in executing justice reforms. In turn, the transparency and accountability of justice institutions are necessary preconditions for building public trust.  Access to information necessitates that the relevant information is easily attainable and understandable by citizens. Albanian citizens have lacked timely and sufficient access to all the necessary documents and information in order to hold the Ministry of Justice and its subordinate institutions accountable. Additionally, documents that are available online, while a step in the right direction, may be too long or technical to be easily understood by citizens. Thus, in order to enable accountability through transparency the Ministry of Justice’s website requires substantial improvements through a coordinated and collaborative strategy that prioritizes on-going updating and improvement with emphasis on ensuring accessibility and relevance to citizens’ needs. | | | **What is the commitment?** | This commitment uses a three part strategy to improve transparency and accountability of the Ministry of Justice and is subordinate institutions through an official website that citizens can rely on the timely and efficient update of documents of interest to citizens in formats that are easily understood by citizens and an improved internal reporting framework. Through a collaborative working group that includes the Ministry of Justice and subordinate institutions, NAIS and civil society organizations the commitment will develop a fully functional and citizen accessible Ministry of Justice website. This will include increasing not only the quantity of strategies, monitoring reports, and reports on the implementation of institution activities published, but also the accessibility of these publications through accompanying audiovisual communication, as well as published summaries of various reports in simplified language. In conjunction, a framework for increased cooperation and coordination of the activities and responsibilities of the Ministry of Justice and its subordinate institutions will establish intra-institutional transparency and formalized mechanisms for accountability regarding these activities.  ***Objective:***  To develop the necessary systems & mechanisms to ensure transparency and consequently promote accountability within the Ministry of Justice and its subordinate institutions through a fully functional website that publishes in real-time all information relevant to citizens in a clear and easily understood format and an intra-institutional operations and reporting framework.  ***Expected results:***  Increased transparency and use of access to public information:   * Fully operational Ministry of Justice website; * Information published on the website in real time and is relevant to citizens when requesting services;   Improved accountability within the Ministry of Justice & subordinate institutions:   * Working group ensures transparency is maintained; * Strengthened cooperation and coordination between relevant activities and responsibilities of the MoJ and its subordinate institutions. | | | **How will the commitment contribute to solving the public problem?** | This commitment focuses on not only increasing transparency through the online publication of Ministry of Justice documents, but also on ensuring that the information is published in an easily understood format. Establishing a dedicated working group the Ministry of Justice (***milestone 1***) will take a structured and collaborative approach to improve the not only the quality and quantity of information available online, but also the accessibility of the content for non-technical citizens. An assessment report drafted by the working group and made available for public comment will identify where access to information can and should be improved to reflect the wants and needs of citizens (***milestone 2***).  Fostering improved technical and professional capacity and the development of updating mechanisms and protocols will seek to ensure the sustainability of these improvements and maintain regular updating of the website (***milestone 3***).  As public trust is being developed it is necessary to not only publish information, but to reach out to citizens through a variety of channels. Justice related strategies, action plans and their accompanying implementation and monitoring reports will not only be published and made public (***milestone 4***), but their conclusions will also be disseminated through audio-visual communication via TV appearances of the Minister, awareness campaigns, awareness activities, etc. (***milestone 5***).  Accountability frameworks will be developed in coordination with relevant institutions in order to develop clear and transparent procedures and regulations (***milestone 6***) and reporting systems (***milestone 7***) for the Ministry of Justice and its subordinate institutions to help ensure duties are carried out efficiently, effectively and with integrity. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **OGP challenge affected by this measures** | | | | Improve public services | | | | Increase efficient management of public  resources | | | Increase public integrity | | | | Increase corporate accountability | | | | Create a safer community for citizens & civil society | | |
| ☒ | | | | ☒ | | | ☒ | | | | ☒ | | | | ☒ | | |
| **Why is this commitment relevant to OGP values?** | **Transparency & Access to Information** | | | * *Does the idea disclose more information to the public?* * *Does the idea improve the quality of information disclosed to the public?* * *Does the idea improve accessibility of information to the public?* * *Does the idea enable the right to information?*   ☒Yes ☐No   * Increasing the capacity to have a fully functional website will enable citizens greater access to resources & relevant information; * Real-time information for citizens in cases where they will request services; * The drafting of the final report based on the current state of the internet will have a direct impact on improving the information requested by the public. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public Accountability** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve rules, regulations, and mechanisms to publicly hold government officials answerable to their actions?* * *Does the idea make the government accountable to the public and not solely to internal systems?*   ☒Yes ☐No   * Monitoring reports, including those from civil society will be published; * Establishment of working groups and cooperation tables with CSOs promotes external accountability; * Reporting system will be established and implemented based on criteria for reporting system selected with feedback from external experts / consultations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public & Civic Participation** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve opportunities, or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions?* * *Does the idea create or improve the enabling environment for civil society?*   ☒Yes ☐No   * Cooperation and coordination of activities will share the respective responsibilities between the institutions; * Establishment of working groups and cooperation tables with CSOs ensures transparency efforts reflect the needs of citizens; * Citizens able to provide feedback and contribute to the monitoring of the implementation of action plan activities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Technology & Innovation** | | | * *Will technological innovation be used in with one of the other three OGP values to advance participation, transparency or accountability?*   ☒Yes ☐No   * Improvement & maintenance of MoJ website central to increasing the accessibility of information to citizens in order for them to contribute & hold public institutions accountable; * Use of audiovisual communication will increase accessibility of information to citizens. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestone Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestones** | | | **Indicators** | | | | | | | **Responsible**  **Institution / s** | | | | | | **New or Continued Idea** | | **Timeframe** | | | |
| Measurable and verifiable achievements to accomplish this measure | | | Result Indicators | | | Output Indicators | | | | Lead Responsible Institution | | Supporting / Coordinating Agencies / Institutions | | | | New or continued from 2018-  2020 OGP AP | | Start Date | | | End Date |
| ***Priority Measure 1:*** Increase of technical and professional capacities of the Ministry of Justice in order to have a fully operational website, so the information is published on real time and the information is useful for citizens when seeking services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 1:***  Establishment of a working group at the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) in order to identify documents and processes that should be published and how to make these more accessible (non-technical language, diagrams, simplified concepts). | | | Working group established at the MoJ.  Working group includes members from civil society organizations. | | | |  | | | Ministry of Justice; National Agency for Information Society (NAIS) | | | | All subordinate institutions; civil society organizations participating in the working group | | ☐No  ☐Yes (which one?) | | Jul. 2020 | | | Dec. 2020 |
| ***Milestone 2:***  Analysis and drafting of report on the current state of the web in which will highlight the information needed to improve access to information to the public | | | Drafted analysis report.  Report published and made publically available with opportunity for civil society organizations to provide feedback. | | | |  | | | Ministry of Justice; National Agency for Information Society (NAIS) | | | | All subordinate institutions; civil society organizations participating in the working group | | ☐No  ☐Yes (which one?) | | Jul. 2020 | | | Dec. 2020 |
| ***Milestone 3:***  Website of MoJ and subordinate institutions fully functional and accessible with detailed and complete published information. | | | Website fully updated.  Mechanisms established to ensure regular updating. | | | |  | | | Ministry of Justice; National Agency for Information Society (NAIS) | | | | All subordinate institutions | | ☐No  ☐Yes (which one?) | | Jan. 2021 | | | Dec. 2021 |
| ***Priority Measure 2:*** Increase transparency and use of access to public information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 4:***  Increased transparency in making public the reporting of the strategies and the implementation of their action plans, as well as the comprehensive activities of the institution. | | | Publication of strategies, monitoring reports, implementation reports on the MoJ website.  Publication of summaries of various reports in simplified language in order to be more accessible. | | |  | | | Ministry of Justice | | | | All subordinate institutions | | | ☐No  ☐Yes (which one?) | | Jan. 2020 | | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 5:***  Audiovisual communication of the activity of the institution as a means of increased transparency (TV appearances of the Minister, awareness campaigns, awareness activities, etc.) | | | Audiovisual communication integrated into communication procedures. | | |  | | | Ministry of Justice | | | | All subordinate institutions | | | ☐No  ☐Yes (which one?) | | Jan. 2020 | | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Priority Measure 3:*** Strengthen cooperation and coordination of relevant activities and responsibilities of the Ministry of Justice and its subordinate institutions, which will have a positive impact on transparency and accountability, including but not limited to, inspections conducted by the Ministry of Justice for institutions of dependence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 6:***  Approval of manuals, instructions, relevant internal rules for the most efficient functioning of the institution.  In order for the institution to be as efficient as possible in its field of activity and policy-making, all internal regulations of the basic structures will be reviewed. | | | Manuals, instructions, relevant internalrules approved.  All internal regulations of the basic structures reviewed. | | |  | | | Ministry of Justice | | | | All subordinate institutions | | | ☐No  ☐Yes (which one?) | Jan. 2021 | | | Jun. 2021 | |
| ***Milestone 7:***  Adopt an efficient reporting system of the duties and responsibilities of each institution in compliance with transparency and accountability.  Based on the revised regulation, the manner of reporting will be determined in order to meet transparency and accountability. | | | Criteria for reporting system selected with feedback from external experts / consultations.  Reporting system approved, adopted and integrated into the Ministry of Justice and all subordinate institutions’ procedures. | | |  | | | Ministry of Justice | | | | All subordinate institutions | | | ☐No  ☐Yes (which one?) | Jan. 2021 | | | Jun. 2021 | |
| **Contact Information** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name of responsible person from implementing agency** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Title, Department** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Email and Phone** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Actors Involved** | | **State actors involved** | | | ***Other government agencies involved:*** Dependent Institutions (Directorate of Free Legal Aid)  ***Non-governmental agencies involved:*** Civil Society Organizations; Faculty of Law, University of Tirana | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Component 4  
*Fiscal Transparency to improve the coverage, quality and accessibility of information on public finances.***

***Why is fiscal transparency a priority for Albania?***

Public services are financed by taxpayer funds and the allocation of these funds is determined through the budget and fiscal cycle. Increasing accountability over the budget and fiscal cycle deters waste and corruption and ensures that budgetary decisions and spending reflect the people’s interests. Through transparency, public participation and legislative oversight this openness can help combat corruption. The public participation across the budget and fiscal cycle is particularly important for Albania.

In order for fiscal transparency to facilitate the citizen empowerment necessary to scrutinize public finances and therefore promote public financial accountability the publication of documents alone will not be sufficient. Due to the technical nature of many public budget and fiscal documents in order for fiscal transparency to be achieved information must be published in a format that is not only physically accessible, but is also easily understood by the citizens, uses plain language and includes accompanying supplementary resources or information that explain more complex or technical concepts in laments terms.

***Government efforts and progress***

Fiscal transparency, on both the government budget and on public revenues, has been an increasingly important of focus for the Ministry of Finance and Economy (MoFE). Within Albania’s Public Finance Management (PFM) Sectorial Strategy 2019-2022, the guiding framework for the implementation of all government PFM reforms, fiscal transparency is prioritized and is one of the strategy’s seven specific objectives. With the aim of achieving ‘‘enhanced accountability and transparency through better financial and non-financial performance reporting in line with the international standards’’ the PFM strategy outlines five key interventions objectives:

1. Timely and reliable government financial statistics in line with international standards;
2. Annual financial reports published in year with accessible financial and non-financial performance information;
3. Formal opportunities to engage the public in the planning and execution of the budget;
4. Financial statements presented in accordance with International Public Sector Accounting (IPSAS) standards;
5. Preparation and publication of improved and full assets registry of the public sector based on improved regulations for the valuation and inventory of assets.

Fiscal transparency had also been included in the previous PFM Strategy 2014-2020. These strategies have utilized the findings and recommendations from the independent international evaluations to address the public finance reform challenges identified. Additionally, fiscal transparency was a priority reform of Albania’s 2018-2020 OGP Action Plan.

In recent years fiscal transparency has been increasing in Albania. Between 2010 and 2019 Albania’s OBI score has increased from 33 to 55 out of a possible 100. While encouraging, not only does the most recent score indicate that transparency is still insufficient to facilitate informed debate, but the increase has slowed in recent years, having only increased 5 points between 2017 and 2019, with the only change having been the publication of mid-year reviews online. As such, efforts to improve fiscal transparency should expand substantially in order to meet the necessary thresholds and targets.

***Collaboration with civil society***

Stakeholder engagement regarding fiscal transparency has long been a challenge; however, efforts to engage, consult and collaborate with civil society organizations (CSOs) and stakeholders has been an increasing focus of the MoFE’s approach. CSOs were frequently invited to contribute to the development of the PFM framework and prior to approval the PFM Strategy was published and subjected to public consultation.

As public trust in these processes is still being established, in 2019 a public workshop was dedicated not only for public consultation of the PFM strategy, but to also receive feedback for how MoFE could improve stakeholder engagement in the different budget phases. Additionally, for each annual PFM monitoring report, CSOs are invited to participate to provide their comments and are invited to attend the PFM Steering Committee meeting. Albania’s Parliament has established public hearings related to the approval of the annual budget and CSOs are invited to collaborate and provide feedback during the preparation of budget documents such as the Medium Term Budget Planning (MTBP).

***Remaining challenges***

Without increasing the accessibility of fiscal information fiscal transparency will not be effective in promoting more accountable fiscal governance. Thus, efforts towards fiscal openness in Albania will aim to facilitate increased public understanding. The OBI has recommended that Albania expand the financial and policy information in the Executive's Budget Proposal, Year-End Report, and Mid-Year Review to be more specific, disaggregating information to provide stakeholders with a more comprehensive understanding.Additionally, the OBI emphasizes the importance of the Citizens’ Budget – recommending that the process be widely publicized to encourage engagement, that the public’s needs be identified and incorporated prior the CB’s release and that the CB be published for additional stages of the budget process.

As Albania’s parliament provides adequate oversight[[5]](#footnote-6) during the planning stage of the budget cycle and limited oversight during the implementation stage in order to improve such oversight it is recommended that Albania strengthens legislative oversight of in-year budget implementation and executive budget proposals, spending and strengthens its independent audit oversight processes.

Realizing the benefits of fiscal openness Albania will need to significantly improve stakeholder engagement and public participation. In the 2019 OBI assessment Albania scored just 7 out of a possible 100 points, with 61 points being considered the threshold for adequate public participation in the budget process. While the global average of 14/100 indicates that public participation in the budgeting process is lacking around the world, with such a low score Albania will need to pursue transformative efforts to improve public participation. In order to work towards a more participatory budgeting process the OBI assessment recommends:

1. MoFE pilot mechanisms to engage the public during budget formulation and to monitor budget implementation and to prioritize active engagement with vulnerable and underrepresented communities, directly or through civil society organizations representing them;
2. Parliament should allow any member of the public or any CSO to testify during its hearings on the budget proposal prior to its approval and during its hearings on the Audit Report;
3. The State Supreme Audit Institution should establish formal mechanisms for the public to assist in developing its audit program and to contribute to relevant audit investigations.

In specific consideration of stakeholder feedback, recent public consultations with CSOs have identified the following recommendations fiscal transparency in Albania:

1. Publication and access to the Government Financial Statistics data to the public;
2. Simplify Budget documents, as Citizen Budget at Central and Local level, Budget Execution Report, etc.;
3. Improve publication of concession contracts and specially for monitoring the concession authorities on the basis of performance;
4. Increase citizens ‘engagement in the budget process etc.

Commitments |Fiscal Transparency | Commitment 8

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Commitment 8***  *Specific Objective:* **Budget Transparency** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **January 2020 – December 2022** | | | | **Lead implementing agency/actor** | | **Ministry of Finance and Economy** | | **Commitment Description** | | | | **What is the public problem that the commitment will address?** | Transparency, public participation, and legislative oversight in the development of budgets creates better outcomes and are the main issues to better improve the citizen access on fiscal documents. Increasing accountability over the budget and fiscal cycle deters waste and corruption and ensures that budgetary decisions and spending reflect the people’s interests. Through transparency, public participation and legislative oversight this openness can help combat corruption. Increasing transparency and public participation across the budget and fiscal cycle is particularly important for Albania. In recent years fiscal transparency has been increasing in Albania. Between 2010 and 2019 Albania’s score on the Open Budget Index[[6]](#footnote-7) (OBI) has increased from 33 to 55 out of a possible 100. While encouraging, according to the OBI’s 2019 assessment Albania have done progress but still does not publish enough material to support informed public debate on the budget[[7]](#footnote-8). In the 2019 assessment of the online availability, timeliness, and comprehensiveness of eight key budget documents Albania ranked 43rd out of 117 countries.  In order for fiscal transparency to facilitate the citizen empowerment necessary to scrutinize public finances and therefore promote public financial accountability the publication of documents alone will not be sufficient. Without increasing the accessibility of fiscal information fiscal transparency will not be effective in promoting more accountable fiscal governance. Thus, efforts towards fiscal openness in Albania will aim to facilitate increased public understanding. The OBI has recommended that Albania expand the financial and policy information in the Executive's Budget Proposal, Year-End Report, and Mid-Year Review to be more specific, disaggregating information to provide stakeholders with a more comprehensive understanding. | | | **What is the commitment?** | Budget transparency consists of publishing budget reports and relevant financial data in formats that are understandable and accessible to all citizens will help to develop the fiscal transparency necessary for citizens to be well enough informed to participate in public debate on aspects of the budget and to meaningfully engage and participate in the planning and execution of the budget.  Due to the technical nature of many public budget and fiscal documents in order for fiscal transparency to be achieved this commitment will establish the timely publication information in a format that is not only easily accessible online, but is also easily understood, uses plain language and includes accompanying supplementary resources or information that explain more complex or technical concepts in laments terms. Further efforts shall be made to engage the public in the budget process so as to promote public accountability to citizens through civic participation.  ***Objective:***  Albania’s commitment to improving budget transparency aims to guarantee a public finance system that promotes transparency, accountability, fiscal discipline and efficiency in the management and use of public resources to improve the quality of service delivery and economic development.The commitment aims to achieve enhanced accountability and transparency through better financial and non-financial performance reporting in line with international standards to improve coverage, quality and accessibility of information on public finances and promote civic engagement throughout the budget cycle.  ***Expected results:***   * A sustainable statistical system for the general government units is in place; * Timely and reliable government financial statistics; * Published in year and annual financial reports contain accessible financial and non-financial performance information; * Strengthened financial oversight and management of the fiscal risks; * Formal opportunities provided for the public to engage in the planning and execution of the budget; * More structured and timely engagement with citizens, civil society organizations and academia in budget planning, monitoring and reporting. | | | **How will the commitment contribute to solving the public problem?** | To established increased budget transparency this commitment will prioritize alignment with international methodologies for statistical information, strengthening the sale, scope, timeliness and accessibility of the information published and create opportunities for citizens to engage in the budget process.  The timely publication of government national accounts in accordance with the European System of Accounts (ESA) 2010 and using a revised statistical system (***milestone 1***) aims to ensure the reliability of published government accounts and provide a framework for efficient and accurate complication and publication of financial statistics that aligns with international best practices. To promote public financial oversight and accountability an improved fiscal risk statement will be developed in order to better monitor and mitigate any financial risks (***milestone 2***).  Increasing fiscal transparency requires that the information available be relevant and timely. As such, budget execution and financial annual (***milestone 3***) and mid-year (***milestone 4***) reports will be published in year. They will include plain language and supplementary non-financial performance information to be easily accessible to citizens and promote comprehensive of budget related information and reports. Finally a budget hearing calendar for key budget processes will enable (***milestone 5***). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **OGP challenge affected by this measures** | | | | Improve public services | | | Increase efficient management of public  resources | | Increase public integrity | | | | Increase corporate accountability | | Create a safer community for citizens & civil society | |
| ☒ | | | ☒ | | ☒ | | | | ☒ | | ☐ | |
| **Why is this commitment relevant to OGP values?** | **Transparency & Access to Information** | | | * *Does the idea disclose more information to the public?* * *Does the idea improve the quality of information disclosed to the public?* * *Does the idea improve accessibility of information to the public?* * *Does the idea enable the right to information?*   ☒Yes ☐No  As one of the expected results is ‘Published upgraded government yearly budget execution report’ through this commitment more budgetary and fiscal information will be accessible to the public through more simplified and understandable formats. These upgraded reports will utilize simplified language in order to be understandable by a non-expert audience.  Budget information will be improved as stated above, but will also be made more accessible through publication on multiple channels including the regular government websites, as well as the OGP website to better reach all citizens who may be interested in the topic. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public Accountability** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve rules, regulations, and mechanisms to publicly hold government officials answerable to their actions?* * *Does the idea make the government accountable to the public and not solely to internal systems?*   ☒Yes ☐No  Increased transparency on budget issues will make the government more exposed in the eyes of citizens how the public money are managed and spent and therefore, more accountable to the public.  Through the increased availability and accessibility of fiscal informationcommitment makes the government accountable to the public and not solely to internal systems, as one of the main principles that transparency aims to promote is the increase of accountability of the government to the public. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public & Civic Participation** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve opportunities, or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions?* * *Does the idea create or improve the enabling environment for civil society?*   ☒Yes ☐No  This idea improves opportunities and capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions, as it creates more accessible information and one of its priority measures is to increase citizen’s engagement in the budget process.  The implementation of a budget calendar for hearing sessions, where CSOs are the main stakeholders, is intended to create and improve a culture of collaboration and the environment for collaboration between CSOs and the government. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Technology & Innovation** | | | * *Will technological innovation be used in with one of the other three OGP values to advance participation, transparency or accountability?*   ☒Yes ☐No  Technological innovation through the use of a variety of channels (MoFE website, OGP website, social network, media, etc.) will be used to promote and enhance transparency and engagement through the publication of notifications/news/information relating to the budget that may be of interest to the public. The use of a variety of communication mediums will help to promote continued and increasing engagement with the public and over time public trust. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestone Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestones** | | | **Indicators** | | | | | **Responsible Institution / s** | | | | **New or Continued Idea** | | **Timeframe** | | |
| Measurable & verifiable achievements to accomplish this objective | | | Result Indicators | | | Output Indicators | | Lead Responsible Institution | | | Supporting / Coordinating Agencies / Institutions | New or continued from 2018-  2020 OGP AP | | Start Date | | End Date |
| ***Priority Measure 1:*** 'Government National Accounts' Timely and reliable Government Financial Statistics' | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 1:***  'Government National Accounts-Timely and reliable Government Financial Statistics | | | Compilation of Government National Accounts according to International Methodology (ESA 2010).  The number of tables constructed against the total requirements was used to measure this indicator. | | | 1. A sustainable statistical system for the general government units is in place;  2. EDP tables will be revised using statistical system created. | | The Institute of Statistics (INSTAT) | | Ministry of Finance and Economy (MOFE); Bank of Albania (BoA) | | ☐No  ☒Yes (which one?)  Compile National Government Account according to international methodologies (ESA 2010 and GFS 2014) | | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2021 |
| ***Priority Measure 2:*** 'Financial and performance monitoring and reporting' Published in year and annualbudget execution reports | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 2:***  Fiscal risk management: Strengthened financial oversight and management of the fiscal risks in order to have an improved FRS with more fiscal risks monitored and mitigated if necessary. | | | An improved Fiscal Risk Statement. | | |  | | MoFE | | Budget Institutions,  Water Supply Sector and other SOE-s, Line Ministries, Contracting Authorities for Concession/PPP contracts with budget support. | | ☐No  ☒Yes: Presentation Fiscal risks in Fiscal Risk Statements | | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 3:***  Published government yearly budget execution report. | | | Published in year and annual financial reports contain accessible financial and non-financial performance information | | |  | | MoFE | | Line Ministries; Budget Institutions | | ☒No  ☐Yes | | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 4:***  Published in-year budget execution reports, including the mid-year review. | | | Published in year and annual financial reports contain accessible financial and non-financial performance information | | |  | | MoFE | | Line Ministries; Budget Institutions | | ☒No  ☐Yes | | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Priority Measure 3:*** Citizens’ engagement in the planning and execution of the budget | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 5:***  Formal opportunities are provided for the public to engage in the planning and execution of the budget. | | | A budget hearing calendar with key budget processes is in place and implemented. | | |  | | MoFE | | | Line Ministries; Budget Institutions | ☒No  ☐Yes | | Dec. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| **Contact Information** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name of responsible person from implementing agency** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Title, Department** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Email and Phone** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Actors Involved** | | **State actors involved** | | | ***Other government agencies involved:*** The Institute of Statistics (INSTAT), Water Supply Sector and other SOE-s, Line Ministries, Contracting Authorities for Concession/PPP contracts with budget support,  ***Non-governmental agencies involved:***Most of the CSO in Albania, which mission is related with economic development and public finance issues/ Universities/ Faculty of Economy. | | | | | | | | | | | |

