

# Measuring Local Units' Transparency and Accountability: The Croatian Open Local Budget Index

---

**Ott, Katarina; Bronić, Mihaela; Urban, Ivica; Bađun, Marijana; Primorac, Marko**

**Other document types / Ostale vrste dokumenata**

*Publication year / Godina izdavanja:* **2010**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:242:492375>

*Rights / Prava:* [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2025-01-17**



*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[Institute of Public Finance Repository](#)



Research project by the  
**Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb**

Funded by the  
**Center on Budget and Policy Priorities**  
and **International Budget Partnership, Washington**

---

## **Measuring Local Units' Transparency and Accountability: The Croatian Open Local Budget Index**

---

Project leaders:  
Katarina Ott and Mihaela Bronić

Researchers:  
Katarina Ott, Mihaela Bronić, Ivica Urban,  
Ivan Škoc, Marijana Bađun and Marko Primorac

December 2010

## Contents

---

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>10</b>
1.1. Purpose of the research	10
1.2. Definition of local budget transparency	11
1.3. Different measures of budget transparency	12
1.4. Local units in Croatia	13
<b>2. Research: structure, methodology and results</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1. Structure of the research	15
2.2. Methodology and results	16
2.2.1. The Croatian Open Local Budget Index	16
2.2.2. The Survey	21
<b>3. Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>4. References</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>5. Annex</b>	
A. Methodology	35
B. Summary of researches on local budget transparency	52
C. The presentation of the Croatian Open Local Budget Index for each city	56
D. The analysis of the Survey responses by	
D1. Local executive bodies	222
D2. Local units' information officers	242
D3. Local representative bodies	259
D4. Local civil society organizations	288
D5. Ministry of Finance	306
E. Why we have selected 33 cities - Financial analysis of the Croatian local units' budgets	317
F. How difficult is for a representative citizen to find the local budget information on official websites of 33 cities?	327
G. Exchange of documents and reports between local units and the Ministry of Finance	333
H. Local budgeting process in Croatia	335
I. Summary of Questionnaire results by cities	337

## Acknowledgements

---

This has been a truly cooperative project and it is very difficult to measure the particular contribution of each researcher and of the numerous colleagues engaged. However, we would like to thank at least some of them.

Our thanks go to the Center of Budget and Policy Priorities and International Budget Partnership, Washington not only for financial and technical support to this project but also for long-term support and friendly cooperation.

It has been a pleasure to work with our close collaborators Ivica Urban, Marijana Bađun, Ivan Škoc and Marko Primorac. Here we must add Martina Popovčić who was with us at the beginning but then had to leave us. The thanks also go to our intern - Cecilia B. Mihaljek - who as a student and inexperienced in budgetary issues served as a proxy for the average citizen.

We would also like to thank our colleagues from the Ministry of Finance – Ivana Jakir-Bajo and Ivana Maletić – who are always at hand to clarify whatever problems we might encounter and Marina Lochert from the Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs who helped us with a sample of local civil society organizations.

Our thanks also go to Draženka Polović and Marija Delija who acted as anonymous citizens requiring additional information from the State Audit Office.

Thanks also go to Ankica Zerec and Graham McMaster translators and editors of the English version of the project; Martina Fabris who helped with the literature and references; Marina Nekić, the technical editor and Josip Adžić who worked on the address book.

We are particularly obliged to two reviewers – Vjekoslav Bratić and Goran Vukšić – for helpful modifications and suggestions.

And finally thanks go to all persons taking part in surveys in 33 cities and in the Ministry of Finance.

Katarina Ott and Mihaela Bronić

Project leaders

---

## Abstract

---

Thanks to the support of the CBPP-IBP, Washington, the IPF, Zagreb explored the budget transparency of 33 biggest Croatian cities, which resulted in the Croatian Open Budget Index (COLBI) for the year 2010. The goal was to investigate the disclosure of budget information by local units and the openness of local units to the public.

Within the project, we: (1) constructed the Questionnaire on the basis of which we calculated the *Main COLBI* of the disclosure of budget information by local units, the *Additional COLBI* of the local units' openness to the public and the *Total COLBI*, as a general measure of local budget transparency; (2) carried out a Survey among the representatives of local information officers (LINFO), local executive bodies (LEXE), local representative bodies (LREP) and local civil society organizations (LCSO) in the observed cities and the Ministry of Finance (MFIN); and (3) engaged a citizen (unacquainted with the budget) to search independently the official websites of these cities.

The *Main COLBI* average shows that we obtained 57% of the expected local budget information (ranging from 79 to 34%); the *Additional COLBI* average shows that cities provided us with 82% of the expected openness to the public (ranging from 100% to 47%); and the *Total COLBI* average shows that the general measure of local budget transparency is 65% (ranging from 82% to 45%).

The main problems encountered in many cities are the following: (1) the lack of: the functional classification of expenditures in the budget documents, the explanations of revenues and expenditures by economic classification, the Citizens Budget, adequate data for the previous and the following two years and macroeconomic forecasts; (2) the unsatisfactory responses of LINFOs, LEXEs and LREPs to citizens' requests for information, the lack of the City Council's meeting agendas on the local units' official websites and the relatively low rate of response by LINFOs, LEXEs and LREPs to our Survey.

The Survey shows that: (1) the opinions of the LREP respondents from the ruling coalition are very often opposite to those from members of the opposition; (2) the role of the LREP is inferior to that of the LEXE; (3) the communication problems between LEXE and MFIN have aggravated due to an excessive number of local units, the understaffed MFIN, complicated laws and their frequent changes; (4) the LCSOs complain about the unintelligible legal terminology, frequent changes in budget classifications and the lack of time and basic information.

The results should be taken cautiously because of the relative arbitrariness in constructing the indexes, problems in measurements and the formulations in the questionnaires that should be more precise in order to capture the subtle nuances of transparency.

*Key words: local budget transparency, disclosure of budgetary information, local units' openness to the public, Croatian Open Local Budget Index*

## Executive summary

---

Thanks to the support of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and International Budget Partnership, Washington, the Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb has undertaken the task of measuring the local units' transparency and accountability and constructing the Croatian Open Local Budget Index (COLBI) for the year 2010.

The goal was to explore local budget transparency, i.e. the disclosure of budget information by local units and their openness to the public. During the project we:

- analyzed the relevant academic and professional literature and Croatian laws and regulations,
- constructed the Questionnaire for measuring local budget transparency in 33 biggest Croatian cities,
- calculated the COLBI for these cities based on the Questionnaire,
- carried out Survey among the local information officers (LINFO), local executive bodies (LEXE), local representative bodies (LREP), local civil society organizations (LCSO) in the observed cities and the Ministry of Finance (MFIN),
- as a proxy for the average citizen - unacquainted with the budget - a sixteen-year-old student independently searched the official websites of the cities.

The information gathered through the Survey and the student's insights were not used for the calculation of the COLBI, but they served for our better understanding of the budgeting process and drawing up our conclusions and recommendations.

**The main results** of the project - the *Main COLBI* of the disclosure of budget information by local units, the *Additional COLBI* of the local units' openness to the public and the *Total COLBI* as a general measure of local budget transparency - are in line with previous results for both national and local budget transparency in Croatia.

**The *Main COLBI*** average is 57, meaning that, on average, we obtained 57% of the searched local budget information, while the best performed city – Slavonski Brod, and the worst – Pazin scored 79 and 34, respectively. The main problems encountered are the following:

- from 67% to over 80% of the cities do not include the functional classification of expenditures in the budget proposal documents for budgetary year, the Half-Year Report or Year-End Report;
- almost 80% of the cities do not give descriptions of revenues and expenditures by economic classification, whereas such descriptions exist in almost 70% of the cities for individual program expenditures;
- almost 80% of the cities do not publish a Citizens Budget;
- the majority of the cities do not present adequate data for the previous and the following two years in their budget proposal documents; and
- 85% of the cities do not present macroeconomic forecasts in the budget proposal documents.

**The *Additional COLBI*** average is 82, meaning that the cities provided us with 82% of the expected openness to the public. The best-performed cities are Karlovac and Labin with the score of 100, and the

worst one is Vinkovci, having scored 47. The majority of the cities can be considered extensively open to the public (e.g. in all 33 cities, citizens are allowed to attend the City Council meetings), while there are still problems relating to:

- unsatisfactory responses of LINFO, LEXE and LREP to citizens' requests for information;
- the lack of City Council's meeting agendas on the local units' official websites; and
- the relatively low response rate of LINFO, LEXE and LREP to our Survey.

Furthermore, despite the provisions of the Right of Access to Information Act, which oblige LINFOs to answer all requests within 15 days, less than 60% of them responded to our Survey.

However, the openness of local units to the public is obviously much better than the disclosure of budget information by local units. While the *Additional COLBI* for only five cities is below 75, only one city has the *Main COLBI* over 72.

**The Total COLBI** average is 65, meaning that the cities provided us with 65% of the expected disclosure of local budget information and the local units' openness to citizens. The best-placed city – Slavonski Brod scored 82, while the worst-placed – Šibenik scored 45. Although it might seem that the difference between the worst and the best-placed cities is not too big – about 50% – one has to have in mind that 33 biggest and most developed cities were selected here. That might suggest that the variation in local budget transparency in Croatia is probably much wider.

**The Results of the Survey** of the LREP, LEXE, LCSO, LINFO and MFIN representatives that aimed at getting more insights into the local budgeting processes, and the issues related to local budget transparency are explained in following paragraphs.

While the majority of respondents find the documents exchanged between LEXE and LREP, as well as the process of such exchange transparent, there are differences in views between LREP from the ruling coalition and the opposition; LEXE seem to be better informed than LREP and LREP often complain about the short deadlines (e.g. in six cities, less than eight days elapsed between LREP receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010 and adopting the budget proposal documents).

The majority of respondents find the documents exchanged between LEXE and MFIN and the process of such exchange partially transparent, often accusing each other for various problems and misdeeds. However, there are problems on both sides and in the system: too many local units (576), understaffed MFIN (only seven employees in charge of local units), poorly equipped local units, complicated laws and their interpretations, frequent changes in laws and regulations and their numerous amendments, plus an unsystematic approach of MFIN to the local unit financing issues.

Less than half of respondents from LCSOs understand the local budget documents, whereas about 40% understand them partially. The biggest challenges for LCSOs are unintelligible legal terminology, frequent changes in budget classifications, plus lack of time and of basic information about the local budget and budgeting process.

**The search of the official websites** of all 33 cities by an inexperienced citizen shows that there are great differences among the cities in how easy it is for them to find and view budget documents. Some cities have a direct link to the budget, but in many others, it is necessary to click on many links that seem

relevant and to use intuition and common sense. There is also a wide variation in the amount and layout of budget information, once you reach the relevant page. Surprisingly, the capital city offers scarce information about its budget, whereas citizens from some smaller cities have excellent access to the budget documents and can find lots of information on the cities' official websites.

The following **Recommendations** can be drawn from these results.

LEXE should concentrate on timely releasing most important documents, preferably on their official websites, regularly updating and improving the website layout, publishing the Citizens Budget, organizing public hearings, increasing investment in their own training, activating citizens and being more responsive to citizens.

Although playing second fiddle to LEXE, LREPs should demand from LEXE the full and correct disclosure of all the relevant local budget information in a timely manner and in an understandable form. They should scrutinize the budget documents more closely, discuss and influence the budgeting policy, hold LEXE accountable, and require opportunities for their professional development.

MFIN should be more cooperative and better coordinated with LEXEs, but before this, it should better organize its unit in charge of the cooperation with LEXEs, and try pressing the Government to reduce the number of local units. Besides, it should try to reduce changes to the relevant laws, regulations and budgetary classifications, or at least inform LEXEs about this and include them in the preparations for changes, send all the documents to them on time and promptly answer their questions.

Although being perceived as the most important subject in the unofficial monitoring and controlling of local budgets, the media should be even more involved in the local budgeting process in order to timely inform citizens about the most important budgetary events.

Citizens should try to educate themselves and demand simple and understandable information from LEXEs.

The **Methodological approach** followed was to first analyze the relevant academic and professional literature regarding the definitions and methodologies, as well as Croatian budget laws and regulations, and then to construct a Questionnaire consisting of 52 questions for measuring local budget transparency of the 33 biggest Croatian cities.

Based on the first 37 questions from the Questionnaire, relating to information available in the seven most important local budget documents, mostly following the example of the IBP's Open Budget Survey, we calculated the first subindex the *Main COLBI*. The next 15 questions, relating to the openness of local units in general, and their cooperation with us during the research served for constructing the second subindex the *Additional COLBI*. The general measure of local budget transparency took into account all 52 questions and was called the *Total COLBI*.

Besides the calculation of the mentioned indexes, we surveyed four types of respondents in each city: LREP, LEXE, LSCO, LINFO plus the MFIN. Altogether, over two hundred Survey questionnaires were sent out, with the purpose of getting a closer insight into the local budgeting processes and problems



relating to local budget transparency. Additionally, a student, inexperienced in budget issues, checked the official websites of the cities to find out how an interested citizen could cope with such task.

**Limitations exist and caution is necessary**, as this is our first attempt to explore and measure local budget transparency, i.e. the disclosure of budget information by local units and the openness of local units to the public. We have learned a lot through this research. Although we have decided to rank the cities, our results should be taken cautiously because of the relative arbitrariness in constructing the indexes, problems in measurements and formulations of possible answers to our questions that should be more precise in order to capture the subtle nuances of transparency.

We hope that by continuing this research for Croatia on a biannual basis and/or broadening the sample (e.g. including all Croatian cities or even all the local units), as well as by carrying out similar research projects in other countries, much better, more credible and hopefully comparable results will be obtained.

## Abbreviations

---

BAPL	budget account plan level
BP	Budget Proposal with Projections
BY	Budget Year
CB	Citizens Budget
CBPP	Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
COLBI	Croatian Open Local Budget Index
CSO	civil society organizations
DEB	Decision on Budget Execution
EB	Enacted Budget
FD	Finance Department
HRK	hrvatska kuna (Croatian Kuna)
HYR	Half-Year Report
HYREBs	half-year reports on execution of the financial plans
IBP	International Budget Partnership
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPF	Institute of Public Finance
LCSO	local civil society organization
LEXE	local executive body
LFB	local finance body
LINFO	local unit information officer
Local units	local and regional government units
LOTUS	Lokalna, odgovorna i transparentna uprava i samouprava ( <i>Local, accountable and transparent government</i> )
LREP	local representative body
MFIN	Ministarstvo Financija ( <i>Ministry of Finance</i> )
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PR	Enacted Projections
RC	representative citizen
ULRSG	units of local and regional self-government
YR	Year-End Report
YREBs	year-end reports on the execution of the financial plans

# 1. Introduction

---

The goal of this research is to measure local budget transparency in Croatia in 2010. The report consists of three main parts: the first part presents the introduction (explaining the purpose of the research and the definition of local budget transparency), the second part explains the structure of our research (methodology and results) and the third part brings conclusions and recommendations.

## 1.1 Purpose of the research

The primary aim of this research is to answer the following questions:

- How is the local budget information presented to the public? Are local budgets transparent?
- Is the local budgeting process transparent? and
- What specifically can be done to make local budgets and the local budgeting process more transparent?

Why is local budget transparency so important? The processes of democratization and fiscal decentralization have resulted in a rising number of locally provided public goods (such as the local public transport, kindergartens or street lighting). In order to provide these goods as efficiently as possible, citizens need to understand their local budgets and to actively participate in the local budgeting process. Because, once accepted, a local budget has an effect on each and every citizen. It determines, for example, how much citizens will pay for local public transport (tram or bus), how much they will pay if their children go to public kindergartens, or whether they will have public street lighting.

But still, in spite of its exceptional importance, many people do not understand the local budget. Citizens usually do not have enough time and/or interest to analyze the local budget data or to examine the topics needed for their participation in the local budgeting process. Apart from a lack of time and interest, the problem is that the necessary local budget data are often unavailable or the data are available, but they are not understandable to citizens.<sup>1</sup> It is known from the literature (Benito and Bastida, 2009) that, given the complexity of modern economies' budgets, policy makers can hide certain tax burdens and government liabilities. It is often not in the interest of politicians to have simple, clear and transparent central or local budgets.

However, we must make an effort to increase local budget transparency, as it allows citizens and financial markets to assess properly the local units' financial positions and performance.<sup>2</sup> It is also very important that the local budgets are transparent, so that citizens can understand them, which will enable them to participate more actively in the local budgeting process and hold the local executive body (LEXE)<sup>3</sup> and local representative body (LREP)<sup>4</sup> accountable.

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, GONG (2010) argues that, according to its most recent annual survey in Croatia (for 2009), less than 50% of responses to their questionnaire sent out to public administration bodies (including local units - counties, municipalities and cities) were received on time and in accordance with the Right of Access to Information Act (In Croatian: *Zakon o pravu na pristup informacijama*). GONG (2010) also argues that the answers are very often only formal and incomplete, concluding that citizens can sometimes gain access to this information only with great difficulty.

<sup>2</sup> Local units – municipalities and cities, but the term also sometimes includes counties.

<sup>3</sup> According to the Act on Local and Regional Self-Government (in Croatian: *Zakon o lokalnoj i područnoj (regionalnoj) samoupravi*), a local executive body consists of the municipal prefect, mayor and county prefect and their deputies. For the purposes of our research, LEXE is considered to include the municipal prefect, mayor and county prefect and their deputies, as well as the local

Since the transparency of local budgets and local units' accountability are interrelated, in this research we will also try to identify the appropriate measures to ensure the accountability of LEXE and LREP. In our research we have calculated the Croatian Open Local Budget Index for 2010 (hence COLBI). The COLBI is a measure of local budget transparency. During 2011 we will publish the COLBI results. Based on the COLBI results, citizens from the surveyed local units can check the transparency of their own local budgets and demand improvements in the non-transparent areas. And when the budget transparency in their local unit improves, citizens will also be able to check more easily the accountability of their LEXE and LREP. Thus, it will be easier for citizens to check if the LEXE and LREP have done all the things they had promised. "Transparency is the first step towards holding the local governments accountable for how they use public money. Open budgets are empowering. They allow people to be the judge of whether or not their local government officials make good use of public funds (---, 2010.)".

## 1.2 Definition of local budget transparency

There are many different definitions of budget transparency. For example, it is interesting to mention one of the main budget principles in Croatia's Budget Act, i.e. the principle of budget transparency. It refers to the obligatory publication of certain budget documents in the national official gazette (for central government) or in the local official gazette (for local units).<sup>5</sup>

This report is focused on the local budget transparency. We have defined local budget transparency as the possibility that citizens can obtain information about their local unit's budgets that is:

- complete,
- relevant,
- correct,
- timely and
- presented in an understandable form.

The local budget transparency actually tells us about the quantity and quality of information presented to the public in local budget documents. It gives us answers on how many different budget reports the local unit publishes and how detailed these reports are. In short, local budget transparency indicates whether citizens can trust these documents or not.<sup>6</sup> It also tells us if a citizen can obtain the local budget information.<sup>7</sup>

---

units' administrative bodies. More specifically, for the performance of tasks from the scope of the self-government activities of local units, as well as the state administration tasks delegated to the local units, administrative departments and services (local units' administrative bodies) are established.

<sup>4</sup> Local representative bodies are county assemblies and the Zagreb City Assembly, as well as the municipal and city councils (Budget Act (In Croatian *Zakon o proračunu*)).

<sup>5</sup> The new Budget Act (87/08) stipulates that several new documents have to be published, which has not been the case before. Thus, since 1 January 2009 the following documents have to be published: the Enacted Budget with Projections, Amendments to the Enacted Budget with Projections, the Decision on Temporary Financing, Half-Year Report and Year-End Report.

<sup>6</sup> Our definition is a combination of two definitions. Firstly, OECD defines the budget transparency as the full disclosure of all relevant fiscal information in a timely and systematic manner (OECD, 2002). Secondly, the IBP (2008) defines budget transparency as a possibility for all people in a country to access the information on how much is allocated for different types of spending and what revenues are collected.

<sup>7</sup> There are several other definitions relating to budget transparency that should be mentioned here. All of them are broader and relate to more than just the information from the budgets, which is actually understandable because to some extent the budget can only be transparent if, for example, the budgeting processes are transparent. Let us imagine that the central government does not present on time the budget proposal to the parliament, the public will obviously not have timely information about the budget proposal.

Thus the International Monetary Fund (IMF, 2008) uses the term fiscal transparency and defines it as being open to the public about the government's past, present, and future fiscal activities, and about the structure and functions of the government that

In this report we have focused on measuring the local budget transparency and, to some extent, the transparency of the local budgeting process. Under the transparency of local budgeting process we actually mean that all participants in the local budgeting process understand what has to be done, when and by whom (meaning the Ministry of Finance - MFIN, LREP and, LEXE).

### 1.3 Different measures of budget transparency

It is as difficult to define budget transparency as it is to measure it. There is no unique or exact way to do so. Different researchers have used questionnaires and surveys to examine budget transparency and, based on the answers from those questionnaires and surveys, they constructed different types of budget transparency indexes (Table 1).

*Table 1: Measures of fiscal/budget transparency*

Authors	Index of	Sample	Method
Alesina, Hausmann and Hommes (1999)	budget institutions	20 Latin American and Caribbean countries	Two questionnaires covering ten characteristics of the budget procedures
Bastida and Benito (2007, 2009)	budget transparency	41 countries	Questionnaire based on OECD's <i>Best Practices</i>
Beales and Thompson (2010)	fiscal transparency	134 localities in Virginia, US	Availability of information on municipalities' websites using 16 criteria on a 100 point scale
Boubeta et al. (2010)	fiscal transparency	33 Galician municipalities, Spain	Questionnaire based on three pillars of the IMF's <i>Code</i> and authors' knowledge about budgeting processes and local units' realities
Hameed (2005)	fiscal transparency	57 countries	Assigning numbers to practices following IMF' <i>Code</i>
IBP (2002)	budget transparency	5 Latin American countries	Survey
IBP (2006)	open budget	Over 80 countries	Questionnaire
Jarmuzek et al. (2006)	fiscal transparency	27 transition economies	Survey of relevant websites based on a Questionnaire following IMF's <i>Code</i>
von Hagen (1992)	fiscal transparency	8 European countries	Questionnaire

We will not discuss these indexes, since some of the important things are highlighted in Table 1. We will just point out the most important guidelines for measuring budget transparency, i.e.:

- OECD's – *Best Practices for Budget Transparency*,
- IMF's - *Code of Good Practices on Fiscal Transparency*, and
- IBP's – *Guide to the Open Budget Questionnaire: An Explanation of the Questions and the Response Options*.

To our knowledge, there is very little published research on the local budget transparency in the world. We managed to find two of them, both from 2010 (Table 1 – Boubeta et al. (2010) and Beales and Thompson (2010)). In Croatia, we have found six projects that are to some extent related to budget

---

determine fiscal policies and outcomes. According to Poterba and von Hagen (1999:3-4) "a transparent budgeting process is one that provides clear information on all aspects of government fiscal policy. Budgets that include numerous special accounts and that fail to consolidate all fiscal activity into a single "bottom line" measure are not transparent. Budgets that are easily available to the public and to participants in the policymaking process, and that do present consolidated information, are transparent".

transparency. One of them deals with the openness of the central government and was run by a foreign organization (IBP - 2006, 2008, 2010b), while the other five relate to the local budget transparency and were carried out by Croatian organizations and authors: Maletić (2006), GONG (2009), Profeta (2009), Bratić (2008b) and Antić and Malatestinić (2010). Only in two of these projects the budget transparency indexes for Croatia were calculated: in IBP (2006, 2008, 2010b) for the central government and in GONG (2009) for local units (all Croatian cities and municipalities). For more details about the research on the local budget transparency issues done so far see Annex B.

Our literature review has shown that the local budget transparency should preferably be measured by some kind of index (Table 1). In addition, it shows that Croatian citizens do not sufficiently participate in the local budgeting process (Maletić (2006); Antić and Malatestinić (2010)) and that both local budgets and the central government budget are perceived as not transparent enough (GONG (2009); Profeta (2008), IBP (2006, 2008, 2010b)).

## 1.4 Local units in Croatia

Since we analyze local budget transparency in Croatia, there is a need to shortly explain the local units in Croatia. Croatia is a small unitary country (4.4 million inhabitants) consisting of 576 local units. The country is divided into counties, cities and municipalities. Counties (21, including the capital city of Zagreb) constitute the *regional self-government*. Cities (126, with a population of around 3 million) and municipalities (429, mainly rural, with around 1.4 million inhabitants) represent the *local self-government*.

*Local units' expenditures.* In 2009, most expenditures of the local units (cities and municipalities) according to function were spent on housing improvement services, e.g. water and gas supply (22%), general services, i.e. the financing of executive and legislative bodies (18%), education (15%), economic operations (17%) and recreation, culture and religion (14%). These expenditures accounted for over 85% of total local spending, whereas the rest related to social protection, environmental protection, health care and public order and safety (Ministry of Finance, 2010).

*Local units' revenues.* The biggest revenue sources for local units' budgets are tax revenues. In 2009, they accounted for about 56% of total local units' revenue. The second largest revenue item (about 30%) is the non-tax revenue, e.g. revenues from the sale of goods and services, from fines, etc. The third largest revenue sources are grants that account for about 10% of total local units' revenues. Finally, capital revenues accounted for about 5% of total local units' revenues in 2009 (Ministry of Finance, 2010).

*Local units' responsibilities.* *Counties* deal with matters of regional significance, e.g.: education, health care, town planning, economic development, traffic and transportation infrastructure, and the planning and development of the networks of educational, healthcare, welfare and cultural establishments. *Cities and municipalities* are charged with matters of local significance, e.g. housing, town planning, utility management, childcare, welfare, primary health care, pre-school and elementary school education, culture, physical culture and sport, environmental protection and improvement, civil protection and fire

---

protection. If *cities and municipalities* are provided with enough funds, they may also deal with matters coming within the competence of a *county*.

During the decentralization process in 2001, 53 local units (20 counties and 33 cities) accepted the additional obligation to finance some parts of education, health care, social welfare and fire fighting, for which they are provided with an additional share in personal income tax and equalization grants.

There are three reasons why we have selected 33 biggest cities that took over decentralized functions in 2001, for our sample to measure the local budget transparency. The first reason is that the budgets of 33 selected cities account for about 56% of all local units' budgets (the budgets of all cities and municipalities). The second reason is that about 49% of the total Croatian population live in these 33 cities.<sup>8</sup> Finally, the revenue and expenditure structure of these 33 cities' budgets do not differ too much from the revenue and expenditure structure of the budgets of other Croatian local units. Consequently, we have decided to cover an as large as possible share of revenues and expenditures in a relatively small number of local units. These three reasons are further elaborated in Annex E.

---

<sup>8</sup> In 33 biggest cities lives around 2.2 million people.

## 2. Research: structure, methodology and results

After introductory part of this report in the second part we will present the structure of our research, methodology (the Questionnaire, the COLBI and the Survey) and results (local budget and local budgeting processes are not transparent enough).

### 2.1 Structure of the research

Based on the literature review, we decided to measure local budget transparency and construct the Croatian Open Local Budget Index by : 1) taking into account the OECD's *Best Practices* and the IMF's *Code*; 2) following the IBP's *Guide* since this is the most comprehensive guideline; 3) paying attention to issues emphasized by other, previously mentioned Croatian and foreign researchers into the budget transparency; and 4) taking into account institutional arrangements, both formal and informal, that are specific to Croatia.

During our research:

- We analyzed relevant academic and professional articles searching for definitions, methodology and results related to budget transparency measuring in the world and in Croatia (literature review).
- We analyzed relevant Croatian budgetary laws and regulations at the central government and local unit level.
- We constructed a questionnaire with 52 questions. The aim of the Questionnaire was to measure local budget transparency in 33 biggest cities in 2010.
- As a result of the Questionnaire, we calculated our COLBI.
  - The first 37 questions in our Questionnaire relate to the information available in seven most important local budget documents. These questions are mostly based on IBP's Open Budget Survey. The responses to these questions are used to calculate the first subindex, *the Main Croatian Open Local Budget Index* (Main COLBI).
  - The following 15 questions in our Questionnaire are concerned with the openness of local units in general and the cooperation of the local units staff with us during our research. These questions are mostly based on the GONG (2009) research, whereas a few questions have been answered on the basis of our Survey (see below). These 15 questions served as a basis for the second subindex, the *Additional Croatian Open Local Budget Index* (Additional COLBI).
  - Taking into account all 52 questions, we have also constructed a summary index - the *Total Croatian Open Local Budget Index* (Total COLBI) as the general measure of local budget transparency in 2010 for 33 biggest cities.
- Two researchers independently searched the official websites of 33 cities, trying to find the needed local budget documents and to answer the Questionnaire for each city. They used guidelines which specify how to respond to each question (see Annex A). Where some local



budget documents could not be found on the city's official websites, we asked the LEXE to send it to us.

- We developed the Survey (for four types of respondents in each city: LREP, LEXE, local civil society organization (LCSO), Local unit information officer (LINFO) and MFIN). The primary aim of the Survey was to gain a deeper insight into the local budgeting process and issues relating to local budget transparency in Croatia. This would help us take our conclusions and interpret the COLBI results properly. However, we also used some information obtained from the Survey to answer a few questions in the Additional COLBI.
- As a pilot project, we carried out the Survey (LREP, LEXE, LCSO, and LINFO) in 4 cities (Karlovac, Rijeka, Kutina and Varaždin).
- We sent the Survey questions by mail to the remaining 29 cities (LREP, LEXE, LCSO, LINFO) and to the MFIN. The results of the Survey are presented in Annex D. Finally,
- we also assigned a task to a citizen (a 16-year-old student) to try to find local budget information on the official websites of 33 cities in the period from 1 to 9 July 2010. These results have not been used for calculating the COLBI, but only for the conclusions in our final report. The aim was to see what problems an average citizen (with no prior experience with budget issues) would face and how easy/hard this exercise would be for her (Annex F).

## 2.2 Methodology and results

The following text first explains the main results of our Questionnaire (i.e. the COLBI) and then the most important conclusions from our Survey.

### 2.2.1 *The Croatian Open Local Budget Index*

On the basis of the Questionnaire, we have calculated one summary index (the Total COLBI) as the general measure of local budget transparency in 2010 for 33 biggest cities. It should be noted that the summary index (the Total COLBI) is the sum of two subindexes – the Main COLBI and Additional COLBI. Given our definition of the local budget transparency that citizens can obtain information about the local units' budgets that are complete, relevant, correct, timely and presented in an understandable form, we wanted to gain a deeper insight into both of these areas. This means that we wanted to investigate the local units' disclosure of budget information (the Main COLBI) and the openness of local units to the public (the Additional COLBI), and give recommendations for both of them. More details about the methodology can be found in Annex A.

#### ***The Main Croatian Open Local Budget Index***

The Main COLBI is calculated on the basis of 37 questions about the disclosure of local budget information (the quantity and quality of information presented in seven most important local budget documents). These documents are: Budget Proposal with Projections, Enacted Budget, Enacted Projections, Decision on Budget Execution, Half-Year Report, Year-End Report and Citizens Budget.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Non-technical presentation intended for a wide audience that describes the budget proposal documents.

The analysis was carried out for 2010 and we analyzed documents for this year, except for Enacted Projections (2011-2012), Half-Year Report (2009) and End-Year Report (2008). In addition, we analyzed the Citizens Budget for 2009 or 2010, where the Citizens Budget existed for any of these two years. For a detailed description of the local budgeting process see Annex H.

Questions in the Main COLBI are about the following:


- Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available?
- In what detail are expenditures presented in different types of local budget documents?
- In what detail are major types of revenues (tax and non-tax revenues and grants) presented in different types of local budget documents?
- Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal explanations and descriptions of expenditures and revenues?
- In what detail is the information about the local units' outstanding debt presented in the budget proposal documents?<sup>10</sup>
- Do the budget proposal documents offer macroeconomic forecasts on which the budget figures are based?
- Does the local unit publish a Citizens Budget? and
- Is the local official gazette available on the Internet?

According to the Main COLBI, the best performing city is Slavonski Brod (79), and the worst one Pazin (34). The average Main COLBI is 57 of 100, which means that on average, from 33 cities we obtained about 57% of local budget information requested in our research (Figure 1). It is interesting to note that Croatia's score on the IBP's Open Budget Index for 2010 (representing the transparency of Croatian central government budget) was also 57% (see Bađun and Urban, 2010).

---

<sup>10</sup> The budget proposal documents include: Budget Proposal with Projections, Enacted Budget, Enacted Projections and Decision on Budget Execution. See Annex A for details.

Figure 1. The Main Croatian Open Local Budget Index



Obviously, much can be done to improve the quality and quantity of the local budget information presented to the public in the observed cities. For example, Budget Proposal with Projections (BP) is the most important document in the budgeting process. However, during our research only 10 local units have made it available on their official websites.<sup>11</sup>

In addition, according to the Main COLBI, most of the cities have failed to provide:

- macroeconomic forecasts underlying the Budget Projections;
- verbal descriptions (explanations) of various revenues and expenditures in the budget proposal documents;
- expenditures by functional classification in the budget proposal documents, the Half-Year Report or the Year-End Report; or

<sup>11</sup> Čakovec, Dubrovnik, Karlovac, Kutina, Labin, Osijek, Rijeka, Samobor, Slavonski Brod and Zagreb.

We have therefore contacted LEXE of the other 23 local units, requesting them to send us their BPs. From one local unit we obtained a hard copy of BP (Sisak). Eleven local units sent no further information about BP (Bjelovar, Gospić, Krapina, Pazin, Rovinj, Split, Umag, Varaždin, Vinkovci, Virovitica and Vrbovec). As to the remaining 11 local units, their LEXEs informed us that BP existed, but they failed to send us the document. They informed us that BP was identical in content to the Enacted Budget, indicating that as a reason why BP was not made available on these cities' official websites (Crikvenica, Koprivnica, Makarska, Opatija, Poreč, Požega, Pula, Šibenik, Velika Gorica, Zadar and Zaprešić).

- Citizens Budget.

It is interesting to note that similar problems exist with respect to the central budget transparency, e.g. the non-existence of a Citizens Budget (see Bađun and Urban, 2010). Detailed recommendations for improving the disclosure of local budget information for each city can be found in Annex C.


### ***The Additional Croatian Open Local Budget Index***

In order to get a deeper insight into the openness of local units in general, we introduced 15 additional questions and calculated the Additional COLBI. These questions are mostly based on the GONG (2009) research, and a few of them are based on our Survey. These questions

- evaluate the cooperation of LINFO, LREP, and LEXE with us during the Survey; and
- are concerned with the existence of a local Committee on Budget Issues and the functioning of the City Councils (e.g. the availability of the City Council's Rules of Procedure on the official websites, or a possibility for citizens to attend the City Council meetings).

According to the Additional COLBI, the best performing cities are Karlovac and Labin (100), and the worst one is Vinkovci (47). The openness to the public reported by the cities is about 82% on average (Figure 2). The performance of the local units according to the Additional COLBI is much better than according to the Main COLBI - only 5 units have scores on the Additional COLBI below 75, while only one city attained a score on the Main COLBI of over 72.

*Figure 2. The Additional Croatian Open Local Budget Index*



The general conclusion according to the Additional COLBI is that most of the observed cities are extensively open to the public, but still much can be done to improve their openness to the public. For example, LINFO, LEXE and LREP should respond to all citizens' requests for access to information. In addition, the agendas of the City Council meetings should be available on the local units' official websites prior to the meetings (see detailed recommendations for improving the openness for each city in Annex C).<sup>12</sup>

Concerning the Additional COLBI, the biggest problem was the relatively low rate of response of LINFO, LREP and LEXE to our Survey (see Annexes D1, D2 and D3). For example, let us explain the problem with LINFO. According to the Right of Access to Information Act all information possessed, disposed of or controlled by bodies of public authority must be made available to interested persons. The bodies of public authority (including the LEXE) are obliged, for the purpose of providing access to information, to designate an official person, such as the LINFO, whose main task is to receive and consider individual requests for access to information. The LINFO must respond to these requests within 15 days from their submission, and the provided information must be complete and accurate.

However, within our research, we sent the Survey questions to LINFOs on 3 May 2010 (Annex D2). After 15 days, the response rate from LINFOs was very low (about 10%). After reminding LINFOs of the Survey on 26 July 2010, the final response rate was 58% (19 out of 33 cities answered).<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, of these 19 cities in which LINFOs did respond to the Survey, 12 cities failed to provide complete or accurate information.<sup>14</sup> They confirmed the existence of certain documents, but, despite our request, they neither submitted them nor explained where such documents could be found.<sup>15</sup>

### ***The Total Croatian Open Local Budget Index***

The summary index (the Total COLBI) describes both the disclosure of local budget information and the openness of local units to the public. According to the Total COLBI, the best placed is Slavonski Brod (82), and the worst is Šibenik (45). The average Total COLBI is 65 of 100, meaning that, on average, 33 cities provided us with about 65% of the expected local budget information and openness to the public (Figure 3).

---


<sup>12</sup> During our research, the agendas of the City Council meetings were available prior the meetings on the official websites of only 24 out of 33 cities (73%).

<sup>13</sup> Koprivnica, Kutina, Požega, Umag, Bjelovar, Crikvenica, Čakovec, Dubrovnik, Karlovac, Labin, Osijek, Pazin, Poreč, Pula, Sisak, Split, Varaždin, Virovitica and Vrbovec.

<sup>14</sup> Kutina, Bjelovar, Crikvenica, Čakovec, Dubrovnik, Labin, Osijek, Pazin, Poreč, Pula, Split and Varaždin.

<sup>15</sup> However, it should also be noted that the openness to the authors of this Survey does not necessarily imply the same level of openness to other citizens, because the authors did not hide the fact that they were conducting a research.

Figure 3. The Total Croatian Open Local Budget Index



When we look at the Total COLBI results, the difference between the best performing city and the worst one is less than 50%. This does not seem to be so much, if compared with the IBP's Open Budget Index for 2010 that enables the international comparison of budget transparency at the central government level (IBP, 2010b). For example, the difference between the best performing country and the worst one in the Open Budget Index for 2010 is more than 90%. Thus, although it seems that the difference in the total local budget transparency (the Total COLBI) for the 33 cities is not big (about 50%), we want to emphasize that this difference would have certainly been much bigger if we had included in our research all local units (all cities and municipalities) in Croatia. This is especially true since we know that the local budget transparency of cities in Croatia is higher than that of municipalities (GONG, 2009).

### 2.2.2. The Survey

In the second part of our research, we carried out the Survey (and had five types of respondents: LREP, LEXE, LCSO, LINFO and MFIN). The primary aim of the Survey was to get more insight about the local budgeting processes and problems related to local budget transparency in Croatia<sup>16</sup>. Based on the Survey, we wanted to answer the two most important questions: 1) Are the budget documents transparent? and 2) Is the local budgeting process transparent? Since we wanted to analyze the entire

<sup>16</sup> We also used some information obtained from the Survey to answer a few questions relating to the Additional COLBI.

local budgeting process, we surveyed all participants in the local budgeting process (LREP, LEXE, LINFO, LCSO (as the representatives of citizens) and MFIN).

In the period from 3 May to 27 July 2010, we surveyed four types of respondents in each city:

- local executive body,
- local information officer,
- local civil society organization and
- two members of the local representative body (one from the party in power/ruling coalition (position) and the other from the opposition).

From 20 September to 27 September 2010, the Survey was also sent to the representatives of the Ministry of Finance dealing with the local unit financing issues.


The response rates were the following:

- 61% LEXE,
- 58% LINFO,
- 52% LCSO,
- 39% LREP, and
- 28% MFIN.

*a) The local budget documents exchanged between the local executive body and local representative bodies and the process of exchange of these documents*


The majority of respondents find the documents exchanged between LEXE and LREP transparent (Figure 4). During our research, we also observed an interesting thing. Almost all LREP from the position believe these documents to be transparent, whereas none of the opposition members shares this belief (see Annex D3). The LREP from the opposition explained their negative responses by the fact that in most cases they obtained the documents just a few days before the sessions or even at the sessions.

*Figure 4: Transparency of local budget documents exchanged between local executive and local representative bodies (%)*



In addition, the majority of respondents find the process of exchange of local budget documents between the LEXE and LREP transparent (Figure 5). These respondents answered that they knew what had to be done (relating to the exchange of documents between the LEXE and LREP), what the deadlines were, and who was responsible for what. LEXEs seem to be better informed about this process than the members of LREP.

Figure 5: Transparency in the local budgeting process between local executive and local representative bodies (%)




Many LREPs' members complain about too much improvisation and endorse the general opinion that the transparency in the local budgeting process between LEXE and LREP could be improved and the entire system made more efficient. For example, the Survey (see, Annex D2) showed that in six cities<sup>17</sup>, less than eight days elapsed between receiving a 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections by LREP and adopting the local budget. The question is whether the LREP in these six cities really had a chance, in such a short time, to effectively analyze the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections prepared by the LEXE, and exert some influence on the budget adoption procedure itself.

b) *The local budget documents exchanged between the local executive body and Ministry of Finance and the process of exchanging these documents*

The majority of the respondents find the documents exchanged between LEXE and MFIN, as well as the process of exchanging these documents partially transparent (Fig. 6 and 7).

Figure 6: Transparency of local budget documents exchanged between local executive bodies and Ministry of Finance (%)



LEXEs complain of the sloppy work of the MFIN, indicating that MFIN does not observe the deadlines for submission of the documentation to LEXE, and that MFIN is preoccupied with central government and therefore pays little attention to local units. Moreover, they complain that the LEXE's inquiries addressed to the MFIN are very often ignored and not responded to (Annex D1).


<sup>17</sup> Bjelovar, Crikvenica, Požega, Sisak, Split and Virovitica.



However, the respondents from the MFIN also set forth some of the most important reasons why the process of exchanging local budget documents and communication between MFIN and LEXE is not fully transparent:

- MFIN pursues an unsystematic approach to local unit financing issues;
- there are frequent changes in regulations relating to local units financing within a relatively short period of time which result in omissions and errors, and, consequently, in numerous amendments which complicate and lengthen the document exchange between MFIN and LEXE;
- the laws are complicated and hard to understand, and their interpretations do not actually facilitate their application. Sometimes there are even multiple interpretations of the one and the same issue, which causes confusion for local units;
- local units are sometimes poorly equipped (both technically and in terms of personnel);
- there are too many local units (576); and
- MFIN - Local Units Financing Department with only seven employees is understaffed (Annex D5).

*Figure 7: Transparency in the local budgeting process between local executive bodies and the Ministry of Finance (%)*



Partial transparency of local budget documents and of the process of exchanging these documents between MFIN and LEXE, often results in the LEXEs' delayed submission of reports to MFIN.

For example, LEXEs are obliged by the Budget Act (Art. 40) to submit the Enacted Budget to the MFIN and State Audit Office within 15 days from the date of its coming into force. However, as at 8 March 2010, 3%<sup>18</sup> local units failed to send the Enacted Budget for 2010 to the MFIN (Annex G).

Again, although it is stipulated by the Budget Act (Art. 112) that LEXEs should submit Year-End Reports to MFIN and the State Audit Office within 15 days from its adoption by LREP, as at 8 March 2010, only 66%<sup>19</sup> of all local units submitted the Year-End Reports for 2008 to MFIN. The problem is that the deadline by which LEXEs are required to submit the Year-End Reports to LREP is set by, but the deadline for the adoption of the Year-End Report by LREP. Therefore, it happens that some of the local units fail to adopt the Year-End Report, and consequently fail to send the adopted Year-End Report to MFIN (Annex G).

<sup>18</sup> 3% = 15 out of 576.

<sup>19</sup> 66% = 379 out of 576.

*c) Local civil society organizations (representatives of citizens)*

We also surveyed LCSO in each city and asked them if they understood the local budget documents. A bit less than 50% of LCSOs argue that they understand very well the local budget documents they use, and another 41% of LCSOs indicate that they understand them partially. In their comments, most of LCSOs also indicate that they understand or partially understand only the part of the local budget documents relating to the LCSO (Annex D4).

Furthermore, the majority of LCSOs indicate that the biggest challenges in using the local budget documents are the unintelligible legal terminology, frequent changes in budget classifications and lack of time. Obviously, LCSOs are not using local budget documents very often, so they need simple explanations of legal terminology. They also need more basic information about the local budget and budgeting process (e.g. what the local budget is and what items it comprises), simple explanations of changes in budget classifications and simple guidelines on how LCSOs, as well as citizens, can participate in the local budgeting process.

### 3. Conclusions and recommendations

#### Conclusions

Our research has proven that in Croatia in 2010, local budgeting processes and local budgets are not transparent enough. Thus, we come to similar conclusions and recommendations as other previously mentioned researchers dealing with budget transparency in Croatia (both at the central and local levels).

Our Survey proves that local budgeting process is only partially transparent. Some of the respondents (MFIN, LEXE and LREP) answered that they did not know what had to be done (relating to the exchange of local budget documents), what the deadlines were, and who was responsible for what. On the one hand, it seems that MFIN is understaffed and mostly preoccupied with the central government budget. On the other side, it seems that in the case of LEXEs and LREPs, the ruling party plays a major role whereas the opposition is just a marginal player, often not very well informed about the local budget issues and with little possibility to influence local budgets. Consequently, no one of them is keen on achieving transparency in the local budgeting process.

Now, if the local budgeting process is not transparent enough, how can we expect local budgets to be transparent? So, we have proven that the 2010 local unit budgets are also not transparent enough. Firstly, there are problems with the quality and quantity of the local budget information presented to the public in 33 cities. The cities do not publish all the relevant and correct local budget information, in a timely manner and in an understandable form. The average Main COLBI is 57 of 100, which means that, on average, from 33 cities we obtained about 57% of local budget information requested during our research. Obviously, much can be improved. Thus, for example, the cities should publish:

- the most important local budget documents (see Annex A);
- verbal descriptions (explanations) of various revenues and expenditures in the budget proposal documents;
- expenditures by functional classification in the budget proposal documents, the Half-Year Report or Year-End Report;
- macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget proposal figures; and
- Citizens Budgets<sup>20</sup>.

Secondly, citizens are faced with problems when they decide to ask for local budget information directly from local units. The average Additional COLBI is relatively high, 82 of 100, which means that, on average, the cities provided us with about 82% of the expected openness-to-the-public indicators. In general, the cities are open to their citizens, but nevertheless, LINFOs, LREPs and LEXEs should try to answer all citizens' requests in the future. We have noticed that LINFOs, LREPs and LEXEs have often failed to answer our requests and that the local budget information provided by LINFOs directly to us have often been incomplete or provided in a complicated way (Annex D2). For example, LINFOs from only 19 cities (58%) answered and returned our Survey, although they had all been obliged to do so

<sup>20</sup> Only 7 out of 33 cities (21%) have published some sort of Citizens Budgets for 2009 or 2010 (Annex C). It is interesting to note that the Croatian central government has also not published a Citizens Budget for 2009 and 2010.

within 15 day pursuant to the Right of Access to Information Act. In their responses to the question concerning the public disclosure of allocation criteria for current and capital grants from the local budgets for 2008 or 2009, 32% of LINFOs that responded to our Survey confirmed the existence of such a document, but failed to specify its location or to submit it to us, although we requested this document (Annex D2)<sup>21</sup>.

Thirdly, citizens also face problems when trying to obtain the local budget information from the cities' official websites. Consequently, local units should put more information on their official websites (such as the agendas of the City Council meetings) prior to the meetings and better organize their official websites. The main problems relating to the budget information present on the cities' official websites are the following:

- non-existence of a direct link to the budget;
- lack of a clear and user-friendly website design; and
- differences in the scope and layout of presented budget information for different years and among the cities (Annex F). One of the best official websites is that of the City of Karlovac and it could serve as an example to the other cities. Another thing to keep in mind is that, while people who often use the internet can find the budget documents without much difficulty, others who are not so familiar with computers and the internet will definitely face more barriers in trying to access these documents. It is important to bear this in mind in order to keep the website design as simple as possible, because these documents are of interest, and should be accessible to everyone.

As result of the partially transparent local budgeting process, partial disclosure of the local budget information, but very often also of citizens' indifference to the participation in local budgeting or their lack of time, the local budget oversight is weak, and sometimes even impossible in some cities. Thus, in some cities citizens do not even know what is happening with the local budgets and/or are not able to hold LEXEs or LREPs accountable. For example, according to the Survey, in four out of 33 cities (21%) the Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010 was presented to the public on the same day when the budget was adopted.<sup>22</sup> In five out of 33 cities (26%), the Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010 was made public only after the adoption of the budget<sup>23</sup>. Public hearings on the city Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010 were held in less than 40% of surveyed cities. It seems that citizens in those cities had little chance to influence the Budget Proposal for 2010<sup>24</sup>.

Hence, the local budget transparency and, consequently, the accountability of the relevant bodies are only possible if all the participants are actively involved. Below we provide some recommendations for LEXEs, LREPs, MFIN, the media and citizens.

<sup>21</sup> Similarly, in response to the question concerning the list of privileged users of city-owned apartments in 2008 or 2009, 47% of LINFOs who responded to the Survey confirmed the existence of such a list without indicating its location, or again failed to submit it to us, although we requested this document.

<sup>22</sup> Dubrovnik, Labin, Varaždin and Virovitica.

<sup>23</sup> Crikvenica, Požega, Sisak, Umag and Vrbovec.

<sup>24</sup> In addition given the obligation of city mayors to submit a series of reports to the MFIN (e.g. the local units' Enacted Budgets, Decisions on Budget Execution – see Annex G), we wished to find out whether the representatives of the MFIN consider their checks of these reports as adequate. Both MFIN respondents believe that they only partly verify the accuracy of these reports, primarily due to a shortage of staff dealing with these issues in the MFIN. They also emphasize that MFIN generally pays too much attention to the central government budget, and much less to the local units' budgets.

## Recommendations

**LEXEs** should:

- release the most important local budget documents in a timely manner (correct and timely release of all relevant local budget information in an understandable form), preferably on the local units official websites<sup>25</sup>;
- publish the Citizens Budget every year, explaining shortly and understandably all the most important issues relating to the current local budget and local budgeting process;
- organize public hearings, preferably with TV and radio broadcasts, whenever possible, especially those relating to local Budget Proposals with Projections and the Half-Year Report or Year-End Report;
- call on citizens to more actively participate in the local budgeting process, especially during the local budget preparation (e.g. by encouraging citizens to submit their proposals or consulting citizens during public hearings)<sup>26</sup>;
- update and systematically organize the local units' official websites;
- invest more in the education of LEXEs;
- LINFOs should answer fully and understandably to all citizens' requests for information within 15 days; and
- if necessary, find adequate premises (e.g. to organize public hearings).

## LREP

According to the results of the Survey, all the respondents believe that LEXE has a much more important role in the local budgeting process than LREP. It also seems that much of the power of LREPs depends on their political party membership (in the position or opposition). LREPs belonging to the opposition often argue that they can change almost nothing as concerns the local budget. Our conclusion is that, despite these obstacles, LREPs need to:

- demand from the LEXE the full and correct disclosure of all relevant local budget information in a timely and understandable form;
- demand more time for consideration of the Budget Proposal with Projections;
- be more active, i.e. scrutinize the budget documents more thoroughly, as well as discuss and influence budget policy;
- hold LEXE accountable; and
- demand better education (from LEXE and MFIN) as concerns local budgets and local budgeting processes.

<sup>25</sup> See Annex A for the most important local budget documents.

<sup>26</sup> Let us single out some of the cities with relatively good communication between the LEXE and citizens in the budgeting process. In Labin, for example, citizens received a booklet "Citizens Guide" at their home addresses during the preparation of the 2010 budget. Enclosed with the booklet (containing financial statements and their explanations) was a reply card on which citizens could express their proposals and suggestions concerning the local budget. Most of these suggestions were incorporated in the local budget. Another shining example is Rijeka. Despite having received no response from this city's LINFO, we found out that, before taking a vote on the 2010 budget, the mayor of Rijeka, invited citizens to vote on priorities in the realization of key municipal projects for 2010. The results of the survey on the municipal project priorities, carried out from 20 November to 22 December 2009, are available at <http://www.vojko-obersnel.com/hr/recite-mi/prioritet-projekata-proracuna-grad-a-rijeke>. The city budget for Rijeka was adopted on 22 December 2009.

**MFIN** should:

- send the documents to LEXE on time;
- reduce the frequency of changes to the laws, regulations and budget classifications relating to local units;
- inform the local units, as soon as possible, about the changes in laws and regulations that will affect them;
- if possible, include the local units in the preparation of changes on laws, regulations and budget classifications;
- find a way to promptly answer inquiries from LEXEs. For example, they could establish a body within MFIN whose function would be to consider and respond to the local units' questions, clear up their doubts and make recommendations;
- define by law what major local budget documents should be publicly available on the official local websites and how they should be presented (the name of the link and the number of years for which these documents should be available);
- define more clearly in the Budget Act how the budget supervision based on citizens' petitions<sup>27</sup> should be carried out;
- fix a deadline for the adoption of the Year-End Report by LREP in the Budget Act;
- try pressing the Government to reduce the number of local units; and
- employ more people to deal with the financing of local units, and allocate more funds for their professional training.

**MEDIA**

Although all the respondents to the Survey perceive local media as the most important subject in the unofficial monitoring and control of local budgets, they believe that media should be even more involved in the local budgeting process. This means that the media should more often and in a timely manner inform citizens about the key local budget-related events (e.g. the Budget Proposal with Projections), discuss current budget issues, specify exactly how citizens can participate in the local budgeting process and publish reader-friendly summaries of local budget documents.

