



**AGENCY FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE RIGHT OF FREE ACCESS TO PUBLIC  
INFORMATION**

**REPORT ON THE MONITORING OF THE PUBLISHED  
DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION THAT THE  
HOLDERS OF THE JUDICIAL AUTHORITY IN THE  
REPUBLIC OF NORTH MACEDONIA ARE OBLIGED TO  
PUBLISH ON THEIR WEB PORTALS**



Skopje, May 2024

**CONTENT:**

INTRODUCTION:..... 3

WHAT IS PROACTIVE TRANSPARENCY?.....4

SUBJECT OF MONITORING:..... 5

PURPOSE OF MONITORING:..... 5

FOLLOW-UP FREQUENCY:..... 5

FRAME OF REFERENCE:..... 6

RESULTS OF THE MONITORING:..... 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:..... 13

    ANNEX 1:..... 15

    ANNEX 2:..... 16

    ANNEX 3:..... 18

    ANNEX 4:..... 19

**Author: Oliver Serafimovski**

## **INTRODUCTION:**

Public information is available to citizens in two ways - by proactivity of the institutions themselves and by reactive means - that is, by submitting a request for information from certain public institutions. Proactive transparency implies the timely publication of public information by institutions that do so on their initiative before they are requested orally, in writing or electronically, through clear and transparent websites that contain all relevant information for the citizens. Such proactive publication of information contributes to the strengthening of law and enables the public to become familiar with the regulations, decisions and other actions that are of interest and affect them.

All obligations of the institutions to make their work transparent also apply to the institutions of judicial power. Courts must protect the freedoms and rights of citizens, the rights and interests of legal entities established by law and ensure constitutionality and legality. For that reason, it is important that citizens are promptly informed about all information of importance to the public, and courts are obliged to provide citizens with access to that information.

The general objective of the monitoring was to perceive the level of proactive transparency of the judiciary. In this report, we present the findings of the monitoring that examined the extent to which the basic, appellate courts, as well as the Higher Administrative Court, the Administrative Court, the Supreme Court and the Judicial Council of the Republic of North Macedonia, publish information relevant to citizens, about the annual reports on their work, whether they provide accurate, precise and complete data to information seekers, whether there is a designated official in the courts to mediate with public information, as well as numerous other issues based on which the application of proactive transparency standards is evaluated.

## **WHAT IS PROACTIVE TRANSPARENCY?**

When the holders of public information are open to the public, citizens find out without problems what and how the bodies of the state government and other establishments and institutions work, in the specific case of the courts in the Republic of North Macedonia. This enables them to participate equally in public life and continuously control the work of the authorities.

The proactive publication of information of a public nature is a legal obligation of all holders of public information, self-initiated and continuous on their websites to publish information about their work and actions, for decision-making, finances and about the services they provide to citizens.

The goal of fulfilling the obligation to proactively publish information is reflected in the opportunity for citizens/information seekers to exercise their constitutionally guaranteed right of access to information, by providing services to information holders in a simple and fast way. At the same time, the holders of information receive the necessary legitimacy, because they demonstrate responsibility in their work, and thus restore the trust of the citizens in the institutions.

With the proactive publication of public information, the legal obligation is established for the holders not only to respond to the submitted requests concerning the Law on Free Access to Public Information, ("Official Gazette of the Republic of North Macedonia" No. 101/2019), (hereinafter - the Law), but also to publish public information on their web sites, as well as those that were not requested. Proactive publication of public information is an integral part of the right of access to information, ensuring that key information is available on time. As stated by the European Court of Human Rights, which recognizes it as a fundamental human right, "information is changeable and any delay in its publication, even for a short time, may reduce its overall value and interest in it."

A major advantage of proactively releasing public information, especially when it is done immediately, is that it makes it more difficult for information holders to deny the existence of the information or manipulate it. This means that all citizens/seekers of public information are saved time, money and effort. The principle of equality enables the realization of this right, fulfilment of obligations, as well as participation in political, social and economic processes, all intending to strengthen trust in institutions. The low proactivity of publishing information makes it impossible for the public to monitor and control the work of information holders.

