Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova-Republic of Kosovo
Qeveria e Kosovës-Vlada Kosova-Government of Kosova

MINISTRIA E ADMINISTRIMIT TË PUSHTETIT LOKAL
MINISTRASTVO ADMINISTRACIJE LOKALNE SAMOUPRAVE
MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

RULES OF THE PERFORMANCE GRANT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2019

Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova-Republic of Kosovo
Qeveria e Kosovës-Vlada Kosova-Government of Kosova

MINISTRIA E ADMINISTRIMIT TË PUSHTETIT LOKAL
MINISTRASTVO ADMINISTRACIJE LOKALNE SAMOUPRAVE
MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

Rules of the
PERFORMANCE GRANT
for the fiscal year 2019

June 2018

PREAMBLE

In 2017, the Ministry of Local Government (MLGA) of the Government of Kosovo (GoK) and the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) agreed to establish and finance a nation-wide performance grant for municipalities. The performance grant will have an annual budget of about 2.25 million euro available in the years 2018-2021. All 38 municipalities of Kosovo are eligible for the performance grant.

The performance grant is meant to stimulate competition amongst the municipalities in Kosovo in the understanding that all citizens in the country are entitled to benefit from equally well performing local governments. The performance grant is therefore designed in such a way that it provides incentives to municipalities to establish good local governance and promote local development. As much as the GoK is responsible to provide a conducive legal and financial environment for municipalities, within that frame, the initiative and effort to develop local communities should come from municipal institutions. Minimum conditions for municipalities to access the performance grant are (I) a solid financial administration and (II) a good expenditure rate of capital investments. This will ensure that the funds only go to municipalities that are able to absorb the performance grant which is provided as an addition to the capital investment part of the general grant.

Once municipalities qualify, the size of the grant will be determined by the relative scores of municipalities on a series of performance indicators. The performance indicators are a reflection of government policy objectives that aim to realise the overall vision of municipalities as '*vibrant democratic local government institutions that deliver quality services in response to citizen's needs and priorities'.* The performance indicators seek to draw municipal attention and to address specific observed weaknesses in realising this vision. All performance indicators should be and can be fulfilled by all municipalities in Kosovo, big or small, rich or poor, provided they make an effort.

This document sets out the context, the objectives and the rules for municipalities to receive the performance grant.

Table of contents

FOREWORD

In 2009, Kosovo was the first country in the region to adopt a performance-based grant scheme for allocating funds to municipalities as incentives for improving municipal governance. In late 2017, the Ministry of Local of Government Administration (MLGA), in partnership with the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC), developed and agreed to co-finance an upgraded scheme for allocating a performance grant to municipalities along with updated indicators.

The aim, the methodology and the plan for the implementation of the new and improved performance grant is laid out in this publication. It informs all relevant local-level stakeholders — including mayors of municipalities, chair persons of municipal assemblies, directors of municipal departments, municipal civil servants, municipal performance management system (PMS) coordinators, members of municipal assemblies, and constituents within municipalities of the rules and procedures of the performance grant.

The document also delineates the responsibilities of actors at the central level, including: (i) members of the Technical Group (chaired by the MLGA) responsible for the performance assessment and; (ii) the Performance Grant Commission, responsible for ratifying the rules of the performance grant and approving annual grant scores and allocations. The grant commission is composed of the General Secretary of the MLGA (Chair), the Budget Director from the Ministry of Finance, a representative from the Ministry of Public Administration, and a civil society organisation, whilst the director of SDC and a representative from the National Audit Office are observers in the Performance Grant Commission. The commission will act as an overseer of the Technical Group.

Between 2018 and 2021, at least 9 million euros will be allocated to municipalities as performance grants. The performance grants to municipalities will be allocated in line with scores for municipal performance, based on a number of indicators centred around three key priority areas: (i) democratic governance, (ii) municipal management, and (iii) integrity and transparency. Indicators are formulated in such a way that they are equally difficult (or easy) to achieve for all municipalities, irrespective of their size of population, territory, or economy.

I encourage all relevant local stakeholders to consider the performance grant as an opportunity through which to gain greater understanding of municipal performance (including areas of improvement and areas in need of improvement) and to engage in healthy competition with other municipalities in an effort to boost municipal capacity and efficiently and effectively provide quality public services for constituents.

The results of the performance evaluations will be publicly announced by the MLGA, and funds will be allocated to municipalities accordingly.

The performance grant will serve as a reward for positive municipal change but also as a tool to stimulate further competition and economic development, to encourage continued improvement and strengthened capacity vis-a-vis municipal governance, and to enhance levels of municipal transparency.

I thank the representatives of municipalities and local officials for their commitment to advancing the system of local self-government and municipal performance and to engaging in fruitful cooperation and competition with the aim of meeting the needs of their constituents.

IVAN TODOSIJEVIC

Minister of Local Government Administration

1. A PERFORMANCE GRANT - AN INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

Municipalities in Kosovo, as entities of decentralised local governance, have an important role in the organisation of the public sector. Apart from the obligation to provide a range of services, the real importance of municipalities is that, on the one hand, they are the first point of contact between citizens and the state and that, on the other hand, they provide an opportunity for citizens to participate in public sector decision making.

Compared to many other countries, municipalities in Kosovo are doing relatively well. Nevertheless, the need for further improvements still remains, considering that: the legal framework is only partly implemented, civil servants are insufficiently encouraged to develop their capacities, and personal relations still prevail over equitable access for all citizens to public services. Clientelism - both in areas of recruitment as well as in areas of service provision - is an often-heard complaint. At the same time, citizens often have the feeling that they are not listened to and that their suggestions and requests are often ignored. Politicians, elected to represent citizens in the day-to-day managing of public affairs have insufficient contact with their constituencies. Finally, municipalities are too often criticised for or associated with corrupt practices and the related lack of transparency.

To reach the government's objective of municipalities as vibrant democratic local institutions that deliver services in response to citizen's needs and priorities, the following topics are identified as priority themes to enhance municipal performance:

- Municipalities to function as ***local democratic institutions,*** where there is a strong municipal assembly that represents the citizens and that has the power to oversee the executive; whilst citizens have opportunity to raise concerns and suggestions that are seriously considered;
- Municipalities to have an ***effective and efficient municipal management***, that is neutral and impartial, treating all citizens in an equal manner whilst delivering services in response to citizen's priorities and needs;
- Municipalities to adhere to ***legal standards of transparency and integrity***, both in the legislative as well as the executive branches of the municipal organisation.

1.2. Objective

The objective of the performance grant is to provide municipalities with incentives that will stimulate them to further improve their performance in democratic governance, municipal management and transparency & integrity.

The performance grant incentivises municipalities in two ways: it, firstly, encourages municipal compliance with legal minimum standards (basic standards). Secondly, the grant stimulates 'real' performance that goes beyond ('mandatory') legal compliance.

1.3. Key topics

Given the analysis of critical factors, which are impeding municipalities to become 'vibrant democratic local service delivery institutions', the performance grant will focus on the following 3 themes:

- Democratic governance
- Municipal management
- Transparency and integrity

These 3 themes are further subdivided in 8 sub themes as shown in Table 1 below. Under these 8 themes, 27 performance indicators are identified (as shown in Table 2) that jointly allow municipalities to score 100 points on performance. The score, as will be explained in chapter 2, determines the size of the grant that a municipality annually gets on the basis of its performance.

Table 1: The 3 main and 8 sub-themes with maximum scores

Themes and sub-themes		Points to be obtained
1. Democratic Governance		**40**
I	Role of the municipal assembly as oversight body	20
II	Citizen participation and consultation	10
III	Inclusiveness	10
2. Municipal Management		**40**
IV	Human resource management	10
V	Financial management and audit	20
VI	Service delivery	10
3. Transparency and Integrity		20
VII	Access to information	10
VIII	Integrity	10
	Maximum number of points to be obtained	100

1.4. Geographical coverage

For the four financial years 2018-2021, municipal performance grant, as well as the accompanying technical assistance, will be available for all municipalities in Kosovo.

1.5. Strategic orientation

The performance grant shall be perceived as a grant from the Government of Kosovo. The strategic aim is to integrate the performance grant into the Kosovo legislation.

The performance grant that municipalities receive will flow through the governmental financial system (treasury) and be made available to municipalities as an addition to the capital investment part of the general grant, the size of which is determined based on a grant allocation formula that has variables like population size, area size, and ethnic composition, next to a fixed base amount[1].

For the spending of the performance grant, all the existing government rules (as applicable for capital investments under the general grant) apply, in terms of use of the grant, planning for the grant as well as reporting and accountability. That means municipalities do not have to submit project proposals. They can use the Kosovan tendering procedures, contracts and technical acceptance procedures. The grant will not be separately audited. The grant will be included in the audit of the National Audit Office. The performance grant is hence administered as a government grant to municipalities. The only added features are the minimum conditions and the performance indicators.

The performance grant for the following financial year will be communicated to municipalities by September each year[2]. This allows municipalities to plan the use of the performance grant as part of their normal planning and budgeting process.

Because the plan is to make the performance grant part of the Kosovan legal framework for fiscal decentralisation in the coming years, it should be aligned as much as possible to the current Kosovan government systems and administrative procedures.

Line ministries and donors that want to delegate responsibilities and related funds to local governments will be encouraged to align their grants with the provisions for the performance grant, that are based on measuring basic good governance. It would leverage both their own (sector) grant and the Performance grant. For example, the same Minimum Conditions could be used, maybe in combination with a minimum percentage of the performance score. Donors that want to invest in good governance issues will be encouraged to channel their funds directly into the basket fund for the performance grant.

1 The allocation formula for the general grant is defined in the law on local government finance (Law No. 03/ L-049)

2 n a normal year, there is one performance grant. In 2018, however, there are two performance grant cycles: one was in spring where the performance of 2016 was assessed for a grant to be released and used in 2018, and one to be done in summer assessing the performance of 2017 resulting in a grant to be released and used in 2019.

