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### SIGMA Principle

**11. Policies and legislation are designed in an inclusive manner that enables the active participation of society**

### WeBER Indicator

**PDC_P11_I1: Civil society perception of inclusiveness and openness of policymaking**

#### Indicator approach

The indicator measures the extent and the quality of involvement/contribution of the public to the policy making process through public consultations. Measurement of all elements of this indicator is based on a widely disseminated online survey of CSOs to collect their perception by answering questions for each element. The survey is performed on a sample, which aims to ensure a representation of CSOs working in as many research areas as possible, so the sample is as representative as possible. Focus groups are used to inform the narrative report with qualitative findings, but not for the calculation of indicator values. They are conducted on a sample of 3 policy areas in each country where a substantial number of CSOs/think tanks actively work and perform research and analyses, ensuring that policy areas where institutes and think tanks are active are selected.

#### Summary of the findings

In general, civil society perception in Serbia is unfavourable towards the existing practices consulting and involving the public into policy making. Firstly, formal consultation procedures do not necessarily provide conditions for effective involvement of the public given that less than third or surveyed CSOs (29%) responded with either strongly agree or agree that formal procedures do provide such conditions. Similarly, 23% agree that the governmental institutions consistently apply these formal procedures in their policy development.

When it comes to phase of involvement of CSOs in policy development, only around of 12% of CSOs believe that involvement in early phases of policy and legislative development takes place often or always. Further on, surveyed CSOs perceive there is a lack of timeliness in provision of necessary information on the content of legislative or policy proposals – 18% either agree or strongly agree that governmental institutions provide this information timely. Also, similar percentage of agreement is reported for adequacy of the information on the content of these proposals that is sent to CSOs, i.e. roughly 20% of surveyed CSOs.

Consistency in adherence to legally prescribed public consultation mechanisms and procedures is, again, negatively perceived by the surveyed CSOs. Just 13% of them state they are often or always consistently followed in practice. Moreover, representation of diverse interest groups in the public consultation process is not ensured enough by relevant ministries since just above 17% of surveyed CSOs state that diverse interest groups are represented either often or always.

Moreover, low frequency is reported by the CSOs when it comes to provision of written feedback to consultees by the relevant ministries. More specifically, below 12% state either often or always to the question on practice of provision of written feedback on acceptance or rejection of their inputs stemming from public consultations. In addition, even less percentage of surveyed CSOs (9.3%) state that relevant ministries accept the feedback coming from their organisations. Lastly, based on CSOs’ perception relevant ministries almost never conduct additional consultations outside of the formal scope of public consultations. In other words, slightly below 7% stated often in relation to this practice.

#### Specific observations

Survey of CSOs was administered through anonymous, online questionnaire. The data collection method included CASI (computer-assisted self-interviewing). For Serbia, N=183 CSOs were surveyed. The base for questions in this indicator was n=161 respondents.

#### Indicator score

0 (out of 30 points)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final indicator value</th>
<th>0 (scale 0-5)(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurement period</td>
<td>Survey of CSOs: April 23(^{rd}) – June 4(^{th}) 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Conversion of points: 0-6 points = 0; 7-10 points = 1; 11-15 points = 2; 16-20 points = 3; 21-24 points = 4; 25-30 points = 5.