Commitments |Fiscal Transparency | Commitment 9

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Commitment 9***  *Specific Objective:* **Transparency on Revenue** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **January 2020 – December 2022** | | | | **Lead implementing agency/actor** | | **Ministry of Finance and Economy** | | **Commitment Description** | | | | **What is the public problem that the commitment will address?** | Fostering a public administration that operates with integrity requires establish complimentary systems with procedures and rules that eliminate opportunities for public servants to exploit their position for personal gain.  When complex and opaque systems are in place a lack of oversight establishes opportunities for corruption. Without fiscal transparency and oversight institutions able to scrutinize revenues corruption can place in the form of: collusion (such as prior agreements to fix prices or terms), patronage (favoritism whereby a person or company is hired/contracted by the public administration regardless of qualifications because of affiliations or connection to government officials), conflicts of interest (whereby an individual is confronted with a choice between their duties and responsibilities and their private interests which can result in a misuse of public resources) and graft (political corruption where government officials benefit from intentionally misdirecting public funds to be purchased at a higher cost from specific venders). Because a lack of transparency on government revenues can provide opportunities to hide corruption it can also hamper public trust.  Transparency of government revenues and assets promotes public integrity by deterring corrupt behavior and by enabling oversight institutions to hold accountable government officials and institutions. Systems that require this transparency help ensure public officials remain honest which consequently build public trust in government. | | | **What is the commitment?** | Increasing revenue transparency consists of publishing and making available all relevant financial data regarding the revenues collected by government from various industries- bringing industry, government and civil society stakeholders into the monitoring process.Information will be in a format that is understandable and accessible to all citizens, such as through the use of plain language and accompanying information to explain more complex aspects.  To promote transparency of public revenues this commitment establishes and publishes a public asset inventory and register that aligns with international public-sector accounting standards and follows an updated and improved methodology and policies for public asset valuation including depreciation and impairment of assets.  ***Objective****:*  The objective of this commitment is to enhance accountability and transparency through better financial and non-financial performance reporting in line with international standards to improve coverage, quality and accessibility of information on public finances. Further efforts shall be made to engage the public in the process.  ***Expected results****:*   * Accounting is in compliance with appropriate international public sector accounting standards; * Preparation and publication of the full asset registry of public sector, based on the improved regulations for the valuation and inventory of these assets. | | | **How will the commitment contribute to solving the public problem?** | To develop a sustainable system for increasing the transparency and accessibility of public revenue information this commitment will take a phased approach to presenting accruals-based government financial statements. It will ensure that public accounting and legal acts are in compliance with international best practices (International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS)) through an approved strategic action plan (***milestone 1***). Guided by an approved methodology an inventory of assets will be implemented in all central government institutions (**milestone 2**). Guidelines and policies will be improved or developed for the recognition and valuation of assets (***milestone 3***) and the depreciation and impairment of assets (***milestone 4***) in compliance with agreed upon standards.  Public asset management will be improved through the development and publication of a full asset registry for the entire public administration. Based on the improved regulations established by milestones 1-4 a methodology will be developed with guidelines for preparing the full asset inventory (***milestone 5***). This methodology will ensure that public institutions accurately and comprehensively disclose public revenues and thus will limit opportunities for unethical practices to be hidden and promote civil engagement and understanding. The public asset inventory will then be recorded into the Albanian Government Financial Information System (AGFIS) (***milestone 6***) for budgetary institutions with AGFIS access and into excel for budget institutions without direct access to AGFIS (***milestone 7***) which will enable traceability and oversight. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **OGP challenge affected by this measures** | | | | Improve public services | | | Increase efficient management of public  resources | | Increase public integrity | | Increase corporate accountability | | | Create a safer community for citizens & civil society | |
| ☒ | | | ☒ | | ☒ | | ☒ | | | ☐ | |
| **Why is this commitment relevant to OGP values?** | **Transparency & Access to Information** | | | * *Does the idea disclose more information to the public?* * *Does the idea improve the quality of information disclosed to the public?* * *Does the idea improve accessibility of information to the public?* * *Does the idea enable the right to information?*   ☒Yes ☐No  This commitment increases the amount of information and data on public assets. An improved system with clear guidelines improves the quality of the information available by ensuring that the information is comprehensive, accurate and updated. It also focuses on using internationally agreed best practices and standards to ensure easy comprehension and comparability of data. Information will be in a format that is understandable and accessible to citizens through the use of plain language where possible and supplementary information to explain more complex subjects. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public Accountability** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve rules, regulations, and mechanisms to publicly hold government officials answerable to their actions?* * *Does the idea make the government accountable to the public and not solely to internal systems?*   ☒Yes ☐No  Increased transparency makes the government more exposed in the eyes of citizens regarding how public money is generated and collected. Through the improvement of certain procedures and methodologies and rules and the establishment of others, all in alignment with international best practices, this commitment develops the framework necessary to hold the public institutions accountable for their asset disclosures and valuations. Through partnerships with SECO the inventory and register will promote accountability to external, as well as internal authorities. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Public & Civic Participation** | | | * *Does the idea create or improve opportunities, or capabilities for the public to inform or influence decisions?* * *Does the idea create or improve the enabling environment for civil society?*   ☒Yes ☐No  By making public revenue information more accessible, through a standardized methodology that utilizes transparent guidelines the public is able to be better informed on public finances and thus, can contribute feedback to inform or influence the relevant government actions and policies. Furthermore, by making available all relevant financial data regarding the revenues collected by government from various industries this commitment will bring industry, government and civil society stakeholders into the monitoring process. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Technology & Innovation** | | | * *Will technological innovation be used in with one of the other three OGP values to advance participation, transparency or accountability?*   ☒Yes ☐No  The functioning of the electronic information system the Albanian Government Financial Information System (AGFIS) will support the functionality of the register. It will also help ensure that the data uploaded is complete and comprehensive in compliance with the set standards to ensure it promotes transparency and traceability such that the public institutions can be held accountable. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestone Activities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Milestones** | | | **Indicators** | | | | | **Responsible**  **Institution / s** | | | | **New or Continued Idea** | **Timeframe** | | |
| Measurable & verifiable achievements to accomplish this objective | | | Result Indicators | | | Output Indicators | | Lead Responsible Institution | | Supporting / Coordinating Agencies / Institutions | | New or continued from 2018-  2020 OGP AP | Start Date | | End Date |
| ***Priority Measure 1:*** Accounting is in compliance with appropriate international public-sector accounting standards. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 1:***  Legal acts and accounting standards in line with International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) and approved country strategic action plan are in place. | | | Moving on a phased basis to presenting accruals-based government financial statements | | |  | | Ministry of Finance and Economy (MoFE) | | World Bank; The Economic Cooperation and Development of the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) | | ☒No  ☐Yes | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 2:***  Inventory of assets implemented in all central government institutions, based on the approved methodology. | | | Asset inventory implement across all central government institutions | | |  | | MoFE | | WB; SECO | | ☒No  ☐Yes | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 3:***  Guidelines for recognition and valuation developed/updated. | | | Guidelines developed. | | |  | | MoFE | | WB; SECO | | ☒No  ☐Yes | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 4:***  Depreciation and impairment policies developed (in line with the strategy for implementing accounting standards). | | | Policies developed. | | |  | | MoFE | | WB; SECO | | ☒No  ☐Yes | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Priority Measure 2:*** Improved Assets management:  Preparation and publication of the full asset registry of public sector based on the improved regulations for the valuation and inventory of these assets. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Milestone 5:***  Methodology and guidelines for a full public asset inventory in Central Government (CG) institutions prepared. | | | Methodology and guidelines prepared based on improved regulations for asset valuation and inventory | | |  | | MoFE | | WB; SECO | | ☒No  ☐Yes | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 6:***  Full public assets inventory is recorded in the Albanian Government Financial Information System (AGFIS)by those Budgetary Institutions (BIs) which have direct access in this system. | | | Public assets recorded into the AGFIS | | |  | | MoFE | | Budgetary Institutions selected to have direct access in AGFIS | | ☒No  ☐Yes | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| ***Milestone 7:***  Full public assets inventory is recorded in Excel (for BIs which not have direct access in AGFIS). | | | Public assets recorded into Excel | | |  | | MoFE | | Budgetary Institutions with no direct access in AGFIS | | ☒No  ☐Yes | Jan. 2020 | | Dec. 2022 |
| **Contact Information** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name of responsible person from implementing agency** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Title, Department** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Email and Phone** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Other Actors Involved** | | **State actors involved** | | | ***Other government agencies involved:*** The Institute of Statistics (INSTAT), Budget Institutions;  ***Non-governmental agencies involved:*** Most of the CSO in Albania, which mission is related with economic development and public finance issues/ Universities/ Faculty of Economy, World Bank, SECO. | | | | | | | | | | |

**ANNEXES**

**ANNEX 1:   
Action Plan Development Process**

Following the official launch of the Open Government Partnership (OGP), the Albanian Government extends support to the values promoted by this multilateral initiative. The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is one of the most important instruments to promote government transparency globally, increase civic participation in public life, and use new technologies to improve administrative efficiency and combat corruption.

**To facilitate improved coordination, oversight, accountability and stakeholder involvement in the development of the action plan the Technical Secretariat acts as the Albanian Government Point of Contact (POC).**

The development of the 2020-2022 OGP Action Plan have take place betrween July 2020 and December 2020. The subsequent sections outline the overall stages of the development process and the intermedary steps towards its completion and finalizatin.

*Figure 1: Primary Stages of Albania’s 2020-2022 OGP Action Plan Development Process*

*Figure 2: Overview of Albania’s 2020-2022 OGP Action Plan Development Process*

July

**Preparations**

Methodological Guide Developed & Approved

*Responsible Institutions:*

POC

Launch of Drafting Process with POC & LFPs

*Responsible Institutions:*

POC, MoJ, MoFE, ADISA

August

**Preliminary Consultation**

**Online Surveys &**

**Pre-Consultation Reports**

*Responsible Institutions:*

POC, MoJ, MoFE, ADISA

**4**

September

**Thematic Group Consultations for Co-Creation**

**13**

*Responsible Institutions:*

POC, MoJ, MoFE, ADISA

**Stakeholder Consultations & Consultation Reports**

October

**Action Plan Draft based on LFP & Thematic Group Inputs**

November

**Public Consultation on Draft Action Plan**

*Responsible Institutions:*

POC, Civil Society Council

Consultation with Civil Society Council

*Responsible Institutions:*

POC

Online Public Consultation

**Consolidation & Government Approval of Final Action Plan**

December

**Action Plan Submitted to OGP**

**Preparations**

**July 2020**

* **Methodology:** The Government Point of Contact (POC) developed the methodology framework for the development of the OGP Action Plan. The framework is based on the mechanisms and processes related to Albania’s Integrated Planning System.
* **Policy Areas of Focus and Lead Focal Point Institutions Selected:** Anti-Corruption, Digital Governance, Access to Justice and Fiscal Transparency are proposed as the policy areas of focus for the 2020-2022 OGP Action Plan through a consultative and co-creation process with the CSO. These thematic policy areas have a leadership by the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Finance, the National Agency for the Information Society and the Agency for Services and centrally managed and coordinated by the POC.

**4**

* **Approval of Methodological Framework:** Methodological package officially approved and launched. Official Letter Package by the Deputy Prime Minister to the 4 Lead Focal Point Institutions (LFPs).
* **Management Calendar:** Designed to facilitate accountability and ensure all procedures are appropriately followed the POC has created a management calendar with all intermediary tasks involved in the development of the action plan.
* **Launch of Action Plan Development Process:** Launch meeting with 4 Secretariats / 4 LFP & presentation of the process and division of tasks.

**Preliminary Consultation**

**August 2020**

* **Key Stakeholders Identified:** Each LFP have identified and selected Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) relevant to their respective thematic policy area of focus. CSOs are predominately chosen from the Agency for Support of Civil Society’s list of registered CSOs in order to identify and contact all CSOs whose focus is either directly or indirectly related to their policy area of focus.

**>150**

* **Pre-Consultation Surveys Designed:** The LFP, with technical support from the POC, each design a pre-consultation survey to identify main issues on the policy area of focus, identify the priorities of stakeholders and identify areas to improve engagement ahead of the consultation period.

**4**

* **Pre-Consultation Surveys Implemented:** The pre-consultation surveys go live and over 200 stakeholders are invited to contribute.

**4**

* **Pre-Consultation Report Template Designed:** The POC designed a pre-consultation report template to ensure all stakeholder contributions are recorded and considered and that all policy areas are reported on in a unified manner that promoted transparency and accountability.

**1**

**September 2020**

* **Pre-Consultation Survey Reports Completed:** Each LFP submits a pre-consultation report to the POC, which results 4 **Pre-Consultation Survey Reports**.

**4**

* **POC Feedback on Pre-Consultation Reports:** The POC provides structured feedback on each report to support improved stakeholder engagement and promote quality and consistency in reporting.

**4**

* **Pre-Consultation Reports Published on the OGP website (4 Pre-Consultation Reports)**

**4**

* **Stakeholders Invited to Participate in upcoming thematic group consultations**

**Thematic Group Consultations for Co-Creation**

**September 2020**

* **Briefs Created for Stakeholders:** The POC created a general OGP information brief and a specific policy brief for each of the four proposed policy focus areas.

**5**

* **Stakeholder Feedback Tools Designed and Distributed to Stakeholders and Published on OGP website.**

**1**

**2**

* **Consultation Report Template Designed**
* **Thematic Group Stakeholder Consultations Conducted**

**6**

* **Weekly strategy meetings held between POC and LFPs to Facilitate and Improve Consultation Process**
* **On-Going Updates to OGP Website with New Materials**

**October 2020**

* **Thematic Group Stakeholder Consultations Conducted**

**14**

* **Weekly strategy meetings held between POC and LFPs to Facilitate and Improve Consultation Process**
* **On-Going Updates to OGP Website with New Materials**
* **Consultation Reports Produced:** Each LFP submits a consultation report to the POC following each consultation. The reports (discussed further in Explanatory Notes 2 and 3) capture stakeholder discussion and contributions and identify main priorities and suggestions made by participants.

**14**

* **POC Feedback on Consultation Reports:** The POC provided through the entire process a structured feedback on each report to support improved stakeholder engagement and promote quality and consistency in reporting.

**14**

**14**

* **Consultation Reports Published**

**Action Plan Draft Based on LFP & Thematic Group Inputs**

**October 2020**

**4**

* **Situation Analysis produced by each of the LFPs**

**4**

* **Commitments and all Accompanying Materials produced by the LFPs**
* **Consolidation of Proposed Action Plan Commitments**
* **Consolidation of all Stakeholder Comments and Inputs**
* **Design of Feedback Tools for Public Consultation**
* **On-Going updates to OGP Website with New Materials**

**Public Consultation on Draft Action Plan**

**November - December 2020**

* **Online Public Consultation of Draft 2020-2022 Albanian National OGP Action Plan**
* **Consultation Meeting with the Civil Society Council (KKSHC)**

**Consolidation & Government Approval of Final Action Plan**

**November 2020**

* **Revisal and Finalization of 2020-2022 Albanian National OGP Action Plan Draft**
* **Updates to OGP Website with new materials**

**December 2020**

* **Discussion and approval of the Action Plan in Integrated Management Policy Group (GMIP) Good Governance and Public Administration**
* **2020-2022 Albanian National OGP Action Plan sent to OGP Headquarters**

The methodology for the process of drafting the OGP Action Plan 2020-2022 is based on the mechanisms and processes related to Albania’s Integrated Planning System. **The Integrated Policy Management Group for Good Governance and Public Administration** under the leadership of the Deputy Prime Minister and focuses on the Albanian Government's priority for 'Good Governance' at the central and local level.

**ANNEX 2:   
Methodological Approach**

**The Multi-stakeholder Forum on Open Government/ Integrated Policy Management Group** (IPMG play the role of the MSF) **supports ongoing dialogue between government and Albania civil society on open government. Its mandate is to provide input and advice on the Government of Albania’s commitments on open government, identify new areas of focus, and build the open government community across country**. The Multi-Stakeholder Forum/ Integrated Policy Management Group (IPMG play the role of the MSF) **is relevant, eligible and is composed of representative of the Government of Albania, representative from civil society and Development Partner’s and is based on the EU requirement.**

**The integrated mechanism of sector-wide/cross-sector approach within the Integrated Planning System (IPS), approved by Prime Minister Order No.157 dated 22 October 2018**, is the main system that defines the tools and mechanisms for integrated public policy planning ensuring effective distribution of financial resources. The IPMG mechanism is clearly formally established by 2 successive Prime Minister’s Orders which present the structure’s organisation, objectives, membership, functioning rules and operation of five Integrated Policy Management Groups (IPMG), five Sector Steering Committees (SSC) headed by a minister at the political level, and twenty-four Thematic Groups (ThGs).

**The Government of Albania considers the mechanism in place on IPMG/MSF as a relevant creating a permanent mechanism for civil society guidance and oversight which offer agility and flexibility in working mechanism**. The IPMG/MSF coordinate policies and monitor implementation covering measures related to civil society advancement, decentralization and local governance, public administration reform, service delivery public, transparency & anti-corruption, statistics, e-government and digitalization. It will also coordinate with civil society all measures that will be planned in the Action Plan 2020-2022, enabling consultations in periodic stages.

**To facilitate improved coordination, oversight, accountability and stakeholder involvement in the development of the upcoming action plan the Technical Secretariat acts as the Albanian Government Point of Contact (POC).**

**Alignment with National Priorities and Frameworks**

**Integrated Planning System**

Strategic planning in Albania is based on the Integrated Planning System (IPS), which was initially approved by Decision of the Council of Ministers, no. 244, dated 21.4.2005 and then by DCM, No. 692, dated 10.11.2005. The IPS aims to provide a comprehensive planning framework within which all government policies and financial planning function in a coherent, efficient and integrated manner. The IPS consists of a framework of operating principles and structures that enable the most harmonious possible connection of all planning processes between them.

There are two basic processes that support IPS:

* A medium to long-term strategic planning process, the National Strategy for Development and Integration (NSDI), which sets strategic priorities and goals;
* A medium-term budgeting process, the Medium Term Budget Program (MTBP), which requires each ministry to develop a three-year plan within budget expenditure ceilings to achieve policy objectives, in line with the NSDI.

**Linking Processes and Drafting the Action Plan 2020-2022**

**The methodology for the process of drafting the OGP Action Plan 2020-2022 is based on the principle of full functioning of all current mechanisms and processes related to the Integrated Planning System.**

**The drafting of the Action Plan 2020-2022 (OGP)** is based especially on the best harmonization with the Medium Term Budget Programming cycle and with the National Plan for European Integration (NPEI) as well as with the strategic planning of the country (sectoral& cross-sectoral strategies).

In particular, **the Action Plan 2020-2022 (OGP)** harmonize:

• **Relation to the priorities of the Albanian Government and NSDI II,** where the priorities set out in the Government program, as well as the priority sectors of the Government, are an integral part of the vision and policies set by the NSDI.

**• Full link between the MTBP and the NPEI,** where activities, measures and commitments under the Stabilization and Association Agreement (SAA) are an integral part of the MTBP and the NSDI.

**• Relation to the policies included in the national sectoral and cross-sectoral strategies of the country.**

**Key Actors**

**Lead Focal Point Institutions (LFPs)**

Under the central coordination and technical support of the POC Lead Focal Point Institutions (LFPs) oversee the development of Action Plan commitments relevant to their policy area of focus. The LFPs work in collaboration with the POC to co-create commitments with civil society. For more information on co-creation see the explanatory note on co-creation.

*Figure 1: Proposed Policy Areas of Focus with Lead Focal Point Institutions (LFPs), thematic groups and aligned strategies*

**Centralized Role of the Technical Secretariat (TS) / Government Point of Contact (POC)**

With improving participation, transparency and accountability central to Albania’s approach to the development and implementation of the action plan the POC has taken additional measures in order to centralize the coordination of the action plan and stand to the OGP co-creation standarts and participatory approach from the evaluation and planning process. In this expanded role the POC has been overseeing the development of action plan commitments under the four areas of policy focus through increased management of and coordination with the Lead Focal Point Institutions (LFPs) designated to each of the policy focuses. **The POC has developed and implemented a new series of support tools, mechanisms and procedures that provide a framework for expanded co-creation for the action plan and from which to further build for future action plans.**

*Figure 2: Overview of POC Coordination of the Thematic Stakeholder Consultations*
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**POC Developed Tools, Mechanisms and Procedures:**

**Strengthened collaboration between line ministries (LFPs) and central government (POC) through the implementation of formal feedback mechanisms** and regular on communication support and guidance with all actors in order to be efficientto coordinate planned actions.

**The creation of sustainable systems and tools to foster and develop capacity within the public administration aims to promote coordination and engagement** between all channels such as society and international organizations to develop and implement lasting governance reforms. **These systems are intended to also encourage capacity building within the PMO and LFP institutions on OGP principles and processes and their integration into policy development.**

**Management Framework**

* **Methodology:** The POC developed the methodology framework for the development of the upcoming OGP Action Plan. The framework is based on the mechanisms and processes related to Albania’s Integrated Planning System.
* **Stakeholder Consultations**: The POC oversees the consultation process between LFPs and stakeholders for each of the four proposed policy areas. Each policy area is to conduct 3-4 stakeholder consultations in collaboration with the POC. An additional stakeholder consultation will be carried out following the drafting of the action plan.
* **Management Calendar:** Designed to facilitate accountability and ensure all procedures are appropriately followed the POC has created a management calendar with all intermediary tasks involved in the development of the action plan.
* **OGP Website:** The POC ensures the OGP website is updated with all the relevant reports, contributions and supplementary information for effective and informed stakeholder participation.

**Process Reporting Framework**

* **Consultation Report Requirement**: Following each consultation initiative each LFP is required to deliver a structured, but brief report based on a specific framework. These reports focus on stakeholder participation during the consultation such as reflecting on the level of engagement, identifying areas for improvement and how this may be achieved in the next consultation and recording all stakeholder feedback. These reports facilitate dialogue between the POC and LFPs and enable for improvements to be made on an on-going basis and are published on the OGP website for public consumption.
* **Report Framework and Templates**: To facilitate reporting that captures the issues of focus through an easy to complete format that does not overburden the LFP with requirements and report writing the POC developed report frameworks with specific questions as opposed to requiring open-ended generalized reports. The templates focus on evidence/ emphasis on identifying areas for improvement regarding engagement and identification of areas where to improve engagement
* **Quality Check for Reports**: The POC developed structured templates to provide feedback to the LFPs on their reports. Answers are flagged as incomplete, partial or complete with recommendations and comments provided by the POC. This system provides a formal and consistent means of feedback to foster consistency in reporting as well as support improvements to stakeholder engagement and participation.
* **Quality Check for Prioritization**: The POC provided quality control of the prioritization process ensuring all ideas are included and evaluated using the prioritization template (discussed below under ‘stakeholder contribution mechanisms’) to ensure transparency and fairness in the evaluation and selection process.
* **Oversee the entire process**: The POC have ensure through drafting all the methodological package and all instruments in order to better ensure the participatory approach and stand the co-creation standards.

**Stakeholder Engagement Tools & Mechanisms[[8]](#footnote-9)**

Informational Tools

* **OGP Stakeholder Brief**: This brief provides an overview of the OGP process for stakeholders. It looks to promote participation through by highlighting the independence of the IRM framework and the opportunities that the OGP process offers for stakeholders to partake in policy making and governance.
* **Policy Area Specific Stakeholder Brief**: This brief focuses specifically on the policy area being proposed in order to spur brainstorming and the development of ideas as well as to equip stakeholders with sufficient information to engage on the topic with contributions that will be relevant to the OGP process.

Stakeholder Contribution Mechanisms

* **Prioritization / Criteria Guidance & Template**: Based in part from the IRM’s stated criteria the POC developed a prioritization framework with categories for verifiability, relevance to OGP principles, estimated impact, civil society engagement, feasibility, alignment with local, national and international priorities. This framework was accompanied with a guidance note for how LFPs can work with civil society to tailor the framework and assess contributed ideas in a transparent and fair manner.
* **Consultation Meeting Ideas**: Stakeholders are encouraged to provide comments, ideas and general feedback during consultations. All comments and discussions are recorded in the consultation report and have been published on the OGP website. Comments and suggestions made during consultations have been incorporated into the development of the action plan.
* **General and Specific Ideas**: In addition to in-person consultations stakeholders are encouraged to provide feedback and ideas outside of the consultation meetings. Both word and googleforms formats provide opportunities for stakeholders to contribute. A ‘general ideas’ version focuses on broad issues and solutions relating to the policy focus, meanwhile a ‘specific ideas’ version enables stakeholders to elaborate and refine their ideas within the format of the OGP requirements. All ideas contributed have been published and evaluated using the prioritization framework.

**Collaboration with LFPs**

* **Partnered Presentations for Stakeholder Consultations**:

To encourage informed participation the focal point of the POC coordinates with the LFP to facilitate presentations for the stakeholders. The LFPs explain the relevant details of their work and suggested ideas and recommendations for the action plan. The POC also presents in most consultations in order to outline the concept of OGP, outline methodological approach, present relevant examples from other countries and the ways in which stakeholders can contribute. The content of these presentations is tailored based on the weekly planning meeting, but broadly focuses on equipping stakeholders with the information and tools to utilize their expertise towards developing ideas relevant to the OGP Action Plan – with each presentation building on the previous consultation. Finally, the POC presentations emphasize encouragement and promotion of discussion and contributions often through prompts.

* **Weekly Consultation Planning Meetings**:   
  Each week the POC conducts online communication with the focal point of the LFP to address any issues in stakeholder engagement, flag potential areas of concern, discuss any adjustments in approach and develop the strategy for the next week. These meetings ensure the POC is aware of any issues and can support changes to meet OGP requirements. Further, they facilitate tailoring of any materials and presentations to fit the particular circumstance of the policy focus (e.g. one focal point may have less stakeholders participating and therefore the outreach strategy may have to be adjusted).

*Figure 3: POC Coordination and Feedback Approach with LFPs for Stakeholder Consultations*

* **Remotely Support & Guidance**: In addition to the more structured meetings the focal point of the POC is available via email, online platforms, phone for regular check-ins with the LFPs. Communication is encouraged and has been facilitated by the feedback procedures established, thus, promoting more cooperation between the POC and LFPs.

**ANNEX 3:   
Participation, Consultation and Co-Creation Process**

One of the primary objectives of Action Plan OGP 2020-2022 development process was to improve the level of engagement with civil society, citizens, and other stakeholders in its development. Significantly advancing civic participation presents a substantial challenge.