**CITIZENS** should:

- be made aware that it is their money that constitutes local budgets;
- be made aware that the local budget is not just a political affair and that they can participate in the local budgeting process (by analyzing the local budget policy or holding the government accountable) and thus influence that the local budget money is spent for the purposes they consider as necessary;
- demand from the LEXE simple information about the local budget in general (what the local budget, is, what different definitions mean, what the phases of the local budgeting process are

---

<sup>27</sup> Article 116, paragraph 1 of the Budget Act stipulates that: "Budget supervision shall be conducted based on citizens' petitions, and the requests of the central government administration bodies, local and regional self-government units and other legal persons, which arise suspicion of irregularities and fraud, as well as by order of the Minister of Finance." It is not clear what 'citizens' petitions' are and what exactly citizens should do.

and how to actively participate in it); such information can be presented to citizens in a Citizens Budgets or on a local unit's official website;

- demand from the LEXE simplified and available local budget documents that are intelligible to a common citizen.

### **Research limitations**

Finally, it should be noted that this is the first time that we measured the transparency of local budgets in Croatia, and that we learned a lot from this research. During the research, we became aware that some things could have been done better. For example, we should have asked the LINFO in each city how the process of the auditing of budget documents was performed and if it was it performed regularly. An additional problem was that in the LINFO Survey we had a few questions with multiple answers (YES, NO, PARTLY, I DO NOT KNOW). However, we did not specify what exactly the answer "PARTLY" implied (see, Annex D2). Therefore, for example, the LIFO in one city answered YES, explaining that some documents were available at the Finance Department, and the LINFO from another city answered PARTLY, also indicating that documents were available in the Finance Department. For the purposes of our analysis, all answers to the questions were classified into categories according to the respondents' answers. However, in the future it would be helpful, if possible, to specify for this kind of questions what the answer PARTLY actually implies.

In addition, the problem of measuring the local budget transparency is related to the problem of data collection. As argued by Benito and Bastida (2009), although formal rules and procedures do exist in local units, maybe they are not implemented in the practice. For example, it may be defined by local regulations that citizens can attend the City Council meetings, but in practice, they cannot exert that right.

On the other hand, it might also be that some of the necessary information exists, but we cannot find it. For example, two different researchers tried independently to answer the Questionnaire for each city and it sometimes happened that one researcher found some data accidentally and after a long search by using the web search engines (such as Google). One researcher, for example, found that in the City of Rovinj, the Committee on Budget Issues existed, and he found the names of the Committee representatives only after accidentally finding a document with the minutes of a City Council meeting.<sup>28</sup> Another thing is that the official websites of some local units are not well organized, and it is therefore hard to find data on them (e.g. the official website of Vinkovci at the time of our research).<sup>29</sup> In addition, the data and links on the official local websites often change. For example, the City of Zadar had the City Council's Rules of Procedure on its website during the GONG (2009) project. However, during our research in 2010, the City Council's Rules of Procedure were not available, neither did the City of Zadar send them to us on request. Consequently, this city appears to be less open (transparent) in our research than in GONG (2009). For more details about the problems encountered during the collection of local budget information from the local units' official websites, see Annex F.

We should also mention that the results for COLBI as well as the results for any other index should be interpreted with caution. In the research of this type, the biggest problem is how to measure the local

<sup>28</sup> The data are available at <http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/gradsko-vijece-sjednice/52>.

<sup>29</sup> Available at <http://www.vinkovci.hr>.

budget transparency, or how to construct the index. Although our index (the Total COLBI) is well correlated ( $\rho=0.6$ ) to the only other index used for measuring the local budget transparency in Croatia (GONG, 2009), it is always possible that our index does not capture all the important criteria for measuring the local budget transparency.

Therefore, we hope that our next research on this subject will be more successful. However, we hope that this research will help other local budget transparency researchers in Croatia in future. We also hope that researchers in other countries will engage in similar projects and that some day we will have international comparisons of local units' transparency and accountability.



## References

- , **2009**. Anketa o redosljedju provedbe gradskih projekata [online]. Available from [<http://www.vojko-obersnel.com/hr/recite-mi/prioritet-projekata-proracuna-grada-rijeke>].
- , **2010**. South Africa in top five for openness [online]. Available at [<http://uk.oneworld.net/article/view/162140/1/5795>].
- Alesina, A. [et al.], 1999**. "Budget institutions and fiscal performance in Latin America". *Journal of Development Economics*, 59 (2), 253-273.
- Alt., J. E. and Lassen, D. D., 2006**. "Fiscal Transparency, Political Parties, and Debt in OECD Countries". *European Economic Review*, 50 (6), 1403-1439.
- Antić, T. and Malatestinić, I., 2010**. Istraživački izvještaj: Smanjenje percepcije korumpiranosti u lokalnoj samoupravi „SPECULAS“ [online]. Zagreb: Udruga općina u Republici Hrvatskoj. Available at [<http://www.udruga-opcina.hr/hrv/projekti/projekt.php?ID=1070>].
- Bađun, M. and Urban, I., 2010**. „Croatia’s Score on Open Budget Index 2010“ [online]. *Press Release*, No. 26. Available at [<http://www.ijf.hr/eng/releases/26.pdf>].
- Bađun, M., 2009**. „Decentralisation, Corruption and Supervision of Local Budgets in Croatia“ [online]. *Newsletter*, No. 38. Available at [<http://www.ijf.hr/eng/newsletter/38.pdf>].
- Bajo, A. and Bronić, M., 2007**. “Assessments of the Effectiveness of the Croatian Fiscal Equalisation Model”. *Financial Theory and Practice*, 31 (1), 1-24. Available from [<http://www.ijf.hr/eng/FTP/2007/1/bajo-bronic.pdf>].
- Bajo, A. and Bronić, M., 2007**. „Are All the Municipalities and Cities in Croatia Able to Provide Adequate Public Services?“ [online]. *Newsletter*, No. 30. Available at [<http://www.ijf.hr/eng/newsletter/30.pdf>].
- Bajo, A. and Filipović, B., 2008**. „The Efficiency of the Water Supply in Croatia“ [online]. *Newsletter*, No. 37. Available at [<http://www.ijf.hr/eng/newsletter/37.pdf>].
- Bajo, A. and Primorac, M., 2009**. „Zašto je lokalnim jedinicama potreban kreditni rejting“. *Zbornik s III konferencije Hrvatski javni sektor u aktualnim gospodarskim uvjetima*. Zagreb: Hrvatska zajednica računovođa i financijskih djelatnika, Opatija 2 i 3 travanj 2009.
- Bajo, A., 2007**. „Do Utility Companies Increase Local Government Debt in Croatia?“ *Newsletter*, No. 28. Available at [<http://www.ijf.hr/eng/newsletter/28.pdf>].
- Bajo, A., 2008**. „Why Has the Credit Rating of Zagrebački Holding Been Downgraded?“ [online]. *Press release*, No. 5. Available at [<http://www.ijf.hr/eng/releases/5.pdf>].
- Bastida, F. and Benito, B., 2007**. "Central Government Budget Practices and Transparency: An International Comparison". *Public Administration*, 85 (3), 667-716.
- Beales, J. and Thompson, M. W., 2010**. *Government Transparency in Virginia: How Localities Compare* [online]. Available at [[http://www.thomasjeffersoninst.org/pdf/articles/Govt\\_Transparency\\_LocalGov.pdf](http://www.thomasjeffersoninst.org/pdf/articles/Govt_Transparency_LocalGov.pdf)].
- Benito, B. and Bastida, F., 2009**. "Budget Transparency, Fiscal Performance, and Political Turnout: An International Approach". *Public Administration Review*, 69 (3), 403-417.
- Boubeta, A. S., Santos, F. R. and Alegre, J. C., 2010**. *Budget Transparency in Local Government: Empirical Analysis on a Sample of 33 Galician Municipalities* [online]. Available at [<http://www.um.es/dp-hacienda/eep2010/comunicaciones/eep2010-65..pdf>].
- Bratić V., 2008a**. „Corporate income taxation in Vukovar: can we trace the effects of tax exemption?“ [online]. *Newsletter*, No. 34. Available at [<http://www.ijf.hr/eng/newsletter/34.pdf>].
- Bratić, V., 2008b**. *Odlučivanje o lokalnim proračunima: između sna i jave*. Zagreb: Institut za javne financije ; Friedrich Ebert Foundation.
- Bronić, M., 2007**. “Personal income tax and surtax sharing in Croatia” [online]. *Newsletter*, No. 27. Available at [<http://www.ijf.hr/eng/newsletter/27.pdf>].
- Bronić, M., 2008**. „The Croatian Ministry of Finance’s Current Grants to Municipalities and Cities in the Areas of Special National Concern“. *Newsletter*, No. 35. Available from [<http://www.ijf.hr/eng/newsletter/35.pdf>].
- DZS, 2007**. *Nacionalna klasifikacija prostornih jedinica za statistiku (NKPJS)* [online]. Available at [[http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2007\\_04\\_35\\_1120.html](http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2007_04_35_1120.html)].

- GONG, 2009.** *Istraživački izvještaj – LOTUS – lokalna odgovorna i transparentna uprava i samouprava* [online]. Available at [<http://www.gong.hr/page.aspx?PageID=185>].
- GONG, 2010.** *Analiza službenog izvješća o provedbi Zakona o pravu na pristup informacijama (ZPPI) za 2009. godinu* [online]. Available at [<http://www.gong.hr/news.aspx?newsID=3373&pageID=1>].
- Hameed, F. 2005.** "Fiscal Transparency and Economic Outcomes". *IMF Working Paper*, No. 05/225. Washington: International Monetary Fund.
- IBP, 2002.** *Index of Budget Transparency in Five Latin American Countries* [online]. International Budget Project. Available at [<http://internationalbudget.org/resources/LAbudtrans.pdf>].
- IBP, 2006.** *More Public information needed to Hold Government to Account* [online]. International Budget Project. Available at [<http://www.internationalbudget.org/files/SummaryReport.pdf>].
- IBP, 2008.** *Open Budget. Transform Lives. The Open Budget Survey 2008* [online]. Available at [<http://openbudgetindex.org/files/FinalFullReportEnglish1.pdf>].
- IBP, 2010a.** *Guide to the Open Budget Questionnaire: An explanation of the Questions and the Response Options* [online]. Available at [[http://internationalbudget.org/files/GuideOBI2010\\_English.pdf](http://internationalbudget.org/files/GuideOBI2010_English.pdf)].
- IBP, 2010b.** *Open Budget. Transform Lives. The Open Budget Survey 2010* [online]. Available at [[http://www.internationalbudget.org/files/2010\\_Full\\_Report-English.pdf](http://www.internationalbudget.org/files/2010_Full_Report-English.pdf)].
- IMF, 2009.** *How Does the IMF Encourage Greater Fiscal Transparency?* [online]. Available at [<http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/fiscal.htm>].
- IMF, 2010.** *Reports on the Observance of Standards and Codes (ROSCs)* [online]. Available at [<http://www.imf.org/external/np/rosc/rosc.asp?sort=topic#FiscalTransparency>].
- Jarmuzek, M. [et al.], 2006.** "Fiscal Transparency in Transition Economies". *Studies and Analyses*, (July). Warsaw: Center for Social and Economic Research.
- Kopits, G. and Craig, J., 1998.** "Transparency in Government Operations". *Occasional Paper*, No. 158. Washington: International Monetary Fund.
- Maletić, I., 2006.** "Subnational Budget Watch in Croatia: Is Anybody There?" in: K. Ott, ed. *Making Public Finance Public: Subnational Budget Watch in Croatia, Macedonia, and Ukraine*. Budapest: Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative. Available at [[http://lgi.osi.hu/publications/2006/338/Making\\_Public\\_Finance\\_Public\\_2.pdf](http://lgi.osi.hu/publications/2006/338/Making_Public_Finance_Public_2.pdf)].
- Marinović, T., 2007.** „Zagrebačka vlast lani poslovala mimo zakona“ [online]. *Vjesnik* 19.10.2007. Available at [<http://www.vjesnik.hr/html/2007/10/19/Clanak.asp?r=zag&c=1>].
- Ministry of Finance, 2001-2010.** *Year-End Reports of the Ministry of Finance*. Zagreb: Ministarstvo financija.
- Ministry of Finance, 2006.** *Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines, 2007 – 2009* [online]. Available at [<http://www.mfin.hr/adminmax/docs/SEFP07-09.pdf>].
- Ministry of Finance, 2007.** *Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines, 2008 – 2010* [online]. Available at [<http://www.mfin.hr/adminmax/docs/SEFP08-10.pdf>].
- Ministry of Finance, 2008.** *Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines, 2009 – 2011* [online]. Available at [<http://www.mfin.hr/adminmax/docs/SEFP09-11.pdf>].
- Ministry of Finance, 2009.** *Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines, 2010 – 2012* [online]. Available at [[http://www.mfin.hr/adminmax/docs/Smjernice\\_ekonomske\\_i\\_fiskalne\\_politike\\_2010.\\_-\\_2012.pdf](http://www.mfin.hr/adminmax/docs/Smjernice_ekonomske_i_fiskalne_politike_2010._-_2012.pdf)].
- Ministry of Finance, 2010.** *Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines, 2011 – 2013* [online]. Available at [[http://www.mfin.hr/adminmax/docs/Smjernice\\_ekonomske\\_i\\_fiskalne\\_politike\\_2011.\\_-\\_2013.pdf](http://www.mfin.hr/adminmax/docs/Smjernice_ekonomske_i_fiskalne_politike_2011._-_2013.pdf)].
- Nikolić, J. 2010.** „Najvažnije je ulagati u ljudske potencijale“ [online]. *Glas Slavonije*, 2. 6. 2010. Available at [[http://www.glas-slavonije.hr/vijest.asp?rub=7&ID\\_VIJESTI=125621](http://www.glas-slavonije.hr/vijest.asp?rub=7&ID_VIJESTI=125621)].
- OBI, 2010.** Open Budget Initiative [online]. Available fromat [[www.openbudgetindex.org](http://www.openbudgetindex.org)].
- OECD, 2002.** *OECD Best Practices for Budget Transparency* [online]. Paris: OECD. Available at [<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/33/13/1905258.pdf>].
- Ott, K. (ed.), 2006.** *Making Public Finance Public. Subnational Budget Watch in Croatia, Macedonia and Ukraine* [online]. Budapest: Local Government and Public Service Reform Initiative. Available at [[http://pdc.ceu.hu/archive/00002987/01/Making\\_Public\\_Finance\\_Public\\_2.pdf](http://pdc.ceu.hu/archive/00002987/01/Making_Public_Finance_Public_2.pdf)].
- Ott, K. [et al.], 2009.** *A citizen's guide to the budget* [online]. Zagreb: Institute of Public Finance. available from [<http://www.ijf.hr/eng/budget-guide/guide-2009.pdf>].
- Ott, K. and Bajo, A., 2001.** „Lokalne financije i lokalni proračuni u Republici Hrvatskoj“. *Financijska teorija i praksa*, 25 (3), 311-453. Available at [[http://www.ijf.hr/FTP/2001/3/bajo\\_ott.pdf](http://www.ijf.hr/FTP/2001/3/bajo_ott.pdf)].

- Poslovnik Gradske skupštine Grada Zagreba.** Službeni glasnik Grada Zagreba 17/09 [online]. Available at <http://www1.zagreb.hr/slglasnik.nsf/10288f1421388ff8c1256f2d0049015b/d8c3e933370d6a85c1257600001e737d?OpenDocument>].
- Poterba, J. and von Hagen, J., 1999.** "Introduction" in: J. M. Poterba and J. von Hagen, eds. *Fiscal Institutions and Fiscal Performance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Premchand, A., 1993.** *Public Expenditure Management*. Washington: International Monetary Fund.
- Profeta, A., 2008.** "Porazni rezultati istraživanja korupcije u 8 hrvatskih gradova" [online]. Available at <http://www.monitor.hr/clanci/porazni-rezultati-istrazivanja-korupcije-u-8-hrvatskih-gradova/102/>.
- Urban, I. and Bađun, M., 2009.** "Open Budget Index 2008 – Small Advances Made in the Accessibility of Information about Croatian Public Finance" [online]. *Press Release*, No. 8. Available at <http://www.ijf.hr/eng/releases/8.pdf><http://www.ijf.hr/osvrti/8.pdf>.
- von Hagen, J., 1992.** "Budgeting procedures and fiscal performance in the European Community". *EEC Economics Papers*, No. 96.
- Zakon** o financiranju jedinica lokalne i područne (regionalne) samouprave, NN 117/93, 69/97, 33/00, 73/00, 59/01, 107/01, 117/01, 150/02, 147/03, 132/06 and 73/08. Zagreb: Narodne novine.
- Zakon** o lokalnoj i područnoj (regionalnoj) samoupravi, NN 33/01, 60/01, 129/05, 109/07, 125/08 and 36/09. Zagreb: Narodne novine.
- Zakon** o pravu na pristup informacijama. NN 172/03. Zagreb: Narodne novine.
- Zakon** o proračunu, NN 87/08. Zagreb: Narodne novine.

---

# Annex A.

---

## Methodology

### 1. Introduction

This Annex describes the design of the Questionnaire and three open local budget indexes for Croatia. The Questionnaire contains a total of 52 questions. The first 37 questions are related to information available in the seven most important local budget documents. The responses to these questions are used to calculate the *Main Croatian Open Local Budget Index* (Main COLBI). The next 15 questions are concerned with the openness of local units in general and cooperation of local units' employees with us during the research. They served as a basis for the second index, *Additional Croatian Open Local Budget Index* (Additional COLBI). Taking into account all 52 questions, we have constructed the Total COLBI.

The responses to all 52 questions were prepared “in house”, principally through the analysis of budget documents and cities' official web pages. The examination was prepared by two researchers who worked independently, following the guidelines that specified how to respond to each question (see Table 6 at the end of this Annex). All this enabled us to achieve a relatively high level of coherence and comparability among the local units.

In the following sections, we describe the documents, questions and construction of the open budget indexes, and present a summary of results for 33 Croatian local units.

### 2. Budget documents

Table 1 lists seven budget documents on which we have based the Questionnaire. The “Budget Proposal with Projections” (BP) is the main document for a budget year (BY) to be delivered to the LREP. BP is then discussed and adopted. Subsequently, LEXE publishes the “Enacted Budget” (EB) and “Enacted Projections” (PR) in the local gazette. At the same time, the “Decision on Budget Execution” (DEB) is produced and published. These are the four documents produced during the budget preparation and approval phases. The other two documents refer to the budget execution phase: the “Half-Year Report” (HYR) and “Year-End Report” (YR). A detailed description of the local budgeting process is given in Annex H.

In this research, the budget year is BY=2010. Four documents – BP, EB, PR and DEB – relate to BY=2010. HYR and YR relate to 2009 and 2008, respectively. CB relates either to 2009 or 2010.

Table 1. Budget documents used in the research

Document	BY
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	2010
Enacted Budget (EB) Enacted Projections (PR) Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	2010
Half-Year Report (HYR)	2009
Year-End Report (YR)	2008
Citizens Budget (CB)	2009 or 2010

The first step in the research was to collect these documents for 33 surveyed local units. For most of the local units, the documents were available on the internet. Where they were not downloadable from the cities' official websites, we sent requests to the local units in order to obtain the hard-copies of the documents.

The Budget Proposal with Projections is the most important document for the budgeting process. However, BP was available on the websites for only 10 local units.<sup>1</sup> We have therefore contacted local officers of the other 23 local units, requesting that they send us their BPs. We obtained a hard copy of BP from one local unit.<sup>2</sup> However, 11 local units submitted no further information about BP.<sup>3</sup> The local officers from the remaining 11 local units informed us that BP existed, but they did not send us the document. Interestingly, they informed us that the content of BP was identical to that of EB combined with PR, indicating that as the reason why BP was not made available on the website.<sup>4</sup>

By contrast, we were able to find EB for all 33 local units, in most cases accompanied by PR and DEB. This was due to the fact that local units are legally obliged to publish EB and PR in their official gazettes. For these reasons, although the questions 1 to 19 are related to BP, in responding to them we decided to use a combination of the following budget documents: BP, EB, PR and DEB. Henceforth, we refer to these four documents as the "budget proposal documents".

Tables were created for each local unit containing the information whether the document was produced, the original title of the document, the date when the document became publicly available and the internet link (see the example of the City of Rijeka, Table 5). We stored the electronic versions of documents in separate computer folders; in the cases where we obtained hard copies of the documents, we digitized them. All this was done for easier future reference.

### 3. Croatian Open Local Budget Index

#### *Questions on the availability of information in the local budget documents*

In this section, we describe the content of the first part of the Questionnaire, which investigates the availability of information in the local budget documents. The complete list of questions is given in Table 6 below.

<sup>1</sup> Čakovec, Dubrovnik, Karlovac, Kutina, Labin, Osijek, Rijeka, Samobor, Slavonski Brod and Zagreb.

<sup>2</sup> Sisak.

<sup>3</sup> Bjelovar, Gospić, Krapina, Pazin, Rovinj, Split, Umag, Varaždin, Vinkovci, Virovitica and Vrbovec.

<sup>4</sup> Crikvenica, Koprivnica, Makarska, Opatija, Poreč, Požega, Pula, Šibenik, Velika Gorica, Zadar and Zaprešić.

Questions 1 to 19 are related to BP. However, as already explained, since we could not obtain BP for all the local units, we decided to use a set of budget documents, referred to as “budget proposal documents” (BP, EB, PR and DEB), instead of the BP only.

We inquire whether the information on important items such as expenditures, revenues and debt is presented, and in how much detail. Questions 1 to 3 ask whether expenditures are shown for BY, using different classifications (economic, functional and program). Questions 4 to 6 are concerned with major types of revenue in BY (tax and non-tax revenue and grants). Questions 7 and 8 relate to local unit debt and interest payments on debt. Question 9 examines if the budget proposal documents offer macroeconomic assumptions on which the budget figures are based. Questions 10 to 12 check whether additional verbal explanations and descriptions of expenditures and revenues are offered in the budget. Questions 13 to 15 inquire whether expenditures for BY-1 are presented according to different classifications. Questions 16 to 19 inquire the same for BY+1 and BY+2.

Question 20 asks whether a Citizens Budget is published. Questions 21 to 25 are related to the information presented in the Half-Year Report: on expenditures (according to economic and functional classification), revenues (tax, non-tax and grants). Questions 26 to 32 seek similar information in the Year-End Report, i.e. on expenditures according to different classifications (economic, functional and program), revenues (tax, non-tax and grants) and outstanding debt.

Questions 33 and 34 were added in order to differentiate between the local units that produce BP covering a multi-year period and make it publicly available, and those that do not.

Question 35 asks whether local representatives have enough time to study the budget proposal before it is enacted.

Questions 36 and 37 are concerned with the availability of the local official gazette on the website and timeliness of the publication of enacted documents in it.

### *Main Croatian Open Local Budget Index*

We have 37 questions dealing with the availability of various information in the main local budget documents. For most of these questions (1 to 32) multiple-choice answers are offered. In fact, there are three choices for each of these questions: “All”, “Some” and “None”. To avoid arbitrariness in making responses and to ensure comparability, we have specified the information required in each of these three choice-responses (see Table 6 at the end of this Annex).

For example, question 1 asks about the expenditures for BY in the budget proposal documents classified by economic classification; the response “All” is given if they are “presented at least at BAPL 3” (BAPL=budget account plan level), the response “Some” is given if expenditures are “presented only at BAPL 2”, and the response “None” is given if “Expenditures are not presented or the document is not available”. Several questions (33, 34 and 36) can be answered with “Yes” or “No”, while some questions require the indication of the number of days as a response.

In order to compare the performances of different local units, we have designed a scheme that assigns numerical values to particular responses. The responses “All”, “Some” and “None” are assigned 1, 0.5 and 0 points, respectively. The responses “Yes” and “No” assigned 1 and 0 points, respectively. If there

are four possible answers, the numbers of points assigned are 1, 0.67, 0.33 and 0, respectively. The list of all questions and of criteria for numerical valuation is given in Table 7 at the end of this Annex.

Now, we add together the points for all 37 questions in order to obtain the “score”. As each question brings a maximum of 1 point, the potential score is 37. By dividing the actual score by the potential score and multiplying this by 100, we obtain our first index – the *Main Croatian Open Local Budget Index* (hence Main COLBI). The index values range from 0 to 100.

Note that all the questions contribute equally to the score (with a maximum of one point), and consequently to the Main COLBI. In other words, all the questions are of equal weight. The reason for such a concept is that from our perspective all the questions are equally important.

Table 2 shows the rankings for 33 local units according to Main COLBI. We can see that the top local unit has a score of 29.2 points and the corresponding Main COLBI of 78.8. Also, we notice a relatively high variation between units, which is best illustrated by the ratio of index values obtained for the top and bottom units, which is equal to  $78.8/33.8=2.3$ .

*Table 2. Main Croatian Open Local Budget Index*

<b>Local unit</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Index</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Slavonski Brod	29.2	78.8	1
Osijek	26.7	72.1	2
Opatija	26.5	71.6	3
Zaprešić	26.0	70.3	4
Zagreb	25.5	68.9	5
Čakovec	25.5	68.9	5
Kutina	25.0	67.6	7
Rijeka	24.0	64.9	8
Dubrovnik	23.8	64.4	9
Zadar	23.5	63.5	10
Crikvenica	23.3	63.1	11
Koprivnica	23.0	62.2	12
Labin	22.7	61.3	13
Krapina	22.5	60.8	14
Karlovac	22.2	59.9	15
Velika Gorica	22.0	59.5	16
Virovitica	21.3	57.7	17
Varaždin	21.2	57.2	18
Rovinj	20.5	55.4	19
Poreč	19.8	53.6	20
Bjelovar	19.8	53.6	20
Pula	19.2	51.8	22
Umag	19.2	51.8	22
Vinkovci	19.0	51.4	24
Požega	18.8	50.9	25
Samobor	18.0	48.6	26
Gospić	18.0	48.6	26
Vrbovec	17.8	48.2	28
Makarska	16.5	44.6	29
Sisak	16.3	44.1	30
Split	15.8	42.8	31
Šibenik	15.0	40.5	32
Pazin	12.5	33.8	33

---

### *Local units' openness in general*

In order to get a deeper insight into the transparency of the budgeting process and the openness of local units in general, we introduced an additional set of questions.

Questions 38 to 41 evaluate the cooperation of local officials and representatives contacted for help during our research. We consider their good response rate as an indication of openness and transparency.

Questions 42 and 43 examine whether citizens know who their elected local representatives are. Questions 44 and 45 ask about the availability of information on the local Committee on Budget Issues. Questions 46 and 47 inquire whether some important city documents, e.g. the City Council's Rules of Procedure and the city's Statute are made available to the public on the website. Questions 48 to 52 inquire about the documents and procedures related to the City Council meetings.

### *Additional Croatian Open Local Budget Index*

Numerical values are assigned to these additional 15 questions, following the same rules as explained above (see Table 7 at the end of this Annex).

We add together the points for all the 15 questions to obtain a new score, which can have a maximum value of 15. Dividing the actual score by the potential score and multiplying this by 100, we obtain our second index – the *Additional Croatian Open Local Budget Index* (hence Additional COLBI). As with the Main COLBI, the Additional COLBI values also range from 0 to 100. Again, all the questions have equal weights.

The results are presented in Table 3. The local units' performance is much better than that according to the Main COLBI - only 5 units have index values below 75. Note that the local units' rankings are quite different from those based on Main COLBI. For example, Karlovac ranks 1<sup>st</sup> according to Additional COLBI, while it took a low 15<sup>th</sup> place on the Main COLBI scale. At the same time, Osijek fell from the 2<sup>nd</sup> place on the Main COLBI scale to the 10<sup>th</sup> place on the Additional COLBI scale.



Table 3. Additional Croatian Open Local Budget Index

Local unit	Score	Index	Rank
Karlovac	15.0	100.0	1
Rijeka	14.0	93.3	2
Virovitica	14.0	93.3	2
Varaždin	14.0	93.3	2
Sisak	14.0	93.3	2
Slavonski Brod	13.7	91.1	6
Koprivnica	13.7	91.1	6
Rovinj	13.7	91.1	6
Bjelovar	13.7	91.1	6
Labin	13.3	88.9	10
Osijek	13.3	88.9	10
Zagreb	13.3	88.9	10
Crikvenica	13.3	88.9	10
Pula	13.0	86.7	14
Dubrovnik	12.8	85.6	15
Velika Gorica	12.7	84.4	16
Požega	12.7	84.4	16
Samobor	12.5	83.3	18
Opatija	12.3	82.2	19
Zaprešić	12.3	82.2	19
Krapina	12.3	82.2	19
Umag	12.3	82.2	19
Makarska	12.3	82.2	19
Poreč	12.0	80.0	24
Čakovec	11.7	77.8	25
Kutina	11.7	77.8	25
Pazin	11.7	77.8	25
Vrbovec	11.3	75.6	28
Gospić	10.5	70.0	29
Split	9.7	64.4	30
Šibenik	8.3	55.6	31
Zadar	7.7	51.1	32
Vinkovci	7.0	46.7	33

### Total Croatian Open Local Budget Index

By summing up the scores for the core 37 and additional 15 questions, we have obtained a “total score”. Dividing it by the potential score of 52 and multiplying this by 100, we have obtained the *Total Croatian Open Local Budget Index* (Total COLBI). Again, the index ranges from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 100. Table 4 presents the new index in comparison with the Main and Additional COLBIs. Notice that all five cities that occupy the top five positions according to Main COLBI (Table 2) also rank among the top five according to Total COLBI. Similar correspondence can be noticed for the bottom-ranked cities.

Table 4. Total, Main and Additional COLBI

Local unit	Total COLBI		Main COLBI		Additional COLBI	
	Index	Rank	Index	Rank	Index	Rank
Slavonski Brod	82.4	1	78.8	1	91.1	6
Osijek	76.9	2	72.1	2	88.9	10
Zagreb	74.7	3	68.9	5	88.9	10
Opatija	74.7	3	71.6	3	82.2	19
Zaprešić	73.7	5	70.3	4	82.2	19
Rijeka	73.1	6	64.9	8	93.3	2
Karlovac	71.5	7	59.9	15	100.0	1
Čakovec	71.5	7	68.9	5	77.8	25
Koprivnica	70.5	9	62.2	12	91.1	6
Crikvenica	70.5	9	63.1	11	88.9	10
Dubrovnik	70.5	9	64.4	9	85.6	15
Kutina	70.5	9	67.6	7	77.8	25
Labin	69.2	13	61.3	13	88.9	10
Virovitica	67.9	14	57.7	17	93.3	2
Varaždin	67.6	15	57.2	18	93.3	2
Krapina	67.0	16	60.8	14	82.2	19
Velika Gorica	66.7	17	59.5	16	84.4	16
Rovinj	65.7	18	55.4	19	91.1	6
Bjelovar	64.4	19	53.6	20	91.1	6
Pula	61.9	20	51.8	22	86.7	14
Poreč	61.2	21	53.6	20	80.0	24
Požega	60.6	22	50.9	25	84.4	16
Umag	60.6	22	51.8	22	82.2	19
Zadar	59.9	24	63.5	10	51.1	32
Samobor	58.7	25	48.6	26	83.3	18
Sisak	58.3	26	44.1	30	93.3	2
Vrbovec	56.1	27	48.2	28	75.6	28
Makarska	55.4	28	44.6	29	82.2	19
Gospić	54.8	29	48.6	26	70.0	29
Vinkovci	50.0	30	51.4	24	46.7	33
Split	49.0	31	42.8	31	64.4	30
Pazin	46.5	32	33.8	33	77.8	25
Šibenik	44.9	33	40.5	32	55.6	31

Table 5. List of budget documents for the City of Rijeka

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Prijedlog proračuna Grada Rijeke za 2010. godinu; Date not available; <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=35674">http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=35674</a>
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Rijeke za 2010. godinu; 22/12/09; <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=36272">http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=36272</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Plan razvojnih programa za razdoblje 2010. - 2012. godine; 22/12/09; <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=36272">http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=36272</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Prijedlog odluke o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Rijeke za 2010. godinu; Date not available; <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=35601">http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=35601</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Rijeke za 2009. godinu; 29/09/09; <a href="http://www.sn.pgz.hr/download.asp?id=14590">http://www.sn.pgz.hr/download.asp?id=14590</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Rijeke za 2008. godinu; 26/03/09; <a href="http://www.sn.pgz.hr/download.asp?id=14436">http://www.sn.pgz.hr/download.asp?id=14436</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

Table 6. Questionnaire with responses for the City of Rijeka

<b>Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY=2010</b>	
Q1.	<p>Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification?</p> <p>All: Expenditures are presented at least at BAPL 3  Some: Expenditures are presented only at BAPL 2  None: Expenditures are not presented or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> All  <u>Citation:</u> BP1: p.132  <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q2.	<p>Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY by <i>functional</i> classification?</p> <p>All: Expenditures are presented by functional classification and economic classification at BAPL 2  Some: Expenditures are presented by functional classification, but without economic classification at BAPL 2  None: Expenditures by functional classification are not presented or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> None  <u>Citation:</u> BP  <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q3.	<p>Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i>?</p> <p>All: Expenditures for individual programs are presented by economic classification at BAPL 3 or higher  Some: Expenditures for individual <i>programs</i> are presented by economic classification at BAPL 2  None: Expenditures are not presented or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> All  <u>Citation:</u> BP1: p.135-186  <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q4.	<p>Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY?</p> <p>All: Tax revenues are presented at least at BAPL 4  Some: Tax revenues are presented at BAPL 3 or lower  None: Tax revenues are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Some  <u>Citation:</u> BP1: p.131  <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q5.	<p>Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY?</p> <p>All: Grants are presented at least at BAPL 4  Some: Grants are presented at BAPL 3 or lower  None: Grants are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Some  <u>Citation:</u> BP1: p.131  <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q6.	<p>Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY?</p> <p>All: Non-tax revenues are presented at least at BAPL 4  Some: Non-tax revenues are presented at BAPL 3 or lower  None: Non-tax revenues are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Some  <u>Citation:</u> BP1: p.131  <u>Comment:</u></p>

Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ?
All:	Information on outstanding debt, new borrowing and principal repayment are all presented
Some:	Information on outstanding debt is <i>not</i> presented, but information on either new borrowing or principal repayment is presented
None:	No information on debt is presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	Some
<u>Citation:</u>	BP1: p.13, 16, 134, 142, 168; DEB: p.12
<u>Comment:</u>	Information on principal repayment in BY is presented
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY?
All:	Interest payments for individual programs are presented by economic classification at BAPL 4
Some:	Interest payments for individual programs are presented by economic classification at BAPL 3 or lower
None:	Interest payments are not presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	Some
<u>Citation:</u>	BP1: p. 132, 142, 167, 168
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based?
All:	Main macroeconomic forecasts are presented, together with the explanation of how they affected the local budget revenues and expenditures
Some:	Main macroeconomic forecasts are presented, but the explanation of how they affected the local budget revenues and expenditures is not included
None:	No such information is presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	Some
<u>Citation:</u>	BP1: p. 4
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY?
All:	Short descriptions of different expenditures according to economic classification is provided
Some:	Only a description for total expenditures is provided
None:	No such information is presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	All
<u>Citation:</u>	BP1: p. 12-16
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY?
All:	Short descriptions of different revenue sources are provided
Some:	Only a description for total revenues is provided
None:	No such information is presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	All
<u>Citation:</u>	BP1: p. 7-11
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures?
All:	Detailed descriptions of different programs are provided, including their goals and projects within them
Some:	Descriptions of different programs are provided, but they are not detailed
None:	No such information is presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	All
<u>Citation:</u>	BP1: p. 19-128
<u>Comment:</u>	

<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1=2009</b>	
Q13.	<p>Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic</i> classification?</p> <p>All: Expenditures are presented at least at BAPL 3  Some: Expenditures are presented only at BAPL 2  None: Expenditures are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> All  <u>Citation:</u> BP1: p.132  <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q14.	<p>Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification?</p> <p>All: Expenditures are presented by functional classification and economic classification at BAPL 2  Some: Expenditures are presented by functional classification, but without economic classification at BAPL 2  None: Expenditures by functional classification are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> None  <u>Citation:</u> BP  <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q15.	<p>Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for individual <i>programs</i>?</p> <p>All: Expenditures for individual <i>programs</i> are presented by economic classification at BAPL 3 or higher  Some: Expenditures for individual <i>programs</i> are presented by economic classification at BAPL 2  None: Expenditures are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> All  <u>Citation:</u> BP1: p.135-186  <u>Comment:</u></p>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1=2011 / BY+2=2012</b>	
Q16.	<p>Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2?</p> <p>All: Tax revenues are presented at least at BAPL 3  Some: Tax revenues are presented at BAPL 2 or lower  None: Tax revenues are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Some  <u>Citation:</u> PR2: p. 1  <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q17.	<p>Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification?</p> <p>All: Expenditures are presented at least at BAPL 3  Some: Expenditures are presented only at BAPL 2  None: Expenditures are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Some  <u>Citation:</u> PR2: p. 2  <u>Comment:</u></p>

<p>Q18. Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification?</p> <p>All: Expenditures are presented by functional classification and economic classification at BAPL 2</p> <p>Some: Expenditures are presented by functional classification, but without economic classification at BAPL 2</p> <p>None: Expenditures by functional classification are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> None  <u>Citation:</u> PR  <u>Comment:</u></p>
<p>Q19. Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for individual <i>programs</i>?</p> <p>All: Expenditures for individual <i>programs</i> are presented by economic classification at BAPL 3 or higher</p> <p>Some: Expenditures for individual <i>programs</i> are presented by economic classification at BAPL 2</p> <p>None: Expenditures are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Some  <u>Citation:</u> PR2: p. 2.-18  <u>Comment:</u></p>
<p><b>Question 20: The Citizens Budget</b></p>
<p>Q20. Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)?</p> <p>All: Citizens Budget is published and it contains important details</p> <p>Some: Citizens Budget is published, but it lacks important details</p> <p>None: Citizens Budget is not published</p> <p><u>Response:</u> None  <u>Citation:</u>  <u>Comment:</u></p>
<p><b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report (BY-1=2009)</b></p>
<p>Q21. Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification?</p> <p>All: Expenditures are presented at least at BAPL 3</p> <p>Some: Expenditures are presented only at BAPL 2</p> <p>None: Expenditures are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> All  <u>Citation:</u> HYR: p. 4-6  <u>Comment:</u></p>
<p>Q22. Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification?</p> <p>All: Expenditures are presented by functional classification and economic classification at BAPL 2</p> <p>Some: Expenditures are presented by functional classification, but without economic classification at BAPL 2</p> <p>None: Expenditures by functional classification are not presented, or the document is not available</p> <p><u>Response:</u> None  <u>Citation:</u> HYR  <u>Comment:</u></p>

Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1?
All:	Tax revenues are presented at least at BAPL 4
Some:	Tax revenues are presented at BAPL 3 or lower
None:	Tax revenues are not presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	All
<u>Citation:</u>	HYR: p. 2
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1?
All:	Grants are presented at least at BAPL 4
Some:	Grants are presented at BAPL 3 or lower
None:	Grants are not presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	All
<u>Citation:</u>	HYR: p. 2
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1?
All:	Non-tax revenues are presented at least at BAPL 4
Some:	Non-tax revenues are presented at BAPL 3 or lower
None:	Non-tax revenues are not presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	All
<u>Citation:</u>	HYR: p. 2-4
<u>Comment:</u>	
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report (BY-2=2008)</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification?
All:	Expenditures are presented at least at BAPL 3
Some:	Expenditures are presented only at BAPL 2
None:	Expenditures are not presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	All
<u>Citation:</u>	YR: p. 3-4
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification?
All:	Expenditures are presented by functional classification and economic classification at BAPL 2
Some:	Expenditures are presented by functional classification, but without economic classification at BAPL 2
None:	Expenditures by functional classification are not presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	None
<u>Citation:</u>	YR
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ?
All:	Expenditures for individual <i>programs</i> are presented by economic classification at BAPL 3 or higher
Some:	Expenditures for individual <i>programs</i> are presented by economic classification at BAPL 2
None:	Expenditures are not presented or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	All
<u>Citation:</u>	YR: p. 6.-37
<u>Comment:</u>	

Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2?
All:	Tax revenues are presented at least at BAPL 4
Some:	Tax revenues are presented at BAPL 3 or lower
None:	Tax revenues are not presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	All
<u>Citation:</u>	YR: p. 1
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY?
All:	Grants are presented at least at BAPL 4
Some:	Grants are presented at BAPL 3 or lower
None:	Grants are not presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	All
<u>Citation:</u>	YR: p. 1
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY?
All:	Non-tax revenues are presented at least at BAPL 4
Some:	Non-tax revenues are presented at BAPL 3 or lower
None:	Non-tax revenues are not presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	All
<u>Citation:</u>	YR: p. 2
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ?
All:	Information on outstanding debt, new borrowing and principal repayment is presented
Some:	Information on outstanding debt is <i>not</i> presented, but information on either new borrowing or principal repayment is presented
None:	No information on debt is presented, or the document is not available
<u>Response:</u>	Some
<u>Citation:</u>	YR: p. 5, 11, 30
<u>Comment:</u>	
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available?
Yes:	It was available on the website, or we received a hard copy from the local unit
No or not known:	
<u>Response:</u>	Yes
<u>Citation:</u>	BP (internet link)
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections?
Yes	
No	
<u>Response:</u>	No
<u>Citation:</u>	BP
<u>Comment:</u>	
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment?
Number of days: x	
Not known	Information could not be obtained
<u>Response:</u>	Not known
<u>Citation:</u>	
<u>Comment:</u>	



Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet?
	Yes No
	<u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?art=7173">http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?art=7173</a> <u>Comment:</u>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette?
	Number of days: x Not known The information on the date of enactment of the budget could not be obtained from the local officer
	<u>Response:</u> 1 day <u>Comment:</u>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey?
	Yes No
	<u>Response:</u> No <u>Citation:</u> 'Survey' <u>Comment:</u>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey?
	All three of them have responded Two of them have responded Only one of them has responded None of them have responded
	<u>Response:</u> All three of them have responded <u>Citation:</u> 'Survey' <u>Comment:</u>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response?
	Number of days No response has been obtained No additional information has been requested
	<u>Response:</u> 5 days <u>Citation:</u> 'Address book' <u>Comment:</u>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data?
	Total number of e-mail messages and/or phone calls No response obtained No additional information has been requested
	<u>Response:</u> 1 (= 0 e-mail messages / 1 phone call) <u>Citation:</u> 'Address book' <u>Comment:</u>

<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	<p>Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website?</p> <p>Yes Some None</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=604">http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=604</a> <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q43.	<p>Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website?</p> <p>All Some None</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=604">http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=604</a> <u>Comment:</u></p>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	<p>Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist?</p> <p>Yes No or not known</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=607">http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=607</a> <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q45.	<p>Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website?</p> <p>Yes Some No The committee does not exist</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?art=276">http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?art=276</a> <u>Comment:</u></p>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	<p>Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website?</p> <p>Yes No or not known</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/gradsko-vijece">http://www.rijeka.hr/gradsko-vijece</a> <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q47.	<p>Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website?</p> <p>Yes No or not known</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/VaznijiAktiGrada">http://www.rijeka.hr/VaznijiAktiGrada</a> <u>Comment:</u></p>

<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	<p>Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings?</p> <p>Yes No or not known</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/8SJEDNICAGRADSKOGVIJECA">http://www.rijeka.hr/8SJEDNICAGRADSKOGVIJECA</a> <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q49.	<p>Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city?</p> <p>Yes No or not known</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> Poslovník GVG Rijeke čl. 120 <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q50.	<p>Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives?</p> <p>Yes No or not known</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> Poslovník GVG Rijeke čl. 120 i 159 <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q51.	<p>Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings?</p> <p>Yes No or not known</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> Poslovník GVG Rijeke čl. 161 <u>Comment:</u></p>
Q52.	<p>Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city?</p> <p>Yes No or not known</p> <p><u>Response:</u> Yes <u>Citation:</u> Poslovník GVG Rijeke čl. 68 <u>Comment:</u></p>

Table 7. Rules for numerical evaluation of responses

Questions	Response choices			
1 to 32	All → 1.0	Some → 0.5		None → 0
33, 34, 36, 38, 42 to 44, 46 to 52	Yes → 1.0		No / not known → 0	
35	22 days and more → 1.0	8 to 21 days → 0.67	0 to 7 days → 0.33	Not known → 0
37	0 to 7 days → 1.0	8 to 21 days → 0.67		22 days and more → 0.33
39	3 → 1.0	2 → 0.67	1 → 0.33	0 → 0
40	No request needed → 1.0	0 to 15 days → 1.0	16 to 30 days → 0.67	31 days and more → 0
41	No request needed → 1.0	1 inquiry → 1.0	2 to 3 inquiries → 0.5	more than 4 inquires → 0
45	Yes → 1.0	Some → 0.5	No → 0	No committee → 0

---

## Annex B.

---

### Summary of researches about local budget transparency

Firstly, we will explain in short the three most important guidelines for measuring budget transparency (OECD's *Best Practices*, IMF's *Code*, IBP's *Guide*) and secondly we will analyze previous eight researches into local budget transparency.

#### ***The most important guidelines for measuring budget transparency***

##### ***1. Best Practices for Budget Transparency (OECD, 2002)***

The OECD (2002) drew up a set of Best Practices in this area, but it referred only to the central government and not local units. Best Practices is divided into three parts. Part 1 lists the principal budget reports that governments should produce and defines their general content. The focus is on the enacted budget, the pre-budget report, monthly reports, the mid-year report and the year-end report. Part 2 describes the specific disclosures to be contained in the reports. This refers to, for example, detailed data on public debt, financial and non-financial assets and pension insurance contributions. Part 3 highlights practices for ensuring the quality and integrity of the reports. This includes accounting policies, internal financial control, auditing, and parliamentary scrutiny.

##### ***2. Code of Good Practices on Fiscal Transparency (IMF, 2009)***

The International Monetary Fund published the Code based on four general principles: 1) clarity of the roles and responsibilities of public sector; 2) open budget processes; 3) public availability of information; and 4) assurances of integrity. Drawing on this Code, the IMF publishes Country Reports on Fiscal Transparency for individual countries, but for different years. The reports are available on the IMF's web page, including that for Croatia for 2004.

##### ***3. Open Budget Survey (IBP, 2006, 2008, 2010b)***

In 2006, prompted by the IMF and OECD guidelines, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) from Washington developed the Open Budget Index, which is calculated every second year, and enables international comparison of budgetary process transparency on the central government level. The Open Budget Questionnaire on which the Index is based gathers information about the public availability and scope of several budgetary documents that appear in individual phases of the budgetary process. In the phase in which the budget is prepared, the pre-budget statement is analyzed; in the phase in which the budget is accepted, the executive's budget proposal and citizens budget are considered; and in the phase of execution of the budget (including implementation, supervision and control), the in-year reports, the mid-year report, the year-end report and the audit report are important.

Within *Open Budget Survey project* the *Guide to the Open Budget Questionnaire* (IBP, 2010a) is specifically intended to help researchers identify what and how much information is publicly available during each of the four stages of the central government budget process, whether it is timely and accessible, and whether there are any information gaps. This Guide assists researchers in evaluating the information that should be made available to the public at each stage. The Open Budget Questionnaire is divided into three sections:

- Availability of budget documents – 4 tables related to information about budgetary documents on which the responses are based,
- Executive's budget proposal – 65 questions, mainly referring to availability of information in the Budget Proposal and
- The budget process – 58 questions dealing with various aspects of budget process.

### ***Previous research into local budget transparency***

Now let us turn to previously published eight researches into local budget transparency. To our knowledge, there have been very few published papers dealing with local budget transparency in the world. We managed to find two, which measured local budget transparency by some sort of index, both from 2010. Boubeta et al. (2010) explored budget transparency in local units on a sample of 33 Galician municipalities. Their questionnaire was designed following the last three pillars of the IMF's Code, as well as drawing on their knowledge about budgetary processes and local unit realities. The other study (Beales and Thompson, 2010) deals with 134 localities in Virginia and it rates the degree to which their websites provide fiscal transparency. Roughly, the criteria can be broken into four groupings: budget documents presented, extent of presented documents, expenditure information and contract information.

In Croatia we found six projects related to transparency of governments. One of them dealt with openness of central government and was run by a foreign organization (IBP, 2006, 2008, 2010b), while the other five relate to local units and were undertaken by Croatian organizations and authors Maletić (2006), GONG (2009), Profeta (2009), Bratić (2008b) and Antić and Malatestinić (2010).

#### ***1. Open Budget Survey (IBP, 2006, 2008, 2010b)***

According to the values of the Index, countries are classified into five groups, from those that provide their citizens with "extensive information" (scores of 81 to 100) to those that provide "scant or no information" (scores ranging from 0 to 20). In 2010 Croatia had an Open Budget Index of 57, which places it in the group of countries that provide their citizens with only "some information" (Urban, I. and Bađun, M., 2010).

#### ***2. Subnational Budget Watch in Croatia: Is Anybody There? (Maletić, 2006)***

This was a one-year investigation mostly about the openness of the local budget process based on the questionnaire filled by the heads of the Financial Department (FD) in the local units. The questionnaire contained 13 questions divided into three parts on:

- the openness of budget process (6 questions),
- monitoring and control (4 questions) and
- general information relating to the person answering the questionnaire and the local unit in question (3 questions).

The research covered all government units in Croatia; responses were made by 44% of units (141/426 municipalities, 61/123 towns, 14/20 counties). The main findings are:

- The local budget process is not open enough and the public is poorly involved.
- Monitoring and control system over local units are very poor. The public practically does not participate in the monitoring of the local budget processes. The monitoring role of the central government over the local units is weak and not systematically organized.
- Factors to consider are legal weaknesses and the shortcomings of institutions, matched with a lack of capacity and willingness to change the situation.

### 3. *The LOTUS project (GONG, 2009)*

The LOTUS project translated into English means “Local, accountable and transparent government”. This research covered all 556 local units (cities and municipalities) in 2009 in Croatia. The aim was to analyse transparency and make recommendations concerning local unit openness and cooperation between local units and civil society. The measurement involved five dimensions: (1) availability of public information about City Council meetings, (2) availability of public information about local units’ decisions, (3) cooperation with civil society, (4) respect for the Right of Access to Information Act, and (5) functioning of the local unit. In these five areas 41 indicators were constructed, and upon them the index is calculated as a weighted average. The sources of information were local units’ official websites, local units’ City Council Rules of Procedure and local units’ Statutes, questionnaires sent by email and fax and telephone calls.

Basic results:

- for 72% of local units all sources of information were available, for 27% some sources were missing, for 1% of local units none of the sources could be found (meaning local units official websites, local units’ City Council Rules of Procedure, local units’ Statutes, or answers to the questionnaires and email/telephone calls),
- the average index result for all units is 3.9 (on a scale from 0 to 10); 5.3 for cities and 3.4 for municipalities,
- only 18% cities and municipalities can be regarded as ‘transparent or extensively transparent’ (index value larger than 51%),
- municipalities are in a much worse state: only 7% can be regarded as ‘transparent’, while 56% of cities are ‘transparent’.

### 4. *The Answer of Civil Society on the Corruption (Profeta, 2008)*

The central topic of this research performed by 8 civil society organizations named BURA during 2007/2008 was conflict of interest in local units. Under consideration were eight Croatian cities: Čakovec, Karlovac, Osijek, Sisak, Split, Udbina, Vukovar and Zagreb. To some extent the analysis was related to the Right of Access to Information Act, quality of information about local budgets and transparency. The results showed that the legal framework in these cities is too weak to prevent conflict of interest. Legal sanctions are inadequate. Public information was successfully obtained in fewer than half of inquiries made according to the Right of Access to Information Act. Information about contracts on public procurement is insufficiently traceable (comparable). In local budgets, a significant portion of expenditures is put under the item “other expenditures”.

### 5. *Deciding about the Local Units' Budgets – Between Dreams and Reality (Bratić, 2008)*

The book is based on a PhD thesis research about the roles of LEXE and LREP in the local budgetary process. Firstly, the author performed surveys in the representative bodies of counties (regional level) and cities (local level). The response rate was 46-45%. Secondly the author undertook interviews with LEXE in selected counties and cities. The main conclusion was that the LEXE is the key factor deciding about local budget.

### 6. *Lowering Perception of Corruption in Local Units (Antić and Malatestinić, 2010)*

The research was performed in 15 municipalities in Croatia analyzing the possibly corrupt areas in local units' organization and work. Among other things the transparency of local units' budget process and the transparency of local units' work was investigated. Antić and Malatestinić concluded that the public should be more involved in the local units' budgetary process (especially in the phase of budget preparation and enactment) and that local units should inform their citizens more about the local unit budgets and budgetary process (especially using the official local units' websites).

## **Conclusion**

To conclude, leading international instructions (OECD's *Best Practices*, IMF's *Code*, IBP's *Guide*) deal with the quality and quantity of budget documents that should be published, openness of the budget process to the public and clarity of roles and responsibilities for public sector. They especially point out the importance of publishing information about budgets that is full, relevant, correct, timely and in understandable form. They specify what types of budget documents should be published, when and in what kind of detail. They also explain how the quality and integrity of those reports should be checked.

Previous researchers in Croatia have shown that:

- Croatian citizens do not participate enough in the local budget process (Maletić (2006); Antić and Malatestinić (2010)),
- the LEXE is the key factor when deciding about local units budgets (Bratić, 2008),
- the Right of Access to Information Act is not respected in practice ((Profeta (2008), GONG (2009)), and
- both local and central government budgets are perceived as insufficiently transparent (GONG (2009), IBP (2006, 2008, 2010b)).

Only in two of mentioned projects budget transparency indexes for Croatia were calculated: in IBP (2006, 2008, 2010b) for central government level and in GONG (2009) for local units (for all Croatian cities and municipalities).

Accordingly, we decided to measure local budget transparency and construct the Croatian Open Local Budget Index by: 1) taking into account the OECD's *Best Practices* and the IMF's *Code*; 2) following the IBP's *Guide* since it is the most comprehensive guideline; 3) paying attention to issues emphasized by other, previously mentioned Croatian and foreign researchers into budget transparency (especially IBP (2006, 2008, 2010b) and GONG (2009) - mostly focusing on the quality and quantity of local budget information) and 4) taking into account institutional arrangements specific for Croatia, both formal and informal.



