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# **Abbreviations**

**ABR** Administrative Burden Reduction

**AIP** Agency for Information and Privacy

**CD** Concept Documents

**CSO** Civil Society Organization

**DEIPC** Department for European Integration and Policy Coordination

**DTU** Digital Transformation Unit

**GCS** General Coordinating Secretariat

**IPA** Instrument of Pre-Agreement

**ISA** Information Society Agency

**KIPA** Kosovo Institute for Public Administration

**LGAP** Law on General Administrative Procedure

**LO** Legal Office of the OPM

**MALG** Ministry for Administration of Local Governance

**MIA** Ministry of Internal Affairs

**OPM** Office of the Prime Minister

**SCM** Standard Cost Model

**SD** Strategic Document

**SPC** Strategic Planning Committee

**SPO** Strategic Planning Office

**TAK** Tax Administration of Kosovo

**CRA** Civil Registration Agency

**AIS** Agency for Information Society

**EU** European Union

**GIZ** German Agency for International Cooperation

**EC** European Commission

**ABPRP** Administrative Burden Prevention and Reduction Program

**NDP** National Development Plan

**ICT** Information and Communication Technology

# **Introduction**

The Administrative Burden Prevention and Reduction Programme 2025-2028 for the Republic of Kosovo aims to transform the public administration system by reducing the complex and inefficient administrative processes that burden citizens, businesses, and governmental institutions. Administrative burdens, such as redundant regulations, lengthy procedures, and inconsistent service delivery, not only cause delays and frustration but also hinder economic growth and erode public trust in government institutions.

Recognizing the urgent need for reform, Kosovo’s government has committed to streamlining processes, improving digital service delivery, and making public services more accessible, efficient, and user-friendly. The Programme is a crucial component of Kosovo's wider efforts to modernize governance in line with European standards and to strengthen the principles outlined in the Law on General Administrative Procedure. It sets ambitious targets for reducing administrative costs, modernizing public services through simplification and digitalization, and building a more transparent and effective public sector.

The revision of the Programme comes at a critical time as Kosovo embarks on the next phase of its eGovernment strategy and broader public service reforms. The need for greater synergy between digital transformation initiatives, administrative simplification efforts, and a user-centric approach to service design is paramount. This revision will ensure that the Programme continues to address evolving challenges while making use of new opportunities to enhance service delivery and reduce burdens across all sectors of government. The revision also reflects the growing importance of decentralizing administrative burden reduction efforts, fostering collaboration between different levels of government, and promoting a culture of innovation and continuous improvement in public service delivery.

The current Programme was initially developed in a different context. At that time, there was limited focus, resources, and institutional support for reducing the administrative burdens for citizens and businesses. Complementary frameworks for strategic and practical implementation were not in place, nor were the necessary institutional structures. The primary goal of the original Programme was to launch a policy initiative to address these burdens, and significant progress has been made in this regard.

The Strategic Planning Office of the Office of the Prime Minister successfully raised awareness among both government and non-government stakeholders through extensive consultations and collaborative efforts. This awareness has helped build momentum for broader reforms in public service design and delivery, particularly through initiatives like the eGovernment Strategy, which has become a key driver in modernizing administrative processes. Given this evolving landscape, it is necessary to revise the Programme to better align with the current reform efforts. The proposed revision will ensure the following key improvements.

Further integration with public service design and digitalization efforts: The revised Programme will ensure a closer alignment with ongoing digitalization initiatives, particularly those aimed at modernizing public service delivery. The goal is to create synergy between administrative burden reduction and the broader goals of digital transformation, ensuring that both efforts support each other and accelerate the delivery of efficient, accessible public services.

Decentralization of administrative burden reduction efforts: The revised framework will move toward decentralizing the responsibility for reducing administrative burdens, empowering line ministries, local governments, and agencies to take more ownership of these efforts. This shift will ensure that burden reduction is more responsive to specific needs and conditions, allowing for more tailored and effective interventions at various levels of government.

Embedding a user-centric approach: A stronger focus will be placed on embedding a user-centric approach in the design and delivery of services. This means that the needs and experiences of citizens and businesses will be central to all burden reduction efforts. Public services will be redesigned with the end user in mind, ensuring that they are more intuitive, accessible, and easier to navigate.

Focus on horizontal, cross-Government interventions: The role of the SPO will increasingly focus on providing overarching support and guidance for administrative burden reduction across all levels of government. This will be done through the development of soft measures such as guidelines, methodologies, and training programmes. These tools will empower various institutions to carry out their own burden reduction initiatives while ensuring consistency and coherence across the entire public administration.

In this new phase of the Programme, the focus will be on creating sustainable, long-term reforms that improve the quality of public services, reduce administrative burdens, and enhance the overall experience for both citizens and businesses.

# **State of Play**

The Programme, developed under the coordination of SPO of OPM and under supervision of the Cabinet of First Deputy Prime Minister, has made significant strides, driven by high political support and strong cooperation among ministries, civil society, business associations, and international partners like the European Union, Germany, GIZ, World Bank, International Financial Corporation and USAID. European Commission recognized achievements and efforts for reducing of administrative burdens in Country Report 2024, by stating that “Kosovo [advanced](https://www.linkedin.com/feed/hashtag/?keywords=advanced&highlightedUpdateUrns=urn%3Ali%3Aactivity%3A7257413749089718272) in reducing administrative burden by simplifying procedures through implementing the related [Programme](https://www.linkedin.com/feed/hashtag/?keywords=programme&highlightedUpdateUrns=urn%3Ali%3Aactivity%3A7257413749089718272) for 2022-2027”.[[1]](#footnote-1) OECD/SIGMA recognize the process by emphasising that “the policy on administrative simplification, reducing and preventing administrative burdens has made considerable progress” and “the simplification Programme is going according to schedule”, by achieving 100% score of indicator.[[2]](#footnote-2) Key achievements for the period 2022-2024[[3]](#footnote-3), are as following:

**Leadership and coordination**: The government has established a clear hierarchy of responsibility for implementing the Programme. 4 meetings of the Strategic Planning Commission, chaired by the Prime Minister, were held, and the National Administrative Burden Coordinator was appointed. Also, every relevant Ministry, Agency and all Municipalities, appointed responsible officials for ABR, constituting around 60 officials across the public sector working on the process. Administrative Burden Reduction Process is one of the key reform areas in Growth Plan[[4]](#footnote-4) and part of Municipal Performance Grant[[5]](#footnote-5) Indicators as great incentive to extend reduction to the local level.

**Tools and Methodologies**: The development of essential methodologies and tools, such as service catalogues and digitalization frameworks, was a priority. Tools and methodologies for measuring such as Standard Cost Model and Cost Recovery (developed also as digital applications), for user engagement such as Design Thinking (included in trainings, service design and digitalization), for Digital Ready Legislation such as Check List for Digital Ready Legislation (used for prevention and reduction of burdens) and AS IS TO BE methodology for digitalization of public services (applied fully for analyses of more than 200 services in central level), were developed.

**Capacity building**: Training materials and modules focusing on administrative burden prevention were prepared, and 400 public officials (central and local) were trained. From January 2025, online training will start through Moodle Platform. The officials who underwent the training demonstrated significant improvement in knowledge, since they are tested in beginning and in the end of the trainings, as following:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Pass | % | Not pass | % | Total |
| Test 1 | 325 | 65 | 175 | 35 | 500 |
| Test 2 | 430 | 86 | 70 | 14 | 500 |

Table 1: Public Officials trained 2023-2024

**Administrative Burden Prevention**[[6]](#footnote-6): 35 concept documents were reviewed before approval in Government leading to better evidence-based policy making that promotes digitalization and simplified services, as following:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ABR Implications | Adoption of overall input[[7]](#footnote-7) | Level of input adoption by document[[8]](#footnote-8) |
| Total | 35 |  | Total  | 149 |  | Low | 2 | 8% |
| AB implications | 16 | 43% | Comments addressed | 109 | 73% | Partially | 4 | 23% |
| No AB implications | 19 | 57% | Comments not addressed  | 40 | 27% | Fully | 10 | 69% |

Table 2: ABR in Concept Documents 2023-2024

Around **220 legal acts** were reviews before approval in Government leading to less complex legislation that **promotes** simplification and digitalization of services, as following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ABR Implications | Overall input | Comments adopted[[9]](#footnote-9) |  |
| Total  | 220 |  | Total | 95 |  | Total | 180 |  | Services simplified |
| AB implications | 95 | 43% | Fully drafted for ABR | 28 | 30% | Comments addressed | 60 | 33% | 45 |
| No AB implications | 125 | 57% | Commented  | 67 | 70% | Comments not addressed | 120 | 67% |

Table 3: ABR in Legal Acts 2023-2024

**Administrative Burden Reduction**: 85 services were simplified services at the central and around 450 simplified services at local level. This simplification led to over 3.5 million euros in savings for citizens and businesses, as following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Level | Simplified services[[10]](#footnote-10) | Annual Cost Savings | Total |
| Central | 85 | 2.5 mil EUR | 3.5 mil EUR  |
| Local | 450 | 1,0 mil EUR |

Table 4: Simplified services and cost savings in local and central level 2022-2024

**Digitalization**: Major efforts were made toward digitizing public services, including the integration of several fully digital services into the eKosova platform, such as free legal professions services, surveyors’ services, etc. Further digitalization efforts are planned for over 65 services in 2024 and more than 70 in 2025 that already started to be developed, that led to proper simplified and digitalized services, addressing user needs and reducing administrative burdens in public administration as well. All of the services gone through a full reform: by developing the back-end systems, by developing of APIs to integrate services in eKosova, by drafting the proper digital legal base and by ensuring the maintenance at least a year from launching.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | Back Ends | eKosova | Legislation | Maintenance |
| Systems | 15 | 7 | 8 | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| Services | 135 | 65 | 70 | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| Year |  | 2024[[11]](#footnote-11) | 2025[[12]](#footnote-12) |  |  |  |  |

Table 5: Systems and services finished or started for 2024-2025

**Cooperation**: A collaborative approach with development partners, civil society, and business associations was critical to the success of the Programme. More than 50 activities ranged from training public officials to simplifying regulations and reducing costs in both central and local governments.

However, challenges remain. Some of the main challenges are, gender disparity, since there was low participation by women in the administrative burden reduction training programs, particularly at the local level. One of the challenges is public service quality, despite the improvements, challenges remain in fully digitizing and simplifying services across all government levels for level of understanding of simplification and digitalization of services and its effect, that invoke resistance for change.

# **Main Goal**

The primary goal of the Administrative Burden Prevention and Reduction Programme 2025–2028 is to foster a more efficient, transparent, and user-centric public administration system that minimizes unnecessary complexities, enhances service delivery, and builds trust between citizens, businesses, and government institutions. This will be achieved by reducing administrative costs and time for users, modernizing public services through simplification and digitalization, and embedding user-centric approaches throughout the service design and delivery process. By aligning with European standards and leveraging innovative methodologies, the Programme aims to create an enabling environment for economic growth and citizen satisfaction. Additionally, decentralization and capacity building will empower stakeholders at all levels, ensuring tailored, responsive, and sustainable reforms across the Republic of Kosovo.

Looking ahead, and building on the successful achievements of the current Programme, the main goal remains to enhance users’ satisfaction with public service delivery and reduce costs for accessing these services. The results of our efforts will be measured through the following strategic-level targets.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Indicators | Baseline(2024) | Interim goal (2026) | Last year goal (2028) | Outcome |
| General Goal |
| 1 | Time savings | TBM | >50% | >70% | Ensuring affordable public services through administrative burden reduction. |
| 2 | Cost savings | 3.5 MIL EUR | >15 MIL EUR | >30 MIL EUR |

Table 6: Strategic Level Targets

# **Capacity building**

The capacity building of public officials at both **central and local levels** regarding the prevention and reduction of administrative burden is one of the main program’s components. This is because the administrative burden lies not only in legislation but also in how administrative procedures are applied in service delivery. One of the principles in managing administrative procedures is that “the administrative procedure should not be subject to a specific form; it should be completed as quickly as possible, with minimal costs both for the party and the public authority, except when otherwise required by law.”

In this regard, the trainings within component aims not only to enhance capacities but also to **raise awareness** and **inform public administration about the administrative burden**. Therefore, communication and the approach to citizens to facilitate access to service is a priority, rather than creating formalities and administrative burdens that obstruct citizens from obtaining services. In this sense, DigiCamps, also will be organized.

The training is organized in two phases spanning five days: 1) three days of training on principles and administrative behavior affecting the prevention and reduction of administrative burden, the SCM as a tool for measuring the administrative burden, digitalization as a tool for prevention and reduction of the burden, and legal harmonization, and 2) two days on “design thinking.” In terms of digitalization, emphasis is placed on whether the legislation promotes digitalization, and for this purpose, a checklist has been developed to assess whether the legislation creates obstacles to or promotes digitalization of services. The aim here is for legislation to **promote rather than hinder digitalization**. The checklist will also be used in the future to ensure that newly drafted legislation promotes, rather than hinders, the digitalization of procedures.

As for the second phase, “**design thinking**” is an innovative methodology for improving public service delivery by placing the user at the center (user-centric approach). Through this, the training aims to equip participants with knowledge and practical skills to explore and create solutions for complex challenges through key stages: user empathy, problem definition, ideation, prototyping, and testing. This process supports creativity and teamwork, producing ideas that are both innovative and applicable in real-world contexts.

