



# ■ WeBER Indicator Summary

AREA: ACCOUNTABILITY

## BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

- **Author: Foreign Policy Initiative BH – FPI**
- **Date: 13.12.2017.**

|                        |   |                |            |
|------------------------|---|----------------|------------|
| <b>PAR Area</b>        | <b>ACCOUNTABILITY</b>   | <b>Country</b> | <b>BIH</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>Information on scope of work on websites of institutions is not completely stated and in line with description in legal acts for all sampled institutions. This information is easily accessible on the websites, but it is not consistently presented in a citizen-friendly manner, as majority of sample institutions do not adopt formal legal language. Within the section on Information Booklets, the sampled institutions provide complete and updated information on who they are accountable to, with one exception. Information on relevant policy documents and legal acts from their purview is complete, up to date and accessible for each sampled institution. This information is not regularly followed with textual explanations, so the lack of citizen-friendliness is evident for almost all institutions. Similarly, majority of websites (with two exceptions) contain up to date, accessible and citizen-friendly information on policy papers, studies and analyses relevant to policies.</p> <p>Almost half of the institutions do not publish information on annual reports on their work, but those that do, publish it on a regular basis and make them easily accessible, although they are not written in a citizen-friendly manner. It is noteworthy that institutions generally publish information on the institutions' budget (appropriation of funds) only within their financial reports, which are regularly made available. Practice of publishing citizen budget is non-existent for the sampled institutions.</p> <p>Contact information is fully published, with different contact channels stated in separate website sections, easily accessible online. Organisational charts with hierarchy of units are generally not in line with acts on internal structure and job positions (only two exceptions in the sample). In two cases, organisational information is defined as confidential. For most of the sampled institutions, organisational charts are generally presentable and in downloadable format (two exceptions).</p> <p>Information for cooperation with civil society organizations is generally available, though practices differ across institutions. It is of note that a centralized Online Platform for Public Consultations<sup>1</sup> is introduced, providing legislative action plans, consultation plans, information about consultations, list of interested organizations and individuals, names of officials in charge and contact information. The platform is not promoted by two sampled ministries, meaning that they do not invite the public to cooperate or give suggestions. Four institutions provide information as to which external stakeholders they cooperate with and in which fields, in line with the criterion on citizen-friendliness. Finally, institutions do not proactively publish datasets related to their work in open formats.</p> |   |
| <b>Specific observations</b>   |   |
| None.  |   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Indicator score</b>       | 22 (out of 56 points)   |
| <b>Final indicator value</b> | 1 (scale 0 – 5) <sup>2</sup>  |
| <b>Measurement period</b>    | September 25 <sup>th</sup> – 29 <sup>th</sup> , 2017 (except for FOI requests, sent on October 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2017) |

<sup>1</sup> <https://ekonsultacije.gov.ba/>

<sup>2</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