1.6. Structure and target audience

This document explains the policy behind the performance grant and informs about the rules for the grant.

Chapter 1 provided a short overview of the rationale of the municipal performance grant and its areas of focus. Chapter 2 outlines the minimum conditions, the performance indicators, and the principles of grant allocation and the auditing of the performance grant. Chapter 3 presents the process of assessing the municipal performance from data collection to grant allocation. The final Chapter 4 briefly discusses the link of the grant to capacity development and other issues of governance.

The annexes provide a more detailed scoring guide for the minimum conditions (annex 1) and for the performance indicators (annex 2), with a definition of what is measured, where the data come from, how it is measured and how the performance points are allocated. Annex 3 provides a template for a scorecard that will be used to communicate the performance score to municipalities. Annex 4 describes in detail the way the grant amounts for each municipality are calculated, once the performance scores are known. Annex 5 and 6 describe the ToR of the Technical Group and the Performance Grant Commission. Annex 7 provides contact details. Annex 8 describes the possibility of alignment of performance grant with the grant scheme of MESP/GIZ.

This document targets all stakeholders in all municipalities in Kosovo, notably the mayor, directors, senior management, PMS coordinator, members of the municipal assembly and interested citizens. At the national level the rules for the performance grant are of interest for the members of Technical Group (which prepares the assessment and the grant allocation), the Performance Grant Commission (which approves the rules and procedures, and the annual grant), all ministries that produce policies that affect municipalities, as well as for Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) that work on local service delivery and local governance. This document may also serve as an overview for development partners that are contemplating to join the performance grant.

2. A PERFORMANCE GRANT DESIGN PARAMETERS

2.1. Basic principles

The municipal performance grant, that will be made available as an addition to the capital investment part of the general grant, is based on the following principles:

- Municipalities must, for each year, meet a number of minimum conditions before they become eligible for the grant on an annual basis;
- For all the municipalities that have met the minimum conditions, the grant that each municipality gets is based on its relative scores against 27 performance indicators (its score as compared to the scores of all other municipalities).

The minimum conditions are there to ensure that the available amount is only shared amongst those municipalities that are able to use it well and that are capable of spending it responsibly. Meaning they have the financial management systems in place to properly manage and account for the extra amounts received.

The performance indicators (and the relative scores) are meant to stimulate competition amongst municipalities for the extra financial resources but equally for the pride and the glory to be amongst the best scoring municipalities in terms of critical performance areas. Publication of the assessment results (and a public discussion around the analysis of the assessment results) is an important aspect of the performance grant.

2.2. Minimum conditions

Three minimum conditions have been formulated for the grant:

- Municipalities must have signed a tripartite participation agreement (the municipality, MLGA and HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation[3]);
- The audit opinion must be at least unmodified with emphasis of matter;
- Municipalities must have spent 75% or more of their capital investment;

Municipalities that either did not sign the participation agreement (for whatever reason), or that had either a modified audit opinion or a disclaimer, or did spent less than 75% of its capital investment budget, will not be eligible to receive a performance grant, regardless what their performance scores may be.

3 HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation has been contracted by SDC to support MLGA on its behalf in further developing the municipal performance grant during the period 2018-2021, whilst ensuring good use of the Swiss contribution.

The rationale of the minimum conditions is that:

- Municipalities, as autonomous local governments, are free to choose whether they want to participate in the scheme. None will be forced, but joining means adhering to the rules of the performance grant and the participation agreement;
- In order to get the grant, municipalities should have a sufficiently sound financial management system in place as evidenced by the latest available audit report;
- The grant will only be allocated to those municipalities that have shown to have sufficient capacity to absorb additional funding as shown by the capital budget expenditure rate.

All three minimum conditions must be met before a municipality becomes eligible for the performance grant allocation. Annex 3 has a template to communicate to each municipality the results of the assessment of the minimum conditions.

2.3. Performance indicators

As shown in Table 2 below, a total number of 27 performance indicators are identified under three main headings and eight sub headings (see also table 1 in page 6).

Table 2: An overview of themes of the performance grant[4]

#	Theme / Indicator area	Max #of points
Democratic Governance		**40**
I	Role of the municipal assembly as oversight body	20
1	The municipal assembly approves the annual budget in time	3
2	The municipal assembly discusses the expenditures versus budget reports on a regular basis	5
3	Discussions on the municipal performance report by the municipal assembly	4
4	Attendance of mayors in municipal assembly meetings	3
5	The municipal assembly discusses the findings of the internal and external audit reports	5
II	Citizen participation and consultation	10
6	Legally required public meetings of the municipality with citizens are duly and timely announced	4
7	Public consultation on municipal acts prior to adoption by the municipal assembly	6
III	Inclusiveness	10
8	Women participation in public meetings of the municipality with citizens	4
9	Women in politically appointed positions in municipality	3
10	Municipal compliance with the use of official local languages	3

4 A more detailed explanation of the indicator themes and the colours can be found in the text and in annex 2.

Municipal Management		40
IV	Human Resource Management	10
11	Staff appraisals are done annually and in accordance with legal requirements	3
12	Vacancies for civil servants are processed through the Human Resource Information System	2
13	The municipal assembly discusses the annual human resource report	2
14	Special service contracts are in compliance with the legal framework	3
VI	Financial management and audit	20
15	Invoices are paid within the legal deadline of 30 days	3
16	Implementation of the annual procurement plan	3
17	The property tax register has been regularly updated	3
18	Collection of the annual property tax bill (without debt, fines, interests, etc.)	5
19	High and medium priority recommendations from the NAO have been addressed	6
VI	Service Delivery	10
20	Responsiveness of the municipality to request and complaints	4
21	Project managers are appointed to monitor contract implementation	3
22	Municipal executive signs off , prior to final payment, on satisfactory delivery against contracts	3
Transparency and Integrity		20
VII	Access to information	10
23	Municipal website is up to date as per legal requirements	3
24	Responsiveness to citizen's requests for public documents	3
25	Publication of acts as approved by the municipal assembly and the mayor	4
VIII	Integrity	10
26	The municipal assembly discusses the annual implementation report of the integrity plan	4
27	Suspension of civil servants that are indicted for misuse of official position	6
	TOTAL	100

The indicators reflect performance areas that (i) are considered important for a good functioning of the municipal structures as entities of democratic local governance and (ii) are, across the board for all municipalities, considered to have scope for improvement. It is not useful to include indicators of performance areas for which all, or at least the majority of municipalities already have established routines of good performance (as all would score maximum points and no change is generated). Instead, the performance grant will focus on areas where a large group of municipalities need and can make further improvements. The grant will create incentives to facilitate that change.

Different indicators have different maximum scores, related to their attributed weight and importance. Annex 2 has a detailed guideline on the allocation of the points within the maximum scores. The points have been calibrated such that good and acceptable levels of performance are rewarded but that, for each indicator, sub optimal performance are given very little or no points, which means that the points really stimulate good performance (instead of mediocre performance). It also means that municipalities that perform well on a number of indicators will receive substantially more points than the ones that show ordinary performance.

It is important to note that the indicators have been selected and formulated such that they are more or less equally attainable by all municipalities, irrespective of population or area size and economic strength. In principle, the indicators reflect attributes that all municipalities 'ought to have' - as they are part of good local governance, to which all citizens in Kosovo are entitled.

Finally, it is important to mention that three indicators (those in orange/pink in Table 2) will be 'frozen' for the determination of the grant for FY 2019 (and for which the assessment is done in summer 2018 based on 2017 performance). This means the score for these indicators will not be taken into account in the total score.[5] The reason for this is that the data for these indicators have not been collected by all municipalities in 2017 and thus are not available for the assessment in summer 2018. These data will be available for the assessment of the performance of the year 2018, which will be done in summer 2019.

5 The maximum score for the 24 indicators that will be assessed in summer 2018 (for the year 2017) will be 90.

2.4. Sources of funding of the performance grant

The performance grant will be co-funded by the Government of Kosovo (out of the budget allocation of the MLGA) and SDC.

The total amount available for 4 years (2018-2021) is Euro 9.0 million, meaning Euro 2.25 million per year. The government contribution will gradually increase over the 4 years (so the grant could be taken over by government at the end of the four year period if so desired), whilst the contribution of SDC will gradually diminish in the same period.

For the moment, the schedule of funding is as shown in Table 3 below. It is possible that the total grant budget will increase in the years to come with contributions from line ministries and/or other donors.

Table 3: Sources of funding of the performance grant 2018-2021

	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total	
GoK/MLGA	453,649	950,000	1,600,000	1,496,351	4,500,000	50%
SDC	1,796,351	1,300,000	650,000	753,649	4,500,000	50%
Total	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	9,000,000	100%

2.5. Calculation of the performance grant amount

The indicators are defined such that all municipalities, independent of their size, location or economic strength, can be a good performer provided they make an effort to perform as a democratic local government serving its people. The size of the performance grant allocation is determined by (i) the relative performance of each municipality as measured against the defined performance indicators and (ii) its weight in the general grant allocation. In fact, the performance grant will be allocated on the basis of relative scores, in such a way that two municipalities that have the same score will get an equal relative addition to the capital investment part of the general grant. This means they would both get a grant allocation that is the same percentage of their general grant (whilst the absolute amounts of the performance grant will differ). The size of the absolute amount is proportional to the general grant. The justification for this is obvious: a municipality that has a much higher general grant needs a bigger amount to 'feel' the same incentive to improve its performance. Annex 4 shows how the performance grant allocation is calculated.