## **SUBJECT OF MONITORING:**

The monitoring is focused on checking the categories of information that should be published regularly and updated on the websites of the holders of public information in

the case in accordance with the provisions of Article 9 and Article 10 of the Law on Free Access to Public Information (LFAPI ).

## **PURPOSE OF MONITORING:**

The purpose of the monitoring is to detect the situations in the implementation of the obligation of the courts as holders of public information to proactively publish the 22 categories of information on their websites. It helps in realizing the competence of the Agency for the protection of the right of free access to information of a public nature for the implementation of the provisions of LFAPI and increasing the capacities of the holders of public information in relation to their greater transparency and openness. Also, the monitoring will contribute to a better identification of the training needs of the officials among the information holders.

## **FOLLOW-UP FREQUENCY:**

The frequency of monitoring can be once a year, on a two-year basis or over a longer period, to ensure comparability of results and to be used for problem identification, training needs and strategy development, for those reasons monitoring is worth conducting often enough.

## **FRAME OF REFERENCE:**

The reference framework for monitoring is the questionnaire developed specifically for that purpose based on the categories listed in Article 10 of the LFAPI. The questionnaire for this group of holders contains **31** questions and sub-questions. All the questions to the holders of information stem from Article 10 of the LFAPI and through the said questions the holders carry out a self-evaluation of their web pages and their proactivity, i.e. whether and to what extent they publish the necessary information that is of interest to the citizens.

## **RESULTS OF THE MONITORING:**

The Agency for the Protection of the Right to Free Access to Public Information, in accordance with its competencies and in accordance with the signed Memorandum of Cooperation with the Judicial Council for increasing the active transparency of the courts in the direction of consistent implementation of the provisions of the Law on FAPI and the realization of the rights of citizens for free access to public information, conduct

monitoring of the websites of the basic, appeals courts, the Administrative Court, the Higher Administrative Court, the Supreme Court and the Judicial Council in connection with compliance with Article 10 of the Law.

The Agency carried out monitoring of 35 holders, that is, on the websites of the courts, and published on the List of holders of information on the Agency's website. The monitoring was carried out from April 15 to May 15, 2024. The Department of Cooperation and Analysis was in charge of monitoring websites for the full publication of documents and information that the holders of information are obliged to publish according to Article 10 of the Law.

We should mention that the Monitoring does not analyze the contents, that is, the quality of the published information.

The monitoring was carried out according to the new methodology implemented in cooperation with external experts, hired by the IPA II Project "Transparency and Accountability of Public Administration", whose beneficiary is the Agency. The prepared questionnaire contains a total of 31 questions, and they derive from Article 10 of the Law and are in accordance with their competencies. Some of them contain one or more sub-questions, and the maximum number of possible points is 53. Holders of the published data receive 0, 0.5 and 1 points, depending on the number and update of the published documents. The questionnaire was distributed to the holders, who were asked to carry out a self-evaluation of their transparency.

By the Judicial Council, the questionnaires were delivered to the holders of information and within the period provided for the delivery of the answers, **22** holders answered the questionnaires, and they contained links to the specific documents as requested to monitor the web pages. They did not conduct a self-evaluation and did not answer the questionnaire **of 13** holders from the monitored category of holders. **(Annex 3: Delivered/not delivered questionnaires for self-evaluation)**

Proactively published information of the holders should be easily accessible and understandable, usable, relevant to citizens and regularly updated. Information is a prerequisite for responsible government and a basis for democratic processes - information about the work of the holders enables citizens to adequately draw conclusions and participate in decision-making on issues that are of interest. Transparency and access to public information are inseparable instruments in the fight against corruption.