A new feature of the training is that it is not conducted by a single trainer, but five trainers are engaged over the five training days to discuss specific aspects within the prevention and reduction of administrative burden. Each day includes two exercises that facilitate group work, greater interactivity, and hands-on learning based on case studies where citizens approach public administration to receive a service. Also, through this training the approach established with the Program, is promoted: **different subjects, different officials, different trainers**, since it resulted that **combination** motivates **interactive discussions**, but also for a proper simplified and digitalized public services, different profiles are needed.

## Targeted training

Trainings so far have often been provided in a targeted manner, or for **specific groups** based on the field of work. For example, targeted training for inspectorates or on the connection between administrative burden and inspection procedures, or with **business registry contact points** all over the country, etc. Similar trainings will also be organized with different **key officials** at both the central and local levels, that implement procedures and work directly with parties.

## Training evaluation

An important element of trainings is a) the training evaluation by participants and b) the assessment of participants' knowledge. Regarding the first aspect, KIPA, through standard evaluation forms, has gathered feedback from officials and any recommendations they may have for the future. The training is also evaluated by the SPO and experts with the aim of updating content and exercises based on the needs assessment of participants in the training. For the second aspect, the evaluation of participants' training knowledge was initially conducted through a 22-question multiple-choice test given to participants at the start of the training and at the end of the training. The effectiveness of this method was assessed after six months, and it was considered useful by participants, with the suggestion that the test be shorter and conducted online. Following this recommendation, the test was reduced from 22 to 13 multiple-choice questions and converted to an online format. Participants now take the test on their phones via a link sent to their email on the first and third day of training. Additionally, results are collected online, and periodic assessments of the training’s impact on participants are conducted from time to time.

## E-learning

An important component of the training and increasing the level of information in administration regarding the administrative burden will be the online training, which will be made available through the **Moodle** platform of KIPA. Moodle is an online learning (e-learning) platform used by universities and organizations to create interactive environments for training.

The online training will be based on the program of on-site training structured around four modules, accompanied by **videos, quizzes, case studies, and a final test**. Participants will have the opportunity to register using their official email addresses, to pause during the process whenever needed, until completion. Each participant during the training will be informed of how many minutes each module takes and the total duration of the training, meaning the participant will have the time divided into minutes according to the modules and the overall time it takes for the entire training.

Each module will be accompanied by a case study and a quiz with five multiple-choice questions. At the end of each quiz, participants will be able to see the correct and incorrect answers immediately. There will be no conditions for successfully passing the quiz for one module to move on to the next module. A participant who completes all the modules is considered to have attended the training.

At the end of the four modules, participants will take a final test with 10 questions, also with multiple-choice options. Passing the final test will be a prerequisite for receiving the **certificate**, which will be generated online. Thus, the system generates a certificate that is the same as the certificates currently issued by KIPA for the training program. However, even though a participant may start from module two or three, rather than the beginning, they will not have the opportunity to complete and receive the certificate if they do not complete all the modules.

We aim to measure our success in capacity building efforts, through the following targets:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Indicators | Baseline(2024) | Interim goal (2026) | Last year goal (2028) | Outcome |
| Capacity Building |
| 1 | Number of public officials trained | 500 | 1500 | 2000 | Equip stakeholders with the skills and tools to lead administrative burden reduction efforts across all levels of government. |
| 2 | Ratio between T1 and T2 | 21% | 30% | 50% |
| 3 | Impact of trainings on the routine in the public officials | 0 | >50% | >70% |

Table 7: Capacity building targets

# **Prevention**

A key approach to alleviating administrative burdens involves preventive measures throughout the entire policy cycle, particularly during policy analysis and planning stages. The purpose of prevention of administrative burden is to proactively integrate strategies to minimize burdens from the outset of the policy-making process, ensuring they are avoided before they materialize; in contrast, reduction of administrative burden focuses on addressing and mitigating existing burdens after they have been identified within established policies and procedures. Recognizing this, we introduced prevention as a fundamental component of burden reduction.

To facilitate this, we established close collaboration with line institutions, especially involving ABR coordinators, and the Departments for European Integration, IT, Policy Coordination, and Legal Affairs. When implementing interventions, as a general rule, we have been promoting multi-disciplinary teams to engage in prevention efforts, involving not only sectorial and legal officials, but also IT, finance and direct service providers.

In support of these preventive efforts, and in partnership with the aforementioned bodies, we began by identifying primary policy documents for assessment through an ABR lens. Concurrently, we reviewed the government’s list of Strategic Documents, Concept Documents, and primary and secondary Legislation. Our focus was on pinpointing those policy instruments with the most immediate and significant implications for service delivery and ABR. To further strengthen the support for line ministries, we have also been developing special tools to support them in the process:

1. Checklist for Strategic Documents and Concept Documents:[[13]](#footnote-13) The checklist provides guidelines for integrating administrative burden reduction strategies into the development of concept documents and strategic plans. It emphasizes the importance of incorporating service delivery considerations, guided by the best practices from SIGMA principles and Kosovo's legislation on general administrative procedures. The document outlines key areas of focus, including **problem identification, setting objectives, service improvement, option comparison, and impact assessment**, with an emphasis on reducing administrative burdens like document requirements, service time, and costs. It also includes monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for measuring these improvements. The tool will play a critical role in ensuring that ABR related issues are properly reflected in the policy instruments deriving from impact assessment.
2. Digital ready legislation checklist[[14]](#footnote-14): The checklist outlines key considerations for drafting and evaluating legislation related to the design and digitalization of public services. It emphasizes enabling **electronic communication, automation, interoperability, and innovation**, ensuring that laws do not hinder but promote digital service delivery. The checklist guides officials to avoid legal barriers like requiring physical documents or in-person interactions and encourages the use of electronic authentication, data exchange between institutions, and emerging technologies while adhering to user-centric design principles. The tool also promotes use of key simplification and streamlining approaches, such as elimination of services, their combination, reduction of information required and extension of renewal. SPO makes most use of this tool, when providing input to legal acts, in the drafting and consultation stages.
3. Standard Cost Model Manual[[15]](#footnote-15): The manual is a guide to the SCM used for **measuring administrative burdens** imposed by legal requirements on businesses. It explains how to identify, quantify, and reduce administrative burdens related to mandatory information obligations from regulations. The manual outlines steps for measuring these costs, including identifying laws, defining data requirements, estimating time and financial costs for businesses, and calculating the overall burden. It also details how SCM can support reforms such as simplification or digitalization of administrative procedures. In addition, based on the manual an IT Solution on calculating the SCM was designed and made available for use by the administration.[[16]](#footnote-16)
4. Cost Recovery Manual[[17]](#footnote-17): The manual focuses on calculating fees for administrative procedures in Kosovo based on the **cost recovery principle**, as per the requirements of the LGAP, Article 12. It outlines a detailed methodology for determining costs, dividing them into direct and indirect categories. The document provides a step-by-step guide for public institutions to assess these costs and apply **appropriate fees**, ensuring that charges reflect the actual expenses of issuing permits or licenses. It emphasizes regular reviews and adjustments to maintain accurate fee levels and includes a model to automate calculations. In addition, an IT solution was developed and made available for the administration to calculate the costs needed for covering service delivery.[[18]](#footnote-18)

Making use of the above tools, interventions were carried out during the development of both CD and legislation. In terms of the strategic framework, 31 CD were reviewed for the period of 2023-2024, during drafting and consulting phases.[[19]](#footnote-19) Of these, 19 were approved by the Government. 14 of these were deemed to be relevant for ABR, and hence assessed by the team. At the level of the document, 58% addressed in full the provided input, 25% partially and 17% at a low level.

In addition, during 2023-2024[[20]](#footnote-20), SPO also provided input during the legal drafting process. The main activities included providing initial input, based on the above tools, and then holding extensive consultations with the line ministries and the relevant working groups. 188 pieces of legislation were reviewed, of which, 43 were approved. Of these, 75 were relevant to the ABR, which were further analysed and reviewed. The input was provided in line with the above tools, which focused on the LGAP service delivery principles, as well as digital ready principles. In total, 41 services were simplified or burdens were prevented.[[21]](#footnote-21)

With all the progress achieved, there are still challenges faced in the prevention process. The main challenges remain in resistance to introduction of a user-centric approach to reducing administrative burden, difficulties in terms of capacities to carry out complex measuring methodologies such as SCM, but also in making use of modern digital ready legislation methodologies. As emphasized in Capacity Building session, to achieve proper simplification and digitalization of services, a combination of subject and officials is needed. Therefore, to make digital ready legislation, not only lawyers are important. In contrary, users are first, IT, policy and service providers are second, and then comes lawyers to compose the results of the first two as legal norms. Moreover, line ministries still face great difficulties in developing impact assessments, in the planning phase, which adds to difficulties in the reflecting the ABR issues. To address the challenges in preventing administrative burdens effectively, it will be essential to build on the current achievements by implementing a multi-faceted strategy:

* **Update and strengthen intervention tools**: Regularly revising and improving the ABR Checklist, Digital Ready Legislation Checklist, SCM Manual, and Cost Recovery Manual is crucial. This ensures they stay aligned with evolving needs and best practices, making them more practical and user-centric for the line ministries. Clear guidance and accessible tools will support line ministries in embedding these tools early in their analysis.
* **Organize interventions earlier in the policy making:** Interventions will take place as early as possible in the policy cycle, ideally at the analysis and planning stages. Early intervention allows line ministries to consider administrative burden prevention from the outset, making it easier to integrate ABR principles into both strategic documents and legal acts and minimizing the need for revisions later in the process.
* **Promote ABR reflection to policy design**: Resistance to adopting a user-centric approach and more modern digital ready legal drafting and SCM remain major barriers. To overcome such challenges, additional training and capacity-building measures will be introduced. Regular workshops, on-the-job training, and technical assistance will help line ministry officials gain expertise in using SCM as a measurement tool, thus improving the accuracy of cost assessments and enabling data-driven decision-making.
* **Facilitate inter-institutional collaboration and knowledge sharing**: Facilitating regular collaboration and exchanges between line ministries and multi-disciplinary teams—including legal, financial, IT, and policy specialists—will improve consistency in ABR implementation. Regular workshops, knowledge-sharing sessions, and case studies on successful interventions will help overcome isolated efforts and reinforce a cohesive approach across government institutions.

To measure our success in preventing administrative burden, we will make use of the following targets:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Indicators | Baseline(2024) | Interim goal (2026) | Last year goal (2028) | Outcome |
| Prevention |
| 1 | Concept Documents which address ABR related input by SPO and GCS[[22]](#footnote-22) | 58%[[23]](#footnote-23) | 70% | 80% | Proactively eliminate complexities, streamline processes, and make use digitalization in the policy making and legal drafting. |
| 2 | 100% of the new laws imposing an administrative burden are reviewed in context of prevention of administrative burden according to Administrative Burden Reduction methodology[[24]](#footnote-24) | 100%[[25]](#footnote-25) | 100% | 100% |

Table 8: Prevention Targets

# **Reduction**

The Programme has identified reducing administrative burden as a key objective, primarily through efforts focused on simplification, streamlining, and digitalizing public services. To achieve this, extensive measures have been undertaken across central and local government levels. Over the implementation period, for 2022-2024 AROUND 250 services underwent significant simplification in central and local level, and an additional 64 services were discontinued in 3 municipalities. And more than 65 services following ABR criteria are ready to be digitalized and 70 waiting to be digitalized.[[26]](#footnote-26) Also, other systems were developed or are under development that affect service delivery in particular institutions.[[27]](#footnote-27) These actions collectively yielded financial savings exceeding more than 3 million euros. These efforts reflect a continued commitment to advancing administrative efficiency, reducing the time and costs associated with accessing public services, and fostering a more responsive, user-centred government framework.

## Simplification

A key lesson learned during the implementation period is that **simplification is closely linked to digitalization**. In most cases, successful simplification has been **driven by digitalization**, which acts as a catalyst for streamlining processes. Consequently, the future efforts will continue in this **parallel approach**, advancing simplification hand-in-hand with digitalization and making use of digital tools as primary enablers. This strategy has proven especially effective in the digitalization of services such as those of the Ministry of Justice and surveyors' licensing, where digitalization directly facilitated simplification and reduced administrative burden, not only for users, but also for the administration itself.[[28]](#footnote-28)

In terms of simplification and streamlining of public services, future efforts will consist in further strengthening the following areas.