2.6. Use of the performance grant

The performance grant is to be used for capital investments only. As the performance grant is to be seen as an additional to the budget allocation for capital investments under the general grant, **the performance grant is to be used and treated in exactly the same way as the budget for capital investments under the general grant.** It cannot be used for salaries, goods and services or subsidies.

The municipality is free to decide for which investments the performance grant will be used. The decision on the use of the performance grant should be part of the annual municipal planning and budget cycle. Funds should be used for exactly the same type of activities as the general grant for capital investments, whilst also rules for budgeting, financial management (including procurement) and reporting are the same as for the general grant. No specific proposals, monitoring standards, reporting or auditing for the performance grant is required. The performance grant allocations are really an addition to the capital investment part of the general grant.

2.7. Audit of the performance grant

The performance grant will have no separate audit. The expenditures under the performance grant are audited as part of the regular audit that will be done by the National Audit Office.

However, an annual ***special audit*** may be commissioned for a randomly selected group of municipalities and/or capital investments, to look at one or more aspects of public financial management around capital investment projects (including those funded under the performance grant) such as, for example, procurement processes, procedures for technical acceptance of services, payments etc.. Details for such ***special audit are*** to be further specified by the NAO.

3. A PERFORMANCE GRANT - ASSESSMENT PROCESS

3.1. Institutional arrangements

Two entities are responsible for the performance grant allocation: the Performance Grant Commission and the Technical Group.

3.1.1. Performance Grant Commission

The Performance Grant Commission is the highest decision making body for the grant that assumes final responsibility. The tasks of the Performance Grant Commission are, based on advice from the Technical group:

- To set the rules and procedures;
- To endorse the assessment results;
- To endorse the grant allocations;
- To take decisions on appeals.

The main function of the Performance Grant Commission is to guarantee integrity of the assessment by formally assuming (political) responsibility for the rules, the assessment results and the ensuing calculations for the allocations. The Performance Grant Commission cannot alter the results of the assessment, nor the allocations, but its task is to oversee and ensure that the Technical Group has followed the rules and procedures.

The Performance Grant Commission will be composed of

- 1 member from the MLGA (Secretary General / Chair)
- 1 member from MoF (Budget Director)
- 1 representative from MPA
- 1 observer from the NAO and
- 1 observer from SDC (director).
- 1 observer from the NGO sector

For later grant cycles, representatives from line ministries and/or donors that decide to participate in the performance grant may be added as members to the Performance Grant Commission.

3.1.2. Technical group

The tasks of the Technical Group are:

- To draft and when necessary make proposals to amend the rules;
- Carry out the actual performance assessment following the rules as set in this document;
- Determine the scores and make the calculations for the ensuing grant allocation;
- Review appeals if any;
- Provide secretarial services to the Performance Grant Commission.

The Technical group is composed of 2 members:

- 5 members from the MLGA (one being the Chairperson), and
- 2 members from HELVETAS

For later grant cycles (cycles 2-3-4), two representatives from the MoF may be added as members to the technical group. The detailed Terms of Reference for both the Technical Group and the Performance Grant Commission are provided in annexes 5 and 6, respectively

3.2. Timeline

The performance assessment process starts each year when the data regarding municipal performance become available. The table below shows the timeline of the annual grant allocation cycles between 2018 and 2021[6].

Table 4: Tentative timeline of the assessment process for 4 cycles

Activity	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4
Endorsement of the rules	February 2018	June 2018	Before May 2019	Before May 2020
Signing participation agreement	Feb. - March 2018	n/a	n/a	n/a
Performance assessed for FY	2016	2017	2018	2019
Data collection	February 2018	June 2018	May – Jun 2019	May - Jun 2020
Actual assessment / scoring process	Feb. - March 2018	July 2018	July 2019	July 2020
Endorsement of assessment results	Mid-March 2018	August 2018	July 2019	July 2020
Communicate results to municipalities	Mid-March 2018	Aug. 2018	Aug. 2019	Aug. 2020
Appeal period	Mid-March 2018	Aug. 2018	Aug. 2019	Aug. 2020
Confirmation of final results and of grant amounts	March-April 2018	Sept 2018	Aug. 2019	Aug. 2020
Transfer funds	End-April 2018	Jan. 2019	Jan. 2020	Jan. 2021
Utilisation of funds	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021

6 The planning of the grant allocation cycle is similar each year between 2018 and 2021. Only the grant allocation cycle in spring 2018 is an exception. The grant allocation cycle in spring 2018 is added to the regular cycle of 2018 to allow municipalities to start using a grant already in the fiscal year 2018.

3.3. Procedure

3.3.1. Preparations

The Technical Group will prepare a meeting of the Performance Grant Commission that will endorse the rules for FY 2019. The rules will then be distributed to municipalities.

3.3.2. Data collection and assessment

The Technical Group collects the data for the assessment of the performance. These data come from the following sources: the municipal Performance Management System (PMS) report by MLGA, the audit reports for each of the 38 municipalities as prepared by the NAO and a specific NAO report on a set of new indicators. The relevant data from these reports will be transferred to datasets per municipality[7]. Then the minimum conditions will be assessed (met/not met) which will identify the municipalities that qualify or do not qualify (see annex 1). For the remaining municipalities the performance indicators will be assessed (see annex 2). Once that is done, the scorecard (see template in annex 3) will be filled in with scores per municipality. The total scores will be entered in the grant allocation table, which will calculate the size of the performance grant amount for each municipality that has qualified (annex 4).

3.3.3. Communication to municipalities and appeal procedure

After the Performance Grant Commission has endorsed the assessment results of the performance assessment and the grant allocation, the scorecards and grant allocation will be communicated to the municipalities.

At the same moment, the option to appeal is opened (for 1 week) for cases a municipality is of the opinion, based on evidence, that procedural mistakes are made to its disadvantage. Hence, the appeal should concern cases where the assessors (the Technical Group) has not used the right sources, not correctly copied the data from those sources, or made mistakes in the calculation of the scores. The appeal cannot be made on those data itself; for that the municipality should direct its complaints and requests for clarification to the responsible institution that published the respective data.

Municipalities can only appeal their own score, not those of other municipalities. If a municipality is of the opinion that the assessors used wrong data (from the right source), or if they think mistakes were made in the calculation in the performance score, the following appeal mechanism can be invoked:

7 If a municipality has not submitted data for some indicators, the performance for these indicators will be zero.

Steps and timelines in an appeal process		
1.	If, after receiving the scorecard, a municipality is of the opinion that procedural or material mistakes are made in the performance assessment it has the opportunity to appeal to the Performance Grant Commission. The appeal should: • be justified with factual data. • be signed by the mayor of the respective municipality. • be submitted in writing (letter) to: Performance Grant Commission p/a Venera Çerkini Ministry of Local Government Administration Tel: 038 200 35 559 E-mail: Venera.Cerkini@rks-gov.net Upon submission, a written confirmation will be provided mentioning the name of the municipality and stating the time of submission of the appeal.	Within 5 working days of receiving the scorecard before 16:00 'o clock
2.	A week after the communication of the assessment score cards, the Technical Group will review the appeal (if any). It may call for a meeting with one or more appellants to get a better understanding of the appeal	
	The Technical Group will subsequently prepare a report on all appeals received with recommendations on how to handle and forward it to the Performance Grant Commission for their decision.	Within one week after closure of the appeal period
3.	The Performance Grant Commission will endorse the reply.	Within 2 weeks after appeal period closure
4.	The Technical Group will inform the appellant(s) about the decision of the Grant commission	Within 1 week after the Commission meeting

In case an appeal of one or more municipalities is successful and leads to a change in their grant allocation, this will also have an effect on the size of the grant to other municipalities (because the total budget for the performance grant in a fiscal year remains the same). This change in grant allocation to other municipalities will be approved by the Performance Grant Commission unilaterally and implemented by the Technical Group. It is not open for appeal.

3.3.4. Finalising and publishing the assessment results and grant allocations

Once the Performance Grant Commission has decided on appeals, the assessment results as well as the ensuing allocation of the performance grant are final. Final results and grant amounts will be communicated to municipalities so that they can plan the use of the performance grant as part of their normal planning and budgeting process.

3.3.5. Mitigation of possible manipulation of data and assessment

There is a risk for manipulation of data or the assessment process. That could lead to some municipalities receiving a bigger performance grant than they deserve. This would erode the trust of beneficiaries and donors in the performance grant.

Such risk will be mitigated by an annual audit on all stages of the assessment (data, assessment and grant allocation). The audit will be commissioned by the Performance Grant Commission and be implemented by a third party (not the NAO).

In case fraud is detected, the Performance Grant Commission decides on measures to be taken, for instance:

- disqualification for next year(s) of the respective municipality(ies), member(s) of Technical Group or Commission;
- retrieving of (part of the) respective funds from the municipality or the budget for the performance grant;
- improving on-system control mechanisms (including data quality assurance process);
- re-designing the performance grant.

4. A PERFORMANCE GRANT A GUIDE TO CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

The performance grant intends to facilitate change in the behaviour of municipalities (whilst respecting their own right of decision-making). They are a means to an end and not an objective in itself. In that sense the primary goal is not the assessment scores in themselves, but rather the process of discussion and reflection that the assessment provokes.

It therefore needs to be ensured that the results of the assessment do indeed generate debate and discussion both within the municipalities as well at national policy level, to enrich policy dialogue and better understanding of the sector. It may well be that there are some indicators in the present design that are totally not critical, e.g. because all municipalities score the number of points (in which case that indicator should be quickly replaced). In other cases, the score may show that for some indicators all municipalities score dismal, in which case some concerted action may be required or a discussion on the underlying reasons for this (it could be that there are external factors prohibiting the municipalities to fulfil the performance criteria).

As such, the results of the performance assessment not only feed into policy dialogues, it can also guide capacity development efforts, both by the municipalities themselves as well as by international projects, and their technical assistance. This link between the assessment results and the capacity development efforts cannot be easily overstated as it is in the end the most important argument to have a performance grant: as a tool to incentivise change.