The web pages of the holders monitored by the judicial authorities are unified, that is, they are all identical in their content and links to the information that is published. They are updated according to their activities and have their function as the first informant for the citizens and the services they provide. However, we should emphasize that most of the web pages of the holders do not publish the data from their legal competencies

(Law on Courts and its amendments and additions) and do not systematize the information in accordance with Article 10 of the Law on FAPI. We also want to emphasize that unsystematized information creates confusion among citizens, that is, information is more difficult to access. This means that web pages should be easily accessible, and thus the information needed by the applicants, and is in accordance with the legal obligation for transparency of the holders of information of a public nature. Therefore, we appeal to the judicial authorities to make the information available for use by citizens with a maximum of three clicks. "Informed citizens, satisfied citizens", that is the maxim for a transparent judiciary.

Depending on the total number of points that the monitored holders received in relation to the published necessary documents and information in accordance with Article 10 of the Law, a gradation was made of the degree of fulfillment of the legal obligation for their active transparency, as follows: holders with many low level of transparency who have between 0 and 21 points, with a low level between 21.5 and 32 points, holders with a medium level between 32.5 and 42 points and with a high level of transparency from 42.5 to 53 points. At the same time, in this report it was determined that only **two** of the holders have a high degree of transparency in relation to the published information from all 35 monitored holders, namely the Basic Court of Kratovo, which in 2022 was the only holder that was rated with a medium level of transparency at that time, as well as the Supreme Court of the Republic of North Macedonia, which from a low level of transparency in 2022, moved to the category of a high level of transparency. The monitoring showed that **three** holders have a medium level of transparency, while **21** holder is of low level, and **9** are with a very low level of performance in terms of active transparency.

In this report, we can also make a comparative analysis of the proactive transparency of the monitored holders, according to the results obtained with the monitoring in 2022. Both then and now the best-ranked holder is the Basic Court of Kratovo, which, in terms of proactively published information on its portal, has the most published information in accordance with Article 10 of the Law on Criminal Justice. The Supreme Court of the Republic of North Macedonia also notes a high upward trend in published information. The Basic Court of Gevgelija, the Court of Appeal of Skopje, as well as the Basic Court of Prilep in this monitoring showed a medium level of transparency, in contrast to 2022, when they had a low level of proactively published information. However, we should emphasize that although these holders show greater proactive transparency, they still have room to market their information in a proactive way, which will bring their work closer to citizens and other stakeholders in social action. The Bitola Court of Appeal, the Basic Court Ohrid, the Basic Court Resen and the Basic Court Berovo have a decline in their transparency. We should emphasize that the Judicial Council of the the Republic of North Macedonia and the Administrative Court of the the Republic of North Macedonia

show stagnation, that is, the same proactive transparency in their work. (**Annex 2: Comparison table 2024/2022**)

Based on the monitored web pages according to the methodology and the Questionnaire, in relation to the first group of questions ACCESS TO INFORMATION, the following results and indicators for the proactive transparency of the holders were obtained: out of total **35** monitored holders, although on the home page they have a link entitled Free access to information, which for all holders is in the lower part of the web portals, only **seven** holders have links that are in a visible place on the initial pages and they lead to partial information from the List of Information and the 22 categories according to Article 10 of the Law. Regarding published anonymized requests/responses for free access to public information, the situation is as follows: for 2021 **7** holders have published this information, **8** holders have moved the information for 2022, a only **9** out of total **35** holders published this data for 2023. We encourage the holders of this information to publish the requests/responses for free access to information that they have received and acted upon within the legal term, which will familiarize future applicants with the information that was requested by the holders, and they will not submit the same requests to receive the information already given and received. In this way, the officials will reduce the number of submitted requests based on this Law, by directing the requester to the link from the web portals where the received requests have been moved, and at the same time, on which they have acted. This is one added value of proactive transparency.

They have published information about their jurisdiction **33** holders, while all (**35**) monitored entities have published the basic contact data with the owner of the information.

Data about the official or the person in charge of the holder of the information: biography of the web pages have published **19** holders, while only **8** of the monitored holders published contact information.

From the monitoring we can conclude that in the link free access to information, everyone (**35**) holders have published the basic contact data for the officials who mediate the public information. Only **seventeen** holders have published data on persons for authorized protected internal reporting. Regarding the information that refers to a list of persons employed by the holder of the information with a position, i.e. official email, the monitoring showed that this type of information was published only by **seven** holders, while from **35** do you have, **six** of them have published the official telephone contacts.