1. Elimination of procedures when deemed unnecessary to achieve legal objectives: there are certain administrative procedures which are not defined by legislation, however, required by the administration. These services are not legal thus must not be requested from the administration and hence will be eliminated. For instance, filling a paper requested from a ministry in order to proceed to another ministry to start the application process, is not grounded on legislation. It is administrative burden created by the officials in the public body, to be eliminated. The future efforts will follow with elimination of administrative procedures which are not based on legislation to ensure that administrative procedure is conducted according to the principle of legality endorsed by the LGAP;
2. Merging of two services into one procedure: there are often times specific services which must be integrated or merged into one because they serve the same purpose, or there is no sense why should two separate permits exist when both go the same direction. The future efforts will follow such practices and other similar services will be merged into one procedure;
3. Removal of conditional service delivery: in order to receive a service, the administrative procedure requires from the party to obtain supporting documents to be presented to the public body needed for the issuance of the service. For instance, to obtain the service working as Taxi driver in individual basis, the party when applying for the service has to present the payment of property taxes, waste collection. In such cases, the permit to work as Taxi driver is conditioned if the party pays in regular basis the property tax, waste collection which are public services provided by the municipality. Such conditionality is not legal and has to be removed from all administrative procedures and the future efforts will further work on this aspect;
4. Decreasing the number of supporting documents requested from the party:often times the public body requires from the party to present various supporting documents which are not directly linked to the service the party is applying for. For instance, the request to present a proof for the payment of tax property when applying for a permit to work as Taxi driver, is not reasonable because the fact if the party is paying or not the property tax is an issue of the department for tax property, and not of the municipality when reviewing the application file to obtain the permit for a Taxi driver. The future efforts will work on this aspect;
5. Administrative fee defined according to LGAP: article 12 of LGAP defines the principle of gratuity in administrative procedure. However, when an administrative fee is foreseen by a special law, the administrative procedure should be paid, however, the fee shall not be higher than the necessary average cost for carrying out that type of administrative procedure. The Standard Cost Model (SCM) tool will be used to measure exactly the cost to be applied. For instance, when the municipality requests an administrative fee worth 60 EUR for a permit to work as Taxi driver, but the cost incurred to the municipality is not worth 60 EUR, the LGAP requires from the municipality to adjust accordingly. The future efforts will be focused on this aspect;
6. Electronic communication, including the right to notify through appropriate means: electronic communication is important in the reduction of administrative burden because it eliminates the need for physical presence of the party, if not otherwise provided specifically by a special law. If the latter allows, the public body is free to choose the appropriate tools to communicate with the party. Also, when a secondary legislation requires the communication to happen “in written” this does not necessarily mean in traditional paper, but refers also to communication through electronic means. The future efforts will be focused on this aspect;
7. Non-formality and efficiency of administrative procedure: this is another aspect of administrative simplification and streamlining which requires from the public body not to be tied to specific form, unless provided otherwise by the special law. According to this principle, a public body shall conduct an administrative proceeding as fast as possible and with as little costs as possible, for the public organ and for the parties. As such, the public body should have strict deadlines for the delivery of the service, however, it should not wait the deadline if the service can be provided in advance for the party. The future efforts will be focused on this aspect;
8. Extension of the need for renewal, by strengthening monitoring and inspection: extension of validity for existent service is another step to reduce the administrative burden both in central and local level. For instance, if a permit has one-year validity and has to be renewed in annual basis by the party, it creates unnecessary administrative burden. If the public body removes the obligation to the party to apply to renew the permit, but strengthens the monitoring and inspection capacities to ensure conformity of the subject with the regulations, it is a reduction of administrative burden for citizens and businesses. The future efforts will focus to support this endeavour and support public institutions in their simplification efforts and streamlining of administrative procedures on this aspect.

All abovementioned areas will go hand in hand with digital efforts, digital solutions and digital ready legislation, through particular methodologies and tools explained in following section.

## Digitalization

As regards digitalization, the Programme fully subscribes to the principles of digitalization as prescribed in the E-Government Strategy. Such principles consist in the following:

|  |
| --- |
| Digitalization Principles[[29]](#footnote-29) |
| Digital by Default | 💻 | Embeds digital solutions into policymaking and service design from the beginning, prioritizing transformation over merely digitizing old processes. |
| Data-Driven | 📊 | Treats data as a valuable asset, establishing systems that use data to improve decision-making, service delivery, and performance assessment. |
| Interoperability by Design | 🔗 | Ensures integrated government architecture, enabling seamless, connected services that work smoothly across departments and sectors. |
| User-Centric and Inclusive | 👥 | Focuses on designing services around the needs and feedback of citizens and businesses, fostering a government that is responsive and people-oriented. |
| Once-Only Principle | ✔️ | Reduces repetitive data submissions by allowing citizens and businesses to provide information only once, streamlining service interactions. |
| Multi-Channel Delivery | 📱💻🏢 | Provides accessible services through various channels—digital, telephone, and in-person—ensuring ease of access for all users. |
| Privacy by Design | 🔒 | Integrates data privacy from the beginning, making sure that personal data protection is a core part of service development. |
| Trust and Security | 🛡️ | Establishes strong security protocols to protect data and infrastructure, building user trust and ensuring service reliability. |
| Open Innovation | 💡 | Encourages partnerships with academia, the private sector, and citizens to promote continuous innovation and improvement of digital services. |

Table 9: Digitalization Principles, as adopted by the e-Government Strategy

These principles fully align and intersect with the overarching approach outlined in the revised Programme framework.

## e-Service design stages

This Programme will support a well-structured e-service design process. The above principles will be applied throughout the process of service design. The process of service design will follow a number of clear stages, as in the following.

* Preparation: This stage focuses on laying the groundwork for service development. It involves identifying the specific service to be developed and determining its priority relative to other initiatives. A dedicated **team** is assigned, and a **service owner** is appointed to oversee the entire development process. This phase is crucial for aligning goals and clarifying roles and responsibilities, and ensuring coherence with the strategic framework (Concept Documents, Strategies, Programmes) and compliance with the legal requirements. At this stage, a key criterion for intervention is assessing the **institution’s readiness for digitalization**, which includes assessing its commitment, expertise, and infrastructure. Meeting these criteria is essential in deciding whether digitalization efforts can proceed, as institutional readiness will significantly influence the success of these initiatives.
* Understanding (**AS IS**): This phase is centred on gaining a deep understanding of the current state of the service, often referred to as the **AS IS** analysis. It involves a thorough problem analysis, identifying the issues and gaps in the existing service delivery. It also emphasizes understanding the needs and expectations of **users** (those who will benefit from the service) and **stakeholders** (individuals or groups who are directly involved in the service design). This stage aims to map out the existing processes and challenges, providing a solid foundation for designing improvements. During this stage, we conduct a thorough analysis of the **legal and strategic frameworks** governing service delivery, with a particular focus on the extent of **harmonization with LGAP** requirements. In parallel, we assess how **user-centric** the service design and delivery are, considering essential aspects like the level of user engagement, the availability and quality of user support, and the overall accessibility of services to the end users.

Furthermore, we analyse the current **state of digitalization** within service delivery. This includes reviewing any **existing IT solutions** that facilitate service delivery and the degree of **data digitalization** present, as well as identifying which **functional requirements** are currently met. Finally, we assess the **digitalization maturity** of the service delivery processes to understand how advanced and capable these digital solutions are in supporting a modernized, efficient service experience.[[30]](#footnote-30)

* Desired state (**TO BE**): In this stage, the focus moves toward defining the TO BE state, or the desired future state of the service. Achieving this vision requires **active user involvement**, ensuring that the service design aligns with users’ needs and expectations. **Simplification** of processes is prioritized to enhance efficiency and make the service more accessible and user-friendly. In this stage, we identify all activities that need **alignment with LGAP** and any other service delivery requirements, ensuring that relevant legislation is harmonized. We also streamline the service delivery process by **mapping out each service** and simplifying it—reducing unnecessary steps and minimizing the amount of information required from users.

At this point, we also make key decisions about digitalization. This involves determining the appropriate **level of digitalization for each service**, deciding on the need for **IT solutions**, defining the functional requirements of these solutions, assessing the extent of **data digitalization** needed, as well as the **digitalization maturity** aimed for. To measure progress and effectiveness, **key performance indicators (KPIs)** are established, setting clear, measurable targets that help monitor the success and impact of the improved service, ensuring alignment with the service delivery principles as set forth in this Programme and the e-Government Strategy.

* Implementation: The implementation stage is the phase in which plans and improvements are brought to life. This begins with the **development** of the actual service, integrating the features and functionalities outlined during the design phase. Once developed, rigorous **testing** is conducted to confirm that the service operates smoothly and meets established requirements and user expectations. Training follows, equipping staff and stakeholders with the **knowledge and skills** needed to use and support the new system effectively. The service is then **launched** officially, making it accessible to users. **Communication** efforts accompany this rollout, informing users, stakeholders, and the public of the new service’s benefits and how it can be accessed. **Monitoring and evaluation** are ongoing, allowing for continuous performance assessment through KPIs and user feedback. These efforts are focused on ensuring compliance with the Programme’s and e-Government Strategy’s service design principles, with a particular emphasis on user-centricity and support. This approach allows for adjustments and improvements to be made as necessary, ensuring that the service consistently meets desired outcomes and remains aligned with user needs

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preparation | AS IS | TO BE | Implementation |
| Service identification | Mapping | Mapping | Development |
| Prioritisation | Problem analysis | User involvement | Training |
| Teams and Service owner | Stakeholders | Simplification | Launching |
| Institutional readiness | Users | Digitalization | Monitoring and evaluation |

Table 10: Service Design Map

To measure the performance of the above approach and undertakings, we will make use of the following targets:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Indicators | Baseline(2024) | Interim goal (2026) | Last year goal (2028) | Outcome |
| Reduction |
| 1 | Number of services simplified in central level, gender and vulnerable groups disaggregated  | 81 | >120 | >150 | Design and development of affordable, simple, streamlined services. |
| 2 | Municipalities that comply with ABR Indicator in Municipal Performance Grant | 15 | >20 | >30 |
| 3 | Number of services simplified in local level[[31]](#footnote-31) | 167 | >250 | >350 |
| 4 | Number of services digitalized using ABR methodology, gender and vulnerable groups disaggregated[[32]](#footnote-32) | 65[[33]](#footnote-33) | >100 | >150 |

Table 11: Reduction Targets

# **User involvement**

User involvement in service design and delivery is fundamental to ensuring a **user-centric approach**, aiming to create services that meet the real needs and expectations of the public. Building on the success of the current Programme, we remain dedicated to deeply involving service users throughout the development of the revised Programme. This commitment encompasses several key areas:

* Consultation during policy development:During the creation of policy instruments, such as Concept Documents, Strategic Documents, and legal acts, it is essential to identify and understand the needs of **target groups affected** by the proposed changes. This includes detailed analysis of users’ demographics—like **gender, ethnicity, age, and digital literacy levels** when dealing with citizens, or factors like business size and digital maturity when engaging with businesses.

We will take special steps to ensure these **groups are actively consulted** through existing public consultation mechanisms. For policies with significant implications for Administrative Burden, line ministries will be instructed to adopt specific measures for greater inclusion, such as targeted meetings with representatives of affected groups or leveraging further research techniques to gather insights.

* Use of research in service design: Research plays a crucial role in **understanding the needs, preferences, and challenges of users throughout the service design process**. A variety of research tools, including surveys, focus groups, interviews, and mystery shopping, will be employed to gather comprehensive feedback from users. These tools will provide valuable insights into user experiences and help identify ways to reduce costs, time, and potential frustrations in service delivery. The goal is to ensure that our service design decisions are grounded in data and evidence, allowing us to fine-tune services in ways that maximize user satisfaction and efficiency.
* Enhancing co-design methodologies: We are committed to further strengthen the use of **co-design** methodologies in **service design** under the revised program. Co-design involves working directly with users to create services that truly meet their needs, fostering a sense of ownership and collaboration. Special emphasis will be placed on utilizing tools like customer journey mapping and other co-design techniques to gain a clearer understanding of user experiences at each stage of service delivery. To support this effort, we will provide line institutions with guidelines and resources, including support from development partners, aimed at enhancing the application of co-design in service reforms. Special attention will be paid to promoting including service users’ representatives (where possible) in the design teams, whereby they can be involved in all stages of the service design.
* Integrating user feedback: **User feedback** is vital for the continuous improvement of services. Therefore, we will ensure that mechanisms for user feedback are integrated into every stage of service delivery, particularly in digital service offerings. This will allow users to share their experiences and suggestions directly, providing us with valuable data for refining services. Line institutions will be required to collect user feedback systematically and regularly, using it as a basis for ongoing service enhancements. By making user feedback a central part of the service improvement process, we aim to create a more responsive and adaptive service environment.

## Ongoing commitment to user involvement

Our approach is rooted in the belief that **user involvement** should be a continuous, structured process throughout all stages of service design and delivery. Already, we have embedded this approach into the programme's ongoing implementation, ensuring user involvement is considered from the **early stages** of policy development through to the rollout of specific service initiatives. Over the last two years, numerous surveys and focus groups have been conducted to gather user insights, and user involvement has been systematically integrated into service design efforts. As we look to the future, we remain committed to building on this foundation by allocating resources to support the most effective methods of user involvement, including advanced methodologies like co-design.[[34]](#footnote-34)

## Future focus: advanced involvement strategies

Moving forward, we will focus on making better use of more sophisticated involvement strategies. This will include refining the consultation process to ensure deeper engagement with **hard-to-reach user groups**, leveraging digital tools for broader participation, and experimenting with innovative co-design methods to explore new ways of enhancing user satisfaction. The success of our approach will be measured by the degree to which services are improved to better align with **user needs**, ensuring that the voice of the service user is heard and valued at every step.

In summary, user involvement is not a one-time activity but a continuous thread woven through every stage of service design and delivery. By engaging users in a meaningful way, we aim to build services that are not only efficient and cost-effective but also tailored to the evolving needs of those they are meant to serve. This commitment ensures that our revised program remains **user-centric, transparent, and adaptive**, fostering a culture of co-creation and continuous improvement.