5. ANNEXES

5. ANNEX 1: SCORING GUIDE - MINIMUM CONDITIONS

#	Minimum condition	Minimum condition definition	Legal basis	Data source	Criteria MC met / not met
1	The municipality accepts and adheres to the rules of the performance grant	The tripartite participation agreement (between municipality, MLGA and HELVETAS) signed	Framework agreement concerning Technical and Financial Co-operation and Humanitarian Aid between the Swiss Federal Council and the Government of the Republic of Kosovo Agreement between MLGA, MoF and SDC concerning the Decentralisation and Municipal Support (DEMOS) project, phase II	MLGA	• **Yes**, if the participation agreement is signed and submitted to MLGA before the deadline; • **No**, if participation agreement is not signed and submitted to MLGA before the deadline
2	The municipality has a sound financial management system	The annual audit opinion at least unmodified opinion with emphasis of matter 1	Law no.03/L-048 on Public Finance Management and Accountability (LPFMA) Regulation no.01/2017 on Annual Financial Reporting of Budget Organisations issued by the MoF International Public Sector Accounting Standards	NAO reports	• **Yes**, if municipality receives *unmodified opinion or unmodified opinion with emphasis of matter;* • **No**, if municipality receives qualified *or adverse opinion,* and if NAO *disclaims an opinion.*
3	The municipality has sufficient capacity to absorb additional funding	At least 75% of the budget for capital investments spent.	LPFMA Financial Rule no.01-2013 on Spending of Public Money	NAO reports	• Total expenditures on capital investment / Final budget for capital investments (general grant + own source revenues + donations) • **Yes**, if municipality has spent at least 75% or more of the final budget for the capital investment. • **No**, if municipality has spent less than 75% of the final budget for the capital investment.

NAO provides several types of opinions:

Unmodified opinion:
- if it is concluded that the financial statements are prepared, in all material aspects, in accordance with the applicable financial framework

Qualified opinion:
- If having obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence, the auditor concludes that misstatements, individually or in the aggregate, are material, but not pervasive, to the financial statements; or
- If the auditor was unable to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence on which to base an opinion, but concludes that the effects on the financial statements of any undetected misstatements could be material but not pervasive

Adverse opinion:
- If having obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence, the auditor concludes that misstatements, individually or in the aggregate, are both material and pervasive to the financial statements

Disclaim an opinion:
- If having been unable to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence on which to base the opinion, the auditor concludes that the effects on the financial statements of any undetected misstatements could be both material and pervasive. If, after accepting the engagement, the auditor becomes aware that management has imposed a limitation on the audit scope that the auditor considers likely to result in the need to express a qualified opinion or to disclaim an opinion on the financial statements, the auditor should request that management remove the limitation.

Emphasis of matter:
- If the auditor considers it necessary to draw the user's attention to a matter presented or disclosed in the financial statements that is of such importance that it is fundamental to their understanding of the financial statements, but there is sufficient appropriate evidence that the matter is not materially misstated in the financial statements, the auditor should include an Emphasis of Matter paragraph in the auditor's report. Emphasis of Matter paragraphs should only refer to information presented or disclosed in the financial statements.

ANNEX 2: SCORING GUIDELINE - PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The table below shows the 27 performance indicators. The way how indicators from the PMS are measured, is described in the PMS documents (see the PMS indicator number in the column 'data source'). These documents have been distributed separately by the MLGA earlier. How indicators that come from the NAO and the MoF are measured, is described in the column 'brief definition' below. The indicators highlighted in orange are excluded from the assessment in 2018.

#	Indicator name	Brief definition	Data source	Max points	Scoring key
1. Democratic governance				**40**	
I	Role of the Municipal Assembly as oversight body			20	
1	Timely approval of proposed municipal annual budget by the municipal assembly	This indicator aims to measure the level of compliance of municipal bodies' legal obligation to prepare and have the draft municipal budget approved by the municipal assembly. The indicator measures compliance with legal provisions that request the approval of the draft annual municipal budget of the assessed year by the municipal assembly no later than 30th of September of the assessment year.	PMS 2.3.1	3	• 3 points if the budget was duly discussed and approved by MA • 0 points if the budget was not duly discussed and approved by MA
2	Discussions on the previous tear budget report by the Municipal Assembly	This indicator aims to measure the municipal bodies' compliance with the legal obligation of presenting and discussing quarterly budget reports before the municipal assembly. Budget reports should be submitted for discussion on a quarterly basis to the municipal assembly, i.e., reports should be submitted to the municipal assembly by the mayor. The indicator measures compliance with legal provisions that request the mayor to present quarterly budget reports to the municipal assembly at the latest 30 days after the end of the quarter. The reporting deadlines for the quarterly budget reports are as follows: 31 January, 30 April, 31 July, and 31 October of the assessed fiscal year.	PMS 2.3.2	5	• 5 points if all 4 quarterly reports were discussed by MA (i.e. the end of months of January, April, July and October) • 2 points if 3 quarterly reports were discussed by MA • 0 points if 2 or less of quarterly reports were discussed by MA

#	Indicator name	Brief definition	Data source	Max points	Scoring key
3	Discussions on the previous year municipal performance report by the Municipal Assembly	This indicator aims to measure the fulfilment level of municipal bodies' legal obligation regarding the presentation and discussion before the municipal assembly of the Municipal Performance Management System (PMS) municipal performance results. The measurement of discussion of the PMS report by the municipal assembly refers to PMS report of the assessed year (i.e. PMS report of 2015 should be discussed by the municipal assembly in 2016). In order to measure this indicator, evidence that the PMS report has been included as an item in the municipal assembly's agenda after the publication of the report is required.	PMS 2.3.3	4	• 4 points if the PMS report was discussed by MA • 0 points if the PMS report was not discussed by MA
4	Municipal Assembly meetings with presence of the Mayor	This indicator aims to measure the level of participation of the mayor in the municipal assembly sessions. For the purpose of measuring this indicator an amount of 10 municipal assembly meetings was taken as the basis for participation of the mayor in municipal assembly meetings (the legally mandatory number of assembly sessions). For measuring this indicator, evidence is required for the number of meetings held by the municipal assembly in the assessed year, and evidence for the participation of the mayor in these municipal assembly meetings	PMS 2.3.4	3	• 3 points if the mayor attended at least 7 meetings of MA • 1 points if the mayor attended between 2 and 6 meetings of MA • 0 points if the mayor attended 1 or none of MA meetings

#	Indicator name	Brief definition	Data source	Max points	Scoring key
5	Discussion of findings and recommendations (including the Action plan) of both the internal and external audit (NAO) in the Municipal Assembly meetings	This indicator aims to measure the degree of presentation of, internal and external audit reports (NAO) including the Action Plan on findings, for discussion at the municipal assembly. The indicator measures weather the internal and audit reports were submitted to the municipal assembly for discussion in the assessed year (i.e. internal and external audit reports of 2015 should be discussed by the municipal assembly in 2016). This indicator measures the percentage of fulfilment of audit reports discussed by the municipal assembly within the required timeframe.	Separate NAO report	5	• 5 points if both audit reports were discussed by MA • 2 points if only 1 of the audit reports was discussed by MA • 0 points if none of the reports was discussed by MA
II	Citizen participation and consultation			10	
6	Published announcements for two public meetings	This indicator aims to measure the level of compliance with the obligation of publishing the notices for the two public meetings of the mayor (mandatory), at least 14 days before the date of each meeting for the assessed year. This indicator measures the implementation of the legal provisions only for the 2 mandatory meetings of the mayor.	PMS 2.1.4	4	• 4 points if at least 2 public meetings were announced as per the legal requirements • 1 point if only 1 public meeting was announced as per the legal requirement • 0 points if no public meeting was announced as per the legal requirements

#	Indicator name	Brief definition	Data source	Max points	Scoring key
7	Acts adopted by the Municipal Assembly for which the public was consulted	This indicator aims to measure the fulfilment level of municipal assembly's obligations for public consultation upon drafting general acts (pursuant to Administrative Instruction 01/2015, Article 8). The indicator is interested in the number of general acts for which the public has been consulted during the assessed year. All meetings held with citizens with regard to municipal acts are considered as consultations.	PMS 2.1.2	6	• 6 points if over 90% of acts were consulted with the public prior to MA approval • 3 points if between 50 – 90% of acts were consulted with the public prior to MA approval • 0 points if <50% of acts were consulted with the public prior to MA approval
III	Inclusiveness			10	
8	Level of women participants in public meetings	This indicator aims to measure the fulfilment of the municipal obligation to ensure the participation of women in municipal public meetings during the assessed year, respectively to measure developments in the integration of women and their anti-discrimination. Public meetings mean all meetings with citizens organised by the municipality, such as regular meetings with citizens (minimum 2 per year), budget hearings (minimum 2 per year), and consultative meetings. For the needs of this indicator, the agendas and points of agenda of the public meetings are not relevant	PMS 3.1.4	4	• 4 points if 50% or more of participants are women • 2 points if between 30 – 50% of participants are women • 0 points if <30% of participants are women
9	Level of women appointed in political positions	This indicator aims to measure the fulfilment of the municipal obligation to ensure the gender balance in the political posts of the municipal structure in the assessed year. Namely, the indicator measures the appointments in political posts such as deputy mayor, municipal directors, political advisors, and posts with a political mandate.	PMS 3.1.5	3	• 3 points if over 50% of political positions are assigned to women • 1 point if between 30 – 50% political positions are assigned to women • 0 points if <30% or less of political positions are assigned to women

