



# Openness of judicial institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina and region

**ZaštoNe** 

 **ActionSEE**



This project was funded by the European Union.  
Analysis was done with the help of European Union.  
ActionSEE is solely responsible for the contents of the analysis, and  
the analysis does not reflect the stance of the European Union.

**Authors:** Damir Dajanović, Blerina Ramaj i Xheni Lame

**Analysis of openness of judicial institutions  
in Bosnia and Herzegovina and region**

**PROPOSALS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF  
A CURRENT STATE**

---

THE VIEWS EXPRESSED IN THIS DOCUMENT ARE AUTHORS' AND  
DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF THE DONOR.

Sarajevo, October 2018.

## INTRODUCTION

UG "Why not", in co-operation with its partners from the regional network "ActionSEE", prepared a proposal of practical policy, analyzing the level of transparency, openness and accountability of judicial institutions in the Western Balkans region.

The proposal is a result of extensive research based on methodology, which the members of the ActionSEE network have been implementing in the last few months in all the Western Balkan countries. The objective is to establish the real situation in this area through objective measurement of judicial openness in the region and make recommendations for its improvement. It also aims to strengthen the principles of good governance and help institutions, by making them more effective in their work. We believe that these are the goals we share with the institutions that are involved in the research.

The practical policy proposal, with accompanying analysis, is the second document of this type. The network members also made recommendations for improving institutional openness last year after the research.

Based on the results of the research conducted in 2016, policies have been developed to provide an overview of the situation in the judicial institutions of BiH and the region, including the observed shortcomings and good practices in this area. Based on these analysis recommendations and "road maps" were developed to improve the specific areas covered by the research last year.

After that, the members of the ActionSEE network, based on their knowledge of the findings and results of last year's monitoring, started improving and adapting the research methodology and its indicators, hoping that the new information that was gathered will contribute to better project results. The aim of using new and improved indicators is to add new dimensions to research and to make a more effective contribution to enhancing the openness of the institutions of the region.

Having knowledge, concrete results and analysis of regional openness, and believing that judicial institutions, led by one-way steps to improve the situation in these areas, will work to improve the situation, we have decided to advocate a higher level of openness of government institutions in the region.

Thus, this year's survey is enriched with indicators advocating a higher standard of proactive transparency.

The policy of openness must be the policy of all institutions in the region. It must also be defined as other important policies and should not depend on the current decision-makers or the current mood of the person in charge of the institution. Each country in the region has its own specific, political conditions in which it develops its openness, but one can notice a significant space for a common regional action to improve the state.

Our principle document is for the needs of decision-makers in the courts and prosecutors' offices of the countries of the region. It can also be useful to representatives of international institutions and colleagues from the non-governmental sector dealing with these issues.

We are at your disposal for any suggestions, well-meaning criticism and discussion.

## OPENNESS OF JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE REGION

The judiciary bodies in the Western Balkans have not achieved satisfactory results in terms of openness in 2017.

Decline in the performance of judicial bodies is an alarm bell for the transparency, openness and accountability of the administrative activities conducted by these institutions. Challenges for reforms implemented in these bodies as well as a low result on transparency do not leave the impression that concrete steps are being taken to promote transparency, empowerment of citizens and anti-corruption activities. The open government is not a goal just for the executive and legislative branch, but also the need for the judiciary to understand how they can help improve governance, society and democracy (OGP, 2016).

Urgent and concrete steps to improve the performance of this authority need to be taken in order to regain public trust in the judiciary.

## COURTS AND PROSECUTORS' OFFICES IN THE REGION

The overall score of all courts in the region shows that they meet 42% of the indicators, while the prosecution meets approximately 31% of the openness indicators. The research shows that the distribution of results is not the same in either country; significant differences in performance occur among the Western Balkan countries.

Several findings on the work of the judiciary in the region and all the countries of the ActionSEE network are presented through this document to highlight the most important problems that the authorities of each country should address as soon as possible within the framework of the openness of the rule of law.

### COURTS IN THE REGION

The results of the research carried out show a fall in the work of the courts on the efficient fulfillment of openness indicators. On average, the regional courts met 42% of the 2017 measurements.

The level of regional courts openness to citizens according to the four basic principles of openness is: awareness with 50% of the indicators met, transparency 40%, accessibility 39% and integrity 37%. The situation seems even more serious in the case of judicial councils in the region, where the principles of the Regional Index of Openness on average are 10% lower than in the previous measurement.