In order to measure our progress towards achieving a heightened user engagement, we will follow the below listed targets:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Measure and Indicators | Baseline(2024) | Interim goal (2026) | Last year goal (2028) | Outcome |
| USER ENGAGEMENT |
| 1 | Implementation of user engagement methods in simplification and digitalization of services*[[35]](#footnote-35)* | 15 | >25 | >40 | Enhance user involvement and accessibility |
| 2 | Simplification of services using findings of mystery shops | 0 | 2 | 5 |

Table 12: Engagement Targets

# **Communication and awareness raising**

The activities and results in the prevention and reduction of administrative burdens will be continuously communicated to citizens and businesses. The entire process will be transparent, and clear messages will be provided regarding what will be done in prevention, reduction, which services have been simplified, which have been eliminated, how much cost and time has been saved, especially after the digitization of services. The services that will be digitized will be integrated into the Government's one-stop-shop, known as **eKosova**, which allows citizens to access services from a **single digital gateway**.

SPO will prepare periodic comprehensive reports on the implementation of the program for the prevention and reduction of administrative burdens. These reports will be publicly accessible through the OPMs website, in three languages, and will include statistics and data visualization to facilitate easier reading by citizens. Infographics will be created from the data in the reports to be shared across social networks to reach a wider audience regarding the results in preventing and reducing administrative burdens. The results will consist of the number of simplified services, the number of eliminated services, the number of digitized services, the time saved as a result of interventions, and the cost benefits. These activities will also contribute to raising public awareness and information about the reforms in the prevention and reduction of administrative burdens.

For effective communication, including raising public awareness, both traditional and social media will be used. In traditional media, messages will be conveyed by political leaders such as the Prime Minister, First Deputy Prime Minister, and Ministers, as well as through participation in conferences, events, debates, and programs that allow the Government to present planned reforms for preventing and reducing administrative burdens to facilitate access to services for citizens and businesses. Additionally, information will be shared through local and regional conferences organized by either the Government or partner civil society organizations that have activities in preventing and reducing administrative burdens. In this context, the Government will build partnerships with CSOs, economic chambers, and business associations to reach all relevant stakeholders in the process.

Periodic events and debates will be organized with economic chambers with participants from businesses to gather proposals from them, challenges in accessing public-administrative services, fostering collaborations, etc. Debates and discussions will also be organized with CSOs as a whole, particularly with CIVIKOS, which serves as a network for all CSOs, and events organized by the Government will be disseminated to CSOs through the CIVIKOS platform. Videos with animations and infographics will be created to better inform the public about the results and activities regarding the overall reforms in service delivery. This collaboration will be achieved within the framework of the Strategy for Cooperation with Civil Society 2024-2029.

Social media will also play an important role in communication and disseminating information to the public. Platforms such as Facebook and Instagram will be used to communicate with the public and share information about results achieved. Genuine communication and transparency will help external actors to have the necessary information when assessing Kosovo concerning the reforms in service delivery to citizens.

There will also be also a dedicated channel for administrative burdens on YouTube where all developments, both past and future, such as reports, videos, infographics, assessments, and photos from various debates and programs, including those on TV, will be published.

To monitor our progress in achieving the desired results in these areas of communication and awareness raising, we will closely follow the following target:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Measure and Indicators | Baseline(2024) | Interim goal (2026) | Last year goal (2028) | Outcome |
| COMMUNICATION AND AWARENESS |
| 1 | Knowledge of service delivery rights and obligations by businesses and citizens | TBD | >20% | >35% | Users are knowledgeable about their rights and obligation when accessing public services  |

Table 13: Communication and awareness targets

# **Implementation and Monitoring**

The First Deputy Prime Minister of the Government is politically responsible for the successful implementation of the Program. To this end, the First Deputy Prime Minister will be committed to advancing the measures in the Program for preventing and reducing the administrative burden, asking the ministers and their deputies for political commitment and dedication.

The inter-institutional structure at the political level responsible for the successful implementation of the Program is the SPC, chaired by Prime Minister and First Deputy Prime Minister. The SPC meetings are attended by ministers who should be informed and asked to implement measures to reduce the administrative burden, according to the Program.At SPC meetings, decisions and recommendations can be made for the implementation of the Program, as well as solutions to challenges and problems in the process can be requested.

For the successful implementation of the Program, following bodies constitute the core team, with following responsibilities:

* SPO is responsible for prevention and reduction of administrative burdens, and planning, coordinating, monitoring, evaluating and reporting of the implementation of the Program and international obligations related to the process, measuring or quantifying the administrative burden, as well as other aspects highlighted in this Program. SPO will support all institutions indicated below to fulfil their tasks to successfully implement the Programme. National Coordinator for Administrative Burden Process, sits on SPO.
* DTU is responsible for the review and monitor of all digital initiatives within the process of ABR.
* ISA is responsible maintaining of the eKosova platform and integrating of digitalized services in the platform, among many other responsibilities, as indicated in eGovernment Strategy.
* DEIPC in Ministries are first responsible to take measures for prevention and reduction of burdens in concept documents.
* GCS is responsible for review of quality of concept documents and ensure ABR integration in CD.
* LD of Ministries are first responsible to take measures for prevention and digital readiness legislation.
* LO of OPM is responsible for review of legality and constitutionality of legal acts.
* MALG is responsible for coordination of reporting process for ABR indicator on Municipal Performance Grant.
* MIA is responsible for public administration reform.
* KIPA is responsible for coordination and implementation of the capacity building section of the Programme.
* Municipalities are responsible for simplification of services in local level.

The department responsible for the administrative burden process is the SPO, while other above-mentioned stakeholders are responsible for implementation of measures stated in Action Plan. SPO will support institutions by participation in the processes.

ABR Process will be extended to central and local level. Prioritization will be through evidencing of institutional readiness and commitment. Local level will be supported equally, meaning that every municipality will get the same support for burden reduction, in implementing of the Programme and Municipal Performance Grant Indicator on ABR. Central level will be supported according to readiness and prioritization, based on services, frequency, population and relevance, on implementing the Programme and reform area on the Growth Plan, “2.1.1. User friendly digital public service delivery through administrative burden reduction and improved quality and increased number of services available online”, and its quantitative and qualitative steps as indicated on the Reform Agenda.Activities related to Growth Plan and Municipal Performance Grant, will be discussed in SPC meetings and by Frist Deputy Prime Minister, as political responsible. For those central level institutions resulting not having institutional readiness for burden reduction, measure will be taken accordingly.

For the implementation of the Program as a whole, the assistance of development partners will be coordinated and requested. For the implementation of the measures and actions of the Program, the assistance and engagement of experts, young professional and interns may be requested, depending on the topic and priority. The two last categories can be especially helpful for interviewing the parties and measuring the baseline value of the administrative burden and field indicators, as well as other administrative aspects in order to implement the Program.

Consultation and cooperation with development partners is one of the key priorities highlighted in the Program. The main goal of the development partners is to create a stable platform for the administrative burden process, respectively for the simplification and digitization of administrative services, based on some principles such as those of the European Commission for electronic governance and the principles of local administrative procedure.

Coordination will be done through regular meetings with all stakeholders, especially within the technical assistance project for the process of reducing and preventing the administrative burden, financed by IPA and the German government and implemented by GIZ. In the meetings of the Steering Committee, chaired by SPO, all partners who support the process will be invited and the tasks and activities that will be carried out by each partner will be divided.

The budgetary impact of the Program for the Prevention and Reduction of the Administrative Burden 2025-2028 is considered to be around 10 million euros, and for Action Plan 2025-2026 is 4.1 million euros. Period of Action Plan 2025-2026 is fully covered by Government Budget and donor support, or around 3 million euros support from donors and around 1 million euros Government budget. Considering the budget sustainability of e-Government Strategy, the necessary budget of ABR Programme is decreased since many important and costly measures and activities are now part of e-Government Strategy. Financial gap for period of 2025-2026 is considered to be around 15 million due to the cost savings after successful implementation of the Action Plan, and for the period of 2027-2028 is considered to be more than 15 million.

Progress monitoring of the Action Plan will be done continuously and reporting will be done annually, by reporting for activities and indicators at the same time. Also, monitoring of the implementation of the Action Plan will be done by CSOs and Chambers of Commerce.

Risk assessment and mitigation are provided in annex 3. Main tools for prevention are provided in annexes 1 and 2. Link between ABPR Programme and other relevant strategic documents such as e-Gov Strategy, Public Administration Reform Strategy and National Development Strategy 2030 is provided in annex 4.

Progress report for 2022-2024 will be drafted and published during Q1 2025.