#	Indicator name	Brief definition	Data source	Max points	Scoring key
10	Level of use of official languages	This indicator measures the level of compliance with official language by the municipalities, through three (3) proxy indicators coming from the PMS.	PMS 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.6	3	• The average values of PMS 3 indicators • 3 points if local languages are used as per legal requirements 90% or more • 1 point if local languages are used as per legal requirements between 60 - 90% • 0 points if local languages are used <60%
2. Municipal management				**40**	
IV	Human resource management			10	
11	Implementation of the scheme on distribution of appraisals for civil servants	This indicator aims to measure the fulfilment of the municipal obligation to ensure the appraisal of the performance of the municipal staff in accordance with the legal provisions for the assessed year. Namely, the indicator measures the implementation of job performance appraisal system according to the rated categories and by applying the limitations for dissemination of results for the appraised staff.	PMS 3.3.1	3	• 3 points if over 90% of appraisals are done as per legal requirements • 1 points if between 50 - 90% of appraisals are done as per legal requirements • 0 points if <50% of appraisals are done as per legal requirements
12	Vacancies for civil service processed through HRMIS	This indicator aims to measure the fulfilment of the municipal obligation to process its vacancies through the Human Resource Information System (HRMIS) for the assessed year.	PMS 3.3.2	2	• 2 points if 90% or more of vacancies are processed through HRMIS • 1 point if between 50 - 90% are processed through HRMIS • 0 points if <50% of vacancies are processed through HRMIS

#	Indicator name	Brief definition	Data source	Max points	Scoring key
13	Presentation for discussion at the Municipal Assembly of the Annual report of the municipal personnel office for the previous year	This indicator aims to measure the presentation and discussion of the work report of the personnel office before the municipal assembly for the assessed year	PMS 3.3.3	2	• 2 points if the human resource report was discussed by MA • 0 points if the human resource report was not discussed by MA
14	Use of Special Service Agreements (SSA) in compliance with legislation	This indicator aims to measure the level of fulfilment of the legal obligation of municipal bodies regarding the use of special service agreements (SSAs) in accordance with legislation such as the Law on Civil Service, the Law on Obligational Relationships, and the Regulation on Civil Servants Appointment. The indicator assesses if in the employment acts through SSAs the following criteria in accordance with the legislation were observed: 1) Development of simplified recruitment procedures, 2) Use of agreements with stated purpose, for specific work, 3) Duration of the agreements in accordance with the legislation. The act of measuring the fulfilment of provisions according to the criteria is referring to the assessed year. This indicator assesses the municipal authorities by measuring the compliance with legislation regarding engagement of employees under SSA, according to the criteria specified in the list presented within the assessed year. The indicator measures the percentage of legal criteria observance upon application of recruitment procedures through SSA.	Separate NAO report	3	• 3 points if 90% or more of SSAs are as per legal requirements • 1 point if between 50 - 90% of SSAs are as per legal requirements • 0 points if <50% of SSAs are as per legal requirements

#	Indicator name	Brief definition	Data source	Max points	Scoring key
V	Financial management and audit			20	
15	Financial discipline in payments (executed payments within legal deadline)	This indicator aims to measure the degree of fulfilment of the legal obligation of the municipal bodies regarding the execution of financial obligations in relation to the obligations for payment, having as a criterion the 30-day deadline for obligation settlement. The assessment for this indicator is obtained from the samples reviewed during the audit process. Namely, percentage value of this indicator derives from the data obtained from the sample examined in the audit process, where the act for execution of payments within 30 days, according to the law is referred to the matured payment obligations. The act of measuring the performance refers to the assessed year. This indicator assesses the municipal authorities by measuring the observance of time limits for the settlement of obligations during the assessed year. In this context, the indicator measures the financial values of invoices and settlements/non-settlements, rather than the number of invoices received and settled/unsettled.	Separate NAO report	3	• 3 points if 90% or more of payments are executed within deadline of 30 days • 1 point if between 60 -90% of payments are executed within deadline • 0 points if <50% of payments are executed within deadline

#	Indicator name	Brief definition	Data source	Max points	Scoring key
16	Implementation of the procurement plan (contracted vs planned activities)	This indicator aims to measure the performance of municipal bodies in implementing their legal obligation related to the implementation of activities envisaged in the procurement plan for which a contract has been signed. More specifically, the indicator aims to verify for which activities, out of the activities listed in the procurement plan for the reporting year, there are valid (signed) contracts namely the percentage of signed activities in comparison to planned activities. The act of measuring the compliance with the requirement for implementing activities regarding which a contract has been signed refers to the assessed year. This indicator assesses municipal authorities by measuring compliance with the procurement plan in terms of activities contracted during the assessed year. The indicator measures the implementation percentage in terms of compliance with the initial plan, i.e., which of the activities foreseen in the annual plan have been completed. For purposes of this indicator, activities are considered as completed upon contract signing.	Separate NAO report	3	• 3 points if >90% of procurement plan is implemented • 1 point if between 60 - 90% of procurement plan is implemented • 0 points if <60% of procurement plan is implemented
17	Update of property tax register (re-survey of objects pursuant to the legislation)	This indicator aims to measure the performance of municipal bodies in implementing their legal obligation related to the re-survey of buildings for property tax purposes by the end of the year as required by legislation. The resurvey process of buildings for property tax purposes refers to the obligation for evidencing changes to existing buildings to enable property tax billing as required by law, and should be conducted on annual basis. For purposes of this indicator, the resurvey activity refers to the assessed year. This indicator assesses municipal authorities by measuring compliance with time limits in the assessed year. The indicator measures the fulfilment level of building resurvey for property tax purposes within the year.	NAO Regulatory Audit Report	3	• 3 points if >30% of properties are resurveyed as per legal requirements • 1 point if between 20 - 30% of properties are resurveyed as per legal requirements • 0 points if <20% of properties are resurveyed as per legal requirements

#	Indicator name	Brief definition	Data source	Max points	Scoring key
18	Level of property tax collection (paid vs billed)	This indicator aims to measure the performance of municipal bodies in implementing their legal obligation related to property tax collection expressed as a percentage of the total billed property tax within one year. It calculates collection rate in a year without including debts from invoices of previous year, interest payments and penalties. The measurement of property tax collection rate refers to the assessed year. This indicator assesses municipal authorities by measuring the property tax collection rate in comparison to the invoiced tax during the assessed year. The indicator measures the implementation percentage of property tax collection for the billed value of that year, where billing and collection refer only to the annual period. As such, the indicator does not measure the total collected funds of property tax, as the total amount also includes debts transferred from previous years, interest payments and penalties, but it only measures the collection rate of billed tax within the reporting year.	Separate NAO report	5	• 5 points if >85% of annually billed property tax is collected • 3 points if between 60 - 85% of annually billed property tax is collected • 1 points if between 40 - 60% of annually billed property tax is collected • 0 points if <40% of annually billed property tax is collected
19	Addressing the external audit (NAO) high and medium priority recommendations	This indicator aims to measure the degree of fulfilment of the legal obligation of municipal bodies with regard to addressing of the high and medium level recommendations explicitly deriving from NAO report. The municipal authorities are assessed by measuring the implementation of high and medium level recommendations from the NAO audit report for the assessed year (i.e. report for 2015 performance published in June 2016). This is compared with the NAO audit report for the previous fiscal year (i.e. report for 2014 performance published in June 2015). The indicator measures the percentage of addressing the NAO recommendations by the municipal authorities within the required deadline and in their entirety.	NAO Regulatory Audit Report	6	• 6 points if over 90% of recommendations are addressed (or if there are no recommendations) • 4 points if between 70-90% of recommendations are addressed • 2 points if between 50– 70% of recommendations are addressed • 0 points if <50% of recommendations are addressed

VI	Service delivery			10	
20	Cases reviewed during the year	The indicator aims to measure municipal effectiveness in reviewing requests submitted by citizens and different stakeholders for the assessed year. According to law, municipalities are obliged to review all citizens' requests within certain deadlines. The indicator measures only requests or cases processed through the Municipal Citizens' Services Centre (MCSC). It measures the percentage of cases reviewed versus total cases managed through the MCSCs.	PMS 1.1.1	4	• 4 points if over 90% of cases reviewed is within deadlines • 2 points if between 70 – 90% of cases reviewed is within deadlines • 1 point if between 50 – 70% of cases is within deadlines • 0 points if < 50% of cases reviewed is within deadlines
21	Project managers appointed for monitoring contract enforcement	This indicator aims at measuring the fulfilment of the legal obligation of municipal bodies regarding the formal appointment of a manager of public contracts for works, services, and supplies for the assessed year. The act of appointing a contract manager implies assigning the responsibility to a person with regard to the issues related to contract management by the municipality.	Separate NAO report	3	• 3 points if >90% of contracts have appointed contract managers • 1 point if between 70 – 90% contracts have appointed contract managers • 0 point if <70% of contracts have appointed contract managers
22	Municipal executive confirms the service/satisfactory works vs contracts	This indicator aims to assess for what percentage of municipal contracts the municipal executive approves the deliverables before payments are done for the assessed year. The assessment of the appointment of managers for public contracts is done through a sample that assesses the percentage of public contracts for which a manager has been appointed through a formal process. The sample is generalised for the whole category of public contracts. The assessment period is for public contracts during the assessed year.	Separate NAO report	3	• 3 points if >90% of deliverables are approved before the payment • 1 point if between 70 – 90% of deliverables are approved before the payment • 0 points if <70% of deliverables are approved before the payment