To facilitate progression in stakeholder engagement towards the Action Plan, but to also provide a foundation from which to increasing improve civic engagement the Government Point of Contact (POC) prioritized a close dialogue with the Lead Focal Point Institutions (LFPs) and the development of a framework with materials and tools. This approach aimed to not only enable stakeholder participation and contributions, but facilitate accountability regarding the incorporation and consideration of stakeholder contributions. Further, this approach have taken into consideration the integration of OGP recommended processes into government systems which can be further elaborated and developed over time.

**Collaboration during COVID-19**

Pursuing this objective during the COVID-19 pandemic produced additional challenges as avenues for consultations were severely limited and largely confined to online modalities to ensure physical distancing. Facilitation/ adaptations to online only modalities the POC worked through the entire process closely with the National Agency for Information Society (NAIS / AKSHI) also a close collaboration to facilitate online feedback mechanisms and support timely and comprehensive upload of relevant materials. Additionally, the POC provided the LFPs with a guidance brief on facilitating online consultations and stakeholder dialogues based on OGP’s recommendations and reference sources.

**Efforts to Increase Collaboration**

Both a broad outreach and targeted approach to stakeholder engagement was pursued to increase collaboration during the action plan development process.

**Targeted Approach**

To promote the active involvement of stakeholders with an interest in the policy areas of focus the LFPs utilized the list of registered civil society organizations (CSOs) compiled by the Agency for Support of Civil Society in order to identify and contact all CSOs whose focus is either directly or indirectly related to their policy area of focus. **This approach aimed to establish a personal and collaborative approach to stakeholder involvement and engagement to promote ownership by CSOs and accountability for the LFPs.** It is resulted that such an approach have facilitate the open dialogue and close collaboration with the CSOs assist in the building up relationships for on-going dialogue.

Stakeholders were personally contacted via emails that were sometimes followed up with calls, and were invited to participate in consultations, provided with supplementary information, provided with tools to provide feedback and input and conclusions from consultations (more on these in subsequent sections). To address instances where relevant CSOs may have not been included contacted stakeholders were requested to invite other stakeholders that made have an interest or relevant knowledge in the topic and the targeted CSO lists were expanded accordingly.

**Broad Outreach Approach**

To complement, a broad outreach approach was simultaneously pursued. All OGP AP materials and feedback mechanisms were published online. Further, an online public consultation period enables all stakeholders to provide feedback and a consultation meeting with the Agency for Support of Civil Society enables the wider CSO community to provide inputs and feedback.

**Mechanisms for Stakeholder Participation**

To facilitate improved stakeholder participation in the development of Albania’s 2020-2022 OGP Action Plan the POC in collaboration with the LFPs and NAIS established a framework to enable a broader scope of opportunities for CSOs and stakeholders to propose their own ideas for government reform as well as to discuss, refine and elaborate on government proposed reforms. These advancements are summarized by the figure below.

*Figure 1: Mechanisms for Participation in the Development of Albania’s 2020-2022  
OGP AP*

**Mechanisms for Stakeholder Participation**
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**14** Consultation Reports

**Stakeholder Support**

A structured approach to dissemination of information to stakeholders was a hallmark of the 2020-2022 AP development process. In order to engage civil society, citizens, and other stakeholders throughout the OGP process stakeholders were provided with information relating to all aspects of the OGP AP development process including: background information, how to contribute and how their feedback would be utilized. A summary of these materials is outlined below.

**Consultation Materials**

All materials utilized in the AP development process are made available online and/or provided directly to stakeholders. This includes, but is not limited to:

* Government proposed AP commitments;
* Support materials and briefs;
* Pre-consultation reports;
* Consultation meeting information, presentations, minutes and operational conclusions;
* Consultation reports;
* Prioritization tools used for AP commitment selection.

**Open Government Partnership Brief**

This brief provides an overview of the OGP process for stakeholders. It looks to promote participation through by highlighting the independence of the IRM framework and the opportunities that the OGP process offers for stakeholders to partake in policy making and governance.

The brief covers:

* Overview of the OGP;
* Role of the IRM;
* OGP principles;
* Proposed policy areas of focus for the Albanian 2020-2022 AP;
* Why participation and co-creation is important for effective government reforms;
  + Principles of public participation;
  + Reasons for collaboration between government, citizens and civil society;
* Issues that OGP can help address (expanding beyond the four selected areas of focus for the Albanian 2020-2022 AP).

**Policy Area Specific Stakeholder Briefs**

This brief focuses specifically on a specific policy area (e.g. Digital Governance) being proposed in order to:

* Spur brainstorming and support stakeholders in the development their ideas;
* Equip stakeholders with sufficient information to engage on the topic with contributions that will be relevant to the OGP process.
  + Hyperlinks and references are included to facilitate further research. These briefs are published on the OGP website.

Among other topics each of the four brief includes:

1. OGP recommendations for the policy area of focus;
2. Means of public and civic participation relevant to the policy focus;
3. Potential thematic priorities to consider;
4. Selection of potentially relevant OGP commitments in the policy area from other countries.

**Feedback &Collaboration Mechanisms**

To enable stakeholder participation the Albanian 2020-2022 OGP AP development process facilitated a variety of spaces and platforms for dialogue and co-creation that included collaborative/discussion based spaces and opportunities to provide written feedback and input.

**Dialogues and Meetings**

**Thematic Stakeholder Consultations**

To encourage informed participation the focal point of the POC coordinated with the LFP to conduct thematic stakeholder consultations with brief informative presentations to facilitate stakeholder dialogue and contribution. The LFPs explains the relevant details of their agency’s work and suggested reform ideas and recommendations for the AP. The POC also presents in most consultations in order to outline the concept of OGP, outline Albania’s approach, present relevant examples from other countries and the ways in which stakeholders can contribute.

The content of these presentations is tailored based on the weekly planning meeting, but broadly focuses on equipping stakeholders with the information and tools to utilize their expertise towards developing ideas relevant to the OGP Action Plan – with each presentation building on the previous consultation. Finally, the POC presentations emphasize encouragement and promotion of discussion and contributions often through prompts.

* The POC oversees the consultation process between LFPs and stakeholders for each of the four proposed policy areas
* The LFP of each policy area have **conducted 3-4 stakeholder consultations in collaboration with the POC**
* Stakeholders have been encouraged to provide comments, ideas and general feedback during consultations.
* All comments and discussions are recorded in the consultation report and have been published on the OGP website.
* Comments and suggestions made during consultations have been incorporated into the development of the action plan.

*Figure 2: General Structure of Thematic Stakeholder Consultation Meetings*

* Overview of Ministry / Agency focus
* Introduction to OGP / criteria
* Encouragement / explanation for incentives to participate
* Intro of supplementary materials / general feedback tool
* Opportunities for discussion / feedback

**1st  
Consultation**

* Brief summary for new comers
* Encouragement / explanation for incentives to participate
* Presentation of idea criteria
* Explanation of general & specific feedback tool
* Opportunities for discussion / feedback

**2ndConsultation**

**3rdConsultation**

* Brief summary for new comers
* Duel emphasis on expanding on existing action plan suggestions
* Presentation of government proposed AP reforms
* Opportunities for discussion / feedback

**POC Collaboration with LFPs**

To facilitate continuous improvement in stakeholder engagement the POC worked closely with each of the LFPs individually to adapt the approach to stakeholder engagement to fit the particular context and any challenges specific to the policy area of focus.

**Partnered Presentations for Stakeholder Consultations:**

* POC coordinates with the LFP to facilitate presentations for the stakeholders
* LFPs will explain the relevant details of their work and suggested ideas and recommendations for the action plan
* POC outlines the concept of OGP, Albania’s approach, relevant examples from other countries and the ways in which stakeholders can contribute
* Focuses on equipping stakeholders with the information and tools to utilize their expertise towards developing ideas relevant to the OGP Action Plan – with each presentation building on the previous consultation

**Weekly Consultation Planning Meetings**:

* POC conducts a phone meeting with the focal point of the LFP to address any issues in stakeholder engagement, flag potential areas of concern, discuss any adjustments in approach and develop the strategy for the next week

**On-Call Support & Guidance**:

* POC is available via email and phone for regular check-ins with the LFPs
* Communication is encouraged and has been facilitated by the feedback procedures established, thus, promoting more cooperation between the POC and LFPs

**Consultation Reporting**

To ensure each component meets the co-creation criteria of the IRM for each component pre-/consultation reports are required that assess and report on the engagement, participation and feedback from civil society. The reports detail:

* Level of engagement;
* Detail stakeholder suggestions/comments/feedback/ideas;
* Identify potential topics of focus based on the feedback from civil society;
* Areas to improve stakeholder engagement and participation.

**Report templates are provided to facilitate consistency, ease of use, accountability and reinforce importance of engagement at each stage.** Consultation guidance & accompanying report templates were provided to LFPs for the pre-consultation study and for the stakeholder consultative meetings.

* Reports are to be delivered using structured template
* Focus on evidence/ emphasis on identifying areas for improvement regarding engagement and identification of areas where to improve engagement
* Each report will be published

**Consultation Report Guidance**

* Will identify which stakeholders are engaged in the process;
* Will identify gaps in stakeholder engagement and participation that can be addressed ahead of the next stages;
* Will identify preliminary areas for focus and priority for the action;
* Outline stakeholder contributions in details.

**Quality Check for Reports**

* POC developed structured templates to provide feedback to the LFPs on their reports;
* Answers are flagged as incomplete, partial or complete with recommendations / adjustments outlined by the POC;
* Provides a formal and consistent means of on-going feedback to foster consistency in reporting as well as support improvements to stakeholder engagement and participation.

*Figure 3: Consultation Report Template for Thematic Stakeholder Consultation Meetings*

|  |
| --- |
| **CONSULTATION REPORT TEMPLATE** |
| **Consultation Details** |
| Policy Goal Focus |
| Lead Focal Point Institution |
| DateConsultation Meeting Number |
| 1. **Objective of Consultation Meeting** |
| **What was the aim of this consultation?  Please answer for all that apply** |
| 1. Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policy goal |
| 1. Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process |
| 1. Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders |
| 1. Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders |
| 1. Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas |
| 1. Gather feedback on proposed policy goals |
| 1. Prioritize proposed policy goals |
| 1. Other (provide details) |
| 1. **Methodology** |
| **What was the format of the meeting?  How were stakeholders able to participate?** |
| 1. Presentations |
| 1. Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders |
| 1. Questions and answers |
| 1. Brainstorming |
| **Stakeholder Selection** |
| 1. How were stakeholders selected? |
| 1. How were stakeholders contacted? |
| 1. How many stakeholders were contacted? |
| 1. Was the consultation announced publically?  (via websites, social media, etc.) |
| 1. Were stakeholders reminded? |
| 1. **Results/ Findings** |
| **Stakeholder Contributions** |
| 1. How many stakeholders attended? |
| 1. Did stakeholders contribute? |
| 1. Main issues identified by stakeholders |
| 1. Main recommendations from stakeholders? |
| 1. **Shortcomings Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** |
| 1. Limitations in stakeholder attendance |
| 1. Limitations in stakeholder participation |
| 1. What can be done to improve attendance? |
| 1. What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? |

*Figure 4: Stakeholder Feedback Template for Thematic Stakeholder Consultation Meetings*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK TEMPLATE** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **Name:** |  | | **Organization/ Affiliation:** |  | **Position:** |  |
| ***Issues Raised*** | |  | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | |  | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | |  | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | |  | | | | |

**Consultation meeting with Civil Society Council**

Following the thematic consultations a consultation meeting with the Civil Society Council have been enable contributions and refinement of the draft action plan from a wider audience of CSOs.

**Written Feedback**

**Pre-Consultation Survey**

The LFP, with technical support from the POC, each design a pre-consultation survey to identify main issues on the policy area of focus, identify the priorities of stakeholders and identify areas to improve engagement ahead of the consultation period.

**General Idea Proposal Tools**

Available as a word template and as a googleform (provided as a link to stakeholders and embedded within the OGP website) the general idea tool enables stakeholders to outline what they believe to be the most important issues relating to the proposed policy area and to provide some general ideas in broad terms that can be elaborated on in further consultations.

The tool asks participants the following:

* *What do you think are the most important issues the Albanian government should prioritize to improve digital governance/anti-corruption/access to justice/fiscal transparency (depending on the policy focus)?*
* *Please propose any ideas or solutions you may have to improve digital governance/anti-corruption/access to justice/fiscal transparency efforts*
  + *Briefly describe the overall idea*
  + *What is the problem the idea will address*
  + *What is the main objective of the idea*

**Specific Idea Proposal Tools**

Available as a word template and as a googleform (provided as a link to stakeholders and embedded within the OGP website) the specific idea tool enables stakeholders to detail specific government reform ideas they may have to improve an issue relating to the proposed policy area.

The tool asks participants to consider the following as they provide details of their proposed idea (see figure 5):*“Please outline any ideas or solutions you may have for improving digital governance/anti-corruption/access to justice/fiscal transparency. Please include any and all information or details for this idea. When thinking of ideas keep in mind the following:*

* + ***Problem****: What is the social, economic, political, or environmental problem addressed by this commitment?*
  + ***Objective****: What are the objectives stated in the commitment? How does the commitment’s objective contribute to solving or improving the problem?*
  + ***Solution****: What activities does the commitment propose to achieve the objective? How would the activities contribute to the objective of the commitment?*
  + ***Impact****: If fully implemented as written, what potential effect would this approach have on the problem?*

*Figure 5: Stakeholder Feedback Form for Specific Idea Proposals*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Details of idea** | |
| **What is the problem the idea will address** | |
| **How will the idea address the problem** | |
| **Objective of idea / Potential impact** | |
| **Main beneficiaries** (who benefits) | |
| **How does it improve or promote:** | Transparency & Access to Information? |
| Public & Civic Participation |
| Public Accountability |
| Technology & Innovation |
| **What are the main agencies who would implement the idea (Ministries/NGOs/etc.)** | |

**Online Public Consultation**

The draft action plan have been available on the online consultation the wider public have been invited to review and provide feedback to the proposed ideas.

**Inclusion & Incorporation of Stakeholder Feedback**

All ideas submitted have been considered in a transparency and fair manner using the prioritization criteria previously established. Based on the assessments according to the criteria established idea proposals have been categorized into one of four groups:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Accepted** | **Accepted with Changes** | **Recommended for Future** | **Not Accepted** |
| Proposals to be incorporated in the 2020-2022 Action Plan | Proposals to be admitted to the 2020-2022 Action Plan with changes | Proposals to be incorporated in future Action Plans | Inadmissible  Proposals |

**ANNEX4:   
Summary of Stakeholder/CSO’s Consultation Feedback**

**270 CSOs Invited**

**24 CSOs Responded**

**Pre-Consultation Surveys**

**Thematic Stakeholder   
 Consultations**

**12 Contributed**

**30 CSOs Attended**

**190 CSOs Invited**

***1 - Academic Institution***

***13 - Good Governance Organizations***

* + 8 -think tanks / research institutes
    - * 4 - EU integration focused

***3 - International Development   
Organizations***

***11 - Human Rights Organizations***

* + 2 - focused on people with disabilities
  + 2 - focused on the Roma population
  + 1 - focused on women’s rights
  + 6 - focused on other human rights issues

***Stakeholders Who Attended***

***Annex: 4.1***

***Summary Stakeholder/CSO’s Consultation Feedback Reports***

***NAP 2020-2022***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 1:**  ***Anti-Corruption*** | | | | | | |
| ***Lead Focal Point*** | **Ministry of Justice** | ***No. of Consultations*** | | **4** | ***No. of Stakeholders Participated*** | **14** |
| ***Participating Stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| ***Good Governance & EU Integration:***   * Institute for Democracy & Mediation (IDM) * Albania/National Democratic Institute * Albanian Centre for Economic Research * Cooperation & Development Institute (CDI) * International Chamber of Commerce in Albania * International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) * Partners Albania for Change & Development * European Movement Albania (EMA) | | | ***Human Rights:***   * Albanian Helsinki Committee Albanian Legal & Territorial Research Institute (ALTRI) * Albanian Institute of Public Affairs/ Universiteti M. Barleti * Different & Equal * Child Rights Centre Albania (CRCA)   ***International Development:***   * European Bank for Reconstruction & Development (EBRD) | | | |
| **Overview of Stakeholder Feedback** | | | | | | |
| ***Main issues raised by stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| * Adoption of acts to check for corruption cases, ethical behavior and accountability * Oversight mechanisms, percentage of audited budgets, percentage of recruitment of new public servants transparently * Lack of Transparency regarding Public Procurement Contracts / Public Private Partnerships * Improving the public services and promoting of ethic and transparency * Trainings of civil servants on risks of integrity and IP * Corruption Proofing of legislation methodology drafted * Continues trainings on whistle blower internal mechanisms | | | | | | |
| ***Main recommendations from stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| * Budget reports should be simplified to be understandable by citizens * Publication of concession contracts’ /PPP * User friendly of public administrations acts and standardization of reporting in webpages of institutions; programs of transparencies * Increasing the number of CSO-s and their involvement in monitoring and implementation of the strategic policy documents * Government – CSO partnership to be established in revising of strategic policy documents | | | | | | |
| ***Specific proposals from stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| **Drafting and adoption of a methodology for monitoring of the implementation of the Integrity Plan**  Monitoring of the Integrity Plan is on annual bases, but the institution itself should check the implementation twice/year. It is needed a methodology how the monitoring should be done and the reports to be published. | | | | | | |
| **Integrity Plan revision (in compliance with recommendations of the monitoring reports)**  Integrity Plan document has an implementation time for 2020-2023 and referring to the possible findings and recommendation, the revision to be based on. | | | | | | |
| ***How was stakeholder feedback used in the action plan*** | | | | | | |
| * ***Milestones*** * Methodology document: instrument on monitoring Integrity Plans in central government institutions (commitment 1, milestone 1) | | | | | | |
| **Lessons Learn on Stakeholder Engagement** | | | | | | |
| ***Challenges*** | | | | | | |
| * The process of drafting and consulting of draft OGP action plan for the specific specification has been done online due to Pandemic Covid 19. * The stakeholders provided tire contribution respectively in all consultation meetings verbally as well as electronically. * MoJ/NCAC delivered calls of the participations via email, social media, MoJ website, phonecalls | | | | | | |
| ***Efforts to engagement*** | | | | | | |
| * Encourage them by talking directly to stakeholders about the importance of their participation and incorporating ideas and suggestions into concrete measures. * The creation of a joint bridge between the stakeholders and the Ministry of Justice will influence the provision of proposals and contributions in order to improve the problems encountered in the exercise of their activity. | | | | | | |
| ***Recommendations to improve stakeholder participation in the future*** | | | | | | |
| * Publication and press release * Open Invitation and Promotions on social networks and Web of events * Increase and involvement of stakeholders in consultative meetings in order to closely present their problems * Post-sharing the draft of the documents/action plan | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 2:**  ***Digital Governance*** | | | | | | |
| ***Lead Focal Point*** | **Service Agency for the Provision of Integrated Services**  **(ADISA)** | ***No. of Consultations*** | | **3** | ***No. of Stakeholders Participated*** | **4** |
| ***Participating Stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| ***Human Rights****:*   * Roma Active Albania; * Down Syndrome Albania; | | | ***InInternational Development:***   * United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); * Institute for Development Research and Alternatives (IDRA). | | | |
| **Overview of Stakeholder Feedback** | | | | | | |
| ***Main issues raised by stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| * Lack of accessibility in public services for people with intellectual disabilities; * Insufficient accessibility for marginalized groups of public service delivery. | | | | | | |
| ***Main recommendations from stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| * The addition of a section which identifies marginalized groups in the questionnaire that ADISA uses to measure citizen satisfaction in the Integrated Service Centres (ISC’s); * Converting the official website in an easy-reading format. * Training of ADISA office clerks to deliver public services to people with intellectual disabilities. | | | | | | |
| ***Specific proposals from stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| **Satisfaction questionnaire' to identify & address the problems & difficulties in the public service delivery process for marginalized groups**  *Problem the Idea Addresses*  Citizens prefer not to declare if they are part of a marginalized or vulnerable group due to fear of discrimination or bullying  *Objective of Idea*  Increase the engagement and satisfaction of marginalized groups in public service delivery | | | | | | |
| **‘Office clerks trained to deliver public services to people with intellectual disabilities’**  *Problem the Idea Addresses*  People with intellectual disabilities are bound to be accompanied by a care taker if they with to apply for a public service  *Objective of Idea*  Increasing accessibility of public services to people with intellectual disabilities | | | | | | |
| ***‘Easy reading website' that can be accessed from people with intellectual disabilities***  *Problem the Idea Addresses*  Website information could be difficult to understand from people with disabilities, so adapting it in an easy reading format could be more easy in terms of accessibility.  *Objective of Idea*  Increase engagement of people with disabilities in the information provided from official websites | | | | | | |
| ***How was stakeholder feedback used in the action plan*** | | | | | | |
| ***Commitment 5 (Milestones 1-5)***  Redirection of commitment to focus on increasing stakeholder feedback mechanisms so that the needs and circumstances of all citizens are reflected in public service delivery, particularly for those in marginalized and vulnerable groups. | | | | | | |
| **Lessons Learn on Stakeholder Engagement** | | | | | | |
| ***Challenges*** | | | | | | |
| * Lack of commitment | | | | | | |
| ***Efforts to engagement*** | | | | | | |
| * Use different channels of communication | | | | | | |
| ***Recommendations to improve stakeholder participation in the future*** | | | | | | |
| * Publish the consultation on social media * Developing a platform with all contacts and people of contact for civil society organizations. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 3:**  ***Access to Justice*** | | | | | | |
| ***Lead Focal Point*** | **Ministry of Justice** | ***No. of Consultations*** | | **4** | ***No. of Stakeholders Participated*** | **11** |
| ***Participating Stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| ***Good Governance & EU Integration:***   * Center for Institutional Development and Democratization * Albanian Institute of Sciences * European Movement Albania (EMA) | | | ***Human Rights:***   * Protection of Persons with Disabilities * Institute of Roma Culture in Albania * Center for the Protection of the Rights of the Child in Albania (CRCA) * Different & Equal   ***Academia:***   * Representative from the Law Clinic / Pedagogue at the Faculty of Law, University of Tirana | | | |
| **Overview of Stakeholder Feedback** | | | | | | |
| ***Main issues raised by stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| * Lack of accessibility of complete and detailed information on the Website of the Ministry of Justice * Lack of full digital functioning of electronic systems, mainly notaries, bailiffs and other dependent institutions * Slow pace of justice reform * Lack of awareness of citizens for mediation and mediation services & support * Lack of cooperation between the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and Universities * Lack of capacity among justice professionals * Lack of capacity and other issues that complicate law enforcement | | | | | | |
| ***Main recommendations from stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| * Improve the quality of representation in trials * Strengthen the system of transparency, efficiency & impartiality in Albanian courts * **Increase the capacity of civil society to monitor & address these issues** * Create simpler & less bureaucratic mechanisms to facilitate citizens' access to justice * **Accelerate justice reform**: improve independence & impartiality of the justice system * **Organize training courses for administrative staff of courts & prosecutor's offices** * **Increase stakeholder involvement in consultative roundtables & e**stablish dialogue to strengthen cooperation in the consultation & decision-making process for justice reforms * **Establish an electronic register** for magistrates, judges & prosecutors. * Increase control & periodic reporting on aspects of changes in justice. * Legislation review focusing on collective claims, small claims | | | | | | |
| ***Specific proposals from stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| ***Establishing bridges of cooperation between civil society and other actors***   * Increase the involvement of civil society in the process of consultation and decision-making on justice reform * Involvement of civil society and increased transparency in making public the reporting of the Strategies and the implementation of their action plans, as well as the comprehensive activities of the institution will increase civic trust * Increase and strengthen inter-institutional cooperation between the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and civil society actors in the framework of strengthening access to justice | | | | | | |
| ***Strengthen impartiality, transparency and accountability***   * Strengthening the system of transparency, efficiency and impartiality in Albanian courts * Improving the quality of representation at trial, increasing the capacity of civil society to monitor and address these issues * Increasing transparency and access to public information will have a positive impact * Organizing training courses for the administrative staff of courts and prosecutors 'offices, the result of which is aimed at improving the quality of services, application of adequate standards during the work process in courts and prosecutors' offices. * The aim of a management system of its main actors - judges, prosecutors, lawyers, notaries, bailiffs, mediators - possess the moral integrity and professional skills to implement the European standard and direction in Albania. | | | | | | |
| ***How was stakeholder feedback used in the action plan*** | | | | | | |
| * Stakeholders express their contribution to the proposal of concrete activities, measurable feasible and in accordance with specific objectives. * The contribution of stakeholders influenced the improvement of activities focusing mainly on increasing access to justice and transparency * Influenced the improvement of cooperation through the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and public institutions / national organizations and by using as well as civil society actors in the context of strengthening access to directions (Joining Courts; Prosecutions; Donors; Providers of free legal aid; Law Clinics in HEIs; Primary Legal Aid Service Center; Authorized Non-Profit Organizations and Secondary Legal Aid Lawyers). * Influenced the improvement and measures related to the website of the Ministry of Justice and subordinate institutions | | | | | | |
| **Lessons Learn on Stakeholder Engagement** | | | | | | |
| ***Challenges*** | | | | | | |
| * Substantial improvement in civic engagement on government initiatives on justice reform presents a substantial challenge; * Approach guided by continuous & sustained efforts is required to enable and facilitate the development of on-going dialogues and collaboration and contributions from civil society | | | | | | |
| ***Efforts to engagement*** | | | | | | |
| * Encourage stakeholders directly by emphasizing the importance of their participation; * Incorporate stakeholder ideas and suggestions into concrete measures. | | | | | | |
| ***Recommendations to improve stakeholder participation in the future*** | | | | | | |
| * Publication and press releases on opportunities to participate, contribute or submit feedback; * Open Invitation and Promotions on social networks and Web of events * Increase and involvement of stakeholders in consultative roundtables in order to closely present their problems * The inclusion and creation of bridges of cooperation (e.g. working groups) will have a positive impact on the improvement & engagement of stakeholders | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component 4:**  ***Fiscal Transparency*** | | | | | | |
| ***Lead Focal Point*** | **Ministry of Finance and Economy** | ***No. of Consultations*** | | **3** | ***No. of Stakeholders Participated*** | **6** |
| ***Participating Stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| ***Good Governance & EU Integration:***   * Gender Alliance for Development Center (GADC) * EuroPartners Development Center * European Movement Albania (EMA) * ‎Institute of Public and Private Policies | | | ***Human Rights:***   * Co-PLAN – Institute for Habitat Development   ***International Development:***   * SECO Project for PFM at Local Level | | | |
| **Overview of Stakeholder Feedback** | | | | | | |
| ***Main issues raised by stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| * Limited publication and access to the Government Financial Statistics data to the public; * Non-Simplified Budget documents, as Citizen Budget at Central and Local level, Budget Execution Report, etc.; * Limited publication of concession contracts and specially for monitoring the concession authorities on the basis of performance; * Limited citizens ‘engagement in the budget process etc. | | | | | | |
| ***Main recommendations from stakeholders*** | | | | | | |
| * Increase the public trust of government work * Fight corruption perception * Increase citizens’ engagement in budget process * Unify taxpayer system at all municipalities * Simplify content of key budget documents * Increase public participation in budget processes * Improve the monitoring of concessionaire contracts & publish information based on their performance * Publish concessionaire contracts * Set clear targets & performance management (sometimes there are not clear targets during the budget process formulation) * Strengthen role of auditing in budgetary process * Simplify Citizen's Budget document at local level * Publication & public access to Government Financial Statistics data * Provide unique account system for all BIs at local levels * Expand AGFIS in BIs at local level | | | | | | |
| ***How was stakeholder feedback used in the action plan*** | | | | | | |
| ***Priority Measures added in NAP OGP 2020-2022:***   * C1-Priority Measure 2: 'Financial and performance monitoring and reporting' Published in year and annual; * Priority Measure 3: Citizens’ engagement in the planning and execution of the budget; * C2-Priority Measure 1: Accounting is in compliance with appropriate international public sector accounting standards. * Priority Measure 2: Improved Assets management-Preparation and publication of the full asset registry of public sector based on the improved regulations for the valuation and inventory of these assets.   ***Milestones***   * Most of the governments milestones proposed were similar with the stakeholders recommendations, since they were based on pre consultation survey findings, but changes and adoption were incorporated after consultations. | | | | | | |
| **Lessons Learn on Stakeholder Engagement** | | | | | | |
| ***Challenges*** | | | | | | |
| * Limited public participation; * Limited public understanding; * Limited public trust in consultation processes. | | | | | | |
| ***Efforts to engagement*** | | | | | | |
| * Most of current challenges **have been addressed in NAP OGP** 2020-2022; * **Increase no. of communication channels** with stakeholders (social media, website as MoFE, OGP etc) * **Use different tools** to receive stakeholders feedback, as: surveys, emails, publish notifications, etc. * Increasing **transparency on consultation** process; * Reach out to **new organizations** | | | | | | |
| ***Recommendations to improve stakeholder participation in the future*** | | | | | | |
| * Increase government organizational efforts; * Needs to maintain the process’s time-consistency; * **Create a Dedicate OGP Committee** with different stakeholders (government members, international development partners, CSOs, academia etc) * **Prepare and adopt an annual OGP calendar** for periodic public consultations/meetings. | | | | | | |

**Support Unit of the General Secretariat**

**ANNEX 6:**

**Consultation feedback reports**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Anti-Corruption - CONSULTATION 1** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Consultation Details** | | | | | | | | |
|  | Policy Goal Focus | | | | | Open government for the fight against corruption / Integrity Plans | | | |
|  | Lead Focal Point Institution | | | | | Ms. Rovena **Pregja** / Mrs. Jona **Karapinjalli** Ministry of Justice | | | |
|  | Date | | | | | 25/09/2020 | | | |
|  | Consultation Meeting Number | | | | | **1** | | | |
|  | 1. **Objective of Consultation Meeting** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **What was the aim of this consultation?  Please answer for All That Apply** | | | | | **Details:**  The purpose of this first consultative meeting was the introduction and presentation of the draft plan OGP action component of the Anti-Corruption / specific objective: Integrity Plans, revised according to comments and preliminary proposals obtained by civil society through the online questionnaire on Integrity Plans with all the key elements of an action plan such as priority measures / activities, responsible institutions, contributing / respective institutions, timelines and financial costs. Also, the main purpose of this meeting is to ensure the involvement of stakeholders, civil society organizations, academia and anyone interested in drafting and consolidating the components of the OGP national plan, in order to receive concrete comments and proposals regarding the acquisition. of new measures and activities in function of this objective as well as in monitoring the implementation of the latter. | | | |
|  | 1. Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policy goal | | | | | ☐No / ☒Yes  The strategic purpose of this action plan aims to guarantee “*Open Government in the fight against corruption*” seen as a collaborative meeting point between institutions, civil society and academia, the Integrity Plan is well thought out as a mechanism that aims to make the fight against corruption more effective and to guarantee the strengthening of the institutional transparency framework, the strengthening of the ethics and integrity of the civil servant and senior public officials through the principles of inclusiveness of stakeholders. The draft Action Plan for the Anti-Corruption / Integrity Plan component in the implementation of the work calendar has been consulted in advance with the interested groups through the online questionnaire. All comments and proposals received at this early stage of the consultation are reflected in the draft presented at the first Consultative Meeting, held on dt. 09/25/2020. Stakeholders in this meeting have provided their respective contributions regarding the updating of measures and activities, addressing various problems in the field of corruption in the country, have identified the main issues related to Anti-Corruption and have provided solutions and ideas. to support the fight against corruption. | | | |
|  | 1. Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | | | | | ☐No / ☒Yes  About 50 representatives of Civil Society Organizations, Academics and other interested actors were invited to the first Consultative Meeting. | | | |
|  | 1. Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | | | | | ☐No / ☒Yes  At the first Consultation Meeting, Held Online via the Webex platform, Ms. Pregja made a brief presentation in general lines of the OGP process as well as concrete obligations and commitments for the respective components of the Ministry of Justice. Mrs. Karapinjalli made a brief presentation at Power Point regarding the recognition and presentation of the draft OGP action plan; Component: Anti-Corruption / Integrity Plans as well as performance document: Prioritization Matrix. | | | |
|  | 1. Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | | | | | ☐No / ☒Yes  Review of measures / activities of the draft OGP PV, Component IV: specific objective "*Integrity Plans"* according to concrete proposals received from representatives of the Institute for Democracy and Mediation (IDM), specifically like; “Carrying out integrity risk assessment and IP; Approval and Publication of the Risk Assessment Methodology; Development of a methodology for the IP implementation monitoring report; Approval and Publication of the MoJ PI document; Consultation meetings with Stakeholders / CSOs regarding the IP implementation monitoring report; Consultation with Stakeholders / CSOs on the recommendations within the findings of the evaluation conducted;Review of PI (in support of the recommendations left) ”. | | | |
|  | 1. Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | |
|  | 1. Gather feedback on Proposed policy goals | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | |
|  | 1. Prioritize Proposed policy goals | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | |
|  | 1. Other (Provide details) | | | | | ☐No / ☒Yes  get opinions on the measures concrete, activities in their function and on implementation timelines. | | | |
|  | 1. **Methodology** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **What was the format of the meeting?  How were stakeholders able to participate?** | | | | | The first Consultation Meeting was organized Online due to the Covid 19. pandemic 19. The nature of the meeting was open and interactive. | | | |
|  | 1. Presentations | | | | | ☐No / ☒Yes   * Presentation of the OGP process and the constituent components of the Open Government Action Plan 2020-2022. * Presentation of the draft Action Plan / Anti-corruption component: Integrity Plans * Presentation of the Prioritization Matrix | | | |
|  | 1. Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | | | | | ☐No / ☒Yes The  Institute for Democracy and Mediation (hereinafter IDM) provided concrete proposals on activities and measures to improve transparency process, methodological framework, the role of responsible institutions / stakeholders, the role of civil society mainly in monitoring the implementation of this objective. | | | |
|  | 1. Questions and answers | | | | | ☐No / ☒Yes  Participants were given the opportunity to ask questions, but there were none. | | | |
|  | 1. Brainstorming | | | | | ☐No / ☒Yes | | | |
|  | **Stakeholder Selection** | | | | | **Details** | | | |
|  | 1. How were stakeholders selected? | | | | | Participants were selected from the list that the MoJ, for the field of policy CA has and uses to discuss and share opinions. MoJ has an agreement with CSOs, Civil Society Forum in the field of CA, established in February 2020 (Integrity Week) and in this list are all the organizations involved in this Forum.  Participants were also selected from previous contacts and experiences similar to the Ministry of Justice. | | | |
|  | 1. How were stakeholders contacted? | | | | | Interested parties were contacted electronically / via e-mail / telephone. The agenda of the meeting was published in advance in the link of OGP - Albania - anti-corruption component. | | | |
|  | 1. How many stakeholders were contacted? | | | | | (About) 50 | | | |
|  | 1. Was the consultation announced publicly? (via websites, social media, etc.) | | | | | Po. The pre-consultation process has been announced on the official website of OGP / Albania.  **The notification was made only electronically / via-email and telephone.** | | | |
|  | 1. Were stakeholders reminded? | | | | | Yes. Stakeholders and guests in this process are reminded electronically / via- e-mail / Telephone. | | | |
|  | 1. **Results / Findings** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Stakeholder Contributions** | | | | | **Details** | | | |
|  | 1. How many stakeholders attended? | | | | | **4** Civil Society Organizations /  *Total 6 participants*. | | | |
|  | 1. Did stakeholders contribute? | | | | | Yes | | | |
|  | 1. Main issues identified by stakeholders | | | | | * Transparency in the field of public procurement / PPP in Public administration. * Public administration reform aimed at improving public services and promoting ethics and transparency. | | | |
|  | 1. Main recommendations from stakeholders? | | | | | Jo | | | |
|  | 1. **Shortracas Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | **Details** | | | |
|  | 1. Limitations in stakeholder attendance | | | | | Po | | | |
|  | 1. Limitations in stakeholder participation | | | | | Po | | | |
|  | 1. What can be done to improve attendance? | | | | | Press Release - Open Invitation / Promotion on social networks of the event. | | | |
|  | 1. What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | | | | | Organizing a Brainstorming | | | |
|  | **Stakeholder Feedback** | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Name:** | Ms. Rovena Sulstarova | **Organization / Affiliation:** | Institute for Democracy and Mediation  [**https://idmalbania.org/**](https://idmalbania.org/) | | | **Position:** | | Government Program Manager / Legal Experts |
|  | **Comments / Issues Raised / Feedback / Ideas** | | | | | | | | |
|  | * A normative approach to controlling corruption, ethics and accountability. * Lack of ethical responsibility to control the corruption and opportunistic behavior of the public servant. * Anti-corruption efforts include the creation of laws, codes of conduct and other bylaws, the organization of oversight mechanisms, the percentage of audited budgets, the percentage of recruitment of new public servants by examinations and other merit criteria, and the number of systems. of financial accounting operating under a concept of institutional integrity management. * Transparency in the field of public procurement / PPP in public administration. * Public administration reform aimed at improving public services and promoting ethics and transparency. * Review of measures and activities / their update for priority measure 1 and 2, specifically as;  1. Conduct integrity and IP risk assessment; 2. Approval and Publication of the Risk Assessment Methodology; 3. Development of a methodology for the IP implementation monitoring report; 4. Approval and Publication of the MoJ PI document; 5. Consultation meetings with Stakeholders / CSOs regarding the IP implementation monitoring report; 6. Consultation with Stakeholders / CSOs on the recommendations within the findings of the evaluation conducted; 7. I PI review (in support of recommendations left). | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | | | | |
| **STAKEHOLDER ATTENDANCE** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | **Name** | **Organization / Affiliation  (full name, not acronyms)** | | **Position** | | | **Email** | |
| **1** | | Mario Prendi | Albanian Legal and Territorial Research Institute (ALTRI) | |  | | |  | |
| **2** | | Sabina Babameto | Albania / National Democratic Institute | |  | | |  | |
| **3** | | Eriola Sovali | International Chamber of Commerse in Albaniapë | |  | | |  | |
| **4** | | Sotiraq Hroni | InstitutiDemokraci and Mediation | |  | | |  | |
| **5** | | Rovena Sulstarova | Institute for Democracy and Mediation | |  | | |  | |
| **6** | | Alban Dafa | Institute for Democracy and Mediation | |  | | |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Anti-Corruption - CONSULTATION 2** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Consultation Details** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy Goal Focus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Open government for the fight against  corruption / Integrity Plans | | | | | | |
| Lead Focal Point Institution | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mrs. Rovena **Pregja** / Mrs.Jona  **Karapinjalli** Ministry ofJustice | | | | | | |
| Date | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 29/09/2020 | | | | | | |
| Consultation Meeting Number | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **2** | | | | | | |
| **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **hat was the aim of this consultation? Please anwer for all that apply** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details: The**  purposeofthisSecondConsultativeMeeting was to present the draft OGP action plan for the Anti-Corruption component / Specific Objective: Integrity Plans, revisedaccording to concrete comments and proposals received from civil society through the First Consultative Meeting, held on dt. 25/09/2020, Online according to the Webex Platform. Also, the main purpose of this meeting is to ensure the continued involvement of stakeholders, civil society organizations, academia and anyone interested in drafting and consolidating the components of the OGP national plan, in order to receive concrete comments and proposals regarding by obtaining new measures and activities in function of this objective as well as in monitoring the implementation of thelatter. | | | | | | |
| (i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policy goal | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   The strategic goal of this action plan aims to guarantee "*Open Government in the fight against Corruption*" seen as a collaborative meeting point between institutions, civil society and academia. The Integrity Plan is wellthoughtoutasamechanismthataimsto make the fight against corruption more effective and to ensure the strengthening of theinstitutionaltransparencyframework,the strengthening of the ethics and integrity of civil servants and senior public officials through the principles of inclusive actors. interested. The draft Action Plan for the Anti-Corruption component / Integrity Plans in implementation of the work calendar was consulted with the stakeholders in the First Consultative meeting. All comments and proposals received at this stage of the consultation are reflected in the draft presented at the second Consultative  meeting, held on dt. 09/29/2020. | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Stakeholders in this meeting have provided their respective contributions regarding the updating of measures and activities, addressing various problems in the field of corruption in the country, have identifiedthe main issues related to Anti-Corruption and haveprovidedsolutionsandideas.tosupport the fight againstcorruption. | | | | | | |
| (ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   In the second Consultative meetingwere invited about 50 representatives of Civil Society Organizations, Academic World and other interestedactors. | | | | | | |
| iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   In the second Consultation meeting, held Online through the Webex platform, Ms. Pregja made a brief presentation at Power Point on the outline of the progress of the review process ofthe draft OGP Action Plan for the anti-corruption component 2020- 2022 and shared with stakeholders the revised Prioritization Matrixdocument.  The participants in the Second Consultative Meeting presented their ideas verbally online, provided concrete proposals within the framework of open government and addressed real concerns in the fight against corruption. They also offered to bring comments and suggestions on updating the measures and activities of the OGP / Integrity Plans PV as well as other ideas in this regard electronically. | | | | | | |
| (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   IntheframeworkoftheSecondConsultative Meeting, the participants were given the opportunity to address beyond specific comments on the measures and activities of the OGP 2020-2022 Action Plan, concrete problems and real solutions in the field of anti-corruption. | | | | | | |
| (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | |
| (vi) Gather feedback on proposed policy goals | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | |
| (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | |
| (viii) Other (provide details) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | |
| **II. Methodology** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details:**  The Second Consultation Meeting was organized Online due to the Covid 19. pandemic 19. The nature of the meeting was open and interactive. | | | | | | |
| (i) Presentations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✔Presentation of the OGP process and the constituent components of the Open Government Action Plan 2020-2022.  ✔ Presentation of the draft Action Plan  / Anti-corruption component: Integrity Plans, revised  ✔Presentation of the Prioritization Matrix, revised | | | | | | |
| (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes | | | | | | |
| (iii) Questions and answers | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Participants were given the opportunity to do questions, but there were none. | | | | | | |
| iv) Brainstorming | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Representatives of the Albanian Center for Economic Research emphasized the review and improvement of methodological instruments in the process of drafting, planning, implementation and monitoring of strategic documents, the amendment of the legal framework in the field of procurement, the issue of lobbying and institutional (personal) responsibility of the head of the institution, unification of public data / permanentupdatingoftheofficialwebsiteof the institution, etc. Representatives of "Partners" emphasized the increasing role of civil society in the process of consultation and monitoring of strategic documents, the budgeting of strategic plans, increasing investment in the field of system building and improving human resource capacity, transparency increased / publication of data in the field of procurement and expenditures by central and local institutions, acquisition of knowledge and increasing the implementation of the "Law on whistleblowers", etc. Representatives of the Institute for Democracy and Mediation emphasized the discussion on the inclusion of methodological instruments designed as: Risk Assessment Methodology; Methodology for drafting Monitoring Reports of various PI / templates or even drafting amethodology *Corruption Proof* in order to prevent the phenomenon of custom lawmaking andcorruption. | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Selection** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | | |
| i) How were stakeholdersselected? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Participants were selected from the list that the MoJ, for the field of policy CA has and uses to discuss and share opinions. MoJ has an agreement with CSOs, Civil Society Forum in the field of CA, established in February 2020 (Integrity Week) and in this list are all the organizations involved in this Forum.  Participantswerealsoselectedfromprevious contacts and experiences similar to the Ministry ofJustice.  Participants in this meeting offered to forwardacontactlistwithnew/activeCSOs to be present at other consultative meetings of PV-OGP 2020-2022 within dt. 02/10/2020. | | | | | | |
| (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Interested parties were contacted electronically / via e-mail / Telephone. | | | | | | |
| (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (About) 50 | | | | | | |
| (iv) Was the consultation announced publicly? (via websites, social media, etc.) The | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | announcement was made only electronically  / via-email and telephone. The event is published / promoted on the official website of the Ministry of Justice. see: [http://www.drejtesia.gov.al/newsroom/lajme/ministria-e-drejtesise-koordinatori-kombetar-kunder-korrupsionit-forcon-bashkepunimin-me-oshc-ne-hartimin-e-akteve-te-kuadrit- strategic-policymakers /](http://www.drejtesia.gov.al/newsroom/lajme/ministria-e-drejtesise-koordinatori-kombetar-kunder-korrupsionit-forcon-bashkepunimin-me-oshc-ne-hartimin-e-akteve-te-kuadrit-strategjik-politikeberes/) | | | | | | |
| (v) Were stakeholders reminded? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes. Stakeholders and guests in this process are reminded electronically / via- e-mail / telephone. | | | | | | |
| **III. Results / Findings** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Contributions** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | | |
| (i) How many stakeholdersattended? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **7** Civil Society Organizations /  *Total 7 participants*. | | | | | | |
| (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes | | | | | | |
| (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Transparency in the field of public procurement / PPP / Increased transparency on the official websites of central and local institutions./ Amendment of the legal framework in the field of procurement / lobbying / etc / Improving strategic instruments / Unification of data public / Increasing the role of CSOs in the quality of expert in drafting strategic documents / monitoring the implementation of strategic documents. | | | | | | |
| (iv) Main recommendations from stakeholders? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Jo | | | | | | |
| **IV. Shortracas Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | |
| (i) Limitations in stakeholderattendance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Po; are invited to be part of the meeting CSOs operating in the field of policies AK | | | | | |
| (ii) Limitations in stakeholder participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | No. All CSOs invited to the meeting had no obstacles to attend. The meeting has been easily accessible via *webex*. | | | | | |
| (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Press Release - Open Invitation / Promotion on social networks of the event. | | | | | |
| (iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Organizing a Brainstorming | | | | | |
| **STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | | | | Mrs. Ro Sulstaro | | vena va | | | **Organizatio n / Affiliation:** | | | Institute for Democracy and Mediation  [**https://idmalbania.org/**](https://idmalbania.org/) | | | | | | **Positio n:** | | | Government Program Manager / Legal Experts |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | | | ✔ Set another objective which is related to “Transparency of procurement contracts or PPP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | | | ✔ Inclusion of methodological tools designed as: Risk Assessment Methodology; Drafting Methodology of Monitoring Report of PI / various templates etc. as part of the curricula and training modules of the School of Public Administration in order for public administration employees to get acquainted with these documents | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | | | | ✔Draftingamethodologyof*CorruptionProof*aphenomenonwidelyknownin the Balkans which is identified as "State Seizure" associated with the so- called "Custom Made Laws" in order to prevent the phenomenon of custom lawmaking andcorruption. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | | Mr. Zef Preçi | | | | | | | | **Organizatio n / Affiliation:** | | | Albanian Center for Economic Research | | | | | **Positio n:** | | |  |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | | | ✔ Shifting the debate from corruption as a whole as a political slogan and overcome in time towards good governance in order for institutions to be analyzed individually | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | | | | *-* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | | | ✔ Review with attention and care of all reports of law enforcement agencies such as KLSH or institutions such as the Prosecution which can be considered as good resources to be considered by the head during the decision-making process and improvement of findings.  ✔ Amendment of the legal framework regarding the institutional (personal) responsibility / irresponsibility of the head of the institution. *(In the case of*  *dismissals without right, the implementation of final court decisions, etc.).* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | ✔ Amendment / review of the legal framework in the field of procurement (*especially in times of pandemic Covid-19*), based on addressing issues with public contracts / PPP in the procurement sector.  ✔Amendment/reviewofthelegalframeworkregardingtheissueoflobbying. Establishment of a special register of lobbyists. Determining the obligation for the stakeholders / lobbyists / responsible persons who carry out the lobbying activity to document and make public the meetings / discussions within the lobbyingactivity.  ✔ Uniformity of information and reporting standards in the framework of transparency and their publication periodically on the official website of the institution / organization.  ✔ Increasing the role of Civil Society Organizations (hereinafter CSOs) and their involvement in the process of monitoring and implementation of strategic documents. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | | | | *-* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | | | | Ariola Agolli | | | | | **Organizatio n / Affiliation:** | | | Partners | | | | | | **Positio n:** | | | **Program Director** | |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | | | Open Government in the Fight against Corruption | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | | | | *-* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | | | ✔ Increasing the role of CSOs and their involvement as experts (s) in drafting methodological instruments in preventing and combating corruption.  ✔ Unification of public data, their publication on official websites in order to increase public transparency, especially for the part of procurements and expenditures in all central and local institutions *(especially in times of pandemic Covid-19*).  ✔ Budgeting strategic plans in detail.  ✔ Increase investment in systems and human resource capacities.  ✔ Strengthening the monitoring of the implementation of the “Law on Signaling and Protection of Signalers”  ✔Acquisitionofknowledgeandmechanismsofthe“LawonSignalingand Protection of Signalers” by the employees of the administration / responsible structure. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | | | | *-* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | **STAKEHOLDER ATTENDANCE** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | **Name** | | | | | | **Organization / Affiliation**  **(full name, not acronyms)** | | | | | | | **Position** | | | | | **Email** | | |
|  | | **1** | Arsild Tepelija | | | | | | Cooperation | | | | | | |  | | | | | [arsild.tepelija@cdinstitut](mailto:arsild.tepelija@cdinstitute.edu) | | |
|  | |  |  | | | | | | Development Institute | | | | | | |  | | | | | [e.edu](mailto:arsild.tepelija@cdinstitute.edu) | | |
|  | | **2** | Sabina Babameto | | | | | | Albania / National Democratic Institute | | | | | | |  | | | | |  | | |
|  | | **3** | Eriola Sovali | | | | | | International Chamber of Commerse in Albania | | | | | | |  | | | | | [info @ icc-albania.org.al](mailto:info@icc-albania.org.al) | | |
|  | | **4** | Zef Preci | | | | | | Shiptare Center for Economic Research | | | | | | | Executive Director | | | | | [zpreci@icc-al.org](mailto:zpreci@icc-al.org) | | |
|  | | **5** | Rowena Sulstarova | | | | | | Institute for Democracy and Mediation | | | | | | | Program Manager of Government / legal expert | | | | | [rsulstarova@idmalbania.org](mailto:rsulstarova@idmalbania.org) | | |
|  | | **6** | Ariola Agolli | | | | | | Partners | | | | | | | Director Programs | | | | | [aagolli@partnersalbania.org](mailto:aagolli@partnersalbania.org); | | |
|  | | **7** |  | | | | | | KSHH | | | | | | |  | | | | | [office@ahc.org.al](mailto:office@ahc.org.al) | | |
|  | | **8** | Rovena Pregja | | | | | | MD | | | | | | | Head of Sector | | | | | [Rovena.pregjadirectionesia.gov.al](mailto:Rovena.pregja@drejtesia.gov.al) | | |
|  | | **9** | @Jona Karapinjalli@ | | | | | | MD | | | | | | | Specialist | | | | | [Jona.karapinjallidirectionesia.gov.alSandzhaku](mailto:Jona.karapinjalli@drejtesia.gov.al) | | |
|  | | **10** | Arbër | | | | | | MD | | | | | | | Specialist | | | | | [Arber.sanxhakudirectionesia.gov.al](mailto:Arber.sanxhaku@drejtesia.gov.al) | | |
|  | | **11** | @Anisa Xake@ | | | | | | MD | | | | | | | Specialist | | | | | [Anisa.xakedirectionesia.gov.al](mailto:Anisa.xake@drejtesia.gov.al) | | |
|  | | **12** | Courtney McLaren | | | | | | OGP Canada | | | | | | | Expert OGP | | | | | [Courtney.MCLaren@kryeministria.al](mailto:Courtney.MCLaren@kryeministria.al) | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Anti-Corruption -CONSULTATION 3** | |
|  | **Consultation Details** | |
|  | Policy Goal Focus | Open government for the fight against corruption / Integrity Plans |
|  | Lead Focal Point Institution | Ms. Rovena **Pregja** / Mrs. Jona **Karapinjalli**  Ministry of Justice |
|  | Date | 06/10/2020 |
|  | Consultation Meeting Number | **3** |
|  | **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | |
|  | **What is the purpose of this consultation? Please answer for all that apply** | **Details:**  Third Consultative Meeting ledthrough the mechanization of the Anti-Corruption Thematic GroupinthethirdmeetingoftheAnti-Corruption Coordination Committee dt. 6/10/2020 aimed at recognizing and presenting the draft OGP action plan for the Anti-Corruption component / Specific Objective: Integrity Plans, revised according to comments and preliminary proposals received by civil society through the first and second online consultancy on Integrity Plans regarding the respective measures and activities. Also, the main purpose of thismeeting is to draft and consolidate the components of the nationalplanofOGP,inordertoreceiveconcrete comments and proposals regarding the acquisition of new measures and activities in function of this objective and to monitor the implementation of thelatter. |
|  | (i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policy goal | * No /☒Yes   The strategic goal of this action plan aims to guarantee "*Open Government in the fightagainst corruption*"seenasacollaborativemeetingpoint between institutions, civil society and academia, the Integrity Plan is well thought out as a mechanism that aims to make the fight against corruption more effective and to ensure the strengthening of the institutional transparency framework, the strengthening of the ethics and integrity of the civil servant and senior public officials through the principles of inclusiveness of stakeholders. The draft Action Plan for the Anti-Corruption component / Integrity Plans in implementation of the work calendar has been consulted in advance with the stakeholders through the first and second Consultative Meeting.Allcommentsandproposalsreceivedat thisearlystageoftheconsultationarereflectedin  the draft presented at the Third Consultative Meeting, Directed through the Mechanizationof |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | the Thematic Anti-Corruption Group at the third meeting of the Coordination Committee against Corruption dt. 06/10/2020.  Stakeholders in this meeting have provided in advance electronically their respective contributions related to addressing various problemsinthefieldofcorruptioninthecountry, have identified the main issues related to Anti- Corruption and have provided preliminary solutions and ideas for it. supported the fight againstcorruption. |
|  | (ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | * No /☒Yes   In the Third Consultative Meeting chaired through the Mechanism of the Thematic Anti- Corruption Group in the third meeting of the Coordination Committee against Corruption dt. 06/10/2020. about 50 representatives of Civil Society Organizations, academia, other stakeholders, representatives of the Prime Minister, OGP experts, representatives of EU technical assistance, Members of the Coordination Committee against Corruption, focalpointsofanti-corruptionininstitutionswere invited. respectiveetc. |
|  | (iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | * No /☒Yes   At the Third Consultation Meeting, Held Online via Webex Platform, Ms. Pregja made a brief presentation at Power Point outlining the progress of the process of reviewing the draft OGP Action Plan for the anti-corruption component 2020-2022. The participants in the Third Consultative Meeting had previously submitted electronically via e-mail their ideas as well as concrete proposals within the open government |
|  | (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | ☒No / ☐Yes |
|  | (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | ☒No / ☐Yes |
|  | (vi) Gather feedback on proposed policy goals | ☒No / ☐Yes |
|  | (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals | ☒No / ☐Yes |
|  | (viii) Other (provide details) | ☒No / ☐Yes |
|  | **II. Methodology** | |
|  | **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** | The Third Consultation Meeting was organized Online due to the Covid 19. pandemic 19. The  nature of the meeting was determined based on |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | | | the protocol evidence led by the mechanism of the Thematic Anti-Corruption Group. | | |
|  | (i) Presentations | | | | * No /☒Yes   ✔Presentation of the draft Action Plan / Anti-corruption component: Integrity Plans | | |
|  | (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | |
|  | (iii) Questions and answers | | | | * No /☒Yes   Participants were given the opportunity to ask questions, but there were no Like that. | | |
|  | (iv) Brainstorming | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | |
|  | **Stakeholder Selection** | | | | **Details** | | |
|  | (i) How were stakeholdersselected? | | | | Participants were selected from the list that the MoJ, for the field of policy CA has and uses to discuss and share opinions. MoJ has an agreementwithCSOs,CivilSocietyForuminthe field of CA, established in February 2020 (Integrity Week) and in this listare all the organizations involved in thisForum.  Participants were also selected from previous contacts and experiences similar to the Ministry of Justice / list of responsible actors of the Anti- Corruption CoordinationCommittee. | | |
|  | (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | | | | Interested parties were contacted electronically / via e-mail / Telephone. | | |
|  | (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | | | | (About) 50 representatives of civil society, academia, other stakeholders, representatives of the Prime Minister, OGP experts,representatives ofEUtechnicalassistance,MembersoftheAnti- CorruptionCoordinationCommittee,focalpoints of anti-corruption in the respectiveinstitutions | | |
|  | (iv) Was the consultation announced publicly? (via websites, social media, etc.) The | | | | **announcement was made only electronically / via-email and telephone.** | | |
|  | (v) Were stakeholders reminded? | | | | Yes. Stakeholders and guests in this process are reminded electronically / via- e-mail / Telephone. | | |
|  | **III. Results / Findings** | | | | | | |
|  | **Stakeholder Contributions** | | | | **Details** | | |
|  | (i) How many stakeholdersattended? | | | | **Total 55 participants.** | | |
|  | (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | | | | Po | | |
|  | (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders | | | | Jo | | |
|  | (iv) Main recommendations from stakeholders? | | | | Jo | | |
|  | **IV. Shortracas Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | **Details** | | |
|  | (i) Limitations in stakeholderattendance | | | | Po | | |
|  | (ii) Limitations in stakeholder participation | | | | Po | | |
|  | (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | | | | Press Release - Open Invitation / Promotion on social networks of the event. | | |
|  | (iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | | | | Organizing a Brainstorming | | |
|  | **Stakeholder Feedback** | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | | |
|  | **Name:** | Ms. Rudina Shehu | **Organization**  **/ Affiliation:** | Albanian Helsinki Committee | | **Position**  **:** | Project Coordinator |
|  | **Comments / Issues Raised / Feedback / Ideas** | | | | | | |
|  | * Ongoingtrainingontheinternalsignalingmechanism, legalprovisionsandwiderknowledgeofthe law on signaling by administration employees and members of responsibleunits * Lack of alert cases or increase of registered alertcases. * A deeper knowledge of the law will lead to better self-enforcement and increased awareness of addressing corruptioncases. * More reliable and transparent administrative bodies for thecitizens. * Takingmeasuresbytheauthoritiesatthecentralandlocallevel,forthereviewoftheprofessionalprofile (job description) of the members of the Responsible Units, in the internal and external signaling mechanism. * MembersofResponsibleUnitswithveryhighintegrityandwho havesufficientprofessionaltrainingto understand and implement thelaw. * Increase the credibility of the mechanism set up to fight corruption, build the necessary capacity to implement the signaling mechanism and protectwhistleblowers. * Drafting annual reports in detail regarding the registered cases of corruption, administrative investigation, decisionstakenbythecompetentbodies.Publishthemonthewebsitesoftheresponsible bodies in order for the public to have access and build trust in the transparency shown for the fight againstcorruption.   Bypublishingthecaseshandledandthe manneroftreatment,theleveloftrust,awareness,transparency in the competent bodies dealing with the fight against corruption will increase and more cases will be reported in thefuture.   * Increase of external control by HIDAACI to the units as well as strengthening of the external signaling mechanism(bytheemployeesdirectlytoHIDAACI).Thedependenceoftheunitsonsuperiorsdirectly prejudices the process of the internal referral mechanism, so the HIDAACI should be strengthened in parallel.Lackofautonomyin handlingreportedcasesastheydependdirectlyonthemanagementofthe institution. * Increasing the independence in the functioning of the Responsible Units and in the handling of the registered cases ofsignaling. * Registered cases of internal signaling will be handled moreindependently. * Transparency in the way of handling registered cases of corruption, publication of decisions taken by thecompetentbodiesforthesecases,increaseofhumancapacitytohandleregisteredcasesofcorruption and placement of people with high integrity in handlingcases. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | | | |
|  |  | | | | |
| **Stakeholder ATTENDANCE** | | | | | |
|  | | **Name** | **Organization / Affiliation (full name,not**  **Acronyms)** | **Position** | **Email** |
| **1** | | Adea Pirdeni | Ministry of Justice | Deputy Minister |  |
| **2** | | Bardhylka Kospiri | Ministry of Health and Social Welfare | Deputy Minister |  |
| **3** | | Hunt Bonati | Ministry of Infrastructure and Energy | Deputy Minister |  |
| **4** | | Sokol Offier | Ministry of Foreign Affairs andEurope | Deputy Minister |  |
| **5** | | Ornela Çuçi | Ministry of Tourism and Environment | Deputy Minister |  |
| **6** | | Constantine February | Ministry of Education, Sports andYouth | Deputy Minister |  |
| **7** | | Emira Gjeci | Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development | Deputy Minister |  |
| **8** | | Belinda Ikonomi | Ministry of Finance and Economics | Deputy Minister |  |
| **9** | | Rowena Pregja | MD | staff |  |
| **10** | | Evis Fico | MD | staff |  |
| **11** | | Stela Suloti | MD | staff |  |
| **12** | | Arber Sandzak | MD | staff |  |
| **13** | | Enea Babameto | MD | staff |  |
| **14** | | Jonas Karapinjalli | MD | staff |  |
| **15** | | Anisa Xake | MD | staff |  |
| **16** | | Ornela Xhembulla | General Prosecution |  |  |
| **17** | | Evis cried | Prime |  |  |
| **18** | | brikel Muka | MEPJ |  |  |
| **19** | | Filloreta Nika | MARD |  |  |
| **20** | | Antoinette Hoxha | MB |  |  |
| **21** | | Aurora Mukaj | KLP |  |  |
| **22** | | Eljesa Harapi | MSHMS |  |  |
| **23** | | Ada Bedini |  |  |  |
| **24** | | Reida Ka shots | APP |  |  |
| **25** | | Joanna Ristani | APP |  |  |
| **26** | | Elona Hoxha | MD |  |  |
| **27** | | Tatjana Janku | MD |  |  |
| **28** | | Suzana Frasheri | MD |  |  |
| **29** | | Jonida Narazani | OSCE |  |  |
| **30** | | Migena Xoxa | Amb Austria |  |  |
| **31** | | Frederik Eberhardt | representatives of Amb |  |  |
| **32** | | German Embassy | representatives of Amb |  |  |
| **33** | | Marsela Isaku | representatives of Amb |  |  |
| **34** | | Aida Lahi | Amb Hollandes |  |  |
| **35** | | Hemion Braho | Amb Hollandes |  |  |
| **36** | | Ermelinda Xhaja | Amb Sweden |  |  |
| **37** | | Desareta Mitro x3 | representatives of Amb |  |  |
| **38** | | Eridana Cano | ADB |  |  |
| **39** | | Eurona Leka x2 | Albanian Institute of Public Affairs /University  M. Barleti |  |  |
| **40** | | Stephanie Beckmann | Amb USA |  |  |
| **41** | | Linda Krasniqi | Amb USA |  |  |
| **42** | | Alketa Koja | KDIMDHP |  |  |
| **43** | | Rovena Sulstarova | IDM |  |  |
| **44** | | Ersida Sefa | Foundation Open Society Soros |  |  |
| **45** | | Nirvana Deiu | EMA |  |  |
| **46** | | Ardita Seknaj | ICC Albania |  |  |
| **47** | | Isida Roshi | MB / AMVV |  |  |
| **48** | | Nevila Como | Expert of IPMG / DBE |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **49** | Endrita Xhaferraj | European Bank for Reconstruction and Development |  |  |
| **50** | Ardian Hackaj | CDI Albania |  |  |
| **51** | Milaim Demushaj | Different & Equal Organizations |  |  |
| **52** | John Heck | DBE Technical Assistance for MD / AK |  |  |
| **53** | Arjan Dyrmishi | DBE Technical Assistance for MD / AK |  |  |
| **54** | Silvana Rusi | MD | Staff |  |
| **55** | Selami Shehu | MD | Staff |  |

**Q**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Anti-Corruption - CONSULTATION 4** | | |
|  | **Consultation Details** | | |
|  | Policy Goal Focus | Open government for the fight against corruption / Integrity Plans | |
|  | Lead Focal Point Institution | Ms. Rovena **Pregja** / Mrs. Jona **Karapinjalli**  Ministry of Justice | |
|  | Date | 14/10/2020 | |
|  | Consultation Meeting Number | **4** | |
|  | **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | | |
|  | **What was the aim of this consultation? Please answer for all that apply** | **Details: The**  purpose of the Fourth, Concluding Consultative Meeting is:  -PresentationofthedraftOGPactionplanforthe Anti-Corruption component / SpecificObjective: Integrity Plans, revised and Prioritization Matrix according to comments and proposals concrete resultsobtainedbycivilsocietythroughtheFirst, Second and Third Consultative Meeting as well as those received electronically.  -Obtainingvarioussuggestionsintheframework of composing new measures for the Specific objective "*IntegrityPlans".*  Obtaining and receiving comments in the framework of the improvement of the Document "Prioritization Matrix".  -FinalizationandconsolidationofcomponentIV: Anti-corruption / Integrity Plans as well as the document "Prioritization Matrix" through the involvement of stakeholders, civil society organizations, academia and the generalpublic. | |
|  | (i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policy goal | * No / ☒Yes-   The Integrity Plan is well thought out as a mechanism that aims to make the fight against corruption more effective and guarantee strengthening the framework of institutional transparency, strengthening the ethics and integrity of the employee civilian and senior public officials.  - The draft Action Plan for the Anti-Corruption component / Integrity Plans in implementationof the work calendar has been consulted in advance with the interested groups through the online questionnaire and then with the stakeholders during the consultation meetings in order to  improve the process of drafting and composing measures and activities of the specificobjective | |
|  |  | as well as the consolidation of the strategic document as well.  -All comments and proposals received at this early stage as well as in other subsequent consultation meetings are reflected in the draft presented at the last consultation meeting, dt.14 / 10/2020.  Stakeholders in this meeting have verbally provided their respective contributions regarding addressing various issues in the fight against corruption in the country and have provided concrete proposals on updating the current draft, namely: the involvement of other responsible / contributing institutions central and local government, new measures, review of the chronological framework for carrying out activities, new definitions of deadlines for implementation of measures, -  Fulfilling the policy goal and implementation of the specific objective requires the stable and permanent commitment of civil society. Therefore, their role and contribution is seen in two main moments: First in the design of methodological instruments and in monitoring the implementation of Integrity Plans. |
|  | (ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | * No /☒Yes   About 50 representatives of Civil Society Organizations, the Academy and other interested actors were invited to the Fourth Consultative Meeting. |
|  | (iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | * No /☒Yes   -, Mrs. Pregja chaired the meeting of the Fourth Consultative Meeting.  -znj. McLaren, OGP expert made a detailed presentationregardingtheOGPactivity,thebasic principles of the OGP, the main documents, the importanceoftheparties inthisprocess,thedraft PV for the dedicated anti-corruption component, etc.  - Mrs. Jona Karapinjalli made a short presentationatPowerPointontheprogressofthe process of drafting, consulting, reviewing the draft OGP Action Plan for the anti-corruption component2020-2022andsharedwithinterested stakeholders the revised Prioritization Matrix document.  -Participants in the Fourth Consultation Meeting presented their ideas verbally online and offered concrete proposals in the framework of open government.  -Participantsweregiventheopportunitytoreflect their ideas and proposals, addressing issuesand |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | issues online through a questionnaire sent online via e-mail.  -Participants also sent via e-mail their comments regarding the respective measures. |
|  | (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | * No /☒Yes |
|  | (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | * No /☒Yes |
|  | (vi) Gather feedback on proposed policy goals | * No /☒Yes |
|  | (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals | * No /☒Yes |
|  | (viii) Other (provide details) | ☒No / ☐Yes |
|  | **II. Methodology** | |
|  | **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** | The Fourth Consultative Meeting was organized Online due to the Covid pandemic 19. The nature of the meeting was open and interactive |
|  | (i) Presentations | * No /☒Yes   ✔Presentation of the OGP process and the constituent components of the Open Government Action Plan 2020-2022.  ✔ Introducing the OGP process at the macro-McLaren level.  ✔Presentation of the draft Action Plan / Anti-corruption component: Integrity Plans / Accompanying measures and activities revised  ✔ Presentation of the Prioritization Matrix, revised |
|  | (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | * No /☒Yes |
|  | (iii) Questions and answers | * No /☒Yes   Participants were given opportunity to ask questions. |
|  | (iv) Brainstorming | * No /☒Yes |
|  | **Stakeholder Selection** | **Details** |
|  | (i) How were stakeholdersselected? | -ParticipantswereselectedfromthelistthatMoJ, for the field of policies CA has and uses to discuss and share opinions. MoJ has an agreementwithCSOs,CivilSocietyForuminthe field of CA, established in February 2020 (Integrity Week) and in this list are all the organizations involved in thisForum. |

☒

N

☐

Y

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | | | -Also, participants were selected from previous contacts and experiences similar to the Ministry of Justice.  - The**announcement for the public consultation of the draft Action Plan 2020- 2022 for the anti-corruption component / Integrity Plans was published on the official website of the Ministry of Justice.** see:[http://drejtesia.gov.al/neësroom/njoftime/tryeze- pune-konsultim-per-diskutimin-e-planit-te-veprimit- pqh-ogp-2020-2022/](http://drejtesia.gov.al/newsroom/njoftime/tryeze-pune-konsultim-per-diskutimin-e-planit-te-veprimit-pqh-ogp-2020-2022/) | | |
|  | (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | | | | Interested parties were contacted electronically / via e-mail / Telephone / Official website of the institution. | | |
|  | (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | | | | * (About) 50 representatives of civil society, academia, other interested actors were contacted electronically and bytelephone. * The**call for participation in the last consultativemeetingwasalsoaddressedtothe general public through the announcement published on the official website of the institution**. | | |
|  | Was the consultation announced publicly? (via websites, social media, etc.) | | | | Po.   * The notification was done electronically /via- email andtelephone. * The announcement for the public consultation of the draft Action Plan 2020-2022 for the anti- corruption component / Integrity Plans was published on the official website of theMinistry of Justice. see:<http://drejtesia.gov.al/newsroom/njoftime/tryeze-pune-konsultim-per-diskutimin-e-planit-te-veprimit-pqh-ogp-2020-2022/> | | |
|  | (iv) Were reminded stakeholders? | | | | Yes. Stakeholders and guests in this process are reminded electronically / via- e-mail / Telephone. | | |
|  | **III. Results / Findings** | | | | | | |
|  | **Stakeholder Contributions** | | | | **Details** | | |
|  | (i) How many stakeholdersattended? | | | | **8 representatives of Civil Society,** *8 (others, staff)*  ***Total 16 participants.*** | | |
|  | (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | | | | Yes. IDM representatives provided their views verbally, mainly by reviewing the respective measures and activities. | | |
|  | (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders | | | | Po.  ✔ Increasing Transparency regarding Public Procurement Contracts / PPP | | |
|  | (iv) Main recommendations from stakeholders? | | | | Yes.  ✔ Improving the package of acts and the | | |
|  |  | | | | internal regulatory environment related to strengthening the integrity of the public servant | | |
|  | **IV. Shortcut Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | **Details** | | |
|  | (i) Limitations in stakeholderattendance | | | | No | | |
|  | (ii) Limitations in stakeholder participation | | | | No | | |
|  | (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | | | | Promotion of the event on social networks. | | |
|  | (iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | | | | - | | |
|  | **Stakeholder Feedback** | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | | |
|  | **Name:** | Mrs. Rovena Sulstarova | **Organization**  **/ Affiliation:** | Institute for Democracy and Mediation [**https://idmalbania.org**](https://idmalbania.org/)  [**/**](https://idmalbania.org/) | | **Position**  **:** | Government Program Manager / Legal Experts |
|  | **Issues Raised / Feedback / Ideas** | | | | | | |
|  | Suggestions for reviewing measures and activities for the Anticorruption component: Objective of Integrity  **For objective 2.1:**   * Activity 2.1.6 to pass first in the ranking as the whole process of developing an Integrity Plan will be based on this methodological instrument - integrity riskassessment. * Also within this objective to detail the ML measures related to the approval of the PI (ie not to remain only in the drafting of IntegrityPlans); * Provide activities / measures for the process of drafting an Integrity Plan for the Institutions of ML and MoJ. * Provide activities for the process of drafting Integrity Plans for local self-government units / municipalitiesinreferencetothenumberprovidedinthe AP 2020-2023,fortheperiodoftimethatwill be covered by this actionplan;   **For objective 2.2:**   * Specification of activity 2.2.1 defining a methodological instrument on IP monitoring for all central government institutions (not only MoJ); the time limit provided for the realization of this activity to be before the start of the IP monitoring process of theMoJ; * Forecastofasimilaractivityasabove,butforlocalgovernment;Theforeseendeadlinefortherealization ofthisactivityisbeforethestartoftheIPmonitoringprocessforthe6municipalitiesthathaveapproved IPs. * Following activity 2.2.2 provide for the establishment of monitoring groups for the 6 municipalities of the country that already have an integrity plan (5 ofthem). * For activity 2.2.2 to review the deadline taking into account the start of this monitoring process: one year of IP implementation from the moment of its approval as well as the period of development of the methodological instrument for IP monitoring (perhaps a suggestion can to be 6M First2022); * Activity 2.2.2 to be replicated for those municipalities that will follow a process similar to the MoJ for monitoring IPs after the first year of theirimplementation. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Comments The**  contribution of Civil Society in this plan OGP Action for the component dedicated to the fight against corruption, 2020-222 is seen in two main moments:  ✔ First in the design of methodological instruments  ✔ Second in monitoring the implementation of Integrity Plans  -Increasing Transparency related with public Procurement contracts / PPP  -Improvement of the regulatory package regarding the strengthening of the integrity of the public servant | | | | |
| **STAKEHOLDER ATTENDANCE** | | | | | |
|  | | **Name** | **Organization / Affiliation (full name,not**  **acronyms)** | **Position** | **Email** |
| **1** | | Rovena Pregja | Ministry of Justice | Responsible Sector | [Rovena.Pregja .al](mailto:Rovena.Pregja@drejtesia.gov.al) |
| **2** | | Jona Karapinjalli | Ministry of Justice | Specialist | [Jona.karapinjalli@rejtesia.gov.alSandzhaku](mailto:Jona.karapinjalli@drejtesia.gov.al) |
| **3** | | Arbër | Ministry of Justice | Specialist | [Arber.sanxhaku@rejtesia.gov.al](mailto:Arber.sanxhaku@drejtesia.gov.al) |
| **4** | | Enea Babameto | Ministry of Justice | Specialist | [Enea.babameto@rejtesia.gov.al](mailto:Enea.babameto@drejtesia.gov.al) |
| **5** | | Ermira Bani | Ministry of Justice | Intern Intern | [Ermirabani96@gmail.com](mailto:Ermirabani96@gmail.com) |
| **6** | | Selami Shehu | Ministry of Justice | IT |  |
| **7** | | Evis F ico | Ministry of Justice | Advisor | Evis.fico@straightency.gov.al |
| **8** | | Marsela Isaku | representative of Amb |  |  |
| **9** | | Rovena Sulstarova | Institute for Democracy and Mediation | Governance Program Manager / LegalExpert | [rsulstarova@idmalbania.org](mailto:rsulstarova@idmalbania.org) |
| **10** | | Sabina Babameto | Albania / National  Democratic Institute |  |  |
| **11** | | Rudina Shehu | Albanian Helsinki  Committee |  | [office@ahc.org.al](mailto:office@ahc.org.al) |
| **12** | | Ervjola Osmanaj | CRCA |  |  |
| **13** | | Eriola Sovali | ICC Albania |  | [info@icc-albania.org.al](mailto:info@icc-albania.org.al) |
| **14** | | Rovena Balla | Diferent & Equale |  |  |
| **15** | | Cortney McLaren | OGP, Canada | Expert | [Courtney.MCLaren@kryeministria.al](mailto:Courtney.MCLaren@kryeministria.al) |
| **16** | | Jozef Shkambi | CRCA |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Digital-Governance - CONSULTATION 1** | |
| **Consultation Details** | |
| Policy Goal Focus | Accessibility in public services |
| Lead Focal Point Institution | Mrs. Jonida Taraj / Mrs. Deborah Hatellari Integrated Public Service Delivery Agency (**ADISA**) |
| Date | 30/09/2020 |
| Consultation Meeting Number | **1** |
| **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | |
| **What was the purpose of this consultation? Please answer for all that apply** | **Details** |
| (i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policygoal | * No /☒Yes   The main purpose of this workshop is related to the need for joint discussion in the process of implementing the ADISA OGP action plan that addresses accessibility and the needs of marginalized groups in providing public services based on your knowledge, experience and contribution as part of civil society and key institutions in the country. |
| (ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | * No /☒Yes   In the first workshop were invited representatives from 5 civil society organizations, who represented various marginalized groups. |
| (iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | * No /☒Yes   Inthefirstpresentationmeeting,heldonlinethrough the Webex platform, a presentation was made on ADISA, the mission and purpose of the institution, as well as a presentation on digital governance and open government partnership. |
| (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | * No /☒Yes   One of the main suggestions discussed regarding increasing accessibility for people with intellectual  disabilities was the training of a dedicated casket. |
| (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| (vi) Gather feedback on proposed policy goals | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goalsdhe | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| (viii)Other (provide details) | * No /☒Yes   U discussed ideasInnovative solutions for ways to achieve inclusion and increase accessibility in public services for some marginalized groups. |
| **II. Methodology** | |
| **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** |  |
| (i) Presentations | * No /☒Yes   - Presentation of the OGP process and the constituent components of the Open Government Action Plan 2020-2022. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | - Presentation of ADISA's mission and purpose, location and measures taken so far to increase accessibility to publicservices. | | |
| (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | | | | * No / ☒YesThe   representative of Roma Active Albania (hereinafter RAA) provided concrete proposals and ideas regardingtheactivitiesthatcanbeundertakeninthe framework of inclusiveness and increasing accessibility in publicservices. | | |
| (iii) Questions and answers | | | | * No /☒Yes | | |
| (iv) Brainstorming | | | | * No /☒Yes | | |
| **Stakeholder Selection** | | | | **Details** | | |
| (i) How were stakeholdersselected? | | | | Participants were identified through a listthat ADISA has and uses for meetings and events involving civil society representatives. | | |
| (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | | | | All participants were contacted and notified electronicallyviaofficialemailaswellasbyphone. | | |
| (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | | | | About 60 representatives of civil society organizations | | |
| (iv) Was the consultation announced publicly? (via websites, social media, etc.) | | | | Jo. The announcement was made only via official email and phone. | | |
| (v) Were stakeholders reminded? | | | | Yes, the participating parties were reminded in the same way they received the first notification of the event / meeting. | | |
| **III. Results / Findings** | | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Contributions** | | | | **Details** | | |
| (i) How many stakeholdersattended? | | | | 2 civil society organizations | | |
| (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | | | | Yes | | |
| (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders The | | | | difficulty of obtaining public services by persons with intellectual disabilities. | | |
| (iv) Main recommendations from stakeholders? | | | | Yes, the addition of a section which identifies marginalized groups in the questionnaire that ADISA uses to measure citizen satisfaction in the process of receiving public services in ADISA integrated centers. | | |
| **IV. Shortcuts Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | **Details** | | |
| (i) Limitations in stakeholderattendance | | | | Po | | |
| (ii) Limitations in stakeholder participation | | | | Po | | |
| (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | | | | Promotion of the event on social networks | | |
| (iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | | | | Conduct brainstorming and discuss ideas between representatives of various civil society organizations. | | |
| **Stakeholder Feedback** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | **Blerta Kalavace** | **Organization / Affiliation:** | **IDRA Research and Consulting** | | **Position:** | **Project Manager** |

* Identify “best practice” in similar countries in theregion.
* Identifyandimplementalistofcivilsocietyparticipantswhereeveryonecanbeformallyinvolvedanddiscuss the open government partnership process.
* During the presentation of digital governance and open government partnership, the existence of an independent board that monitors the standards was mentioned, and the question was raised whether the progress of the implementation of the open government partnership could bemonitored.