## Annex C.

---

### **The presentation of the Croatian Open Local Budget Index for each city**

The main purpose of this section is to give a closer insight into the disclosure of local budget information and openness to the public for each city. Therefore, for each city a short analysis has been written based on our Questionnaire (see Annex A) and the recommendations for the local budget transparency improvement.

The report for each city consists of three paragraphs and two tables:

- The first paragraph gives analysis of results according to the Main COLBI, where we comment on the existence of local budget documents, together with quality and quantity of information presented within.
- The second paragraph gives analysis of results according to the Additional COLBI – e.g. comments on availability of various documents on the web page (budget documents, local gazette, Statute of the city, City Council Rules of Procedure, etc.).
- The last paragraph interprets city's rank according to the Total COLBI and concretely suggests how to improve the local budget transparency in each city.
- The first table provides information on public availability of seven main local budget documents with document's original names and location links (in case they were web-published). As most of websites are often updated or redesigned, the date when these links were last checked has been given.
- The second table is our Questionnaire containing the answers of each city. Answers to the Questionnaire were being collected in the period from 1 April to 10 July, 2010.

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Bjelovar

<http://www.bjelovar.hr>

Population: 42,000

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>54 / rank 20</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>91 / rank 7</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>64 / rank 19</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI =54 (rank 20).** Bjelovar provides relatively little information through the budget documents. As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the 2010 Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. The Enacted Budget lacks, for example, the information on the functional classification of expenditure, the descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures, and, as with most cities, there are no data on the city's outstanding debt. A Citizens Budget has also not been published.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 91 (rank 7).** Bjelovar has an excellently designed and regularly updated website, offering almost all information of interest to a common citizen. It includes all major documents (City Council's Rules of Procedure, city's Statute and local gazette), a list of the City Council meetings including their agendas, contact information on the city's administrative bodies and City Council members, as well as the contact of the information officer. Unlike officers in most other cities, who have often given incomplete and vague responses to the questions about the availability of certain documents, the information officer from Bjelovar responded very precisely to our questionnaire, even indicating where all the requested documents could be found.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 64 (rank 19).** The budget transparency can be further improved by providing more detailed information in local budget documents, e.g. descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures for the current fiscal year. The openness to the public could be enhanced, for example, by organising public debates on the city budget by local executive bodies and by disclosing the materials for the City Council meetings on the city's official website.

<sup>1</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Not known	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Plan proračuna za 2010. godinu; 12/12/2009; <a href="http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Vazniji-dokumenti.aspx">http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Vazniji-dokumenti.aspx</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 10/12/2010; <a href="http://glasnik.bjelovar.hr/Portals/BjelovarHr/Property">http://glasnik.bjelovar.hr/Portals/BjelovarHr/Property</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Bjelovara za 2010. godinu; 12/12/2009; Link not available
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Izvršenje proračuna do 30.06.2009.; 17/09/2010; <a href="http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Vazniji-dokumenti.aspx">http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Vazniji-dokumenti.aspx</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna grada Bjelovara za 2008. godinu; 08/04/2010; <a href="http://glasnik.bjelovar.hr/Portals/BjelovarHr/PropertyAgent/11961/Files/163103/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Bjelovara_broj_05-2009.pdf">http://glasnik.bjelovar.hr/Portals/BjelovarHr/PropertyAgent/11961/Files/163103/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Bjelovara_broj_05-2009.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 30/04/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Bjelovar

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB: Opći dio-Rashodi
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: Društvene djelatnosti; Komunalne djelatnosti i uređenje prostora; Opće javne službe grada; Gospodarstvo; Predstavnička i izvršna tijela</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio-Prihodi, p. 1</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio-Prihodi, p. 1-2</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio-Prihodi, p. 2-4</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio-Rashodi, p. 8; Društvene djelatnosti, p. 9, 11-12, 18, 26</i> Comment: <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio-Rashodi, p. 3; Društvene djelatnosti, p. 8-11, 1., 26</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: Opći dio-Rashodi</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: Opći dio-Prihodi</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: Opći dio-Rashodi</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio-Rashodi</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio-Prihodi, p. 1</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio-Prihodi, p. 1-2</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio-Prihodi, p. 2-5</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 9-20</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 21-96</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3-4</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-8</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 20, 45, 47, 49, 59, 72, 73</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>7 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://glasnik.bjelovar.hr">http://glasnik.bjelovar.hr</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>2 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Two of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>2 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 e-mail)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Gradsko-vijece.aspx">http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Gradsko-vijece.aspx</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Gradsko-vijece.aspx">http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Gradsko-vijece.aspx</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Radna-tijela.aspx">http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Radna-tijela.aspx</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Radna-tijela.aspx">http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Radna-tijela.aspx</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Vazniji-dokumenti.aspx">http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Vazniji-dokumenti.aspx</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Vazniji-dokumenti.aspx">http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Vazniji-dokumenti.aspx</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Najave-sjednica.aspx">http://www.bjelovar.hr/Gradska-uprava/Najave-sjednica.aspx</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Bjelovara čl. 61</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: No Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Bjelovara</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Bjelovara čl. 87</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Bjelovara čl. 71</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Crikvenica

<http://www.crikvenica.hr>

Population: 11,300

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>63 / rank 11</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>89 / rank 11</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>71 / rank 10</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 63 (rank 11).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. Crikvenica has not achieved a higher score in this category due to a poor quality of documents, e.g. the items in the Enacted Budget are only shown up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts, which makes it impossible to see all tax revenues and grants. Moreover, there are no descriptions or explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures. As with most cities, there are no data on the city's outstanding debt. However, it is commendable of Crikvenica to be one of eight cities publishing a Citizens Budget.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 89 (rank 11).** Such a high rank is mostly attributable to an excellent website. Almost all budget documents for the 2006-2010 period can be found at the link '*proračun*'. The website also contains invitations to tender, data on the members of the local Committee on Budget Issues and invitations to and minutes of the City Council meetings. However, although the website does contain a contacts directory of the representative body and executive body members, it does not contain a list of members of the City Council's working bodies, such as the finance department. The information officer and a local executive representative have responded to the Survey, but nobody from the City Council (or Committee on Budget Issues) has.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 71 (rank 10).** Crikvenica is a city with relatively high openness to the public, reflected in a large availability of information on the website, but it is also a city lacking detailed information available in the local budget documents. It would be helpful, for example, to show budget items in the Enacted Budget up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, which would provide greater insight into tax revenues and grants. Had this issue been treated with enough care, Crikvenica would have certainly ranked among five most transparent cities.

<sup>2</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Not known	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Crikvenice za 2010. godinu i projekcije za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.crikvenica.hr/download.asp?iddocs=141">http://www.crikvenica.hr/download.asp?iddocs=141</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun Grada Crikvenice za 2010. godinu i projekcije za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.crikvenica.hr/home.asp?id=10&amp;text=96&amp;glavni=0">http://www.crikvenica.hr/home.asp?id=10&amp;text=96&amp;glavni=0</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Crikvenice za 2010. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=odluke&amp;id=18809">http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=odluke&amp;id=18809</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji obračun proračuna Grada Crikvenice za 2009. godinu; 30/07/09; <a href="http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=odluke&amp;id=17383">http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=odluke&amp;id=17383</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna Grada Crikvenice za 2008. godinu; 30/03/09; <a href="http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=odluke&amp;id=16557">http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=odluke&amp;id=16557</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Yes	Proračun u malom za 2009.; Date not available; <a href="http://www.crikvenica.hr/UserFiles/File/PUM_2009_.pdf">www.crikvenica.hr/UserFiles/File/PUM_2009_.pdf</a>

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 09/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Crikvenica

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3-4</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 57-58</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 7-56</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 6, 13-14</i> <u>Comment:</u> Information on principal repayment in BY is present
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 4, 13</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>



Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3-4</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 57-58</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 7-56</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3-4</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 57-58</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 7-56</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>CB</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 3-6</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 7-8</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 1-2</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 1-3</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2-5</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6-7</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 7-35</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 1</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 1-2</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6, 12-13</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>7 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=query&amp;SearchType=1&amp;search=crikvenica&amp;submit.x=0&amp;submit.y=0">http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=query&amp;SearchType=1&amp;search=crikvenica&amp;submit.x=0&amp;submit.y=0</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>6 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them has responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 e-mail)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.crikvenica.hr/gradsko-vijece-adresar">http://www.crikvenica.hr/gradsko-vijece-adresar</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.crikvenica.hr/gradsko-vijece-adresar">http://www.crikvenica.hr/gradsko-vijece-adresar</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.crikvenica.hr/gradsko-vijece/o-gradskom-vijecu">http://www.crikvenica.hr/gradsko-vijece/o-gradskom-vijecu</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: No Citation: 'Address book'
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.crikvenica.hr/gradsko-vijece/o-gradskom-vijecu">http://www.crikvenica.hr/gradsko-vijece/o-gradskom-vijecu</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.crikvenica.hr/gradsko-vijece/o-gradskom-vijecu">http://www.crikvenica.hr/gradsko-vijece/o-gradskom-vijecu</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="#">poziv na 13 sjednicu vijeća</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG čl. 59</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG čl. 59</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG čl. 100</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG čl. 46</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Čakovec

<http://www.cakovec.hr>

Population: 30,500

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>69 / rank 5</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>78 / rank 25</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>72 / rank 8</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 69 (rank 5).** Čakovec provides fairly detailed information in its budget documents. Its lower score compared to the leader – Slavonski Brod – is, among other things, due to the fact that it does not publish a Citizens Budget, and that the Budget Proposal with Projections does not contain descriptions of various kinds of revenues and expenditures for the current budget year.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 78 (rank 25).** The city's official website contains the City Council's Rules of Procedure, city's Statute, official gazette archives up to the year 2001 and other useful information. However, it is not easy to find all the budget documents on the website, as they are not all at the same link. Some of them are published in the official gazette, e.g. the 2009 Half-Year Report. Responses to the Survey were received from the information officer, representative of the city executive and one City Council member. No response came from the other City Council member. The Budget Proposal with Projections was made available to the public at the same time as it was submitted to the City Council members. Thirty days after, the budget was enacted, which could mean that the representative body and citizens had an opportunity to participate actively in the budgeting process.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 72 (rank 8).** However, unlike Karlovac, which attained the highest score in 'a local unit's openness to the public', Čakovec was the best in the 'availability of local budget information' category. Consequently, Čakovec should publish its budget-related information in a more efficient way, primarily by improving its official website so that it contains more information (e.g. a list of the City Council members), and by making it more simple and transparent (e.g. through a more systematic organisation of the website content by category, so that, for example, all information on the budget could be retrieved under '*budget*').

<sup>3</sup>A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Prijedlog Proračuna Grada Čakovca za 2010.; 11/12/09; <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=607&amp;Itemid=151">http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=607&amp;Itemid=151</a>
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Čakovca za 2010.; 26/11/09; <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/dokumenti/financije/proracun_2010.pdf">http://www.cakovec.hr/dokumenti/financije/proracun_2010.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna Grada Čakovca za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/dokumenti/glasnik/2009/16_2009.pdf">http://www.cakovec.hr/dokumenti/glasnik/2009/16_2009.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Prijedlog odluke o izvršavanju proračuna Grada Čakovca za 2010. godinu; 11/12/09; <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=607&amp;Itemid=151">http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=607&amp;Itemid=151</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju Proračuna Grada Čakovca za razdoblje od 01. 01. do 30. 06. 2009.; 24/09/09; <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/dokumenti/glasnik/2009/11_2009.pdf">http://www.cakovec.hr/dokumenti/glasnik/2009/11_2009.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna grada Čakovca za 2008. godinu; 12/03/09; <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/dokumenti/glasnik/2009/6_2009.pdf">http://www.cakovec.hr/dokumenti/glasnik/2009/6_2009.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 30/04/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Čakovec

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 10-12</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 14-70</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 6</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 7</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 7-9</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>DEB: p. 6; BP: p. 13</i> <u>Comment:</u> Information on principal repayment in BY is present
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 10-11, 69</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various expenditures for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various revenues for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 10-12</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 14-70</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 722-723</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 723-737</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 724-741</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 7-53</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 3-4</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 4</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 5-6</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 201-244</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 204-244</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 198</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 198-199</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 199-200</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 203, 244-246, 251</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=607&amp;Itemid=151">http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=607&amp;Itemid=151</a>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=607&amp;Itemid=151">http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=607&amp;Itemid=151</a>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>30 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=section&amp;id=11&amp;Itemid=78">http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=section&amp;id=11&amp;Itemid=78</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Two of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>4 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 e-mail)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=565&amp;Itemid=153">http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=565&amp;Itemid=153</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=604&amp;Itemid=157">http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=604&amp;Itemid=157</a>

Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=604&amp;Itemid=157">http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=604&amp;Itemid=157</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=85&amp;Itemid=73">http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=85&amp;Itemid=73</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=85&amp;Itemid=73">http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=85&amp;Itemid=73</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_">http://www.cakovec.hr/index.php?option=com_</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG čakovca čl. 54</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG čakovca čl. 54</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG čakovca čl. 78</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG čakovca čl. 43</i>



The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Dubrovnik

<http://www.dubrovnik.hr>

Population: 41,000

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>64/ rank 9</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>86/ rank 15</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>71/ rank 10</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 64 (rank 9).** Despite the relatively high rank in this category, there are still some imperfections, e.g. certain items in the Budget Proposal with Projections (grants and tax revenues) are only booked up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts, thus providing insufficiently detailed information. As with most surveyed cities, there are no macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures and there are no data on the city's outstanding debt. We were not able to obtain any information from the LEXE on whether a Citizens Budget was published.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 86 (rank 15).** Dubrovnik has a very well designed website, offering lots of information: a list of the City Council members, the City Council's Rules of Procedure and meeting agendas, the city's Statute and official gazette archives up to 2001. Particularly commendable is the possibility to search the archives by means of a special search engine. All important budget documents for 2009 and 2010 are available at the link '*proračun grada Dubrovnika*' (The City of Dubrovnik budget), whereas those for previous years can be found in the official gazette. The web sites also include the contact of the information officer together with an information catalogue. The City Council members received the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections ten days prior to taking a vote on it, and it was made available to the public only on the day the budget was enacted. There has been no public debate on the budget proposal. The Survey was answered by the information officer, a representative of the city executive (the Finance Department head) and only one member of the City Council (out of two).

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 71 (rank 10).** A measure to improve budget transparency would be, for example, to provide more detailed information in Budget Proposal with Projections (by showing expenditures according to functional classification). There is also a need to promote cooperation with the public, as during some e-mail messages sent to the information officer and to the City Council during the survey remained unanswered.

<sup>4</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Prijedlog proračuna grada Dubrovnika za 2010. godinu i projekcije za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 30/11/09; <a href="http://www.dubrovnikportal.com/data/1260254446_375_mala_pror-opci%20dio.rtf">http://www.dubrovnikportal.com/data/1260254446_375_mala_pror-opci%20dio.rtf</a>
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun grada Dubrovnika za 2010. godinu i projekcije za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 15/12/09; <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/odjel_za_proracun_financije.php?id=3114">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/odjel_za_proracun_financije.php?id=3114</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun grada Dubrovnika za 2010. godinu i projekcije za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 15/12/09; <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/data/1264774649_318_m.pdf">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/data/1264774649_318_m.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Prijedlog odluke o izvršavanju proračuna Grada Dubrovnika za 2010. godinu; Date not available; <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=3362">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=3362</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna za prvo polugodište 2009. godine; 10/08/09; <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/data/1259674210_334_m.pdf">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/data/1259674210_334_m.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna grada Dubrovnika za 2008. godinu; 10/08/09; <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/data/1259674210_334_m.pdf">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/data/1259674210_334_m.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 03/05/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Dubrovnik

<b>Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY</b>	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2-4</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP, EB/PR</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5-127</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 4, 15, 35, 73, 124; DEB/PR: p. 6</i> <i>Comment: Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3, 15, 34, 73, 124</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP: Obrazloženje prijedloga proračuna</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various expenditures for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Obrazloženje prijedloga proračuna p. 11-13</i>

Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various revenues for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Obrazložnje prijedloga proračuna p. 3-10</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2-4</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5-127</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 2</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 2-4</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5-127</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 51-53</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 50</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 51</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 51</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3-5</i>

Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6-49</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2-3</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6, 11</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.dubrovnikportal.com/data/1260254446_375_mala_pror-opci%20dio.rtf">http://www.dubrovnikportal.com/data/1260254446_375_mala_pror-opci%20dio.rtf</a>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>10 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/sluzbeni_glasnik.php">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/sluzbeni_glasnik.php</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>9 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>Not obtained</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>3 (3 e-mails)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=8">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=8</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=8">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=8</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=10">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=10</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=10">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=10</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=12">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=12</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=11">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/novost_gradsko_vijece.php?id=11</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/sjednice_gradskog_vijeca.php">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/sjednice_gradskog_vijeca.php</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik Grada Dubrovnika, cl 76.</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik Grada Dubrovnika, cl 108.</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik Grada Dubrovnika, cl 107.</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik Grada Dubrovnika, cl 65.</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Gospić

<http://www.gospic.hr>

Population: 13,000

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>49 / rank 26</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>70 / rank 29</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>55 / rank 29</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 49 (rank 26).** Gospić attained a relatively modest score in this category, but there is enough room for improvement. The Budget Proposal with Projections is not available on the website. As the Year-End Report for 2008 was not available on the website, we used the report for 2007. The Enacted Budget lacks, for example, forecasts and explanations of macroeconomic indicators, as well as descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures. In addition, budget items are only booked up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts, so that it is impossible, for example, to get a detailed picture of all tax and non-tax revenues. A Citizens Budget is not published.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 70 (rank 29).** While not being visually attractive, the official website of Gospić is fairly informative. It contains the official gazette archives, a list of the City Council members including their party membership, the City Council's Rules of Procedure and city's Statute, as well as the agendas (posted in advance) of the City Council meetings that are open to the public. However, there is no list of members of the Committee on Budget Issues; we had to wait for 20 days and send as many as four e-mail messages to the City Office in order to obtain their contact information. The website does not contain the e-mail addresses of the employees of particular city departments, but only their telephone numbers. We received no responses to our Survey from the information officer or the City Council members (members of the finance department). In a telephone conversation with the City Office, we were advised that no information officer had been appointed in Gospić and that public statements are only given by the mayor.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 55 (rank 29).** Gospić has a slightly better score in the "openness to the public" category, whereas it ranks the worst in the information it should provide in its budget documents. The city could improve its score by providing more detailed information in its local budget documents (e.g. by including descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures) and by promoting cooperation with the public (e.g. it could publish materials for the City Council meetings on the city's official website).

<sup>5</sup>A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes*	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Gospića za 2010. godinu; 23/12/09; <a href="http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/Proračun_2010.pdf">http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/Proračun_2010.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna Grada Gospića za razdoblje od 2010. - 2012. godine; <a href="http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/PROJEKCIJA%20PROR.%202010..pdf">http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/PROJEKCIJA%20PROR.%202010..pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju proračuna grada Gospića za 2010. godinu; 23/12/ 09; <a href="http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/Odluka%20o%20izvršenju%20proracuna%202010.pdf">http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/Odluka%20o%20izvršenju%20proracuna%202010.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna grada Gospića za razdoblje od I-VI 2009. godine; 24/9/09; Link not available
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna grada Gospića za 2007 godinu; 03/06/08; Link not available
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 07/04/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Gospić

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2-3</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 4-20</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3, 6</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2, 6</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>Programs</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio p. 3-5</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio p. 2</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio p. 2</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio p. 2</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-6</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>



Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 8-36</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2-3</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 7, 13</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/sluzbeni_glasnik.asp">http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/sluzbeni_glasnik.asp</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>0 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them has responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>20 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>4 (3 e-mails + 1 fax)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/gradsko_vijece.asp">http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/gradsko_vijece.asp</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/gradsko_vijece.asp">http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/gradsko_vijece.asp</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/radna_tijela.asp">http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/radna_tijela.asp</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Some Citation: <a href="http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/radna_tijela.asp">http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/radna_tijela.asp</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/Propisi/GRAD%20GOSPIC/Poslovnik%20Gradskog%20vijeca.pdf">http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/Propisi/GRAD%20GOSPIC/Poslovnik%20Gradskog%20vijeca.pdf</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/Propisi/GRAD%20GOSPIC/Statut%20Grada%20Gospi%C4%87a%2007-01.%2001-06.pdf">http://www.gospic.hr/uprava/Propisi/GRAD%20GOSPIC/Statut%20Grada%20Gospi%C4%87a%2007-01.%2001-06.pdf</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: No Citation: 'Questionnaire'
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Gospića čl. 66</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings; the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Gospića čl. 66</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Gospića čl. 94</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Gospića čl. 55</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Karlovac

<http://www.karlovac.hr>

Population: 59,395

<b>Main COLBI:</b>	<b>60 / rank 15</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>100 / rank 1</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>72 / rank 8</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 60 (rank 15).** The Budget Proposal with Projections does not contain the functional classification of expenditures, as well as the description of macroeconomic forecast underlying the budget figures. Finally, as with most surveyed cities, there are no data on the city's outstanding debt. By publishing a Citizens Budget the local budgeting process would be brought closer to citizens.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 100 (rank 1).** Karlovac has an excellently designed website, offering plenty of detailed information. At the web page link '*financije*', visitors can get quick access to all the most important budget documents from the period between 2007 and 2010, as well as to various forms relating to public utility services, construction, agriculture, etc. The contact of the information officer is also available, as well as the Access to Information Request Form. Citizens can attend the City Council's meetings; meeting agendas and materials are published in a timely manner and are publicly available. All four respondents replied to the Survey (the information officer, head of the Finance Department and two members of the Finance Committee). The 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections was made publicly available at the same time as it was submitted to the City Council members, i.e. 27 days prior to its enactment. Before this, two public debates on the budget proposal had been organised, which is an example of good communication with citizens.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 72 (rank 8).** Karlovac belongs to the most transparent cities in Croatia, primarily due to its openness to the public in which it has a maximum score. However, there is still room for budget transparency improvement, primarily through offering more detailed information in budget documents (e.g. explanations of particular revenues and expenditures).

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Nacrt prijedloga proračuna Grada Karlovca za 2010. godinu; 30/11/09; <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/download.aspx?f=dokumenti/Cianci/NACRT_PRIJEDLOGA_PRORACUNA_2010.pdf">http://www.karlovac.hr/download.aspx?f=dokumenti/Cianci/NACRT_PRIJEDLOGA_PRORACUNA_2010.pdf</a>
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun grada Karlovca za 2010. godinu i projekcije za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=188">http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=188</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna grada Karlovca za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/download.aspx?f=dokumenti/Stranice/PROJEKCIJAZA2011.2012.GODINU.xls">http://www.karlovac.hr/download.aspx?f=dokumenti/Stranice/PROJEKCIJAZA2011.2012.GODINU.xls</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju proračuna Grada Karlovca za 2010. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=188">http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=188</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna 2009.; 28/09/09; <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/news.aspx?newsID=746&amp;pageID=51">http://www.karlovac.hr/news.aspx?newsID=746&amp;pageID=51</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna za 2008. godinu; 17/03/09; <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=97">http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=97</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 30/04/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Karlovac

<b>Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY</b>	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 3- 30</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 5- 30</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2-3</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>DEB: p.7; BP: p. 5, 7, 22</i> <i>Comment: Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 4,7,22</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 19-38 (gazette)</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Opći dio</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Posebni dio</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Opći dio</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Opći dio</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Opći dio</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: Opći dio, Programski dio</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/download.aspx?f=dokumenti/Clanci/NACRT_PRIJEDLOGA_PRORACUNA_2010.pdf">http://www.karlovac.hr/download.aspx?f=dokumenti/Clanci/NACRT_PRIJEDLOGA_PRORACUNA_2010.pdf</a>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>27 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/cpage.aspx?page=glasnikRoot.aspx&amp;PageID=39">http://www.karlovac.hr/cpage.aspx?page=glasnikRoot.aspx&amp;PageID=39</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>12 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation:
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>All three of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>0 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 email)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11">http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11">http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11">http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11">http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11">http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11">http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=11</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/cpage.aspx?page=materijali.aspx&amp;PageID=72">http://www.karlovac.hr/cpage.aspx?page=materijali.aspx&amp;PageID=72</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Karlovca čl. 75</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Karlovca čl. 75</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Karlovca čl. 109</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Posl. GVG Karlovca čl. 80</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Koprivnica

<http://www.koprivnica.hr>

Population: 31,000

<b>Main COLBI:</b>	<b>62 / rank 12</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>91 / rank 7</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>71 / rank 10</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 62 (rank 12).** The Budget Proposal with Projections lacks, for example, the functional classification of expenditures, and macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures. As with most surveyed cities, there are no data on the city's outstanding debt and no Citizens Budget is issued.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 91 (rank 7).** The official website is informative. At the link '*značajniji dokumenti*' access is provided to the 2010 budget documents, as well as to the City Council's Rules of Procedure, the city's Statute, the amounts of fees paid to the City Council members and allocation criteria for current and capital grants paid by the city in 2009. The 2008 and 2009 budget documents can be found in the official gazette that has a table of contents for easier search. Koprivnica was the first among the surveyed cities whose information officer responded to the Survey, providing clear and precise answers to each question and even indicating where the requested documents could be found. The 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections was made publicly available at the same time as it was submitted to the City Council members, i.e. a month before the budget was enacted. According to the information officer, the local executive organised a public debate on the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections. Moreover, through the local weekly magazine "Glas Podravine" citizens were allowed to address their written suggestions and questions concerning the budget proposal to the mayor and City government, and call-in shows were broadcast on Radio Koprivnica, dealing with the city budget before and after its adoption.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 71 (rank 10).** Mostly thank to its good score in the 'openness to the public' category, Koprivnica ranks among ten most transparent cities. However, budget transparency could be improved, e.g. by introducing descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures for the current budget year and by posting (in advance) the agendas of the City Council meetings on the city's official website.



Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Koprivnice za 2010. godinu; 23/12/09; <a href="http://www.koprivnica.hr/user_content/documents/proracun_grada_koprivnice_za_2010.g.zip">http://www.koprivnica.hr/user_content/documents/proracun_grada_koprivnice_za_2010.g.zip</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcije proračuna Grada Koprivnice za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 23/12/2009; <a href="http://koprivnica.hr/user_content/documents/broj_9.pdf">http://koprivnica.hr/user_content/documents/broj_9.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Koprivnice za 2010. godinu; 23/12/09; <a href="http://koprivnica.hr/user_content/documents/broj_9.pdf">http://koprivnica.hr/user_content/documents/broj_9.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Koprivnice za razdoblje od 01. siječnja do 30. lipnja 2009. godine; 28/09/09; <a href="http://koprivnica.hr/user_content/documents/glasnik_broj_6.pdf">http://koprivnica.hr/user_content/documents/glasnik_broj_6.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna grada Koprivnice za 2008. godinu; 23/03/09; <a href="http://koprivnica.hr/user_content/documents/glasnik_broj_3_09.pdf">http://koprivnica.hr/user_content/documents/glasnik_broj_3_09.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 05/05/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Koprivnica

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 4.-20</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2-3</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2-3</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2, 4, 12</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3, 6, 12</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 21-29</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 29</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 29-30</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 30-49</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 11-15</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 7-8, 31-32</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 9</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 8-11, 32-34</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 10-14, 28-30</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 30-33</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 36-66</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6-7, 27, 33-34</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 8,27,34</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 7.-10, 27, 34-36</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 22, 25-26, 29-30, 66</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>29 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/glasnik-grada-koprivnice">http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/glasnik-grada-koprivnice</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Two of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 email)</i> Citation: <i>Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/gradsko-vijece">http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/gradsko-vijece</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/gradsko-vijece">http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/gradsko-vijece</a>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca">http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca</a>

Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca">http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/znacajniji-dokumenti">http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/znacajniji-dokumenti</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/znacajniji-dokumenti">http://www.koprivnica.hr/gradska-uprava/znacajniji-dokumenti</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: No Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovník GVG Koprivnice čl. 70</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovník GVG Koprivnice čl. 70. i 96.</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovník GVG Koprivnice čl. 96</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovník GVG Koprivnice čl. 64</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Krapina

<http://www.krapina.hr>

Population: 13,000

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>61 / rank 14</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>82 / rank 19</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>67 / rank 16</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 61 (rank 14).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE of Krapina submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the 2010 Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections, which, for example, did not include the functional classification of expenditures, descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures. Moreover, as with most of the cities, there were no data on the city's total outstanding debt. We received no feedback from the city authorities concerning the publishing of a Citizens Budget, nor could we find it on the website.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 82 (rank 19).** Krapina has a fairly well designed official website, containing the 2009 and 2010 issues of the official gazette, the City Council's Rules of Procedure and the city's Statute. Citizens are allowed to attend the Council's meetings. Moreover, the link '*proračun*' provides access to the 2010 budget documents (Enacted Budget, Enacted Projections and Decision on Budget Execution). However, the documents for previous years can only be found in the official gazette. Therefore, it is recommended that a search engine be installed for the search of the official gazette (as, for example, in Dubrovnik<sup>7</sup>). Only one member of the City Council and a representative of the local executive responded to the Survey, whereas the other member of the Council and the information officer failed to respond.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 67 (rank 16).** While Krapina has attained a better score on Main COLBI than, for example, Varaždin or Virovitica, the latter two cities rank higher on the total list than Krapina, due to their much better scores in the 'openness to the public' category. Budget transparency could be improved, for example, by introducing the descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures for the current budget year, and by presenting budget items in the Enacted Projections up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, which would ensure a more detailed presentation of tax revenues and grants. In addition to this, city employees should respond to online inquiries more promptly.

<sup>6</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>7</sup> The search engine is available at [http://www.dubrovnik.hr/arhiv\\_novosti.php](http://www.dubrovnik.hr/arhiv_novosti.php)

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Not known	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Krapine za 2010. godinu sa projekcijom za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 21/12/09; <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Sluzbeni%20glasnik%20br.7%20inddf11.pdf">http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Sluzbeni%20glasnik%20br.7%20inddf11.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun Grada Krapine za 2010. godinu sa projekcijom za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 21/12/09; <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Sluzbeni%20glasnik%20br.7%20inddf11.pdf">http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Sluzbeni%20glasnik%20br.7%20inddf11.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju proračuna grada Krapine za 2010. godinu; 21/12/09; <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Sluzbeni%20glasnik%20br.7%20inddf11.pdf">http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Sluzbeni%20glasnik%20br.7%20inddf11.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Krapine za 2009. godinu; 30/09/09; <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Sluzbeni%20glasnik%20br.5.pdf">http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Sluzbeni%20glasnik%20br.5.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Krapine za 2008. g.; 30/06/09; <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Sluzbeni_glasnik_br_4.pdf">http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Sluzbeni_glasnik_br_4.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 07/05/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Krapina

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 37-38</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 39-51</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 36</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 36</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 36</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 38, 40, 53</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 37, 40</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 54-71</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 37-38</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 39-51</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 36.</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 37-38</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 39-51</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 28-29</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 27</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 27</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 27</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-5</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 7-18</i>

Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6, 8</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/default.aspx?id=79">http://www.krapina.hr/default.aspx?id=79</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them has responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>14 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>4 (3 emails+1 call)</i> Citation: <i>'Adress book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocs/Images/VIJE%C4%86NICI.pdf">http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocs/Images/VIJE%C4%86NICI.pdf</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocs/Images/VIJE%C4%86NICI.pdf">http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocs/Images/VIJE%C4%86NICI.pdf</a>



<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Odbor%20za%20financije%20i%20prora%C4%8Dun.pdf">http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Odbor%20za%20financije%20i%20prora%C4%8Dun.pdf</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Odbor%20za%20financije%20i%20prora%C4%8Dun.pdf">http://www.krapina.hr/UserDocsImages/Odbor%20za%20financije%20i%20prora%C4%8Dun.pdf</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/default.aspx?ID=36">http://www.krapina.hr/default.aspx?ID=36</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/default.aspx?ID=29">http://www.krapina.hr/default.aspx?ID=29</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.krapina.hr/default.aspx?ID=36">http://www.krapina.hr/default.aspx?ID=36</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Krapine čl. 74</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Krapine čl. 74</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Krapine čl. 121</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Krapine čl. 84</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Kutina

<http://www.kutina.hr>

Population: 24,600

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>68 / rank 7</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>78 / rank 25</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>71 / rank 10</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 68 (rank 7).** Kutina is among the cities providing fairly detailed information in the budget documents. It has also published a Citizens Budget for 2010, which represents a very good practice in involving citizens in the budgeting process. However, there is still room for improvement, because, as with most of the cities, there are no data on the city's total outstanding debt, and the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections, for example, lacks the explanations of revenues and expenditures and the functional classification of expenditures.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 78 (rank 25).** The official website contains the official gazette archives (for the period 2000-2010) that can be easily searched by means of a search engine. It also contains the City Council's Rules of Procedure, the city's Statute, and various forms and decisions relating to utility services, construction and agriculture. Citizens are allowed to attend the City Council's meetings. All major budget documents are available on the website, including the agendas of the City Council meetings that are open to the public. All four respondents replied to the Survey (the information officer, head of the Finance Department and two members of the Finance Committee). Kutina does not have a Committee on Budget Issues, and it took us more than 15 days to obtain this information from the LEXE.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI =71 (rank 10).** Notwithstanding the good score on the 'availability of local budget information', Kutina still does not rank high on the total list, mostly on account of the non-existence of a Committee on Budget Issues and long time lags in responses from the LEXE. The Budget Proposal with Projections lacks the projections and explanations of macroeconomic indicators underlying the proposal, as well as the descriptions of various kinds of revenues and expenditures for the current budget year. Otherwise, Kutina would certainly rank among top ten cities for local budget transparency.

<sup>8</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal (BP)	Yes	BP1: Nacrt proračuna 2010.; 09.12.2009.; BP2: Proračun 2010.; 08/12/10; <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=QSHmoijMfQ%3d&amp;tabid=281&amp;mid=957">http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=QSHmoijMfQ%3d&amp;tabid=281&amp;mid=957</a>
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Kutine za 2010 godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=sP2hxXzY3Bc%3d&amp;tabid=142">http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=sP2hxXzY3Bc%3d&amp;tabid=142</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija prihoda i rashoda proračuna Grada Kutine za razdoblje 2010.-2012.; Date not available; <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=sUsD9bVbvVo%3D&amp;tabid=281&amp;mid=957">http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=sUsD9bVbvVo%3D&amp;tabid=281&amp;mid=957</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o Izvršenju Proračuna Grada Kutine za 2010. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=sP2hxXzY3Bc%3d&amp;tabid=142">http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=sP2hxXzY3Bc%3d&amp;tabid=142</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji obračun Proračuna Grada Kutine za 2009. godinu; 29/09/09; <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/Portals/0/Dokumenti/Sluzbene_Novine/2009/06_09.pdf">http://www.kutina.hr/Portals/0/Dokumenti/Sluzbene_Novine/2009/06_09.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna grada Kutine za 2008. godinu; 31/03/09; <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/Portals/0/Dokumenti/Sluzbene_Novine/2009/02_09.pdf">http://www.kutina.hr/Portals/0/Dokumenti/Sluzbene_Novine/2009/02_09.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Yes	Konsolidirani proračun grada Kutine za 2010. godinu; Date not available; <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=sUsD9bVbvVo%3d&amp;tabid=281&amp;mid=957">http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=sUsD9bVbvVo%3d&amp;tabid=281&amp;mid=957</a>

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 30/04/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Kutina

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 3-7</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP1</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 9-30</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 1</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 1</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 1-2</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 5, 8, 10</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 3, 7, 10</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP2: p. 5</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP2: p. 5</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP2: p. 5</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP2.: p. 4-59</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP1</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP1</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP1</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP2: p. 60</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP2: p. 61</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP2</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP2</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>CB</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 175-206</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 175, 179</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 175-176</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 176-179</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 86-87, 88-115</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 89-115</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 85, 88</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 85</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 85, 88</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 84, 87, 89, 90</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=QSHmoijMlfQ%3d&amp;tabid=281&amp;mid=957">http://www.kutina.hr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=QSHmoijMlfQ%3d&amp;tabid=281&amp;mid=957</a>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>23 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/Zaqra%C4%91ane/Onlineservisi/Dokumenti/Slu%C5%BEbenenovineGradaKutine/tabid/142/Default.aspx">http://www.kutina.hr/Zaqra%C4%91ane/Onlineservisi/Dokumenti/Slu%C5%BEbenenovineGradaKutine/tabid/142/Default.aspx</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>0 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>All three of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>16 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>4 (3 e-mails + 1 tel. call)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/Zaposjetitelje/Ustrojgrada/GradskoVije%C4%87e/tabid/119/Default.aspx">http://www.kutina.hr/Zaposjetitelje/Ustrojgrada/GradskoVije%C4%87e/tabid/119/Default.aspx</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/Zaposjetitelje/Ustrojgrada/GradskoVije%C4%87e/tabid/119/Default.aspx">http://www.kutina.hr/Zaposjetitelje/Ustrojgrada/GradskoVije%C4%87e/tabid/119/Default.aspx</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No committee</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/Zaqra%C4%91ane/Onlineservisi/Dokumenti/Lokalnasamouprava/tabid/165/ItemId/456/Default.aspx">http://www.kutina.hr/Zaqra%C4%91ane/Onlineservisi/Dokumenti/Lokalnasamouprava/tabid/165/ItemId/456/Default.aspx</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/Zaqra%C4%91ane/Onlineservisi/Dokumenti/Lokalnasamouprava/tabid/165/ItemId/456/Default.aspx">http://www.kutina.hr/Zaqra%C4%91ane/Onlineservisi/Dokumenti/Lokalnasamouprava/tabid/165/ItemId/456/Default.aspx</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.kutina.hr/Naslovnica/Novostiizgrada/tabid/138/ArticleId/8360/oamid/516/Default.aspx">http://www.kutina.hr/Naslovnica/Novostiizgrada/tabid/138/ArticleId/8360/oamid/516/Default.aspx</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Kutine čl. 72</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Kutine čl. 72</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Kutine čl. 105</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Kutine čl. 60</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Labin

<http://www.labin.hr>

Population: 12,400

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>9</sup></b>	<b>61 / rank 13</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>100 / rank 1</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>72 / rank 7</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 61 (rank 13).** Labin is one of eight cities producing a Citizens Budget, and the only city, except Požega, disclosing the information on its total outstanding debt. However, some improvements are still possible. For example, the Budget Proposal with Projections, the Half-Year and Year-End Reports do not include the functional classification of expenditures. Also, the Budget Proposal with Projections lacks macroeconomic forecasts on which the budget figures are based.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI =100 (rank 1).** The official website is very informative and its layout is very easy to follow. At the link '*proračun*' access is given to the most important 2010 budget documents, including the archives up to the year 2003. The search of the official gazette is facilitated by a search engine, and the contact of the information officer is also available. The list of the names and contacts of the City Council members is very detailed - it contains their party memberships, e-mail addresses and telephone numbers. All four respondents replied to the Survey (the information officer, head of the Finance Department and two members of the Finance Committee). Having met all the required criteria in this category, Labin has a maximum score and shares the first position with Karlovac.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 72 (rank 7).** Despite its highest score on Additional COLBI, a worse performance in Main COLBI pushed Labin toward the lower ranks. Consequently, budget transparency should be improved, primarily by providing more detailed information in the budget documents, e.g. the descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures for the current budget year, and by including the functional classification of expenditures in these documents.

<sup>9</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Plan proračuna za 2010.; Date not available; <a href="http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Proracun%20Grada%20Labina%20za%202010..pdf">http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Proracun%20Grada%20Labina%20za%202010..pdf</a>
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun grada Labina za 2010. godinu; 23/12/09; <a href="http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Proracun%20Grada%20Labina%20za%202010.%20godinu.pdf">http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Proracun%20Grada%20Labina%20za%202010.%20godinu.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Plan proračuna za 2011. godinu; plan proračuna za 2012. godinu; 23/12/09; <a href="http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Proracun%20Grada%20Labina%20za%202010.%20godinu.pdf">http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Proracun%20Grada%20Labina%20za%202010.%20godinu.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju proračuna Grada Labina za 2010. godinu; 23/12/09; <a href="http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Odluka%20o%20izvršenju%20Proracuna%202010..pdf">http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Odluka%20o%20izvršenju%20Proracuna%202010..pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Plan i izvršenje proračuna po grupama konta od 1.1.2009 - 30.6. 2009.; Date not available; Link not available
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna grada Labina za 2008. godinu; 23/03/09; <a href="http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/SNGL%2004%202009.pdf">http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/SNGL%2004%202009.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Yes	Proračun Grada labina za 2010. godinu prilagođen recesijskim prilikama; Date not available; <a href="http://www.labin.hr/node/858">http://www.labin.hr/node/858</a>

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 10/05/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Labin

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 3-5</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 5-25</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 1</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 1-2</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2-3</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 5, 9; DEB p. 7</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 4, 9</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>



Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>Programi</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 36-37</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 37-38</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>CB</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Plan i izvršenje, Rashodi</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Plan i izvršenje, Prihodi p. 1.</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Plan i izvršenje, Prihodi p. 1.</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Plan i izvršenje, Prihodi</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 9-13</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 15-59</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5-7</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5-8</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3, 14-15</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Proracun%20Grada%20Labina%20za%202010..pdf">http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Proracun%20Grada%20Labina%20za%202010..pdf</a>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>15 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.labin.hr/sluzbene_novine">http://www.labin.hr/sluzbene_novine</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>All three of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>No request needed</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>No request needed</i> Citation: <i>Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.labin.hr/node/651">http://www.labin.hr/node/651</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.labin.hr/node/651">http://www.labin.hr/node/651</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Rjesenja%20o%20izboru%20predsjednika%20i%20clanova%20radnih%20tijela%20Gradskog%20vijeca.pdf">http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Rjesenja%20o%20izboru%20predsjednika%20i%20clanova%20radnih%20tijela%20Gradskog%20vijeca.pdf</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Rjesenja%20o%20izboru%20predsjednika%20i%20clanova%20radnih%20tijela%20Gradskog%20vijeca.pdf">http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Rjesenja%20o%20izboru%20predsjednika%20i%20clanova%20radnih%20tijela%20Gradskog%20vijeca.pdf</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.labin.hr/node/641">http://www.labin.hr/node/641</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.labin.hr/node/240">http://www.labin.hr/node/240</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Poziv%20za%2011.%20sjednicu%20Gradskog%20vijeca%20C4%87a.pdf">http://www.labin.hr/sites/default/files/Poziv%20za%2011.%20sjednicu%20Gradskog%20vijeca%20C4%87a.pdf</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovník GVG Labina čl. 52</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovník GVG Labina čl.52</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovník GVG Labina čl. 78</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovník GVG Labina čl. 41</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Makarska

<http://www.makarska.hr>

Population: 13,716

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>10</sup></b>	<b>45 / rank 29</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>82 / rank 19</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>55 / rank 28</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 49 (rank 29).** Since the Budget Proposal with Projections was not available, we have based our responses to the corresponding questions on the 2010 Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. The Enacted Budget lacks, e.g., the functional classification of expenditures, as well as macroeconomic forecasts on which the budget figures are based. Budget items in both the Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections are presented only up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts and are therefore not presented in sufficient detail. As with most of the cities, there is no information on the city's total outstanding debt.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 82 (rank 19).** Makarska's score in this category is slightly better, due to a fairly well designed website. It offers all major documents, such as the City Council's Rules of Procedure, the city's Statute, official gazette and various forms, and the contact of the information officer. However, the Council meeting agendas have not been posted on the website prior to meetings. No responses to the Survey have been received from one representative of the local executive and the information officer.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 55 (rank 28).** A relatively poor performance is mostly the result of rather inadequate information provided in budget documents. It is recommended that the quality of budget documents be improved, for example, by presenting the budget items in the Enacted Budget up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, in order that tax revenues and grants are shown in greater detail, and by including the descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures for the current budget year. It is also necessary to expand the cooperation, of the information officer in particular, with the public, as this is his/her duty pursuant to the Right of Access to Information Act.

<sup>10</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes*	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Makarske za 2010. godinu; 21/12/09; Link not available
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna Grada Makarske za 2011-2012. godine; 21/12/09; Link not available
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju proračuna Grada Makarske za 2010. godinu; 21/12/09; Link not available
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna 2009.; 28/09/09; Link not available
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna za 2008. godinu; 17/03/09; Link not available
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 07/04/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Makarska

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: Posebni dio</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio p. 3, Posebni dio p. 1</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio p.2, Posebni dio p. 1</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various expenditures for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various revenues for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: Opći dio</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB: Posebni dio</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio p. 2-5</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio p. 1</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio p. 3</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Opći dio p. 1</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Opći dio p. 5.-7</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Posebni dio</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Opći dio p. 1-2</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Opći dio p. 3</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Opći dio p. 1-4</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.makarska.hr/?show=19">http://www.makarska.hr/?show=19</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them has responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>2 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 e-mail)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.makarska.hr/?show=2&amp;sub=249">http://www.makarska.hr/?show=2&amp;sub=249</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.makarska.hr/?show=2&amp;sub=249">http://www.makarska.hr/?show=2&amp;sub=249</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.makarska.hr/?show=2&amp;sub=255">http://www.makarska.hr/?show=2&amp;sub=255</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.makarska.hr/?show=2&amp;sub=255">http://www.makarska.hr/?show=2&amp;sub=255</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.makarska.hr/?show=7&amp;sub=299">http://www.makarska.hr/?show=7&amp;sub=299</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.makarska.hr/?show=7&amp;sub=299">http://www.makarska.hr/?show=7&amp;sub=299</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: No Citation: <a href="http://www.makarska.hr/?show=2&amp;sub=253">http://www.makarska.hr/?show=2&amp;sub=253</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Makarske čl. 67</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Makarske čl. 67</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Makarske čl. 97</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Makarske čl. 61</i>



The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Opatija

<http://www.opatija.hr>

Population: 12,700

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>72 / rank 3</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>82 / rank 19</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>75 / rank 3</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 72 (rank 3).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE of Opatija submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the relevant questions on the 2010 Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. Opatija is among 11 cities providing the functional classification of expenditures in its budget proposal documents. It is also among eight cities producing a Citizens Budget. Notwithstanding the city's excellent third position, there are some deficiencies. For example, the budget proposal documents lack macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures. Moreover, tax and non-tax revenues and grants are presented only up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts. As with most of the surveyed cities, there is no information on the city's total outstanding debt.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 82 (rank 19).** The link '*Proračun grada Opatije za 2010.*' on the official website provides access to all major budget documents (for the period 2008– 2010); also available are the official gazette archives and the contact of the information officer. Citizens are allowed to attend the City Council meetings, and the meeting agendas and materials are made publicly available in a timely manner. By contrast, the information officer, a representative of the local executive and one member of the Committee on Budget issues failed to respond to the Survey, thus depriving us of some information, such as, e.g., the date when the City Council members received the Budget Proposal with Projections, and whether a public hearing on the 2010 budget Proposal had been organised.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 75 (rank 3).** According to its total score, Opatija belongs to the group of most transparent cities in Croatia, primarily on account of the information offered in budget documents. However, while its score on Main COLBI equals that of Osijek, the latter city is still one place ahead of Opatija on account of its better cooperation with the public. Consequently, there are possibilities for further improvement in budget transparency, e.g. by promoting cooperation between city employees and the public. It would also be useful to present certain budget items in the budget proposal documents up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, in order to provide more details of tax revenues and grants.

<sup>11</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes*	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Plan proračuna Grada Opatije za 2010. godinu i projekcija plana za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 08/12/09; <a href="http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3583&amp;sec=45">http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3583&amp;sec=45</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Plan proračuna Grada Opatije za 2010. godinu i projekcija plana za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 08/12/09; <a href="http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3583&amp;sec=45">http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3583&amp;sec=45</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Opatije za 2010. godinu; 08/12/09; <a href="http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3583&amp;sec=45">http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3583&amp;sec=45</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Izvršenje proračuna Grada Opatije za I.-VI. 2009. godine; 03/08/09; <a href="http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=odluke&amp;id=17436">http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=odluke&amp;id=17436</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Izvršenje proračuna grada Opatije za 2008. godinu; 30/03/09; <a href="http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=odluke&amp;id=16618">http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=odluke&amp;id=16618</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Opatije za 2010. - naša zajednička kasica prasica; Date not available; Link not available

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 11/05/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Opatija

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Opći dio</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Posebni dio; p. 132</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Posebni dio; p. 1-131</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Opći dio; p. 1</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Opći dio p. 1</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Opći dio; p. 1-2</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>DEB: p. 5; EB/PR: Opći dio p. 6; Posebni dio p. 65</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Opći dio p. 3; Posebni dio p. 65-66</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Programi</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Posebni dio</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Posebni dio p. 132</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Posebni dio; p. 1-131</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Opći dio</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Opći dio</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Posebni dio; p. 132</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Posebni dio; p. 1-131</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>CB</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2-4</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 36-37</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 0-1</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 1</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 1-2</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3-5</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 36</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6-35</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 0-1</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 1</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 1-3</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 0, 5, 22</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=popis&amp;sifra=10006">http://www.sn.pgz.hr/default.asp?Link=popis&amp;sifra=10006</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>7 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them has responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>10 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>Not obtained (3 e-mails)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?sec=19">http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?sec=19</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?sec=19">http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?sec=19</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?sec=20">http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?sec=20</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3480&amp;sec=20">http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3480&amp;sec=20</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3380&amp;sec=44">http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3380&amp;sec=44</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3379&amp;sec=44">http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3379&amp;sec=44</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3701&amp;sec=21">http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx?art=3701&amp;sec=21</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Opatije čl.61</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Opatije čl.61</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Opatije čl.84</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Opatije čl.55</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Osijek

<http://www.osijek.hr>

Population: 115,000

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>12</sup></b>	<b>72 / rank 2</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>89 / rank 11</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>77 / rank 2</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 72 (rank 2).** Osijek lags behind the leader Slavonski Brod, by 7 points in this category. Some of the reasons for this are that the Budget Proposal with Projections, Half-Year Report for 2009 and Year-End Report for 2008 lack the functional classification of expenditures, and that the Budget Proposal with Projections contains no information on the city's total outstanding debt.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 89 (rank 11).** The official website provides access to the city's Statute, the City Council's Rules of Procedure and official gazette; the meeting agendas and materials are made publicly available in a timely manner. While the website contains a list of the City Council members, there is no information on their party membership. It would be good if all the budget documents were available at a special website link, as is the case, e.g. in Karlovac<sup>13</sup>. A representative of the local executive and one City Council member (a member of the Committee on Budget Issues) failed to respond to the Survey.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI =77 (rank 2).** Budget transparency can be further improved by providing more detailed information in all the budget documents. For example, the functional classification of expenditures could be introduced, and the official website could be upgraded, so that the budget documents are made available under a special category. Osijek would have attained a better score had the other member of the City Council and the information officer responded to the Survey.

<sup>12</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>13</sup> Available at [www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx=ID=51](http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx=ID=51).

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Prijedlog Proračuna Grada Osijeka za 2010. godinu i Projekcija Proračuna Grada Osijeka za razdoblje 2011.-2012. godine; 07/12/09; <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/prijenos-sjednice/index.php">http://www.osijek.hr/prijenos-sjednice/index.php</a>
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun grada Osijeka za 2010. godinu i projekcija za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/content/download/3773/33383/file/590-proracun_doc">http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/content/download/3773/33383/file/590-proracun_doc</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Prijedlog Proračuna Grada Osijeka za 2010. godinu i Projekcija Proračuna Grada Osijeka za razdoblje 2011.-2012. godine; 07/12/09; <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/prijenos-sjednice/index.php">http://www.osijek.hr/prijenos-sjednice/index.php</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Prijedlog Odluke o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Osijeka za 2010. godinu; 07/12/09; <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/prijenos-sjednice/index.php">http://www.osijek.hr/prijenos-sjednice/index.php</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Ostvarenje proračuna Grada Osijeka s 30.06.2009.godine; 20/10/09; <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/sluzbeni-glasnik/pdf/395-izvijestaj%20o%20izvršenju%20proracuna.pdf">http://www.osijek.hr/sluzbeni-glasnik/pdf/395-izvijestaj%20o%20izvršenju%20proracuna.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Ostvarenje proračuna Grada Osijeka 2008. s 31.12.2008.; 21/07/09; <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/sluzbeni-glasnik/pdf/200909_3072.pdf">http://www.osijek.hr/sluzbeni-glasnik/pdf/200909_3072.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 17/05/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Osijek

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio, p. 33-39</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Posebni dio</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio, p. 9-12; 30-31</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio, p. 9-10</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio, p. 12-18; 31-33</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio, p. 19; 21-22; DEB: p. 5</i> <i>Comment: Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio p. 20, 24, 35; Posebni dio p. 130, 276</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio p. 4</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio p. 19-22</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio p. 5-8</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Programi</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio p. 34-39</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio p. 30-34</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: Opći dio p. 33-39</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: Posebni dio</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 4-7</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p 2-3</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2-4</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 8-17</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>



Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 21-110</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3-5</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5-8</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 19-20</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/prijenos-sjednice/index.php">http://www.osijek.hr/prijenos-sjednice/index.php</a>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>8 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/sluzbeni-glasnik/">http://www.osijek.hr/sluzbeni-glasnik/</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>4 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>4 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 e-mail)</i> Citation: <i>Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Gradska-uprava/Gradsko-vijece/Vjecnici">http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Gradska-uprava/Gradsko-vijece/Vjecnici</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Gradska-uprava/Gradsko-vijece/Radna-tijela">http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Gradska-uprava/Gradsko-vijece/Radna-tijela</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Gradska-uprava/Gradsko-vijece/Radna-tijela/Odbor-za-financije-i-gospodarstvo">http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Gradska-uprava/Gradsko-vijece/Radna-tijela/Odbor-za-financije-i-gospodarstvo</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Gradska-uprava/Vazni-dokumenti/Poslovnik-Gradskog-vijeca-Grada-Osijeka">http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Gradska-uprava/Vazni-dokumenti/Poslovnik-Gradskog-vijeca-Grada-Osijeka</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Gradska-uprava/Vazni-dokumenti/Statut-Grada-Osijeka">http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Gradska-uprava/Vazni-dokumenti/Statut-Grada-Osijeka</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Novosti/4.-sjednica-Gradskog-vijeca-Grada-Osijeka">http://www.osijek.hr/index.php/cro/Novosti/4.-sjednica-Gradskog-vijeca-Grada-Osijeka</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Osijeka čl. 117</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Osijeka čl. 168</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Osijeka čl. 166</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Osijeka čl. 127</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Pazin

<http://www.pazin.hr>

Population: 9,200

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>14</sup></b>	<b>34 / rank 33</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>78 / rank 25</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>47 / rank 32</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 34 (rank 33).** One of the main reasons for Pazin to take the last position in this category is that we were unable to respond to most of the questions related to budget. Specifically, neither the Budget Proposal with Projections nor the Year-End Report could be found on the website, and we received no answer to our e-mail messages sent to the city's Committee on Budget Issues, requesting the submission of the relevant documents or providing any information about the existence of these documents or their location. Consequently, the only documents available were the Enacted Budget, Decision on Budget Execution and Citizens Budget. However, the Enacted Budget lacks the functional classification of expenditures; budget items are only presented up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts, which prevents any deeper insight into all tax and non-tax revenues and grants. Also missing are macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures, as well as the explanations of the planned amounts of revenues and expenditures. A good thing is that a Citizens Budget is produced.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 78 (rank 25).** The official website contains the city's Statute, City Council's Rules of Procedure, the contacts of the city's administrative bodies and of the City Council members, and the official gazette. Both members of the City Council (members of the Committee for Budget Issues) and head of this Committee failed to respond to the Survey. The only response came from the information officer.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 47 (rank 32).** Improvements are possible by making all the budget documents available on the website. Furthermore, budget items in the Enacted Budget could be presented up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts and the functional classification of expenditures could be introduced. City employees should respond to online inquiries more promptly. The openness to the public could be increased, e.g. by making the City Council's meeting agendas available on the city's official website, as well as by categorising all budget documents and making them available at one link, as is the case, for example, in Karlovac<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>15</sup> Available at [www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51](http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51).