### ACCESSIBILITY AND COMMUNICATION WITH CITIZENS

Most courts in the region fail to provide citizens with access to their offices, using mechanisms to provide information to vulnerable groups about their rights and available solutions on their websites. There are no guidelines or mechanisms to express concerns and appeals, and low scores in publishing the verdicts together with the relevant explanations are another problem for the judiciary.

Access to public information in the Western Balkans courts does not go beyond 30% of the indicators met. Certain number of courts in the region do not have a website and for that reason citizens have difficulty finding publicly available information or having insight into progress of their cases. Columns with relevant information on free access to information are seldom found on court web sites because most courts in practice do not develop policies that deal with the institution's openness.

Public trials meet 39% of openness indicators. Persons with disabilities have far more difficulties to access courtrooms, although there are regulations defining the obligation of all public institutions to adapt infrastructure in their facilities and facilitate access to this marginalized group.

## PREVENTION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

This domain of integrity principle reaches approximately 20% of the indicator's fulfillment. Integrity plans are tools for verifying the readiness of the institution to deal with unethical practices and corruption. The lack of these plans is a serious problem with regard to the processes that take place before the courts in the Western Balkans. In addition, most of the courts in the region responded that it did not provide training or workshops on how to deal with conflict of interest/prevention of corruption/whistleblowers in the event of detected irregularities.

## PROSECUTION IN THE REGION

The measurement results for this year show a significant drop in the performance of prosecutors in the region. The Prosecution in the region in 2017 fulfilled 31% of the set of openness indicators.

Montenegro with 65% of the indicators met, BiH with 41% and Kosovo with 46% are the three most open prosecutions in the region. Much has to be done in this area, especially in the prevention of conflict of interest and reporting on work that is done in the prosecution.

The degree to which Prosecution Offices are open to citizens according to the four basic principles is as follows: accessibility 22% of the completed indicators, awareness with 38%, integrity with 34% and transparency with 18%.

## ACCESSIBILITY AND COMMUNICATION WITH CITIZENS

The offices of the prosecution in the region have shown a bad result regarding the availability of information, with only 22% of the indicators being fulfilled. From this we can conclude that prosecuting offices generally do not give the interested parties access to information that should be accessible to the public. As with the courts in the region, most prosecutors do not offer any form of direct communication mechanism with prosecutors. In addition, the prosecutor's offices in the region do not provide adequate information on its websites, nor do their websites have parts for raising concerns.

In the end, the prosecutor's offices in the region mostly have available websites, but fail to provide adequate information, particularly in the area of freedom of information.

## PREVENTION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The conflict of interest as part of the integrity component in the region had 20% of the criteria met. This is a very low and worrying outcome, bearing in mind that the conflict of interest is a prosecution integrity tool and is linked to non-ethical practices and corruption.

The countries of the Western Balkans in the region are on the road to European integration. Some of them have opened chapters on the rule of law and reform of the justice system and are facing challenges and changes that will bring improvements to the existing system, so it is essential to include recommendations for the part about the integrity gained from this research that will contribute to improving the results for the prosecution in next measurement.

## JUDICIARY IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Judiciary system in Bosnia and Herzegovina somewhat different than judiciary systems in other countries of the region. In order to make a comparison between them a unique methodological approach is required.

Since Bosnia and Herzegovina, due to its specific structure does not have a unique judicial system on state level, like other countries of the region do, this research was conducted by examining chosen courts and prosecutors' offices of state and entity level, with the addition of High Judicial and Prosecutorial Council of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

## OPENNESS OF PROSECUTOR'S OFFICES IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

In this years' analysis we gathered data on eleven Prosecutors' offices in total: 5 cantonal prosecutors' offices, three district prosecutors' offices, both entity procesutors' offices, and Prosecutors' office of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The research showed that there are significant differences when it comes to degree of openness of these institutions. Cantonal prosecutors' offices fulfilled 30% of required indicators, entity prosecutors' offices fullfiled 49%, district prosecutors' offices fulfilled 35% and Prosecutors' office of Bosnia and Herzegovina fulfills 56 percent of said indicators.

In total, Procecutors' offices in Bosnia and Herzegovina fulfill 41% of the indicators, and are third in the region, behind Montenegro (65%) and Kosovo (46%). If we look at the average score in the region, Prosecutors' offices in Bosnia and Herzegovina are significantly above the average score, which is 24%.