3. Transparency and Integrity				20	
VII	Access to information			10	
23	Fulfilment of criteria for municipal official website	This indicator measures the municipal compliance with the legal obligations for the assessed year regarding the form and content of the official web site, including technical maintenance and update with necessary information as required by the Administrative Instruction no. 01/2015 on the Web Sites of Public Institutions.	PMS 2.2.6	3	• 3 points if website is 90% or more compliant with legal requirements • 1 point if website is between 70 - 90% compliant with legal requirements • 0 points if website is 69.99% or less compliant with legal requirements
24	Realisation of requests of citizens for access to public documents	This indicator measures the implementation level of citizens' requests for access to official documents in accordance with legal provisions on access to public documents (Law no. 03/L-215 on Access to Public Documents, Administrative Instruction no. 01/2015 on Transparency in Municipalities) during the assessed year.	PMS 2.2.5	3	• 3 points if >90% of requests are answered as per legal requirements • 1 points if between 70 - 90% of requests are answered as per legal requirements • 0 points if <70% of requests are answered as per legal requirements
25	Published acts of the Municipal Assembly at the official website of the municipality; Published acts of general interest, adopted by the Mayor at the official website of the municipality	This indicator intends to measure all municipal acts (executive and legislative) which are published in the official municipal website during the assessed year. The value of this indicator comes as an average of two PMS indicators (2.2.1 and 2.2.2)	PMS 2.2.1 and 2.2.2	4	• Average values of both indicators • 4 points if 90% or more of acts are published on municipal website • 2 points if between 70 - 90% of acts are published on municipal website • 1 point if between 50 - 70% of acts are published on municipal website • 0 points if <50% of acts are published on municipal website

VIII	Integrity			10	
26	Reporting on the annual plan of the Integrity Plan at the Municipal Assembly	This indicator aims to measure fulfilment of the obligations by the responsible municipal officials, to regularly report on the implementation of the integrity plan during the assessed year, thus ensuring transparency and accountability for anti-corruption measures foreseen by the integrity plan as a preventative instrument of corruption.	PMS 2.4.1	4	• 4 points if the integrity plan was duly discussed by MA • 0 points if the integrity plan was not duly discussed by MA
27	Suspension of civil servants against whom an indictment has been filed	This indicator aims to measure the fulfilment of the obligation by the responsible municipal officials to suspend municipal officials who are indicted for abuse of office for the assessed year. It aims to measure implementation of the requirement arising from Article 69, point 1 of the Law on Civil Service of the Republic of Kosovo.	PMS 2.4.2	6	• 6 points if no indictments • 5 points if indicted civil servants are suspended as per legal requirements • 0 points if indicted civil servants are not suspended as per legal requirements

ANNEX 3: TEMPLATE FOR SCORECARD

Assessment of the Performance Grant 2016 - Municipality of xx		
#	**Minimum Conditions**	**Assessment**
1	Annual Audit Opinion at least 'Unmodified with Emphasis of Matter'	
2	At least 75% of the budget for capital investments spent	
3	Participation Agreement signed	
The Municipality is eligible/not eligible for the performance grant		
#	**Fields and sub-fields of performance indicators**	**Assessment**
I	Role of the Municipal Assembly as oversight body	0
II	Citizen participation and consultation	0
III	Inclusiveness	0
	Score for democratic governance	**0**
IV	Human resources management	0
V	Finance management and audit	0
VI	Service delivery	0
	Score for municipal management	**0**
VII	Access to information	0
VIII	Integrity	0
	Score for transparency and integrity	**0**
	Final score	**0**

Scored by:
Name: **Venera Çerkini**
Title: Chair of Technical Group
Signature:
Date:

Reviewd by:
Name: **Rozafa Ukimeraj**
Title: **Chair of Performance Grant Comission**
Signature:
Date:

Assessment of minimum conditions for the year xx for the Performance grant - Municipality of …….						
#	**Minimum condition**	**Assessment guidelines**	**Value as seen in the source**	**Assess-ment**	**Source of information***	**Observations (if any)**
1	Annual Audit Opinion at least 'Unmodified with emphasis of matter '	YES, if the municipality received a: 1) Unmodified opinion, or 2) Unmodified opinion with emphasis of matter NO, if the municipality received: 3) Qualified opinion 4) Qualified opinion with emphasis of matter 5) Adverse opinion, or 6) NAO Disclaimer of Opinion	unmodified opinion	YES	NAO**, Regularity Audit Report, page xx	
2	At least 75% of the budget for capital investments spent	YES, if the municipality spent at least 75% or more of the final budget on capital investments NO, if the municipality spent less than 75% of the final budget on capital investments	74.8%	NO	NAO, Regularity Audit Report, page xx	
3	Participation Agreement signed	YES, if the Participation Agreement is signed before deadline NO, if the Participation Agreement is not signed before deadline	DATE	YES	MLGA*** (Participation Agreement)	
Municipality fulfilled all 3 minimum conditions			NO	* Score refers to the Albanian version of the data source ** NAO -National Audit Office *** MLGA - Ministry of Local Government Administration		

Performance Assessment for 2017 - Municipality of...........

#	Indicator	Assessment guidelines	Value as seen in the source**	Max. score	Assessment	Data Source	Com-ments
1	Democratic governance			40	0		
I	Role of the Municipal Assembly as oversight body			20	0		
1	Timely approval of proposed municipal annual budget by the Municipal Assembly	• 3 points if the budget was discussed and timely approved by Municipal Assembly • 0 points if the budget was discussed and timely approved by Municipal Assembly		3	0	PMS Report*, Indicator: 2.3.1	
2	Discussions on the previous year budget report by the Munici-pal Assembly	• 5 points if all 4 quarterly reports were discussed by Municipal Assembly (i.e. the end of months of January, April, July and October) • 2 points if 3 quarterly reports were discussed by Municipal Assembly • 0 points if 2 or less of quarterly reports were dis-cussed by Municipal Assembly		5	0	PMS report Indicator 2.3.2	
3	Discussions on the previous year munic-ipal performance re-port by the Municipal Assembly	• 4 points if the PMS report was discussed by MA • 0 points if the PMS report was not discussed by MA		4	0	PMS Report Indicator: 2.3.3	
4	Municipal Assembly meetings with pres-ence of the Mayor	• 3 points if the mayor attended at least 7 meetings of MA • 1 points if the mayor attended between 2 and 6 meetings of MA • 0 points if the mayor attended 1 or none of MA meetings		3	0	PMS Report Indicator: 2.3.4	
5	Discussion of findings and recommenda-tions (including the Action plan) of both the internal and exter-nal audit (NAO) in the Municipal Assembly meetings	• 5 points if both audit reports were discussed by MA • 2 points if only 1 of the audit reports was dis-cussed by MA • 0 points if none of the reports was discussed by MA		5	0	Separate NAO report	

II	**Citizen participation and consultation**			**10**	**0**		
6	Published announcements for two public meetings	• 4 points if at least 2 public meetings were announced as per the legal requirements • 1 point if only 1 public meeting was announced as per the legal requirement • 0 points if no public meeting was announced as per the legal requirements		4	0	PMS Report Indicator: 2.1.4	
7	Acts adopted by the Municipal Assembly for which the public was consulted	• 6 points if over 90% of acts were consulted with the public prior to MA approval • 3 points if between 50 – 90% of acts were consulted with the public prior to MA approval • 0 points if <50% of acts were consulted with the public prior to MA approval		6	0	PMS Report Indicator: 2.1.2	
III	**Inclusiveness**			**10**	**0**		
8	Level of women participants in public meetings	• 4 points if over 50% of participants are women • 2 points if between 30 – 50% of participants are women • 0 points if <30 of participants are women		4	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 3.1.4	
9	Level of women appointed in political positions	• 3 points if over 50% of political positions are assigned to women • 1 point if between 30 – 50% political positions are assigned to women • 0 points if <30% of political positions are assigned to women		3	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 3.1.5	
10	Level of use of official languages	• Average values of 3 indicators • 3 points if local languages are used as per legal requirements 90% or more • 1 point if local languages are used as per legal requirements between 60 – 90% • 0 points if local languages are used as per legal requirements is <60%		3	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 2.2.1; 2.2.2; 2.2.6	This indicator is not scored. For more explanations, please refer to the *Performance Grants Rules for Fiscal Year 2018*

2	**Municipal Management**			**40**	**0**		
IV	**Human resource management**			**10**	**0**		
11	Implementation of the scheme on distribution of appraisals for civil servants	• 3 points if over 90% of appraisals are done as per legal requirements • 1 points if between 50 – 90% of appraisals are done as per legal requirements • 0 points if <50% of appraisals are done as per legal requirement		3	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 3.3.1	
12	Vacancies for civil service processed through HRMIS	• 2 points if over 90% of vacancies are processed through HRMIS • 1 point if between 50 – 90% of vacancies are processed through HRMIS • 0 points if <50% of vacancies are processed through HRMIS		2	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 3.3.2	
13	Presentation for discussion at the Municipal Assembly of the Annual report of the municipal personnel office for the previous year	• 2 points if the human resource report was discussed by MA • 0 points if the human resource report was not discussed by MA		2	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 3.3.3	
14	Use of Special Service Agreements (SSA) in compliance with legislation	• 3 points if over 90% of SSAs are as per legal requirements • 1 point if between 50 – 90% of SSAs are as per legal requirements • 0 points if <50% of SSAs are as per legal requirements		3	0	Separate NAO report	
V	**Finance management and audit**			**20**	**0**		
15	Financial discipline in payments (executed payments within legal deadline)	• 3 points if over 90% of payments are executed within legal timeline • 1 point if between 60 - 90% of payments are executed within legal timeline • 0 points if <60% or less of payments are executed within legal timeline		3	0	Separate NAO report	