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Not known	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun grada Pazina za 2010. godinu; 15/12/09; <a href="http://www.pazin.hr/baza/download.php?filename=SN_31_2009.pdf">http://www.pazin.hr/baza/download.php?filename=SN_31_2009.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Not known	Not available
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršenju proračuna grada Pazina za 2010. godinu; 15/12/09; <a href="http://www.pazin.hr/baza/download.php?filename=SN_31_2009.pdf">http://www.pazin.hr/baza/download.php?filename=SN_31_2009.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Not known	Not available
Year-End Report (YR)	Not known	Not available
Citizens Budget (CB)	Yes	Proračun u malom grada Pazina za 2010. godinu; Date not available; <a href="http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?proracun">http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?proracun</a>

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 07/04/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Pazin

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 4-13</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 4</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3,5</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various expenditures for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various revenues for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 15-35</i>

<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 4-13</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <a href="#">CB</a>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>

Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>36 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?novine">http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?novine</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>None of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>16 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>4 (3e-mails+ 1 call)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=90,101,0,0,1,0">http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=90,101,0,0,1,0</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=90,101,0,0,1,0">http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=90,101,0,0,1,0</a>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=91,0,0,1,0,0">http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=91,0,0,1,0,0</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=91,0,0,1,0,0">http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=91,0,0,1,0,0</a>

<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=90,101,0,0,1,0">http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=90,101,0,0,1,0</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=3,27,0,0,1,0&amp;highlight=statut">http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=3,27,0,0,1,0&amp;highlight=statut</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: No Citation: <a href="http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=90,903,0,0,1,0">http://www.pazin.hr/index.php?id=90,903,0,0,1,0</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Pazina čl. 88</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Pazina čl. 126</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Pazina čl. 129</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Pazina čl. 82</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the survey results for

## Poreč

<http://www.porec.hr/>

Population: 17,500

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>54 / rank 20</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>80 / rank 24</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>61 / rank 21</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 54 (rank 20).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE of Poreč submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the 2010 Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. The Enacted Budget, the Half-Year Report for 2009 and the Year-End Report for 2008 lack the functional classification of expenditures; the Enacted Budget also lacks macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures. A Citizens Budget is not produced.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 80 (rank 24).** The official website offers the city's Statute, the City Council's Rules of Procedure, the contacts of the city's administrative bodies, City Council members and of the information officer, as well as the official gazette archives (for the period 2001-2010). All budget documents can be found in the official gazette. However, they would be much easier to retrieve if they were categorised and available at one link, as, for example, in Karlovac<sup>17</sup>. Both members of the City Council (members of the Committee for Budget Issues) and head of this Committee failed to respond to our Survey. The only response came from the information officer.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 61 (rank 21).** The score of Poreč on the total list of cities is solid, but there is still room for improvements. The website can be improved by making all the budget documents available under a special category. Further improvements could be achieved by presenting revenues from grants in the Enacted Budget up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, introducing the functional classification of expenditures and producing a Citizens Budget.

<sup>16</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>17</sup> Available at [www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51](http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51).



Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes*	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Poreča - Parenzo za 2010. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.porec.hr/download.aspx?f=g&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Poreca_broj_13_09.pdf">http://www.porec.hr/download.aspx?f=g&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Poreca_broj_13_09.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna Grada Poreča - Parenzo za 2010., 2011. i 2012. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.porec.hr/download.aspx?f=g&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Poreca_broj_13_09.pdf">http://www.porec.hr/download.aspx?f=g&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Poreca_broj_13_09.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju proračuna grada Poreča - Parenzo za 2010. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.porec.hr/download.aspx?f=g&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Poreca_broj_13_09.pdf">http://www.porec.hr/download.aspx?f=g&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Poreca_broj_13_09.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Poreča za 2009. godinu; 03/09/09; <a href="http://www.porec.hr/download.aspx?f=g&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Poreca_broj_07_09.pdf">http://www.porec.hr/download.aspx?f=g&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Poreca_broj_07_09.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna Grada Poreča za 2008. godinu; 09/04/09; <a href="http://www.porec.hr/download.aspx?f=g&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Poreca_broj_03_09.pdf">http://www.porec.hr/download.aspx?f=g&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbeni_glasnik_Grada_Poreca_broj_03_09.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 17/05/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Poreč

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 5</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 11-99</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 7</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 4</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 7-11</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 6, 24, 56, 73</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 5, 24, 56, 73</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various expenditures for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>

Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various revenues for the BY? Response: None Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 115-134</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: None Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 136</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 136</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 138-200</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 31-34</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 28</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 28</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 28.-30</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 9-12</i>

Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 20-142</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6, 14</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 7</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6-8, 14.-19</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-5, 13</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>21 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=61&amp;pid=54">http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=61&amp;pid=54</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>11 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>None of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>12 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1(1 call)</i> Citation: <i>Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=152&amp;pid=59">http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=152&amp;pid=59</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=152&amp;pid=59">http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=152&amp;pid=59</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: No Citation: 'Address book'
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: No committee Citation: 'Address book'
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=57&amp;pid=54">http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=57&amp;pid=54</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=60&amp;pid=62">http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=60&amp;pid=62</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=1319&amp;j=CRO">http://www.porec.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=1319&amp;j=CRO</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Poreča čl.88</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings; the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Poreča čl.88 i 130</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Poreča čl.128</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Poreča čl.73</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the survey for

## Požega

<http://www.pozega.hr/>

Population: 28,000

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>51 / rank 25</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>84 / rank 16</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>61 / rank 22</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 51 (rank 25).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE of Požega submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the 2010 Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. The Enacted Budget, Half-Year Report for 2008 and Year-End Report for 2008 do not contain the functional classification of expenditures, and the Enacted Budget also lacks the descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures. As with most cities, there are no data on the city's total outstanding debt. Citizens Budget is not produced.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 84 (rank 16).** Požega has a very well designed official website. The link '*proračun*' provides a quick access to all the major budget documents (covering the period from 2001 to 2010) and a list of City Council members, excluding their party membership. Only one City Council member (a member of the Committee on Budget Issues) failed to respond to the Survey.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 61 (rank 22).** It would be useful to present the revenues from grants in the Enacted Budget up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, and include the functional classification of expenditures in the documents. Budget transparency could be further improved by producing a Citizens Budget and by making the materials for City Council meetings available on the website.

<sup>18</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes*	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Požege za 2010. godinu; 10/12/09; <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/images/stories/Dokumenti/Proracuni/Proracun_2010/Proracun%202010.pdf">http://www.pozega.hr/images/stories/Dokumenti/Proracuni/Proracun_2010/Proracun%202010.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna; 10/12/09; <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/images/stories/Dokumenti/Proracuni/Proracun_2010/Proracun%202010.pdf">http://www.pozega.hr/images/stories/Dokumenti/Proracuni/Proracun_2010/Proracun%202010.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju proračuna grada Požege za 2010. godinu; 10/12/10; <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/images/stories/Dokumenti/Proracuni/Proracun_2010/Proracun%202010.pdf">http://www.pozega.hr/images/stories/Dokumenti/Proracuni/Proracun_2010/Proracun%202010.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Požege za 2009. godinu; 10/09/09; <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/images/stories/Dokumenti/Sluzbene%20novine/2009/sn-18-09.pdf">http://www.pozega.hr/images/stories/Dokumenti/Sluzbene%20novine/2009/sn-18-09.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Požege za 2008. godinu; 24/03/09; <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/images/stories/Dokumenti/Sluzbene%20novine/2009/sn-08-09.pdf">http://www.pozega.hr/images/stories/Dokumenti/Sluzbene%20novine/2009/sn-08-09.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 18/05/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Požega

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 5-33</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2, 4,6, 39-40, DEB 68</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3, 6</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various expenditures for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>

Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various revenues for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 152-172 (gazette)</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 39</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 39</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 40-65</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 46-50</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 44-45</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 45</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 45-46</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 7-12</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 13-126</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5, 13-14, 68</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5- 6</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5-7</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4, 13, 21</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>5 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pozega.hr">http://www.pozega.hr</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Two of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>5 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 call)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/Gradska-uprava/Clanovi-gradskog-vijeca-2009.html">http://www.pozega.hr/Gradska-uprava/Clanovi-gradskog-vijeca-2009.html</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/Gradska-uprava/Clanovi-gradskog-vijeca-2009.html">http://www.pozega.hr/Gradska-uprava/Clanovi-gradskog-vijeca-2009.html</a>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/Gradska-uprava/Tijela-Gradskog-vijeca.html">http://www.pozega.hr/Gradska-uprava/Tijela-Gradskog-vijeca.html</a>



Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/Gradska-uprava/Clanovi-gradskog-vijeca-2009.html">http://www.pozega.hr/Gradska-uprava/Clanovi-gradskog-vijeca-2009.html</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/Dokumenti-i-natjecaji/Poslovnik-Grada-Pozege.html">http://www.pozega.hr/Dokumenti-i-natjecaji/Poslovnik-Grada-Pozege.html</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/O-gradu/Statut-grada.html">http://www.pozega.hr/O-gradu/Statut-grada.html</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: No Citation: <a href="http://www.pozega.hr/Gradska-uprava/U-cetvrtak-3.-sjednica-Gradskog-vijeca.html">http://www.pozega.hr/Gradska-uprava/U-cetvrtak-3.-sjednica-Gradskog-vijeca.html</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Požege čl. 66</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Požege čl. 66</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Požege čl. 96</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Požege čl. 63</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Pula

<http://www.pula.hr/>

Population: 58,600

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>52 / rank 22</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>87 / rank 14</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>62 / rank 20</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 52 (rank 22).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE of Pula submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections for 2010. The Enacted Budget, the Half-Year Report for 2009 and the Year-End Report for 2008 lack the functional classification of expenditures. The Enacted Budget also lacks macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures, and explanations of the planned amounts of revenues and expenditures. A good thing is that a Citizens Budget is produced.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 87 (rank 14).** The enacted budgets and their revisions (for the period 2008-2010) are easily retrievable at the link '*proračun*', whereas the half-year and year-end reports can be found, but not so easily, in the official gazette. Citizens are allowed to attend the City Council's meetings. The website also provides a list of City Council members, but the list of members of the Committee on Budget Issues is missing. Two City Council members (members of the Committee on Budget Issues) and head of this Committee failed to respond to the Survey.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 62 (rank 20).** Budget transparency can be further improved, e.g. by a more detailed presentation of tax and non-tax revenues in the Enacted Budget (up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts), and by introducing a functional classification of expenditures. It would be good if all the budget documents on the official website would be available at the same link, as is the case, for example, in Karlovac<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>19</sup>A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>20</sup> Available at [www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51](http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51).

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes*	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Pule za 2010. godinu; 15/12/09; <a href="http://www.pula.hr/uploads/media/sn_20-09_hr_web.pdf">http://www.pula.hr/uploads/media/sn_20-09_hr_web.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna za razdoblje 2011-2012; 15/12/09; <a href="http://www.pula.hr/uploads/media/sn_20-09_hr_web.pdf">http://www.pula.hr/uploads/media/sn_20-09_hr_web.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o Izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Pule za 2010. godinu; 15/12/09; <a href="http://www.pula.hr/uploads/media/sn_20-09_hr_web.pdf">http://www.pula.hr/uploads/media/sn_20-09_hr_web.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju Proračuna Grada Pule za 2009. godinu; 31/07/09; <a href="http://www.pula.hr/uploads/media/novine11.pdf">http://www.pula.hr/uploads/media/novine11.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna grada Pule za 2008. godinu; 31/7/09; <a href="http://www.pula.hr/uploads/media/novine11.pdf">http://www.pula.hr/uploads/media/novine11.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 07/04/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Pula

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 4</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 7-27</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 5, 9; DEB: p. 131</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 4, 8</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 105</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 107-128</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 2</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 3</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 5-26</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 78-81</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 74</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 74-75</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 75-77</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 8-12</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 14-71</i>

Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-5</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5-7</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 12, 39</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>9 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=26">http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=26</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>None of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>5 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 e-mail)</i> Citation: <i>Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=46">http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=46</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=46">http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=46</a>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=48">http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=48</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>

<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=44&amp;L=0">http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=44&amp;L=0</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=88&amp;L=0">http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=88&amp;L=0</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=645&amp;L=0">http://www.pula.hr/index.php?id=645&amp;L=0</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Pule čl. 76</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings; the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Pule čl. 116</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Pule čl. 114</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Pule čl. 62</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Rijeka

<http://www.rijeka.hr>

Population: 144,043

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>21</sup></b>	<b>65 / rank 8</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>93 / rank 3</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>73 / rank 6</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 65 (rank 8).** Rijeka achieved a relatively high score in this category, but there are still some drawbacks. For example, the Budget Proposal with Projections lacks the functional classification of expenditures and, as with most surveyed cities, there are no data on the city's outstanding debt. By publishing a Citizens Budget, the local budgeting process would be brought closer to citizens.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 93 (rank 3).** Rijeka has an excellently designed website with plenty of detailed information. It contains all major documents (the City Council's Rules of Procedure, city's Statute and official gazette archives), a list of the City Council meetings including their agendas, contact information on the city's administrative bodies and City Council members, as well as the contact of the information officer. Citizens can attend the City Council's meetings; meeting agendas and materials are published on the official website prior to the meetings. The information officer was the only surveyed person who failed to respond to the Survey.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 73 / (rank 6).** Rijeka belongs to the group of most transparent cities in Croatia, primarily on account of its openness to the public in which it ranks third. However, there are still possibilities for further improvements in budget transparency. Namely, more detailed information can be provided in budget proposal documents, e.g. by introducing the functional classification of expenditures, publishing a Citizens Budget, or by showing the budget items in the Enacted Budget up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, which would provide more detailed information on tax and non-tax revenues and grants. It would also be helpful to have all budget documents at one link (for example, the half-year and year-end budget execution reports are currently published in the official gazette of the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County<sup>22</sup>, where they are more difficult to find.)

<sup>21</sup>A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>22</sup> Rijeka does not have its own official gazette, so that the city executive's decisions are published in the official gazette of the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County, available at <http://www.sn.pgz.hr>.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Prijedlog proračuna Grada Rijeke za 2010. godinu; Date not available; <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=35674">http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=35674</a>
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Rijeke za 2010. godinu; 22/12/09; <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=36272">http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=36272</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Plan razvojnih programa za razdoblje 2010. - 2012. godine; 22/12/09; <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=36272">http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=36272</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Prijedlog odluke o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Rijeke za 2010. godinu; Date not available; <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=35601">http://www.rijeka.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=35601</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Rijeke za 2009. godinu; 29/09/09; <a href="http://www.sn.pgz.hr/download.asp?id=14590">http://www.sn.pgz.hr/download.asp?id=14590</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Rijeke za 2008. godinu; 26/03/09; <a href="http://www.sn.pgz.hr/download.asp?id=14436">http://www.sn.pgz.hr/download.asp?id=14436</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 21/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Rijeka

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 132</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY by functional classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 135-186</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 131</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 131</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 131</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 13, 16, 134, 142, 168; DEB: p. 12</i> <i>Comment: Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 132, 142, 167, 168</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 4</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 12-16</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 7-11</i>



Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 19-128</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 132</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: p. 135-186</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR2: p. 1</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR2: p. 2</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR2: p. 2-18</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 4-6</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2-4</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3-4</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6-37</i>

Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 1</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 1</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5, 11, 30</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/lqs.axd?t=16&amp;id=35674">http://www.rijeka.hr/lqs.axd?t=16&amp;id=35674</a>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?art=7173">http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?art=7173</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1day</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>All three of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>5 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1(0 e-mail messages / 1 phone call)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=604">http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=604</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=604">http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=604</a>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=607">http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?sec=607</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?art=276">http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx?art=276</a>

<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/gradsko-vijece">http://www.rijeka.hr/gradsko-vijece</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/VaznijiAktiGrada">http://www.rijeka.hr/VaznijiAktiGrada</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/8SJEDNICAGRADSKOGVIJECA">http://www.rijeka.hr/8SJEDNICAGRADSKOGVIJECA</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Rijeke čl. 120</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Rijeke čl. 120 i 159</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Rijeke čl. 161</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Rijeke čl. 68</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the survey results for

## Rovinj

<http://www.rovinj.hr>

Population: 14,200

<b>Main COLBI<sup>23</sup>:</b>	<b>55 / rank 19</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>91 / rank 7</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>66 / rank 18</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 55 (rank 9).** As the Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. Rovinj is one of 11 cities whose budget proposal documents include the functional classification of expenditures for the current budget year. However, they do not include the descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures, and, as with most of the cities, there are no data on the city's total outstanding debt. A Citizens Budget is not produced.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 91 (rank 7).** Rovinj has an excellently designed website with lots of detailed information. The link '*Proračun 2010*' contains the budget archives (for the period 2005–2010), which lacks the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections. The website also offers the contacts of the city's administrative bodies and of the City Council members. A search engine facilitates the search of the official gazette archives. Citizens are allowed to attend the City Council meetings. The information officer and one member of the City Council (member of the Committee on Budget Issues) failed to respond to the Survey.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 66 (rank 18).** Rovinj holds an almost medium position on the Total COLBI scale. Given a good score on Additional COLBI, there is room for further improvements in budget transparency, by providing detailed information in the budget documents, e.g. the explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures, by including macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures and producing a Citizens Budget.

<sup>23</sup>A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Not known	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Rovinja - Rovigno za 2010. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://rovinj.hr/rovinj/5/proracun2010.pdf">http://rovinj.hr/rovinj/5/proracun2010.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun Grada Rovinja - Rovigno za 2010. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://rovinj.hr/rovinj/5/proracun2010.pdf">http://rovinj.hr/rovinj/5/proracun2010.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju proračuna Grada Rovinja-Rovigno za 2010. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://rovinj.hr/rovinj/5/proracun2010.pdf">http://rovinj.hr/rovinj/5/proracun2010.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Izveštaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Rovinja za razdoblje siječanj - lipanj 2009. ; 22/10/09; <a href="http://rovinj.hr/rovinj/6/glasnik/2009-04.pdf">http://rovinj.hr/rovinj/6/glasnik/2009-04.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna Grada Rovinja za 2008. g.; 06/08/09; <a href="http://rovinj.hr/rovinj/6/glasnik/sl_glasnik_0903a.pdf">http://rovinj.hr/rovinj/6/glasnik/sl_glasnik_0903a.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 21/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Rovinj

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 6-8</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 41-44</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 14-40</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3-5</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 8-9, 24, 41, 42, 43, 46</i> <i>Comment: Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 6, 24, 41-43, 45</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>DEB: p. 73-93</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 49</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 48, 50</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 50-57</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 22.-24</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 19</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 19</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 19-20</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 10-13</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 17-51</i>

Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-5</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-5</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-9</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 13, 14, 32</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/odluke-zahtjevi/sluzbeni-glasnik">http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/odluke-zahtjevi/sluzbeni-glasnik</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Two of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>4 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 email)</i> Citation: <i>Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/gradsko-vijece-sastav">http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/gradsko-vijece-sastav</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/gradsko-vijece-sastav">http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/gradsko-vijece-sastav</a>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/gradsko-vijece-sjednice/52">http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/gradsko-vijece-sjednice/52</a>

Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/gradsko-vijece-sjednice/52">http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/gradsko-vijece-sjednice/52</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/dokumenti/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/Poslovnik-rada-Gradskoga-vijeca-hrv.pdf">http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/dokumenti/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/Poslovnik-rada-Gradskoga-vijeca-hrv.pdf</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/ustrojstvo-statut">http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/ustrojstvo-statut</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/gradsko-vijece-sjednice/69">http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/gradska-administracija/gradsko-vijece/gradsko-vijece-sjednice/69</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GV Rovinja čl. 107</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GV Rovinja čl. 108</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GV Rovinja čl. 134</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Rovinja čl. 103</i>



The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Samobor

<http://www.samobor.hr>

Population: 36,000

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>24</sup></b>	<b>49 / rank 26</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>83 / rank 18</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>59 / rank 25</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 49 (rank 26).** Samobor does not publish a Citizens Budget. The Budget Proposal with Projections and the Half-Year Report for 2009 are not available on the website, but the LEXE have submitted them to us upon our request. The Budget Proposal with Projections does not contain the functional classification of expenditures, the descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures and, as with most of the cities, there are no data on the city's total outstanding debt. It would be good if the functional classification of expenditures were included in the observed Half-Year and Year-End Reports.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 83 (rank 18).** The official web site contains all the relevant documents, including the city's Statute, the City Council's Rules of Procedure and official gazette. Citizens are allowed to attend the City Council's meetings. The link '*proračun za 2010*' only contains the 2010 budget documents. Therefore, it would be good to make all important budget documents for at least three years available at one link, as, for example, in Karlovac<sup>25</sup>. The information officer, one member of the City Council (member of the Committee on Budget Issues) and head of this Committee failed to respond to the Survey.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 59 (rank 25).** Given that the Half-Year Report for 2009 and the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections have not been made available on the website, the budget transparency improvement measures should be focused on making all the budget documents available at one easy-to-find link. Moreover, by producing a Citizens Budget, the citizens' active participation in the local budgeting process would be encouraged. All the budget documents should provide more detailed information, for example, the Budget Proposal with Projections should include the functional classification of expenditures and macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures.

<sup>24</sup>A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>25</sup> Available at <http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?PageID=51>.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Nacrt prijedloga proračuna Grada Samobora za 2010. godinu; Date not available; Link not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Samobora za 2010. godinu; 22/12/09; <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/dld/20100101-proracun.pdf">http://www.samobor.hr/dld/20100101-proracun.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna Grada Samobora za 2010. i 2011. godinu; 15/09/09; <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/baza/sluz_vij/7_09%20-%20Sluzbene%20vijesti.pdf">http://www.samobor.hr/baza/sluz_vij/7_09%20-%20Sluzbene%20vijesti.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršenju Proračuna Grada Samobora za 2010. godinu; <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/web/datoteke/2010/04/10_09-Sluzbene-vijesti.pdf">http://www.samobor.hr/web/datoteke/2010/04/10_09-Sluzbene-vijesti.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Realizacija proračuna grada Samobora od 1.1.2009 do 30/06/09; <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/baza/sluz_vij/7_09%20-%20Sluzbene%20vijesti.pdf">http://www.samobor.hr/baza/sluz_vij/7_09%20-%20Sluzbene%20vijesti.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna Grada Samobora za 2008. godinu; 14/07/09; <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/baza/sluz_vij/5_09%20-%20Sluzbene%20vijesti.pdf">http://www.samobor.hr/baza/sluz_vij/5_09%20-%20Sluzbene%20vijesti.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 21/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Samobor

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2-5</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 6-33</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 4, 14</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 3, 14</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>

<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 41</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 41-42</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 42-44</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 3-20</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 1</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 1</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 1-2</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 307-310</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 310-328</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 306</i>

Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 306</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 306-307</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 310</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>BP</i> <u>Comment: <i>Hard copy of BP obtained</i></u>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/dokumenti.htm">http://www.samobor.hr/dokumenti.htm</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them has redponded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>30 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>3 days (2 e mails + 1 call)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/gradsko_vijece.htm">http://www.samobor.hr/gradsko_vijece.htm</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/gradsko_vijece.htm">http://www.samobor.hr/gradsko_vijece.htm</a>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/web/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca/">http://www.samobor.hr/web/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca/</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/web/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca/">http://www.samobor.hr/web/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca/</a>

<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/web/vazni-propisi/poslovnik-gradskog-vijeca/">http://www.samobor.hr/web/vazni-propisi/poslovnik-gradskog-vijeca/</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation : <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/web/vazno/statut/">http://www.samobor.hr/web/vazno/statut/</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.samobor.hr/web/datoteke/2010/06/Dnevni-red-10.-sjednice-Gradskog-vije%C4%87a-Grada-Samobora.pdf">http://www.samobor.hr/web/datoteke/2010/06/Dnevni-red-10.-sjednice-Gradskog-vije%C4%87a-Grada-Samobora.pdf</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Samobora čl. 132</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Samobora čl. 175</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Samobora čl. 177</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Samobora čl. 142</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Sisak

<http://www.sisak.hr/>

Population: 52,200

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>26</sup></b>	<b>44 / rank 30</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>93 / rank 3</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>58 / rank 26</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 44 (rank 30).** Sisak brings up the rear in this category, due to numerous deficiencies in its budget documents. The Budget Proposal with Projections, the Half-Year Report and the Year-End Report do not include the functional classification of expenditures. The Budget Proposal with Projections also lacks, among other things, macroeconomic forecasts on which the budget is based, the information on the city's outstanding debt, and the descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures. Budget items are presented only up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts, which makes it impossible to get a detailed picture of all tax or non-tax revenues and grants.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 93 (rank 3).** Such a high score in this category is mostly due to an excellently designed website containing all the relevant documents and information, from the city's Statute, the City Council's Rules of Procedure, the contacts of the city's administrative bodies, City Council members and of the information officer to the official gazette archives (for the period 1994-2010). Sisak would have attained an even higher score had the City Council members (i.e. the members of the Committee on Budget Issues) and head of the Committee responded to the Survey. The only response came from the information officer.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 58 (rank 26).** The total score could be improved by providing more extensive and detailed information in the budget documents, e.g. by introducing the functional classification of expenditures and descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures, as well as by presenting certain items (namely tax and non-tax revenues and grants) up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts. The openness to the public could be additionally increased by making all the budget documents available at one link.

<sup>26</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Prijedlog proračuna Grada Siska za 2010. godinu; Date not available; <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/1.-PRIJEDLOG-PRORA%C4%8CUNA-GRADA-SISKA-ZA-2010.-">http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/1.-PRIJEDLOG-PRORA%C4%8CUNA-GRADA-SISKA-ZA-2010.-</a>
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Siska za 2010. godinu; 15/12/09; <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/Proracun_Grada_Siska_za_2010.g.xls">http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/Proracun_Grada_Siska_za_2010.g.xls</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna za razdoblje od 2010. do 2012. godine; <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/Projekcija_2010-2012.g.xls">http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/Projekcija_2010-2012.g.xls</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Siska za 2010. godinu; 15/12/09; <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/Odluka_o_izvršavanju_proracuna_za_2010.g.doc">http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/Odluka_o_izvršavanju_proracuna_za_2010.g.doc</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji Izvještaj o izvršenju Proračuna Grada Siska za 2009. godinu; Date not available; Link not available
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna grada Siska za 2008.godinu; 27/03/09; <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/SLUZBENI-GLASNIK-GRADA-SISKA-BROJ-6-OD-2009.-GODINE.pdf">http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/SLUZBENI-GLASNIK-GRADA-SISKA-BROJ-6-OD-2009.-GODINE.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 21/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Sisak

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2-3</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 6-26</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 4, 10, 13</i> <i>Comment: Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 2, 10, 12</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Programi</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 10-13</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 9</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 9</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 9-10</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 13-49</i>



Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2, 3, 7</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/1.-PRIJEDLOG-PRORA%C4%8CUNA-GRADA-SISKA-ZA-2010">http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/1.-PRIJEDLOG-PRORA%C4%8CUNA-GRADA-SISKA-ZA-2010</a> .
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>7 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/?page_id=6394">http://www.sisak.hr/?page_id=6394</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>3 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>None of them has responded</i> Citation: <i>Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 e-mail)</i> Citation: <i>Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/?page_id=722">http://www.sisak.hr/?page_id=722</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/?page_id=722">http://www.sisak.hr/?page_id=722</a>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2008/05/Poslovnik-Gradskoq-vijeca.pdf">http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2008/05/Poslovnik-Gradskoq-vijeca.pdf</a>

Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/?p=4605">http://www.sisak.hr/?p=4605</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/?page_id=724">http://www.sisak.hr/?page_id=724</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/?page_id=720">http://www.sisak.hr/?page_id=720</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.sisak.hr/?p=8212">http://www.sisak.hr/?p=8212</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Siska čl. 64</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Siska čl. 64</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Siska čl. 91</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Siska čl. 53</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Slavonski Brod

<http://www.slavonski-brod.hr>

Population: 64,600

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>27</sup></b>	<b>79 / rank 1</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>91 / rank 7</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>82 / rank 1</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 79 (rank 1).** Slavonski Brod convincingly ranks first in this category, followed by Osijek that lags behind by 7 points. All the observed budget documents are publicly available. Slavonski Brod is one of 11 cities whose budget proposal documents include the functional classification of expenditures, and one of eight cities producing a Citizens Budget. However, there are still some deficiencies, e.g. the Budget Proposal with Projections lacks information on the city's outstanding debt, as well as macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures. Moreover, there is no functional classification of expenditures in the observed half-year and year-end reports on budget execution.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 91 (rank 7).** Slavonski Brod has attained a slightly lower score in this category, as one City Council member (a member of the Committee on Budget Issues) and the information officer did not respond the Survey. The official website provides the city's Statute, the City Council's Rules of Procedure and official gazette. The meeting agendas and materials are made publicly available in a timely manner, as is the list of the City Council members. It would also be helpful to make all the budget documents available at a special link, as, for example, in Karlovac<sup>28</sup>.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 77 (rank 2).** Notwithstanding its highest score in budget transparency according to the Total COLBI, Slavonski Brod can still make improvements by providing even more detailed information in all the budget documents, for example, by introducing the functional classification of expenditures into the Half-Year and Year-End Reports, presenting the city's outstanding debt in the Budget Proposal with Projections and improving the city's web site in the way that all the budget documents are available under a special category. A better score would also have been attained had the other member of the City Council and the information officer responded to the Survey.

<sup>27</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>28</sup> Available at [www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51](http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51).

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Prijedlog Odluke o proračunu Grada Slavenskog Broda za 2010. godinu; 16/11/09; <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=1176&amp;Itemid=30">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=1176&amp;Itemid=30</a>
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun grada Slavenskog Broda za 2010. godinu; 24/12/09; <a href="http://www.bpz.hr/Data/Files/VJESNIK18-2009.pdf">http://www.bpz.hr/Data/Files/VJESNIK18-2009.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun grada Slavenskog Broda za 2010. godinu; 24/12/09; <a href="http://www.bpz.hr/Data/Files/VJESNIK18-2009.pdf">http://www.bpz.hr/Data/Files/VJESNIK18-2009.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršenju proračuna Grada Slavenskog Broda za 2010. godinu; 16/11/09; <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/sjednice/sjednica2010122009/58%20-">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/sjednice/sjednica2010122009/58%20-</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Izveštje o izvršenju proračuna Grada Slavenskog Broda za razdoblje od I. do VI. mjeseca; 24/09/09; <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=1047&amp;Itemid=30">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=1047&amp;Itemid=30</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Izveštje o izvršenju proračuna Grada Slavenskog Broda za 2008. godinu; 19/06/09; <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=932&amp;Itemid=30">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=932&amp;Itemid=30</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Yes	Proračun za 2010. godinu; Date not available; <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/images/Glasnik/glasnik_09.pdf">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/images/Glasnik/glasnik_09.pdf</a>

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 18/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Slavonski Brod

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: Plan izdataka</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: Funkcijska</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: Plan izdataka</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP2: Plan prihoda, p. 1.-2.</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP2: Plan prihoda, p. 2. -3.</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP2: Plan prihoda, p. 2.-5.</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP2: Nacrt proračuna, p. 6; Plan izdataka, p. 9, 24</i> <i>Comment: Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP3: Plan izdataka p. 9, 23</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Nacrt proračuna</i>

Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: Nacrt proračuna</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: programi i obrazloženja</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: Plan izdataka</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: Plan izdataka</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP1: Plan prihoda</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP1: Plan izdataka</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP1: Plan izdataka</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>CB</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Izdaci ukupno</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Izvršenje prihoda, p. 1.</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Izvršenje prihoda, p. 2</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: Izvršenje prihoda, p. 2-5</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Izvršenje izdataka</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Izvršenje izdataka</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Izvršenje prihoda</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Izvršenje prihoda</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Izvršenje prihoda</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: Izvješće o izvršenju proračuna za 2008., p. 11; Izvršenje izdataka, p. 5</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=1176&amp;Itemid=30">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=1176&amp;Itemid=30</a>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.BPPz.hr/sluzbeni_vijesnik/default.aspx">http://www.BPPz.hr/sluzbeni_vijesnik/default.aspx</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>14 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Two of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>0 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 call)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=blogcategory&amp;id=88&amp;Itemid=198">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=blogcategory&amp;id=88&amp;Itemid=198</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=blogcategory&amp;id=88&amp;Itemid=198">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=blogcategory&amp;id=88&amp;Itemid=198</a>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=922&amp;Itemid=26">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=922&amp;Itemid=26</a>

Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=922&amp;Itemid=26">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=922&amp;Itemid=26</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/images/Poslovnik_Gradskog_vijeca.pdf">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/images/Poslovnik_Gradskog_vijeca.pdf</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=blogcategory&amp;id=49&amp;Itemid=155">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=blogcategory&amp;id=49&amp;Itemid=155</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=blogcategory&amp;id=153&amp;Itemid=2406">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=blogcategory&amp;id=153&amp;Itemid=2406</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Sl. Broda čl. 84</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Sl. Broda čl. 118</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Sl. Broda čl. 85, 117 i 118</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Sl. Broda čl. 72</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Split

<http://www.split.hr>

Population: 189,000

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>29</sup></b>	<b>score 43 / rank 31</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>score 64 / rank 30</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>score 49 / rank 31</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 43 (rank 31).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE of Split submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. The Enacted Budget lacks, for example, the functional classification of expenditures and, as the budget items are only presented up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts, no deeper insight is provided into all tax revenues and grants. Also missing are macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures, as well as the descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures. A Citizens Budget is not produced and the non-availability of the half-year report additionally worsens the score.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI =64 (rank 30).** The official website offers the city's Statute, the City Council's Rules of Procedure, the contacts of the city's administrative bodies, City Council members and of the information officer, as well as the official gazette archives (for the period 2005-2010). The link '*najvažniji akti*' provides only some of the budget documents, excluding, for example, the Year-End Report for 2008 that can be found in the official gazette. Therefore it would be better if all the important budget documents relating to the previous period of at least three years would be available at one link (like, for example, in Rovinj<sup>30</sup>). Neither of the City Council members (members of the Committee on Budget Issues) has responded to the Survey. Only the information officer and head of the Committee on Budget Issues have.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 49 (rank 31).** We could not download the 2009 Half-Year Report on Budget Execution from the website, because the link was inactive. Moreover, our request for fixing the link was ignored. Apart from improving the regular website maintenance, the budget transparency could be further increased by presenting the budget items in the Enacted Budget up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, reducing the time the LEXE need for responding to e-mail inquiries and by publishing a Citizens Budget.

<sup>29</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>30</sup> Available at <http://rovinj.hr/rovinj/gospodarstvo/ekonomija/proracun>



Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Not known	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Splita za 2010. godinu sa projekcijama za 2011. - 2012. godinu; 22/12/09; <a href="http://www.split.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=2754">http://www.split.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=2754</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun Grada Splita za 2010. godinu sa projekcijama za 2011. - 2012. godinu; 22/12/09; <a href="http://www.split.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=2754">http://www.split.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=2754</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Splita za 2010. godinu; 22/12/2009; <a href="http://www.split.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=2754">http://www.split.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=2754</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes*	Not available
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun Proračuna Grada Splita za 2008. godinu; 17/07/09; <a href="http://www.split.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=2255">http://www.split.hr/lgs.axd?t=16&amp;id=2255</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 18/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Split

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3-4</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5-62</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 2</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5, 62</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3, 62</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3-4</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5-62</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 2</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3-4</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5-62</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 9-12</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 14-88</i>

Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 6-8</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 12, 39, 90-91, 96-98</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>7 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=368">http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=368</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>4 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them has responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>62 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>27 ( 25 emails+ 2 tel. calls)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=630">http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=630</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=630">http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=630</a>
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=631">http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=631</a>

Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=343">http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=343</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=343">http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx?sec=343</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Splita čl. 88</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Splita</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Splita čl. 116</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Splita čl. 17-20</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Šibenik

<http://www.sibenik.hr/>

Population: 51,600

<b>Main COLBI:</b> <sup>31</sup>	<b>41 / rank 32</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>56 / rank 31</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>45 / rank 33</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 41 (rank 32).** As the Budget Proposal with Projections is not made available on the website, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. Šibenik is one of 11 cities whose budget proposal documents include the functional classification of expenditures. By contrast, the Half-Year and Year-End Report provide almost no information, which accounts for such a poor performance.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 56 (rank 31).** The official website contains the city's Statute, City Council's Rules of Procedure, official gazette archives (for the period 2008-10), and the contacts of the City Council members excluding the information on political party membership. The 2010 budget documents are available at a special link, whereas those for the previous years can be found in the official gazette. However, they would be much easier to find if they were categorised and available at same link, as, for example, in Karlovac<sup>32</sup>. No responses to the Survey were received from one City Council member (a member of the Committee on Budget Issues), head of the Committee on Budget Issues and the information officer.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 45 (rank 33).** Šibenik ranks last on the total list of cities but there is much room for budget transparency improvement. The main reason for the low score is a poor quality of the Half-Year and Year-End Report that include none of the three usually applied budget classifications.<sup>33</sup> Our request submitted to the LEXE for sending us detailed reports, if available, remained unanswered. Apart from the fact that the aforementioned documents should provide much more detailed information, the Enacted Budget also lacks the data on the city's outstanding debt. It is recommendable that a link should be introduced providing the archives of the most important budget documents for at least a three-year period, and that the agendas of the City Council meetings should be posted on the city's official website a day before the meeting.

<sup>31</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>32</sup> Available at [www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51](http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51).

<sup>33</sup> Budget documents usually apply economic, functional and program classifications.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes*	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju proračuna Grada Šibenika za 2010. godinu; 21/12/09; EB1: <a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/dok/proracun.asp">http://www.sibenik.hr/dok/proracun.asp</a> EB2: <a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/glasnik/2009/09.pdf">http://www.sibenik.hr/glasnik/2009/09.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija Grada Šibenika za 2011. i 2012. godinu; Date not available; <a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/doc/Proracun-2010/Projekcija%202011-2012.pdf">http://www.sibenik.hr/doc/Proracun-2010/Projekcija%202011-2012.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	EB1: Proračun Grada Šibenika za 2010. godinu; EB2: Proračun Grada Šibenika za 2010. godinu; 21/12/09; <a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/doc/Proracun-2010/Odluka%20o%20izvršavanju%202010.pdf">http://www.sibenik.hr/doc/Proracun-2010/Odluka%20o%20izvršavanju%202010.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Izveštaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Šibenika za prvo polugodište 2009. godine; 22/09/09; <a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/glasnik/2009/07.pdf">http://www.sibenik.hr/glasnik/2009/07.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna Grada Šibenika za 2008. godinu; 22/09/09; <a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/glasnik/2009/07.pdf">http://www.sibenik.hr/glasnik/2009/07.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 17/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Šibenik

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1: Opći dio, p. 3-4
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1: Funkcijska
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1: Posebni dio
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1: Opći dio, p. 2
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1: Opći dio, p. 2
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1: Opći dio, p. 2
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: EB1: Opći dio, p. 4; Posebni dio, p. 2-3, 8, 12 <u>Comment:</u> Information on principal repayment in BY is present
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1: Opći dio p. 3; Posebni dio p. 2.-3, 12
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1: Obrazloženje proračuna p. 1-3
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1: Obrazloženje proračuna p. 6-10

Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1: Obrazloženje proračuna p. 4-6
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB2: p. 27-39
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB1</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB1</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB1</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 1</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 2-5</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 2-5</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 5</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 5</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 5</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 5</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 5</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>

Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/glasnik/index.asp">http://www.sibenik.hr/glasnik/index.asp</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>7 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>2 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>4 (1 email + 3 calls)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/ustrojstvo_grada/gradsko_vijece.asp">http://www.sibenik.hr/ustrojstvo_grada/gradsko_vijece.asp</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>



<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/ustrojstvo_grada/odbori_i_povjerenstva.asp">http://www.sibenik.hr/ustrojstvo_grada/odbori_i_povjerenstva.asp</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: 'Address book'
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/dok/poslovnik_gv.asp">http://www.sibenik.hr/dok/poslovnik_gv.asp</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/dok/statut.asp">http://www.sibenik.hr/dok/statut.asp</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: Poslovnik GVG Šibenika čl. 65
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: Poslovnik GVG Šibenika čl. 65 i 93
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: Poslovnik GVG Šibenika čl. 92
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: Poslovnik GVG Šibenika čl. 54

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Umag

<http://www.umag.hr>

Population: 12,900

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>34</sup></b>	<b>52 / rank 22</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>82 / rank 19</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>61 / rank 22</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 52 (rank 22).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the city authorities of Split submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the 2010 Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. The budget proposal documents lack, among other things, the functional classification of expenditures, and budget items are only presented up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts, so that no deeper insight is provided into all tax revenues and grants. Also missing are macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures, the descriptions and explanations of various kinds of revenues and expenditures and the information on the city's outstanding debt.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 82 (rank 19).** The official website offers the city's Statute, the City Council's Rules of Procedure, the contacts of the city's administrative bodies, City Council members and of the information officer, as well as the official gazette archives (for the period 2002-2010). The link '*proračun*' provides only some of the budget documents for 2010 and 2009, whereas the Half-Year Report for 2009 and the Year-End Report for 2008 can be found in the official gazette. Citizens are allowed to attend the City Council meeting, as the meeting agendas and materials are publicly available in a timely manner.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 61 (rank 22).** Budget transparency could be improved by presenting the budget items in the Enacted Budget up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, introducing the functional classification of expenditures into the budget proposal documents, as well as in Half-Year and Year-End Report. It would be good if all the important budget documents relating to the previous period of at least three years would be available at one link. Umag could have attained a better score had both members of the City Council responded to the Survey.

<sup>34</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Not known	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Umaga za razdoblje 2010. - 2012. godine; 23/12/09; EB1: <a href="http://www.grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5932&amp;pid=&amp;dir=2010">http://www.grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5932&amp;pid=&amp;dir=2010</a> EB2: <a href="http://www.grad-">http://www.grad-</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun Grada Umaga za razdoblje 2010. - 2012. godine; 23/12/09; <a href="http://www.grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5932&amp;pid=&amp;dir=2010">http://www.grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5932&amp;pid=&amp;dir=2010</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Umaga za 2010. godinu 23/12/09; <a href="http://www.grad-umag.hr/download.aspx?f=sluzbene_novine_grada_umaga_CRO&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbene_novine_Grada_Umaga_15_09.pdf">http://www.grad-umag.hr/download.aspx?f=sluzbene_novine_grada_umaga_CRO&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbene_novine_Grada_Umaga_15_09.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.grad-/">http://www.grad-/</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada umaga za 2009. godinu; 18/08/09; <a href="http://www.grad-umag.hr/download.aspx?f=sluzbene_novine_grada_umaga_CRO&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbene_novine_Grada_Umaga_09_09.pdf">http://www.grad-umag.hr/download.aspx?f=sluzbene_novine_grada_umaga_CRO&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbene_novine_Grada_Umaga_09_09.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna Grada Umaga za 2008. godinu; 31/03/09; <a href="http://www.grad-umag.hr/download.aspx?f=sluzbene_novine_grada_umaga_CRO&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbene_novine_Grada_Umaga_03_09.pdf">http://www.grad-umag.hr/download.aspx?f=sluzbene_novine_grada_umaga_CRO&amp;fajl=2009/Sluzbene_novine_Grada_Umaga_03_09.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 16/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Umag

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1/PR: p. 3-4
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: EB1/PR
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB1/PR: p. 5-60
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: EB1/PR: p. 2
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: EB1/PR: p. 2
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: EB1/PR: p. 2-3
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: EB1/PR: p. 4, 14, 15, 51 <u>Comment:</u> Information on principal repayment in BY is present
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: EB1/PR: p. 3, 14, 51
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: EB1/PR
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: EB1/PR

Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB1/PR</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: EB2: p. 217-267
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB1/PR</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB1/PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB1/PR</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: EB1/PR: p. 2-3
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: EB1/PR: p. 3-4
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB1/PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: EB1/PR: p. 5-60
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: HYR: p. 57-59
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: HYR: p. 55-56
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 56</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: HYR: p. 56-57
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-6</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: YR: p. 6-64
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: YR: p. 2
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: YR: p. 2
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: YR: p. 2-4
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: YR: p. 6, 34, 59
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>9 days</i> Citation: 'Survey'
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5929&amp;pid=3341&amp;dir=2009">http://www.grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5929&amp;pid=3341&amp;dir=2009</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: 'Questionnaire'
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: 'Survey'
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them has responded</i> Citation: 'Survey'
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>0 days</i> Citation: 'Address book'
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 email)</i> Citation: 'Address book'
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5777&amp;pid=3341">http://grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5777&amp;pid=3341</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5777&amp;pid=3341">http://grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5777&amp;pid=3341</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: No Citation: 'Address book'
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: No committee Citation: 'Address book'
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5931&amp;j=CRO">http://www.grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5931&amp;j=CRO</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5930&amp;j=CRO">http://www.grad-umag.hr/prva.aspx?stranica=5930&amp;j=CRO</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.grad-umag.hr/sjednice-vijeca.html">http://www.grad-umag.hr/sjednice-vijeca.html</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: Poslovnik GVG Umaga članak 90
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: Poslovnik GVG Umaga čl. 120
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: Poslovnik GVG Umaga čl. 118 i 119
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: Poslovnik GVG Umaga čl. 84 i 85

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Varaždin

<http://www.varazdin.hr>

Population: 49,400

<b>Main COLBI:</b> <sup>35</sup>	<b>57 / rank 18</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>93 / rank 3</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>68 / rank 15</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 57 (rank 18).** The Budget Proposal with Projections lacks, e.g. the functional classification of expenditures and macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures. The budget items are only presented up to level 3 of The Chart of Accounts, which prevents any closer insight into tax and non-tax revenues. As with most surveyed cities, there are no data on the city's total outstanding debt. A Citizens Budget, if published, would bring the local budgeting process closer to citizens.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 93 (rank 3).** Varaždin has an excellently designed official website, offering a lot of detailed information. The list of names and contacts of the City Council members is exhaustive and it contains the members' party membership and telephone numbers. The official gazette archives cover the period from 2000 to date, and the search is facilitated by a search engine. However, the website does not include the City Council's Rules of Procedure, neither are all budget documents available at the same link. All four respondents replied to the Survey (the information officer, head of the Finance Department and two members of the Finance Committee).

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 68 (rank 15).** Varaždin ranks solidly on the total list, mainly due to its excellent score on the openness to the public. However, there are still some possibilities for transparency improvement, primarily through providing more exhaustive information in the budget documents (e.g. more detailed explanations of certain kinds of revenues and expenditures), producing a Citizens Budget and making all the budget documents available at a special website link, as is the case, for example, in Karlovac<sup>36</sup>.

<sup>35</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>36</sup> Available at [www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51](http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51).

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Not known	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Varaždina za razdoblje 2010. - 2012. godine; 21/12/09; <a href="http://www.glasila.hr/Glasila/SVGV/SVGV1009.pdf">http://www.glasila.hr/Glasila/SVGV/SVGV1009.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun Grada Varaždina za razdoblje 2010. - 2012. godine; 21/12/09; <a href="http://www.glasila.hr/Glasila/SVGV/SVGV1009.pdf">http://www.glasila.hr/Glasila/SVGV/SVGV1009.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Varaždina za 2010. godinu 21/12/09; <a href="http://www.glasila.hr/Glasila/SVGV/SVGV1009.pdf">http://www.glasila.hr/Glasila/SVGV/SVGV1009.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji obračun proračuna Grada Varaždina za razdoblje 01.01. - 30.06.2009. godine; 30/09/09; <a href="http://www.glasila.hr/Glasila/SVGV/SVGV609.pdf">http://www.glasila.hr/Glasila/SVGV/SVGV609.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Varaždina za 2008. godinu; 01/07/09; <a href="http://www.glasila.hr/Glasila/SVGV/SVGV409.pdf">http://www.glasila.hr/Glasila/SVGV/SVGV409.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 16/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Varaždin

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3-4</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5-38</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 2</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 4, 14, 18, 24, 28, 154</i> <i>Comment: Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3, 14, 17, 24, 27</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>



Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 43-150</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 2-3</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3-4</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5-38</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 4-7</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 38-39</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 3</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 4</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 3-4</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-7</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 48-49</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 9-47</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2-3</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2-4</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 8, 24, 31, 38, 44</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>13 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.glasila.hr/svgv.htm">http://www.glasila.hr/svgv.htm</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>0 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>All three of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>No request needed</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>No request needed</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.varazdin.hr/ustroj/vijece/index.html">http://www.varazdin.hr/ustroj/vijece/index.html</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.varazdin.hr/ustroj/vijece/index.html">http://www.varazdin.hr/ustroj/vijece/index.html</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.varazdin.hr/ustroj/qv_radna_tijela.html#3">http://www.varazdin.hr/ustroj/qv_radna_tijela.html#3</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.varazdin.hr/ustroj/qv_radna_tijela.html#3">http://www.varazdin.hr/ustroj/qv_radna_tijela.html#3</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: No Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.varazdin.hr/dokumenti/index.html">http://www.varazdin.hr/dokumenti/index.html</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.varazdin.hr/vijesti/2009/20090629_qv.html">http://www.varazdin.hr/vijesti/2009/20090629_qv.html</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik VG Varaždina čl.81</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Varaždina čl.104 i 105</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Varaždina čl.103</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Varaždina čl.22</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Velika Gorica

<http://www.gorica.hr>

Population: 63,500

<b>Main COLBI:</b> <sup>37</sup>	<b>60 / rank 16</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>84 / rank 16</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>67 / rank 17</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 60 (rank 16).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE of Velika Gorica submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the 2010 Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. The budget proposal documents include the functional classification of expenditures. However, there are some deficiencies, e.g. there are no macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures, or the explanations of the planned amounts of revenues and expenditures. Moreover, the budget items are only presented up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts, which prevents any closer insight into tax and non-tax revenues and grants.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 84 (rank 16).** The official website provides access to the official gazette archives (for the period 2006-2010), the city's Statute, the City Council's Rules of Procedure and a list of the City Council members, excluding their party membership. The link '*proračun*' provides access to only some of the budget documents. One City Council member (member of the Committee for Budget Issues) failed to respond to the Survey.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 67 (rank 17).** Possibilities for further improvement of budget transparency include the provision of more detailed information in the documents, e.g. by introducing the functional classification of expenditures and presenting the budget items in the budget proposal documents up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, which would permit a more detailed insight into tax and non-tax revenues and grants. It would be good if all the budget documents were available on the website, or if a link were provided to the official gazette site, where the required Half-Year and Year-End Reports could be found.