If we look at individual institutions, the best result was achieved by District Public Prosecutors' Office in Banja Luka, which fulfilled 61% of the indicators. District Public Prosecutors' Office in Doboј has the worst result, with only 21% on indicators fulfilled.

However, although there are differences between institutions, there are also similarities between them, so we could extrapolate recommendations which can apply to all the institutions. There are four basic principles through which the institutions are monitored: Accessibility, Awareness, Transparency and Integrity.

## Accessibility

When it comes to the accessibility principle, prosecutors offices in Bosnia and Herzegovina fulfil 44% of set indicators. In order to improve this result, institutions need to implements some of the following recommendations:

- Institutions need to publish FOI approved requests, and the Register of information they have in their possession
- Data that's being published needs to be in open data format, and appropriate trainings need to be conducted for persons responsible for publishing of said data
- FOI guides need to be published, as well as contacts of person or persons who are responsible for fulfilling these requests

## Awareness

Indicators for the Awareness principle were fulfilled at a rate of 52%, which is the highest percentage of all openness principles. Since this principle is comprised mostly of indicators related to reports on performance, it has been noted that these reports are not delivered to the competent authorities in a timely manner. These reports should also include data on disciplinary measures and complaints against prosecutors. Some of the recommendations are as follows:

- Yearly reports need to be delivered to the competent authorities in a timely manner
- Yearly reports need to include data on disciplinary measures and complaints against prosecutors
- Yearly reports need to include data on solved cases, verdicts etc. U godišnje izvještaje uključiti podatke o riješenim slučajevima, presudama i sl.

## Integrity

Integrity principle was fulfilled with 38% success rate, and key problems that were identified are lack of integrity plans and non-publishment of codes of ethics. Recommendations are as follows:

- Publish the Code of Ethics for prosecutors on web pages of the prosecutors' offices
- Compose and publish the Integrity plan for prosecutors (a document which clearly outlines measures for prevention and elimination of different forms of corrupt and unethical behaviour within the institution)

## Transparency

In the area of transparency prosecutors' offices in BiH fulfilled 38% of indicators set. One of the positive findings in this area is that the prosecutors' offices regularly publish news and other content on their web pages, and the fact that more than half of the prosecutors' offices publish names and contacts of prosecutors on their web pages. However, there is still a significant number of flaws that were noted during the monitoring, and to improve the score institutions should implement the following recommendations:

- Publish the data on salaries of prosecutors on websites
- Publish current strategies by which the prosecutors' office is acting
- Publish yearly Work programmes on websites
- Publish organograms of institutions on websites
- Set up online notice board on websites

## OPENNESS OF COURTS IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

In this year's research we gathered data on 18 courts in total: four Basic courts in Republika Srpska, two District courts in Republika Srpska, eight Municipality courts in Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, two Commercial district courts, and supreme courts of Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Republika Srpska.

When total results of courts in BiH are concerned, only 26% of indicators were fulfilled, which puts Bosnia and Herzegovina in the last place in the region. Montenegro had the best score, with 57%. Courts in BiH are also well behind the regional average, which is 40%.

Differences were observed in different types of courts, so the worst are commercial district courts (21%) followed by the district courts (25%), basic courts (26%), municipal courts (26%), and finally the supreme courts with 31% of fulfilled indicators.

Municipality court in Livno had the best results with 35% of indicators fulfilled, while the worst result was recorded by Commercial district court in Trebinje with only 16% of indicators fulfilled.

However, although there are differences between institutions, there are also similarities between them, so we could extrapolate recommendations which can apply to all the institutions. There are four basic principles through which the institutions are monitored: Accessibility, Awareness, Transparency and Integrity.

## Accessibility

In the area of accessibility, courts in Bosnia and Herzegovina fulfilled 24% of indicators set. The problems that were observed are related to not publishing the verdicts with explanations, not publishing FOI approved information, non-existence of separate departments for communicating with the public, non-existence of electronic databases of court verdicts etc.

Additionally, the fact that there are no departments for communication with the public significantly complicates access to information, as well as the fact there are no hotlines set up for citizen's complaints. In order to improve the score in this area, the following recommendations need to be carried out:

- Set up electronic databases of court verdicts
- Publish verdicts, together with explanations
- Update FOI guides once a year, and make them accessible on court's official websites
- Set up hotlines for citizens' complaints
- Set up departments for communication with the public
- Organize trainings for persons who are responsible for publishing the data, in order to get them acquainted with open data formats, and in order for them to adopt the practices of publishing said data in machine readable formats

## Awareness

Concerning the awareness principle, court institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina have a miserable output of only 8% of indicators fulfilled. Key problems observed are related to lack of information about disciplinary measures and complaints against judges, not publishing statistics about the number of cases, duration of the process, and number of verdicts etc. The fact that reports to relevant institutions are not being sent on time poses another problem. The recommendations are as follows:

- Work reports need to be delivered to relevant institutions on time
- Work reports need to contain information on disciplinary measures and complaints about the judges
- Statistics on number of cases, duration of the process and number of verdicts need to be published.