## **ACTION PLAN 2025-2026**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nr.** | **STRATEGIC GOAL** | **BASELINE****2024** | **TARGET 2025** | **TARGET 2026** | **REFORM** |
| **PREVENTION AND REDUCTION OF ADMINISTRATION BURDEN** |
| **1** | **Indicator:** *Time savings* | TBM[[36]](#footnote-36) | +30% | >50% | Ensuring affordable public services through administrative burden reduction.  |
| **2** | **Indicator:** *Cost savings[[37]](#footnote-37)* | 3.5 mil EUR | >5 mil EUR | >15 mil EUR |
|  **Nr.** | **MEASURES, INDICATORS AND ACTIVITIES** | **BASELINE 2024** | **TARGET 2025** | **TARGET 2026** | **REFORM** |
| **1** | **CAPACITY BUILDING** |
| **1** | **Indicator:** *Number of public officials trained[[38]](#footnote-38)* | 500 | 1000 | 1500 | Equip stakeholders with the skills and tools to lead administrative burden reduction efforts across all levels of government. |
| **2** | **Indicator:** *Ratio between T1 and T2[[39]](#footnote-39)* | 21% | 25% | 30% |
| **3** | **Indicator:***Impact of trainings on the routine in the public officials* | 0% | / | >50% |
| **Nr.** | **Activity** | **Timeline** | **Budget** | **Financial Source** | **Responsible and supporting institutions** | **Product** |
| **Y1** | **Y2** |
| 1.1 | ABR and Design Thinking training of public officials  | Ongoing | 93,000 | 93,000 | KB, Donors | KIPA/SPO | At least 1 training per month and at least 12 trainings per year. |
| 1.2 | Revision/updating of ABR and Design Thinking Training Module | Q2 | 5,760 | / | KB | KIPA/SPO | ABR and Design Thinking training module revised/updated. |
| 1.3 | Developing online ABR and Design Thinking Module training module  | Q2 | 50,760 | / | Donors | KIPA/SPO | Online ABR training module developed. |
| 1.4 | ABR training of public officials through eLearning platform | Ongoing | 8,760 | 8,760 | KB | KIPA/SPO | At least 1 training per month and at least 12 trainings per year. |
| 1.5 | Training of responsible officials for SCM (digital app included) | Q4 2026 | 5,760 | 5,760 | KB | SPO | At least 10 responsible officials trained per year. |
| 1.6 | Organizing of Digi Camps for public officials | Ongoing | 20,760 | 20,760 | KB, Donors | SPO/DTU | At least 1 Digi Camp per year. |
| 1.7 | Organizing of roundtables with public officials for ABR | Ongoing | 23,000 | 11,520 | KB | SPO | At least 5 roundtables per year. |
| 1.8 | Analysis of institutional readiness for ABR | Q2 2025 | 5,760 | / | KB | SPO | Institutional readiness for ABR covering all relevant line ministries drafted. |
| 1.9 | Developing guidelines, manuals and tools to increase capacities for ABR | Ongoing | 17,280 | 17,280 | KB | SPO | Guidelines, manuals and tools are developed as needed. |
| 1.10 | Organizing of ITIL trainings  | Q4 2025 | 73,000 | / | KB, Donor | ISA, SPO, KIPA | At least 3 trainings per year |
| 1.11 | Organizing of ToT for ABPR | Q4 2025 | 12,760 | / | KB, Donor | SPO, KIPA | At least 5 trainers are certified |
| 1.12 | Organizing of ToT for Design Thinking | Q4 2025 | 12,760 | / | KB, Donor | SPO, KIPA | At least 5 trainers are certified |
| 1.13 | Identification of relevant ABR categories for targeted trainings | Q2 2025 | 5,760 | / | KB | SPO | At least 5 categories identified and proposed for training |
| ***Total budget for Measure 1:*** | ***336,740*** ***(2025)*** | ***245,080******(2026)*** |  |  |  |  |
| *Of which capital:* | ***45,000******(2025)*** | ***88,000******(2026)*** |  |  |  |  |
| *Of which current:* | ***291,740******(2025)*** | ***157,080******(2026)*** |  |  |  |  |
| **2** | **PREVENTION** |
| **1** | **Indicator:** *Concept Documents which address ABR related input by SPO and GCS[[40]](#footnote-40)* | 58%[[41]](#footnote-41) | 70% | 80% | Proactively eliminate complexities, streamline processes, and make use digitalization in the policy making and legal drafting. |
| **2** | **Indicator:** *100% of the new laws imposing an administrative burden are reviewed in context of prevention of administrative burden according to Administrative Burden Reduction methodology[[42]](#footnote-42)* | 100%[[43]](#footnote-43) | 100% | 100% |
| **Nr.** | **Activity** | **Timeline** | **Budget** | **Financial Source** | **Responsible and supporting institutions** | **Product** |
| **Y1** | **Y2** |
| 2.1 | Ongoing regulatory check of concept documents in context of ABR | Ongoing | 23,000 | 23,000 | KB | SPO/GCS | 100% of concept documents are reviewed during drafting or consultation phases, before approval at the Government meeting.  |
| 2.2 | Ongoing regulatory check of legal acts in context of ABR (design of services and digital readiness)  | Ongoing | 23,000 | 23,000 | KB | Legal Departments of Line Ministries  | 100% of legal acts (laws and bylaws) are reviews during drafting or consultation phases, before approval at the Government meeting. |
| 2.3 | Organising of roundtables, workshops and information settings for burden preventions with relevant public officials | Ongoing | 5,760 | 5,760 | KB | SPO | At least 5 roundtables, workshops or information settings are organised per year. |
| 2.4 | Proactively measuring administrative burdens through SCM and administrative fee through CRP | Ongoing | 11,520 | 11,520 | KB | SPO | At least 100 services are measured through CSM and CRP. |
| 2.5  | Proactively update the prevention tools | Ongoing | 5,760 | 5,760 | KB, Donors | SPO | ABR Checklist on Concept Documents, Digital Ready Checklist, SCM manual are to be updated regularly to reflect lessons learned. |
| 2.6  | Regularly consulting working groups on ABR related issues | Ongoing | 5,760 | 5,760 | BK | SPO | Working groups engaged in Concept Document, Strategies and legal drafting will be regularly consulted in ensuring ABR related issues are properly reflected. |
| ***Total budget for Measure 2:*** | ***57,520******(2025)*** | ***57,520******(2025)*** |  |  |  |  |
| *Of which capital:* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Of which current:* | ***57,520******(2025)*** | ***57,520******(2025)*** |  |  |  |  |
| **3** | **REDUCTION** |
| **1** | **Indicator:** *Number of services simplified in central level, gender and vulnerable groups disaggregated*  | 81 | >120 | >150 | Design and development of affordable, simple, streamlined services. |
| **2** | **Indicator:** Municipalities that comply with ABR Indicator in Municipal Performance Grant | 15 | >20 | >30 |
| **2** | **Indicator:** *Number of services simplified in local level[[44]](#footnote-44)* | 400 | >600 | >800 |
| **3** | **Indicator:***Number of services digitalized using ABR methodology, gender and vulnerable groups disaggregated[[45]](#footnote-45)* | 65[[46]](#footnote-46) | >100 | >150 |
| **Nr.** | **Activity** | **Timeline** | **Budget** | **Financial Source** | **Responsible and supporting institutions** | **Product** |
| **Y1** | **Y2** |
| 3.1 | Simplification of services in central level (eliminating the stock) | Ongoing | 23,000 | 23,000 | KB, Donors | Line institutions/SPO | Simplification of services in different process: through regulatory check of amendments of legal acts (during prevention process), through digitalization, through abolishment, through merging.  |
| 3.2 | Update of inventory of services in central level (catalogue of services)  | Q3 2025 | 11,520 | / | BK, Donors | SPO | Catalogue of services in central level updated. |
| 3.3 | ABR baseline analysis and service charters of different sectors and activities (NACE2 based)  | Q4 2025 | 5,760 | / | KB, Donors | SPO | Baseline analyses and services charters drafted. |
| 3.4 | Simplification of services in local level (eliminating the stock) | Ongoing | 48,000  | 23,000 | KB, Donors | Municipalities/SPO | At least 10 services of at least 10 municipalities are simplified according to methodology approved in Municipal Performance Grant Indicator.  |
| 3.5 | Update of inventory of services in local level (catalogue of services) | Q3 2025 | 36,520 | / | KB, Donors | SPO | Catalogue of services in local level updated. |
| 3.6 | Full analysis of local services in all municipalities  | Q3 2025 | 36,520 | / | KB, Donors | SPO | Full analysis of local services drafted.  |
| 3.7 | Recommendations for simplification of services on local level (in all municipalities)  | Q4 2025 | 36,520 | / | KB Donors | SPO | Recommendations for simplification of services in local level drafted.  |
| 3.8 | Unification of local regulations of taxes  | Q2 2026 | 5,760 | 5,760 | KB, Donors | SPO/MALG | At least 10 municipalities have unified regulations for local taxes.  |
| 3.9 | Unification of services fees in local level  | Q2 2026 | 11,520 | 11,520 | KB, Donors | SPO/MALG | At least 10 municipalities have unified taxes for at least 10 same services.  |
| 3.10 | Continuous d digitalization of services in central level | Ongoing  | 1,123,000 | 523,000 | KB, Donors | Line institutions/ISA/DTU/SPO | At least 10 central institutions have digitalized all/part of their services  |
| 3.11 | Digitalization of grant and subsidy procedures in central level | Ongoing | 118,000 | 73,000 | KB, Donors | Line institutions/ISA/DTU/SPO | At least 2 institutions that provide grants and subsidies have digitalizes procedures.  |
| 3.12 | Digitalization of process for access on public documents “Case Management System”  | Q2 2025 | 66,520 | / | KB, Donors | IPA/SPO | CMS developed, and functionalised with users covering all institutions, and requests and complaints for access to public documents are in eKosova.  |
| 3.13 | Feasibility study for digital transformation of e-procurement  | Q4 2025 | 223,000 | / | KB, Donors | PPIC/SPO | Feasibility study finished covering all areas, analysis, suggestions, recommendation and processes for digital transformation of e-procurement platform.  |
| 3.14 | Digital transformation of employment services in Employment Agency  | Q4 2025 | 153,000 | / | KB, Donors | MFLT/SPO | Fully digitalized platform for employment services that provide better services for business and citizens.  |
| 3.15 | Updating of Transparency Portal and digitalization of Vendor Registry Process | Q2 2025  | 153,000 | / | KB, Donors | MFLT/SPO | Transparency Portal updated and Vendor Registry Developed.  |
| 3.16 | Analysing of central services through AS IS TO BE methodology | Ongoing | 173,000 | 173,000 | KB, Donors | SPO/DTU | At least 150 central services are being analysed with AS IS TO BE methodology.  |
| 3.17 | Identifying of central services linked with EU Service Directive  | Q2 2025 | 5,760 | / | KB | SPO | Central services linked with EU Service Directive identified.  |
| 3.18 | Introducing AI in central service delivery | Q4 2025 | 25,760 | / | KB, Donors | Line institutions/SPO | At least 2 chatbots per year.  |
| 3.19 | Identifying of central and local services relevant for gender equality and vulnerable groups | Q2 2025 | 11,520 | / | KB | SPO/GEA, OGG | Central and local services relevant for gender equality identified.  |
| 3.20 | Analysing of central and local identified services for gender equality and vulnerable groups | Q4 2025 | 15,760 | / | KB, Donors | SPO, GEA, OGG | All identified services analysed and ready for implementation.  |
| 3.21  | Simplification of services in central and local level most populated by woman and vulnerable groups | Q2 2026 | 25,760 | 25,760 | KB, Donors | SPO, GEA, OGG | At least 50 services simplified.  |
| 3.22 | Removing/reducing service fees for services most populated by woman and vulnerable groups | Q2 2026 | 5,760 | 5,760 | KB | SPO, GEA, OGG | At least 50 services with fees reduced or removed, focused on property registration and other important areas.[[47]](#footnote-47)  |
| 3.23 | Assessing and addressing and simplification of administrative burdens for farmers, especially smaller farmers | Q3 2026 | 15,760 | 15,760 | KB, Donors | SPO | Administrative burdens for farmers, assessed and implemented.  |
| 3.24 | Assessing and addressing and simplification of administrative burdens in the area of foreign direct investments. | Q3 2026 | 15,760 | 15,760 | KB, Donors | SPO | Administrative burdens for FDI, assessed and implemented. |
| 3.25 | Mapping of services and institutions for POS introducing  | Q3 2025 | 5,760 | / | KB, Donors | SPO/DTU | Mapping finalised.  |
| 3.26 | Introducing of POS in service delivery | Q2 2026 | 5,760 | 5,760 | KB, Donors | SPO/DTU | At least 5 public institutions introduce POS at their premises.  |
| 3.27 | Abolishment of relicensing based on inspection capacity  | Ongoing | 5,760 | 5,760 | KB | Line institutions/SPO/OGI | At least for 10 licenses relicensing is not required per year.  |
| ***Total budget for Measure 3:*** | ***2,176,240******(2025)*** | ***856,840******(2026)*** |  |  |  |  |
| *Of which capital:* | ***1,400,000******(2025)*** | ***500,000******(2026)*** |  |  |  |  |
| *Of which current:* | ***776,240******(2025)*** | ***356,840******(2026)*** |  |  |  |  |
| **4** | **USER ENGAGEMENT, COMMUNICATION AND AWARENESS**  |
| **1** | **Indicator:** *Implementation of user engagement methods in simplification and digitalization of services[[48]](#footnote-48)* | 15 | >25 | >40 | Enhance user involvement and accessibility |
| **2** | **Indicator:**Knowledge of service delivery rights and obligations by businesses and citizens | TBD | >20% | >35% |
| **3**  | **Indicator:** Simplification of services using findings of mystery shops | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| **Nr.** | **Activity** | **Timeline** | **Budget** | **Financial Source** | **Responsible and supporting institutions** | **Product** |
| **Y1** | **Y2** |
| 4.1 | Regularly embed research methods in understating user needs and preferences for services being designed | Ongoing | 11,520 | 11,520 | KB | SPO/Line Ministries | For all services being re-designed research activities will be undertaken, such as surveys, interviews, focus groups etc. |
| 4.2 | Gradual introduction of more advanced co-design methodologies in service design | Ongoing | 11,520 | 11,520 | KB | SPO/Line Ministries | Use of co-design in at least 15 key services for the implementation period. |
| 4.3 | Ongoing development of feedback mechanisms for users  | Ongoing | 11,520 | 11,520 | KB | SPO/Line Ministries | Feedback mechanisms integrated in all services being re-designed. |
| 4.4 | Preparation of periodic reports on the implementation of the program for the information of citizens | Ongoing | 11,520 | 11,520 | KB | SPO | Reports published in Albanian, Serbian and English language, on the website of the OPM |
| 4.5 | Design and publication of infographics to highlight achievements and reforms in administration burden prevention and reduction | Ongoing | 11,520 | 11,520 | KB | SPO | Infographics published in Albanian, Serbian and English language, on the website of the OPM |
| 4.6 | Organisation of regional conference with decision-makers, policy-makers, academia, experts to discuss the current trends and developments on regional level on ABR | Ongoing | 55,760 | 55,760 | KB, Donors | SPO | At least 1 regional conference organized and broadcasted through traditional and social media |
| 4.7 | Organisation of roundtable discussions with businesses and CSO s to discuss on simplification of administrative services for businesses  | Ongoing | 12,760 | 5,760 | KB | SPO | At least 2 roundtable discussions organized |
| 4.8 | Participation to TV debates organized to discuss the progress on administration burden prevention and reduction | Ongoing | 5,760 | 5,760 | KB | SPO | At least 1 per year on TV debates broadcasted online |
| 4.9 | Participation to various events organized to discuss the status and the way ahead on administration burden prevention and reduction | Ongoing | 5,760 | 5,760 | KB | SPO | At least 2 participation per year to conferences/events relative to ABR |
| 4.10 | Preparation in periodic basis of infographics and animated videos to highlight the progress on both prevention and reduction of administrative burden | Ongoing | 5,760 | 5,760 | KB, Donors | SPO | At least 2 animated videos per year prepared and published |
| 4.11 | Creation of a dedicated channel for administrative burdens on YouTube where all communication material will be uploaded to better inform citizens and businesses on the process | Ongoing | 5,760 | 5,760 | KB | SPO | ABR channel created on YouTube |
| 4.12 | Identification of complex, highly populated and frequented services for applying of mystery shop methodology | Q3 2025 | 5,760 | / | KB | SPO |  |
| 4.13 | Assessing of services through mystery shop methodology | Q4 2025 | 21,520 | / | KB, Donors | SPO |  |
| 4.14 | Initiating simplification of services as result of mystery shop findings | Q1 2026 | 11,520 | 5,760 | KB | SPO |  |
| 4.15 | Assessing difficulties of woman, vulnerable groups and ageing population on using of digitalization.  | Q4 2025 | 21,520 | / | KB, Donors | SPO, EGA, OGG |  |
| 4.16  | Gender Impact Assessment of ABR Process | Q1 2026 | 21,520 | 5,760 | KB, Donors | SPO, EGA |  |
| ***Total budget for Measure 4:*** | ***331,000******(2025)*** | ***142,160******(2026)*** |  |  |  |  |
| *Of which capital:* | ***/*** | ***/*** |  |  |  |  |
| *Of which current:* | ***331,000******(2025)*** | ***142,160******(2026)*** |  |  |  |  |
| ***Total budget for Action Plan:*** | ***2,901,500******(2025)*** | ***1,213,600******(2026)*** |  |  |  |  |
| *Of which capital:* | ***1,445,000******(2025)*** | ***500,000******(2026)*** |  |  |  |  |
| *Of which current:* | ***1,456,500******(2025)*** | ***713,600******(2026)*** |  |  |  |  |

# **Annex 1: Checklist for Handling of administrative burden issues during the drafting of concept documents and strategic documents**

# Background

The aim of this Checklist is to aid drafters and implementers of policies in reflecting on the needs of addressing administrative burden (AB) in the development of Concept Documents (CDs).

The checklist is dedicated to the officials involved in the process of drafting and monitoring of CDs, and provides some of the main elements that they should take into account when designing and delivering public services. The elements of service delivery that will be added to the usual analysis for CD are based on best practices for improving services based on the SIGMA Principles for Public Administration, the Law on General Administrative Procedure, as well as the principles and elements of the Administrative Burden Prevention and Reduction Programme (ABPRP).

This checklist follows the structure of the CD, and its focus is on the addition of AB elements throughout the stages of their drafting. Special importance has been paid especially to the phase of problem identification, development of objectives, identification of impacts, options, their comparison, planning of implementation measures as well as development of monitoring and evaluation arrangements.

During the preparation of this checklist, we have followed a harmonized approach with the Guide and Handbook for CDs, however, in case of inconsistency during its use, then the instructions of the Guide and Handbook take precedence.

# Overview of the document concept

* **Does the summary focus on the prevention and reduction of administrative burden?**

It is preferred that this section reflects the focus, among other things, on efforts to improve the state of public service delivery covered by CD.

# Introduction

* **Does the introduction address issues around administrative burden?**

It is recommended that this section provides a brief description of the AB problem, as well as the preferred option for its reduction and prevention. In this section, it is recommended to provide the link with the requirements arising from LGAP and ABPRP.

# Chapter 1: Problem definition

* **Description of policies and legal framework**

During the process of identifying the policies and legal framework related to the concept document, it is preferred to also identify issues related to the service delivery/administrative burden. During this process, it is necessary to identify the legal provisions of primary and secondary legislation, as well as the elements of relevant strategic documents related to the service delivery/AB. As for the legislation, at this stage importance is given to the identification of the provisions that are contrary to the Law on General Administrative Procedure, as well as to the requirements of the Prevention and Reduction of Administrative Burden Program. Regarding this harmonization with the LGAP, for the purposes of AB, special importance should be given to the following issues:

1. Is the assessed legislation harmonized with the requirements of the LGAP for the implementation of the 'only once' principle (Article 86.3).
2. Is the assessed legislation harmonized with the requirements of the LGAP for the implementation of the principle of non-payment (Article 12);
3. Is the legislation in accordance with the requirements of LGAP for the provision of services on time (Articles 98 and 135), and
4. Is the legislation in line with the requirements of the LGAP for enabling electronic communication (Article 73.3);

On the other hand, as far as the strategic documents are concerned, special focus is given to issues regarding objectives and measures to improve service delivery, including the reduction of the administrative burden, cost identification, as well as the development of specific indicators for measuring the improvement of service providing.[[49]](#footnote-49) Regarding the strategic framework, it is important to consider whether the strategic documents provide adequate arrangements for planning and costing measures aimed at reducing administrative burden.

* **Has the problem related to administrative burden been clearly presented?**

The main issue identified by CD, is to add administrative elements by describing the main challenges in providing services covered by CD. During this discussion, the focus should be on the challenges and difficulties surrounding the current state of service delivery, with a focus on:

* 1. **Service provision procedure:** including the number of documents required for the application. During this elaboration, the requirements of ABPRP regarding the prevention and reduction of the administrative burden should also be taken into account, especially regarding the mandatory information, the required documents and their validity.
	2. **Service delivery time:** while elaborating on service delivery, special attention should also be paid to ABPRP's requirements regarding the waiting time to receive answers from administrative bodies.
	3. **Cost of service provision to the user:** During the cost analysis, the requirements arising from ABPRP regarding cost reduction for users during the provision of public services should also be taken into account.
	4. **Involving users in the design of services:** at this stage, among other things, the requirements of ABPRP should also be taken into account to ensure proactive and personalized services.
	5. **Mechanisms for providing user support:** among other things, at this stage, the requirements of the ABPRP should also be taken into account for the development of a multi-channel user support system.
	6. **Mechanisms for user information:** among other things, this element is also linked to the requirements of the ABPRP for providing proactive services.
	7. **The current state regarding the digitization of services covered by CD:** among other things, digitization is also linked to the requirements of ABPRP regarding the principle of 'first digitally' where the user communicates with administrative bodies digitally on a regular basis, before communicating through other forms of communication.[[50]](#footnote-50)
* **Are the causes and effects of the administrative burden on stakeholders clearly presented?**

Once the components of the administrative burden are outlined and integrated with the main problem, the explanation of the causes that have led to this situation is provided, referring to gaps and difficulties regarding the legal, strategic, financial, institutional, and technical framework.

Also, in this section, the negative effects that the identified problems cause to the stakeholders should be integrated. During the identification of impacts, attention should be paid to the time, cost, or other difficulties that may be caused to the service users.

* **Have stakeholders been identified, including those affected by the provision of services?**

When developing the list of affected parties, make sure to include the parties that are users of the services covered by CD, such as citizens, businesses, civil society, etc. When identifying the parties affected by these services, it is advisable to provide a user profile, considering elements such as the following:

1. **Service is provided for citizens;**
	1. Gender ratio of users;
	2. Age;
	3. Ethnicity;
	4. Social status;
	5. Vulnerable groups;
	6. Digital knowledge;
	7. Access to electronic services;
2. **Service is provided for businesses;**
	1. Business industry;
	2. Business size;
	3. Ownership structure (individual, partnership, etc.), and
	4. Level of digitalization of businesses;

# Chapter 2: Objectives

* **Are issues about preventing and reducing the administrative burden clearly reflected in the objectives, especially with regard to specific objectives?**

Referring to the problem identified above, develop relevant objectives for improving the service delivery.

It is preferred that objectives addressing the reduction and prevention of administrative burden be specific, according to the definition of the Guide and Handbook, which address the causes and effects of the main problem.

# Chapter 3: Options

* **Have different approaches to prevention and reduction of administrative burden been considered and compared?**

During this phase, at least three options are identified for solving problems and achieving objectives related to the prevention and reduction of administrative burden. Regarding the aspects of AB, it is recommended that for all three options identified for achieving the CD objectives, additional elements related to service delivery should be considered.

1. The first option represents the status quo. This option represents the situation in which no intervention is undertaken to change the situation. As for AB, at this stage the elements of the status quo are added to the first option of CD, regarding the current state of service delivery. This part can be presented as a summary of the problem as above.
2. Regarding the AB, the second option focuses on reducing and preventing administrative burden through potential legal and operational changes. Regarding the AB, this option includes possible interventions that improve the implementation of the current legal framework, covering the targeted services. In this option, aspects related to service improvement such as service delivery time, cost, documentation requirements, etc., can be particularly considered.
3. The option can focus on utilizing digitalization of services to reduce and prevent administrative burden. Through this option, it is proposed that administrative procedures, now simplified, be offered electronically, including elements such as delivery, payment, review, notification, and printing of digital documents. Furthermore, this option also includes the requirement for integrating the proposed system into e-governance processes such as the State Data Center, Government Gateway, cybersecurity requirements, and those for personal data protection.

# Chapter 4: Identification and assessment of future impacts

* **Have the potential effects on administrative burden been clearly articulated for all the options under consideration?**

Throughout the impact identification phase, it is advisable to pinpoint the influences on users, encompassing accessibility, user experience, cost and time savings, and digital inclusiveness.

Consideration should be given to the Standard Cost Model (SCM) as the primary methodology used for impact identification. SCM outlines the process of identifying the administrative burden on citizens and businesses, offering solutions to reduce this burden and save time and costs for users. If you choose to use this methodology, you can refer to the SCM Manual.[[51]](#footnote-51)

Nevertheless, if data or implementation capacities are lacking, it is advisable to identify the impacts as follows:

1. How much will the number of documents that users have to submit for access to the service be reduced (by implementing technical interoperability or by simplifying the procedure);
2. How much money users will save;
3. How much time will be saved for users in accessing the service (time needed to gather the required information, fill out forms, waiting in institutions, phone calls, etc.)?
4. How much has accessibility increased for disadvantaged groups (these groups are defined depending on the nature of the service)?
5. What is the level of digitalization of the service?[[52]](#footnote-52)

# Chapter 5: Communication and consultation

* **During consultations, has consideration been given to the consultation of service users?**

During the internal and external consultation phase, special importance is given to the involvement of as many stakeholders as possible who are concerned with the administrative burden.

During the public consultations, efforts are made to inform as many users as possible about the changes and impacts that CD will offer. If possible, in case meetings are organized with different interest groups, it is recommended to make efforts to invite to such meetings also representatives of the users of the services covered by CD. Special importance should be given to the invitation of vulnerable groups, such as groups of people with disabilities, users of advanced ages, etc.

# Chapter 6: Options comparison

**6.1: Comparison of three options**

* **Are AB elements included in the comparison of options?**

During this phase, it is important to ensure that the objectives and outcomes identified for improving service delivery are included in the comparative analysis of options. These elements are added to the methodology that has now been selected to compare the options.

If Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA) has been selected, it must be ensured that the AB is reflected in the decision-making process and the actions planned in order to achieve all identified options.

On the other hand, if Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) has been chosen now, it must be ensured that the AB reflects the value of benefits for each option as well as determining the actions necessary to achieve those benefits.

If the Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) has already been selected, then we must ensure that the AB elements are reflected in the results expected to be achieved for each option, as well as the actions to be taken to achieve them.

Depending on the chosen methodology, it is presented in tabular form at the end of the options comparison section.

**6.2: Implementation plan for the preferred option**

* **Does the Implementation Plan refer to measures planned for prevention and reduction of administrative burden?**

In the Implementation Plan, it must be ensured that the objectives, products, actions, costs and deadlines for the AB elements, among others, are included.

If the option for service simplification only is chosen, then the products that will reduce costs and time for users must be presented. Also, all legal, strategic, institutional and financial interventions are presented for this option. Furthermore, this option also presents the steps that will be taken to enhance user support and information. Clear cost, including the source of funding, must also be specified.

If the chosen option is digitization, then products and activities that clearly show the steps of how digital systems will be developed (by the institution itself, through procurement, or through collaboration with donors) must be presented, how those systems will be implemented, how they will be integrated with the Government Gateway and other e-governance requirements in Kosovo. Finally, activities and costs should also reflect how maintenance and updating of the system to be developed will be arranged.

# Chapter 7: Conclusion and next steps

* **Does this chapter refer to issues around prevention and reduction of administrative burden?**

It is preferred that general conclusions regarding the service delivery/AB in the field covered by CD be added to the conclusions, as well as the steps expected to be taken to change this situation.

**7.1: Monitoring and evaluation provisions**

* **Are there specific measures around monitoring the reduction of administrative burden?**

In this section, it is preferred that within the arrangements for monitoring and evaluation, the elements of service delivery/AB are also reflected. Of particular importance is the identification of Key Performance Indicators for these elements.

These indicators should focus on the key aspects of improving service delivery, such as reducing costs for users, reducing waiting times, reducing the number of documents for submission, etc.

**Annex 1: Economic Impact Assessment Form**

Pay attention to completing the included table, especially regarding the part that addresses the administrative burden. In this section, one must answer the questions of whether businesses should provide new information, as well as whether the obligations for providing information by businesses have been simplified.

**Annex 2: Social Impact Assessment Category**

Reflect on the possible impacts on the relevant sections, depending on whether the improvement of services covered by CD.

**Annex 3: Environmental Impact Assessment Form**

Reflect on the possible impacts on the relevant sections, depending on whether the improvement of services covered by CD.

**Annex 4: Fundamental Rights Impact Assessment Form**

Reflect on the possible impacts on the relevant sections, depending on whether the improvement of services covered by CD.

# **Annex 2: Checklist on legislation for design and digitalization of services[[53]](#footnote-53)**

# Background

The purpose of this short checklist is to ensure a consistent approach to the drafting and evaluation of legislation that supports the provision of electronic services, through their appropriate design, putting the user at the centre.

Digitalization of public services is promoted by the national strategic framework, including the National Development Strategy and Plan (NDS/NDP), e-Government Strategy, Administrative Burden Prevention and Reduction Program (ABPRP) and Digital Agenda 2030 (DA). This framework contains the principle of a 'digital first' approach to the design of user-oriented services.

On the other hand, the Law on General Administrative Procedure (LGAP), directly and indirectly promotes the digitalization of public services, through the inclusion of the 'once only' principle as well as through the support of electronic communication.[[54]](#footnote-54)

This list is dedicated to all public officials involved in the drafting of legislation, at all levels. We must bear in mind that the design of services is not directly related to the legal profession, but to all professions involved in providing the service. Therefore, in certain cases, the service provider or expert in the relevant field is in a better position to design the relevant service. Therefore, this list serves all public officials, policy makers, information technology officials, legal officials, developers, and communications officials.

The list includes a number of questions and explanations about what should be taken into account during legal drafting in order not to hinder but also promote the design and digitalization of public services. An important part of this list are the questions related to enabling electronic communication during the development of an administrative procedure, such as informing the user, submitting the request, authentication, signing, review and communication with the parties. While elaborating on these aspects, special importance is given to the identification of legal aspects that can hinder digitalization.

On the other hand, this list also identifies some requirements that legislation must adhere to in order to promote as much as possible the digitalization of services, such as the possibility of automation, reflection of processes, interoperability and data exchange, as well as the adoption of an innovative approach.[[55]](#footnote-55)

Compliance with and implementation of this list automatically affects the prevention and reduction of the administrative burden, since with automation, authentication, electronic signature, etc., the requirements, information, documents, processes and steps, that a user needs to follow are reduced, in order to receive the corresponding service from the public administration. Other aspects of the validity period, the complaint period are regulated according to the horizontal or specific legislation for the service in question.