<sup>37</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes*	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Velike Gorice za 2010. godinu (Službeni glasnik Grada Velike Gorice, str.1226-1229);30/12/09; <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/dokumenti/proracun-2010.zip">http://www.gorica.hr/dokumenti/proracun-2010.zip</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun Grada Velike Gorice za 2010. godinu, s projekcijom za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 30/12/09; <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/dokumenti/proracun-2010.zip">http://www.gorica.hr/dokumenti/proracun-2010.zip</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Velike Gorice za 2010. godinu, s projekcijom za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 30/12/09; <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/upravni-odjel-za-financije/">http://www.gorica.hr/upravni-odjel-za-financije/</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Velike Gorice za 2009. godinu; 29/09/09; <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/dokumenti/sluzbeni-glasnik/SGGVG-2009-12.pdf">http://www.gorica.hr/dokumenti/sluzbeni-glasnik/SGGVG-2009-12.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna Grada Velike Gorice za 2008. godinu; 28/07/09; <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/dokumenti/sluzbeni-glasnik/SGGVG-2009-10.pdf">http://www.gorica.hr/dokumenti/sluzbeni-glasnik/SGGVG-2009-10.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 16/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Velika Gorica

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: OPĆI DIO sa projekcijama za 2011. i 2012. godinu</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Plan Proračuna za 2010. godinu po funkcionalnoj klasifikaciji</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: PRORAČUN ZA 2010. GODINU, Posebni dio</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: OPĆI DIO sa projekcijama za 2011. i 2012. godinu</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: OPĆI DIO sa projekcijama za 2011. i 2012. godinu</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: OPĆI DIO sa projekcijama za 2011. i 2012. godinu</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: OPĆI DIO sa projekcijama za 2011. i 2012. godinu; Posebni dio</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: OPĆI DIO sa projekcijama za 2011. i 2012. godinu; Posebni dio p. 23</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>

Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: OPĆI DIO sa projekcijama za 2011. i 2012. godinu</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: OPĆI DIO sa projekcijama za 2011. i 2012. godinu</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: Posebni dio Proračuna za 2010. sa projekcijom za 2011. i 2012.</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 6-8</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 4</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 5</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 5-6</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 16-18</i>

Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 55-57</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 21-54</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 14.</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 14-15</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 15-16</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 18, 31, 57</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/sluzbeni-glasnik-grad-a-velike-gorice/">http://www.gorica.hr/sluzbeni-glasnik-grad-a-velike-gorice/</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Two of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 email)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/gradsko-vijece/">http://www.gorica.hr/gradsko-vijece/</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/gradsko-vijece/">http://www.gorica.hr/gradsko-vijece/</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/gradsko-vijece/">http://www.gorica.hr/gradsko-vijece/</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/dokumenti/sluzbeni-glasnik/SGGVG-2007-04.pdf">http://www.gorica.hr/dokumenti/sluzbeni-glasnik/SGGVG-2007-04.pdf</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/statut-grada-velike-gorice/">http://www.gorica.hr/statut-grada-velike-gorice/</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.gorica.hr/2010/04/obavijest-o-odrzavanju-8-sjednice-gradskog-vijeca-grada-velike-gorice/">http://www.gorica.hr/2010/04/obavijest-o-odrzavanju-8-sjednice-gradskog-vijeca-grada-velike-gorice/</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GV grada Velika Gorica čl. 125</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GV grada Velika Gorica čl. 166</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GV grada Velika Gorica čl. 168</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GV grada Velika Gorica čl. 138</i>



The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Vinkovci

<http://www.vinkovci.hr>

Population: 35,900

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>38</sup></b>	<b>51 / rank 24</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>47 / rank 33</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>50 / rank 30</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 51 (rank 24).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE of Vinkovci submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the 2010 Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. The budget proposal documents lack, among other things, macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures and the explanations of planned amounts of revenues and expenditures.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 47 (rank 33).** Vinkovci ranks last in openness to the public. The official website only gives access to the city's Statute and the City Council's Rules of Procedure. The official gazette, a list of City Council members and the observed budget documents are not available online. Both City Council members (members of the Committee on Budget Issues), head of the Finance Department and the information officer failed to respond to the Survey.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 50 (rank 30).** There are many ways to improve budget transparency. First of all, the official website should be upgraded in line with the standards applied in other cities, e.g. Crikvenica, Karlovac, Labin and Rovinj, so that it provides access to the budget documents, official gazette archives, a list of the City Council members and the agendas of the City Council meetings. The budget items should be presented up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, and the explanations of the planned amounts of revenues and expenditures should be included in the document.

<sup>38</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Not known	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Vinkovaca za 2010. godinu; 17/12/09; Link not available
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun Grada Vinkovaca za 2010. godinu; 17/12/09; Link not available
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o proračunu grada Vinkovaca za 2010. godinu; Date not available; Link not available
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Pregled izvršenja proračuna za razdoblje 1.1.2009 do 30.6.2009 godine; Date not available; Link not available
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Vinkovaca za 2008. godinu; 30/06/09; Link not available
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 07/04/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Vinkovci

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3-4</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 68-69</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 13-67</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3, 6-7</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3, 8</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 3, 8-11</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5, 16, 56, 74</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 4, 56, 59</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various expenditures for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 74-83</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 75-83</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 73</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 74</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 75-83</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p.425-427</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p.424-425</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p.424</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p.424-425</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-6, 15-19</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>

Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 21-79</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3, 9-11</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3, 11</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3-4, 11-14</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 8, 19, 34, 69</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>None of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 e-mail)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: ' <i>Address book</i> '
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: ' <i>Address book</i> '
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.vinkovci.hr/upload/PoslovnikGradVinkovci.pdf">http://www.vinkovci.hr/upload/PoslovnikGradVinkovci.pdf</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.vinkovci.hr/upload/StatutGradVinkovci.pdf">http://www.vinkovci.hr/upload/StatutGradVinkovci.pdf</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: ' <i>Questionnaire</i> '
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Vinkovci čl. 40</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Vinkovci</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Vinkovci čl. 62</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Vinkovci čl. 14</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Virovitica

<http://www.virovitica.hr>

Population: 22,600

<b>Main COLBI:</b> <sup>39</sup>	<b>58 / rank 17</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>93 / rank 3</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>68 / rank 14</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 58 (rank 17).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE of Virovitica submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the 2010 Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. Virovitica belongs to a group of 11 cities whose budget proposal documents contain the functional classification of expenditures. However, macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures and the explanations of the planned amounts of revenues and expenditures are missing, and the budget items are only presented up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts, which prevents any closer insight into tax and non-tax revenues and grants.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 93 (rank 3).** The official website gives access to the City Council's Rules of Procedure, city's Statute, contacts of the city's administrative bodies and City Council members, and the contact of the information officer. The official gazette archives cover the period from 2006 to 2010, and it would be helpful if the search were made easier by means of a search engine (used e.g. in Dubrovnik<sup>40</sup>). Citizens are allowed to attend the City Council meetings, and the meeting agendas are posted on the website prior to meetings. Both City Council members (members of the Committee on Budget Issues) and head of the Finance Department failed to respond to the Survey. The only response came from the information officer.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 68 (rank 14).** Possibilities for further budget transparency improvement include, e.g. a more detailed presentation of tax and non-tax revenues and grants (up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts) in the Enacted Budget, and the inclusion of macroeconomic forecasts underlying the proposal in the document. It would also be good if all the budget documents were available at the same website link, as, for example, in Karlovac<sup>41</sup>.

<sup>39</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>40</sup> Available at [http://www.dubrovnik.hr/arhiv\\_novosti.php](http://www.dubrovnik.hr/arhiv_novosti.php).

<sup>41</sup> Available at [www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51](http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51).

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Not known	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun grada Virovitice za 2010. godinu; 22/12/09; <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/preuzimanje/proracun2010.pdf">http://www.virovitica.hr/preuzimanje/proracun2010.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna 2011.-2012. godina; 22/12/09; <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/media/upload/attachments/sluzbenigrad19.pdf">http://www.virovitica.hr/media/upload/attachments/sluzbenigrad19.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Virovitice za 2010. godinu; 22/12/09; <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/media/upload/attachments/sluzbenigrad19.pdf">http://www.virovitica.hr/media/upload/attachments/sluzbenigrad19.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Virovitice za 2009. godinu; 18/09/09; <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/media/upload/attachments/Sluzbenivjesnik14.pdf">http://www.virovitica.hr/media/upload/attachments/Sluzbenivjesnik14.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju Proračuna Grada Virovitice za 2008.g.; 30/06/09; <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/media/upload/attachments/Sluzbenivjesnik10.pdf">http://www.virovitica.hr/media/upload/attachments/Sluzbenivjesnik10.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 31/03/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Virovitica

<b>Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY</b>	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2-3</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 19-21</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3-18</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2-3</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 3, 18</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 2, 18, 19</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>

Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 86-112</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 88</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 88</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 88</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 88</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 4-7</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 36-43</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2-5</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5-8</i>
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 35-36</i>



Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 9-34</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 4-5</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3, 8, 34</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>7 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/kategorije/vijesnik">http://www.virovitica.hr/kategorije/vijesnik</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>0 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No one of them has responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>0 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 call)</i> Citation: <i>Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/gradskovijece/vijecnici">http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/gradskovijece/vijecnici</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/gradskovijece/vijecnici">http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/gradskovijece/vijecnici</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/gradskovijece/radnatijela">http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/gradskovijece/radnatijela</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/gradskovijece/radnatijela">http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/gradskovijece/radnatijela</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/znacajnidokumenti">http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/znacajnidokumenti</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/znacajnidokumenti">http://www.virovitica.hr/uprava/znacajnidokumenti</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/vijesti/8388">http://www.virovitica.hr/vijesti/8388</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik grada Virovitice čl. 102</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik grada Virovitice čl. 103 i čl. 134</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik grada Virovitice čl. 132 i 133</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik grada Virovitice čl. 95-99</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Vrbovec

<http://www.vrbovec.hr>

Population: 14,700

<b>Main COLBI<sup>42</sup>:</b>	<b>48 / rank 28</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>76 / rank 28</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>56 / rank 27</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 48 (rank 28).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE of Vrbovec submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. This document lacks the functional classification of expenditures and, as the budget items are only presented up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts, it is not possible to see all tax and non-tax revenues and grants. Also missing are macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures, as well as the explanations of the planned amounts of revenues and expenditures.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 76 (rank 28).** The official website gives access to the contacts of the city's administrative bodies and City Council members. However, the city's Statute, and City Council's Rules of Procedure are not available. The budget documents can only be found in the Zagreb County Gazette. Both City Council members (members of the Committee on Budget Issues) failed to respond to the Survey, while the responses came from head of the Finance Department and the information officer.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 56 (rank 27).** Overall budget transparency can be improved, e.g. by presenting the budget items up to level 4 of the Chart of Accounts, and by providing the functional classification of expenditures. The openness to the public could be increased by categorising all the budget documents and making them available at one link, as, for example, in Karlovac<sup>43</sup>. Like in most of the cities, the City Council's Rules of Procedure and city's Statute should also be available on the website.

<sup>42</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>43</sup> Available at [www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51](http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51).

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Not known	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Vrbovca za 2010. i projekcije za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 11/02/10; <a href="http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2010/Glasnik03_2010.pdf">http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2010/Glasnik03_2010.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun Grada Vrbovca za 2010. i projekcije za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 11/02/10; <a href="http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2010/Glasnik03_2010.pdf">http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2010/Glasnik03_2010.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Vrbovca za 2010. godinu; 25/02/10; <a href="http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2010/Glasnik05_2010.pdf">http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2010/Glasnik05_2010.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnje Izvešće o izvršenju Proračuna Grada Vrbovec za razdoblje od 01. siječnja 2009. do 30. lipnja 2009. godine; 01/02/10; <a href="http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2010/Glasnik02_2010.pdf">http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2010/Glasnik02_2010.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Izvršenje Proračuna 01. siječnja - 31. prosinca 2008. godine; 21/07/09; <a href="http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2009/Glasnik18_2009.pdf">http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2009/Glasnik18_2009.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

\*\*Internet link checked 16/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Vrbovec

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 6-7</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 8-28</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 6</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 6</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 6</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 5, 8, 11</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 7, 11</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>

Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 6</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 6-7</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB: p. 8-28</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 9-11</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 8</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 8</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 8-9</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 13-15</i>

Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 15-38</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 12, 15</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 12-13</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 13</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 12, 20</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>46 days</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/glasnik">http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/glasnik</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>44 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them has responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 e-mail)</i> Citation: <i>Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.vrbovec.hr/podstranica.aspx?id=71">http://www.vrbovec.hr/podstranica.aspx?id=71</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.vrbovec.hr/podstranica.aspx?id=71">http://www.vrbovec.hr/podstranica.aspx?id=71</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2009/Glasnik18_2009.pdf">http://www.zagrebacka-zupanija.hr/static/files/misc/glasnik/2009/Glasnik18_2009.pdf</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: 'Address book'
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: 'Questionnaire'
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Questionnaire</i>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://vrbovec.hr/podstranica.aspx?id=71">http://vrbovec.hr/podstranica.aspx?id=71</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Vrbovca čl. 84</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Vrbovca čl. 84</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Vrbovca čl. 133</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Vrbovca čl. 105</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Zadar

<http://www.zadar.hr>

Population: 72,700

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>44</sup></b>	<b>64 / rank 10</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>51 / rank 32</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>60 / rank 24</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 64 (rank 10).** The Budget Proposal with Projections is not available on the website. Zadar is among 11 cities whose budget proposal documents contain the functional classification of expenditures, and is one of eight cities producing a Citizens Budget. Notwithstanding the relatively good score in this category, there are some deficiencies. For example, certain items in the Budget Proposal with Projections, namely grants and tax revenues, are only presented up to level 3 of the Chart of Accounts, thus providing insufficiently detailed information. Besides, there are no macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget figures.

**\*A Local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI – = 51 (rank 32).** The official website provides access to a list of the City Council members, the city's Statute and the official gazette archives for the period from 2004 to date. It would be helpful if the archives could be searched by means of a search engine, used e.g. in Dubrovnik<sup>45</sup>. Some of the budget documents for 2009 and 2010 are available at the link '*proračun grada*', whereas the observed Half-Year and Year-End Reports can be found in the official gazette. The website does not contain the City Council's Rules of Procedure. The information officer and one City Council member failed to respond to the Survey.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 60 (rank 24).** The score attained on 'openness to the public' resulted in a relatively low position on the Total COLBI list. The City Council's Rules of Procedure were not available on the website, nor have the LEXE submitted them to us, as promised, so that we were unable to respond to some questions from the Survey. It would be good if all the budget documents were available at one website link, as, for example, in Karlovac<sup>46</sup>. Another possibility to improve budget transparency would be a more detailed presentation of tax and non-tax revenues, and grants in the Enacted Budget, and the inclusion of macroeconomic forecasts underlying the budget into the document.

<sup>44</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>45</sup> Available at [http://www.dubrovnik.hr/arhiv\\_novosti.php](http://www.dubrovnik.hr/arhiv_novosti.php).

<sup>46</sup> Available at [www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51](http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51).



Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes*	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Zadra za 2010. godinu i projekcije za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 17/12/2009; <a href="http://www.grad-zadar.hr/doc/proracun_2010.pdf">http://www.grad-zadar.hr/doc/proracun_2010.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun Grada Zadra za 2010. godinu i projekcije za 2011. i 2012. godinu; 17/12/09; <a href="http://www.grad-zadar.hr/doc/proracun_2010.pdf">http://www.grad-zadar.hr/doc/proracun_2010.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju Proračuna Grada Zadra za 2010. godinu; 17/12/09 <a href="http://www.grad-zadar.hr/img/files/Glasnik_17_1261554802.pdf">http://www.grad-zadar.hr/img/files/Glasnik_17_1261554802.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Zadra za 2009. godinu; 17/08/09 <a href="http://www.grad-zadar.hr/img/files/GLASNIK_11_1251976878.pdf">http://www.grad-zadar.hr/img/files/GLASNIK_11_1251976878.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju godišnjeg proračuna Grada Zadra za 2008. godinu; 07/07/09 <a href="http://www.grad-zadar.hr/img/files/Glasnik_Grada_Zadra_9_1247729378.pdf">http://www.grad-zadar.hr/img/files/Glasnik_Grada_Zadra_9_1247729378.pdf</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Yes	Proračun grada Zadra u 2010. godini; Date not available; <a href="http://www.ezadar.hr/clanak/proracun-grada-zadra-u-2010-godini">http://www.ezadar.hr/clanak/proracun-grada-zadra-u-2010-godini</a>

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 14/06/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Zadar

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 59-60</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 95-101</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 6-40</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 57</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 57</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 57</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR; DEB/PR</i> <u>Comment:</u> <i>Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 4, 6</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EBiPR</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>

Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 1-55</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 59-60</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 61-94</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 80</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 81</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 82-94</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>CB 2010</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 49-51</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 78-82</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 45</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 45</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 46-48</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 35-46</i>

Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 72-77</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 47-70</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 28-29</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 29 - 30</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 29-34</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.grad-zadar.hr/glasnik/">http://www.grad-zadar.hr/glasnik/</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Two of them have responded</i> Citation: <i>Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>0 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1 call)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.grad-zadar.hr/gradsko-vijece/">http://www.grad-zadar.hr/gradsko-vijece/</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.grad-zadar.hr/vijesti/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca">http://www.grad-zadar.hr/vijesti/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.grad-zadar.hr/vijesti/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca">http://www.grad-zadar.hr/vijesti/radna-tijela-gradskog-vijeca</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: No Citation: 'Address book'
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.grad-zadar.hr/vazni-dokumenti/statut/">http://www.grad-zadar.hr/vazni-dokumenti/statut/</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: No Citation: 'Questionnaire'
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Not known Citation: 'Questionnaire'
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Not known Citation: Not available
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: Statut cl. 97
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Not known Citation: Not available

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Zagreb

<http://www.zagreb.hr>

Population: 779,000

<b>Main COLBI:</b> <sup>47</sup>	<b>score 69 / rank 5</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>score 89 / rank 11</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>score 75 / rank 3</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information - Main COLBI = 69 (rank 5).** As the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections has not been made available on the website, nor have the LEXE of Zagreb submitted it to us, we have based our responses to the questions relating to the Budget Proposal with Projections on the Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections. Notwithstanding the very good score attained in this category, some deficiencies have been identified in the budget documents. Namely, the Half-Year and Year-End Reports do not contain the functional classification of expenditures, and the budget proposal documents lack the information on the city's total outstanding debt.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 89 (rank 11).** The official website provides access to the city's Statute, the City Council's Rules of Procedure and the official gazette archives (for the period 2001-2010), including the meeting agendas and materials that are publicly available in a timely manner. It would be good if all the budget documents were available at a special website link, as, for example in Karlovac<sup>48</sup>. No responses to the Survey have been received from the members of the Committee on Budget Issues or the information officer.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI =75 (rank 3, shared with Opatija).** Possibilities for further improvement in budget transparency include, e.g., the inclusion of the financial classification of expenditures in the Half-Year and Year-End Reports, presentation of the city's total outstanding debt in the Budget Proposal with Projections and an upgrade in the official website by making the budget documents available under one category. Zagreb could have attained a better score had the members of the representative authorities and the information officer responded to the Survey.

<sup>47</sup>A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

<sup>48</sup> Available at [www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51](http://www.karlovac.hr/page.aspx?ID=51).

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes	Prijedlog proračuna: Proračun Grada Zagreba za 2010.; October 2009; <a href="http://www1.zagreb.hr/sjednice_skupstine_web.nsf">http://www1.zagreb.hr/sjednice_skupstine_web.nsf</a>
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Zagreba za 2010.; 22/12/09; <a href="http://www1.zagreb.hr/slglasnik.nsf/52e5cbe929e7b66fc125696500452b27/8e9493dc81dc3951c125769c003344e5/\$FILE/010%20Proračun%20Grada%20Zagreba%20za%202010.pdf">http://www1.zagreb.hr/slglasnik.nsf/52e5cbe929e7b66fc125696500452b27/8e9493dc81dc3951c125769c003344e5/\$FILE/010%20Proračun%20Grada%20Zagreba%20za%202010.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Projekcija proračuna Grada Zagreba za 2010. – 2012. (Prijedlog); October 2009; <a href="http://www1.zagreb.hr/sjednice_skupstine_web.nsf/PW?">http://www1.zagreb.hr/sjednice_skupstine_web.nsf/PW?</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju proračuna Grada Zagreba za 2010.; Date not available; <a href="http://www1.zagreb.hr/sjednice_skupstine_web.nsf/PW?">http://www1.zagreb.hr/sjednice_skupstine_web.nsf/PW?</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada Zagreba za 2009. za razdoblje siječanj - lipanj 2009.; 24/09/09 <a href="http://www1.zagreb.hr/slglasnik.nsf/52e5cbe929e7b66fc125696500452b27/1db3347b2ce08013c125764100335e18">http://www1.zagreb.hr/slglasnik.nsf/52e5cbe929e7b66fc125696500452b27/1db3347b2ce08013c125764100335e18</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji obračun proračuna Grada Zagreba za 2008.; 31/03/09; <a href="http://www1.zagreb.hr/SlGlasnik.nsf/52e5cbe929e7b66fc125696500452b27/f730d152fde54383c125759100486afc">http://www1.zagreb.hr/SlGlasnik.nsf/52e5cbe929e7b66fc125696500452b27/f730d152fde54383c125759100486afc</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	Not known	Not available

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 28/04/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Zagreb

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 18-22</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 13</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 27-123</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 15</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 15</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 15-17</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 12, 23-24, 48</i> <i>Comment: Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 11, 19, 48, 70, 85</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 4-5</i>
Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 11-13</i>

Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 6-10</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 86-112; BP: p. 27, 31, 33-34, 38-39, 44, 46, 49, 52.-54, 63-66, 72, 76-77, 82-83, 86, 89, 91-92, 95, 99, 102-104, 112-119</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 18-22</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>BP: p. 27-123</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 4</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 5</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>PR: p. 7-47</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 4-6</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>HYR</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 2-3</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5-7</i>

Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>YR</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 11-51</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3-4</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 1, 8, 44</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www1.zagreb.hr/sjednice_skupstine_web.nsf">http://www1.zagreb.hr/sjednice_skupstine_web.nsf</a>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>BP</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www1.zagreb.hr/slglasnik.nsf">http://www1.zagreb.hr/slglasnik.nsf</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>6 days</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them has responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>No request needed</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>No request needed</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=40">http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=40</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=40">http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=40</a>



<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=121">http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=121</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=1184">http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=1184</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=130">http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=130</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=110">http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=110</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www1.zagreb.hr/sjednice_skupstine_web.nsf">http://www1.zagreb.hr/sjednice_skupstine_web.nsf</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Zagreba čl. 135 i čl. 136</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Zagreba čl. 136 i 180</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Zagreba čl. 179</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik GVG Zagreba čl. 147</i>

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb in collaboration with the CBPP-IBP, Washington has assessed budget transparency in 33 Croatian cities. More information on this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr>. This report contains the results for

## Zaprešić

<http://www.zapresic.hr>

Population: 23,100

<b>Main COLBI:<sup>49</sup></b>	<b>score 70 / rank 4</b>
<b>Additional COLBI:</b>	<b>score 82 / rank 19</b>
<b>Total COLBI:</b>	<b>score 74 / rank 5</b>

**\*Availability of local budget information – Main COLBI = 70 (rank 4).** As the Budget Proposal with Projections is not available on the website, we used the Enacted Budget and Enacted Projections instead. Zaprešić provides fairly detailed information in its budget documents, e.g. the functional classification of expenditures is included in the Enacted Budget. The deficiencies include a failure to produce a Citizens Budget and the fact that the budget proposal documents lack the descriptions of various kinds of revenues and expenditures for the current year and the underlying macroeconomic indicators.

**\*A local unit's openness to the public – Additional COLBI = 82 (rank 19).** The official website is good. It contains the city's Statute, the official gazette archives (for the period 2007-2010) and other useful information. However, all the budget documents are not very easy to find, as they are not available at the same link. Some documents are published in official gazettes, namely the Half-Year Report for 2009. The City Council's Rules of Procedure cannot be downloaded, as the link is inactive. No responses to the Survey have been received from the information officer and one City Council member.

**\*Total budget transparency – Total COLBI = 74 (rank 5).** The bulk of Zaprešić's total score derives from the Main COLBI. Consequently, more effort should be put in improving the quality of the published budget information. The official website should be maintained more regularly (the link to the City Council's Rules of Procedure has not been activated, despite our e-mail message sent to the City Office). Moreover, the budget proposal documents might, for example, include the descriptions of various kinds of revenues and expenditures for the current year, as well as macroeconomic indicators underlying the proposal, which would additionally increase budget transparency.

<sup>49</sup> A maximum value of each COLBI is 100.

Table 1. Document availability

Type of Document	Document produced?	Title of the document; Date of issue; Internet link**
Budget Proposal with Projections (BP)	Yes*	Not available
Enacted Budget (EB)	Yes	Proračun Grada Zaprešića za 2010. godinu s projekcijama do 2012. godine; 29/12/09; <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2010/sluzbene_novine_Grada_Zapresica_br10.pdf">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2010/sluzbene_novine_Grada_Zapresica_br10.pdf</a>
Enacted Projections (PR)	Yes	Proračun Grada Zaprešića za 2010. godinu s projekcijama do 2012. godine; 29/12/09; <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2010/sluzbene_novine_Grada_Zapresica_br10.pdf">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2010/sluzbene_novine_Grada_Zapresica_br10.pdf</a>
Decision on Budget Execution (DEB)	Yes	Odluka o izvršavanju proračuna grada Zaprešića za 2010. godinu; 29/12/09; <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2010/sluzbene_novine_Grada_Zapresica_br10.pdf">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2010/sluzbene_novine_Grada_Zapresica_br10.pdf</a>
Half-Year Report (HYR)	Yes	Polugodišnji izvještaj o izvršenju Proračuna Grada Zaprešića od 1.1. 2009. do 30.6.2009. godine; 28/07/09; <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2010/Sluzbene_novine_Grada_Zapresica_br8_indd.pdf">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2010/Sluzbene_novine_Grada_Zapresica_br8_indd.pdf</a>
Year-End Report (YR)	Yes	Godišnji izvještaj o izvršenju proračuna Grada zaprešića za 2008. godinu; 02/04/09; <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2009/Godisnji%20obracun%20proracuna%">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2009/Godisnji%20obracun%20proracuna%</a>
Citizens Budget (CB)	No	Not available

\*BY=2010

Yes\* - According to LEXE, the document exists but could not be obtained

\*\*Internet link checked 28/04/2010

Table A2. Questions and responses for the City of Zaprešić

Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY	
Q1.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 11-24</i>
Q2.	Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 145</i>
Q3.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 25-144</i>
Q4.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5-6</i>
Q5.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 6</i>
Q6.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 6-10</i>
Q7.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 4, 24, 38, 152</i> <i>Comment: Information on principal repayment in BY is present</i>
Q8.	Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of <i>interest</i> on debt for the BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 16, 37-38</i>
Q9.	Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>

Q10.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>expenditures</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q11.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various <i>revenues</i> for the BY? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q12.	Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of <i>individual programs</i> and the underlying expenditures? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 156-192</i>
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>	
Q13.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 11-24</i>
Q14.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q15.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 25-144</i>
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1 / BY+2</b>	
Q16.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>tax and non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 5-10</i>
Q17.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>economic classification</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 11-24</i>
Q18.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR</i>
Q19.	Do the budget proposal documents present <i>expenditures</i> for BY+1 and BY+2 for <i>individual programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>EB/PR: p. 25-144</i>
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>	
Q20.	Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)? Response: <i>None</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report</b>	
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 6-9</i>
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-1, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 81</i>
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 4</i>
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>grants</i> for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 4</i>
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-1? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>HYR: p. 4-5</i>
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report</b>	
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>economic</i> classification? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 5-7</i>

Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2, classified by <i>functional</i> classification? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 139</i>
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>expenditures</i> for BY-2 for individual <i>programs</i> ? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 8.-138</i>
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY-2? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3.</i>
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>grants</i> for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3,4</i>
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present <i>non-tax revenues</i> from different sources for BY? Response: <i>All</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 3-4</i>
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on <i>outstanding debt</i> ? Response: <i>Some</i> Citation: <i>YR: p. 2, 7, 25</i>
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>Not available</i>
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment? Response: <i>Not known</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article_main&amp;cat_id=27&amp;id=74">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article_main&amp;cat_id=27&amp;id=74</a>
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette? Response: <i>1 day</i> Citation: <i>'Questionnaire'</i>
<b>Questions 38 to 41: Cooperation with local officials and representatives</b>	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey? Response: <i>No</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? Response: <i>Only one of them has responded</i> Citation: <i>'Survey'</i>
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response? Response: <i>3 days</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or e-mail messages have been needed to obtain the data? Response: <i>1 (1email)</i> Citation: <i>'Address book'</i>
<b>Questions 42 to 43: Information about local representatives</b>	
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website ? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article&amp;cat_id=2&amp;id=10">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article&amp;cat_id=2&amp;id=10</a>
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on the city's official website? Response: <i>Yes</i> Citation: <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article&amp;cat_id=2&amp;id=10">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article&amp;cat_id=2&amp;id=10</a>

<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>	
Q44.	Does the local Committee on Budget Issues (as a part of the local City Council) exist? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article&amp;cat_id=19&amp;id=958">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article&amp;cat_id=19&amp;id=958</a>
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article&amp;cat_id=19&amp;id=958">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article&amp;cat_id=19&amp;id=958</a>
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>	
Q46.	Are the City Council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official website? Response: No Citation: <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/zapresic.hr/admin/fckeditor/File/download/poslovnik_g_vijeca.tf">http://www.zapresic.hr/zapresic.hr/admin/fckeditor/File/download/poslovnik_g_vijeca.tf</a>
Q47.	Is the Statute of the city available on the city's official website? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2009/STATUT%202009%5B1%5D_.doc">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/admin/fckeditor/File/download/2009/STATUT%202009%5B1%5D_.doc</a>
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>	
Q48.	Are the agendas of the City Council meetings made available on the city's official website prior to the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article_news&amp;cat_id=34&amp;id=1095">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php?page=article_news&amp;cat_id=34&amp;id=1095</a>
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik grada Zaprešića čl. 71</i>
Q50.	Do the City Council's Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than the City Council representatives? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik grada Zaprešića čl. 95</i>
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik grada Zaprešića čl. 94</i>
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council's Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city? Response: Yes Citation: <i>Poslovnik grada Zaprešića čl. 79</i>

## Annex D1.

---

### **The analysis of the Survey responses by local executive bodies**

According to the Local and Regional Self-Government Act, the executive body of a city is represented by the mayor who is assisted in his/her work by administrative departments and services (administrative bodies). In this research LEXE means mayor and administrative bodies. The administrative bodies' organization is governed by a general bylaw of the city and it depends on the size and economic power of the city (Local and Regional Self-Government Act, OG 33/01). The administrative bodies are managed by heads appointed by the mayor on the basis of public vacancy announcements. One of the city administrative bodies is the Finance Department (FD). The persons surveyed were principals/heads of the FD in each of the 33 cities.

The aim of this survey was to assess, from the LEXE's point of view, the transparency of local budgets and budgeting processes, as well as the interaction of LEXE with LREP (in our research City Council) and the public. Responses were requested to the following questions:

- Is the local budgeting process transparent? Examined is the document exchange between the LEXE and LREP and state authorities (Ministry of Finance). Are the responsibilities clearly assigned?
- What are the formal and informal possibilities and limitations for LEXE, media and citizens to make the desirable changes in the local budget's items?
- What can actually be done to improve the transparency of the local budgeting process and local budgets?

The questions were formulated on the basis of the most relevant laws governing local budgets and budgeting processes, and of similar surveys previously conducted in Croatia, namely Maletić (2006), Bratić (2008) and GONG (2009). The Survey comprised 21 questions (see the Survey at the end of this Annex).

The Survey was sent to the FD principals/heads on 22 May 2010, and the deadline for submission was 7 June 2010. The Survey was anonymous; enclosed with the Survey was a postage-paid envelope, together with the telephone and fax numbers and an e-mail address for further inquiries. The last response arrived on 10 July 2010.

The Survey response rate as at the specified deadline (7 June) was relatively low - 36%. Thus telephone contacts were made to the FD principals or heads, in order to find out the status of responding to the Survey, and to reiterate the request for co-operation. Where no telephone contact could be established, e-mail messages were sent, requesting that the Survey could be completed despite the expiry of the deadline.

Telephone calls to the respondents revealed various reasons for not responding to the Survey. In most cases, this was due to time pressure caused by a heavy workload. Another problem was that FD heads have been generally burdened with numerous questionnaires of all kinds. For the purposes of this Survey, for example, the FD heads in a great number of cities were supposed to complete two Surveys – this one that was sent to them directly and the other addressed to LINFO, but usually forwarded to the principals/heads of FD. This definitely accounts for a poor response from the principals/heads of FD, and has often been the cause of misunderstanding. More specifically, sometimes they completed only one of our Surveys, because they believed this Survey to be the same as the one forwarded to them by the LINFO. In the end, until 10 July 2010 inclusive, responses were received from 60% of the surveyed cities. The Survey results and question analysis are given below.

*Question 1. In what city are you a member of the local executive body?*

Table 1

No.	CITIES		
	Responses received within the deadline	Delayed responses	No responses
1	Bjelovar	Gospić	Krapina
2	Crikvenica	Požega	Makarska
3	Čakovec	Slavonski Brod	Opatija
4	Dubrovnik	Split	Osijek
5	Karlovac	Velika Gorica	Pazin
6	Koprivnica	Vrbovec	Poreč
7	Kutina	Zadar	Pula
8	Labin	Zagreb	Samobor
9	Rijeka		Sisak
10	Rovinj		Šibenik
11	Umag		Vinkovci
12	Varaždin		Virovitica
13			Zaprešić

The lowest response rate was from the Adriatic region, where only 6 out of 15 cities responded (namely, Crikvenica, Dubrovnik, Labin, Pazin, Poreč and Umag)<sup>1</sup>. The bulk of responses came from Central and East Croatia, where 7 out of 9 cities responded to the Survey.

*Question 2. You are a:*

Table 2

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Male	6	30
Female	14	70
Total	20	100

<sup>1</sup> According to the National Classification of Territorial Units for Statistics, Croatia is divided into 3 statistical regions: the North-west Croatia, Central and East Croatia and the Adriatic region of Croatia. The North-west Croatia comprises the following cities: Čakovec, Koprivnica, Krapina, Samobor, Varaždin, Velika Gorica, Vrbovec, Zagreb and Zaprešić. The Central and East Croatia includes: Bjelovar, Karlovac, Kutina, Osijek, Požega, Sisak, Slavonski Brod, Vinkovci and Virovitica, and the Adriatic region covers the cities of Crikvenica, Dubrovnik, Gospić, Labin, Makarska, Opatija, Pazin, Poreč, Pula, Rijeka, Rovinj, Split, Šibenik, Umag and Zadar.



Women account for as many as 70% of the surveyed persons. This is expected to some extent, given that, interestingly, women are principals/heads of the FD in 24 (72%) out of 33 surveyed cities.

*Question 3. Your age is:*

*Table 3*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Under 20 years	0	0
20 to 30 years	0	0
30 to 40 years	3	15
40 to 50 years	6	30
50 to 60 years	7	35
Over 60 years	3	15
No response	1	5
Total	20	100

Almost 80% of the respondents are over the age of 40. An almost identical age structure was observed in the case of the surveyed LREP/Committee on Budget Issues members (see annex D3).

*Question 4. How long have you been dealing/acquainted with/interested in budgetary issues?*

*Table 4*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
For less than one year	0	0
For 1-5 years	2	10
For 5-10 years	5	25
For over 10 years	13	65
Total	20	100

Over 60% of the respondents have been dealing with the budget for over 10 years.

*Question 5. In your opinion, what presents the most important problem in understanding the budget documents? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 5*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Legal terms which are not understandable	0	0
Frequent changes in laws	3	15
Frequent changes of budget classifications	0	0
Complicated laws which are hard to understand	1	5
Time pressure	1	5
Other	1	5
The budget documents are fully comprehensible to me	14	70
Total	20	100

The majority of the respondents have no difficulties in understanding the local budget documents. This is not surprising, given that 65% of the respondents have been dealing with the budget for over 10 years.

However, frequent changes in laws pose an obstacle to understanding the budget documents for 15% of the LEXE respondents.

*Question 6. Have you had enough time to draft and prepare the Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010? Please choose only one answer. If your answer is NO or NOT QUITE ENOUGH, please explain why.*

*Table 6*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	8	40
Not quite enough	8	40
No	4	20
Total	20	100

Forty percent of the respondents believe to have had enough time to prepare the Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010. Another 40% are only partially satisfied with the time available for this exercise, while 20% did not have sufficient time for preparing the Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010. It is obvious that both the LEXE and LREP members are under time pressure, which certainly hinders, to some extent, the creation of a realistic budget. According to the LEXE respondents, the most frequent causes of the lack of time are the following:

- Delayed Local Budget Preparation Instructions by the state authority (Ministry of Finance);
- Lack of basic elements for the planning of actual figures, particularly revenues in the Local Budget Preparation Instructions; and
- Local politicians showing no appreciation for professional expertise.

Responses to this question reveal a communication problem between the LEXE and the Ministry of Finance that either lags behind in providing Local Budget Preparation Instructions or provides Instructions that are not clear enough. This is certainly one of the reasons why enacted local budgets are frequently unfeasible and need to be revised.

*Question 7. What would help you participate more actively in the local budgeting processes of your city?*

This was not a question with pre-defined answers, but the respondents are rather expected to express their own opinions and offer proposals. Here are some of them:

- "Holding public debates and more active involvement of citizens would facilitate the drafting of budget proposal documents.
- ...an obligation to reach a political consensus and generally reduce political influence on budget execution.
- Observing the time limits by all participants in the budgeting process would make the entire process much easier."

It seems that the surveyed principals/heads of FD act as more of professionals than politicians, and hence they rightfully believe that a more active participation of citizens and less political interference in the local budgeting process would make their work much easier.

*Question 8. In your opinion, who plays the most important role in the official monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 8*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
State Audit Office	8	40
Local executive body	8	40
Local representative body	2	10
Local representative body – Committee on Budget Issues or some other committee	1	5
Other	0	0
No response	1	5
Total	20	100

Interestingly, the State Audit Office and LEXE are each rated as playing the most important role by 40% of the respondents. The same response to this question was obtained from members of the LREP. This supports the argument that the basic role of the LREP in the budget execution control is distorted, and that the main "protagonists" of the budgeting process is the LEXE (Bratić, 2008). Obviously, the LEXE members are also aware of this fact. It is interesting to note that, also in this Survey, no respondent ever mentions the Government, Ministry of Finance or any other ministry as the bodies exercising official control and supervision of the local budget execution.

*Question 9. In your opinion, who has the most important role in the external (unofficial) monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Multiple answers are possible.*


*Table 9*

	<b>Number of responses<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Citizens directly	8	25
CSOs	3	10
Local newspapers	7	22
Local radio	2	6
Local websites	6	18
Local TV	2	6
Other	3	10
Nobody	1	3
Total	32	100

It is interesting that the LEXE respondents consider citizens to have the most important role in external (unofficial) budget execution monitoring (25%). Local media (newspapers, radio and TV, and websites, taken together - 52%) obviously represent the most powerful communication vehicles between the public and LREP and LEXE, monitoring the local budget execution-related matters. This corresponds with the results obtained from LREP (the most important role - media 59%), whereas almost identical conclusions (the most important role - media 48%) are found in Maletić (2006).


<sup>2</sup> Question 9 was a multiple-choice one. Therefore, only the responses the total number of which exceeded the number of surveyed persons were taken into account. However, the number of surveyed persons completed remained the same as for the previous questions (20).

Graph 9



Question 10. On a scale of (1) to (5), please, rank the most important participants in the local budgeting process in your city.

Graph 10



Obviously, LEXE considers itself to play the key role in the local budgeting process. It is interesting to note that no respondent ranks the LREP higher than the LEXE. However, according to over 60% of the respondents, the LREP ranks firmly as the second most important participant in the local budgeting

process (Rank 2), followed by the Ministry of Finance (Rank 3), and locally organized groups of citizens that hold a firm fourth position (Rank 4). The majority of the respondents consider individual citizens as the least important participants in the budgeting process (Rank 5). These findings once again confirm that the awareness among citizens of the need to participate in the local budgeting process is still very low.

*Question 11. In your opinion, are the citizens in your city interested in the local budget? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 11*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	7	35
Partly	12	60
No	0	0
I do not know	0	0
No response	1	5
Total	20	100

Respondents believe that citizens are interested (35%), or at least partly interested (60%) in their local budgets. However, they consider the citizens to be insufficiently acquainted with the system and focused on their narrow personal interests. One of the respondents argued that for example pensioners just want to know whether they will receive the pension supplement and everything beyond that is of no interest to them. Or, young parents, on the other hand, are interested in projects relating to kindergartens and schools, as well as the utility infrastructure projects. Therefore, the surveyed LEXE, in their comment to this question, also support the idea that citizens should be more actively involved in and trained for the creation and execution of the local budget.

*Question 12. In your opinion, what is the most important reason for citizens' interest in/indifference towards the local budget of your city?*

This was not a question with pre-defined answers. The exclusive reason for citizens' interest in the local budget, as indicated by LEXE members, is their personal interest in:

- resolving the matters relating to utilities, sports and culture;
- improving their standards of living, and
- realizing their private investment projects.

On the other hand, the reasons for citizens' indifference, indicated by the respondents, are lack of concern, preoccupation with own problems and citizens' perception that they have no influence on the budget because this is a political issue.

*Question 13. In your opinion, what can be done to make the local budget more transparent?*

In response to this question, which is actually a supplement to the previous one, the respondents generally indicate that:

- The media should be more active in publishing local budget proposals and other budgetary reports in a timely manner and inform the public about the events related thereto;

- Budget brochures (Citizens Budgets) understandable to each citizen should be printed and disseminated to the public;
- Public debates on the budget should be held;
- Citizens should be trained in the budgeting process, and
- Civil awareness of the need and importance of citizens participation should be raised.

The LEXE is obviously aware of deficiencies in achieving transparency, and of numerous improvement possibilities, consisting primarily in an active involvement of citizens and understandable and available local budget documents. Thus we think that although the aforementioned reforms could (and should) be implemented by the LEXE itself, it is the citizens who should also win their positions and provide impetus for the implementation of the above listed measures. Otherwise, everything will remain a dead letter.

*Question 14. Do the citizens in your city, in practice have access to the city budget data, in accordance with the Right of Access to Information Act? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 14*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes, to all the information	18	90
Yes, to some information	2	10
No	0	0
I do not know	0	0
Total	20	100

All the respondents believe that citizens can exercise their right of access to almost all information, which looks perfect at first glance. However, while working on this Survey, the authors were personally convinced that this was not quite true. Specifically, LINFOs from 15 surveyed cities (45%) failed to respond to the Survey at all (Gospić, Krapina, Makarska, Opatija, Pula, Rijeka, Rovinj, Samobor, Slavonski Brod, Šibenik, Velika Gorica, Vinkovci, Zadar, Zagreb and Zaprrešić). Furthermore, some respondents failed to provide additionally requested documents (see Annex D2). These respondents confirmed the existence of certain documents, but, upon our inquiry, they neither submitted them nor explained where such documents could be found. This obviously shows that there is a gap between theory and practice, i.e. that laws may exist but are not always enforced.

*Question 15. Have your local executive body held consultations with the local representative body members, as part of the budget priority establishing process for 2009 and/or 2010? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 15*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes, regularly	12	60
Sometimes	4	20
No	1	5
I do not know	3	15
Total	20	100

As many as 60% of the respondents indicate that their LEXE hold regular consultations with the LREP members. However, it is disappointing that 15% of the respondents know nothing about that. Account should also be taken of the respondents' comments indicating that the communication depends on having a comfortable majority in the LEXE, i.e. on the membership of a particular political party.

This is supported by a comparison between the responses to this question obtained from LREP in different cities. Specifically, in Karlovac, Kutina and Labin, LREP members from the opposition deny the holding of consultations with the LEXE, whereas the ruling coalition member and the head of the FD claim the opposite.

*Question 16. Do you know how much revenue your city obtains from the central government (in the forms of tax sharing and current and capital grants), and according to what criteria? Please, choose only one answer.*

Table 16

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	17	85
Partly	2	10
No	0	0
I do not know	1	5
Total	20	100

As many as 85% of the respondents claim to be acquainted with the rather complicated system of tax sharing and the allocation of central government grants to local units. The Act on the Financing of Local and Regional Self-Government Units is difficult to understand and has undergone numerous amendments<sup>3</sup>. This problem has been addressed in the respondents' comments. The respondents also warn of an inequitable budget resources distribution from central to local governments and non-transparent allocation criteria for central government grants, as well as of inadequate allocation of tax revenues to local units. One comment reveals that a city's position depends on the political orientation of its government relative to the central government. Specifically, as indicated, if the local government is in opposition to the central government, this puts it at a disadvantage when grants are assessed and allocated.

*Question 17. Do you think that the documents exchanged between the local executive body and local representative body are timely, complete, clear and understandable? Please, choose only one answer. If your answer is PARTLY or NO, please, explain why.*

Table 17

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	17	85
Partly	3	15
No	0	0
I do not know	0	0
Total	20	100

<sup>3</sup> See Bajo and Bronić (2007) and Bronić (2007).

No less than 85% of the respondents consider the documents exchanged between the LEXE and the LREP to be timely, complete, clear and understandable, i.e. that the local budget documents are transparent.

On the other side, this opinion is shared by as little as 43% of the surveyed LREP members, whereas 23% of LREP members consider the exchanged budget documents to be non-transparent (Annex D3). In order to make both parties more efficient, the LREP should receive complete, accurate and timely data from the LEXE. It is obvious that more effort is needed to improve the cooperation between LREP and LEXE authorities.

*Question 18. Do you know what has to be done (relating to the exchange of documents between the local executive body and local representative body), what the deadlines are, and who is responsible for what? Please, choose only one answer.*

Table 18

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	17	85
Partly	3	15
No	0	0
I do not know	0	0
Total	20	100

The majority of the LEXE respondents are well acquainted with the document exchange procedure and they believe that it is relatively well defined in the regulations acts, and the Statute and other city bylaws. However, the respondent in one city indicates that the city is poorly organized and that the responsibilities and duties of employees are not clearly defined. Obviously, such problems have still not completely disappeared.

*Question 19. Do you personally communicate with the citizens and how? (E.g., do you ask the citizens whether they are satisfied with the existing programs, whether they feel a need to change those programs and/or introduce new ones)? Please, choose only one answer.*

Table 19

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes, very often	11	55
Yes, sometimes	6	30
No, I do not	2	10
No response	1	5
Total	20	100

As many as 55% of the respondents claim to often communicate personally with citizens. According to the responses given, the communication with citizens is mostly established through the following:

- telephone,
- e-mail;
- public forums; and
- radio broadcasts.



Our examination of the relevant official websites of the cities during this research shows positive movements in this area. Many cities offer contact phones and contact centers for free communication with citizens. Moreover, many cities offer e-mail addresses and/or telephone numbers of responsible city officers. This provides citizens with at least a theoretical possibility to get in touch with a person responsible for the required information.

*Question 20. Do you think that the documents exchanged between the local executive body and the Ministry of Finance are timely, complete, clear and understandable? Please, choose only one answer. If your answer is PARTLY or NO, please, explain why.*

*Table 20*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	12	60
Partly	4	20
No	2	10
I do not know	0	0
No response	2	10
Total	20	100

The majority of the LEXE respondents (60%) consider the documents exchanged with the Ministry of Finance to be transparent. However, the LEXE respondents complain of the sloppy work of the MFIN, that MFIN does not observe of submission deadlines for the documentation to LEXE, that the MFIN is preoccupied with central government and pays little attention to local units. Moreover, the LEXE questions addressed to the Ministry of Finance are very often ignored.

*Question 21. Do you know what has to be done (relating to the exchange of documents between the local executive body and the Ministry of Finance), what the deadlines are, and who is responsible for what? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 21*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	17	85
Partly	2	10
No	0	0
I do not know	0	0
No response	1	5
Total	20	100

While most of the respondents (85%) understand their role and obligations, they again complain about the Ministry of Finance, indicating the same reasons as in the responses to the previous question.

Question 22. In your opinion, what presents the key problem in the communication with the Ministry of Finance? Multiple answers are allowed.

Table 22

	Number of responses <sup>4</sup>	Response rate (%)
Complicated laws that are hard to understand	1	4
Frequent changes in budget classifications	3	14
Frequent changes in legislation	4	18
Frequent changes in the budgeting procedures	1	4
Poor planning by the Ministry of Finance and insufficient information provided to local units about the amendments to the relevant laws	6	27
Sometimes I am not clear what should be done and when	0	0
Poor communication with the Ministry of Finance	2	9
Other	5	24
Total	22	100.0

The key problem in the communication between the Ministry of Finance and LEXE appears to be poor planning by the latter, and insufficient and untimely information submitted to local units about the changes in the relevant legislation (27%). This is further aggravated by frequent changes in legislation and budget classifications that tend to be incomprehensible and, as such, they are subject to different interpretations. Communication with the Ministry of Finance is difficult; there are problems in establishing telephone contacts, and, most of all, in approaching senior staff. As indicated by a respondent, the Budget Classification Rulebook has been adopted with a delay, and only after the IT-system design of the local units' budgets had already been completed. Therefore, it has been almost impossible to include the existing IT-solutions in the prescribed framework.

A solution suggested by the LEXE respondents is to establish an advisory body within the Ministry of Finance, responsible for clearing up some ambiguities, and receiving suggestions relating to local budget planning and execution. The respondents also believe that the experiences of the State Audit Office can point to potential problems and serve as input for better functioning of local budgets.

<sup>4</sup> This question was of a multiple choice type. Therefore, only the responses the total number of which exceeded the number of surveyed persons were taken into account. However, the number of surveyed persons remained the same as for the previous questions (20).

## Conclusion

The aim of this Survey was to assess, from the point of view of LEXE, the transparency of local budgets and of the budgeting process, as well as the interaction of the LEXE with LREP and the public.

As many as 85% of the respondents consider the documents exchanged between the LEXE and LREP to be timely, complete, clear and understandable, i.e. that the local budget documents are transparent. The majority of the respondents are well acquainted with the document exchange procedure between the LEXE and LREP, and consider this procedure to be well defined in the regulations.

More than a half of the respondents believe that the documents exchanged between LEXE and the Ministry of Finance are transparent. However, they complain about having problems with the Ministry of Finance, consisting in the non-observance of submission deadlines for the required documentation, and the MFIN's central government-oriented behavior. In addition, inquiries addressed to the MFIN are often ignored. All this is further aggravated by frequent changes in legislation and budget classifications that tend to be incomprehensible and are therefore subject to different interpretations.

The principals/heads of FD propose the following measures to improve the transparency of local budgets:

- A more active participation of the media in publishing budget proposals and other budgetary reports in a timely manner, and informing the public about the events related to them;
- The printing and dissemination of budget brochures (budget summaries) understandable for each citizen;
- Organizing public discussions on the budget, instructing the citizens in budgetary matters and raising public awareness of the need and importance of their participation in the budgeting process;
- A more active involvement of citizens in the preparation of budget proposals;
- Establishing an advisory body within the Ministry of Finance, responsible for clearing up some ambiguities, and receiving suggestions relating to local budget planning and execution, and
- Reaching a political consensus and generally reducing the policy influence on local budget execution.

There is obviously a consensus between the LEXE and the public<sup>5</sup> on the need to improve the communication, to encourage citizens to participate in all the local budgeting processes, and help reduce citizens' apathy and indifference towards local budgets. It is only through a good communication between citizens, LEXE and LREP that the budgeting process can be efficiently monitored, with a common goal to offer citizens best possible public services. After all, it should not be forgotten that LEXE and LREP exist for the sake of citizens and not the other way round.

---

<sup>5</sup> See, results of the local civil society organization survey (Annex D4).



Institut za javne financije • Zagreb • Institute of Public Finance  
Smičiklasova 21, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska/Croatia, p.p. 320 • tel. (+385 1) 4886 444, 4819 363  
fax (+385 1) 4819 365 • E-mail: [office@ijf.hr](mailto:office@ijf.hr) • Web: <http://www.ijf.hr>

---

**CROATIAN OPEN LOCAL BUDGET INDEX**  
**— A SURVEY FOR LOCAL EXECUTIVE BODY REPRESENTATIVES —**

The Institute of Public Finance (IPF), Zagreb has been measuring the local budget transparency in 33 biggest cities in Croatia. More information about this project can be found on the IPF's website: <http://www.ijf.hr/eng/index.php?ime=173>.

You are kindly requested to participate in this Survey by answering the following questions. This Survey is anonymous. The results will be used solely for the purposes of this Survey. Any comments from you will also be appreciated.

The deadline for submission of the Survey is 7 June 2010. For anonymity purposes, you can detach this page and send us the answers by fax No.: 01/4819365 or by post (Institute of Public Finance, Smičiklasova 21, p.p. 320, 10000 Zagreb). A postage-paid envelope is enclosed.

If you need any further explanations or have any additional comments, please, contact Mihaela Bronić, phone No.: 01/4886452, fax No.: 01/4819365 or email address: [mihaela@ijf.hr](mailto:mihaela@ijf.hr).

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

*Mihaela Bronić*



Institut za javne financije • Zagreb • Institute of Public Finance  
Smičiklasova 21, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska/Croatia, p.p. 320 • tel. (+385 1) 4886 444, 4819 363  
fax (+385 1) 4819 365 • E-mail: [office@ijf.hr](mailto:office@ijf.hr) • Web: <http://www.ijf.hr>

**CROATIAN OPEN LOCAL BUDGET INDEX**  
**— A SURVEY FOR LOCAL EXECUTIVE BODY REPRESENTATIVES —**

1. In what city are you a member of the local executive body?

\_\_\_\_\_

2. You are:

- a) a female,
- b) a male.

3. Your age is:

- a) under 20 years,
- b) 20-30 years,
- c) 30-40 years,
- d) 40-50 years,
- e) 50-60 years,
- f) over 60 years.

4. How long have you been dealing/acquainted with/interested in budgetary issues:

- a) for less than one year,
- b) for 1-5 years,
- c) for 5-10 years,
- d) for over 10 years.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. In your opinion, what presents the most important problem in understanding the budget documents? Please choose only one answer.

- a) Legal terms which are not understandable,
- b) Frequent changes of laws,
- c) Frequent changes in budget classifications,
- d) Complicated laws which are hard to understand,
- e) Time pressure,
- f) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- g) The budget documents are fully comprehensible to me.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. Have you had enough time to draft and prepare Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010? Please choose only one answer. If your answer is NO or NOT QUITE ENOUGH, please explain why.