In the section for clarification of the method of submitting the request for access to information (method of submitting an oral, written request and electronically), **7** of them fully clarify the way in which applicants can get the requested information of a public nature, **nine** holders in part, a **19** from them they do not have a clarification on how the



applicants can get the information of a public nature. Here we should emphasize that the holders of their portals should remove the clarifications about the Law on Free Access to Public Information that refer to the Law of 2006 and its amendments because in that way they provide incorrect data, that is, they list the applicants of the Law which is no longer in force.

The same remark applies to the moved request form for free access to information of a public nature, for the reason that even **21** holders have on their portals the form according to the Law of 2006, while **14** of them have the form according to the valid Law of 2019.

They have uploaded the annual report on the implementation of the Law on FAPI on their web portals **24** holders for 2022, and **25** holders for 2023. The publication of the Annual Report on the web portals is also a legal obligation of the officials according to Article 36 of the Law on FAPI.

Concerning the second group of questions, which refer to ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, the following results were obtained from the monitored web portals: in relation to the laws that refer to the competence of the holder of information, this legal obligation from Article 10 of LFAPI, has been fulfilled by only **10** holders, which means that the citizens, that is, the applicants, are prevented from getting to know the basic information about the legal basis on which the holders from the judicial authority work.

In the section on Regulations that are within their jurisdiction in the form of a by-law, which **35** holders have published, which refers to: the rules for internal organization, this document has only been published by **18** holders, they have moved the regulation for the systematization of jobs on web portals **20** holders, while the rules for protected internal reporting have been published **7** monitored holders. In the section of published decrees, orders and instructions only **one** holder has published such information. They have published the organogram for internal organization on the web portals of **15** holders from the judicial authority.

Information of a public nature, in accordance with Article 10 of LFAPI, and which refers to the third group of issues titled OPERATIONAL, the holders publish on a larger scale, but not enough to fully fulfil the proactive transparency, that is, in this part, they should be for the citizens/ applicants to publish the largest amount of information, for the reasons that this section refers precisely to their activity and scope of work.

There are three strategic plans and work programs published. **14** annual plans and work programs have been moved on their portals, while **3** holders have announced the obligation partially, and **18** holders have not published this document. Information about Proposal of documents (proposal of programs, programs, views, opinions, studies) on the web portals have been published only by **4** information holders, **12** holders have partially published this type of information, while **29** have not fulfilled this obligation. On

the web portals in the section where the holders publish the work reports that they submit to the supervisory authorities, **23** holders have moved the information here, **3** holders have partial information, and **9** of them do not have information from this category of information. 29 holders have published statistical data about their work, **2** have partially published it, and **4** holders have not published any data.

Information about published acts and measures resulting from the authority and work of the holder, the monitoring showed that **16** holders publish this type of information on their web portals, **2** partially publish the information, while **17** holders have not published the information at all. A link in which the holders publish the specific information (judgments) has **34** holders, and only **one** holder at the time of monitoring this link was not active. In the section on published services provided by information holders, the monitoring showed that **28** holders publish this information on their web portals, and **7** of them do not have this type of information. 17 holders have published the tariffs for fees for issuing real acts, **1** partially has published this information, while **17** have no information. Court portals, through active links and access to them, which will be filled with information from their scope of work, will enable citizens to quickly and easily access information that is of interest to them.

In the part of the questions related to the fourth group BUDGET, FINANCIAL OPERATION AND PUBLIC PROCUREMENT, the holders publish insufficient information, so only **5** out of a total of **35** holders have announced the annual budget for 2024, **7** holders have moved the budget for 2023, while **5** holders published the budget for 2022.

In the section that refers to information about the final accounts, the holders have published a large amount of information, so for the year 2023, **30** holders have published this information, **28** holders published the final account for 2022, while **26** holders have published data for the account that refers to the year 2021.