It should be noted that this list does not cover the aspects of legality or constitutionality of the legislation, which is a vital part, but only the aspects of design and digitalization of the service, in the best case, through the involvement of users or taking as a basis their needs and demands.

# Electronic communication

Regarding the development of legislation for designing services and ready for their digitalization, a crucial aspect is also the possibility of electronic communication between parties and institutions providing services, during all phases of service provision. During the drafting and amendment of the legislation, it is recommended to avoid provisions that limit, prohibit or block such communication, throughout the procedure, such as requests for physical documents, when the information they possess can be obtained through the interoperability of registers. In cases where such registers are missing, then the electronic option should be allowed, emphasizing or making it known that such an approach will be implemented when the relevant registers are made functional.

***How is user information about the provision of the service regulated?***

The first step that the user encounters in obtaining the benefits of a service is information about the main elements of the service. These elements include data such as: the conditions that must be met for receiving the service, the need for payment (how much and how), the necessary information that must be available, how can one apply, waiting time, etc. When drafting and amending legislation, the language used must reflect the need to provide information as simple and accessible as possible to all users, especially in online form.[[56]](#footnote-56)

***How is user authentication handled?***

A very important part of the digitalization ready legislation is the authentication of service users. In many cases, this authentication is done through requests for physical appearance, providing a copy of the ID card, or any other identification documents. To ensure that the legislation does not hinder digitalization, it is recommended to consider provisions that do not exclude the possibility of electronic authentication. Such authentication can be done through the use of the electronic version of the identity card, which can be in physical (as a card) or electronic (as an application) form with different degrees of security, depending on the service.[[57]](#footnote-57) Or, in cases when the service is put online, then the same can be done through the eKosova portal, as the only central portal in the country for the provision of services.

***How is submission of requests/applications regulated?***

In some cases, it has been observed that requests or applications must be made through physical presence, providing original documents (or physical copies), as well as through physical signature. This should be avoided by the legislation, where the language used should at least not exclude online application and in line with the LGAP's requirements for providing information only once (see below this principle is elaborated in the section on interoperability).[[58]](#footnote-58) Normally, depending on the nature of the service being offered, if in-person contact cannot be avoided, then it should be minimized as much as possible. For example, it is almost impossible to digitalize the entire application process for ID cards, since the user is required to provide a photo with special standards, as well as biometric data. However, the service can be re-designed in such a way that the application, payment and part of the communication between the party and the administration, is digitalized.

***How is the review of applications regulated?***

Legislation regulating the services should avoid limiting the way in which the review is conducted during an administrative procedure. As far as possible, the language used should allow the possibility of conducting the review or its parts, in an automated and digital fashion through information and communication technology (ICT) solutions and in automatic interoperability with other systems.[[59]](#footnote-59) Moreover, the legislation should not limit the possibility of using electronic signatures or seals when they are necessary, during communication between public institutions and parties.[[60]](#footnote-60)

***How is notification to the parties regulated?***

As a rule, the legislation should not exclude electronic communication with the parties, throughout the duration of the procedure, but also the notification of administrative decisions.[[61]](#footnote-61) It is recommended that during the legal drafting, no language be used which excludes the notification of the parties with administrative acts, according to the legal requirements of the LGAP.[[62]](#footnote-62)

# Automation

One of the key benefits for the design of services brought about by the digitalization of services is the possibility of automating the review of applications, during the provision of services. Such a process reduces the possibility of errors or illegal attempts during the evaluation of various conditions and criteria, but also allows the relevant officials more time to focus on examining those elements of service provision, which are more complex and require human evaluation.

To ensure that the legislation allows for automation opportunities, the following questions can help us in identifying these opportunities:

***How the conditions and criteria are defined?[[63]](#footnote-63)***

If we want the different ICT solutions to help us in examining the requests of the parties, then we need very clear and objective conditions and criteria.[[64]](#footnote-64) These conditions and criteria can be related to the application requirements, the conditions for benefits, those for issuing various documents, etc. As far as possible, complex provisions should be avoided, ensuring that the various conditions and criteria are as clear and comprehensive as possible, and the number of exceptions as limited as possible.

As long as these provisions are clear and logical, then we allow ICT systems to apply them in specific cases in the future, even if the current systems are not ready for this.[[65]](#footnote-65)

***How are the exceptions to the general rules regulated?***

The more complex the provisions, the greater the number of exceptions to the general rules, which makes automation difficult and increases the need for human intervention. During the review stage of requests or other stages of the administrative procedure, there are steps when human intervention and discretion are unavoidable. However, when regulating public services, it is advisable to ensure that legal acts reduce the need for human intervention as much as possible, through the reduction of complex provisions and exceptions. Normally, the reduction of exceptions should be in accordance with the legal requirements, as well as not reduce the level of protection of the legal rights and interests of the parties.

# Processes

Another way in which legislation can support digitalization is how it handles the mapping of processes and steps required to provide a service. It is recommended that the legislation, especially the secondary one, provide these processes in the most fluid and logical way, which will facilitate digitalization in many aspects. The evaluation of the reflection of the processes in the legislation can be done through the following questions:

***Do the legal provisions reflect in a clear way the steps and the appropriate processes for the provision of services?***

To help the digitalization process, legal acts should contain provisions that reflect all the steps and processes of service provision in a clear way. Ideally, these steps should follow a flow, including application, review, payment, issuance, and appeal.

As long as the legislation reflects the provision of a service in such a way, this, among other things, also helps the digitalization process, since such a clear overview helps in mapping the steps and processes.[[66]](#footnote-66) Such an approach helps especially the officials involved in the digitalization teams of these processes, as it makes it easier to transform them from analogue processes to digital ones.

***Are the duties and responsibilities of different actors clearly reflected during service delivery?***

A precise and clear reflection of the tasks and responsibilities of different actors during the provision of services helps to break down the service into separate tasks for each actor, which helps the digitalization process. Such an overview facilitates the digitalization teams to develop ICT solutions, as well as their connection with institutional responsibilities and integration with existing ICT systems.

# Interoperability and data exchange

In order to facilitate digitalization, the legislation that regulates services must also take into account the requirements arising from the need for interoperability and data exchange between different institutions. This is done to support the implementation of the 'once only' principle, which is a good practice for providing services but also a legal obligation according to LGAP.[[67]](#footnote-67)

***Are the same concepts reused with other areas or institutions?***

During the drafting of the legislation, special importance should be given to enabling the implementation of the 'once only' principle, allowing the (re)use of concepts and data between different institutions. During legal drafting, it is advisable to use the same concepts consistently by different institutions, which enables semantic interoperability.

***Does the legislation promote the exchange of data with other institutions?***

The legal framework should promote (or at least not prohibit) the exchange of data with other institutions, as long as this does not conflict with legal or data security requirements. When the legislation prohibits or limits this exchange of data with other institutions, then these must be clearly presented in the relevant acts, which must be in line with the requirements of the legislation for the protection of personal data and data security.[[68]](#footnote-68)

***Does the legislation clearly identify the institution responsible for data collection and management?***

In cases where data is exchanged, it is recommended that the legislation regulating the provision of services clearly define the institution responsible for data collection and the conditions for their exchange with other institutions.

When it comes to data collection, it should be borne in mind that one of the main processes that help the service digitalization is also the digitalization of the data that the institution manages. Data digitalization involves the development of all data in digital format, through the development and maintenance of digital databases. When drafting legislation, care must be taken that the language used does not exclude this possibility.

# Innovative approach

The successful digitalization of service delivery requires room for the development of an approach that promotes innovation. Such an approach offers opportunities for flexibility in the development of digital services.

***How flexible is the legislation for an innovative approach?***

Legislation should provide opportunities for innovation and testing with different systems and technologies during the implementation of digitalization projects. It is recommended that the language used should reflect this approach, avoiding possible limitations as much as possible.[[69]](#footnote-69)

***How is the adoption of emerging technologies regulated?***

An important part of the innovative approach is the adoption of emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence, blockchain, etc. The language used should not limit the possibilities of implementing these technologies.

***Can provisions be identified that determine the use of a specific technology for the provision of services?***

If the legislation promotes electronic communication, the language used should be neutral as regards the technology used. Legislation should be neutral in this regard, first to enable the application of different technologies to provide the same quality of services, but also to ensure that innovation in technology in the future does not make it necessary to change the legislation.[[70]](#footnote-70)

# **Annex 3: ABR Risk Management Matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Likelihood** | **Significance** | **Impact** | **Mitigation Strategy** | **Responsible Institutions** |
| **Resistance to change** | High | High | Delay in implementation of administrative simplification and digitalization initiatives. | Continue conducting targeted awareness campaigns and training sessions for public officials and users. | DPM, SPC, SPO, Line Ministries |
| Promote change champions within institutions. |
| **Insufficient Institutional capacity** | Medium | High | Insufficient ability to implement the ABR Programme at both central and local levels. | Provide continuous capacity-building initiatives (e.g., training, e-learning, Digi Camps). | SPO, KIPA |
| Engage with line institutions to allocate the necessary resources.  |
| **Low participation of public officials to ABR training** | Medium | Medium | Lack of insufficient institutional capacity to deal with ABR | Meetings with General Secretaries of Ministries and Mayors of Municipalities to advocate for increasing the level of participation | SPO, KIPA |
| **Lack of coordination between institutions** | Medium | High | Duplication of efforts, delays, and inconsistent implementation across different levels of government. | Continue regular coordination meetings with line ministries and municipalities. | DPM, SPC, SPO |
| Further strengthen ABR coordination mechanisms.  |
| **Inadequate digital infrastructure** | Medium | High | Delay in the digitalization of public services and integration into the eKosova platform. | Assess and improve IT infrastructure readiness before implementation. | SPO, DTU, ISA, Line Ministries |
| Continue ensuring coordination in implementation with the eGovernment Strategy.  |
| **Low user engagement and feedback** | Medium | High | Services may not meet user needs, reducing user satisfaction and adoption rates. | Regularly conduct surveys, focus groups, and workshops with users. | SPO, Line Ministries |
| Integrate feedback mechanisms into digital services. |
| **Inconsistent legal framework** | Medium | High | Legal barriers to simplification and digitalization. | Regularly update and review the Digital Ready Legislation Checklist. | SPO, Legal Office |
| Expand cooperation with multi-disciplinary teams during the drafting of new laws and policies. |
| **Budget constraints** | Medium | High | Delay in implementing key activities due to insufficient funding. | Align Programme activities with the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework. | SPO, Ministry of Finance |
| Ensure adequate cooperation with international development partners. Align with the Growth Plan implementation efforts.  |
| **Insufficient donor coordination** | Medium | High | Overlap in assistance provided, leading to inefficient use of already limited financial resources | Continue involving all development partners in the process of consultation, throughout all stages of service development initiatives.  | SPO |
| **Gender and social inclusion gaps** | High | High | Limited participation of women and marginalized groups in ABR processes. | Targeted outreach and training Programmes for underrepresented groups. | SPO, KIPA, CSOs |
| Include gender indicators in monitoring and evaluation frameworks. |
| **Data privacy and security risks** | Medium | High | Breach of sensitive user data during digital service delivery. | Implement Privacy by Design principles, in line with eGovernment Strategy.  | ISA, DTU |
| Regularly coordinate with eGovernment Strategy measures on security protocols.  |
| **Slow adoption of new tools and practices** | Medium | Medium | Delayed adoption of ABR tools and methodologies, reducing Programme effectiveness. | Organize regular training and hands-on workshops on ABR tools (SCM, CRP). | SPO |
| Provide user-friendly manuals and guidelines. |

# **Annex 4: Link between ABPR Programme 2025-2028 and other strategic documents**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Indicator** | **E-Governance Strategy** | **Public Administration Reform Strategy** | **National Development Strategy 2030**  |
| General Goal | Time Savings | Strategic Objective 4, Indicator 2.  | General Objective 2, Indicator 1.  | Indicator 10.1[[71]](#footnote-71) |
| Cost Saving |
| Capacity Building | Number of public officials trained | Specific Objective 2.1, Indicator 1 | Specific Objective 2.1, Indicator 2. |
| Ratio between T1 and T2 |
| Impact of trainings on the routine in the public officials |
| Prevention | Concept Documents which address ABR related input by SPO and GCS | N/A | Specific Objective 2.1, Indicator 1, andSpecific Objective 2.2, Indicator 1.  |
| 100% of the new laws imposing an administrative burden are reviewed in context of prevention of administrative burden according to Administrative Burden Reduction methodology |
| Reduction | Number of services simplified in central level, gender and vulnerable groups disaggregated  | Strategic Objective 4, Indicator 1 andSpecific Objective 4.2, Indicator 1 | Specific Objective 2.4, Indicator 1.  |
| Municipalities that comply with ABR Indicator in Municipal Performance Grant |
| Number of services simplified in local level |
| Number of services digitalized using ABR methodology, gender and vulnerable groups disaggregated |
| User engagement, communication and awareness | Implementation of user engagement methods in simplification and digitalization of services | Specific Objective 4.2, Indicator 1 | N/A |
| Knowledge of service delivery rights and obligations by businesses and citizens |
| Simplification of services using findings of mystery shops |

1. Country Report 2024: <https://neighbourhood-enlargement.ec.europa.eu/kosovo-report-2024_en>, pg. 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. OECD/SIGMA 2024: <https://www.sigmaweb.org/publications/monitoring-reports.htm> (report will be published on December 2024). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. A detailed progress report for period of 2022-2023 is published at the following link: <https://kryeministri.rks-gov.net/en/blog/report-on-the-implementation-on-the-administrative-burden-prevention-and-reduction-programme-2022-2027-and-action-plan-2022-2024/>. However, a progress report that covers all first phase 2022-2024, will be published at Q1 2025. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Growth Plan: <https://kryeministri.rks-gov.net/en/blog/reform-agenda-of-kosova-rgf/> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. MALG, Decision Nr. 02 – 793/4, dt. 24.06.2024. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Prevention process includes reviewing every piece of CD or piece of legislation if it is relevant for ABR or not. If it is relevant for ABR, then each of them is commented or drafted entirely, deepening on institutional readiness, before approval in the Government. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Input provided for those CD with AB implications measured after the approval of the same. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Input adoption measured only for 13 CD approved so far. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Input adoption measured only for 43 legal acts approved so far. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Simplified services as part of prevention showed in Table 3, included. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Services are on the priority plan list in Information Society Agency, to be hosted and integrated in eKosova for 2024. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Services are on the development phase and will be ready by April 2025.These data covers state of play, and not the vision, which is set on Action Plan, and below in sections. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. See Annex 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. See Annex 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. For further details please refer to <https://kryeministri.rks-gov.net/blog/modeli-standard-i-kostos-doracak-per-matjen-e-barres-administrative/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. SCM Digital App is internal system that works only internally in Gov Domain. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. For further details please refer to <https://kryeministri.rks-gov.net/blog/doracaku-per-llogaritjen-e-tarifave-taksave-per-procedurat-administrative-bazuar-ne-parimin-e-mbulimit-te-kostos/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. CRP Digital App is internal system that works only internally in Gov Domain. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Review started in June 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Reviews started in June 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Review is being conducted at various stages of the legislative development process – including drafting, preliminary, and public consultation phases. This does not imply that every law approved by the Government and sent to the Assembly has been scrutinised for ABR, as much of the legislation was drafted prior to ABR review commencement. Additionally, numerous legislative items have experienced delays in approval, notwithstanding their completion of preliminary and public consultations – for instance, a law or bylaw may have been drafted and consulted upon in 2021, 2022 or early 2023, yet still awaits approval of Government. On time, this is going to change. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. The indicator is linked to SIGMA Principle 19 on *Users are at the centre in design and delivery of administrative services,* respectively sub-indicators 19.3 and 19.4. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Approved concept documents relevant for ABR for 2024 that address ABR inputs. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Indicator is part of Reform Agenda (Growth Plan), respectively of Reform Measure 2.1.1.1. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Approved laws from 1 October 2024 reviewed in context of ABR. 15 laws were approved, and 14 of them were not relevant for ABR, and 1 was relevant for ABR. There were also 5 other laws that ratified international agreements, however these were not calculated and if they were, they do not impose ABR, therefore are not relevant for ABR. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. All services have been sent to ISA, with AS IS and TO BE analyses and APIs finalized. And, legal acts that cover these services are completed, approved and published. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Different systems have been developed that affect service delivery, such as Call Management Application in Tax Administration, that offers features like caller identification, call registration, case editing, call history display, report generation, configurable fields, that results in increase of transparency, speed and efficiency, quality of reporting, ease of management and reduce of staff burden. Other systems like this, are AIP Case Management System, Transparency Portal and Vendor Registration in Public Finance, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Find the digitalized services in eKosova, in the following link: <https://ekosova.rks-gov.net/Service/49>. Other examples, are Surveyor Services, Driving Schools Services, grant and subsidies in culture, and many other as emphasized in Implementation Report for first Action Plan 2022-2024. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. E-Government Strategy 2023-27, p. 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Progression of digital service maturity, begins with a basic informative level where only essential information is available online for users. Moving to the next stage, one-way communication allows users to access more detailed information, though there is no interaction or with service providers at this point. As digital maturity advances, services reach a transactional level, enabling users to complete actions or transactions digitally, thus providing a more interactive experience. At the highest level, personalized services are developed, where services are fully tailored to meet individual user needs, creating a user-centred digital experience. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Simplification of services in local level in many cases are the same, regulated by the same Administrative Instruction. However, we considered 1 service per municipality, since there is not unification of service delivery in local level, meaning that municipalities deliver services differently in terms of document requirements, fees, staff and so on. After unification of services in local level, we will start to consider them as one. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. ABR methodology means digitalization of service following these steps: analysing the service, measuring the baseline costs, amending the legislation, developing back end systems, exposing in eKosova and measuring the cost savings. Moreover, the indicator is linked to SIGMA Principle 19 indicator 19: *Enablers for user-centric services* and indicator 20: *Delivering high-quality services.* Additionally, the indicator and measures supporting them feed the eGov Strategy Objective 4, indicators 1 and 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. The baseline 65 shows the number of services that followed the ABR methodology and delivered to ISA for integration in eKosova. The same services might be exposed on the first quarter of 2025, however the ABR Team work has been finished and that’s why it is considered to be finished in 2024. Indicator will feed Reform Agenda (Growth Plan) indicators, respectively indicator of Reform Measure 2.1.1.5 – “50% of public services for citizens and businesses are offered online through an on-line e-Kosova portal” [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. As good examples of user involvement were while developing of free legal professions system, where ABR Team meet and consulted students and lawyers for their insights on how to regulate the process better. The same was applied to Call Management Application for Tax Administration, surveyors’ services, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. This indicator links to SIGMA Principle 19 *Users are at the centre in design and delivery of administrative services,* respectively sub-indicator 19.2 on User Engagement. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Baseline will be measured during first half of 2025. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Indicator is part of Strategic Objective 4 of eGov Strategy. This indicator will feed the eGov indicator on cost saving, by measuring only those services simplified or digitalized in compliance with ABR methodology. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. The indicator will also be reported in terms of gender-based disaggregation. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. The indicator will also be reported in terms of gender-based disaggregation. Explanation for the indicator is in Capacity Building narrative part. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. The indicator is linked to SIGMA Principle 19 on *Users are at the centre in design and delivery of administrative services,* respectively sub-indicators 19.3 and 19.4. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Approved concept documents relevant for ABR for 2024 that address ABR inputs. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Indicator is part of Reform Agenda (Growth Plan), respectively of Reform Measure 2.1.1.1. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Approved laws from 1 October 2024 reviewed in context of ABR. 15 laws were approved, and 14 of them were not relevant for ABR, and 1 was relevant for ABR. There were also 5 other laws that ratified international agreements, however these were not calculated and if they were, they do not impose ABR, therefore are not relevant for ABR. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Simplification of services in local level in many cases are the same, regulated by the same Administrative Instruction. However, we considered 1 service per municipality, since there is not unification of service delivery in local level, meaning that municipalities deliver services differently in terms of document requirements, fees, staff and so on. After unification of services in local level, we will start to consider them as one. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. ABR methodology means digitalization of service following these steps: analysing the service, measuring the baseline costs, amending the legislation, developing back end systems, exposing in eKosova and measuring the cost savings. Moreover, the indicator is linked to SIGMA Principle 19 indicator 19: *Enablers for user-centric services* and indicator 20: *Delivering high-quality services.* Additionally, the indicator and measures supporting them feed the eGov Strategy Objective 4, indicators 1 and 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. The baseline 65 shows the number of services that followed the ABR methodology and delivered to ISA for integration in eKosova. The same services might be exposed on the first quarter of 2025, however the ABR Team work has been finished and that’s why it is considered to be finished in 2024. Indicator will feed Reform Agenda (Growth Plan) indicators, respectively indicator of Reform Measure 2.1.1.5 – “50% of public services for citizens and businesses are offered online through an on-line e-Kosova portal” [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Through influence of ABR Process, certain municipalities removed fees for property registration when owner or co-owner is woman. This will be not only burden reduction but also incentivizing other reforms and aspirations like increase of property ownership by woman. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. This indicator links to SIGMA Principle 19 *Users are at the centre in design and delivery of administrative services,* respectively sub-indicator 19.2 on User Engagement. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. These indicators should focus on issues such as: reducing service delivery time, user involvement, cost reduction, waiting time in line (if applicable), user support mechanisms, indicators of electronic platform usage for the service, level of technical interoperability, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Please refer to Programme’s section on methodology. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. SCM Manual. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. High level of digitalization is considered when the entire service can be provided electronically, including: delivery, payment, review, document printing, and notification. Furthermore, a system that provides such a level of digitalization is hosted at the State Data Centre, as well as integrated into the EG. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. The term 'digitalization-ready legislation' throughout the text is used in the sense of drafting legislation that at least does not hinder the digitalization of public services, and at best, legislation that promotes this process. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. It should be noted that in addition to the mentioned Law, the digitalization of services is also helped by the legislation on permits and licenses, that on electronic identification and trusted services, as well as the legislation on inspections. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. The guiding questions included in this list are based on the Danish Government's 2018 Guide to Drafting Digitalization-Friendly Legislation: https://en.digst.dk/digital-governance/digital-ready-legislation/what-is-digital-ready-legislation/. Moreover, they have been adapted based on the Tools for Better Regulation, prepared by the European Commission: https://commission.europa.eu/law/law-making-process/planning-and-proposing-law/better-regulation/ better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox\_en. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. At the very least, legislation should not prevent the provision of this information online. For the provision of information to users, the use of service information cards (service charters) is recommended. When preparing the provisions that deal with informing users about the service, the provisions of the LGAP about notification (Part VI), as well as the Law on the System of Permits and Licenses (Article 14), should also be taken into account. Moreover, it is recommended that online information about services be provided based on the requirements of Regulation (EU) 2018/1724 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 2 October 2018 for the creation of a single digital portal to provide access to information, in procedure and in assistance and services for solving problems and amending Regulation (EU) No. 1024/2012: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32018R1724>. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. In the case of Kosovo, it is planned to issue physical identification cards containing electronic certificates of identification and digital signature, as well as applications for smart devices, which will be able to be used as digital ID. Currently, Law 08/L - 022 on Electronic Identification and Trusted Services in Electronic Transactions is in force, which, among other things, provides the conditions for authentication (Article 6) and electronic signature (Chapter IV). [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Article 73 of the LGAP provides for the possibility of submitting requests electronically. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. In the public sector, automation should be undertaken with increased caution, bearing in mind that a large part of the legal norms is directly related to human rights and freedoms. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. During the time of developing this checklist, the Government of Kosovo is developing a system of providing electronic ID cards to citizens, which can be used by them for authentication and digital signature. Currently, Law 08/L - 022 on Electronic Identification and Trusted Services in Electronic Transactions is in force, which, among other things, provides the conditions for authentication and electronic signature. The use of electronic signature by administrative bodies is also regulated by LGAP, Article 47. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. As noted, the LGAP regulates notice to parties in detail in Part VI, including electronic notice. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. Here we are talking about the conditions and criteria during the provision of services, e.g. regarding the conditions for application, the conditions for benefiting from subsidies, permits, or obtaining various documents. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. As a good service design practice, before developing the conditions, it is advisable to develop the proportionality test. If these conditions are necessary under the test, then they should be formulated as criteria (e.g. being registered as a business, not requiring a business certificate). [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. As long as the conditions and criteria are clear and objective, an ICT solution can, in an automated way, help the decision-making process of who can pass the selection stage for further consideration in an administrative procedure. For example, also using automatic interoperability, an ICT solution can indicate that the applicant meets the prerequisites (such as citizenship, age, professional qualification, business registration, etc.). However, such automated processing becomes difficult if the conditions and criteria contain numerous exceptions or are very complex. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. During the drafting of the legislation, care should be taken in using an approach based on a clear flow of processes, where the service is divided into concrete and easily recognizable steps. Provisions covering these steps should be developed after analyzing the provision of services, based on methodologies such as BPMN (Business Process Model and Notation), which provides a clear overview of all steps from the user's point of view. service, as well as from the provider's side. If legislation (especially secondary legislation) is developed following such methodologies, it facilitates the development or updating of ICT solutions for the service. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. Article 86.3 of the LGAP, requires that '[Unless otherwise provided by law, the documents proving acts, facts, qualities or subjective conditions, necessary for the administrative review, are administered, ex-officio, by the public body that conducts the administrative procedure, if they are under its administration or those of other public bodies. A public body may ask the party to present only the necessary information for their identification. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. When drafting the legislation that supports the digitalization of services, it is recommended to take into account compliance, especially with the requirements of the legislation for the protection of personal data and their security. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. During the evaluation of legal acts, the following aspects can be evaluated:

Check that the legal act uses language and terminology that reflect innovative and digital approaches.

Make sure that the text of the act does not restrict the use of new technologies or innovative methods.

Check whether the legal act allows organizations and institutions to test and develop new technologies without unnecessary restrictions.

Ensure that there are mechanisms in place for security assessment during the testing phase. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. Neutrality in terms of technology also helps in ensuring that digitalization is 'future-proof', or secure in terms of changes in technology. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. Based on the cascading objectives approach, all targets of programmes, sectoral, and horizontal strategies must contribute towards achieving the higher national targets outlined in the National Development Strategy. The same applies in this case, where the targets of the Administrative Burden Prevention and Reduction Programme, the e-Governance Strategy, and the Public Administration Reform Strategy, complementing each other, lead to the achievement of the mentioned NDS target. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)