16	Implementation of the procurement plan (contracted vs planned activities)	• 3 points if over 90% of the procurement plan is implemented • 1 point if between 60 – 90% of the procurement plan is implemented • 0 points if <60% or less of the procurement plan is implemented		3	0	Separate NAO report	
17	Update of property tax register (re-survey of objects pursuant to the legislation)	• 3 points if over 30% of properties are resurveyed as per legal requirements • 1 point if between 20 – 30% of properties are resurveyed as per legal requirements • 0 points if <20% or less of properties are resurveyed as per legal requirements		3	0	NAO, Regularity Audit Report	
18	Level of property tax collection (paid vs billed)	• 5 points if over 85% of annually billed property tax is collected • 3 points if between 60 – 85% of annually billed property tax is collected • 1 points if between 40 – 60% of annually billed property tax is collected • 0 points if <40% or less of annually billed property tax is collected		5	0	Separate NAO report	
19	Addressing the external audit (NAO) high and medium priority recommendations	• 6 points if >90% of recommendations are addressed (or if there are no recommendations) • 4 points if between 70 – 90% of recommendations are addressed • 2 point if between 50 – 70% of recommendations are addressed • 0 points if <50% of the recommendations are addressed		6	0	NAO, Regularity Audit Report	

VI	**Service delivery**			**10**	**0**		
20	Cases reviewed during the year	• 4 points if over 90% of cases reviewed within legal timeline • 2 points if between 70 – 90% of cases reviewed within legal timeline • 1 point if between 50 – 70% of cases reviewed within legal timeline • 0 points if <50% of cases reviewed within legal timeline		4	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 1.1.1	
21	Project managers appointed for monitoring contract enforcement	• 3 points if 90% or more of contracts have appointed contract managers • 1 point if between 70 – 90% contracts have appointed contract managers • 0 point if <70% of contracts have appointed contract managers		3	0	Separate NAO report	
22	Municipal executive confirms the service/satisfactory works vs contracts	• 3 points if 90% or more of deliverables are approved before the payment • 1 point if between 70 – 90% of deliverables are approved before the payment • 0 points if <70% of deliverables are approved before the payment		3	0	NAO report	
3	**Transparency and Integrity**			**20**	**0**		
VII	**Access to information**			**10**	**0**		
23	Fulfilment of criteria for municipal official website	• 3 points if the municipal website is for over 90% compliant with legal requirements • 1 point if the municipal website is between 70 – 90% compliant with legal requirements • 0 points if the municipal website is for less the 70% compliant with legal requirements		3	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 2.2.6	This indicator is not scored. For more explanations, please refer to the *Performance Grants Rules for Fiscal Year 2019*

24	Realisation of requests of citizens for access to public documents	• 3 points if over 90% or requests are answered as per legal requirements • 1 points if between 70 – 90% of requests are answered as per legal requirements • 0 points if <70% of requests are answered as per legal requirements		3	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 2.2.5	
25	Published acts of the Municipal Assembly at the official website of the municipality; Published acts of general interest, adopted by the Mayor at the official website of the municipality	(average values of both indicators) • 4 points if 90% or more of acts are published on municipal website • 2 points if between 70 – 90% of acts are published on municipal website • 1 point if between 50 – 70% of acts are published on municipal website • 0 points if <50% of acts are published on municipal website		4	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 2.2.1; 2.2.2	This indicator is not scored. For more explanations, please refer to the *Performance Grants Rules for Fiscal Year 2019*
VIII	**Integrity**				**0**		
26	Reporting on the annual plan of the Integrity Plan at the Municipal Assembly	• 4 points if the integrity plan was timely discussed by MA • 0 points if the integrity plan was not timely discussed by MA		4	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 2.4.1	
27	Suspension of civil servants against whom an indictment has been filed	• 6 points if no indictments • 5 points if indicted civil servants are suspended as per legal requirements • 0 points if indicted civil servants are not suspended as per legal requirements		6	0	PMS Report, Indicator: 2.4.2	
Final score					**0**		

* 2017 Municipal Performance Report, published at MLGA website

**Score refers to the Albanian language version of the data source

ANNEX 4: TEMPLATE FOR CALCULATION OF ALLO CATED GRANT AMOUNTS

The allocation of the Municipal performance grant, which is provided as an addition to the capital investment part of the general grant, is determined by the relative performance of each municipality as measured against the defined performance indicators. At the same time, the performance is allocated such that two municipalities that have a same score will get an equal relative additional grant (meaning that with the same score, they would both get say 5 or 10% more, whilst the absolute amounts of the additional grant will differ).

In order to achieve this, the following steps are required to calculate the allocations:

- Firstly, the assessment scores for each municipality are weighted with the share of the General grant that each Municipality receives for that year (on the basis of a compounded allocation formula, taking into account various expenditure needs based variables as defined by government). This is the weighted score.
- Secondly, the relative share of each municipality in this weighted score is calculated.
- Thirdly, this latter relative share in the weighted performance score is multiplied by the total amount available for the grant for the year (e.g. the € 2.25 million that is now available for the performance grant.

This may look complicated, but the example below may help to clarify.

The table on the next page shows an example of the calculation of the performance grant allocation, using the general grant allocation for 2019 as per the government's budget circular, under the following assumptions (as example) that (i) all municipalities have met the minimum conditions and (ii) that all municipalities achieved exactly the same score of 75 (which is unlikely in reality, but which allows to treat every municipality equally in this example).

The following steps are taken to calculate the allocations:

- The share of the municipal grant in the general grant is determined by dividing the municipal general grant (column 3) by the total general grant (total column 3). That is a percentage called 'relative share general grant' (column 4);
- Then the weighted performance score is calculated as shown in column (7) by multiplying the performance assessment score (column 6) with the relative share in the general grant and the results of meeting the minimum conditions (reflected in column 5), which is either 1 if the minimum conditions are met or "0" if the minimum conditions were not met (column 5). A municipality that does not meet the minimum conditions is excluded from further calculations (and columns 6 to 10 will show a "0").
- The municipal 'calculated weighted score' (in column 7) is then divided by the total of the 'calculated weighted score' (i.e. the total of column 7), to obtain the 'relative share weighted score' (column 8);
- Finally, this 'relative share weighted score' is multiplied with the total amount of funds available for performance grant in a year (total amount performance grant). This leads to the municipal performance grant allocation as reflected in column 9.

Calculation of the performance grant allocation per Municipality - 20

Total amount Performance Grant: 2,250,0

#	Municipality	General Grant allocations 2019	Relative share General Grant	Assessment results MCs YES=1 NO=0	Assessment score	Calculated weighted score	Relative share weighted score	Calculated amount Performance Grant	Perform e Grant % of Genera
1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1	Deçan/Dečane	3,852,920	2.1%	1	75	1.60	2.1%	47,978	1
2	Dragash/Dragaš	4,089,125	2.3%	1	75	1.70	2.3%	50,919	1
3	Ferizaj/Uroševac	9,908,869	5.5%	1	75	4.11	5.5%	123,388	1
4	Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje	3,397,977	1.9%	1	75	1.41	1.9%	42,313	1
5	Gjakovë/Đakovica	9,061,498	5.0%	1	75	3.76	5.0%	112,836	1
6	Gjilan/Gnjilane	8,292,890	4.6%	1	75	3.44	4.6%	103,265	1
7	Gllogovc/Glogovac	5,384,031	3.0%	1	75	2.23	3.0%	67,043	1
8	Hani i Elezit/Elez Han	1,394,122	0.8%	1	75	0.58	0.8%	17,360	1
9	Istog/Istok	4,060,981	2.2%	1	75	1.69	2.2%	50,568	1
10	Junik/Junik	1,031,060	0.6%	1	75	0.43	0.6%	12,839	1
11	Kaçanik/Kačanik	3,184,460	1.8%	1	75	1.32	1.8%	39,654	1
12	Kamenicë/Kamenica	3,701,498	2.0%	1	75	1.54	2.0%	46,092	1
13	Klinë/Klina	3,767,839	2.1%	1	75	1.56	2.1%	46,918	1
14	Leposavić/Leposaviq	3,068,478	1.7%	1	75	1.27	1.7%	38,210	1
15	Lipjan/Lipljan	5,510,543	3.0%	1	75	2.29	3.0%	68,619	1
16	Malishevë/Mališevo	5,079,524	2.8%	1	75	2.11	2.8%	63,252	1
17	Mamushë/Mamuša	1,253,609	0.7%	1	75	0.52	0.7%	15,610	1
18	Mitrovicë e jugut/Južna Mitrovica	6,677,528	3.7%	1	75	2.77	3.7%	83,150	1
19	Novo Brdo/Novobërdë	1,375,841	0.8%	1	75	0.57	0.8%	17,132	1
20	Obiliq/Obilić	2,782,493	1.5%	1	75	1.15	1.5%	34,648	1
21	Pejë/Peć	9,317,021	5.2%	1	75	3.87	5.2%	116,018	1
22	Podujevë/Podujevo	8,310,705	4.6%	1	75	3.45	4.6%	103,487	1
23	Prishtinë/Priština	17,807,980	9.9%	1	75	7.39	9.9%	221,750	1
24	Prizren/Prizren	17,392,374	9.6%	1	75	7.22	9.6%	216,574	1
25	Rahovec/Orahovac	5,231,296	2.9%	1	75	2.17	2.9%	65,141	1
26	Štrpce/Shtërpcë	1,439,956	0.8%	1	75	0.60	0.8%	17,931	1
27	Shtime/Štimlje	2,633,077	1.5%	1	75	1.09	1.5%	32,788	1
28	Skenderaj/Srbica	4,827,101	2.7%	1	75	2.00	2.7%	60,108	1
29	Suharekë/Suva Reka	5,591,288	3.1%	1	75	2.32	3.1%	69,624	1
30	Viti/Vitina	4,406,302	2.4%	1	75	1.83	2.4%	54,868	1
31	Vushtrri/Vučitrn	6,458,007	3.6%	1	75	2.68	3.6%	80,417	1
32	Zubin Potok/Zubin Potok	1,747,734	1.0%	1	75	0.73	1.0%	21,763	1
33	Zvečan/Zveçan	1,659,489	0.9%	1	75	0.69	0.9%	20,664	1
34	Gračanica/Graçanicë	2,329,064	1.3%	1	75	0.97	1.3%	29,002	1
35	Klokot Vrbovac/Kllokot Vërbovc	664,809	0.4%	1	75	0.28	0.4%	8,278	1
36	Severna Mitrovica/Mitrovicë e veriut	2,354,383	1.3%	1	75	0.98	1.3%	29,317	1
37	Parteš/Partesh	630,995	0.3%	1	75	0.26	0.3%	7,857	1
38	Ranilug/Ranillug	1,013,136	0.6%	1	75	0.42	0.6%	12,616	1
	Total/Average	**180,690,003**	100.0%	38	75	75.00	100.0%	2,250,000	1

Column 10 shows the grant allocation for each municipality as a percentage of its general grant allocation (column 3). In this example, it shows that all municipalities get a 1.25% increase to the general grant allocation.[8]

In reality, and as not all Municipalities will meet the three minimum conditions, it is anticipated that, through the performance grant, municipalities with a score above average will see a noticeable 2-6% increase in their capital budget.