## Transparency

Courts in Bosnia and Herzegovina achieved the best result in the area of transparency, with 36% of indicators fulfilled, but there is still a lot of room for improvement. Work programmes of institutions are not being published, as well as current strategies under which the courts operate. There are no documents written to ensure transparency, nor are judges' salaries or organograms of institutions published. The following recommendations should be implemented:

- Publish yearly Work programmes
- Publish current strategies under which the courts operate
- Publish judges' salaries
- Publish data from notice boards on websites
- Set up strategies which ensure openness and transparency

## HIGH JUDICIAL AND PROSECUTORIAL COUNCIL OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Unlike other countries in the region, which have separate judicial and court councils, Bosnia and Herzegovina has only one body in charge of ensuring independent, unbiased and professional judiciary in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and that body is High Judicial and Prosecutorial Council of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In order for the results of the research to be comparable with regional results, methodological approach required to assess different indicators in relation to courts and prosecution.

## OPENNESS OF HIGH JUDICIAL AND PROSECUTORIAL COUNCIL OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA – JUDICIAL INDICATORS

HJPC BiH fulfills 65% of judicial indicators, and holds a second place among the institutions in the region, behind Montenegro (79%). HJPC is significantly better than regional average (48%).

As with the other institutions, there are four basic principles which were researched: Accessibility, Awareness, Transparency and Integrity.

## Accessibility

When it comes to the accessibility principle, HJPC fulfils 72% of the indicators. However, there are certain problems when it comes to the area of access to information: FOI approved requests are not published, nor is the FOI guide published and updated.

Additionally, there is a need to set up guidelines for cooperation with the media in regards to monitoring the work of the council. These are only indicators that were observed as negative, so the recommendations are as follows:

- Update FOI guides once a year, and make them available on the Council website
- Publish approved FOI requests
- Set up guidelines for cooperation with the media in regards to monitoring the work of the council

### Awareness

HJPC has fulfilled 100% of indicators from the awareness principle. Mechanisms for assignment of cases are established, yearly report includes information on disciplinary measures and complaints, and documents which determine the content of yearly work reports sent to the Council by other judicial institutions also exist.

### Integrity

From the integrity principle, the Council fulfilled 69% of the indicators. Although this is a solid result, the Council needs to establish mechanisms for monitoring of implementation of the Code of Ethics, as well as procedures to sanction the cases of violations of said code. As with other judicial institutions, there is a need to establish an Integrity plan. Recommendations are as follows:

- Establish mechanisms for monitoring of implementation of the Code of Ethics
- Establish procedures to sanction the cases of violations of the Code of Ethics
- Create and publish an Integrity plan (a document which clearly outlines measures for prevention and elimination of different forms of corrupt and unethical behaviour within the institution)

### Transparency

In this area HJPC achieved the worst result by fulfilling only 53% of indicators. Biggest objections are related to the budget of the institution, since the budgets are not available on the website, and reports on budget spending are not published regularly. Current strategies under which the Council acts and data on salaries also need to be published. Transparency in regards to the process of public procurement also needs to be improved. The recommendations for improving in this area, are as follows:

- Publish yearly budgets on the official website
- Publish reports on budget spending on the official website
- Publish yearly work programmes on the official website

- Publish strategies under which the council acts on the official website
- Publish data on salaries of Council members on the official website
- Publish the contracts on public procurement on the official website

## OPENNESS OF HIGH JUDICIAL AND PROSECUTORIAL COUNCIL OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA – PROSECUTORIAL INDICATORS

HJPC BiH fulfills 62% of prosecutorial indicators, and holds a second place among the institutions in the region, behind Montenegro (62%). HJPC is significantly better than regional average (41%).

As with the other institutions, there are four basic principles which were researched: Accessibility, Awareness, Transparency and Integrity.

### Accessibility

When it comes to the accessibility principle, HJPC fulfils 70% of the indicators. However, there are certain problems when it comes to the area of access to information: FOI approved requests are not published, nor is the FOI guide published and updated. Additionally, there is a need to set up guidelines for cooperation with the media in regards to monitoring the work of the council. These are only indicators that were observed as negative, so the recommendations are as follows:

- Update FOI guides once a year, and make them available on the Council website
- Publish approved FOI requests
- Set up guidelines for cooperation with the media in regards to monitoring the work of the council

### Awareness

HJPC has fulfilled 100% of indicators from the awareness principle. Mechanisms for assignment of cases are established, yearly report includes information on disciplinary measures and complaints, and documents which determine the content of yearly work reports sent to the Council by other judicial institutions also exist.

### Integrity

From the integrity principle, the Council fulfilled 64% of the indicators. Although this is a solid result, the Council needs to establish mechanisms for monitoring of implementation of the Code of Ethics, as well as procedures to sanction the cases of violations of said code.

5g'k ]h' c'hYf' 1 X]WU' ]bgh]i h]cbgž hYfY' ]g' U' bYYX' hc' YgHUV' ]g' Ub' }bhY[ f]m d'Ub''  
FYWta a YbXU]cbg'UFY'Ug'Zc''ck g.'

'9ghUV' ]g' a YWU' ]g' a g'Zc'f' a cb]hcf]b[ 'cZ]a d'Ya YbhU]cb'cZ h'Y'7cXY'cZ9h' ]Vg'  
'9ghUV' ]g' d'fcW'Xi fYg'hc'g'UbV]cb' h'Y'WUg'Yg'cZ] ]c'U]h]cbg'cZ h'Y'7cXY'cZ9h' ]Vg'  
'7fYU'Y' UbX' di V' ]g' Ub' }bhY[ f]m d'Ub' fU' XcW' a Ybh' k \ ]W' WYU' m' ci h' ]bYg'  
a YUgi fYg' Zc'f' dfY] Ybh]cb' UbX' Y' ]a ]bU]cb' cZ X]ZYfYbh' Zcfa g' cZ Vtffi dh' UbX'  
i bYh' ]W' VY\Uj ]ci f'k ]h' ]b' h'Y' ]bgh]i h]cbt

### HfUbgdUFYbVrh

}h' ]g' UfYU' <>D7' UWX' ]Y' YX' h'Y' k' c'fgh' fYgi' h'VmZ' 'Z]' ]b[ 'cb' m' (-i' 'cZ' ]bX' ]W]h'c'f'g''  
6] [ [ Ygh' cV' YW]cbg' UfY' fY' U'YX' hc' h'Y' Vi X[ Yh' cZ' h'Y' ]bgh]i h]cbž' g]bW' h'Y' Vi X[ Yhg'  
UfY' bchU] U] UV' Y' cb' h'Y' k' YVg' ]h'Z' UbX' fYd'c'f'g' cb' Vi X[ Yhg' dYbX] ]b[ 'UfY' bchidi V' ]g' YX'  
fY[ i' 'Uf' m' 7i fFybh' gh' U'Y' [ ]Yg' i bXYf' k \ ]W' h'Y' 7ci bW' U'V'g' UbX' XU'U' bUa Yg' cb'  
gU' Uf]Yg' U'gc' bYYX' hc' VY' di V' ]g' YX'' HfUbgdUFYbVrh' ]b' fY[ UfXg' hc' h'Y' d'fcW'gg' cZ'  
di V' ]W' d'fcW' fYa Ybh' U'gc' bYYXg' hc' VY' ]a d'fcj YX'' h'Y' fYWta a YbXU]cbg' Zc'f'  
]a d'fcj ]b[ ' ]b' h' ]g' UfYUz' UfY' U'g' Zc''ck g.'