- a) Yes.
- b) Not quite enough.
- c) No.

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. What would help you participate more actively in the local budgeting processes of your city?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8. In your opinion, who has the most important role in the official monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Please choose only one answer.

- a) State Audit Office
- b) Local executive body
- c) Local representative body
- d) Local representative body - Committee on Budget Issues or some other committee
- e) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9. In your opinion, who has the most important role in external (unofficial) monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Multiple answers are possible.

- a) Citizens directly
- b) CSO's
- c) Local newspapers
- d) Local radio
- e) Local websites
- f) Local TV
- g) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- h) Nobody.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. On a scale of (1) to (5), please, rank the most important participants in the local budgeting process in your city:

\_\_\_ Local executive body,

\_\_\_ Local representative body,

\_\_\_ Ministry of Finance,

\_\_\_ locally organized groups of citizens (e.g. CSOs, lobbies),

\_\_\_ individual citizens.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

11. In your opinion, are the citizens of your city interested in the local budget? Please, choose only one answer.

a) Yes.

b) Partially.

c) No.

d) I do not know.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

12. In your opinion, what is the most important reason for the citizens' interest in/indifference towards the local budget of your city?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

13. In your opinion, what can be done to make the local budget more transparent?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

14. Do the citizens of your city, in practice, have access to local budget information, in accordance with the Right of Access to Information Act? Please, choose only one answer.

a) Yes, to all the information.

b) Yes, to some information.

c) No.

d) I do not know.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

---

15. Have your local executive body held consultations with the local representative body members, as part of the budget priority establishing process for 2009 and/or 2010? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) Yes, regularly.
- b) Sometimes.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

16. Do you know how much revenue your city obtains from the central government (in the forms of tax sharing and current and capital grants) and according to what criteria? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

17. Do you think that the documents exchanged between the local executive body and local representative body are timely, complete, clear and understandable? Please choose only one answer. If your answer is PARTLY or NO, please explain why.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

*Why?* \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

18. Do you know what has to be done (relating to the exchange of documents between the local executive body and local representative body), what the deadlines are, and who is responsible for what? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

*Why?* \_\_\_\_\_



*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

19. Do you personally communicate with the citizens and how? (E.g. do you ask the citizens whether they are satisfied with the existing programs, whether they feel a need to change those programs and/or introduce new ones)? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) Yes, very often.
- b) Yes, sometimes,
- c) No, I do not.

*Comment on how you communicate:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

20. Do you think that the documents exchanged between the local executive body and Ministry of Finance are timely, complete, clear and understandable? Please, choose only one answer. If your answer is PARTLY or NO, please, explain why.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

21. Do you know what has to be done (relating to the exchange of documents between the local executive body and Ministry of Finance), what the deadlines are, and who is responsible for what? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

22. In your opinion, what presents the biggest problem in the communication with the Ministry of Finance? Multiple answers are possible.

- a) Complicated laws which are hard to understand,
- b) Frequent changes in budget classifications,
- c) Frequent changes in laws,
- d) Frequent changes in budgetary procedures,
- e) The Ministry of Finance's poor planning and informing the local units about the amendments to laws which affect them,
- f) Sometimes I am not clear about what should be done, and when,
- g) Poor communication with the Ministry of Finance,
- h) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## Annex D2.

### The analysis of the Survey responses by local units' information officers

According to the Right of Access to Information Act (2003), all information possessed, disposed of or controlled by bodies of public authority must be made available to interested persons<sup>1</sup>. The bodies of public authority (including, among others, the LEXE)<sup>2</sup> are obliged, for the purpose of providing access to information, to designate an official person as the information officers, whose main task is to receive and consider individual requests for access to information submitted by natural or legal persons. According to this Act, the requests must be decided upon within 15 days from their submission, and the provided information must be complete and accurate.

During our research, in order to collect the information on local budgets that could not be found on the surveyed cities' official websites, Surveys have been sent out to local information officers (LINFOs) in 33 cities. They have been requested to respond to the following questions:

- To what extent and in what way is the public involved in the local budgeting process?
- Does LREP keep oversight of the operations of companies in their ownership (i.e. utility companies)?
- Do citizens have access to information and how is city budget spent? Are certain budget expenditure-related documents available to the public (e.g. city budget Audit Reports, the lists of current and capital grant recipients, decisions on the amounts of remuneration paid to LREP members)?

The Survey has been sent out on the 3 May 2010 to LINFOs in 33 cities<sup>3</sup>, via their e-mail addresses found on the cities' official websites, or obtained through direct telephone calls, where the contact data were not explicitly indicated on the website. Along with instructions for completion, the Survey also comprised the names of contact person for possible further questions. No calls for further questions were received. In accordance with the Right of Access to Information Act, the response deadline was 15 days from sending out the Survey. The Survey comprised 13 questions (see the Survey at the end of this Annex).

<sup>1</sup> "Information" means data, photographs, drawings, films, reports, records, tables, charts, sketches or other articles possessed, disposed of or controlled by bodies of public authority, regardless of whether they are stored in a document or not, and regardless of their source, date of origin, place of storage or manner of discovery, regardless of by whose order, on whose behalf and for whose account they are stored and regardless of any other characteristic of the information (Article 3, paragraph 3 of the Right of Access to Information Act).

<sup>2</sup> The bodies of public authority are state authorities, bodies of units of local and regional self-government, legal persons vested with public authority and other persons to whom public powers have been delegated (Article 3, paragraph 2 of the Right of Access to Information Act).

<sup>3</sup> Local Information officers exist in almost all of the surveyed cities. Only Pula has no officially appointed LINFO, but the responsibility for exercising the right of access to information rests with a City Protocol officer.

It should be noted that there have been some difficulties and drawbacks in conducting this Survey. The response rate as at the specified deadline was relatively low. Only twelve percent of the cities responded within the legally prescribed time limits. After that, in the period from 20 June to 5 July 2010, telephone contacts were made to LINFOs to remind them of our request and to get a feedback on the Survey. The telephone interviews revealed the following reasons for the low response rate:

- *Delegation of responsibilities.* Given the questions related to finance and budgeting, our Survey was in most cases forwarded to the FD. Therefore, to obtain any further information concerning the Survey we had to contact this body. However, as another version of the Survey had been submitted to the FD heads, they most frequently received two Surveys related to our research, which they were supposed to complete. This was usually the cause of delayed responses and the reason for complaints by some FD heads (e.g. in Osijek and Vrbovec).
- *LINFO's absence from work.* Fifteen percent of the respondents indicated that they had not received the Survey or that they found it only after our telephone call, because of their longer absence from work, most frequently due to sickness or vacation.
- *Technical problems,* for example with computers, fax machines, etc. Some officers claimed to have sent their responses by fax, but these responses have never been received. On our request, some of them agreed to repeat sending the fax message, whereas others just promised to do so, but failed to keep the promise.
- *Legal framework.* Some respondents complained that the Survey did not explicitly refer to the Right to Access to Information Act. However, it should be noted here that, according to the Right of Access to Information Act, it is not necessary to refer to this Act when filing a request for information. After preliminary discussions within our team we decided not to mention the Act as we wanted to see how LINFO will react without our appeal to the Act. Hence, it is interesting that LINFOs in some cities misinterpret this Act.
- It is also interesting that in Zagreb (the country's capital), it was almost impossible to get further information regarding the Survey sent to the LINFO, because it simply disappeared and concluding with 5 July nobody knew where it ended up.

The last response came from Pula on 26 July 2010. In the end, 19 cities (58% of the total) answered and returned the Survey.

	Responses received within the deadline	Delayed responses	No response
1.	Koprivnica	Bjelovar	Gospić
2.	Kutina	Crikvenica	Krapina
3.	Požega	Čakovec	Makarska
4.	Umag	Dubrovnik	Opatija
5.		Karlovac	Rijeka
6.		Labin	Rovinj
7.		Osijek	Samobor
8.		Pazin	Slavonski Brod
9.		Poreč	Šibenik
10.		Pula	Velika Gorica
11.		Sisak	Vinkovci
12.		Split	Zadar
13.		Varaždin	Zagreb
14.		Virovitica	Zaprešić
15.		Vrbovec	

The Survey consisted of two main parts and included altogether 13 questions. The first part dealt with the preparation and execution of local budgets. Therefore, the questions were aimed at finding out to what extent the public participated in the local budget preparation or supervision processes. The second part of the Survey was aimed at examining whether the documents providing detailed explanations of local budget expenditures were available to the public. Below is an analysis of all the questions and answers.

*Question 1. Do you know the date the local representative body members received the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections?*

*Table 1*

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	19	100
No	0	0
Total	19	100

Budget transparency should ensure an active role of citizens in the budgeting process, which includes not only getting an insight into the budget spending, but also participating in the creation of local budgets through their suggestions and comments. This question (the identification of the date of receiving the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections by LREP members) was aimed at assessing the time that elapses between the point in time when the LREP members receive a Budget Proposal with Projections for consideration and the moment when this document is voted through. The date of adoption of city budgets was taken from the official local documents about the adopted city budgets. Based on the responses given by LINFOs, the cities were classified into three groups, depending on the time elapsed between the date of receipt of a Budget Proposal with Projections by the LREP members and the date of adoption of the budget.

*Table 1.1 Time between the receipt of a Budget Proposal with Projections and adoption of the budget*

22 days or more	Čakovec, Karlovac, Koprivnica, Kutina, Pazin and Vrbovec
8 – 21 days	Dubrovnik, Labin, Osijek, Poreč, Pula, Umag and Varaždin
0 – 7 days	Bjelovar, Crikvenica, Požega, Sisak, Split and Virovitica

In most cities, more than 8 days elapsed from the date the LREP members received a Budget Proposal with Projections and the date when this document was voted through, i.e. the effective date of the budget. However, in six cities (Bjelovar, Crikvenica, Požega, Sisak, Split and Virovitica) less than eight days elapsed between receiving a Budget Proposal with Projections and adopting the budget. The question is whether the LREP members in these six cities really had a chance, in such a short time, to effectively analyze the Budget Proposal with Projections prepared by the LEXE, and exert some influence on the budget adoption procedure itself. In other words, if the preparatory phase of the budgeting process is relatively short, the LREP members have less time to examine the Budget Proposal with Projections, and hence they are less capable of significantly influencing the final budget. Therefore, they usually just approve the Budget Proposal with Projections submitted to them by the LEXE. All this is further supported by the fact that in most cities, the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections was identical to the Enacted Budget. The next question was aimed at assessing to what extent citizens can really influence city Budget Proposal with Projections.

*Question 2. Do you know the date the 2010 City Budget Proposal with Projections was made available to the public (e.g. available on request, put on the website or published in the local newspapers)?*

*Table 2*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Date	19	100
It has not been made available to the public	0	0
I do not know	0	0
Total	19	100

In all the cities, Budget proposals with Projections were made available to the public, either on the website or in local official gazettes and/or on request.

*Table 2.2 The Budget Proposal with Projections was made available to the public:*

before the budget adoption date	Bjelovar, Čakovec, Karlovac, Koprivnica, Kutina, Osijek, Pazin, Poreč, Pula and Split
on the budget adoption date	Dubrovnik, Labin, Varaždin and Virovitica
after the budget adoption date	Crikvenica, Požega, Sisak, Umag and Vrbovec

The good news is that in ten cities (52%) Budget Proposals with Projections were made available to the public prior to the adoption of the city budget. In nine cities, Budget Proposals with Projections were made available to both the public and the LREP members on the same day, whereas in Kutina even the Budget Proposal with Projections was publicly disclosed on the website on 20 November 2009 while the Budget Proposal with Projections was delivered to the LREP members on 24 November 2009. It is our hope that other cities will soon follow this example.

By contrast, in four cities Budget Proposals with Projections were made public on the same day when the budgets were voted through, whereas in five cities, Budget Proposal with Projections were made publicly available only after the budgets had already been adopted. This suggests that in these cities, citizens had no opportunity to see the Budget Proposal with Projections until the budget was adopted and that they, as actual budget revenue providers, were probably presented with *a fait accompli*. This, of course, applies on condition that the citizens had not been invited to participate in a public hearing or in some other way give their opinion on the City Budget Proposal with Projections.

*Question 3. Did the local executive body (the mayor or administrative bodies) organize a public hearing on the 2010 City Budget Proposal with Projections late in 2009? If so, when was the public hearing held?*

Table 3

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	8 <sup>4</sup>	42
No <sup>5</sup>	11	58
I do not know	0	0
Total	19	100

In their responses to this or the following question, some respondents indicated that the public was involved in making decisions on Budget Proposals with Projections by attending local-district meetings (*hrv. sastanci mjesnog odbora*). However, alternative answers were given to the two questions, meaning that if a respondent answered to this Question (3) that a public hearing had been organized by local committees, then the local committees were not mentioned in the answer to next Question (4).

In slightly more than 40% of the cities, the LEXE organized public hearings on the 2010 City Budget Proposals with Projections. For example, as indicated by LINFOs in Karlovac, Koprivnica, Kutina, Labin and Varaždin, hearings were organized through radio broadcasts. As Labin and Varaždin belong to the group of cities where the public disclosure of Budget Proposals with Projections coincided with the adoption of the budgets, it is commendable that public hearings were organized before the budgets had been voted through, thus enabling citizens to participate in the budgeting process.

*Question 4. Has the local executive body (the mayor or administrative bodies) in some other way included the public in the City budget decision-making for 2010 (e.g. by sending out a questionnaire to citizens, requesting their opinion on the 2010 Budget priorities)? If so, please, indicate when and how?*

Table 4

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	13	68
No	6	32
I do not know	0	0
Total	19	100.0

<sup>4</sup> This group of cities also includes Čakovec, where the LINFO chose none of the answers, but indicated that a public hearing had been organized by local committees and political parties. As in such case other cities answered "Yes", Čakovec was included in the same group.

<sup>5</sup> This group includes, among others, the city of Pazin, where the LINFO indicated that, public hearing was not organized and commented that consultations had been held with local committees, associations and political parties.

About 70% of the respondents indicate that the public have been included in making decisions about Budget Proposals with Projections mostly via meetings and sessions with local committees. Let us single out some of the cities with relatively good communication between the authorities and citizens in the budgeting process. In Labin, for example, citizens received a booklet “Citizens Guide” at their home addresses during the preparation of the 2010 budget. Enclosed with the booklet (containing financial statements and their explanations) was a reply card on which citizens could express their proposals and suggestions concerning the budget. Most of these suggestions were incorporated in the budget.

During the budget preparation process in 2010 the mayor of Koprivnica appeared on various radio stations (Radio Drava, Radio Koprivnica and Radio Glas Podravine). Moreover, through the local weekly magazine “Glas Podravine” citizens could submit written suggestions and questions to the LEXE, and there was a call-in show on Radio Koprivnica dealing with certain issues related to the city budget before and after its adoption. Citizens could also post their suggestions concerning budget priorities on the city’s official website; they could leave them in a special box in front of the LEXE’s building or express them via a free phone.

Another shining example is Rijeka. Despite having received no response from its LINFO, we found out that, before taking a vote on the 2010 budget, the mayor of Rijeka, invited the citizens to vote on priorities in the realization of key municipal projects for 2010<sup>6</sup>.

As suggested by responses to Question 3 and Question 4, in a number of cities, the public was not included in making decisions on the 2010 budget. Therefore, we believe that LEXE should generally do more in this area, and employ additional communication mechanisms to increase the participation of citizens in the budgeting process.

*Question 5. Has the local executive body (the mayor or administrative bodies) organized a public hearing on the Year-End Report for 2008? If so, when?*

Table 5

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	15	79
No	4	21
I do not know	0	0
Total	19	100

It is interesting as well as encouraging that in about 80% of the surveyed cities, the LEXE organized public hearings on the 2008 budgets.

Questions 6 and 7 were supposed to examine to what extent the LREP supervise the operations of companies in their ownership (utility companies). In their paper *Local Finance and Local Budgeting in the Republic of Croatia*, Bajo and Ott (2001) warned that very little was known about the privatisation and ownership of the utility companies owned by local units. It is often the case that even the value of city-owned utility companies is unknown, and their financial operations are not quite transparent. Utility

<sup>6</sup> The results of the survey on the municipal project priorities, carried out from 20 November to 22 December 2009 are available at <http://www.voiko-obersnel.com/hr/recite-mi/prioritet-projekata-proracuna-grada-rijeka>. The city budget for Rijeka was adopted on 22 December 2009.



companies are profit-making enterprises, but their losses are usually covered from local budgets (cities often take loans just to cover these losses).

*Question 6. Have the local representative body members received the annual financial statements of utility companies as an annex to the Year-End Report for 2008?*

*Table 6*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	15	79
No	4	21
I do not know	0	0
Total	19	100

In most of the cities, the utility companies' annual financial statements are available to members of the LREP. In about 80% of the cities, the LREP members either received the annual financial statements of utility companies as annexes to the Year-End Report for 2008, in the form of a separate document (e.g. in Virovitica), or the financial statements of a utility company were discussed under a special item of the City Council meeting agenda (e.g. in Osijek).

*Question 7. Does the local representative body approve decisions on utility companies' borrowing?*

*Table 7*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	15	79
Partly	2	11
No	1	5
I do not know	1	5
Total	19	100

In almost 80% of the cities, the LREP approves decisions on the utility companies' borrowing. In 11% of the cities, the LREP approves only a part of such decisions. In Varaždin, for example, decisions on borrowing are approved if they are regulated by the utility company's Statute, the City Statute or the law. In Pazin, which responded negatively, the LREP decides on the members of utility company's governing Council, who independently take decisions on the company's borrowing. No response to this question came from Požega. However, there was a comment indication that "there have been no such requests so far". As it was impossible to conclude what the answer would be, Požega was classified among the cities responding with "I do not know".

Judging by responses to the previous two questions, despite being in city ownership, the operations of some utility companies are not, but should be, supervised by the city. And why should city-owned companies be supervised? One of the reasons is the conflict-of-interest problem. For example, according to the Antić and Malatestinić (2010) survey, conducted in 15 municipalities in Croatia with a view to providing recommendations for anti-corruption measures in the local self-government, in one municipality, a member of the Municipal Council provides public utility services for the municipality on the basis of a concession contract. It is likely that such examples of the conflict of interest (in this case, performing a duty in the Municipal Council and providing services for the same council via privately

owned utility company) also exist at the city level. Similarly, there is a problem of uncontrolled borrowing by companies in city ownership, which can produce severe consequences for both the city budget and all the citizens, as a result of the inability of companies to repay their debts (Bajo, 2008).

The second part of our Survey dealt with the availability of certain documents through which local budget expenditures are made transparent to the public. Where such a document existed, in each of the questions that follow we asked the respondents to indicate a URL or any other information about its location. Local information officers were also requested, to submit the documents if they were available on request only.

It should be emphasized that the answers to these questions were very often incomplete and vague. Specifically, it was claimed that a certain document had been made publicly available, but it was neither specified where exactly the document could be found, nor was it sent to us, although this was explicitly requested in the Survey. In such cases, we sent the inquiry again, asking the local information officers to complete their responses, or we tried to contact them by telephone. Nevertheless, only some of the respondents submitted additional responses, not all of them being complete. Where the following questions were responded with “yes”, but without specifying the location of the required document, or where it was responded that the document was only available on request, but was not submitted to us, the response was classified as “Yes, but with no documents attached”.

An additional problem was that the Survey did not specify what exactly the answer "Partly" implied. Therefore, all answers to the questions that follow were classified into this category if the respondents themselves answered with "Partly", regardless of the fact that some of their answers, compared with the answers of other LINFOs, could be classified into another group.

*Question 8. Is the list of civil society organizations that received current and capital grants from the city in 2008 or 2009 publicly available?*

*Table 8*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	9	47
Yes, but with no documents attached <sup>7</sup>	4	21
Partly	6	32
No	0	0
I do not know	0	0
Total	19	100

The list was apparently available in all the cities. However, in 32% of the cities it was only partly available, which most frequently meant that the list was contained as a part of the data on budget execution, i.e. in the special part of the budget. Hence, none of the cities responded that such a list did not exist, but the way in which the recipients of the grants could be identified was usually complicated and contrary to our expectations. We believed that the list should be available on the website as a single document providing clear and accurate information. If the list was included in the special part of the

<sup>7</sup> This group of cities also includes Varaždin, where this document is available on request. Varaždin is the only city having responded to this question in this way.

budget, it was much more difficult to find it than if it existed as a separate document on the official website, as in Koprivnica, Kutina<sup>8</sup>, Labin, Osijek and Split.

*Question 9. Are the names of the privileged tenants (the users of apartments in city ownership) in 2008 or 2009 publicly available?*

Table 9

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	0	0
Yes, but with no documents attached	9	47
Partly	4	21
No	6	32
I do not know	0	0
Total	19	100

The list of the users of city-owned apartments is fully or partially publicly available in most of the cities, meaning that it is available by the request (nearly 70%). It should be noted that, according to the aforementioned responses, almost none of the cities publicly discloses the list of the users of city-owned apartments in its local official gazette or on the city's official website.

Among the cities in which such list is unavailable, Umag, Pazin and Vrbovec should be singled out, because they actually do not belong in this group. More specifically, the LINFO in Pazin misinterpreted the question, believing that it relates to the list of privileged users of such apartments for 2010. Consequently, he responded that such a list did not exist, because there were no such privileged tenants in Pazin in 2010, whereas the lists for 2008 and 2009 were available in the local official gazette. In Umag, such data are available on request and are kept by the LEXE. Vrbovec has no city-owned apartments. It seems that only three cities (Bjelovar, Čakovec and Požega) belong to the group with no publicly disclosed lists, and they failed to state the reason for non-disclosure.

*Question 10. Are the amounts of remuneration received by the local representative body members in 2008 or 2009 publicly disclosed?*

According to Article 31 of the Local and Regional Self-Government Act, members of the LREP perform their activities on an honorary basis and receive no salary for this. However, LREP members are entitled to compensation for expenses in accordance with the decision of the local representative body. This actually means that the LREP determines the amount of its own remuneration for participating in the City Council meetings. This question was aimed at examining whether the amounts of the remuneration paid to the LREP members in 2008 or 2009 were publicly available.

<sup>8</sup> In Kutina, for example, the list is available at <http://www.kutina.hr/Naslovnica/Novostiizgrada/tabid/138/ArticleId/8286/oamid/516/Default.aspx>.

Table 10

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	13	68
Yes, but with no documents attached	4	21
Partly	2	11
No	0	0
I do not know	0	0
Total	19	100

In 13 cities, the Decision on the Remuneration of LREP members is available on the city's official website. It contains the exact amounts of remuneration received by members of the LREP for their participation in the LREP meetings. These amounts range between 100 and 400 kuna per meetings<sup>9</sup>. In this connection, prominence should be given to Poreč, where the members of the LREP waived their remuneration due to the city's difficult economic situation, which was indeed a praiseworthy act of solidarity.

The following cities are classified under the response category "Yes, but with no documents attached". Specifically, the respondents from Dubrovnik and Pula failed to specify where the stated document could be found, whereas those from Labin and Osijek indicated that the document was available on request, but failed to submit it to us.

Respondents from Čakovec and Požega indicated that these data were partly available, i.e. that the aggregate amount of the remuneration was shown in the budget execution documents disclosed on the city's official website. This means that the amounts of the remuneration are not explicitly shown as is the case in the cities where this is regulated by the remuneration decisions.

*Question 11. Are the criteria for receiving current and capital grants from the city in 2008 or 2009 publicly disclosed?*

Table 11

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	6	32
Yes, but with no documents attached	6	32
Partly	2	11
No	5	26
I do not know	0	0
Total	19	100

Usually, once in a year, prior to determining Budget Proposals with Projections, the cities invite open tenders with the allocation criteria for grants from the budget. To participate in the tender, potential beneficiaries are required to submit their programmes in accordance with the specified criteria. Based on the tender results, the Finance Department is obliged to inform budget beneficiaries about the amounts of funds approved to them in the current fiscal year. These funds are allocated within the special part of the budget. The budget beneficiaries are not allowed to use the allocated funds for purposes other than

<sup>9</sup> Approximately 20 to 80 US Dollar. For example see, The Decision on the Remuneration of City Council Members for Karlovac is available at <http://www.karlovac.hr/news.aspx?newsID=261&pageID=42>.

those planned in the budget (Bajo and Ott, 2001). Given that budget resources are actually provided by citizens, the idea of this question was to find out whether the citizens have insight into the manner of spending and the recipients of these funds.

In 32% of the cities, information about criteria for receiving current and capital grants from the city in 2008 or 2009 is available on the city's official websites or published in the local official gazettes. Six cities that confirm the availability of these data, but fail to indicate their location are classified under the response category "Yes, but with no documents attached."<sup>10</sup> In Čakovec and Karlovac, these documents are partly available, as suggested by the LINFOs.<sup>11</sup> However, it should be noted that this information is not publicly available in Osijek, Pazin, Pula, Požega and Vrbovec.

*Question 12. Is the city's Budget Audit Report for 2008 or 2009 publicly available?*

Table 12

	Number of questionnaires	Response rate (%)
Yes	4	21
Yes, but with no documents attached	7	37
Partly	4	21
No	4	21
I do not know	0	0
Total	19	100.0

The audit procedure includes the check of regularity in the planning and execution of the budget, i.e. the examination whether the local governments' financial statements render a true account of the financial position and results of the local unit (Bajo and Ott, 2001). It should also be noted that, as there is no separate state audit service to examine the local units' budgets, this job is done by a specially organized department of the State Audit Office. Local units draw up basic reports on budget execution to be submitted to the State Audit Office. After the audit, authorised state auditors compile an Audit Report.

The City Budget Audit Reports for 2008 and 2009 are publicly available in about 80% of the cities. As indicated by LINFOs, in most cases the reports are available through the City Council meetings that are open to the public, and through the media houses to which the meeting materials are delivered. In Bjelovar, for example, the reports are published and delivered to local newspapers, radio and TV stations, information centres and even to "Vjesnik" and "Večernji list". However, in as many as 21% of the surveyed cities, the City Budget Audit Report is still not publicly available.

On the other hand, the problem lies in the fact that the detailed Audit Reports performed each year in each local unit by the State Audit Office are not available on the State Audit Office website either. So we wanted to find out is it possible for a citizen to obtain from the State Audit Office the detailed city budget Audit Reports.

<sup>10</sup> Included in this category are also two cities responding that the relevant document is available on request, but failing to submit them, i.e. Labin (the relevant document is stored in the Finance Department) and Varaždin (the information is available on request pursuant to the Right of Access to Information Act).

<sup>11</sup> In his response, the respondent from Čakovec indicates the Decision on Budget Execution, which only lays down how budget revenues and receipt are to be allocated, but without specifying the allocation criteria for current and capital grants. It should also be noted that Karlovac should be assigned to the same category as Labin, given that the stated document is also stored in this city's Finance Department.

We asked two citizens from two cities (Karlovac and Dubrovnik) to ask, in their name, from The State Audit Office the detailed City Budget Audit Report for the year 2008. Both citizens obtained these reports, but both needed to contact the State Audit office twice.<sup>12</sup>

While the State Audit Office performs its duties in an effective manner, its findings and recommendations are obviously not accepted and applied in order to rectify the irregularities in the operations of the local units' budgets (Bajo and Ott, 2001). For example, the mayor of Zagreb refused to publicly comment on the findings of the State Audit Office about the violations of the Public Procurement Act and the 2006 Budget Act (Marinović, 2007).

*Question 13. Is the organisational structure of the city's administrative bodies publicly available?*

The public availability of this document enables citizens to get acquainted in an easy way with their local administrative bodies and their scope of activities. This provides them with a better insight into the functioning of the LEXE and helps them find out to whom they can direct their inquiries and requests. Furthermore, the organisational structure is linked with accountability, which is crucial for the good functioning of the system. Specifically, a precise regulation of the tasks, responsibilities and methods of operation facilitates the supervision but also involves the obligation to perform the assigned tasks more efficiently.

*Table 13*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	16	84
Yes, but with no documents attached	3	16
Partly	0	0
No	0	0
I do not know	0	0
Total	19	100

The 2010 organizational structure of the city's administrative bodies is publicly available in all surveyed cities. In 16 of them, these data can be found in the city's official papers that are also available on the city's official website. In some of these 16 cities (e.g. Crikvenica, Labin, Osijek and Sisak), the structure is published as a separate document on the city's official website, which provides a much easier access to information than the local official gazette<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> First citizen contacted the State Audit Office on 25 May and obtained the document on 7 June 2010. The second citizen contacted the State Audit Office on 2 June and obtained the document on 8 June 2010.

<sup>13</sup> See, for example, a Decision on the Organisation of City Administrative Bodies in Sisak at <http://www.sisak.hr/wp-content/uploads/2008/05/Odluka-o-ustrojstvu-upravnih-tijela-Grada-Siska.pdf>.

## Conclusion

Despite the purpose of the Right of Access to Information Act to facilitate the communication between the public and city authorities, there are still difficulties in the enforcement and application of this Act. In support of this is also the low response from LINFOs (as little as about 10% of the cities responded within the prescribed time limits). Therefore, telephone and e-mail contacts were established in order to get the required information. However, these communication media proved to be rather inefficient, because such calls usually remained unanswered. Moreover, the required information could rarely be obtained only by making a telephone call to an LINFO, but it was necessary to contact the city's Finance Department to which the Survey had usually been forwarded. We are of the view that LINFOs should assume full responsibility for giving information. This means that if a citizen who has not received a response to his/her inquiry asks about the inquiry status, the responsible LINFO should give him/her clear information rather than just refer the citizen to other departments of LEXE or LREP.

Moreover, the information to citizens is often incomplete and provided in a complicated way. For example, in response to the question concerning the public disclosure of allocation criteria for current and capital grants, 32% of the LINFO confirmed the existence of such a document but failed to specify its location, or indicated that it was available on request, but failed to submit it to us. Similarly, in response to the question concerning the list of privileged users of city-owned apartments, 47% of the cities confirmed the existence of such a list without indicating its location, or again, said that it was available on request, but failed to submit it to us. Given that these and similar documents are usually not published on the official websites, but are rather available on request, it seems that it will take considerable time and effort for an ordinary citizen to gain access to the necessary information.

Local budget oversight is still weak in some cities. For example in four cities (21%), the Budget Proposal with Projections was presented to the public on the same day when the budget was adopted. In five cities (26%), the Budget Proposal with Projections was made public even after the adoption of the budget. Public hearings on city Budget Proposal with Projections were held in less than 40% of surveyed cities. Some cities have obviously not developed a systematic way of involving citizens in the budgeting process. Access to information should be quick, efficient, accurate and complete, and it should be aimed at meeting the needs of citizens and not only satisfying legal formalities. In the times to come, efforts should be redoubled to promote the transparency and openness of local governments and to strengthen their accountability, which makes the participation of citizens indispensable.



Institut za javne financije • Zagreb • Institute of Public Finance  
Smičiklasova 21, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska/Croatia, p.p. 320 • tel. (+385 1) 4886 444, 4819 363  
fax (+385 1) 4819 365 • E-mail: [office@ijf.hr](mailto:office@ijf.hr) • Web: <http://www.ijf.hr>

**CROATIAN OPEN LOCAL BUDGET INDEX**  
**— A SURVEY FOR LOCAL INFORMATION OFFICERS —**

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Institute of Public Finance (IPF), Zagreb has been conducting a Survey measuring the local budget transparency in 33 biggest cities in Croatia. More information about this project can be found on the IPF's website at <http://www.ijf.hr/index.php?ime=256>.

You are kindly requested to answer the questions below. Should you have any suggestions for improving the Survey, or comments on any of the questions, please, fill in the space provided. This Survey is anonymous.

If you need any further explanations or have any additional comments, please contact Mihaela Bronić, Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb, Smičiklasova 21, phone: 01/4886452, fax: 01/4819365, or email address: [mihaela@ijf.hr](mailto:mihaela@ijf.hr)

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

*Mihaela Bronić*



---

**Please, circle and/or fill in the appropriate answer.**

1. Do you know the date the local representative body members received the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections?

- a) Date:\_\_\_\_\_
- b) The City Council members have not received it.
- c) I do not know.

Comment:\_\_\_\_\_

2. Do you know the date the 2010 City Budget Proposal with Projections was made available to the public (e.g. available on request, put on the website or published in the local newspapers)?

- a) Date:\_\_\_\_\_
- b) It has not been made available to the public.
- c) I do not know.

Comment:\_\_\_\_\_

3. Did the local executive body (the mayor or administrative bodies) organize a public hearing on the 2010 City Budget Proposal with Projections in 2009? If so, when was the public hearing held?

- a) Yes, on\_\_\_\_\_.
- b) No.
- c) I do not know.

Comment:\_\_\_\_\_

4. Has the local executive body (the mayor or administrative bodies) in some other way included the public in the City budget decision-making for 2010 (e.g. by sending out a questionnaire to citizens, requesting their opinion on the 2010 Budget priorities)? If so, please, indicate when and how.

- a) Yes, (when and how?)\_\_\_\_\_
- b) No.
- c) I do not know.

Comment:\_\_\_\_\_

5. Has the local executive body (the mayor or administrative bodies) organized a public hearing on the Year-End report for 2008? If so, when?

- a) Yes, on\_\_\_\_\_
- b) No
- c) I do not know.

Comment:\_\_\_\_\_

- 
6. Have the Local representative body members received the annual financial statements of utility companies as an annex to the Year-End report for 2008?
- a) Yes.
  - b) Yes, but only some of them.
  - c) No.
  - d) I do not know.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

7. Does the Local representative body approve decisions on utility companies' borrowing?
- a) Yes.
  - b) Partly.
  - c) No.
  - d) I do not know.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

*If the answer to any of the following questions is YES or PARTLY, please indicate where such documents can be found. If the documents are available in publications such as local official gazettes, please indicate the number of the gazette. If the documents are only available on request, please, send us these documents. Please, circle and/or fill in the appropriate answer.*

8. Is the list of civil society organizations that received current and capital grants from the city in 2008 or 2009 publicly available?
- a) Yes.
  - b) Partly.
  - c) No.
  - d) I do not know.

Where can this document be found? \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

9. Are the names of the privileged tenants (the users of apartments in city ownership) in 2008 or 2009 publicly available?
- a) Yes.
  - b) Partly.
  - c) No,
  - d) I do not know.

Where can such a list be found? \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

---

10. Are the amounts of remuneration received by the local representative body members in 2008 or 2009 publicly disclosed?

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

Where can such a list be found? \_\_\_\_\_

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

11. Are the criteria for receiving current and capital grants from the city in 2008 or 2009 publicly disclosed?

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

Where can such a list be found? \_\_\_\_\_

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

12. Is the city's Budget Audit Report for 2008 or 2009 publicly available?

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

Where can such a list be found \_\_\_\_\_

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

13. Is the organizational structure of the city's administrative bodies publicly available?

- a) Yes
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

Where can such a list be found? \_\_\_\_\_

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

## Annex D3.

### The analysis of the Survey responses by local representative bodies

The Survey covers members of the LREP (in our research city councils) and/or Committee on Budget Issues in 33 cities included in the project. The Committee is in fact the working body of the LREP. Each city independently prescribes the tasks and number of the Committee members. Thus, for example, Article 60 of the Rules of Procedure of the Zagreb City Council<sup>1</sup> lays down the following: “The Committee on Budget Issues considers the City budget proposal documents, decisions on amendments to the budget, budget execution and the annual calculation of the budget, proposals for decisions on taxes and fees, and other bylaws governing the financial and material operations of the City of Zagreb and the management of the City’s assets; it submits proposals and gives opinions to the City Council”.

There is no law stipulating that local units must have Committee on Budget Issues. These committees are frequently called just Finance Committees. In 15% of surveyed cities, such a specialized committee even does not exist, for example in Kutina, Poreč, Šibenik, Umag and Vinkovci.

In each of the cities, two members of the Committee on Budget Issues have been selected by random sampling (one from the ruling coalition – most frequently the Committee Chairman, and one from the opposition). The Survey was sent to them by post. In cities where such committees do not exist, two LREP members were selected by random sampling – one from the ruling coalition and one from the opposition.

The purpose of the Survey was to assess, from the standpoint of the LREP, the transparency of the local budget and budgetary process, and the degree of interaction among LREP/Committee members, LEXE and the public. Responses were requested to the following questions:

- How is the local budget presented to the members of the LREP/Committee? Is it written in a simple way and understandable to the reader? Is the information presented timely and accurate?
- Is the local budgeting process transparent? (Examined was the document exchange between LREP and LEXE). Is it clear who is responsible for what?
- What are the formal and informal possibilities and limitations for LREP, media and citizens to make the desirable changes in the local budget’s items?
- What can actually be done to help the LREP, media and citizens improve the transparency of the local budgeting process and of the local budget?

The questions were formulated on the basis of the most important laws governing local budgets and budgeting processes, and of similar surveys previously conducted in Croatia, namely Maletić (2006),

<sup>1</sup> Available at <http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx?id=130>

---

Bratić (2008) and GONG (2009). The Survey comprised 25 questions (see the Survey at the end of this Annex).

The Survey was sent to the home addresses of selected members of the LREPs and/or Committee on Budget Issues on 22 May 2010, and the deadline for submission was 7 June 2010. In the cases where the respondents' home addresses were unavailable, the official address of the LREP concerned was used. The Survey was anonymous; enclosed with the Survey was a postage-paid envelope. For further information, the Survey also included the contact data: telephone and fax numbers and e-mail address.

The Survey response rate as at the specified deadline (7 June 2010), was very low - only slightly over 20%. At the end of June, telephone calls were made to the LREP secretaries, or respondents were contacted directly by fixed or mobile telephone in order to find out the status of responding to the Survey, and to reiterate the request for cooperation. In the bulk of cases, it was impossible to establish a contact, as nobody answered the phone. In such cases, where possible, e-mail messages were sent to the respondents asking them to complete the Survey, despite the expiry of the deadline.

Telephone calls to the respondents revealed various reasons for not responding to the Survey. In most cases, this was due to lack of time or, simply due to oblivion caused by absence from work (being on business trip or vacation). Some respondents claimed not to have received the Survey at their home addresses or to have lost it. It is interesting to note that in the cities like Labin, Makarska and Krapina, where the Survey was sent to the LREP's address, they were only delivered to the Committee Chairman (from the ruling coalition), whereas the member of the opposition claimed not to have received the Survey. In such cases, the Survey was sent again by post to an address of the respondent's choice. Furthermore, as the Survey was voluntary, some participants refused to respond (e.g. from Čakovec).

The above-mentioned "reminders" had some effect, so that by 21 July 2010, 39% of all participants (i.e. 26 out of 66) responded to the Survey; 15 ruling coalition members and 11 opposition members. The Survey results and analysis of the questions are given below.

Question 1. In which city are you the local representative body member and/or a member of the local Committee on Budget Issues?

No.	CITIES		
	No response	One response	Two responses
1.	Crikvenica	Bjelovar	Karlovac <sup>2</sup>
2.	Gospić	Čakovec	Kutina
3.	Pazin	Dubrovnik	Labin
4.	Poreč	Koprivnica	Rijeka
5.	Pula	Krapina	Varaždin
6.	Sisak	Makarska	
7.	Split	Opatija	
8.	Umag	Osijek	
9.	Vinkovci	Požega	
10.	Virovitica	Rovinj	
11.	Vrbovec	Samobor	
12.	Zagreb	Slavonski Brod	
13.		Šibenik	
14.		Velika Gorica	
15.		Zadar	
16.		Zaprešić	

Only one response came from each of 16 cities (48%). Responses from both respondents were received from five cities (15%). No response came from 12 cities (36%). The Survey was answered by about 60% of members of the ruling party/coalition and 40% of opposition members (Q18).

The lowest response rate was from the Adriatic part of Croatia, where responses came from seven cities (out of 15): Dubrovnik, Labin, Makarska, Opatija, Rijeka, Rovinj and Šibenik. Similar response rates were reported by the remaining two regions: of nine cities in each of the regions, two or three failed to respond<sup>3</sup>.

Question 2. You are a:

Table 2

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Male	18	69
Female	8	31
Total	26	100


Although not being the subject matter of this question it seems that, the generally known under-representation of women in the policy positions has also been monitored at the local level. Graph 2

<sup>2</sup> The score of Karlovac, Kutina, Rijeka and Varaždin is upwards biased. This question asks whether the two Local representative body / Committee on Budget Issues members responded to our Survey. As only these four cities were included into our Pilot Survey we have personally arranged and held the meetings with both persons in each city.

<sup>3</sup> In 2010, pursuant to a Government decision, Croatia was divided into 3 statistical regions: the North-western region (including the cities of Čakovec, Koprivnica, Krapina, Samobor, Varaždin, Velika Gorica, Vrbovec, Zagreb and Zaprešić), Central and Eastern region (covering Bjelovar, Karlovac, Kutina, Osijek, Požega, Sisak, Slavonski Brod, Vinkovci and Virovitica) and Adriatic region (covering the cities of Crikvenica, Dubrovnik, Gospić, Labin, Makarska, Opatija, Pazin, Poreč, Pula, Rijeka, Rovinj, Split, Šibenik, Umag and Zadar).

shows sex distribution according to party membership. The vertical axis represents the number of respondents to this question.

*Graph 2*



Among both male and female population, a slight prevalence of the ruling coalition members was observed, with the highest response rate observed among the male members of the ruling coalition. Consequently, the responses to the following questions should be treated in accordance with these indicators.


*Question 3. Your age is:*

*Table 3*

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
under 20 years	0	0
20 to 30 years	0	0
30 to 40 years	6	23
40 to 50 years	6	23
50 to 60 years	10	39
over 60 years	4	15
Total	26	100

It is evident that elderly population prevails in the committees. Only 23% of the respondents are under the age of 40, and there are no respondents younger than 30 years. Most respondents are between 50 and 60 years old. The age distribution according to party membership is shown on Graph 3. The vertical axis represents the number of respondents to this question.

Graph 3



It seems that most respondents from the opposition are slightly older than the respondents from the ruling coalition.

*Question 4. How long have you been dealing/acquainted with/interested in budgetary issues?*


Table 4

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
For less than one year	1	4
For 1-5 years	9	35
For 5-10 years	5	19
For over 10 years	11	42
Total	26	100

Over 40% of the respondents have been dealing with the budget for over 10 years. It is therefore expected that the respondents should be fairly well acquainted with the city budgeting process and the issues related to the adoption and execution of budget documents, as well as with the events that take place in their respective cities. The respondents from both the ruling coalition and opposition seem to have similar experiences with the city budget (Graph 4).



Graph 4




Question 5. What is, in your opinion, the most important budget document? Please, choose only one answer.

Table 5

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Budget Proposal with Projections	7	27
Enacted Budget	17	65
Year-End Report	2	8
Other	0	0
Total	26	100

As many as 65% of the respondents consider the Enacted Budget as the most important budget document, whereas 27% of them consider the Budget Proposal with Projections to be the most important. Given the fairly long and complex city budget adoption procedure (Annex H), each of the specified documents is important for a particular stage of the budgeting process. Mixed responses to this question are therefore understandable. However, the responses suggest that the LREP have little influence on the formulation of the budget itself (given that they do not consider the Budget Proposal with Projections as the most important document) and that the cooperation between the LREP and LEXE at the city budget planning stage is likely to be limited.

Graph 5




Question 6. Do you use any local budget document and how often? Please, choose only one answer

Table 6.

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes, I often use them	12	46
Yes, I sometimes use them	13	50
No	1	4
Total	26	100

Almost all the respondents claim to use budget documents often or at least sometimes, which is, in a way, a matter of course. Generally, the task of the LREP should be to control LEXE in the budget adoption and approval processes, so that the response to this question was expected. The analysis of the responses in terms of party membership is given in Graph 6.

Graph 6



Budget documents are more frequently used by the ruling coalition (or party) members.


Question 7. To what extent do you understand the budget documents you use? Please, choose only one answer.

Table 7

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
I understand them	21	81
I partly understand them	5	19
I do not understand them	0	0
Total	26	100

Over 80% of the respondents (interestingly mainly ruling coalition members) understand the budget documents well. The fact that the majority of the respondents clearly understand the budget document should not be surprising. Bratić (2008) arrived at a similar conclusion in his survey conducted in 2004, when about 65% of interviewed City Council members claimed to fully understand the next year's Budget Proposal with Projections. It would be appropriate to ask why this percentage is not higher. It should not be ignored that nearly 20% of the respondents in our Survey claim to only partly understand the budget documents, and these are mainly the members of Committee on Budget Issues. The question is how the persons, who do not fully understand the matter which is supposed to be the basis for their participation in the budgeting process, can make relevant and reasonable judgments. Are they able to decide on how the funds for the city budget should be collected or spent?

Graph 7



The responses to the following question were supposed to provide the reasons for not fully understanding the budget documents.


Question 8. In your opinion, what presents the most important problem in understanding the budget documents? Please, choose only one answer.

Table 8

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Legal terms which are not understandable	1	4
Frequent changes in laws	4	15
Frequent changes of budget classifications	5	19
Complicated laws which are hard to understand	1	4
Time pressure	2	8
Other	1	4
The budget documents are fully comprehensible to me	12	46
Total	26	100

While almost half of the respondents confirm full understanding of the budget documents, the main causes of problems in understanding the budget documents are those diagnosed in a similar survey by Bratić (2008). As indicated by the respondents in our Survey, most of them being members of the opposition, frequent changes in laws and budget classifications, as well as complicated laws present the main problems in understanding the budget documents. This makes it difficult to compare the budget items, as it is rather hard to adapt to such frequent and quick changes. In this way, the demanding work on efficient planning and analysis of the city budget, carried out by professionally experienced members becomes even more difficult. Interestingly 13 respondents fully understanding the budget documents, 11 come from the ruling coalition.

Graph 8




Question 9. Did you have enough time to analyze the local Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010 before its adoption? Please, choose only one answer.

Table 9

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	12	46
Not quite enough	9	35
No	5	19
Total	26	100

Almost the majority of the respondents (46%) were satisfied with the time available for the analysis of the city Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010, whereas almost 20% of the total claim not to have enough time for such an analysis. However, these responses appear to be far more interesting in terms of the respondents' party membership.

Graph 9



While Graph 9 suggests that the membership of the ruling coalition and opposition increases and reduces, respectively, the degree of the LREP members' satisfaction with the time offered for the budget proposal analysis. Thus, the majority of the respondents, satisfied with the time offered for the analysis, were members of the ruling party, whereas most opposition members claimed not to be fully satisfied with the time available for the analysis. However, there are some interesting things to note. For example, the Committee members from Opatija and Šibenik claimed not to have had enough time, although they were members of the ruling coalition, while both respondents from Varaždin claimed not to have had enough time, although they came from opposite parties. By contrast, in Labin, both respondents expressed their satisfaction with the time available for the analysis.

*Question 10. Do you think you could change some items in your local budget (for example, suggest the reduction of or an increase in certain budget expenditures, or inclusion of some new expenditure items)? If your answer is NO, please, explain why.*


**Table 10**

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	15	58
No	11	42
Total	26	100

This question is aimed at getting an immediate assessment of the extent to which the respondents believe they can directly influence the budgeting process. While 58% of total LREP respondents believe to be able to influence the local budgeting process, it is worth noting that out of these 15 respondents, 12 (80%) come from the ruling coalition, which suggests that the role of the LREP, i.e. the Committee on Budget Issues, depends on the membership in the ruling party. This is also confirmed by the indicated reasons for being unable to change the city budgets, e.g.:

- “Only the ruling coalition could change something, the opposition has no influence on the budget.”
- “I am an opposition member.”
- “My suggestions about budget changes are not accepted, because they have majority in the LREP.”
- “Deciding on the budget is subject to party discipline. The ruling party does not accept arguments even if they are in the public interest, unless they are in the interest of the party.”
- “I cannot influence the budget because I am not in power.”

**Graph 10**



*Question 11. What would help you to participate more actively in the local budgeting processes of your city?*

This question is not a multiple-choice one, but the respondents are rather expected to give their opinions and proposals. They believe that more frequent Committee meetings, more time for budget proposal consideration and additional budget materials, as well as more understanding from the party in power and their active inclusion in the budgeting process from its very beginning would improve their participation. Here are some of their comments:

- “High civil awareness (like in Nordic countries) combined with honest and strong government.” (An opposition member)
- “... if all Council members would use their head, and not blindly follow their parties”. (An opposition member)
- “Less politicizing and less “hidden” items in the budget”. (A ruling coalition member)
- “To be a ruling party supporter.” (An opposition member)
- “Additional budget-related materials”. (A ruling coalition member)


*Question 12. In your opinion, who has the most important role in the official monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 12*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
State Audit Office	10	38
Local executive body	10	38
Local representative body	3	12
Local representative body–Committee on Budget Issues or some other committee	2	8
Other	0	0.0
No response	1	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>

Particularly worrying is the fact that almost 80% of total LREP respondents consider the State Audit Office and LEXE as the most influential bodies in the official monitoring and supervision of local budget. Giving priority to the LEXE over the LREP, as the body controlling and supervising the local budget execution, suggests a deviation from the primary role of the LREP in the budgeting process. The task of the LREP is to adopt general bylaws and supervise their implementation, including the adoption and supervision of the budget. Similar conclusions about the role of the LREP in the budgeting process are found in Bratić (2008), i.e. that the role of the LREP is relatively negligible and that the main role in the local budgeting process is played by the LEXE. Maletić (2006) points to another important fact, namely that other external supervision mechanisms are evidently underdeveloped, as no one even mentions the Government, or Ministry of Finance, or other ministries functioning as the bodies exercising control and supervision over the local budget execution. The responses in our Survey appear to be even more interesting if considered in the context of political party membership (Graph 12).

Graph 12



Only the ruling coalition members consider the LREP and the Committee on Budget Issues to have the most important role in the official supervision of the city budget execution. It would be interesting to find out why only they have such opinion.

*Question 13. In your opinion, who has the most important role in the external monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Multiple answers are possible.*

Table 13


	Number of responses <sup>4</sup>	Response rate (%)
Citizens directly	5	12
CSOs	7	17
Local newspapers	14	34
Local radio	4	10
Local websites	4	10
Local TV	2	5
Other	1	2
Nobody	4	10
Total	41	100

The majority of the respondents (about 34%) believe that local newspapers have the key role in external (unofficial) budget execution monitoring. The local papers do not include official city journals. Taken together, local newspapers, radio and TV stations and websites, i.e. local media, seem to be the most powerful communication vehicles between the public and local authorities (59%). The respondents believe that individual citizens have very little opportunities to supervise the budget execution. Maletić (2006) reached a similar conclusion about the low participation of individual citizens in the local budget supervision.

<sup>4</sup> The thirteenth question allowed multiple responses. Therefore, only the responses the total number of which exceeded the number of surveyed persons were taken into account. However, the number of surveyed persons remained unchanged (26).




Graph 13



It is interesting to note that only some members of the opposition pessimistically responded that nobody supervised the city budget execution. No member of the ruling coalition gave such response.

Question 14. On a scale of (1) to (5), please, rank the most important participants in the local budgeting process in your city.

Graph 14



Over 75% of the respondents consider the LEXE to be the most important participant in the budgeting process. Less than 10% rank the LREP as the most important participant (Rank 1). However, the LREP holds a convincing second position (Rank 2), with its share of over 50%. The Ministry of Finance is the

third most important participant in the budgeting process (Rank 3), followed by locally organized groups of citizens (Rank 4) and individual citizens (Rank 5).

These results support the conclusions reached by Maletić (2006) that citizens are insufficiently involved in the local public life and that there is a lot of room for improvement in the communication between local authorities and citizens who actually provide budget revenues.


*Question 15. In your opinion, are the citizens in your city interested in the local budget? Please, choose only one answer.*

**Table 15**

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	4	16
No	6	23
Partially	11	42
I do not know	0	0
No response	5	19
Total	26	100

The responses to this question are supposed to provide an estimate of the citizens' participation from the LREP's perspective. The majority of the respondents (about 60%) optimistically believe that citizens are interested or at least partially interested in their local budgets.

**Graph 15**



*Question 16. In your opinion, what is the most important reason for the citizens' interest in/indifference towards the local budget of your city?*

This question was not of a multiple-choice type. The reasons for citizens' indifference cited by the respondents were: lack of information on, and poor understanding of the complex legal procedures, being preoccupied with own problems and unawareness of the need to participate in the local budgeting process.

*Question 17. In your opinion, what can be done to make the local budget more transparent?*

The most frequent answers to this question were the following:

- The media should be more active in publishing budget proposal documents and other budgetary reports in a timely manner, and informing the public about the events related to them.
- Budgetary documents should be simplified, in order to make them intelligible to a common citizen.
- The Committee on Budget Issues should work more efficiently, and the checks of the LEXEs' operations should be more frequent.

Obviously, even the Committee members are aware of the challenges facing citizens when dealing with the city budget.

*Question 18. Are you a member of the ruling party/coalition or of the opposition?*

*Table 18*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Ruling party/coalition	15	58
Opposition	11	42
Total	26	100

The Survey was answered by about 60% of members of the ruling party/coalition and 40% of opposition members. Although an equal number of Survey questionnaires was sent to both ruling coalition and opposition members, the former seemed to be more willing to respond. Bratić (2008) reached a similar conclusion. According to his survey conducted in 2004, the ruling coalition members of the LREP were more motivated to fill it.


*Question 19. Have your local executive body held consultations with the local representative body, as part of the budget priority establishing process for 2009 and/or 2010? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 19*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes, regularly	6	23
Sometimes	6	23
No	8	31
I do not know	5	19
No response	1	4
Total	26	100

Over 30% of the respondents indicate that the LEXE failed to hold consultations with the LREP members as part of the budget priority establishing process for 2009 and/or 2010. However, it is more interesting to consider the responses to this question in terms of the respondents' party membership.

Graph 19



The responses differ widely between the ruling coalition and opposition members. The former group largely confirms regular or occasional consultations held between the LEXE and the LREP members within the budget priority setting for 2009 and/or 2010. By contrast, the majority of responses obtained from the opposition members are opposite, i.e. that no consultations have been held. For example, in Karlovac, Kutina, Labin and Varaždin, where both the ruling coalition and opposition members responded to the Survey, all the ruling coalition members confirm, while the opposition members deny that the consultations between the LEXE and the LREP have been held. The respondents frequently comment that in most cases, the co-operation, if any, between the LEXE and LREP members depended on the political party membership.

*Question 20. Do you know how much revenue your city obtains from the central government (in the forms of tax sharing and current and capital grants), and according to what criteria? Please, choose only one answer.*


Table 20

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	17	65
Partly	7	27
No	1	4
I do not know	1	4
Total	26	100

It is interesting to note that as many as 65% of the respondents confirm to be acquainted with the rather complicated system of tax sharing and the allocation of central government grants to local units. Of 17 respondents giving such statements, 11 are members of the ruling coalition. It seems that the ruling coalition members are more familiar with these issues. The comments further suggest that a city's position depends on the political orientation of its government relative to the central government.

Specifically, as indicated by some respondents, if the local government is in opposition to the central government, this puts it at a disadvantage regarding the assessment and allocation of grants.

Graph 20




Question 21. Do you think that the documents exchanged between the local executive body and local representative body are timely, complete, clear and understandable? Please, choose only one answer. If your answer is PARTLY or NO, please, explain why.

Table 21

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	11	42
Partly	6	23
No	8	31
I do not know	1	4
Total	26	100

Over 40% of the respondents consider the documents exchanged between the LEXE and the LREP to be timely, complete, clear and understandable, i.e. that the local budget documents are transparent. However, the responses to this question are far more interesting in the context of party membership.

Graph 21



Almost all respondents from the ruling coalition believe the documents exchanged between LEXE and LREP to be timely, complete, clear and understandable, whereas none of the opposition members shares this belief. Two respondents from the ruling coalition who responded negatively explained this by a lack of a systematic cooperation between these two bodies in a city. The opposition members explained their negative responses by the fact that they mostly obtained the documents just a few days before the sessions or even at the sessions. Moreover, they claimed that that the ruling party would vote through these documents despite their possible disagreement.


*Question 22. Do you know what has to be done (relating to the exchange of documents between the local executive body and local representative body), what the deadlines are, and who is responsible for what? Please, choose only one answer.*

Table 22

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	16	61
Partly	7	27
No	3	12
I do not know	0	0
Total	26	100

The majority of the respondents (about 90%) are fully or at least partly acquainted with the document exchange procedure between LREP and LEXE, but in their comments they still complain about too much improvisation and endorse the general opinion that the procedure could be improved and the entire system made more efficient.

Graph 22




*Question 23. Do you personally communicate with the citizens and how? (E.g., do you ask the citizens whether they are satisfied with the existing programs, whether they feel a need to change those programs and/or introduce new ones)? Please, choose only one answer.*

**Table 23**

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes, very often	16	61
Yes, sometimes	9	35
No, I do not	1	4
Total	26	100

Over 60% of the respondents claim that they often communicate personally with citizens. The responses of both ruling coalition and opposition members were similar (Graph 23). Such answers have been expected, as most members of the Committee are also members of the City Council, i.e. elected representatives of citizens who are supposed to participate in the local representative authority. It is therefore normal for them to consult with citizens.

**Graph 23**




Interestingly, however, one respondent indicates that he does not communicate with citizens. It is possible that he misunderstood the question.

*Question 24. Do you clearly understand the explanations presented by the local executive body to the Committee on Budget Issues? Please, choose only one answer.*

**Table 24**

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	15	58
Partly	4	15
No	1	4
I do not know	0	0
No response	6	23
Total	26	100

Graph 24



Although 15 respondents (58%) indicate that they understand the explanations provided by the LEXE, it is noteworthy that as many as 11 of them come from the ruling coalition. Notice should also be taken of the respondents' comments, e.g. that the LEXE only present the data serving the purposes of the current city administration policy, and that the poor budget presentation in the media and vague budget items can easily "fog up" the situation.

*Question 25. In your opinion, what is the most important task of the Committee on Budget Issues?*

As there is no law stipulating the obligation to establish local Committee on Budget Issues or defining their role, we wanted to see what the Committee members really thought about this role. According to the responses of 8 respondents from the opposition and the remaining 11 from the ruling coalition, the tasks of the Committee are as follows:

- control of the LEXE and explanation of the city finance to other LREP members;
- assessment, consideration and formulation of the annual budget, supervision of its execution and deciding on other financial and material operations of the city;
- continued monitoring of the budget during the year in order collect reliable information for the next budget which will be presented to the LREP irrespective of the information presented by the LEXE in pursuit of its political goals;
- providing assistance to the LREP in taking budgetary decisions (on budget revisions, etc.); or
- as perceived by some Committee members, "raising the hands by the majority and flogging a dead horse by the minority".



## Conclusion

Some 40% of the respondents believe that the documents exchanged between LEXE and LREP are timely, complete, clear and understandable, i.e. that these budget documents are transparent. However, while almost all members of the ruling coalition consider these documents to be transparent, none of the opposition members shares this opinion. The opposition members argue that they generally receive the documents as late as two days before the session or at the session itself, and that the ruling party would vote through these documents despite their possible disagreement.

The vast majority (80%) of the respondents are fully, or at least partly acquainted with the document exchange procedure between LREP and LEXE (i.e. they consider the city budget to be transparent), but they still complain about too much improvisation and endorse the general opinion that the procedure could be improved and the entire system made more efficient.

While 15 respondents (58%) believe to be able to influence the budgeting process, 11 of them (80%) come from the ruling coalition, which suggests that the role of the LREP, i.e. the Committee on Budget Issues member, depends on the membership in the ruling party. The respondents believe that their participation in the local budgeting process could be made more active through:

- more frequent Committee meetings and more time available for budget proposal documents consideration;
- more understanding from the party in power, and
- their active inclusion in the budgeting process from its very beginning.

The respondents propose the following ways of making the local budgets more transparent:

- the media should be more active in publishing budget proposals and other budgetary reports in a timely manner and informing the public about the events related to them;
- budgetary documents should be simplified, in order to make them intelligible to a common citizen; and
- the Committee on Budget Issues must work more efficiently and the LEXEs' operations should be subject to checks that are more frequent.

The respondents generally believe that local media play the most significant role in external budget execution monitoring. They also say that individual citizens have very little possibility to supervise the budget execution, and that the public are insufficiently involved in the local public life. They indicate the following reasons for the lack of public interest in the budgeting process:

- lack of information;
- poor knowledge of the complex legal procedures;
- citizens' indifference and preoccupation with own problems; and
- unawareness of the need to participate in the local budgeting process.

There is obviously a lot of room for improvement. More intense communication between the LREP and the public in the form of public forums and debates, TV and radio broadcasts, budget summary booklets, etc., would help citizens better understand the importance of their city budgets and strengthen their influence over it. Raising the public awareness of the possibilities and importance of participation in local budgeting processes would certainly increase the transparency of operations and accountability of the LREP and LEXE, as well as ensure more efficiency in public service provision.



Institut za javne financije • Zagreb • Institute of Public Finance  
Smičiklasova 21, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska/Croatia, p.p. 320 • tel. (+385 1) 4886 444, 4819 363  
fax (+385 1) 4819 365 • E-mail: [office@ijf.hr](mailto:office@ijf.hr) • Web: <http://www.ijf.hr>

**CROATIAN OPEN LOCAL BUDGET INDEX**  
**— A SURVEY FOR LOCAL REPRESENTATIVE BODY MEMBERS AND/OR MEMBERS OF**  
**COMMITTEE ON BUDGET ISSUES —**

Dear Mr./Ms.

The Institute of Public Finance (IPF), Zagreb has been measuring the local budget transparency in 33 biggest cities in Croatia. More information about this project can be found on the IPF's website: <http://www.ijf.hr/eng/index.php?ime=173>.

You are kindly requested to participate in this Survey by answering the following questions. This Survey is anonymous. The results will be used solely for the purposes of this Survey. Any comments from you will also be appreciated.

The deadline for submission of the Survey is 7 June 2010. For anonymity purposes, you can detach this page and send us the answers by fax No.: 01/4819365 or by post (Institute of Public Finance, Smičiklasova 21, p.p. 320, 10000 Zagreb). A postage-paid envelope is enclosed.

If you need any further explanations or have any additional comments, please contact Mihaela Bronić, phone No.: 01/4886452, fax No.: 01/4819365 or email address: [mihaela@ijf.hr](mailto:mihaela@ijf.hr).

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

*Mihaela Bronić*



Institut za javne financije • Zagreb • Institute of Public Finance  
Smičiklasova 21, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska/Croatia, p.p. 320 • tel. (+385 1) 4886 444, 4819 363  
fax (+385 1) 4819 365 • E-mail: [office@ijf.hr](mailto:office@ijf.hr) • Web: <http://www.ijf.hr>

**CROATIAN OPEN LOCAL BUDGET INDEX**  
**— A SURVEY FOR LOCAL REPRESENTATIVE BODY MEMBERS AND/OR MEMBERS OF**  
**COMMITTEE ON BUDGET ISSUES —**

1. In what city are you the local representative body member and/or a member of the Committee on Budget Issues?  

---
2. You are:
  - a) a female,
  - b) a male.
3. Your age is:
  - a) under 20 years,
  - b) 20-30 years,
  - c) 30-40 years,
  - d) 40-50 years,
  - e) 50-60 years,
  - f) over 60 years.
4. How long have you been dealing/acquainted with/interested in budgetary issues:
  - a) for less than one year,
  - b) for 1-5 years,
  - c) for 5-10 years,
  - d) for over 10 years.

*Comment:*  

---

---

- 
5. What is, in your opinion, the most important budget document? Please, choose only one answer.
- a) Budget Proposal with Projections,
  - b) Enacted Budget,
  - c) Year-End Report,
  - d) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. Do you use any local budget document and how often? Please, choose only one answer.
- a) Yes, I often use them.
  - b) Yes, I sometimes use them.
  - c) No.

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. To what extent do you understand the budget documents you use? Please, choose only one answer.
- a) I understand them well.
  - b) I partly understand them.
  - c) I do not understand them.

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8. In your opinion, what presents the most important problem in understanding the budget documents? Please, choose only one answer.
- a) Legal terms which are not understandable,
  - b) Frequent changes in laws,
  - c) Frequent changes of budget classifications,
  - d) Complicated laws which are hard to understand,
  - e) Time pressure,
  - f) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - g) The budget documents are fully comprehensible to me.

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9. Did you have enough time to analyze the local Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010 before its adoption? Please, choose only one answer.
- a) Yes.
  - b) Not quite enough.
  - c) No.
  - d) I have not received it.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. Do you think you could change some items in your local budget (for example, suggest the reduction of, or an increase in certain budget expenditures, or inclusion of some new expenditure items)? If your answer is NO, please, explain why.

YES  NO

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

11. What would help you participate more actively in the budgeting processes of your city?

\_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

12. In your opinion, who has the most important role in the official monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) State Audit Office
- b) Local executive body
- c) Local representative body
- d) Local representative body - Committee on Budget Issues or some other committee
- e) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

13. In your opinion, who has the most important role in the external (unofficial) monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Multiple answers are possible.

- a) Citizens directly
- b) CSO's
- c) Local newspapers
- d) Local radio
- e) Local websites
- f) Local TV
- g) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- h) Nobody.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

---

14. On a scale of (1) to (5), please, rank the most important participants in the local budgeting process in your city:

\_\_\_ Local executive body,

\_\_\_ Local representative body,

\_\_\_ Ministry of Finance,

\_\_\_ locally organized groups of citizens (e.g. CSOs, lobbies),

\_\_\_ individual citizens.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

15. In your opinion, are the citizens in your city interested in the local budget? Please, choose only one answer.

a) Yes.

b) Partially.

c) No.

d) I do not know.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

16. In your opinion, what is the most important reason for the citizens' interest in/indifference towards the local budget of your city?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

17. In your opinion, what can be done to make the local budget more transparent?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

18. Are you a member of the:

a) ruling party/coalition,

b) opposition.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

19. Have your local executive body held consultations with the local representative body members, as part of the budget priority establishing process for 2009 and/or 2010? Please, choose only one answer.

a) Yes, regularly.

b) Sometimes.

c) No.

d) I do not know.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

20. Do you know how much revenue your city obtains from the central government (in the forms of tax sharing and current and capital grants), and according to what criteria? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

21. Do you think that the documents exchanged between the local executive body and local representative body are timely, complete, clear and understandable? Please, choose only one answer. If your answer is PARTLY or NO, please, explain why.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

*Why?* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

22. Do you know what has to be done (relating to the exchange of documents between the local executive body and local representative body), what the deadlines are, and who is responsible for what? Please, choose only one answer. If your answer is PARTLY or NO, please, explain why.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

*Why?* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

23. Do you personally communicate with the citizens and how? (E.g. do you ask the citizens whether they are satisfied with the existing programs, whether they feel a need to change those programs and/or introduce new ones)? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) Yes, very often.
- b) Yes, sometimes.
- c) No, I do not.

*Comment on how you communicate:*

---

---

24. Do you clearly understand the explanations presented by the local executive body to the Committee on Budget Issues? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

*Comment:*

---

---

25. In your opinion, what is the most important task of the Committee on Budget Issues?

---

---



---

## Annex D4.

---

### **The analysis of the Survey responses by local civil society organizations**

A developed civil society is a key prerequisite for establishing and maintaining a democratic state. Civil society organizations are founded with the purpose of promoting the common interests and needs of their members, as well as dealing with issues of general social significance.

This Survey covered the representatives of local civil society organizations in 33 cities. Our idea was to include in the sample civil society organizations from various areas of local government financing, e.g. culture, sports, environmental protection, health care, etc. The first step was to select a sample for each city, consisting of three areas of financing which had received the largest amounts of funds from the city budget in 2007. From each of these areas, we selected a local civil society organization having received the largest amount of funds from the local budget. In selecting the sample, we received assistance from the Government's Office for Cooperation with NGOs. At the second phase, despite the initial goal of questioning only one local civil society organization in each city, the Surveys were sent to two randomly chosen local civil society organizations (LCSOs) in each of the cities, in order to increase the likelihood of response.

The purpose of the Survey was to assess, from the LCSOs' point of view, the transparency of local budgets and of the budgeting process, as well as the activity and participation of the LCSO in the local budgeting process. We were interested in the LCSOs' views on the following questions:

- How is the local budget presented to the public? Is it written in a simple way and understandable to the reader? Is the presented information timely and accurate?
- What are the formal and informal possibilities and limitations for LCSO, media and citizens to make the desirable changes in the local budget's items? Do they make use of these possibilities?
- What can actually be done to improve the transparency of the local budgeting process and local budget?

The Survey was sent out on 22 May 2010, and the deadline for submission of responses was 7 June 2010. The Survey was anonymous; enclosed with the Survey was a postage-paid envelope, and, for further information, the contact data (telephone and fax numbers and the e-mail address).

The questions were formulated on the basis of the most relevant laws governing local budgets and budgeting processes. Reference was made to some similar surveys previously conducted in Croatia, namely Maletić (2006), Bratić (2008) and GONG (2009). The Survey comprised 21 questions (see the Survey at the end of this Annex).

The response rate as at the specified deadline was relatively low - 39%. At the end of June, telephone contacts were made to the local civil society organization presidents, in order to find out the status of responding to the Survey, and to reiterate the request for co-operation. Where no telephone contact could be established, e-mail messages were sent, requesting that the Survey could be completed despite the expiry of the deadline.

The majority of the respondents were unavailable, as they did not answer the phone. However, telephone conversations with some of the respondents revealed that the main reason for not responding to the Survey was lack of time. On the other hand, some respondents claimed not to have seen, or not to remember receiving the Survey. To such respondents the Survey forms were sent again.

In the end, until 8 July 2010 inclusive, 52% of all the participants responded to the Survey. The Survey results are given below.

*Question 1. In what city are you a member of a local civil society organization?*

Table 1

	CITIES		
	Responses received within the deadline	Delayed responses	No responses
1.	Bjelovar <sup>1</sup>	Labin	Crikvenica
2.	Karlovac	Sisak	Čakovec
3.	Kutina	Virovitica	Dubrovnik
4.	Opatija <sup>1</sup>	Zaprešić	Gospić
5.	Pula		Koprivnica
6.	Rijeka		Krapina
7.	Rovinj		Makarska
8.	Samobor		Osijek
9.	Slavonski Brod		Pazin
10.	Split		Požega
11.	Varaždin		Poreč
12.	Velika Gorica		Šibenik
13.	Vrbovec		Umag
14.			Vinkovci
15.			Zadar
16.			Zagreb

Viewed by region, the lowest response rate was observed in the Adriatic region of Croatia (40%), and the highest one in the Central and East Croatia (66%)<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Responses were received from both local civil society organisations only in Bjelovar and Opatija. For statistical processing purposes, only one organisation from each of these two cities was randomly selected.

<sup>2</sup> According to the National Classification of Territorial Units for Statistics, Croatia is divided into 3 statistical regions: the North-west Croatia, Central and East Croatia and the Adriatic region of Croatia. The North-west Croatia comprises the following cities: Čakovec, Koprivnica, Krapina, Samobor, Varaždin, Velika Gorica, Vrbovec, Zagreb and Zaprešić. The Central and East Croatia includes: Bjelovar, Karlovac, Kutina, Osijek, Požega, Sisak, Slavonski Brod, Vinkovci and Virovitica. The Adriatic region covers the cities of Crikvenica, Dubrovnik, Gospić, Labin, Makarska, Opatija, Pazin, Poreč, Pula, Rijeka, Rovinj, Split, Šibenik, Umag and Zadar.

Question 2 You are a:

Table 2

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Male	9	53
Female	8	47
Total	17	100

The number of male and female respondents was almost equal.

Question 3. Your age is:

Table 3

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
under 20 years	0	0
20 to 30 years	1	6
30 to 40 years	5	29
40 to 50 years	4	24
50 to 60 years	4	24
over 60 years	3	17
Total	17	100

Most respondents belong to middle-aged or elderly population, similar as in the case of the LREP Survey (Annex D3).

Question 4. How long have you been dealing/acquainted with/interested in budgetary issues:

Table 4

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
For less than one year	0	0
For 1-5 years	4	24
For 5-10 years	6	35
For over 10 years	7	41
Total	17	100

Given the age distribution and the fact that the respondents should have been presidents of local civil society organisation, the information that they have been acquainted with, or interested in the budgetary issues for more than 5 or 10 years is fully expected.

Question 5. What is, in your opinion, the most important budget document? Please, choose only one answer.

Table 5

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Budget Proposal with Projections	3	17
Enacted Budget	10	59
Year-End Report	4	24
Other:	0	0
Total	17	100

The majority of the respondents (59%) consider the Enacted Budget as the most important budget document. Interestingly enough, the second most important is the Year-End Report (24%), whereas the Budget Proposal with Projections is rated as the least important budget document.

*Question 6. Do you use any of the local budget documents and how often? Please choose only one answer.*

*Table 6*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes, I often use them	6	35
Yes, I sometimes use them	10	59
No	1	6
Total	17	100

Majority of respondents (94%) use some of the city budget documents often or sometimes. According to their comments, the reason for using the city budget documents is, predictably, the desire to find out how many funds have been earmarked for a particular local civil society organization.

*Question 7. To what extent do you understand the budget documents you use? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 7*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
I understand them	8	47
I partly understand them	7	41
I do not understand them	1	6
No response	1	6
Total	17	100 <sup>3</sup>

The responses suggest that majority of respondents (almost 90%) understand, or partly understand the budget documents. Only one respondent does not understand the documents due to the use of unintelligible legal terminology. One of the most frequent comments on this question is that the local budget documents are understandable to them only in the part relating to their local civil society organizations. The wish to deal with own problems is obviously a very strong motive for acquiring the relevant knowledge and experience and for studying the local budget documents.

<sup>3</sup> While only one of the offered answers was allowed, two respondents circled two answers. These answers were also taken into account and processed for the purposes of this analysis.

*Question 8. In your opinion, what presents the most important problem in understanding the budget documents? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 8*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Legal terms which are not understandable	4	23
Frequent changes in laws	1	6
Frequent changes of budget classifications	2	12
Complicated laws which are hard to understand	1	6
Time pressure	2	12
Other	1	6
The budget documents are fully comprehensible to me	6	35
Total	17	100

Given the answers to the previous question, a large number of respondents (some 35%) predictably indicate that they completely understand the budget documents. However, a number of respondents view the unintelligible legal terminology, frequent changes of budget classifications, frequent amendments to laws and time pressure as the main problems. The LEXE also considered frequent changes of budget classifications and laws to be the most serious problems (Annex D1). As local civil society organizations use the budget documents to a much lesser extent than the LEXE does, the unintelligible legal terminology obviously poses a far more serious challenge to them.

*Question 9. Did you have enough time to analyze the Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010 before its adoption? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 9*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	7	41
Not quite enough	3	18
No	2	12
I have not received it	5	29
Total	17	100

Over 40% of the respondents believe to have had enough time for analyzing the Budget Proposal with Projections. However, a number of them (about 30%) indicate that they have not received the Budget Proposal with Projections. The delivery of the Budget Proposal with Projections to a local civil society organization, the media and other interested parties is generally determined and regulated by a City Council's Rules of Procedure<sup>4</sup>. It is worth noting that the LEXE could solve this and similar problems very easily by making the Budget Proposals with Projections available at the website. The only question is whether there is political will to tackle this challenge.

<sup>4</sup> Thus, of the surveyed cities, the delivery of the materials to civil society organisations, the media, etc. is not regulated by a City Council's Rules of Procedure only in Bjelovar, Rovinj and Split.

*Question 10. Do you think you could change some items in your local budget (for example, suggest the reduction of or an increase in certain budget expenditures, or inclusion of some new expenditures)?*

*Table 10*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes	13	76
No	4	24
Total	17	100

Over 75% of the local civil society organization representatives believe they can influence changes in certain items of their city budgets. This is a rather surprising result, given that only 58% of the LREP share this opinion (Annex D3). This may be because the CSO respondents are the representatives of major local civil society organizations that are large beneficiaries of the local budget, so it is likely that the LEXE holds regular annual consultations with them about the allocation of budget funds.

*Question 11. What would help you participate more actively in the local budgeting processes of your city?*

This question was not of a multiple-choice type, but the respondents were expected to express their own opinions and offer proposals. They suggested:

- better information,
- closer co-operation with LEXE and LREP, and
- more knowledge of the matter.

Respondents coming from the local executive body also stressed the need for wider knowledge on the part of citizens (Annex D1). Obviously, the LEXE, the media and various institutions involved in local budgeting should put more effort in making the city budget more clear and accessible to citizens, and giving them the opportunity to influence it.

*Question 12. In your opinion, who has the most important role in the official monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 12*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
State Audit Office	2	12
Local executive body	6	35
Local representative body	3	18
Local representative body – Committee on Budget Issues or some other committee	4	23
Other <sup>5</sup>	2	12
Total	17	100

A large portion of the respondents (35%) believe the LEXE to play the leading role in the monitoring and supervising the local budget execution. This corresponds with the results obtained from members of the LREP and LEXE, and confirms the conclusions about the dominant role of the LEXE in the local

<sup>5</sup> The respondents named the mayor, who actually belongs to the LEXE. However, they probably wanted to emphasize that, in their respective cities, the power was in the hands of a single person, i.e. the mayor.

budgeting process. The second most important role by LCSO opinion is that of the Committee on Budget Issues, or some other LREP committee. The LREP itself occupies a low third position. It is interesting to note that the members of the Committee on Budget Issues themselves, in their Survey, do not believe to play any major role in the monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution (Annex D3).

*Question 13. In your opinion, who has the most important role in the external (unofficial) monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Multiple answers are possible.*

*Table 13*


	<b>Number of responses<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>Response rate</b>
Citizens directly	3	14
CSOs	5	24
Local newspapers	4	19
Local radio	0	0
Local websites	3	14
Local TV	1	5
Other	1	5
Nobody	4	19
Total	21	100

A large portion of local civil society organization representatives (some 38%) believe that civil society organizations and citizens play the key role in external (unofficial) budget execution monitoring. This sounds rather optimistic, as the view that individual citizens and the civil society can have a significant influence on policy seems to be more often endorsed by local civil society organizations than by LEXE or LREP. However, one must not ignore the fact that 19% of the LCSO believe that nobody plays the most important role in external budget execution monitoring. This reveals divided attitudes among the LCSO respondents. It also suggests that there are probably differences in local policy implementation among individual cities, resulting in different opportunities to influence local budgets.

<sup>6</sup> Question 13 was a multiple-choice one. Only the responses, the total number of which exceeded the number of questionnaires, were taken into account. However, the number of questionnaires remained the same as for the previous questions (17).

Question 14. On a scale of (1) to (5), please, rank the most important participants in the local budgeting process in your city.

Graph 14



About 50% of the respondents believe the local executive body to play the key role in the local budgeting process (Rank 1). The LREP (42%) occupies the second position (Rank 2). The Ministry of Finance is the third most important participant in the budgeting process (Rank 3), followed by locally organized groups of citizens (Rank 4) and individual citizens (Rank 5).

Question 15. In your opinion, are the citizens in your city interested in the local budget? Please, choose only one answer.

Table 15

	Number of surveyed persons	Response rate (%)
Yes	11	65
No	4	24
Partially	1	6
I do not know	0	0
No response	1	6
Total	17	100

Another interesting finding is that 65% of the respondents believe that citizens are interested in their local budgets. They explain that everyone wants to know, and should know, how the budget funds are spent and should be acquainted with the balances in their local budgets. By contrast, only 35% of the LEXE



respondent believe that citizens are interested in their local budgets, whereas 60% of them consider citizens partially interested in the budget. Nevertheless, the local civil society organization representatives seem to hold a slightly more optimistic view on the citizens' interest in city budgets.

*Question 16. In your opinion, what is the most important reason for the citizens' interest in/indifference towards the local budget of your city?*

The respondents indicate the following causes of citizens' indifference towards the budget:

- Lack of knowledge of the matter,
- Lack of understanding how the government functions, and
- Ignorance about how to participate in the local community life.

Similar responses also came from the LEXE.

*Question 17. In your opinion, what can be done to make the local budget more transparent?*

The respondents suggest the following measures to improve the local budget transparency:

- Increasing the accessibility of budget documents by publishing them on the Internet and in the local media; and
- Holding public forums and discussions about the budget and the work of LEXE.

As the same measures were suggested by LEXE and LREP it is obvious that more effort is needed to present and explain in a simple way the local budget and budgeting process to citizens, thus enabling them to participate in this process.

*Question 18. Do the citizens in your city have access to the local budget information, in accordance with the the Right of Access to Information Act? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 18*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Yes, to all the information	10	59
Yes, to some information	4	23
No	2	12
I do not know	1	6
Total	17	100


It is optimistic that over 80% of the respondents believe that citizens can exercise their right of access to all or some local budget information. Similar answers came from the LEXE. This leads to the conclusion that the above-mentioned Act finally begins to operate in practice. In contrast to this, GONG (2010) argues that, according to its most recent annual survey (for 2009), less than 50% of responses to the survey sent out to LREP and LEXE (including counties, municipalities and cities) were received on time and in accordance with the Act. It also indicates that the answers are very often only formal and incomplete, concluding that citizens can gain access to information owned by the bodies of public authority only with great difficulty, and that the Right of Access to Information Act needs to be amended. In our own experience majority of LINFO did not respond to our survey within the legally prescribed time

limits; the response rate within the legally prescribed time limits was very low (12%) and the provided information were often incomplete and inaccurate.

*Question 19.* Have you ever seen or read any of the following local budget documents of your city for 2009 and/or 2010:

a) Budget Proposal with Projections	yes	no
b) Enacted Budget	yes	no
c) Half-Year Report	yes	no
d) Year-End Report	yes	no

*Graph 19 (in %)*



"Yes" or "no" had to be circled for each of the listed documents. As many as 71% of the respondents have seen or read the Enacted Budget. Interestingly, slightly more than a half of the respondents has seen or read the Half-Year Report. Only 47% have seen or read the Budget Proposal with Projections. The responses to this question most probably confirm the thesis suggested by the answers to the previous questions, i.e. that local civil society organizations are most interested in the amount of funds allocated to them, which is why the Enacted Budget is the most frequently used document. It is strange that they are not more interested in Budget Proposal with Projections as in Q10 they claim that they can change budgetary items.

*Question 20. Do you ever contact your local executive body, demanding improvement in some locally provided goods or services? Please choose only one answer.*

*Table 20*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
Often	5	29
Occasionally	9	53
Rarely	1	6
Never	1	6
No response	1	6
Total	17	100

As many as 82% of the respondents, contact their LEXE occasionally or often, demanding improvement of some locally provided goods or services. Their comments suggest that these requests typically concern the area of a particular LCSO's activity. Thus, for example, the disabled persons associations demand solutions that would improve the quality of their life and ensure mobility (by providing them with platform lifts, elevators and disabled parking spaces); human rights promotion organizations require solutions for improving the social status of citizens, etc. As individual citizens still have great difficulties when trying to participate actively in the local budgeting process, it can be concluded that such LCSO are perfect vehicles for promoting citizens' interests and facilitating the accomplishment of their preferential goals.

*Question 21. If you have never seen any local budget document, or never participated in any local budgeting process, explain why? Please, choose only one answer.*

*Table 21*

	<b>Number of surveyed persons</b>	<b>Response rate (%)</b>
That is of no interest to me	0	0
I think this is complicated and hard to understand	0	0
I have no time for that	0	0
I think this is useless because I cannot change anything; this is a political issue	2	12
It is not possible to influence the budgeting process	0	0
Other	2	12
No response	13	76
Total	17	100

This question was answered by only four (out of 17) respondents (24%). However, this was expected, as in their answers to the previous questions most of the respondents claimed to have participated in one way or another in the local budgeting process, or to have seen or read some of the local budget documents. The general view of those who responded to this question is that they cannot influence the local budgeting process because this is a political issue.

---

## Conclusion

Almost all surveyed local civil society organization representatives (about 90%) believe they understand or partly understand the budget documents. However, most of the comments suggest that this answer means that each representative only understands that part of the city budget which relates to his/her own local civil society organization. Furthermore, the biggest challenge facing the respondents in using the budget documents is the unintelligible legal terminology, as well as frequent changes in budget classifications and lack of time. It is obvious that citizens need more information about what the local budget is, what items it comprises, what is presented under particular items and how they can participate in the local budgeting process.

What surprises is that 65% of the LCSO respondents believe that citizens are interested in their cities' budgets, primarily because they want to watch the spending of the local budget money. It is optimistic that over 80% of the respondents believe that citizens can exercise their right of access to all or some local budget information, which suggests that they might have positive experiences with this matter. As many as 77% of the respondents believe they can influence changes in some items of the local budget. This is rather surprising, given that only 58% of the surveyed LREP representatives share this view. A possible reason for this is that the respondents are the representatives of major local civil society organizations that are large beneficiaries of the budget, so it is likely that the LEXE holds regular annual consultations with them regarding the allocation of budget funds to local civil society organizations.

The surveyed LCSO representatives believe that the LEXE plays the key role in the budgeting process, but they also consider civil society organizations and individual citizens to play the main role in external (unofficial) budget execution monitoring.

Just like the LEXE and LREP, the LCSO representatives believe that the lack of knowledge and information about the possibilities of participation in the local community life poses obstacles to a more active involvement of citizens in these processes. They hold that publishing the local budget documents on the Internet and organizing public forums with discussions about the local budget would contribute significantly to improving budget transparency. They further indicate that a more active participation of LCSOs in the budgeting process could be achieved through better information, a closer co-operation with LEXE and LREP and better knowledge of the matters relating to the local budget and local budgeting process.



Institut za javne financije • Zagreb • Institute of Public Finance  
Smičiklasova 21, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska/Croatia, p.p. 320 • tel. (+385 1) 4886 444, 4819 363  
fax (+385 1) 4819 365 • E-mail: [office@ijf.hr](mailto:office@ijf.hr) • Web: <http://www.ijf.hr>

**CROATIAN OPEN LOCAL BUDGET INDEX**  
**— A SURVEY FOR LOCAL CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS —**

Dear Mr./Ms.

The Institute of Public Finance (IPF), Zagreb has been measuring the local budget transparency in 33 biggest cities in Croatia. More information about this project can be found on the IPF's website: <http://www.ijf.hr/eng/index.php?ime=173>.

You are kindly requested to participate in this Survey by answering the following questions. This Survey is anonymous. The results will be used solely for the purposes of this Survey. Any comments from you will also be appreciated.

The deadline for submission of the Survey is 7 June 2010. For anonymity purposes, you can detach this page and send us the answers by fax No.: 01/4819365 or by post (Institute of Public Finance, Smičiklasova 21, p.p. 320, 10000 Zagreb). A postage-paid envelope is enclosed.

If you need any further explanations or have any additional comments, please contact Mihaela Bronić, phone No.: 01/4886452, fax No.: 01/4819365, or email address: [mihaela@ijf.hr](mailto:mihaela@ijf.hr).

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

*Mihaela Bronić*



Institut za javne financije • Zagreb • Institute of Public Finance  
Smičiklasova 21, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska/Croatia, p.p. 320 • tel. (+385 1) 4886 444, 4819 363  
fax (+385 1) 4819 365 • E-mail: [office@ijf.hr](mailto:office@ijf.hr) • Web: <http://www.ijf.hr>

**CROATIAN OPEN LOCAL BUDGET INDEX**  
**— A SURVEY FOR LOCAL CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS —**

1. In what city are you a member of a local civil society organization?

\_\_\_\_\_

2. You are:

- a) a female,
- b) a male.

3. Your age is:

- a) under 20 years,
- b) 20-30 years,
- c) 30-40 years,
- d) 40-50 years,
- e) 50-60 years,
- f) over 60 years.

4. How long have you been dealing/acquainted with/interested in budgetary issues:

- a) for less than one year,
- b) for 1-5 years,
- c) for 5-10 years,
- d) for over 10 years.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. What is, in your opinion, the most important budget document? Please choose only one answer.

- a) Budget Proposal with Projections,
- b) Enacted Budget,
- c) Year-End Report,
- d) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

- 
6. Do you use any of the local budget documents and how often? Please choose only one answer.
- a) Yes, I often use them.
  - b) Yes, I sometimes use them.
  - c) No.

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

7. To what extent do you understand the budget documents you use? Please choose only one answer.
- a) I understand them well.
  - b) I partly understand them.
  - c) I do not understand them.

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

8. In your opinion, what presents the most important problem in understanding the budget documents? Please choose only one answer.
- a) Legal terms which are not understandable,
  - b) Frequent changes in laws,
  - c) Frequent changes of budget classifications,
  - d) Complicated laws which are hard to understand,
  - e) Time pressure,
  - f) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - g) The budget documents are fully comprehensible to me.

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

9. Did you have enough time to analyze the local Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010 before its adoption? Please choose only one answer.
- a) Yes.
  - b) No, not quite enough.
  - c) No.
  - d) I have not received it.

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

10. Do you think you could change some items in your local budget (for example, suggest the reduction of, or an increase in certain budget expenditures, or inclusion of some new budget expenditures)? If your answer is NO, please explain why.

YES

NO

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

11. What would help you participate more actively in the local budgeting processes of your city?

\_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

12. In your opinion, who has the most important role in the official monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Please choose only one answer.

- a) State Audit Office
- b) Local executive body
- c) Local representative body
- d) Local representative body – Committee on Budget Issues or some other committee
- e) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

13. In your opinion, who has the most important role in external (unofficial) monitoring and supervision of the local budget execution in your city? Multiple answers are possible.

- a) Citizens directly
- b) CSO's
- c) Local newspapers
- d) Local radio
- e) Local websites
- f) Local TV
- g) Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- h) Nobody.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_



---

14. On a scale of (1) to (5), please, rank the most important participants in the local budgeting process in your city:

- \_\_\_ Local executive body,
- \_\_\_ Local representative body,
- \_\_\_ Ministry of Finance,
- \_\_\_ locally organized groups of citizens (e.g. CSOs, lobbies),
- \_\_\_ individual citizens.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

15. In your opinion, are the citizens of your city interested in the local budget? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

16. In your opinion, what is the most important reason for the citizens' interest in/indifference towards the local budget of your city?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

17. In your opinion, what can be done to make the local budget more transparent?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

18. Do the citizens of your city, in practice, have access to local budget information, in accordance with the Right of Access to Information Act? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) Yes, to all the information.
- b) Yes, to some information.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

---

19. Have you ever seen or read any of the following local budget documents of your city for 2009 and/or 2010:

- |                                     |     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| a) Budget Proposal with Projections | yes | no  |
| b) Enacted Budget                   | yes | no  |
| c) Half-Year Report                 | yes | no  |
| d) Year-End Report                  | yes | no? |

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

20. Do you ever contact your local executive body, demanding improvement in some locally provided goods or services? Please choose only one answer.

- a) Often.
- b) Occasionally.
- c) Rarely.
- d) Never.

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

21. If you have never seen any local budget document, or never participated in any local budgeting process, explain why? Please, choose only one answer.

- a) That is of no interest to me.
- b) I think that is complicated and hard to understand.
- c) I have no time for that.
- d) I think that is useless because I cannot change anything; that is a political issue.
- e) It is not possible to influence the budgeting process,
- f) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

---

## Annex D5.

---

### The analysis of the Survey responses by Ministry of Finance

This Survey was aimed at assessing, from the MFIN's point of view, the transparency of local budgets and budgeting processes, as well as the interaction of the MFIN with LEXE. Responses were requested to the following questions:

- Have the employees of the MFIN had enough time to write Local Budget Preparation Instructions for 2010?
- Are the documents exchanged between the MFIN and LEXE transparent? Are the responsibilities clearly defined?
- What is the communication like between the MFIN and LEXE?
- What exactly can be done to increase the transparency of the local budgeting process and local budgets?

The MFIN evidently plays an important role in the local budgeting process. Specifically, it is the quality and timeliness of Local Budget Preparation Instructions, issued by the MFIN that the entire local budget adoption procedure depends on. This procedure in itself is very complex and has several phases. First, the MFIN submits Local Budget Preparation Instructions to LEXE. Upon receiving the MFIN's Instructions, LEXE issues its own Local Budget Preparation Instructions and delivers it to its budget users (e.g. kindergartens). The local budget users prepare their own financial plan proposals and submit them to LEXE that uses these proposals for making a draft local budget (see Annex H).

The questions in our Survey were formulated on the basis of the most relevant laws governing local budgets and budgeting processes, and of similar surveys previously conducted in Croatia, namely Maletić (2006), Bratić (2008) and GONG (2009). The Survey comprised 13 questions (see the Survey at the end of this Annex).

We intended to interview all the seven employees of the MFIN's Local Units Financing Department. The Surveys were sent out on 20 September and the deadline for submission was 27 September 2010. The Survey was anonymous; enclosed with the Survey was a postage-paid envelope, together with the telephone and fax numbers and an e-mail address for further inquiries, if any.

Given that only two officers responded to the Survey (28%), there was no point in analysing these responses as in other Surveys in this research. Therefore, we give a brief overview of the responses with comments. The two respondents are a man and a woman between 40 and 60 years of age. One of the respondents has been dealing with the budget for 5-10 years and the other for more than 10 years.

*Have you had enough time to write Local Budget Preparation Instructions for 2010?*

One respondent from the MFIN claims to have had enough time, whereas the other indicates that the time was only partly enough. The latter respondent believes that the cause of having only partly enough time is an almost regular delay in issuing Government Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines that provide a basis for the preparation of the above-mentioned Local Budget Preparation Instructions. There is obviously a problem with the timely issuance of the Government Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines. According to Article 25 of the Budget Act, the Government is supposed to issue Government Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines for a three-year period no later than mid-June of the current year for the following year. In the last five years, the issuance of the Government Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines has been delayed. For example, the Government Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines for 2010 were issued in September 2009, and those for 2011 in October 2010<sup>1</sup>. If the Government Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines are behind schedule, then the MFIN is late in issuing Local Budget Preparation Instructions, and, consequently, the LEXE does not have enough time for efficient planning and adoption of a local budget proposal documents.

It is interesting that the surveyed LEXE also pointed to problems in connection with the Local Budget Preparation Instructions (Annex D1). Twenty percent of the LEXE respondents claimed not to have had enough time to draft and prepare a city Budget Proposal with Projections for 2010. They indicated the following reasons relating to MFIN for not having enough time for the drafting and preparation of the 2010 Budget Proposal with Projections:

- Delayed issue of the MFIN's Local Budget Preparation Instructions; and
- A lack of basic parameters for planning, particularly revenue planning (i.e. vaguely defined MFIN's Local Budget Preparation Instructions).

However, since MFIN respondents receive Guidelines from the Government with delay, and the number of local units is simply too large (576) for only seven employees of the MFIN's Local Units Financing Department it can be concluded that MFIN respondents are not the only ones to blame for the delay. As we are dealing with chain responsibility here, it is obvious that an orderly and effective implementation of the local budgeting process requires full cooperation among all the participants (the MFIN, the Government and local units). It is also clear that more attention should be given to the quality of Local Budget Preparation Instructions (as the LEXE complains that they are too general and often ill-defined).

*Has the Ministry of Finance held consultations with the local executive bodies during the writing of Local Budget Preparation Instructions for 2009 and/or 2010?*

One of the respondents indicates that the MFIN only sometimes held consultations with some of local executive bodies about Local Budget Preparation Instructions; whereas the other respondent claims that no such consultations were held. The cause of insufficient consultations, according to the second respondent, is an excessive number of local units (576), which is why consultations cannot be held within the available time. However, it is indicated that the MFIN's employees participate in seminars organised by various private consulting firms (e.g. Accounting and Finance; Accounting, Audit and Finance or TEB

<sup>1</sup> The question remains whether the Macroeconomic Analysis and Planning Bureau drew up the Guidelines with delay, or their voting by the Government was delayed.

Business Consultancy), where they inform the participants on the content of the Local Budget Preparation Instructions.

*Do you think that the documents exchanged between the local executive bodies and Ministry of Finance are timely, complete and understandable to all participants in the process?*

Both respondents from the MFIN believe the documents exchanged between LEXE and the MFIN not to be quite timely, complete and understandable. Interestingly, the respondents also indicate vague Local Budget Preparation Instructions from the MFIN, as the reason for obscurity of documents, but they also believe that the clarity depends on the professional competence of the people performing the local budget-related activities. They say that frequent changes in regulations relating to local units financing within a relatively short period of time result in omissions and errors, and, consequently, in numerous amendments which complicate and lengthen the document exchange between the MFIN and LEXE.

*In your opinion, are all the participants in the budgeting process aware of what has to be done (relating to document exchange between the local executive bodies and Ministry of Finance), what the deadlines are and who is responsible for what?*

Both respondents believe that all the participants in the process are only partly aware of what has to be done with respect to document exchange between the LEXE and MFIN. They also indicate other factors influencing the cooperation between the MFIN and LEXE, such as:

- The quality and level of education of the employees of LEXE;
- Frequent changes in regulations relating to local units financing;
- An unsystematic approach to local unit financing issues on the central government level; and
- Sometimes poorly equipped local units (both technically and in terms of personnel).

*Do you personally communicate with the local executive bodies and how?*

The surveyed representatives of the MFIN indicate that they frequently communicate with LEXE during their normal work, mostly by phone, e-mail and post, for the purpose of providing advice or sending reminders to submit the required documentation.

*In your opinion, what are the problems in the communication with Local/Regional Executive Bodies?*

According to the respondents, the communication is mostly hampered by complicated laws that are hard to understand, and their interpretations that do not actually facilitate their application. They add that sometimes there are even multiple interpretations of the same issue, which causes confusion for local units. The respondents also believe that there are too many local units with too many obligations to the MFIN.

It is interesting that also the surveyed LEXE complained about having communication problems with the MFIN, indicating that it was difficult to establish telephone contacts and, particularly, to approach senior staff, and that the MFIN frequently ignored their inquiries (Annex D1).

*In your opinion, what can be done to improve your communication with Local/Regional Executive Bodies?*

The respondents believe that a systematic approach to dealing with the local unit financing issues would help reduce the number of amendments to the regulations regarding local units financing and thus make them simpler and easier to apply. This would accelerate and facilitate the entire document exchange procedure between the MFIN and LEXE. Moreover, one of the respondents believes the education of employees of the MFIN, and even more so of LEXE, to be the most efficient way of improving the communication.

On the other hand, a way of improving the communication with the MFIN, as suggested by the surveyed LEXE representatives, would be to establish an advisory body within the MFIN, responsible for clearing up certain ambiguities, or receiving suggestions relating to the planning and execution of local budgets (Annex D1).

*On a scale of (1) to (5), please, rank the most important participants in the city's budgeting process.*

The responses to this question are shown in the following table:

*Table 1*

<b>Participants in the budgeting process</b>	<b>Respondent 1</b>	<b>Respondent 2</b>
Rank 1	Local executive body	Local executive body
Rank 2	Local representative body	Local representative body
Rank 3	Locally organised groups of citizens	Locally organised groups of citizens
Rank 4	Ministry of Finance	Individual citizens
Rank 5	Individual citizens	Ministry of Finance

The responses of the surveyed MFIN representatives clearly show that the key player in the city budgeting process is LEXE, followed by LREP, and locally organised groups of citizens (e.g. CSOs and lobbies). Both respondents believe that the MFIN plays only a minor role in the entire city budgeting process, one of them ranking MFIN even lower than individual citizens

*Do you think that you sufficiently verify the accuracy of reports submitted by cities?*

Given the obligation of city mayors to submit a series of reports to the MFIN (e.g. Enacted Budgets or Year-End Reports – see Annex G), we wished to find out whether the representatives of the MFIN consider their checks of these reports as sufficient. Both respondents believe that they only partly verify the accuracy of these reports, primarily due to a shortage of staff dealing with these issues in the MFIN. They also emphasize that, given a ban on employment in the government sector, the MFIN is understaffed, and that MFIN generally pays too much attention to the central government budget.

It should be noted that also the surveyed LEXE representatives complained of the MFIN being too preoccupied with the central government (Annex D1). As there are only seven employees in the MFIN's Local Units Financing Department (only two of them having longer experience in local budgeting) and as many as 576 local units, it is clear that it is almost impossible to ensure high quality of work and a

thorough examination of the reports submitted by all the local units. Therefore, the responses obtained from MFIN are quite expected.

*What would be your suggestions for further improvement of city budgets and budgeting processes, in order to make them more transparent (timely, complete and understandable to all participants in the process)?*

The surveyed representatives of the MFIN propose the following measures to improve the transparency of city budgets and budgeting processes:

- Reducing the number of local units;
- Exclusive and effective application of the Budget Act and regulations pertaining to it;
- Less changes in the existing legislation relating to local units; and
- Adequate training of all participants in the budgeting process (at the local level and in the MFIN).

## Conclusion

The conclusions of this Survey are the following:

- The MFIN's Local Units Financing Department is understaffed.
- The number of local units is excessive, and they have too many obligations to the MFIN.
- The main obstacle to the communication between the MFIN and LEXE is complicated legislation and its interpretations that do not actually explain it; sometimes there are even contradictory interpretations of the same issue.
- The documents exchanged between LEXE and the MFIN are not quite timely, complete and understandable. For example, the Local Budget Preparation Instructions issued by the MFIN are often late and imprecise, whereas the clarity of the documents also depends on the professional competence of the people performing local budget-related activities.
- Closer attention should be paid to the quality of Local Budget Preparation Instructions (given the LEXEs' complaints that they are too general and often vague).
- Due to delayed issue of Government Economic and Fiscal Policy Guidelines, the employees of the MFIN's Local Units Financing Department do not have enough time to prepare Local Budget Preparation Instructions.
- Due to inadequate information and an unsystematic approach to problems, not all participants in the budgeting process are quite clear about what should be done relating to the document exchange between the MFIN and LEXE. A more systematic approach to tackling local units financing problems would reduce the number of changes in the legislation and make it simpler and easier to apply.
- A better understanding of the documents exchanged between the MFIN and LEXE could be gained through improved training of the MFIN's employees, and even more so of those working in the LEXE.

A comparison between the responses of employees of the MFIN and the LEXE shows that both groups are facing the same problems, namely difficulties in communication and a limited amount of time to perform their tasks. The surveyed MFIN representatives are aware of weaknesses and deficiencies in the laws and regulations governing local budgets, and they propose concrete transparency improvement measures, such as additional training for all participants in the budgeting process, reducing the number of local units and less change in the legislation relating to local units.





Institut za javne financije • Zagreb • Institute of Public Finance  
Smičiklasova 21, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska/Croatia, p.p. 320 • tel. (+385 1) 4886 444, 4819 363  
fax (+385 1) 4819 365 • E-mail: [office@ijf.hr](mailto:office@ijf.hr) • Web: <http://www.ijf.hr>

**CROATIAN OPEN LOCAL BUDGET INDEX**  
**— A SURVEY FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE**  
**[Local Units Financing Department] —**

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb has been conducting a Survey measuring the local budget transparency in 33 biggest cities in Croatia. More information about this project can be found at <http://www.ijf.hr/index.php?ime=256>.

You are kindly requested to participate in this Survey by answering the following questions. This Survey is anonymous. The results will be used solely for the purposes of this Survey. Any comments from you will also be appreciated.

The deadline for submission of the Survey is 27 September 2010. For anonymity purposes, you can detach this page and send us the answers by fax No.: 01/4819365 or by post (Institute of Public Finance, Smičiklasova 21, p.p. 320, 10000 Zagreb). A postage-paid envelope is enclosed.

Should you need any further explanations, or have any additional comments, please contact Mihaela Bronić, phone No.: 01/4886452, fax No.: 01/4819365, or email address: [mihaela@ijf.hr](mailto:mihaela@ijf.hr).

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

*Mihaela Bronić*



Institut za javne financije • Zagreb • Institute of Public Finance  
Smičiklasova 21, 10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska/Croatia, p.p. 320 • tel. (+385 1) 4886 444, 4819 363  
fax (+385 1) 4819 365 • E-mail: [office@ijf.hr](mailto:office@ijf.hr) • Web: <http://www.ijf.hr>

**CROATIAN OPEN LOCAL BUDGET INDEX**  
**— A SURVEY FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE**  
**[Local Units Financing Department] —**

1. You are:
    - a) a female,
    - b) a male.
  
  2. Your age is:
    - a) under 20 years,
    - b) between 20 and 30 years,
    - c) between 30 and 40 years,
    - d) between 40 and 50 years,
    - e) between 50 and 60 years,
    - f) over 60 years.
  
  3. How long have you been dealing with budgetary issues:
    - a) for less than one year,
    - b) for 1-5 years,
    - c) for 5-10 years,
    - d) for over 10 years?
- Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Have you had enough time to write Local Budget Preparation Instructions for 2010? Please, choose only one answer. If your answer is PARTLY or NO, please, explain why.
    - a) Yes.
    - b) Partly.
    - c) No.

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

---

5. Has the Ministry of Finance held consultations with local executive bodies during the writing of Local Budget Preparation Instructions for 2009 and/or 2010? Please, choose only one answer. If your answer is SOMETIMES or NO, please explain why.

- a) Yes, regularly.
- b) Sometimes.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Do you think that the documents exchanged between local executive bodies and Ministry of Finance are timely, complete and understandable to all participants in the process? Please choose only one answer. If your answer is PARTLY or NO, please explain why.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

7. In your opinion, are all the participants in the budgeting process aware of what has to be done (with respect to document exchange between local executive bodies and Ministry of Finance), what the deadlines are and who is responsible for what? Please, choose only one answer. If your answer is PARTLY or NO, please explain why.

- a) Yes.
- b) Partly.
- c) No.
- d) I do not know.

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Do you personally communicate with the local executive bodies and how? Please, choose only one answer and explain the method of communication.

- a) Yes, very often.
- b) Yes, sometimes.
- c) No.
- d) I do not.

Method of communication:

---



---

9. In your opinion, what are the problems in the communication with Local/Regional Executive Bodies? Multiple answers are possible.
- a) Complicated laws that are hard to understand;
  - b) Frequent changes in budget classifications;
  - c) Frequent changes in laws;
  - d) Frequent changes in budgetary procedures;
  - e) Too many local units;
  - f) Too many obligations to the Ministry of Finance, to be met by local units;
  - g) Poor planning by the Ministry of Finance and unsatisfactory informing local units on changes in the legislation relating to them;
  - h) It is not always clear what should be done, when and by whom;
  - i) Poor communication with local executive bodies;
  - j) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Comment:

---



---

10. In your opinion, what can be done to improve your communication with local executive bodies?
- 
- 

11. On a scale of (1) to (5), please, rank the most important participants in the city's budgeting process:

- \_\_\_ Local executive body,  
 \_\_\_ Local representative body,  
 \_\_\_ Ministry of Finance,  
 \_\_\_ locally organized groups of citizens (e.g. civil society organizations, lobbies).  
 \_\_\_ individual citizens.

Comment:

---



---

12. Do you think that you sufficiently verify the accuracy of reports submitted by cities? Please, choose only one answer.
- a) Yes.
  - b) Not quite sufficiently.
  - c) No.
  - d) I do not know.

If your answer is NOT QUITE SUFFICIENTLY or NO, please, explain why.

- a) There are no formal and organised supervision and control mechanisms.
- b) The number of employees dealing with this area is insufficient.
- c) The supervision tightening is subject to a political decision.
- d) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Comment:* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

13. What would be your suggestions for further improvement of city budgets and budgeting processes, in order to make them more transparent (timely, complete and understandable to all participants in the process)?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

---

## Annex E.

---

### Why we have selected the 33 cities — Financial analysis of Croatian local units` budgets

#### 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The aim of this part of the report is to explain the three reasons why we have selected 33 biggest cities in Croatia for our sample. The first reason lies in the fact that local budgets of 33 selected cities make up around 56% of all local units' budgets. The second reason is that around 49% of the Croatian population lives in these 33 cities<sup>2</sup>. Finally, the revenue and expenditure structure of these 33 cities' budgets does not differ too much from the revenue and expenditure structure of other Croatian local units, especially other cities and municipalities<sup>3</sup>. In this context, further on we analyze Croatian local units` budgets.

Croatia is a small unitary country (4.4 million people) with a decentralized administrative structure formed by central, regional and local governments. Croatian citizens have a constitutional right to local and regional self-government, which includes the right to participate in deciding on local and regional needs and interests. Therefore the country is divided into counties (21), cities (126) and municipalities (429).

As part of the process of fiscal decentralization, the central government enabled local units, as of 2001, to assume partial responsibility for the financing of education, health care, social welfare and fire fighting. This represented the partial transfer of powers some of the expenditures (material expenditures and expenditures for the acquisition of non-financial assets) to those local units that had assumed responsibility for the financing of health care and education. It also represented the transfer of power over the full expenditures, including salaries, to those local units that had assumed responsibility for the financing of social welfare (the payment of benefits, and services such as nursing home and child protection services) and fire fighting.

In 2001 all the counties (20), 32 cities and the City of Zagreb agreed to assume responsibility for some public services, i.e. expenditures, for education, health care and social welfare, and 126 municipalities/cities took over expenditures for the regular fire fighting activities. Those local units that took over the decentralized public services were allocated an additional share in personal income tax for each public service.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper draws heavily on Ott, K., Bajo, A., Bronić, M., Bratić, V., Medak Fell, D., (2009).

<sup>2</sup> In 33 biggest cities lives around 2.2 million people.

<sup>3</sup> Local units – municipalities and cities, but the term also sometimes includes counties.

## 2. Local unit budgets

Each local unit has its own local budget or plan of revenue and expenditure. The budget of a local unit shows the revenues pertaining to this local unit and the expenditures incurred in the performance of activities within its competence.

### Who are the local budget users?

The local budget users are institutions established by a local unit, which are mostly financed from the local budget, their budget revenue and expenditure being constituent parts of the local budget. They include, for example, primary and secondary schools and kindergartens.

Besides the local budget users, there are also the extra-budgetary users of local budgets. These are legal persons in which the local units exert a decisive influence on the management, and which are financed in part from the budget and partly by the revenues from own operations. An important fact about the extra-budgetary users of local budgets is that they maintain their own budgets, also called financial plans. Their revenues and expenditures are not constituent parts of local budgets, but are only included in the local units' consolidated budget.

## 3. The structure of local units' budgets

In order to understand the importance of 33 cities that took over decentralized functions and their role in the Croatian local government sector, the remainder of this work deals with an in-depth data analysis of local units' budget execution for the year 2009. Four separate data sets were observed and compared. The first, (A), representing total local unit budget execution (556 - municipalities and cities), the second, (B), representing the budgets of 33 cities that took over decentralized functions<sup>4</sup>, the third, (C), representing the budgets of 32 cities that took over decentralized functions (not including the capital city - Zagreb), and the fourth, (D), representing the budgets of Croatian cities that did not take over decentralized functions (values for 94 cities). Special attention is given to a comparison of budgets of the 33 biggest cities that took over decentralized functions in 2001 and the other 94 cities.

The analysis firstly focuses on total local units' revenue and expenditure in 2009, and then proceeds with a detailed examination of revenue structure, with a special emphasis on tax revenue. Thereafter, the analysis focuses on the expenditure side of the local budget, thoroughly covers cities' financial accounts and concludes with the analysis of total financial results of local units.

**Total revenue and expenditures** (not including the financial account). The revenue/expenditure of 33 observed cities that took over the decentralized functions represents more than 56% of total local unit revenue/expenditure (see Table 1)<sup>5</sup>. The city of Zagreb (one of the 33 cities and the capital) alone collects/spends around 30% of all local units' revenue/expenditure<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Zagreb, Samobor, Velika Gorica, Vrbovec, Zaprešić, Krapina, Kutina, Sisak, Karlovac, Varaždin, Koprivnica, Bjelovar, Crikvenica, Opatija, Rijeka, Gospić, Virovitica, Požega, Slavonski Brod, Zadar, Osijek, Šibenik, Vinkovci, Makarska, Split, Labin, Pazin, Poreč, Pula, Rovinj, Umag, Dubrovnik and Čakovec.

<sup>5</sup> The percentages are calculated by i.e. dividing cumulative value of revenues in 33 cities (13,030) with cumulative value total local units' revenue (23,318).

<sup>6</sup> 29% = (13,030-6,287)/23,318.

Table 1. Local units` total revenue and expenditures (not including financial account) in 2009, mil HRK

	A	B	C	D
Current revenue	22,437	12,617	5,939	2,913
Revenue from nonfinancial assets	880	413	348	252
<b>Total revenue</b>	<b>23,318</b>	<b>13,030</b>	<b>6,287</b>	<b>3,165</b>
Current expenditure	19,398	11,194	5,247	2,548
Expenditure for acquisition of nonfinancial assets	5,853	2,980	1,439	977
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>25,251</b>	<b>14,174</b>	<b>6,686</b>	<b>3,525</b>
Current deficit/surplus	3,040	1,423	692	365
Nonfinancial assets deficit/surplus	-4,973	-2,566	-1,091	-725
<b>Net borrowing</b>	<b>-1,933</b>	<b>-1,144</b>	<b>-399</b>	<b>-360</b>

Source: Ministry of Finance

Note: A=all local units; B=33 cities that took over decentralized functions; C=32 cities (without City of Zagreb); D=94 cities that did not take over decentralized functions


Current revenue had a dominant share in total revenue structure both for 33 cities and all local units (96-97%), whereas current expenditure had the most significant share in total expenditure (77-79%). Total revenue and expenditure values for 33 cities resulted in a net borrowing that amounts to almost 60% of all local units` net borrowing in 2009<sup>7</sup>.

**Revenue structure.** Tax revenue dominated in the structure of local units` revenue (Figure 1). Financing of local units strongly relies on personal income tax revenue sharing. Tax revenue (mostly personal income tax and surcharge) represents around 63% of total current revenue for the 33 cities that took over the decentralized functions. That is mainly a reflection of the revenue structure of Zagreb, because if Zagreb is excluded from the sample, taxes provide 52% of the revenue of the remaining 32 cities. A comparison of the tax share in total revenue for 33 cities that took over decentralized functions and those that did not reveals interesting information: tax revenue share for cities that took over the decentralized functions is 12 percentage points higher than for the other cities.

<sup>7</sup> 6% = 1,144/1,933.



Figure 1. Structure of local units' current revenue in 2009, in %



Source: Ministry of Finance

Note: A=all local units; B=33 cities that took over decentralized functions; C=32 cities (not inc. Zagreb); D=94 cities that did not take over decentralized functions

\*Tax revenue consists of personal income tax and surtax, property tax, general sales tax, corporate income tax and other tax revenue.

\*\*Non-tax revenue consists of administrative fees and user charges, income from property, social contributions and other revenue.

\*\*\*The value of grants includes grants from central and general government, international organizations and foreign governments.

The second largest revenue item in the local units' budgets is non-tax revenue. They represent around 30% of current revenue in 33 cities that took over decentralized functions and in other 94 cities that did not take over decentralized functions. The share of grants (third largest revenue item) in total current revenue is considerably lower for 33 cities (around 5%) than for the rest of the 94 cities (around 19%).

#### What are the grants?

Grants are funds received by one government unit from another government unit or from an international institution, which do not have to be repaid or compensated for. Most frequently, the higher-level units of government give grants to the lower-level units. For example, the central government gives a grant to a county, or a county gives a grant to a municipality. Grants can also be provided between local units of the same level, e.g. between two counties or two cities.

We distinguish between current and capital grants. Current grants must be used for current expenditure, and in Croatia there are six types of current grants to counties, cities and municipalities: equalization grants for decentralized public services; the Ministry of Finance's grants to municipalities and cities in the areas of special state concern, Groups I and II; the Ministry of Finance's grants to counties; grants from other ministries and central government institutions; budgetary reserve and compensation for damage caused by natural disasters and replacement of corporate income tax revenue. Capital grants are intended for the procurement of fixed assets<sup>8</sup>.

**Tax revenue.** The key sources of financing for local units are taxes, primarily personal income tax (shared tax) and surtax on personal income tax.


<sup>8</sup> For more details about grants, see Bronić and Bajo (2007) and Bronić (2008).

**What is surtax on personal income tax?**

Surtax on personal income tax is an extra tax that can be levied by municipalities and cities, and is payable on top of the personal income tax. The surtax base is the personal income tax itself, and the surtax rates are determined by local units independently. Municipalities and cities can introduce surtax on personal income tax at limited rates, i.e. the municipality surtax rate can be up to 10%; cities with less than 30,000 inhabitants can have a rate up to 12%; cities with more than 30,000 inhabitants up to 15% and the City of Zagreb up to 30%. The surtax on personal income tax constitutes the revenue of the local unit in which a taxpayer has a domicile or habitual abode.

Personal income tax and surtax represent around 90% of total tax revenue for 33 cities and for 556 local units (cities and municipalities), whereas in the tax revenue structure of the 94 cities that did not take over decentralized functions, personal income tax and surtax represent slightly less than 85% (Figure 2). The remaining share of taxes is distributed between local general sales tax and property taxes. Other tax revenues (corporate income tax, etc.) had a negligible share in total tax revenue for all observed data sets.

Figure 2. Local units' tax revenue in 2009, in %



Source: Ministry of Finance

Note: A=all local units; B=33 cities that took over decentralized functions; C=32 cities (not inc. Zagreb); D=94 cities that did not take over decentralized functions

\* Real property transaction tax, second home tax, public land use tax and inheritance and gift tax.

\*\*Other tax revenues comprise mostly general sales tax, but also of revenue from corporate income tax and some other tax revenues.

When talking about tax sharing, we should explain tax sharing and shared taxes. As already shown, taxes are the basic source of financing for local units and the sharing of common taxes between the central government and local units is legally defined. Shared taxation includes personal income tax and real property transfer tax and implies the division of these taxes among the central government, county, city and municipality. Table 2 shows what it actually looks like:

- In the case of the *real property transfer tax*, the situation is very simple. Of each kuna<sup>9</sup> collected as tax, 40 lipa belong to the central government and 60 lipa to a municipality or city.
- The distribution of the personal income tax is much more complex and depends on the area in which the municipality or city of a given taxpayer is located. Generally, there are *four ways of personal income tax sharing*:
  - ordinary or standard;
  - personal income tax sharing applied in Zagreb;
  - personal income tax sharing applied in the areas of special state concern (ASSC) and hill and mountain areas (HMA); and
  - personal income tax sharing applied on the islands having a special financial status.

Table 2. Tax sharing, 2010, in %

Type of tax	CG	County – basic share	Municipality or city – basic share	Fire brigades – decent. function*	Other decent. functions**	Equalis. fund for decent. functions***	Share for joint capital project financing
PIT – standard sharing	—	15.5	55.0	1.3	10.7	17.5	—
PIT –Zagreb	—	—	70.5	1.3	10.7	17.5	—
PIT –ASSC, HMA	—	10.0	90.0	—	—	—	—
PIT – islands with special financial status	—	15.0	52.0	1.3	10.7	—	21.0
Real property transfer tax	40	—	60	—	—	—	—

Source: Based on the Act on the Financing of Units of Local and Regional Self-government.

\* Goes to the municipality/city that has established and that finances the regular operations of public fire brigades; otherwise, it goes to the central government.

\*\* Goes to the municipality/city/county that finances its decentralised public services; otherwise it goes to the central government.

\*\*\* Funds from the central government from which transfers are made to those local units which are unable to finance from an additional share in personal income tax their own decentralised public services up to the minimum standard.

For example, in the *ordinary or standard tax sharing*, of each 1 kuna collected as personal income tax in its territory, the county receives 15.5 lipa for the performance of its basic public services, whereas a municipality or city receives 55 lipa. Where a local unit assumes the obligation to finance certain decentralized public services, the central government allocates an additional amount of 10.7 lipa of personal income tax to this unit in order to ensure that it has at least the minimum funds necessary to finance the activities taken over. In the case of assuming the obligation to finance fire brigades, local unit receives 1.3 lipa more. The more decentralized public services a local unit takes over, the larger is its share in the personal income tax revenue. In addition to that, 17.5 lipa of each kuna collected as a personal income tax go to the equalization fund. Local units that take over some or all of the decentralized public services, but do not raise enough funds from the additional share in personal income tax to meet the minimum financial standard prescribed by the competent ministry, are allocated grants from the equalization fund by the central government.

<sup>9</sup> 1 kuna = 100 lipa.

**Expenditure.** Total expenditure of local units in 2009 reached 19,398 million HRK, where more than 56% of total expenditure represents the expenditure of 33 cities that took over decentralized functions (see Table 3)<sup>10</sup>. Not including the city of Zagreb, the current expenditure of 32 cities represents around 25% of all local units' current expenditure. This means that Zagreb alone spends 30% of all local unit expenditures.

Table 3. Structure of local units' expenditure in 2009, mil HRK

	A	B	C	D
<b>Current expenditure</b>	<b>19.398</b>	<b>11.194</b>	<b>5.247</b>	<b>2.548</b>
Use of goods and services	7.701	4.097	1.987	1.018
Compensation of employees	4.644	2.969	1.481	694
Other expenditure	4.476	2.375	1.261	658
Subsidies	1.404	1.159	208	39
Social benefits	1.173	596	311	138
<b>Total expenditure for acquisition of nonfinancial assets</b>	<b>5.853</b>	<b>2.980</b>	<b>1.439</b>	<b>977</b>
Acquisition of nonproduced assets	482	282	220	113
Acquisition of fixed assets	4.683	2.374	1.011	758
Acquisition of valuables	1	0	0	0
Acquisition of fixed short term assets	0	0	0	0
Expenditure for additional acquisition (investment) in nonfinancial assets)	687	323	207	106
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>25.251</b>	<b>14.174</b>	<b>6.686</b>	<b>3.525</b>

Source: Ministry of Finance

Note: A=all local units; B=33 cities that took over decentralized functions; C=32 cities (without City of Zagreb); D=94 cities that did not take over decentralized functions

The structure of total expenditure of local units as a whole and of the 33 biggest cities is dominated by current expenditure, around 80% as opposed to expenditure for the acquisition of nonfinancial assets with a share of around 23%<sup>11</sup>. Only the structure of total expenditures for 94 cities that did not take over decentralized functions slightly differs (72% current expenditures and 28% expenditures for nonfinancial assets)<sup>12</sup>.

The expenditure side of the annual budget for the 33 cities that took over the decentralized functions and the remaining 94 cities is structured in a similar way (Figure 3 and Table 3). Most of the expenditure categories have the same share within the structure of total expenditure in both groups of cities. The only items that in the budgetary structure diverge by more than 2 percentage points are subsidies (8% for 33 cities and 1% for 94 cities) and the acquisition of fixed assets (17% for 33 cities and 22% for remaining 94 cities)<sup>13</sup>.


<sup>10</sup> 56% = 14,174/25,251.

<sup>11</sup> 79% = 11,196/14,174. 21% = 2,980/14,174.

<sup>12</sup> 72% = 2,548/3,525. 28% = 977/3,525.

<sup>13</sup> 8% = 1,159/14,174. 1% = 39/3,525. 17% = 2,374/14,174. 22% = 758/3,525.

Figure 3. Structure of local units' expenditure in 2009, in %



Source: Ministry of Finance

Note: A=all local units; B=33 cities that took over decentralized functions; C=32 cities (not inc. Zagreb); D=94 cities that did not take over decentralized functions

\* Other expenditure consists of current and capital grants to households, grants given (to international organizations and grants within the general government), fines, penalties, financial (interest), and other expenditure

\*\* Subsidies – subsidies to public sector corporations and subsidies to private companies and small and medium sized enterprises

\*\*\* Social benefits – compensations to citizens and households based on insurance and compensations to citizens and households from the budget

After detailed elaboration of revenue and expenditure structure, in order to complete an image of local units' budget execution for 2009, additional observations have to be directed to sources of deficit financing.

**Local units' financial account.** Receipts<sup>14</sup> for financial assets and borrowing of local units' as a whole in 2009 exceeded liabilities for financial assets and debt repayment by 144 million HRK (Table 4). Cities that took over decentralized functions have followed this general trend so their receipts from financial assets and borrowing exceeded expenses for financial assets and debt repayment. Only the value of net financial assets of 94 cities that did not take over decentralized functions showed opposite results – a deficit in the financial account.

<sup>14</sup> Besides revenue and expenditure, the budget terminology also contains the terms *receipts* and *expenses*, where the terms *revenue* and *expenditure* are used in the revenue and expenditure account and relate to the purchase and sale of non-financial assets, and the terms *receipts* and *expenses* are used in the financing account and relate to financial assets, borrowing and loan repayments. Briefly, revenue and expenditure relate to nonfinancial, and receipts and expenses to financial transactions.

Table 4. Transactions in financial assets and liabilities in 2009, mil HRK

	A	B	C	D
<b>Net acquisition of financial assets</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>428</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>79</b>
Loans given	272	83	76	32
Securities	0	0	0	0
Shares and other equity	31	1	0	0
Loans (borrowing receipts)	496	344	194	47
<b>Net incurrence of liabilities</b>	<b>655</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>93</b>
Loans given	131	55	54	12
Securities	5	5	0	0
Shares and other equity	90	47	47	17
Loans (principal) repayment	420	253	129	64
Securities (principal) repayment	9	9	9	0
<b>Net transaction</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>-14</b>


Source: Ministry of Finance

Note: A=all local units; B=33 cities that took over decentralized functions; C=32 cities (without City of Zagreb); D=94 cities that did not take over decentralized functions

It is quite clear that local units rely on borrowing (see, Table 4 Loans – borrowing receipts). For 33 cities that took over decentralized functions the value of this item in 2009 represents 80% of net acquisition of financial assets, whereas for 94 remaining cities borrowing represents around 60% of net acquisition of financial assets. In the observed period, local units signed loan agreements mainly with commercial banks and the non-public-sector financial institutions, while “loans given” mainly represented loans provided to local communal enterprises.

**Total local units` deficit/surplus.** Taking into account total revenue and receipts of all local units as well as expenditure and expenses, the budgets of the majority of the reviewed local units were in deficit in 2009. Total deficit of the 33 cities was in 2009, in absolute terms, almost 3 times higher than the deficit of the remaining 94 cities (see Figure 4)<sup>15</sup>.

Figure 4. Local units` budget total deficit/surplus in 2009, mil HRK



Source: Ministry of Finance

Note: A=all local units; B=33 cities that took over decentralized functions; C=32 cities (not inc. Zagreb); D=94 cities that did not take over decentralized functions

<sup>15</sup> 2,9 = 1,084/374.

## 4. Conclusion

Analyzing Croatian local budgets, this text has explained the reasons for selecting the 33 biggest cities in Croatia for our sample. The first reason is that these cities have a predominant role among Croatian local units. Total revenue/expenditure of those 33 cities in 2009 represented around 56% of total local units revenue/expenditure. The second reason is that around 49% of Croatian population lives in these 33 cities.

Finally, the revenue and expenditure structure of these 33 cities' budgets does not differ too much from the revenue and expenditure structure of other Croatian local units. On the revenue side, the tax share (in total current revenue) for cities that took over decentralized functions is 12 percentage points higher than for the rest of the cities. Relating to that the share of grants in total current revenue is lower for the 33 cities (around 5%) than for the other 94 cities (around 19%). The expenditure side of annual budget for the 33 cities that took over decentralized functions and the remaining 94 cities is structured in a similar way, apart from subsidies (to SMEs and companies in and outside the public sector) and the acquisition of fixed assets. Subsidies are a bit higher for the 33 cities than for the other 94 cities, which did not take over the decentralized functions, whereas in terms of acquisition of nonfinancial assets an opposite situation can be observed. From their financial accounts, it is obvious that Croatian cities rely on borrowing, both those that took over the decentralized functions and those that did not.

---

## Annex F.

---

### How difficult is for a representative citizen to find the local budget information on official websites of 33 cities?

The Institute of Public Finance gave a 16 year old student a task to try to find local budget information on the official websites of 33 cities in the period from 1 to 9 July 2010. The aim was to see what problems a representative citizen (henceforth RC) with no prior experience with budget issues will face and how easy/hard will be to find local budget information for RC. The simplicity score thus explains how easy/hard was to find local budget information on official website of the city (especially focusing on the Enacted Budget). The visual score explains the RC's visual impression of the presented local budget information (e.g. lower score for - small and cramped letters which are not easy to read). It might be that some of the information that our RC searched for did exist, but our RC could not find them, which only points to the fact that they are not presented well. The result of this Annex is not used for calculating the COLBI, it is only used for conclusions in our final report.

The RC found local budget information for most cities. However, there was a large difference between the cities in how easy it was to find and view such documents. RC noticed three main problems relating to the budget information on official websites of cities:

- non-existence of direct link to the budget;
- lack of clear and user-friendly website design; and
- variation in the amount and the layout of budget information for different cities.

#### *Direct link to the budget documents*

While many cities had a direct link to the budget documents, this was often not easy to find. For example, Slavonski Brod, Sisak and Rijeka all have a link named "proračun" (budget), but it is placed towards the bottom of the page, and the monotone colors or crowded presentation make it difficult to spot. Some cities do not include a direct link to the budget on the home page, and one has to attempt to find the budget through clicking on links that seem relevant – for example:

- "važni dokumenti" (important documents),
- "financije" (finances),
- "organizacija" (organization) and
- "gradska uprava" (city government).

In this respect, there was little consistency, and one had to use intuition (and common sense) to reach the budget documents. The effectiveness of this approach varied greatly across different official local websites. Karlovac has an excellent design, and although there was no direct link, the indirect one ("finances") was easily spotted a natural choice when searching for budget information, and led to a large



amount of well-organized and relevant information. However, on other websites, such as that of Umag, one had to first click on “organizacija” (organization), then “pristup informacijama” (access to information), and finally scroll down to find a link to the budget (also not easy to spot). “Organization” seems arbitrary, and this way of accessing budget information is slightly difficult and not ideal.

#### *Lack of clear and user-friendly website design*

Lack of clear and user-friendly website design was a further barrier for a number of city websites. Certain cities’ budget documents could only be reached through using the “search” feature – two such websites being those of Zagreb (Croatian capital city) and Vrbovec, and even following links from there on was not as simple as it should be. For example, on the official website of the City of Zagreb there is no single link for all budget documents for all years. Enacted Budget for 2010 can be found only under link INFO but other documents (such as the Half-Year Report for 2009 or the Enacted Budget for 2009) cannot be found. Even when you use website search engine, they cannot be found. Is it not a little bit of absurd that the capital city have so little information about its budget?

On the other hand, it must be said that there were a number of cities with well-designed websites and easily accessible budget documents. For example, Crikvenica, Kutina, Labin, and Rovinj all had a direct link to budget documents; presented clearly and in a noticeable position.

#### *Variation in the amount and the layout of budget information for different cities*

There was also much variation in the amount, and the layout of, local budget information once one reached the relevant page. Karlovac had several budget-related documents for current and the last three years, while others, such as Pazin, only featured documents from last year. Varaždin had an both current information and an impressive archive of budget documents for previous years, but the unclear organization and layout was hard to follow. Many contained more than one document about the budget, but there was often inconsistency in what information was provided.

Altogether RC concluded that there were a number of good examples, but also many websites that require improvement should one want to access local budget information more easily in the future. Karlovac’s official website is a good example for those wishing to improve their website – it was easy to navigate and find information, and there were many relevant documents available. Although there was no direct link that stated “budget”, it was still user-friendly and straightforward.

Another thing to keep in mind is that while people who often use the internet may find the budget documents without too many problems, others who are not as familiar with computers and the internet will definitely find more barriers in trying to access these documents. This is important to recognize so to organize the website as simple as possible, because these documents are of interest, and should be accessible to, everyone.

Details supporting this text could be found in the following table. Evaluations of the easiness to access and the visual impression are personal.

Table 1.

City	Official website	Notes	Simplicity score	Direct link given	Year	Visual score
Bjelovar	<a href="http://www.bjelovar.hr/">http://www.bjelovar.hr/</a>	You have to go to "some important documents of the city" (on the right), then to a page with different documents related to the Enacted Budgets. Perhaps it is a little confusing - the searcher will wonder what is meant by "some important documents"	7	no/1 click	2009, 2010	10
Crikvenica	<a href="http://www.crikvenica.hr/">http://www.crikvenica.hr/</a>	At the top of the page there is a direct link for the budget documents. If you float the cursor over it, a menu will appear where you can choose the Enacted Budget for the last couple of years	10	yes	2006-2010	9
Čakovec	<a href="http://www.cakovec.hr/">http://www.cakovec.hr/</a>	In the local official gazette (no. 17/2008) the Enacted Budget for 2009 is presented. It is necessary to look in every number; the search engine does not help. It is fairly difficult to find, and at the end it is impossible to find the Enacted Budget for 2010	3	yes	2009 (perhaps other years too in other numbers, but for 2010 impossible to find)	6
Dubrovnik	<a href="http://www.dubrovnik.hr/">http://www.dubrovnik.hr/</a>	There is a direct link to the Enacted Budget on the home page. You have to scroll down a little and it is not found at once, but can be found very fast	9	yes	2009, 2010	9
Gospić	<a href="http://www.gospic.hr/">http://www.gospic.hr/</a>	Impossible to find the Enacted Budget	0	no	-	6
Karlovac	<a href="http://www.karlovac.hr/">http://www.karlovac.hr/</a>	From Home with a single click (on the "finances" link) one can arrive at links to download the Enacted Budgets of the last 4 years. It is easy to find; on each page of the website on the right hand side you can find the link "finances" in the "info" column. And at the top of the website you can also float the cursor over the "city administration", and then a menu appears from which one can go to "city finances"	10	no/1 click	2007-2010	10
Koprivnica	<a href="http://www.koprivnica.hr/">http://www.koprivnica.hr/</a>	Probably in the local official gazette. The local official gazette has no search mechanism, and one has to look at each individual issue to find the relevant document.	4	no	-	6
Krapina	<a href="http://www.krapina.hr/">http://www.krapina.hr/</a>	A direct link to the Enacted Budget on the left hand side of the home page. One must scroll down a little, but it is easy to find	9	yes	2010	10
Kutina	<a href="http://www.kutina.hr/">http://www.kutina.hr/</a>	On the home page on the right hand side there is a direct link to the Enacted Budget. Easily visible!	10	yes	2010	10
Labin	<a href="http://www.labin.hr/">http://www.labin.hr/</a>	At once on the left on the home page is a direct link to the Enacted Budget. Easily visible!	10	yes	2003-2010	10

City	Official website	Notes	Simplicity score	Direct link given	Year	Visual score
Makarska	<a href="http://www.makarska.hr/">http://www.makarska.hr/</a>	If you click on "city administration" then on "finance and budget department" you will arrive at a page about the Enacted Budget, although the budget itself cannot be found	0	no/2 clicks	-	8
Opatija	<a href="http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx">http://www.opatija.hr/Default.aspx</a>	If you scroll down, on the right hand side on the home page there is a link to the Enacted Budget. It can be found, but it is not very visible	8	yes	2008 - 2010	7
Osijek	<a href="http://www.osijek.hr/">http://www.osijek.hr/</a>	If you click on "documents" on the home page, links to some documents will appear - the Decision on the Execution of the Budget for 2010 is not among the first (although there is one document related to it). Then you can click on the numbers (1,2,3,4) to come to the next "page" with documents; the Decision on the Execution of the Budget is on the second. It is possible to find it, but perhaps someone who is not very conversant with the Internet will not be able to cope very easily	7	no/2 clicks	2010	8
Pazin	<a href="http://www.pazin.hr/">http://www.pazin.hr/</a>	There is a only direct link to the Citizens Budget of the city for 2010 on the home page. Scroll down, and the link is on the left, at the bottom, but easy to spot	8.5	yes	2010	9
Poreč	<a href="http://www.porec.hr/">http://www.porec.hr/</a>	It is only possible to find the 2008 Enacted Budget via the search engine. I couldn't find the budgets for other years via the links on their website. On the website someone had even commented that there was no Enacted Budget for the current year, and it would be a good idea to publish it	5	no	2008	8
Požega	<a href="http://www.pozega.hr/">http://www.pozega.hr/</a>	On the left, if one scrolls down a bit, under the subtitle "documents" there is a direct link to the Enacted Budget. It is fairly easy to find by searching; well organized	9	yes	2007 -2010	8
Pula	<a href="http://www.pula.hr/">http://www.pula.hr/</a>	On the left hand side of the home page there is a direct link to the Enacted Budget (title "work of the city administration"). It is not very conspicuous, and you have to look fairly hard, but is found quite fast when one searches	9	yes	2008- 2010	8
Rijeka	<a href="http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx">http://www.rijeka.hr/Default.aspx</a>	On the home page there is a direct link to the Enacted Budget. It is not found at once, however, and one has to look rather carefully	8	yes	2007- 2010	7
Rovinj	<a href="http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/index.php">http://www.rovinj.hr/rovinj/index.php</a>	On the home page there is a direct link to the Enacted Budget on the left hand side. It is very easy to find	10	yes	2002-2010	9

City	Official website	Notes	Simplicity score	Direct link given	Year	Visual score
Samobor	<a href="http://www.samobor.hr/web/">http://www.samobor.hr/web/</a>	Bottom right, on the home page. Easily found if the website is working - it happened twice, however, that the page would not render properly, and then it was quite difficult to find	8.5	yes	2010	9 (if it works!)
Sisak	<a href="http://www.sisak.hr/">http://www.sisak.hr/</a>	If one scrolls down on the home page, on the right there is a direct link for downloading the Enacted Budget for the current year. It is not findable at once however (and is not where the visitor would first think of looking)	8.5	yes	2010	7
Slavonski Brod	<a href="http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/">http://www.slavonski-brod.hr/</a>	A direct link on the home page, but difficult to spot	8	yes	2010	7
Split	<a href="http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx">http://www.split.hr/Default.aspx</a>	First you have to click on "city administration" (top) and then left "most important documents of the city". Difficult and complicated to find	6	no/2 clicks	2007-2010	9
Šibenik	<a href="http://www.sibenik.hr/default.asp?cID=1">http://www.sibenik.hr/default.asp?cID=1</a>	Firstly, if one scrolls down on the home page, there is a direct link for downloading the Enacted Budget. It is not to be found at once, but is fairly fast. Secondly, on the menu/toolbar at the top of the page it is possible to run the cursor over "documents", and then a menu appears, where there is a direct link for the Enacted Budget	9	yes	2010	10
Umag	<a href="http://www.grad-umag.hr/">http://www.grad-umag.hr/</a>	On either left or on top click on the title "organization" and then on the subtitle "access to information". When you come to this page, on the left there is one more menu, under which there is a link for the Enacted Budget. It is not ideal, could be better; easy to miss something	6	no/2 clicks	2010, 2009	9
Varaždin	<a href="http://www.varazdin.hr/index.html">http://www.varazdin.hr/index.html</a>	On the left you click on "documents and forms", then on "budgetary documents". You have to concentrate/pay attention to find it. Medium easy to find	7	no/1 click	2001-2010	7
Velika Gorica	<a href="http://www.gorica.hr/">http://www.gorica.hr/</a>	You have to left click on "finances", where there is a subtitle "documents". When you click on "documents", you arrive at a page where budgetary documents can be downloaded. Medium easy to find	7	no/2 clicks	2010	8
Vinkovci	<a href="http://www.vinkovci.hr/">http://www.vinkovci.hr/</a>	Impossible to find the Enacted Budget	0	no	-	7
Virovitica	<a href="http://www.virovitica.hr/">http://www.virovitica.hr/</a>	At the top of the page, there is a toolbar/menu bar where if you float the cursor over "administration" and then choose "important documents" you will come to a page at the bottom of which is the Enacted Budget. Some time is needed to understand how to get at the Enacted Budget - it is not impossible, but could be easier	7	no/2 clicks	2010	8

City	Official website	Notes	Simplicity score	Direct link given	Year	Visual score
Vrbovec	<a href="http://www.vrbovec.hr/">http://www.vrbovec.hr/</a>	The only thing to be found is the "Citizens Budget for 2007" via the search mechanism. Not very accessible	4	no/search and then 1 click	2007	8
Zadar	<a href="http://www.grad-zadar.hr/">http://www.grad-zadar.hr/</a>	The home page has at the top a direct link to the Enacted Budget, as well as a subtitle for "important documents". Very easy to find, but the font could be easier to read	9	yes	2008- 2010	7
Zagreb	<a href="http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx">http://www.zagreb.hr/default.aspx</a>	The Enacted Budget is hard to find because the search mechanism has to be used. Even then it is necessary to go over several websites to find the Enacted Budget	4	no/search and then 3 clicks	2010	8
Zaprešić	<a href="http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php">http://www.zapresic.hr/emu/index.php</a>	One link from the home page; you have to click on "important documents", on the left. There are two Enacted Budgets, for 2009 and 2008. They cannot be easily found because of the small and cramped letters, but can be found quite fast	7.5	no/1 click	2009, 2008	7

## Annex G.

### Exchange of documents and reports between local units and the Ministry of Finance

No.	Title of submitted document/report	Reference period	Submission deadline	Do local units promptly submit the required documents?
1.	The Enacted Budget and the Amendments to Enacted Budget made during the year	three years	15 days from the effective date	Upon reminder, almost all local units submit the Enacted Budgets early in the year; as at 8 March 2010, 15 out of 576 Enacted Budgets for 2010 were missing
2.	The Year-End Report on Budget Execution	one year	15 days from adoption by LREP	66% or 379 local units submitted the reports for 2008, and 361 for 2007. The problem lies in the non-existence of a fixed deadline for the adoption of the Year-End Report on Budget Execution, so that some local units send notifications that their LREP have still not adopted the Year-End Report on Budget Execution
3.	The Form IZJS – Report on Borrowing, Issued Guarantees And Given Approvals <sup>1</sup>	a quarter (some local units additionally submit monthly reports through force of habit, as was required in the period 2004-2007)	the 10th of the month after the expiry of the reference quarter	70% of registered debts, guarantees and approvals are regularly updated through reports
4.	The Form PIR - Survey of Executed Expenditure Financed by Grants Received from the National Budget of the Republic of Croatia <sup>2</sup>	a quarter	no later than 20 days after the expiry of the reference period; the data for the last quarter should be submitted no later than 15 January	generally, yes; in case of delay the payment of grants is suspended

<sup>1</sup> In Croatian *Obrazac IZJS - Izvješće o zaduženju, jamstvu, danoj suglasnosti.*

<sup>2</sup> In Croatian *Obrazac PIR - Pregled izvršenja rashoda od primljenih pomoći iz Državnog proračuna Republike Hrvatske.*

No.	Title of submitted document/report	Reference period	Submission deadline	Do local units promptly submit the required documents?
5.	The Form OA - Survey of Data from a By-Law of the Unit of Local and Regional Self-Government Relating to the Employees of the Local Unit's Bodies (Expenditures for Employees and Other Expenditures, and Compensation of Employees), planned in the Budget for 20xx <sup>3</sup>	one year	no later than 30 March for the current year	generally, yes; in case of delay the payment of grants is suspended
6.	The Form ŽRP - Distribution of a Portion of Grants from the National Budget of the Republic of Croatia for 2010 among Municipalities and Cities Which are Not Direct Beneficiaries of Grants from the National Budget <sup>4</sup>	one year	no later than 30 March for the current year	generally, yes; in case of delay the payment of grants is suspended
7.	Form UDJ20xx - Statement of the Budget's Holdings in Companies/Institutions <sup>5</sup>	one year	the deadline specified in the letter (usually March): 15 or 20 days following the date of the letter	generally, yes; in the first year of data collection, the response rate was 65% (372 local units out of a total of 576); in 2009, 85% (488 units). The obligation is not stipulated by any law or regulation.
8.	Financial statements	one year, 6 months and a quarter	specified in the Rulebook	yes

<sup>3</sup> In Croatian Obrazac OA - Pregled podataka iz općeg akta jedinice lokalne i područne (regionalne) samouprave za zaposlene u tijelima (rashodi za zaposlene i ostali rashodi te naknade zaposlenima) koji su planirani u proračunu za 20xx. godinu.

<sup>4</sup> In Croatian Obrazac ŽRP - Raspored dijela pomoći iz Državnog proračuna Republike Hrvatske za 2010. godinu općinama i gradovima koji nisu izravni korisnici pomoći iz Državnog proračuna.

<sup>5</sup> In Croatian Obrazac UDJ20xx - Izvješće o udjelima proračuna u trgovačkim društvima /ustanovama.

# Annex H.

## Local budgeting process in Croatia

Time	Actions
<b>PHASE 1</b>	<b>THE PREPARATION OF LOCAL BUDGET PROPOSAL</b>
<b>Step 1</b>	<b>Strategy of government programs for a three year period</b>
by mid of March BY-1	MFIN in cooperation with Central Government Office for Strategy prepares Instructions for Creation of Strategic Plans for a Three Year Period (henceforth Instructions), which it delivers to all other ministries and government bodies
by mid April BY-1	Ministries and other government bodies, following the Instructions, prepare and deliver Strategic Plans for the Three Year Period (henceforth Strategic plans) to MFIN
by the end of April BY-1	According to the Strategic plans, MFIN and Central Government Office for Development prepare a Strategy for a Three Year Period and suggest it to the central government (henceforth Strategy)
by mid of May BY-1	Central government adopts the Strategy
<b>Step 2</b>	<b>Guidelines of Economic and Fiscal Policy for a Three Year Period</b>
by the end of May BY-1	MFIN prepares Guidelines of Economic and Fiscal Policy (henceforth Guidelines) based on the Strategy and submits them to the central government
by mid of June BY-1	Central government adopts the Guidelines
<b>Step 3</b>	<b>Local Budget Preparation Instructions</b>
by the end of June BY-1	MFIN delivers Local Budget Preparation Instructions based on the Guidelines to the local units. The FD adjusts, prepares and sends them to all the local budget and extrabudgetary users
<b>Step 4</b>	<b>Preparation of proposals of financial plans of budgetary and extrabudgetary beneficiaries of local units</b>
by the 15 <sup>th</sup> September BY-1	Budgetary and extrabudgetary users follow the Local Budget Preparation Instructions to prepare and send proposals of financial plans to the FD
<b>Step 5</b>	<b>FD prepares a first draft of local budget proposal documents and sends it to the LEXE</b>
by the 15 <sup>th</sup> October BY-1	FD considers and adjusts all financial plans with estimated revenues, prepares the budget proposal documents and delivers it to the LEXE
by the 15 <sup>th</sup> November BY-1	LEXE sets budget proposal documents and sends it to the LREP for adoption
<b>PHASE 2</b>	<b>LOCAL BUDGET APPROVAL</b>
<b>Step 6</b>	<b>Local budget debate and adoption of local budget proposal documents in the LREP</b>
by the end of BY-1	LREP adopts BP in a period that allows the execution of the budget to start from 1 <sup>st</sup> January BY, as well as gives a permission for the financial plans of extrabudgetary users
<b>PHASE 3</b>	<b>LOCAL BUDGET EXECUTION</b>
<b>Step 7</b>	<b>Local budget execution</b>
by 15 <sup>th</sup> January BY	Budgetary users prepare financial plans on a monthly basis, according to the planned obligations. LEXE submits the EB and the DEB to the the MFIN and State Audit Office within 15 days from the date of the coming into force



1 <sup>st</sup> January – 31 <sup>st</sup> December BY	Local budget execution, in line with the resources available and planned obligations
<b>Step 8</b>	<b>Report about the execution of the local budget and financial plans of extrabudgetary users for the first half year</b>
by 30 <sup>th</sup> July BY	Extrabudgetary users prepare and submit to the FD and to the MFIN half-year reports on execution of the financial plans (HYREBs)
by 5 <sup>th</sup> September BY	FD submits the HYR and the (HYREBs) to the LEXE
by 15 <sup>th</sup> September BY	LEXE submits the HYR and (HYREBs) to the LREP
<b>Step 9</b>	<b>Report about the annual execution of the local budget and financial plans of extrabudgetary users</b>
by 31 <sup>st</sup> March BY+1	Extrabudgetary users prepare and deliver to the FD and MFIN the year-end reports on the execution of the financial plans (YREBs)
by 1 <sup>st</sup> May BY+1	FD prepares the YR and the (YREBs) and submits them to the LEXE
by 1 <sup>st</sup> June BY+1	LEXE submits the YR and the (YREBs) to the LREP
	LEXE submits the YR and the (YREBs) to the MFIN and State Audit Office within 15 days of its approval in the LREP
<b>Step 10</b>	<b>Budget control and internal and external audit</b>

## Annex I.

---

### Summary of Questionnaire results by cities

This Annex contains two additional tables representing the results of the research based on the Questionnaire described in Annex A. Table 1 shows the percentages of particular multiple-choice responses to each of the questions. For example, the response on question 2 was “Yes”, “Some” and “None” for 24%, 9% and 67%, respectively. Table 2 contains the responses to all of the questions obtained from all surveyed local units.

Table 1 provides for an easy identification of the cities’ strengths and weaknesses. In this short overview, we will concentrate on several weak points. One of them is the lack of functional classification of expenditures in the budget documents. Specifically, 67% of the cities do not include it in the budget proposal documents for BY (Q2), 82% in the Half-Year Report (Q22) and 76% in the Year-End Report (Q27).

An overwhelming majority of cities do not provide verbal descriptions of revenues and expenditures by economic classification (Q10 and Q11). By contrast, such descriptions are provided for individual program expenditures in almost 70% of cities (Q12).

In most of the cities, budget proposal documents should present the data relating to BY-1, BY+1 and BY+2 in much more detail (Q13 to Q19).

Only 21% of the cities publish a Citizens Budget (Q20).

Table 1. Structure of responses (in %)

Question	Response		
	Yes	Some	None
<b>Questions 1 to 12: Budget proposal documents and BY=2010</b>			
Q1. Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY classified by economic classification?	100	0	0
Q2. Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY by functional classification?	24	9	67
Q3. Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY for individual programs?	100	0	0
Q4. Do the budget proposal documents present tax revenues from different sources for BY?	48	52	0
Q5. Do the budget proposal documents present grants for BY?	45	55	0
Q6. Do the budget proposal documents present non-tax revenues from different sources for BY?	48	52	0
Q7. Do the budget proposal documents present information on outstanding debt?	6	91	3
Q8. Do the budget proposal documents present information on payments of interest on debt for the BY?	52	48	0
Q9. Do the budget proposal documents contain macroeconomic forecasts upon which the budget figures are based?	3	12	85
Q10. Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various expenditures for the BY?	18	3	79
Q11. Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of various revenues for the BY?	18	3	79
Q12. Do the budget proposal documents contain verbal descriptions (explanations) of individual programs and the underlying expenditures?	48	21	30
<b>Questions 13 to 15: Budget proposal documents and BY-1</b>			
Q13. Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY-1 classified by economic classification?	42	15	42
Q14. Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY-1 classified by functional classification?	3	3	94
Q15. Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY-1 for individual programs?	27	9	64
<b>Questions 16 to 19: Budget proposal documents and BY+1/BY+2</b>			
Q16. Do the budget proposal documents present tax and non-tax revenues from different sources for BY+1 and BY+2?	12	85	3
Q17. Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by economic classification?	15	82	3
Q18. Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY+1 and BY+2, classified by functional classification?	3	3	94
Q19. Do the budget proposal documents present expenditures for BY+1 and BY+2 for individual programs?	18	55	27
<b>Question 20: Citizens Budget</b>			
Q20. Does the local government publish a non-technical presentation of the budget intended for a wide audience (Citizens Budget)?	15	6	79
	Yes	Some	None

<b>Questions 21 to 25: Half-Year Report (BY-1=2009)</b>					
Q21.	Does the Half-Year Report present expenditures for BY-1, classified by economic classification?	91	0	9	
Q22.	Does the Half-Year Report present expenditures for BY-1, classified by functional classification?	15	3	82	
Q23.	Does the Half-Year Report present tax revenues from different sources for BY-1?	91	0	9	
Q24.	Does the Half-Year Report present grants for BY-1?	91	0	9	
Q25.	Does the Half-Year Report present non-tax revenues from different sources for BY-1?	91	0	9	
<b>Questions 26 to 32: Year-End Report (BY-2=2008)</b>					
Q26.	Does the Year-End Report present expenditures for BY-2, classified by economic classification?	91	0	9	
Q27.	Does the Year-End Report present expenditures for BY-2, classified by functional classification?	18	6	76	
Q28.	Does the Year-End Report present expenditures for BY-2 for individual programs?	94	0	6	
Q29.	Does the Year-End Report present tax revenues from different sources for BY-2?	88	3	9	
Q30.	Does the Year-End Report present grants for BY?	88	3	9	
Q31.	Does the Year-End Report present non-tax revenues from different sources for BY?	88	3	9	
Q32.	Does the Year-End Report present information on outstanding debt?	24	67	9	
<b>Questions 33 to 37: Availability of Budget Proposal with Projections and local gazette</b>					
		Yes		No or NI	
Q33.	Is the Budget Proposal with Projections publicly available?	33		67	
		Yes	No	NI	
Q34.	Are the information on BY+1/BY+2 presented in the Budget Proposal with Projections?	9	24	67	
		> 21 days	8 - 21 days	0 - 7 days	NI
Q35.	What is the time period between receiving the Budget Proposal with Projections by local unit representatives and its enactment?	18	21	18	42
		Yes		No or NI	
Q36.	Is the local official gazette available on the Internet?	97		3	
		0 - 7 days	8 - 21 days	> 21 days	NI
Q37.	What is the time period between enacting the budget and its publication in the local gazette?	73	12	3	12
		Yes		No	
Q38.	Has the city's information officer responded to the Survey?	58		42	
		3	2	1	0

Q39.	Have the two City Council representatives and the head of the city's Finance Department responded to the Survey? (responses: 3;2;1;0 of them responded)	15	24	42	18	
		NR	0-15 days	16-30 days	> 30 days	
Q40.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many days have passed from request to response?	6	79	12	3	
		NR	1	2 to 3	>3	
Q41.	If some additional contact information has been requested from local governments, how many telephone calls or emails have been needed to obtain the data?	6	70	6	18	
			Yes	No or NA		
Q42.	Is the list of representatives in local City Council available on the city's official web site?		94	6		
Q43.	Is the information on the political party membership of representatives in the City Council available on city's official web site		79	21		
<b>Questions 44 to 45: Information about local Committee on Budget Issues</b>						
			Yes	No or NA		
Q44.	Does the local committee on Budget Issues (as a part of a local City Council) exist?		85	15		
			Yes	Some	No	NC
Q45.	Are the names of members of the local Committee on Budget Issues available on the city's official website?	70	18	3	9	
<b>Questions 46 to 47: Availability of the main city documents</b>						
			Yes	No or NA		
Q46.	Are the City council's Rules of Procedure available on the city's official web page?		88	12		
Q47.	Is the statute of the City available on the city's official web page?		97	3		
<b>Questions 48 to 52: City Council meetings – documents and participation</b>						
Q48.	Are the agenda of the city council meetings available on the city's official web page prior to the city council meeting?		73	27		
Q49.	Is the distribution of documents to city representatives prior to the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the City?		97	3		
Q50.	Do the City Council Rules of Procedure stipulate that, prior to the meetings, the documents should be made available on the city's official website or distributed to parties other than City Council representatives?		88	9		
Q51.	Are citizens allowed to attend the City Council meetings?		100	0		
Q52.	Is the right of the City Council representatives to ask questions at the City Council meetings stipulated by the City Council Rules of Procedure or by the Statute of the city?		97	3		

Abbreviations: NI – no information could be obtained; NC – no committee; NR – no additional request was needed

Table 2. Responses – all questions and all local units

Question:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
<b>Bjelovar</b>	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	A	N	N	N	N	S	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Crikvenica</b>	A	S	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	A	S	A	S	S	S
<b>Čakovec</b>	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	A	N	N	N	N	A	N	A	A	A	N
<b>Dubrovnik</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	A	A	N	A	N	A	S	A	N
<b>Gospić</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Karlovac</b>	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	A	N	N	N	S	A	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Koprivnica</b>	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	A	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Krapina</b>	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	A	N	N	N	A	A	N	A	S	S	N
<b>Kutina</b>	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	A	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Labin</b>	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	N	S	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Makarska</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	N	N
<b>Opatija</b>	A	A	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	S	A	A	A	S	A	A
<b>Osijek</b>	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	A	S	A	A	A	A	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Pazin</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	A	A	N
<b>Poreč</b>	A	N	A	A	S	A	S	A	N	N	N	S	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Požega</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	A	S	N	N	N	S	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Pula</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	N
<b>Rijeka</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	S	S	A	A	A	A	N	A	S	S	N
<b>Rovinj</b>	A	A	A	A	A	A	S	A	N	N	N	A	S	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Samobor</b>	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Sisak</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	A	S	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Slavonski Brod</b>	A	A	A	A	A	A	S	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	S	N
<b>Split</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	A	N	S	S	S	N
<b>Šibenik</b>	A	A	A	A	A	A	S	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Umag</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Varaždin</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Velika Gorica</b>	A	A	A	S	S	S	S	A	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Vinkovci</b>	A	S	A	A	A	A	S	A	N	N	N	N	S	N	S	S	S	N
<b>Virovitica</b>	A	A	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	A	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Vrbovec</b>	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Zadar</b>	A	A	A	S	S	S	N	S	N	N	N	A	A	N	A	S	S	N
<b>Zagreb</b>	A	S	A	A	A	A	S	A	S	A	A	A	A	N	N	S	S	N
<b>Zaprešić</b>	A	A	A	A	A	A	S	A	N	N	N	S	A	N	A	A	A	N
<b>Question:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>

A=All, S=Some, N=None or No; NI=No information could be obtained; NC – no committee; NR – no additional request was needed; Y = Yes

Table 3. Responses – all questions and all local units (continued)

Question:	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
<b>Bjelovar</b>	N	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	NI	NI	7
<b>Crikvenica</b>	S	A	A	S	A	A	A	A	S	A	A	A	A	S	NI	NI	7
<b>Čakovec</b>	A	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	Y	N	30
<b>Dubrovnik</b>	A	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	Y	N	10
<b>Gospić</b>	N	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	N	NI	NI
<b>Karlovac</b>	N	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	Y	N	27
<b>Koprivnica</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	NI	29
<b>Krapina</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	NI	NI	NI
<b>Kutina</b>	N	S	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	Y	Y	23
<b>Labin</b>	N	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	Y	N	15
<b>Makarska</b>	N	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	N	NI	NI
<b>Opatija</b>	A	S	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	S	N	NI	NI
<b>Osijek</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	Y	Y	8
<b>Pazin</b>	A	A	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	NI	NI	36
<b>Poreč</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	NI	NI	21
<b>Požega</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	N	NI	5
<b>Pula</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	NI	NI	9
<b>Rijeka</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	Y	N	NI
<b>Rovinj</b>	N	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	NI	NI	NI
<b>Samobor</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	S	S	S	S	Y	N	NI
<b>Sisak</b>	N	N	A	N	A	A	A	N	N	A	N	N	N	A	Y	N	7
<b>Slavonski Brod</b>	S	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	Y	Y	NI
<b>Split</b>	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	NI	NI	7
<b>Šibenik</b>	S	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	NI	NI
<b>Umag</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	NI	NI	9
<b>Varaždin</b>	S	N	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	S	NI	NI	13
<b>Velika Gorica</b>	A	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	NI	NI
<b>Vinkovci</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	NI	NI	NI
<b>Virovitica</b>	N	N	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	S	NI	NI	7
<b>Vrbovec</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	NI	NI	46
<b>Zadar</b>	S	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	N	N	NI	NI
<b>Zagreb</b>	S	N	A	N	A	A	A	A	N	A	A	A	A	S	Y	N	NI
<b>Zaprešić</b>	A	N	A	A	A	A	A	A	S	A	A	A	A	S	N	NI	NI
<b>Question:</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>35</b>

A=All, S=Some, N=None or No; NI=No information could be obtained; NC – no committee; NR – no additional request was needed; Y = Yes

Table 3. Responses – all questions and all local units (continued)

Question:	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52
Bjelovar	Y	2	Y	2	2	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Crikvenica	Y	6	Y	1	1	1	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Čakovec	Y	1	Y	2	4	1	N	N	x	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dubrovnik	Y	9	Y	1	NI	3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gospić	Y	0	N	1	20	4	Y	Y	Y	S	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Karlovac	Y	12	Y	3	0	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Koprivnica	Y	1	Y	2	1	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Krapina	Y	1	N	1	14	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kutina	Y	0	Y	3	16	4	Y	Y	N	NC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Labin	Y	1	Y	3	NR	NR	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Makarska	Y	NI	N	1	2	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Opatija	Y	7	N	1	10	NI	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Osijek	Y	4	Y	1	4	1	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pazin	Y	1	Y	0	16	4	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Poreč	Y	11	Y	0	12	1	Y	Y	N	NC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Požega	Y	1	Y	2	5	1	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pula	Y	1	Y	0	5	1	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rijeka	Y	1	N	3	5	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rovinj	Y	NI	N	2	4	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Samobor	Y	NI	N	1	30	3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sisak	Y	3	Y	0	1	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Slavonski Brod	Y	14	N	2	0	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Split	Y	4	Y	1	62	27	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Šibenik	Y	7	N	1	2	4	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Umag	Y	1	Y	1	0	1	Y	Y	N	NC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Varaždin	Y	0	Y	3	0	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Velika Gorica	Y	1	N	2	1	1	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Vinkovci	N	NI	N	0	1	1	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Virovitica	Y	0	Y	0	0	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Vrbovec	Y	44	Y	1	1	1	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Zadar	Y	1	N	2	0	1	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	NI	NI	Y	NI
Zagreb	Y	6	N	1	0	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Zaprešić	Y	1	N	1	3	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Question:	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52

A=All, S=Some, N=None or No; NI=No information could be obtained; NC – no committee; NR – no additional request was needed; Y = Yes