The above table is available as an excel spreadsheet for those interested.

8 Obviously, given the assumptions, the calculations show a same relative increase of the general grant for all municipalities as all have the same score. The 1.25% is precisely the performance grant amount as share of the general grant (2,25/180,7). In reality, because some municipalities will not meet the MCs, whilst also the scores differ, the relative increase will be (much) higher depending on the relative performance. In fact, the actual allocation a municipality gets is dependent on its relative score and on the Municipalities that have (or notably those that have not met) the minimum conditions.

Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova-Republic of Kosovo
Qeveria e Kosovës-Vlada Kosova-Government of Kosova

MINISTRIA E ADMINISTRIMIT TË PUSHTETIT LOKAL
MINISTRASTVO ADMINISTRACIJE LOKALNE SAMOUPRAVE
MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

Terms of Reference for the Technical Group (TG)

January 2018

1. Short background

The Ministry of Local Government Administration (MLGA) in cooperation with SDC and the Ministry of Finance (MoF) have decided to establish a performance grant as a top-up to the general grant. This performance grant will be available for 38 municipalities of the Republic of Kosovo.

The funds will flow through the government financial system and are made available to municipalities as a top-up to the general grant.

This document clarifies the role and the function of the Technical Group (TG).

2. Roles of the Technical Group (TG):

The main function of the TG are the following:

- Draft the rules of the performance grant;
- Ensure strict application of the rules without any exception;
- Process data collection for those data that are not yet part of the existing data basis;
- Assess annual municipal performance and prepare the scorecards;
- Ensure the data are correct and undertake remedy measures if necessary;
- Submit the assessment results/reports and scorecards to the Performance Grant Commission for endorsement;
- Review appeals and provide recommendation to the Performance Grant Commission for endorsement;
- Provide secretarial services to the Performance Grant Commission;
- Support organisation of the grant ceremony;
- Propose recommendations to the Performance Grant Commission how to further advance the performance grant.

3. Membership of the Technical group:

The table below provides the names, institution and positions of the TG members:

	Role in TG Institutions & position	Name and surname Contact details
1	Chair MLGA/PMS Head of Department	Venera Cerkini Tel: 038 200 35 559 Email: Venera.Cerkini@rks-gov.net
2	Member MLGA/Municipal Performance Officer	Lazar Mitić Tel: 038 200 35 641 Email: Lazar.Mitic@rks-gov.net
3	Member MLGA/Senior officer for Municipal Performance	Haxhi Krasniqi Tel: 038 200 35 503 Email: Haxhi.Krasniqi@rks-gov.net
4	Member MLGA /Senior officer for capacity building	Ganimete Salihu Tel: 038 200 35 619 Email: Ganimete.salihu@rks-gov.net
5	Member MLGA/Senior officer for HRMR	Ardian Haxhaj - member Tel: 038 200 35 563 Email: ardian.haxhaj@rks-gov.net
6	Member SDC/DEMOS Deputy Project Manager	Majlinda Jupolli Tel: 044 300 516 Email: Majlinda.Jupolli@helvetas.org
7	Member SDC/DEMOS Senior intervention manager	Ilire Buza Daija Tel: 038 517 715 Email: Ilire.Buza@helvetas.org

The mandate of the TG members is for a period of 4 years.

4. Administration of the TG

- The TG will provide secretarial services to the Performance Grant Commission. The secretariat is responsible for preparations of meetings including distribution of documents and proposals to the Performance Grant Commission.
- Members of the TG should preferably understand and speak English. If not, translation will be provided.
- The chairperson will prepare the agenda for each meeting.
- Notice of meetings should be sent out at least one week before the meeting. The agenda and relevant documents should be attached to the notice.
- Minutes will be prepared for every meeting by the chair and approved/endorsed by all members.
- Any member may jointly call other meetings in coordination with the chairperson.

Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova-Republic of Kosovo
Qeveria e Kosovës-Vlada Kosova-Government of Kosova

MINISTRIA E ADMINISTRIMIT TË PUSHTETIT LOKAL
MINISTRASTVO ADMINISTRACIJE LOKALNE SAMOUPRAVE
MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

Terms of Reference for the Performance Grant Commission

January 2018

1. Short background

The Ministry of Local Government Administration (MLGA) in cooperation with SDC and the Ministry of Finance (MoF) have decided to establish a performance grant as a top-up to the general grant. This performance grant will be available for 38 municipalities of the Republic of Kosovo.

The funds will flow through the government financial system and are made available to municipalities as a top-up to the general grant.

This document clarifies the role and the functions of the Performance Grant Commission. The main function of Performance Grant Commission is to guarantee integrity to the assessment system by formally assuming (political) responsibility for the rules, the assessment results and the ensuing calculations for the allocations. The Commission cannot alter the results of the assessment but only ensure that the Technical group (TG) has followed the rules.

2. Role and functions of the Performance Grant Commission

The main functions of the Performance Grant Commission are the following:

- Provide strategic guidance to the performance grant;
- Act as an exchange forum to ensure effective linkages between SDC, MLGA, MoF, municipal practices, the national level policy making process and other donor's interventions;
- Endorse the rules and assure their strict implementation;
- Endorse the assessment results of the municipal annual performance and grant allocation;
- Endorse replies to appeals of municipalities reviewed by the TG;
- Inform the municipalities about their performance score and grant allocations through the TG;

3. Membership of the Performance Grant Commission

The table below shows the membership and the voting rights per member:

	Institutions	Number of members	Number of votes
1	Ministry of Local Government Administration (MLGA) - Chair	1	1
2	Ministry of Finance (MoF)	1	1
3	Ministry of Public Administration (MPA)	1	1
4	National Auditor office (NAO)	1	Observer
5	Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC)	1	Observer
6	NGO – to be defined	1	Observer

Annex 5: Possible PG alignment with MESP/GIZ grant

The mandate of the Performance Grant Commission members is for a period of 4 years.

The TG will provide secretarial services to the Performance Grant Commission. It is responsible for preparations of meetings including distribution of documents and proposals to the Performance Grant Commission.

4. Administration of the Performance Grant Commission

- Members of the Performance Grant Commission should preferably understand and speak English. If not translation will be provided by the TG.
- The chairperson will prepare the agenda for each meeting based on proposals from the TG.
- Notice of meetings should be sent out by the chairperson at least one week before the meeting. The agenda and relevant documents should be attached to the notice.
- Minutes will be prepared for every meeting by the TG and approved/endorsed by the Performance Grant Commission.
- Decisions of the Performance Grant Commission should be made by consensus where possible. If not, the decisions will be taken by simple majority. Minority recommendations should always be noted in the minutes when requested.
- Any Performance Grant Commission members may jointly call other meetings in coordination with the chairperson.

ANNEX 7: CONTACT DETAILS

Technical Group members

1. **Venera Çerkini - Chairperson**
   MLGA/PMS Head of Department
   Tel: 038 200 35 559
   Email: Venera.Cerkini@rks-gov.net
2. **Lazar Mitić - member**
   MLGA/PMS Department
   Tel: 038 200 35 550
   Email: Lazar.Mitic@rks-gov.net
3. **Haxhi Krasniqi – member**
   MLGA/PMS Department
   Tel: 038 200 35 559
   Email: Haxhi.Krasniqi@rks-gov.net
4. **Ganimete Salihu – member**
   MLGA/PMS Department
   Tel: 038 200 35 556
   Email: Ganimete.salihu@rks-gov.net
5. **Ardian Haxhaj - member**
   MLGA/PMS Department
   Tel: 038 200 35 563
   Email: ardian.haxhaj@rks-gov.net
6. **Majlinda Jupolli - member**
   DEMOS/Deputy Project Manager
   Tel: 038 517 715
   Email: Majlinda.Jupolli@helvetas.org
7. **Ilire Buza Daija - member**
   DEMOS/Senior Intervention Manager
   Tel: 038 517 715
   Email: Ilire.Buza@helvetas.org

Performance Grant Commission members

1. **Rozafa Ukimeraj – Chairperson**
   MLGA/General Secretary
   Tel: 038 200 35 577
   Emil: Rozafa.Ukimeraj@rks-gov.net
2. **Salvador Elmazi - Member**
   MoF/Director Budget Department
   Tel: 038 200 34 227
   Email: Salvador.Elmazi@rks-gov.net
3. **Arton Berisha - Member**
   MPA/General Secretary
   Tel: + 381 38 200 60 100
   Email: Arton.Berisha@rks-gov.net
4. **Valbon Bytyqi - Observer**
   NAO/Asisstant Auditor General
   Tel: 045 109 164
   Email: valbon.bytyqi@oagks.org
5. **Patrick Etienne – Observer**
   SCO/Director
   Tel: 038 248 091
   Email: patrick.etienne@eda.admin.ch
6. **NGO – Observer**
   To be defined

Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC