



# ■ WeBER Indicator Summary

AREA: ACCOUNTABILITY

## MONTENEGRO

- **Author:** Institut Alternativa – IA
- **Date:** 13.12.2017.

<b>PAR Area</b>	<b>ACCOUNTABILITY</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>MONTENEGRO</b>
<b>SIGMA Principle</b>	<b>2. The right to access public information is enacted in legislation and consistently applied in practice</b>		

<b>WeBER Indicator</b>	<b>ACC_P2_I2: Proactive informing of the public by public authorities</b>
<b>Indicator approach</b>	
<p>This indicator focuses on the proactivity of public authorities in informing the public, particularly through comprehensiveness, timeliness and clarity of information disseminated through official websites. Indicator consists of 18 elements (sub-indicators), assessing relevant information against two groups of criteria: 1) completeness and up-to-date, 2) accessibility and citizen-friendliness. The element related to open data in public administration, as a proactive way of informing the public, is assessed using separate criteria. Analysis was done on the sample of seven central administration institutions, consisting of three line ministries, one ministry with general planning and coordination function, one government office/agency with CoG function, one subordinate body/agency and one government office/agency in charge of delivering services.</p>	
<b>Summary of the findings</b>	
<p>In explaining their scope of work, institutions mainly satisfy the criteria of completeness, but make no effort to use formulations other than those in the legal acts, gaining no points for citizen-friendliness. Information on lines of accountability of the institutions is lacking for the entire sample. As part of the standard template of the websites of institutions, most of the sample institutions have sections containing relevant policy documents and legal acts, although they vary greatly in how much they make sure that the available documents are the latest versions. On the other hand, publishing of analytical materials is much scarcer, with the most notable lack of publishing of regulatory impact assessments by the ministries.</p> <p>Annual reporting is regular and easily accessible, although there are exceptions in the subordinate institutions, which fail to publish annual information on their work and results or even re-publish the reports of the Ministries that they are a part of. With two exceptions, budgetary information is not published on the websites, and even where it is, updates are not regularly made following budget amendments. Most complete results have been registered regarding the presentation of contact details for each of the sample institutions. Organigrams presenting the structure of the institutions are not systematically available, and when they are, they are not always updated to the latest version of the institution's rulebook on organisation and systematisation.</p> <p>There is a sharp contrast between ministries and subordinate institutions in the way the information on ways in which they cooperate with civil society and other external stakeholders (including public consultation processes) is presented. Regarding open data, none of the observed institutions has published their databases in machine-readable formats, except for several specific reports of the Ministry of Finance.</p> <p>In measuring the degree of efforts of authorities to present their data and documents in a citizen-friendly way, little or no initiative has been registered. The sampled institutions do not strive to provide documents in a manner that would be more clear or understandable to ordinary citizens, in either the way the documents are presented on their websites, or the way the documents themselves are written.</p> <p>In general, most of the key documentation required for measuring this indicator has met the conditions of accessibility, being less than three clicks away from the homepage of the institution. This is due to the template structure of the governmental websites and a multitude of options in the main navigation as well as additional banners on the homepage.</p>	
<b>Specific observations</b>	
None.	

<b>Indicator score</b>	12 (out of 56 points)
<b>Final indicator value</b>	0 (scale 0 – 5) <sup>1</sup>
<b>Measurement period</b>	September 25 <sup>th</sup> – 29 <sup>th</sup> , 2017

<sup>1</sup> Conversion of points: 0-15 points = 0; 16-24 points = 1; 25-32 points = 2; 33-40 points = 3; 41-48 points = 4; 49-56 points = 5