**Comments / Issues Raised / Feedback / Ideas**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STAKEHOLDERATTENDANCE** | | | | |
|  | **Name** | **Organization / Affiliation** | **Position** | **Email** |
| **1** | Valbona Dervishi | Roma Active Albania | Program Coordinator | [dervishivalbona@gmail.com](mailto:dervishivalbona@gmail.com) |
| **2** | Blerta Kalavace | IDRA Research and  Consulting | Project Manager | [Blerta.kalavace@idra.al](mailto:Blerta.kalavace@idra.al) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Digital Governance - CONSULTATION 2** | |
| **Consultation Details** | |
| Policy Goal Focus | Digital Governance / Accessibility in public services |
| Lead Focal Point Institution | Mrs. Jonida Taraj / Mrs. Deborah  Integrated Public Service Delivery Agency (**ADISA**) |
| Date | Hatellari9/10/2020 |
| Consultation Meeting Number | 2 |
| **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | |
| **What was the purpose of this consultation? Please answer for all that apply** | **Details** |
| (i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policygoal | * No /☒Yes   At the beginning of the workshop the presentation of new participants took place. |
| ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | * No /☒Yes   During the workshop a general presentation on OGP was made, addressing the respective purpose and goals of this project, as well as encouraging the proposal of different ideas regarding the accessibility of public services by vulnerable groups in society. |
| (iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | * No /☒Yes   In the second meeting held online through the Webex platform, there was a presentation on ADISA, the mission and purpose of the institution, as well as a presentation on digital governance and open government partnership. |
| (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | * No /☒Yes   During the discussion of ideas was mentioned a successful initiative that ADISA has implemented which is the installation of a dual screen where the ADISA employee can explain step by step to the citizen how to apply for an online service, to enable in this form the necessary social distancing during this period. |
| (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| (vi) Gather feedback on proposed policy goals | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| (viii)Other (provide details) | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| **II. Methodology** | |
| **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** |  |
| (i) Presentations | * No /☒Yes   + Presentation of the OGP process and the constituent components of the Open Government Action Plan2020-2022.   + Presentation of ADISA extension in the territory. |
| (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | * No /☒Yes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | During the workshop, the idea of creating an easily accessible and easy reading website for peoplewith intellectual disabilities wasproposed. |
| (iii) Questions and answers | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| (iv) Brainstorming | * No / ☒YesThe   workshop concluded with the idea of conducting a common questionnaire for all stakeholders which will also be published online. |
| **Stakeholder Selection** | **Details** |
| (i) How were stakeholdersselected? | From a list of contacts |
| (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | Via e-mail |
| (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | 45 |
| (iv) Was the consultation announced publicly? (via websites, social media, etc.) | No |
| (v) Were stakeholders remembered? | Yes |
| **III. Results / Findings** | |
| **Stakeholder Contributions** | **Details** |
| (i) How many stakeholdersattended? | 2 |
| (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | Not yet |
| (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders | Website accessible easy reading |
| (iv) Main recommendations from stakeholders? | The workshop concluded with the idea of conducting a joint questionnaire for all interest groups which will be published online. |
| **IV. Shortcuts Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | |
|  | **Details** |
| (i) Limitations in stakeholderattendance | Yes |
| (ii) Limitations in stakeholder participation | Yes |
| (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | Announcement on several communication channels |
| (iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | Announcement in some communication channels |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | **Emanuela Zaimi** | | **Organization/ Affiliation:** | **Down Syndrome Albania** | **Position:** | **Director** |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | Increasing the accessibility of ADISA integrated centers and the official website by people with intellectual disabilities. | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | Ideas were evaluated and discussed among participants to find the best form and way to increase accessibility in the process of receiving public services for marginalized and vulnerable groups. | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | Training of a receptionist from reception offices to provide public services for persons with intellectual disabilities;  Adapting the official website in easy reading format to be accessible to people with intellectual disabilities, so that it is possible to obtain information in a simpler and more understandable format. | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | The idea of ​​including simple figures or schemes was also discussed to make it easier to increase accessibility by marginalized and vulnerable groups. | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STAKEHOLDERATTENDANCE** | | | | |
|  | **Name** | **Organization / Affiliation** | **Position** | **Email** |
| **1** | Valbona Dervishi | Roma Active Albania | Program Coordinator | [dervishivalbona@gmail.com](mailto:dervishivalbona@gmail.com) |
| **2** | Rudina Mullahi | United Nations  Development Program | Project Manager | [rudina.mullahi@undp.org](mailto:rudina.mullahi@undp.org) |
| **3** | Emanuela Zaimi | Down Syndrome Albania | Founder and Director | [e.zaimi@dsalbania.org](mailto:e.zaimi@dsalbania.org) |
| **4** | Flavia Shehu | Down Syndrome Albania | Coordinator | f.shehu # dsalbania.org |
| **5** | Mirela Juka | Down Syndrome Albania | Project Manager | [m.juka@dsalbania.org](mailto:m.juka@dsalbania.org) |
| **6** | Courtney MCLaren | Prime Minister's Office | Policy Advisor | courtney.mclaren @  kryeministria.al |
| **7** | Deborah Hatellari | ADISA | Head of Project Planning  and Management | [deborah.hatellari@adisa.gov.al](mailto:deborah.hatellari@adisa.gov.al) |
| **8** | Fiona Gjika | ADISA | Head of Communication  with the Citizen Department | [fiona.gjika@adisa.gov.al](mailto:fiona.gjika@adisa.gov.al) |
| **9** | Enea Turlla | ADISA | Head of Services Delivery  Supervision Department | [enea.turlla@adisa.gov.al](mailto:enea.turlla@adisa.gov.al) |
| **10** | Keldi Jani | ADISA | Head of Performance and  Statistics Department | [keldi.jani@adisa.gov.al](mailto:keldi.jani@adisa.gov.al) |
| **11** | Nimfa Temali | ADISA | Specialist at Performance  and Statistics Department | [nimfa.temali@adisa.gov.al](mailto:nimfa.temali@adisa.gov.al) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Digital Governance - CONSULTATION 3** | |
| **Consultation** | |
| Policy Policy Goal Focus | Digital Governance / Accessibility in public services |
| Lead Focal Point Institution | Ms. Jonida Taraj / Mrs. Deborah Hatellari  Integrated Public Service Delivery Agency (**ADISA**) |
| Date | 20/10/2020 |
| Consultation Meeting Number | 3 |
| **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | |
| **What was the purpose of this consultation? Please answer for all that apply** | **Details** |
| (i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policygoal | * No /☒Yes   At the beginning of the workshop the presentation of new participants took place. |
| (ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | * No /☒Yes   During the workshop a presentation was made for Open Government Partnership for all participants of this meeting, presenting an overview, to acquaint us with some important facts of this project , as: when established, the importance of government interaction with civil society in the process of drafting the project action plan in the countries where it operates, which will then be  monitored by an international institution such as OGP. |
| (iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | ☒No / ☒Yes  In the third meeting held online through the Webex platform, a brief presentation on ADISA, the mission and purpose of the institution, as well as a presentation on digital governance and the governance partnership of open. |
| (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | * No /☒Yes   During the discussion of ideas it was emphasized that it is important to set some priorities for the ideas discussed and to be realized despite the fact that they are lengthy processes in time, but offer long-term solutions. We are currently working on the necessary improvements to the ADISACitizen Charter website, where all relevant materials are beingthrown. |
| (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | * No /☒Yes   Participants found it necessary to revise the format of the ADISA website to facilitate the perceptionof information as comprehensibly as possible by persons with intellectual disabilities , thus giving a special value to the visual aspect, where it was suggested that on the ADISA website, the information be accompanied by pictures and short sentences in order to facilitate access to information for all vulnerablegroups. |
| (vi) Gather feedback on proposed policy goals | * No /☒Yes   Based on the discussions made during the previous |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | meetings, the participating stakeholders expressed some thoughts and ideas for achieving this goal set as:   1. Consultations and public hearings with CSOs- for the budgetcalendar; 2. Increasing access to the ADISA websitefor people with intellectualdisabilities; 3. Expanding and increasing access topublic services. |
| (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| (viii)Other (provide details) | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| **II. Methodology** | |
| **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** |  |
| (i) Presentations | * No /☒Yes   - Presentation of the OGP process and the constituent components of the Open Government Action Plan 2020-2022. |
| (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | * No /☒Yes   Another suggestion was the implementation of a chatbot on the website, which will be able to answer various questions about the services requested by citizens for 24h / 7days , a solution that would bring relief to current employees. |
| (iii) Questions and answers | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| (iv) Brainstorming | * No /☒Yes   An effective way to help the citizen is to set up a person management system, which is a way of reminding the citizen who has received a service. (includes those services that have certain deadlines such as passports) and reminds him to receive the same service on another valid date. |
| **Stakeholder Selection** | **Details** |
| (i) How were stakeholdersselected? | From a list of contacts |
| (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | Via e-mail |
| (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | 45 |
| (iv) Was the consultation announced publicly? (via websites, social media, etc.) | No |
| (v) Were stakeholders remembered? | Yes |
| **III. Results / Findings** | |
| **Stakeholder Contributions** | **Details** |
| (i) How many stakeholdersattended? | 2 |
| (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | Not yet |
| (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders | 1. Consultations and public hearings with CSOson the budgetcalendar; 2. Increasing access to the ADISA websitefor people with intellectualdisabilities; 3. Expanding and increasing access topublic services. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| (iv) | Main recommendations from stakeholders? | It was decided that all suggestions addressed during these workshops will be forwarded to those responsible for decision-making and will finally select ideas which can be implemented with the support of UNDP in the framework of increasing accessibility to public services. . |
| **IV. Short borders Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | |
|  | | **Details** |
| (i) | Limitations in stakeholder attendance | Yes |
| (ii) | Limitations in stakeholder participation | Yes |
| (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | | Announcement on several communication channels |
| (iv) | What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | Announcement on several communication channels |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | **Rudina Mullahi** | | **Organization/ Affiliation:** | **UNDP** | **Position:** | **Project Manager** |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | Improving the communication channel with citizens through an intelligent chat implemented on the official website. | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | Due to the situation created by the Covid-19 pandemic, ADISA integrated centers were closed and it was often impossible for citizens to complete the online application process without the assistance of a service counter. This chat was implemented during the pandemic period on the website as the green number of the Public Services Information Center could not be functional since the closure of the offices. | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | Implementing an intelligent chat on the official website would improve and facilitate the work of staff during the assistance process and would enable remote assistance without having to show up at the counter. | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STAKEHOLDERATTENDANCE** | | | | |
|  | **Name** | **Organization / Affiliation** | **Position** | **Email** |
| **1** | Valbona Dervishi | Roma Active Albania | Program Coordinator | [dervishivalbona@gmail.com](mailto:dervishivalbona@gmail.com) |
| **2** | Rudina Mullahi | United Nations  Development Program | Project Manager | [rudina.mullahi@undp.org](mailto:rudina.mullahi@undp.org) |
| **3** | Courtney MCLaren | Prime Minister's Office | Policy Advisor | courtney.mclaren@kryeministria.  al |
| **4** | Deborah Hatellari | ADISA | Head of Project Planning  and Management | [deborah.hatellari@adisa.gov.al](mailto:deborah.hatellari@adisa.gov.al) |
| **5** | Fiona Gjika | ADISA | Head of Communication with the Citizen  Department | [fiona.gjika@adisa.gov.al](mailto:fiona.gjika@adisa.gov.al) |
| **6** | Keldi Jani | ADISA | Head of Performance and  Statistics Department | [keldi.jani@adisa.gov.al](mailto:keldi.jani@adisa.gov.al) |
| **7** | Nimfa Temali | ADISA | Specialist at Performance  and Statistics Department | [nimfa.temali@adisa.gov.al](mailto:nimfa.temali@adisa.gov.al) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Access to Justice - CONSULTATION 2** | |
| **Consultation Details** | |
| Policy Goal Focus | Build an open government that ensures its citizens access to justice, transparency and accountability. |
| Lead Focal Point Institution | Directorate of Policies and Strategies in the Field of Justice. |
| Date | 05 October 2020 |
| Consultation Meeting Number | The second consultative meeting |
| **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | |
| **What was the aim of this consultation? Please answer for All That Apply** | **Details** |
| (i) Introduce stakeholders to the Proposed policygoal | goal of the second consultative meeting with stakeholders was detajueshëm presentation of the Draft PlanofActionComponentno.3“AccesstoJustice”part of the Open Government Partnership 2020-2022 as well as obtaining the opinions and suggestions of the participants regarding this Draft, in particular withthe  main policy of the Component and other specific objectives. |
| (ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | International expert Ms. Courtney McLaren made the presentationontheOGPprocessandwhatisspecifically required by stakeholders to meet the requirements according to the standards set by the OGP. This process was combined with the specific component, access to justice, transparency andaccountability,  an exposition was made on all the previous stages up to this meeting and an introduction was made to the key OGP documents which were distributed to the participants. |
| (iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | During the meeting, concrete examples of the problems encountered were presented, in order to facilitate the contribution of the stakeholders in their opinions. Partëmarrësit expressed orally about their impressions of the process. |
| (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | Partëmarrësit gave their concrete ideas on the draft action plan and which should focus on specific measures to achieve the objektikave. Due to the limited time some of the participants will send their thoughts / ideas by email. |
| (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | ideasfrom the Academy (University of Tirana) they were very concrete. They covered 5-6 specific areas that will increase access to justice and transparency. Also, the opinions from the CRCA Society were very valuable regarding access to justice for vulnerable groups, such as juveniles, especially in criminal matters. |
| (vi) Gather feedback on proposed policy goals | Pjparticipants generally agreed with the main policy of Component 3. Attention was focused on concrete policy implementation measures. |
| (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals | In the meeting, attention was paid to the discussion on the main policy, asking for suggestions from the parties present. Given that the main policy of access to justice aimsattherightdefinitionofspecificobjectivesandthe adoption of concrete and feasible measures, it was  undoubtedly important that the prioritization of specific |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | objectives be given importance to continue with concrete measures. | | | | | | |
| (viii) Other (provide details) | | | | | | | | | | | | | N / A | | | | | | |
| **II. Methodology** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | | |
| (i) PresentationsThe | | | | | | | | | | | | | meeting was held in the conference hall of the Ministry of Justice.  2 presentations were made:  Ms. Elona Hoaxha and Suzana Frasheri from the Ministry of Justice presented in general visas on OGP. Expert Ms McLaren presented the process according to the standards required by the OGP specifically and focused on the expectations of the process and what is required of the stakeholders. | | | | | | |
| (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | The second consultation meeting was positive. As a result of the physical presence of the participants the  discussion was more effective and their involvement was verysatisfactory. | | | | | | |
| (iii) Questions and answers Questions | | | | | | | | | | | | | were asked and concrete answers were received at certain points in the discussion where necessary. | | | | | | |
| (iv) Brainstorming | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ideas were given concretely and will also be provided via email to stakeholders who did not have the  opportunity due to time constraints. | | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Selection** | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | | |
| (i) How were stakeholdersselected? | | | | | | | | | | | | | The list of civil societies / interest groups that are directly or indirectly related to access to justice, transparency and accountability was used to carry out the process. A wide range of civil societies were involved in monitoring the activities of stateinstitutions in order to seek accountability from the government, academics / professors from public and private universities who operate directly in the legalsystem. | | | | | | |
| (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | | | | | | | | | | | | | Stakeholders were contacted via email at the beginning of the process, where they were informed of the OGP web address and the link to access the materials designed for component no.3. They were then notified electronically of the organization of the second consultation meeting and were called in advancefor the meeting. | | | | | | |
| (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | | | | | | | | | | | | | In total about 25 interest groups were contacted by email and phone. | | | | | | |
| (iv) Was the consultation announced publicly? (via websites, social media, etc.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Prior to the consultation, the announcement was not published on social networks. After its realization, the Ministry of Justice published the development of the event on its official website and Facebook. | | | | | | |
| (v) Were stakeholdersreminded? | | | | | | | | | | | | | Reminder emails were being sent and some of them were receivedon the phone. | | | | | | |
| **III. Results / Findings** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Contributions** | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | | |
| (i) How many stakeholdersattended? | | | | | | | | | | | | | It was attended by 7 stakeholders. A considerable part of the representatives of the interest groups who had confirmed their participation were not present, probably due to the virus, consequently the number of  attendees was not as expected, however the attendees were active and involved expressing suggestions and | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | ideas. their concrete in relation to the process and measures cited in the draft action plan. | | | | | | |
| (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | | | | | | | | | | | | | Attendees joined the discussion with opinions contributing through collaboration and their involvement in this process, which will help in the successful finalization of this component. | | | | | | |
| (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders Theidentified by stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | main problemsare the lack of trust that citizens have in the institutions they face; increase cooperation with universities and civil society; increase effidenchs in responding to the citizens; reducing bureaucracy in the justice system. | | | | | | |
| (iv) Main recommendations from stakeholders? | | | | | | | | | | | | | T participants involvedin discussions stressedRndesinof MBshtetjes sgroups n Needs of theDirectorate ss Helps LegalFree; T reviewof the legislation by placing focus onlawsuit, collectivelawsuit phrsmall amount; realization training pofR and administration staffpresenceof institutions suchdas the courts, the prosecutor etc. | | | | | | |
| **IV. Shortcuts Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | | |
| (i) Limitations in stakeholderattendancestakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | Somewere not present, which could be due to the situation caused by Covid-19 and participants eliminate physical participation. For this reason otherconsultative meetings will take placeonline. | | | | | | |
| (ii) Limitations in stakeholder participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | Due to limited time not all participants discussed. Their thoughts will be emailed. | | | | | | |
| (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | | | | | | | | | | | | | In order to have a more comprehensive and transparent process, high participation of stakeholders is needed, whose contributions will be valid to successfully finalize the draft action plan related to component no. 3.  High participation will facilitate the process by taking concrete steps based on ideas, opinions and issues encountered by stakeholders. For this reason, in case of impossibility of participation, the delegation of the invitation to another representative of the institution was requested. | | | | | | |
| (iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | | | | | | | | | | | | | Encourage them by talking directly to stakeholders about theimportance of their participation and incorporating ideas and suggestions into concrete measures. | | | | | | |
| **STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | | Petrina Broka | | | | **Organization / Affiliation:** | | | Faculty of Law | | | | **Position:** | | Representative of the Law Clinic at the Faculty of Law | | | |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | | thanked for the opportunity to be part of this process and called for cooperation in more comprehensive consultation roundtables. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | * Further strengthening and empowerment of the Law Clinic and consequently, of the groups in need, through the provision of legal service, increase of capacities and practical skills of the students of the Clinic in providing free legal aid, for the needy referring to specifically cooperation with theDirectorate   of Free Legal Aid. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | * Organizingtrainingcoursesforadministrativestaffofthecourtsandprosecutors,theoutcomeofwhich isaimedatimprovingthequalityofservices,theapplicationofappropriatestandardsinprodtheworkare reminded in court and theprosecutor. * Despite the achievement of the provision of lawsuits with small amounts, the legislation needs to be improved (Provisions 399 of the Code of Civil Procedure and onwards). He also paid attention to the approval of thedraft law on collective lawsuits, which is very important for thecitizens. * Expressed interest in being part of the roundtables and greater cooperation for more effective public consultations regarding some draft laws which are being drafted, where he specifically emphasizedthe draft law onarbitration. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | **Jozef Shkambi** | | | | | | | **Organization / Affiliation:** | | | **CRCA** | | | | **Position:** | | **Jurist** |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | | As a representative of CRCA, he appreciated the invitation and considered it a valuable opportunity to highlight and discuss closely the issues that citizens face. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | * Emphasized the importance of increasing citizens' trust in access tojustice * Attachedimportancetothepartofthedelayencounteredinrelationtothelawdraftingand implementationphase. * Suggested the creation of mechanisms to measure the implementation oflegislation. * In certain districts, citizens face the impossibility of law enforcement due to lack of capacity or other problems. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | | **Julia Mulla** | | | | **Organization / Affiliation:** | | | **Legal Aid Directory Free** | | | | | | **Position:** | | **Specialist** |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | | expressed gratitude and appreciation for the cooperation and considered it as a good opportunity to have bridges between civil societies and result until the last step of the process. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | * Currently, there are 6 cooperation agreements with 6 clinics, where the Faculty of Lawhas been among the first to expressinterest. * Within this year, a meeting is planned with all clinics as a result of fullercooperation. * 5 centers are active in providing services, where it is intended within this year to be functional and other centers, specifically near the cities of Pogradec, Gjirokastra,etc. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STAKEHOLDERATTENDANCE** | | | | |
|  | **Name** | **Organization / Affiliation** | **Position** | **Email** |
| **1** | Petrina Broka | Faculty of Law | Representative e Law  Clinic | [petrina.br@gmail.com](mailto:petrina.br@gmail.com) |
| **2** | Drita Avdyli | National Chamber of  Mediators | President of the National Chamber of Mediation | [dritaavdyli@dhkn.gov.al](mailto:dritaavdyli@dhkn.gov.al) |
| **3** | Ina Hiri | Institute of Roma Culture  in Albania | Representative | [inahiri@gmail.com](mailto:inahiri@gmail.com) |
| **4** | Nekida Baha | Center for Protection of the Rights of the Child in  Albania | Lawyers | [nekida.baha@gmail.com](mailto:nekida.baha@gmail.com) |
| **5** | Jozef Shkamb i | [Center for the Protectionof the Rights of the Child](https://www.crca.al/sq)  [in Albania](https://www.crca.al/sq) | Lawyer | [fla@crc.com](mailto:fla@crc.com) |
| **6** | Xhulia Mulla | Directorate of Free Legal  Aid | Specialist | [Xhulia.mulla@rejtësia.gov.al](mailto:Xhulia.mulla@rejtësia.gov.al) |
| **7** | Ilir Aliaj | Center for Development and Democratization of Institutions | Executive Director | [Ilir.aliaj @ qzhdi-alb.org](mailto:Ilir.aliaj@qzhdi-alb.org) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Access to Justice - CONSULTATION 3** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Consultation Details** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy Goal Focus | | | | | | | | | | | | | Build an open government that ensures its citizens access to justice, transparency and accountability. | | | | | | |
| Lead Focal Point Institution | | | | | | | | | | | | | Directorate of Policies and Strategies in the Field of Justice. | | | | | | |
| Date | | | | | | | | | | | | | 13 October 2020 | | | | | | |
| Consultation Meeting Number | | | | | | | | | | | | | Third consultative meeting | | | | | | |
| **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **What was the aim of this consultation? Please answer for all that apply** | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | | |
| (i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policygoal | | | | | | | | | | | | | After the first and second consultative meeting with stakeholders, the purpose of which was to present the Draft Component Action Plan no. 3 “Access to Justice” partoftheOpenGovernmentPartnership2020-2022and receivingopinions/suggestionsfromparticipants.Inthe third meeting, concrete steps were taken towards the ideasproposedbythestakeholdersaswellasdiscussions  / analysis of the measures foreseen in the draft action plan. | | | | | | |
| (ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | | | | | | | | | | | | | International expert Ms.Courtney McLaren conducted a brief summary of the stages carried out from the previous two meetings and stressed the importance of the ideas proposed by stakeholders being as close as possible to meeting the requirements according to standardssetbytheOGP.Ms.McLarenstressedthatthe measures must be measurable, respond respectively to each objective, be verifiable and achievable within the requireddeadlines. | | | | | | |
| (iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | third meeting as an effect of the presencessof addedreferred to two meetingsconducted were engagement contribution andeffectiveto the expression of proposals addressing specific issues. | | | | | | |
| (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | The participants discussed andexpressin their opinions about the draft action plan focusing on the analysis of measures intended to improve it. | | | | | | |
| (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mainly, the suggestions from Ms. Arianita Brahaj (Representative of the Albanian Institute of Sciences) were considered very detailed and valuable focusing on proposals that will increase access to justice and transparency.  The proposals of Ms. Petrina Broka (Lecturer and Representative of the Law Clinic) which, referring to previous meetings, again placed emphasis on the inclusion and provision of opportunities for students to elaborate on important processes implemented by the Albanian government.  Z.Jozef Shkambi representatives of husband,civil  CRCA rise was involved in discussions about the main activitiestobeundertakenDNJFand/ortheMinistryof | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | Justice within the framework of the measure for the training and formation of legal services providers.  Also, Znj.Xhulia Mulla was activated ins phresponsets tquestionsderived fromt t attendantswho addressed to the Directorate T Helpinstitution'sFree Legal. | | | | | | |
| (vi) Gather feedback on Proposed policy goals | | | | | | | | | | | | | Psrepresentatives on issues ofh-chairsof tgroupsh tinterest that werepresent,MBshteten main policy which has phr aimed at building an open government that assures its citizens access to justice , transparency and accountability and then focused on paying attention to the suggestions given in the context of improving existing measures. | | | | | | |
| (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals | | | | | | | | | | | | | Prioritization of specific objectives was given due importance referring to the two previous meetings, consequently in the third consultative meeting light was cast on concrete measures. | | | | | | |
| (viii) Other (provide details) | | | | | | | | | | | | | N / A | | | | | | |
| **II. Methodology** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | | |
| (i) PresentationsThe | | | | | | | | | | | | | meeting was conducted online through the Webex platform.  Ms. Elona Hoxha from the Ministry of Justice made a brief presentation of all the steps taken up to the current stage emphasizing the importance of ideas / proposals expressed by stakeholders to successfully finalize the process.  Expert Ms McLaren during the presentation focused on meeting the standards and expectations set by the OGP. | | | | | | |
| (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | In the third meeting held, the presence of stakeholders  was increased, as a result of which the meeting was productive in achieving the intended goal. | | | | | | |
| (iii) Questions and answers | | | | | | | | | | | | | during the meeting they discussed specific questions primarily addressedDirectorate to AidofLegal t swhich  were followed byresponses phrespectivehp from thehrfaqesues totheinstitution. | | | | | | |
| (iv) Brainstorming | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Selection** | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | | |
| (i) How were stakeholdersselected? | | | | | | | | | | | | | Inremembranceoftheprevioustwomeetings,thelistof stakeholders was used, which included civil society, academics / professors of state and private universities who exercise their activity with direct links to the legal system. A part of the groups that were present in the previous two meetings followed with interest the third consultative meeting, giving their contribution by discussing and analyzing the measures foreseen in the OGP actionplan. | | | | | | |
| (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | | | | | | | | | | | | | Stakeholders were informed of the OGP web address and the link to access the materials designed for component no.3. Contact for the organization of the third consultative meeting was maintained through e- mail contact. | | | | | | |
| (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | | | | | | | | | | | | | In total about 25 interest groups were contacted. | | | | | | |
| (iv) Was the consultation announced publicly? (via websites, social media, etc.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ministry ofstraightsishas published inits officialwebsite Facebook to developmeeting.the firstconsultative  Mafter ns nextEsi bethe secondmeeting and tothe third material ns psrespectivehas tof each meeting | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | arepublished inThe face of OGP, where interest groupsKan hadbeatasin of access. | | | | | | |
| (v) Were stakeholdersreminded? | | | | | | | | | | | | | Remindere-mailsweresenttotheparticipantsandsome ofthemwhohadpromisedtheirpresencewerecontacted byphone. | | | | | | |
| **III. Results / Findings** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Contributions** | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | | |
| (i) How many stakeholdersattended? | | | | | | | | | | | | | In the third consultative meeting there was an increased presence of stakeholders who have not participated in previousmeetingsandwereinvolvedandexpressedtheir  comments on the process. | | | | | | |
| (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | | | | | | | | | | | | | Participantsdiscussedandexpressedthecontinuationof their opinions based on the previous two meetings.New ideas and proposals were also put forward by representatives of interest groups which are intended to be concluded in concretemeasures. | | | | | | |
| (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | Representatives of stakeholders mentioned some key issues identified, which were mainly related to the support of Law Clinics; moreconcretizationT detailedT plan;T action electronic service concept. | | | | | | |
| (iv) Main recommendations from stakeholders? | | | | | | | | | | | | | At issue was highlightedMBgroups in the United Needs of theDirectorate ss HelpsFree Legal associated with functional structures which will make possible the realization of this service; capacity building through training for service providers; proposing the establishmentsof ah sheministering p magistrate.ert | | | | | | |
| **IV. Shortcuts Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | | |
| (i) Limitations in stakeholderattendance | | | | | | | | | | | | | Stakeholders who had confirmed participation were present. The high turnout will facilitate the process by concrete steps based onideas,thoughts and problems encountered by stakeholders. | | | | | | |
| (ii) Limitations in stakeholder participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | Almost all participants express their opinions, however it was requested for any intervention and concrete opinion can be sent to the email address. | | | | | | |
| (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | | | | | | | | | | | | | Highlyregarded IRndssishmdiscussion and analysis of themeasuresenvisagedinthedraftPlanthactionpsrhad a positive impact on elementthreekey t tof the process, access,transparencyof andllogaridhhnie. | | | | | | |
| (iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | | | | | | | | | | | | | Krjijimi of abridge th phimportance of commonTbetween tstakeholders andministry s straightsisloves t affect nan dNien proposals and contributions thatsbeginning psupgradeSimior n conclusionconcrete measures. | | | | | | |
| **STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | | **Petrina Broka** | | | | **Organization / Affiliation:** | | | **Faculty of Law** | | | | **Position:** | | **Lecturer and Representative of the Law Clinic at the Faculty of Law** | | | |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | | Ms. Broka, following the previous consultative meetings, reiterated the importance of the opportunity given to stakeholders to express issues and speak under the voice of citizens, recalling the proposals discussed in the second consultative meeting. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | * Reaffirmed the importance of establishing dialogue and more frequent consultations between the Law Clinic and the Directorate of Free LegalAid. * Ms. Broka's proposal remains to involve and provide opportunities to students regarding projects or initiatives undertaken by the Albaniangovernment. * ReferringtotheonlineplatformsetupbytheDirectorate ofFreeLegalAid,itwasdiscussedabout the selection of citizens who seek free legalaid. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | **Jozef Shkambi** | | | | | | | **Organization / Affiliation:** | | | **Center for the Protection of Children's Rights in Albania** | | | | **Position:** | | **Jurist** |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback Mr.*** | | | | | Shkambi, representative of CRCA, in the continuation of the two meetings held, decided again in the form of questions addressed to the Directorate of Free Legal Aid regarding the main activities that DNJF will undertake within the measure for training and formation of providers of free legal aid. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | * Suggested training of all employees at the Free Legal Aid servicecenters. * As part of the measure for training and formation of providers of free legal aid service, suggested focusing on training of non-profitorganizations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | | **Julia Mulla** | | | | **Organization / Affiliation:** | | | **Directorate of Free Legal Aid, at the Ministry of Justice** | | | | | | **Position:** | | **Legal Specialist** |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | | Ms. Mulla thanked the participants for their cooperation and proposals addressed to the Directorate of Free Legal Aid. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | * Newalizoi ane phSUMMARY stressing that the proposed measures to implement the priority measures are mainly related to three very important components for the functioning and administration of state guaranteed legalaid. * Reaffirmed the importance of capacity building and cooperation, mentioning here the current operationoftheonlineplatformaswellasthecontinuityofworktocreateanotherelectronicsystem which will be a data generator for all service providers by elaborating the mentioned suggestion. by Mrs.Brahaj. * Mentionedthetrainingofallstaffatthecenters incooperationwithUNDP.Withinthismonthwill continue with the cooperation and concrete meeting with law clinics and then the focus will be on training of non-profitorganizations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

***Other Comments***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name:** | | | **Aranita Brahaj** | | | **Organization / Affiliation:** | **Representative of the Albanian Institute of Sciences** | | **Position:** | | **President of the Albanian Institute of Sciences** |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback Mr.*** | | | | Brahaj considered the valuable opportunity offered to stakeholders to be participants and to express themainproblemsencounteredincarryingouttheiractivities.Ms.Brahajalsoproposedthecreation of an electronic register for magistrates, judges and prosecutors as a measure of access to justice. Ms. Hoxha, after being aware of this proposal, explained that this register is the competence of the HJCandcurrentlyexistsbutnotonline,asit containspersonaldataformagistratesandthusviolates the right to privacy of the person. However, it was agreed with the participants that this could be a very good measure of the new cross-cutting Justice Strategy, the work for which has started by the ministry staff. This is because the strategy will involve more institutions and will last a long time 5 years. | | | | | | | |
| ***Suggested Ideas*** | | | | * Putemphasisonmoredetailedconcretizationoftheplantoactionbyphrmendurplatformonlinenth created by the Directorate ofAssistanceFreeLegals. * Putting into operation the electronic system ofmagistrates. | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | |  | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **STAKEHOLDERATTENDANCE** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Name** | | | **Organization / Affiliation** | | | **Position** | | **Email** | | |
| **1** | Petrina Broka | | | Faculty of Law | | | Pedagogue and Representative of the Law  Clinic | | [petrina.br@gmail.com](mailto:petrina.br@gmail.com) | | |
| **2** | Aranita Brahaj | | | Representative of the Albanian Institute ofSciences | | | Presidentialof the Institute of Sciences | | [Aranita.brahaj@ais.al](mailto:Aranita.brahaj@ais.al) | | |
| **3** | Erjona Capani | | | Protection of Persons with Disabilities | | | Lawyer | | [erjoncapani@gmail.com](mailto:erjoncapani@gmail.com) | | |
| **4** | Nekida Baha | | | Center for the Protection of the Rights of the Child in Albania | | | Lawyers | | [nekida.baha@gmail.com](mailto:nekida.baha@gmail.com) | | |
| **5** | Jozef Shkambi | | | [Center for the Protectionof the Rights of the Childin Albania](https://www.crca.al/sq) | | | Lawyer | | [fla@crca.com](mailto:fla@crca.com) | | |
| **6** | Xhulia Mulla | | | Directorate of Legal Aid Free | | | Legal Specialist | | [Julia.mulla@travel.gov.al](mailto:Julia.mulla@travel.gov.al) | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Access to Justice -CONSULTATION4** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Consultation Details** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy Goal Focus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Build an open government that provides its citizens with access to justice, transparency and accountability. | | | | |
| Lead Focal Point Institution | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Directorate of Policies and Strategies in the Field of Justice. | | | | |
| Date | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 21 October 2020 | | | | |
| Consultation Meeting Number | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fourth consultative meeting | | | | |
| **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **What was the aim of this consultation? Please answer for all that apply** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | |
| (i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policygoal | | | | | | | | | | | | | | In cooperation with stakeholders, consultative meetings were held in order to draft the Action Plan of Component no. 3 “Access to Justice” part of the Open Government Partnership 2020-2022. The concluding meeting was the fourth consultative meeting, part of which were the discussions on concrete proposals / comments / suggestions on which the stakeholders had conducted on the action plan. Also,Znj.Hoxha  costrndofhow civil society involvement in drafting and revising measures / activities of this plan. | | | | |
| (ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ms. Elona Hoxha conducted a brief summary of the entire process, starting from the pre- consultation report to the fourth consultative meeting. Reflected on the participants the proposals / comments made by them in the framework of the review of the Draft ActionPlan. | | | | |
| (iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | At the last meeting, participants focused inproposals and concrete suggestions tomade be after meetingthe third consultative, which had been sent to the relevantaddress. | | | | |
| (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | N / A | | | | |
| (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ms. Petrina Broka (Lecturer and Representative of the Law Clinic) in the framework of the meetings held, has shown the willingness to be active in the process of drafting draft action plan expressing suggestions and comments. Specifically: Ms. Broka emphasizes the strengthening of inter- institutional cooperation between the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and public institutions / national and international organizations as well as civil society actors. A very good contribution in the training of the target groups would be given by the LawClinicattheFacultyofLaw,UT,whichhas  the necessary human and infrastructuralcapacities | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | for the realization of the trainings. For this reason it is stated that it should be included in the institutions that can contribute in this regard.  Mr. Erjon Capani representative, Protection of Persons with Disabilities, joined the discussion expressing consent regarding the comment of Ms. Broka and the proposal made by the Directorate of Free Legal Aid, reiterating that it supports all discussions and proposals of realized in previous meetings.  Also, Ms. Julia Mulla, in the framework of the priority measure and in accordance with the comments made by Ms. Broka continues with the presentation of the proposal of a new measure: Establishment of the Inter-Institutional Forum for legal aid guaranteed by the state with the technical secretariat in the Directorate of Free Legal Aid. | | | | |
| (vi) Gather feedback on Proposed policy goals | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Psrepresentatives on issues ofh-chairsof tstakeholders early in the process have supported key policy that provides citizens access to justice, transparency and accountability, proposing in this way in accordance with the specific objectives of action / activity concrete, measurable and feasible. | | | | |
| (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals | | | | | | | | | | | | | | During the meetings held, the prioritization of specific objectives was given importance, consequently in the fourth consultative meeting the stakeholders had the clearest comments on new proposals or improvement ofactivities. | | | | |
| (viii) Other (provide details) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | N / A | | | | |
| **II. Methodology** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | |
| (i) Presentations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Due to the impossibility of conducting a physical meeting as a result of the pandemic, the meeting was conducted online through the Cisco Webex platform.  Participants were introduced to the main policy in the meetings held. The fourth meeting focused on discussing and presenting the proposals submitted by the participants. | | | | |
| (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | nthe meeting of thefloorRTConsultative of the interest groups that were partofmaking discussed activities which were focused mainlycooperation; interagency training of target groups; providing an efficient and effective form of legal aid which  provides citizens in need with full access to this service. | | | | |
| (iii) Questions and answers | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes, during the meeting there were discussions on which questions-answers may arise in the framework of comments and suggestions made by those present. Questions were addressed regarding the activity of the Free Legal Aid Directorate. In this focus, Ms. Julia Mulla, representative of the Directorate of Free Legal Aid was active in  answering questions. | | | | |
| (iv) Brainstorming | | | | | | | | | | | | | | N / A | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Selection** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | |
| (i) How were stakeholdersselected? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Stakeholders were selected based on the listof civil societies / groups.  The participants who attended the third consultative meeting, were also present at the last consultative meeting whose purpose was to benefit from civil society concrete proposals which can be included in the draft OGP Action Plan. | | | | |
| (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Participants were introduced after the first meeting with the process, he is sent to their emailp**h**addressrkatës of access to materials. For each consultation meeting stakeholders are kept in constant contact to share any information about the meetings and materials. | | | | |
| (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | In total about 25 interest groups were contacted. | | | | |
| (iv) Was the consultation announced publicly? (via websites, social media, etc.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | In official OGP website arepublished toall materials / pInformationrkatëset any consultative meeting beconducted, where interest groupsKan can haveSinfor access to and recognized by afër. | | | | |
| (v) Were stakeholdersreminded? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Attendees received reminder emails on the last consultative meeting. | | | | |
| **III. Results / Findings** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Contributions** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | |
| (i) How many stakeholdersattended? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | The participants of the third meeting were part of  the continuity of the process which coincided with the fourth and last consultative meeting. | | | | |
| (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | The participants after the end of the third consultative meeting, had considered the submitted materials, expressing themselves with initiatives and comments regarding measures / activities which aim at their inclusion in the current or future actionplan. | | | | |
| (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | During the meeting, the representatives emphasized the inter-institutional cooperation between the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and civil society actors in the framework of access to justice; Involvement of the Law Clinic in the training of target groupsetc. | | | | |
| (iv) Main recommendations from stakeholders? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | The discussion focused on the concrete proposals undertaken by the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and the comments made by Ms. Broka. | | | | |
| **IV. Short Borders Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | |
| (i) Limitations in stakeholderattendance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Participants who had confirmed their participation were present by joining the meeting to discuss the proposals and comments made by them. | | | | |
| (ii) Limitations in stakeholder participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Interested groups were requested to send additional suggestions / interventions / ideas to the relevant email addresses to be considered for inclusion in the actionplan. | | | | |
| (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Forfshirja of stakeholders nh khth process has had | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | a positive impact as a result of their contribution with suggestions / concrete initiatives focusing on the main problems encountered during their activity. | | | | |
| (iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | N / A | | | | |
| **STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | | | **Petrina Broka** | | | | **Organization / Affiliation:** | | **Faculty of Law** | | | | | **Position:** | | **Lecturer and Representative of the Law Clinic at the Faculty of Law** | |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | | | Ms. Broka expressed gratitude for the invitation and attention paid to stakeholders in this important process that concerns the drafting of the action plan regarding component no. 3, “Access to Justice” of the Open Government Partnership 2020-2022. Znj.Broka concrete ideas expressedduring consultation meetings be conducted. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | | * Emphasized the strengthening of inter-institutional cooperation between the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and public institutions / national and international organizations as well as civil society actors in the framework of strengthening access to justice says that it would be more fruitful if the above mentioned cooperation it would not be just between the Free Legal Aid Directorate and the actresses mentioned on the otherside. * A very good contribution in the training of the target groups would be given by the Law Clinic at the Faculty of Law, UT, which has the necessary human and infrastructural capacities for the realization of thetrainings. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | | **Erjon Capani** | | | | | | **Organization / Affiliation:** | | **Protection of Persons with Disabilities** | | | | **Position:** | | **Lawyer** | |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback Mr.*** | | | | | | Capani, joined the discussion expressing consent regarding the comment of Ms. Broka and the proposal made by the Directorate of Free Legal Aid, reiterating that it provides support for all discussions and proposals realized in previous meetings. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | | | **Julia Mulla** | | | | **Organization / Affiliation:** | | **Directorate of Free Legal Aid, at the Ministry of Justice** | | | | | **Position:** | | **Legal Specialist** | |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | | | Ms. Mulla in the framework of the consultative meetings held supported all the initiatives undertaken by the representatives of the interest groups in the realized consultative meetings and considered their proposals. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | | | * Establishment of the Inter-Institutional Forum for state-guaranteed legal aid with the technical secretariat in the Free Legal AidDirectorate. * Cooperation between institutions that provide access to justice should not be only through the institutions of the Ministry of Justice and the Directorate of Legal Aid but also within NGOs with eachother. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **STAKEHOLDER ATTENDANCE** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Name** | | | | | **Organization / Affiliation** | | | | | **Position** | | | | **Email** | | | |
| **1** | Petrina Broka | | | | | Faculty of Law | | | | | Pedagogue and  Representative of the Law Clinic | | | | [petrina.br@gmail.com](mailto:petrina.br@gmail.com) | | | |
| **2** | Erjona Capani | | | | | Protection of Persons with Disabilities | | | | | Lawyer | | | | [erjoncapani @ gmail.com](mailto:erjoncapani@gmail.com) | | | |
| **3** | Julia Mulla | | | | | Legal Aid Directorate Free | | | | | Legal Specialist | | | | [Julia.mulla@mindication.gov.](mailto:Julia.mulla@mindication.gov)al | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fiscal Transparency *-* CONSULTATION 1** | | | | | | | | |
| **Consultation Details** | | | | | | | | |
| Policy Goal Focus | | | | | Fiscal Transparency | | | |
| Lead Focal Point Institution | | | | | Ministry of Finance and Economy | | | |
| Date | | | | | 15 September 2020 | | | |
| Consultation Meeting Number | | | | | 1 | | | |
| **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | | | | | | | | |
| **What was the aim of this consultation? Please answer for all that apply** | | | | | **Details** | | | |
| (i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policygoal | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Yes, it was the aim of this consultation to introduce the stakeholders with the component fiscal transparency, which is led by Ministry of Finance and Economy and to explain the two Specific Objectives: Transparency on Budget and Transparency on Revenues and to ask for CSO’s contribution in order to identify the priority measures as part of these objectives. Transparency, public participation, and legislative oversight in the development of budgets creates better outcomes and are the main issues to better improve the citizen access on fiscal documents. Current challenges related to fiscal transparency have been identified mostly from international evaluations, and based on these findings, Albania should work more to increase fiscal transparency. MoFE prepared a PowerPoint presentation to introduce several priority measures related to fiscaltransparency. | | | |
| (ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Speaker on OGP topic. Delivered brief presentation on the OGP and Albania’s involvement to date.  Yes, it was the aim of this consultative meeting to introduce the stakeholders to the OGP initiative, to launch the process for starting to prepare the New Action Plan of OGP 2020-2022 and to invite all members to work and to promote openness and to identify priority measures to address the improvement on Transparency on Budget and Transparency on Revenues. Considering shortcomings identified by the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) 2018-2020 in the report Albania’s Progress on the Eligibility Criteria for OGP, one of the main issues that need efforts for improvement is Citizen Engagement. As well, the transparency has been part of the OGP action plan 2018-2020 and currently, we are working to address the existing challenges in the new OGP work plan 2020- 2022. | | | |
| (iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Several tools are used to promote the collaboration with citizen and to receive their feedback. The feedback tools to stakeholders we used are: Survey, OGP website, email. | | | |
| (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes  The meeting was focused on the items according to the | | | |
|  | | | | | previously defined agenda:   1. Notice for drafting the OGP Action Plan 2020- 2022\_Fiscal Transparency Component-moderated by DMRFP; 2. Brief presentation of the component structure - moderated byDMRFP; 3. Presentation of the purpose of each measure / policy proposed to be part of the 2020-2020 Action Plan- moderated by DMRFP and then each member of the working group explained what objective each of the proposed measures willhave; 4. InvitationofCSOstobringcontributions/proposals   - DMRFP invited representatives of CSOs present if they had comments, suggestions and opinions. There were no specific suggestions from the present representatives, only congratulations to the MFE in undertaking this process and congratulations for a good process.  In conclusion, before the end of the meeting, it was communicated to the Civil Society that there will be further consultative meetings and they were invited to follow up on their contributions and proposals. It was also requested to complete the survey published on the OGP website. | | | |
| (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | |
| (vi) Gather feedback on proposed policy goals | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes.  No specific feedback was received during this consultation, only some responses from pre consultation survey. | | | |
| (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes  It was only a presentation on several measures that were proposed based on internal evaluations, but being that no idea was discussed from CSO, it was no needed to prioritize at that moment. | | | |
| (viii)Other (provide details) | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | |
| **II.Methodology** | | | | | | | | |
| **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** | | | | | **Details** | | | |
| (i) Presentations | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Presentations on the topics discussed in Section I.  MoFE prepared a PowerPoint presentation to introduce priority measures related to fiscal transparency, which was share with the participants after the consultation. | | | |
| (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | | | | | * No /☒Yes   It was provide the opportunity for discussion but ne specific feedback was receive from CSOs. | | | |
| (iii) Questions and answers | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Opportunity for questions and answers and a specific session for CSOs comments was leave and they were invited to give any opinion but no comments were made, only some written messages to congratulate for this initiative and this consultation. | | | |
| (iv) Brainstorming | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | | |
| **Stakeholder Selection** | | | | | **Details** | | | |
| (i) How were stakeholdersselected? | | | | | CSOs selected are based on the interaction in the framework of PFM reform and considering all CSOs listed by the Agency for Support of Civil Society, focusing on the CSOs that might cover the state economic and finance issues. More specific, CSOs were chosen if their work was related to fiscal matters. Also, CSOs were also requested to invite any missing relevantstakeholders | | | |
| (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | | | | | Through email and OGP website | | | |
| (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | | | | | 55 | | | |
| (iv) Was the consultation announced publically? (via websites, social media, etc.) | | | | | * No /☒Yes   The consultation was published on the OGP website | | | |
| (v) Were stakeholders reminded? | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Stakeholders were reminded a few days before the event and in the meeting day and as well when it was sent the link to access in the virtual meeting. | | | |
| **III. Results/ Findings** | | | | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Contributions** | | | | | **Details** | | | |
| (i) How many stakeholders attended? | | | | | In this meeting participated:  Working group members, which are from Ministry of Finance and Economy and INSTAT, and 3 CSOs attended the consultation meeting:  2 experts from Gender Alliance for Development Center (GADC);  1 expert from Co-plan, and;  1 expert from o non-identified CSO. | | | |
| (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes  In the meeting they did not provide any idea, because the representative from 3 CSOs responded that they had completed the pre consultation survey, so they did not have any other comment. | | | |
| (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders | | | | | None | | | |
| (iv) Main recommendations from stakeholders? | | | | | None | | | |
| **IV. Shortcomings Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | **Details** | | | |
| (i) Limitations in stakeholderattendance | | | | | Stakeholder engagement on this governmental focus has been a challenge for years. Public trust in processes is still being established. COVID-19 may also be posing a greater challenge for awareness and participation as traditional means of in-person meetings are not possible. | | | |
| (ii) Limitations in stakeholder participation | | | | | Stakeholders who attend will need to feel they can contribute meaningfully and their voices heard. Lack of participation may suggest that stakeholders would prefer to learn more on this initiative and then to contribute infuture. | | | |
| (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | | | | | Promotion of consultation through social media channels, contacting key stakeholders for more contacts to approach and encourage stakeholders to invite colleagues. | | | |
| (iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | | | | | Emphasize that all contributions will be considered and made public and subjected to a transparent and egalitarian selection process. | | | |
|  | | | | |  | | | |
| **Stakeholder Feedback** | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** |  | **Organization/ Affiliation:** |  | | | **Position:** |  | |
| **Comments/ Issues Raised /Feedback/ Ideas** | | | | | | | | |
| * No specific comments, only some warm wards and congratulation on the process and initiative to promotefiscal transparency. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STAKEHOLDER ATTENDANCE** | | | | |
|  | **Name** | **Organization/ Affiliation** | **Position** | **Email** |
| **1** | Vanina Jakupi | MoFE | Working Group |  |
| **2** | Blerina Gjaci | MoFE | Working Group |  |
| **3** | Valion Cenalia | MoFE | Working Group |  |
| **4** | Kostandine Dorri | MoFE | Working Group |  |
| **5** | Jonida Fili | MoFE | Working Group |  |
| **6** | Anida Gjanci | MoFE | Working Group |  |
| **7** | Erisa Rodhani | MoFE | Working Group |  |
| **8** | Gentian Sinakoli | INSTAT | Working Group |  |
| **9** | Esmeralda Hoxha | CSO: Gender Alliance for Development  Center (GADC) | Project Coordinator | [hoxha.esmeralda@gmail.com](mailto:hoxha.esmeralda@gmail.com) |
| **10** | Marinela Seitaj | CSO: Gender Alliance for Development Center (GADC) | Coordinator | [marinela.seitaj@live.com](mailto:marinela.seitaj@live.com) |
| **11** | Merita Toska | Co-PLAN | Economic Development Expert | [co-plan@co-plan.org](mailto:co-plan@co-plan.org) |
| **12** | Anisa Feshti | OSHC |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fiscal Transparency *-* CONSULTATION 2** | |
| **Consultation Details** | |
| Policy Goal Focus | Fiscal Transparency |
| Lead Focal Point Institution | Ministry of Finance and Economy |
| Date | 30 September 2020 |
| Consultation Meeting Number | 2 |
| **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | |
| **What was the aim of this consultation? Please answer for all that apply** | **Details** |
| (i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policygoal | * No /☒Yes   Presented on the topic of fiscal transparency: (i) what is it and why it is important for Albania; (ii) the progress made to date on X,Y,Z topics; (iii) strategic aims of the ministry  Yes, it was the aim of this consultation to introduce the stakeholders with the component fiscal transparency, whichisledbyMinistryofFinanceandEconomyandto explain the two Specific Objectives: Transparency on Budget and Transparency on Revenues and to ask for CSO’s contribution in order to identify the priority measures as part of these objectives. As well, PMO held a presentation that was detailed on fiscal transparence issues and the initiative of different countries. Transparency, public participation, and legislative oversight in the development of budgets creates better outcomes and are the main issues to better improve the citizen access on fiscal documents. Current challenges relatedtofiscaltransparencyhavebeenidentifiedmostly from international evaluations, and based on these findings, Albania should work more to increase fiscal transparency. |
| (ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | * No /☒Yes   Speaker on OGP topic. Delivered brief presentation on the OGP and Albania’s involvement to date  Yes, it was the aim of this consultative meeting to introduce the stakeholders to the OGP initiative, to launchtheprocessforstartingtopreparetheNewAction Plan of OGP 2020-2022 and to invite all members to work and to promote openness and to identify priority measures to address the improvement on Transparency on Budget and Transparency on Revenues. Considering shortcomings identified by the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) 2018-2020 in the report Albania’s Progress on the Eligibility Criteria for OGP, one of the main issues that need efforts for improvement is Citizen Engagement. As well, the transparency has been part of the OGP action plan 2018-2020 and currently, we are working to address the existing challenges in the new OGP work plan2020-2022. |
| (iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | * No /☒Yes   Presented the feedback tools to stakeholders and presented examples to facilitate input  Several tools are used to promote the collaboration withcitizenandtheirengagement.Thefeedbacktools tostakeholdersweusedare:OGPwebsiteandsome  templatesformattedforCSOstointroducetheirideas. These formats were explained in thepresentation |
|  | during the meeting, it was published in the OGP website and also it was share via email. |
| (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | * No /☒Yes   Themeetingintendedtoallowforbrainstormingand feedback, even if the actual brainstorming did not take place. The meeting was focused on the items according to the previously definedagenda:   1. Notice for drafting the OGP Action Plan 2020- 2022\_Fiscal Transparency Component-moderatedby MoFE; 2. Detailed presentation of the OGP initiative, component structure and cases form different countries. moderated byPMO; 3. Invitation of CSOs to bring contributions / proposals –OGP coordinator invited representatives of CSOs present if they had comments, suggestions and opinions. There were no specific suggestions from the present representatives, only written messages to congratulate MoFE in undertaking this process and congratulations for a goodprocess.   In conclusion, before the end of the meeting, it was communicated to the Civil Society that there will be further consultative meetings and they were invited to follow up on their contributions and proposals. It was also requested to complete the survey already published on the OGP website. |
| (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| (vi) Gather feedback on proposed policy goals | ☒No / ☐Yes.  No specific feedback was received during this consultation. |
| (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals | ☒No / ☐Yes  No idea or comments were provided by CSO, so it was no needed to prioritize at that moment. |
| (viii)Other (provide details) | ☒No / ☐Yes |
| **II.Methodology** | |
| **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** | **Details** |
| (i) Presentations | * No /☒Yes   Presentations on the topics discussed in Section I.  PMO prepared a PowerPoint presentation to introduce the OGP initiative, component structure and cases form different countries and some priority measures related to fiscal transparency. |
| (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | ☒No / ☒Yes  The format did allow/have the opportunity for discussion, but that no discussion occurred. |
| (iii) Questions and answers | ☒No / ☐Yes  The format did allow/have the opportunity for questions and answers, but that no discussion occurred.Opportunityforquestionsandanswersand a specific session for CSOs comments was leave and they were invited to give any opinion but no  comments were made, only some writtenmessages |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | to congratulate for this initiative and this consultation. | | |
| (iv) Brainstorming | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | |
| **Stakeholder Selection** | | | | **Details** | | |
| (i) How were stakeholdersselected? | | | | CSOs selected are based on the interaction in the framework of PFM reform and considering all CSOs listed by the Agency for Support of Civil Society, focusing on the CSOs that might cover the state economic and finance issues. More specific, CSOs were chosen if their work was related to fiscal matters. Also, CSOs were also requested to invite any missing relevant stakeholders | | |
| (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | | | | Through email, OGP website and by mobile contact. | | |
| (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | | | | 56 | | |
| (iv) Was the consultation announced publically? (via websites, social media, etc.) | | | | * No /☒Yes   The consultation was published on the OGP website | | |
| (v) Were stakeholders reminded? | | | | * No /☒Yes   Stakeholders were reminded a few days before the event and in the meeting day and as well when it was sent the link to access in the virtual meeting. | | |
| **III. Results/ Findings** | | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Contributions** | | | | **Details** | | |
| (i) How many stakeholders attended? | | | | In this meeting participated:  Working group members, which are from Ministry of Finance and INSTAT, PMO coordinator and 2 Organisations attended the consultation meeting:  2 experts from Project for PFM at Local Level;  Executive Director from European Movement Albania. | | |
| (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes | | |
| (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders | | | | None | | |
| (iv) Main recommendations from stakeholders? | | | | None | | |
| **IV. Shortcomings Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | **Details** | | |
| (i) Limitations in stakeholderattendance | | | | Stakeholder engagement on this governmental focus has been a challenge for years. Public trust in processes is still being established. COVID-19 may also be posing a greater challenge for awareness and participation as traditional means of in-person meetings are not possible. | | |
| (ii) Limitations in stakeholder participation | | | | Stakeholders who attend will need to feel they can contribute meaningfully and their voices heard. Lack of participation may suggest that stakeholders would prefer to learn more on this initiative and then to contribute infuture. | | |
| (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | | | | Promotion of consultation through social media channels, contacting key stakeholders for more contacts to approach and encourage stakeholders to invite colleagues. | | |
| (iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | | | | Emphasize that all contributions will be considered and made public and subjected to a transparent and egalitarian selection process. | | |
| **Stakeholder Feedback** | | | | | | |
| **Name:** |  | **Organization/ Affiliation:** |  | | **Position:** |  |
| **Comments/ Issues Raised /Feedback/ Ideas** | | | | | | |
| * No specific comments, only some written messages to congratulate on the process and initiative to promote fiscal transparency. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STAKEHOLDER ATTENDANCE** | | | | |
|  | **Name** | **Organization/ Affiliation** | **Position** | **Email** |
| **1** | Courtney MCLaren | PMO | PMO Expert |  |
| **2** | Gledis Gjipali | European  Movement Albania | Director Executive | [gledis.gjipali@em-al.org](mailto:gledis.gjipali@em-al.org) |
| **3** | Silvana Meko | PFM Project at local level | Expert | [Silvana.Meko@financat-](mailto:Silvana.Meko@financat-lokale.al)  [lokale.al](mailto:Silvana.Meko@financat-lokale.al) |
| **4** | Saimir Sollaku | PFM Project at local level | Expert | [Saimir.Sallaku@financat-](mailto:Saimir.Sallaku@financat-lokale.al)  [lokale.al](mailto:Saimir.Sallaku@financat-lokale.al) |
| **5** | Kostandine Dorri | MoFE | Working group |  |
| **6** | Jonida Fili | MoFE | Working group |  |
| **7** | Erisa Rodhani | MoFE | Working group |  |
| **8** | Gentian Sinakoli | INSTAT | Working group |  |
| **9** | Blerina Gjaci | MoFE | Working group |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fiscal Transparency-CONSULTATION 3** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Consultation Details** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy Goal Focus | | | | | | | | | | | Fiscal Transparency | | | | | |
| Lead Focal Point Institution | | | | | | | | | | | Ministry of Finance and Economy | | | | | |
| Date | | | | | | | | | | | 14 October 2020 | | | | | |
| Consultation Meeting Number | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| **I. Objective of Consultation Meeting** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **What was the aim of this consultation? Please answer for all that apply** | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | |
| (i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policygoal | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Yes, in this consultation the stakeholders were firstly introduce with the OGP initiative and the policy goal. As well it was presented the component fiscal transparency, which is led by Ministry of Finance and Economy and the two SpecificObjectives: Transparency on Budget and Transparency on Revenues. Transparency, public participation, and legislative oversight in the development of budgets creates better outcomes and are the main issues to better improve the citizen access on fiscal documents. Current challenges related to fiscal transparency have been identified mostly from international evaluations, and based on these findings, Albania should work more to increase fiscaltransparency. | | | | | |
| (ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Yes, it was the aim of this consultative meeting to introduce the stakeholders to the OGP initiative, and to ask for their feedback and contribution to prepare the New Action Plan of OGP 2020-2022, in order to promote openness and to identify priority measures to address the improvement on Transparency on Budget and Transparency on Revenues. Considering shortcomings identified by the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) 2018-2020 in the report Albania’s Progress on the Eligibility Criteria for OGP, one of the main issues that need efforts for improvement is Citizen Engagement. As well, the transparency has been part of the OGP action plan 2018-2020 and currently, we are working to address the existing challenges in the new OGP work plan 2020-2022. | | | | | |
| (iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Several tools are used to promote the collaboration with citizen and their engagement. The feedback tools to stakeholders we used are: OGP website 2 surveys: one for specific ideas and one for general ideas so CSOs could incorporate their ideas. These surveys are published in the OGP website and also they were share via email several times. | | | | | |
| (iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   In this meeting are provided several ideas from different CSO. | | | | | |
| (v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   The CSOs proposals/ideas are detailed in the specific | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | section Stakeholders feedback, but to summarize the  ideas provided are mostly related issues raised in the Local government level and some on central government. | | | | | |
| (vi) Gather feedback on proposed policy goals | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes | | | | | |
| (vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Event though, it was not a direct prioritization process, but more a list of measures was discussed. | | | | | |
| (viii)Other (provide details) | | | | | | | | | | | ☒No / ☐Yes  No needed to add other details here, because they are elaborated in specific sections. | | | | | |
| **II.Methodology** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **What was the format of the meeting?**  **How were stakeholders able to participate?** | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | |
| (i) Presentations | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Presentations on the topics discussed in Section I. MoFE held a PowerPoint presentation to introduce the OGP initiative, component structure and cases form  different countries and the draft action plan with  priority measures related to fiscal transparency. | | | | | |
| (ii) Discussion / Feedback from stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   Detailed in the section Stakeholder feedback. | | | | | |
| (iii) Questions and answers | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes | | | | | |
| (iv) Brainstorming | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Selection** | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | |
| (i) How were stakeholdersselected? | | | | | | | | | | | CSOs selected are based on the interaction in the framework of PFM reform and considering all CSOs listed by the Agency for Support of Civil Society, focusing on the CSOs that might cover the state economic and finance issues. More specific, CSOs were chosen if their work was related to fiscal matters. Also, CSOs were also requested to invite any missing relevant stakeholders. | | | | | |
| (ii) How were stakeholders contacted? | | | | | | | | | | | Through email, ministry Facebook webpage also promoted the event | | | | | |
| (iii) How many stakeholders were contacted? | | | | | | | | | | | 58 | | | | | |
| (iv) Was the consultation announced publically? (via websites, social media, etc.) | | | | | | | | | | | Through email, OGP website and by mobile contact. | | | | | |
| (v) Were stakeholders reminded? | | | | | | | | | | | Stakeholders were reminded a few days before the event and in the meeting day and as well when it was sent the link to access in the virtual meeting. | | | | | |
| **III. Results/ Findings** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Stakeholder Contributions** | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | |
| (i) How many stakeholders attended? | | | | | | | | | | | In this meeting participated:  Working group members, which are from Ministry of Finance and INSTAT, PMO coordinator and 2 Organisations attended the consultation meeting:  1 Expert form Co-PLAN, and  1 expert from EuroPartners Development Center | | | | | |
| (ii) Did stakeholders contribute? | | | | | | | | | | | * No /☒Yes   See section below | | | | | |
| (iii) Main issues identified by stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | 1. budget transparency at the local level and to simplify Citizen Budget atLGU; 2. budget transparency at the central level to simplify budget executionreports 3. to improve monitoring the concession authorities on the performancebases 4. Improve all PFM cycle at Local level andfocusing more on revenue mobilization, budget execution and transparency and accountability; | | | | | |
| (iv) Main recommendations from stakeholders? | | | | | | | | | | | To simplify budget documents and improve the quality of reports.  See section below for detailed information | | | | | |
| **IV. Shortcomings Identified & Preparations for Next Consultation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | **Details** | | | | | |
| (i) Limitations in stakeholderattendance | | | | | | | | | | | Stakeholder engagement on this governmental focus has been a challenge for years. Public trust in processes is still being established. COVID-19 may also be posing a greater challenge for awareness and participation as traditional means of in-person meetings are not possible. | | | | | |
| (ii) Limitations in stakeholder participation | | | | | | | | | | | Stakeholders who attend will need to feel they can contribute meaningfully and their voices heard.  Lack of participation may suggest that stakeholders would prefer to learn more on this initiative and then to contribute in future. | | | | | |
| (iii) What can be done to improve attendance? | | | | | | | | | | | Promotion of consultation through social media channels, contacting key stakeholders for more contacts to approach and encourage stakeholders to invite colleagues. | | | | | |
| (iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting? | | | | | | | | | | | Emphasize that all contributions will be considered and made public and subjected to a transparent and egalitarian selectionprocess. | | | | | |
| **STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Name:** | | | Jolanda Trebicka | | | **Organization/ Affiliation:** | | EuroPartners Developments Center | | | | **Position:** | | | Expert | |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | The expert outlined three specific points that could be considered in the government's further work to improve fiscal transparency:   1. The first recommendation was related to the transparency of the budget at the local level: following the work done by projects at the local level for the preparation of the document Citizen's Budget at the local level (Municipality), which has already been produced and published, but it was recommended to work for simplifying the language and presentation of the document to be understandable to anyaudience. 2. The second recommendation was related to budget transparency at the central level: Specifically, in the budget implementation phase, despite the work done in periodic publications of budget execution reports, it is important to continue working to simplify these reports to be understandable by the citizen and not just to budgetexperts. 3. The third recommendation was related to one of the previous recommendations left in the pre consultation survey of CSOs: 'publication of concession contracts', for which the work so far is assessed and which are published in the register of concession contracts, but more work had to be done for monitoring the concession authorities on the basis ofperformance. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | Work is in progress to increase the number of contracts that will be monitored periodically. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | Creating the opportunity for access to materials for all interested parties, consequently the materials developed and presented, is suggested that in the following phases to be in Albanian language. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | After receiving these ideas, the MoFE coordinator thanked the expert and after that summarized the contribution and stated that these ideas will be reviewed in order to address possible measures as part of the NAP OGP 2020-2022, meanwhile for the third issue raised, explained that starting from 2019, the MoFE role in monitoring concession contracts has been strengthen, since the entry into force of the amended Law 'For PPP and Concessions'. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|
| **Name:** | | Merita Toska | | | | | **Organization/ Affiliation:** | | Co-PLAN | | | | **Position:** | | | Economic Development Expert |
| ***Issues Raised*** | | | | The expert practically addressed four main points / pre-conditions that need to be worked on:   1. *Operability of Municipalities* in the AGFIS System. It was considered that currently, major of the municipalities, except Tirana, the other continue to process physical documents, as well as to keep financial statements in excel sheets (or rarely in financial programs such as alpha, finance 5, etc.). Therefore, it was suggested that initially work to be done for the access of local budget institutions intoAGFIS. 2. *Unique accounting system* - stressed the need and importance that all municipalities should use and apply the same accounting standards, as this causes further problems for tracking, auditing and monitoringinformation. 3. The taxpayer system should be the same for all municipalities, as different municipalities treat the taxes they managedifferently. 4. Publication and access to the Government Financial Statistics data to the public, illustrating with the case of BoA system which presents and publishes statistics in a structured and comprehensiblemanner. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Feedback*** | | | | As a conclusion before the closing of the meeting it was agreed that the present and contributing Civil Societies will bring the proposals and in writing via email or questionnaire to be documented as evidence for the consultationprocess.  It was also agreed that the following documents will be forwarded by email as proceeded up to this stage and will be published on the OGP website in accordance with visibility principle. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Ideas Suggested*** | | | | Mrs. Toska proposed how this initiative can be effective, and in this regard the work should start from diagnosing problems in the first stages and not in the last, which is monitoring and auditing, so some pre-conditions must be met to promote and increase the fiscal transparency. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Other Comments*** | | | | The OGP Coordinator thanked for the issues addressed and noted that some of these suggestions are part of the proposed measures and will be addressed in the future to be addressed in the action plan. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **STAKEHOLDERATTENDANCE** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Name** | | | | **Organization/ Affiliation** | | | | | **Position** | | | | **Email** | | |
| **1** | Anida Gjanci | | | | MoFE | | | | | Working group | | | |  | | |
| **2** | Courtney McLaren | | | | PMO | | | | | PMO consultant | | | |  | | |
| **3** | Erisa Rodhani | | | | MoFE | | | | | Working group | | | |  | | |
| **4** | Jolanda Trebicka | | | | EuroPartners Developments Center | | | | | Expert | | | | [europartners@europartners](mailto:europartners@europartners.al)  [.al](mailto:europartners@europartners.al)[info@europartners.al](mailto:info@europartners.al) | | |



|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | Jonida Fili | MoFE | Working group |  |
| **6** | Merita Toska | Co-PLAN | Economic Development  Expert | [co-plan@co-plan.org](mailto:co-plan@co-plan.org) |
| **7** | Kostandine Dorri | MoFE | Working group |  |
| **8** | Blerina Gjaci | MoFE | Working group |  |

Responses from survey ‘General Ideas’ are presented below

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Timestamp** | **12-10-2020 10:51:23 AM (Response 1)** | | | | **12-10-2020 10:58:11 PM (Response 2)** | | | |
| **What do you think are the most important issues the Albanian Government should prioritize to improve fiscal transparency and why?** | -citizen participation;  -set clear targets management  -the role of auditing process | and in | performance the budgetary | | Public private partnerships agreements and detailed budget should be produced, civic education on fiscal transparency and all governmental institutions in charge for reporting on fiscal transparency should produce user friendly reports with clear and  understandable language for an average citizen | | | |
| **1.1 Briefly describe the overall idea** | Public participation refers to the variety of ways in which the public – including citizens, civil society organizations, community groups, business organizations, academics, and other non-state actors – interact directly with public authorities on fiscal policy design and implementation. The interactions range from one-off consultation, through face to face deliberation, to ongoing and  institutionalized relationships | | | | Every central and local institution should publish on their webpage the detailed budget followed by every procurement they have proceed with, every revenue, expenditures, public information about the salary system and other beneficial status their employeeshave. | | | |
| **1.2 What is the problem the idea will address?** | The citizen participation in executive budget preparation is less than it should be. | | | | Corruption Perception that citizens have on governmental bodies will be lower if every citizen would have access on fiscal information, furthermore, the level of transparency would  increased | | | |
| **1.3 Main objective of idea** | To make the right to public participation more practical and meaningful, it should be implemented a program to strength citizen engagement.  Civil society organizations engaged in budget-focused work contribute to public expenditure management and oversight in  several ways. | | | | increase the public trust with regard to government work | | | |
| **2.1 Briefly describe the overall idea** | Set clear targets management | and | performance | | Create an independent network comprised of CSO-s and citizens with knowledge on fiscal transparency to monitor the governmental institutions and their  budgeting process | | | |
| **2.2 What is the problem the idea will address?** | Sometimes there are not clear targets during  the budget process formulation, so there is a need to accomplish this thing. | | | | increase the transparency | citizen | participation | in | fiscal |
| **2.3 Main objective of idea** | To even further increase budget transparency, governments need to provide more comprehensive budget information. This can be an issue of a government's capacity, and so donors and civil society can support progress by providing technical  assistance. | | | | Fight the corruption perception | | | |
| **3.1 Briefly describe the overall idea** | The role of auditing in the budgetary process | | | |  | | | |
| **3.2 What is the problem the idea will address?** | I think that in Albania should strength the role of auditing in the budgetary process. It is very important to control how well the government executed the decisionsand | | | |  | | | |
|  | plans in the budget. | | |  | | | | |
| **3.3 Main objective of idea** | Role of auditing provide one of the few sources of critical and independent information on the impact of the budget on public wellbeing and economic  development. | | |  | | | | |
| **Name/Surname** | S.D | | | Blerta Kalavace | | | | |
| **Name of Organization** | University of Tirana | | | Institute for Development, Research and  Alternatives; | | | | |
| **What kind of institution are you**  **affiliated with** | University | | | Development NGO; | | | | |
| **What is the primary aim of your institution?** | Academic | | | IDRA promotes the values of freedom and democracy, free market economy, and civil society, and continuously serving the democratization of the Albanian society and the process of integration into  the European Union. | | | | |
| **Please provide any feedback on how we can support more participation and engagement from civil society on this and other initiatives** | I suggest to create an 'intermediate organization' that can to link citizens with government in cases of budget process formulation.  In many developing countries, citizens prefer not to contact government officials with complaints (due to the fear of harassment from corrupt officials) and are more comfortable dealing with non-governmental organizations to address such issues. For that reason I suggest this specifically 'intermediate organization ', to increasethe  civil society engagement. | | | Invite Civil Society in decision making and policy making; | | | | |

1. The Institute for Democracy and Mediation (IDM) is an Albanian independent non-governmental organization and think tank on governance, security, civil society development and EU integration [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. <https://www.shqiperiaqeduam.al/> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Established in 1992, the Open Society Foundation for Albania (OSFA) is an NGO within the network of Soros Foundations founded and financed by philanthropist George Soros. The OSFA uses monitoring and policy analysis, advocacy, litigation, and grassroots activism to help the country pursue democratization and EU integration to bring the country in line with EU standards for justice, public administration, anticorruption, governance, and human rights. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. World Justice Project, 2018 General Population Poll survey module on legal needs and access to justice. Data collected by IDRA Research & Consulting using a nationally representative probability sample of 1000 respondents in the country <https://worldjusticeproject.org/sites/default/files/documents/Albania.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Albania was scored 65/100 by the OBI in 2019 for budgetary oversight – the threshold for adequate oversight is 61/100 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. The OBI measures public access to information on how the central government raises and spends public resources and assesses the online availability, timeliness, and comprehensiveness of eight key budget documents [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. According to the OBI a fiscal transparency score of 61/100 or higher indicates a country likely publishes adequate information for informed public debate [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Discussed in further detail in the ‘Co-Creation’ Explanatory Note [↑](#footnote-ref-9)