- 'Di V' ]g' n'YUf' m'Vi X[ Yhg' cb' h'Y' cZ]WU' k' YVg]hY
- 'Di V' ]g' fYd'c'f'g' cb' Vi X[ Yhg' dYbX] ]b[ 'cb' h'Y' cZ]WU' k' YVg]hY
- 'Di V' ]g' n'YUf' m'k' c'f' d'fc[ fUa' a Yg' cb' h'Y' cZ]WU' k' YVg]hY
- 'Di V' ]g' gh' U'Y' [ ]Yg' i bXYf' k \ ]W' h'Y' Vt' bW' U'V'g' cb' h'Y' cZ]WU' k' YVg]hY
- 'Di V' ]g' XU'U' cb' gU' Uf]Yg' cZ7ci bW' a Ya VYf'g' cb' h'Y' cZ]WU' k' YVg]hY
- 'Di V' ]g' h'Y' Vt' b'f' U'V'g' cb' di V' ]W' d'fcW' fYa Ybh' cb' h'Y' cZ]WU' k' YVg]hY
- '7fYU'Y' XcW' a Ybh'g' fY' U'YX' hc' cdYbbYgg' UbX' HfUbgdUFYbVrh' cZ h'Y' ]bgh]i h]cb
- 'Di V' ]g' XU'U' cb' Ya d' c'Y'Yg' fU' bUa Yg' z' d'cg] ]h]cbg' UbX' Vt' b' U'V'g' k' cb' h'Y' k' YVg]hY

### A 9H<C8C@C; MC: 'F 9G95F 7<

CdYbbYgg' ]g' U' \_YmfYei ]fYa Ybh' Zc'f' X'Ya c'V'U'W'U'g' ]h' YbUV' Yg' V]h' n'Ybg' hc' c'V'U] ]b' h'Y'  
]b' Zc'fa U]cb' UbX' \_bck' YX[ Y' b'Y'W'gg' Ufm' Zc'f' Yei U' d'U'f' h' ]W' d'U]cb' ]b' d'c' ]h' W' ' ]ZYž'  
YZY'W]j Y' X'Y'V]g]cb! a U\_]b[ 'UbX' \c'X]b[ 'h'Y' ]bgh]i h]cbg' fYg' d'cbg] V' Y' Zc'f' h'Y' d'c' ]W' Yg'  
h' Ym' Vt' b' X' i W'

5' 'Uf[ Y' bi a VYf' cZ' Vt' b'f]Yg' i bXYf' H\_U' Vt' b' W' Y' h' U'V' ]cbg' hc' ]b' W' Y' U'g' Y' h'Y' ]f'  
HfUbgdUFYbVrh' UbX' U'W' Vt' b' h'U'V' ]]m' r'ck' UfXg' V]h' n'Ybg'' Hc' X'Y' h'Y' fa' ]b' Y' h'Y' Y' i' h'Y' b' h'c' k' \ ]W'  
K' Yg' h'Y' f' b' 6U' \_Ub' V]h' n'Ybg' fY' W' ]j' Y' Z]f' UbX' i' bXYf' g' h'U' b' X' U' Y' ]b' Zc'fa U]cb' Z'ca' h'Y' ]f'  
]bgh]i h]cbgž' h'Y' f' Y' [ ]cbU' }bXYI' cZ' CdYbbYgg' \Ug' V' Y' Y' b' X'Y' j' Y' cdYX''

H'Y' f' Y' [ ]cbU' }bXYI' cZ' CdYbbYgg' a YUgi fYg' h'Y' X'Y' [ f' Y' hc' k' \ ]W' 1 X]WU' ]bgh]i h]cbg'  
UfY' cdYb' hc' V]h' n'Ybg' UbX' g' c'V'Y' m' z' U'g' YX' cb' Zci f' d'f] b' V]d' Yg' f' Y' HfUbgdUFYbVrh' f' &  
U'W' V'gg]V' ]]m' i' f' k' ]b' h'Y' [ f]m' UbX' f' ( k' U'k' UfY' b' Y' gg''

The principle of transparency implies that organizational information, budget and public procurement procedures are publicly available and published. Accessibility refers to providing and respecting procedures for free access to information, and strengthening interaction with citizens.

Integrity includes mechanisms for the prevention of corruption, the implementation of ethical codes and the regulation of lobbying. The ultimate principle, awareness, concerns the monitoring and evaluation of policies being implemented.

Being led with international standards and recommendations and good practice examples, these principles are further elaborated through specific quantitative and qualitative indicators evaluated on the basis of the availability of information on official websites, the quality of the legal framework for individual issues, other sources of public information and questionnaires that were sent to the institutions. Through more than 100 indicators we measured and analyzed the openness of judicial institutions in the region.

The measurement was carried out in the period from December 2017 until the end of March 2018. The standard error of the total openness index is +/- 3%.

Based on the results of the research, a set of recommendations and guidelines addressed to institutions has been developed.

**ACTION SEE** *is a network of civil society organizations that work together to promote and ensure the transparency and accountability of institutions in Southeast Europe, increase the potential for civic activism and participation, promotion and protection of human rights on the internet, and building capacity for the use of new technologies.*