Quarterly financial statements for the current year have moved only **three** holders, and for information relating to the performed audit, as well as the published audit report, only **4** holders proactively share data on their web portals.

As for the publication of the annual public procurement plans, they have only moved this document **16** do you have, **2** you had partially, while **17** have not published information about this type of information. **11** holders have published the announcements for public procurements, as well as the notifications for concluded contracts. **24** holders have not published this information. Holders from the judicial authority, as well as other holders, have a legal obligation, apart from the public procurement e-portal, to publish this information on their web portals as well.

The monitoring from 2022 and the monitoring from 2024 showed that only one holder has a high level of transparency, and that went from a medium level of transparency to

a high level. According to the Methodology for Monitoring the Holders and Article 10 of the Law on FAPI, the holders from the judicial authority have an average medium level of proactive transparency, which means that awareness should be raised among these holders for the publication of public information on their web portals.

The Agency, conducting the monitoring, determined that the active transparency among the holders is still at a low level. Holders of the judicial authority should improve and strengthen as much as possible their proactivity towards citizens and the information they publish should be placed in a separate banner/link under the title LIST OF INFORMATION/FREE ACCESS TO INFORMATION, which will make it available to applicants and to thus, they will reduce the number of requests for free access to public information. We should mention that the holders of the judicial authority have placed a link entitled FREE ACCESS TO INFORMATION on their web portals, but they should adapt it in accordance with Article 10 of the Law and their competencies and link the necessary information that they have published in separate links on their web pages. In that way, information requesters will be able to access information that is of interest to them in a quick and simple way.

In the future, in the training that the Agency continuously organizes for officials with information holders, will emphasize active transparency and consistent application of Article 10 of the Law on FAPI, because in this way holders help citizens to better understand the functioning of institutions, their rights and obligations, the way in which they can influence the making of decisions that are reflected on their daily living and work, as well as to make it easier for them to access the services offered to them by the judicial authority.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The results of the monitoring indicate that the web portals of the holders of the judicial authority apply proactive transparency, but at a level that requires them to further improve the practice of actively publishing information of a public nature.

Where **35** monitored web portals, it is most notable that the courts do not have the practice of publishing the information on the home page in a separate banner LIST OF INFORMATION/FREE ACCESS TO INFORMATION, which will make access to it much faster and simpler.

The most notable shortcoming is that they do not have a practice of publishing anonymized requests/responses for free access to public information, which would reduce the number of requests for information of interest to the requesters. Also, a small number of holders publish the laws under which they operate and are under their jurisdiction. In the future, they will have to overcome this practice and place them on the side so that citizens will be able to access them.

The courts publish the data of the persons who mediate public information, but it is necessary to move the Request Form according to the Law of 2019. By publishing the 2006 form, they create confusion among potential information seekers.

In the future, the holders should move, that is, publish the Annual Report that they submit to the Agency on the websites in accordance with Article 36 of the Law, thus fulfilling the legal obligation.

The web portals also lack data on the internal organization, the systematization of jobs, as well as the publication of strategic plans, programs and other documents related to their operations.

The most missing information is related to the financial operations, i.e. the budgets of the courts, and the publication of the information from the public procurements that they carry out and are obliged to publish on the websites with a link from the page of the electronic system for public procurements (ESPP) of the Bureau for Public Procurement.

The monitoring showed that holders of judicial power should proactively publish as much information as possible about their work. This will increase the satisfaction of citizens/information requesters, thus affecting the reduction of the number of requests for access to public information submitted by the requesters, and will also reduce the number of appeals against the courts submitted to the Agency.

## ANNEX 1:

<b>MONITORED HOLDERS:</b>	<b>POINTS:</b>	
Basic Court Kratovo	50,5	<b>HIGH LEVEL OF TRANSPARENCY</b>
Supreme Court of the Republic of North Macedonia	44	
Gevgelija Basic Court	39,5	<b>MEDIUM LEVEL OF TRANSPARENCY</b>
Court of Appeal Skopje	37,5	
Prilep Basic Court	36,5	
Higher Administrative Court of the Republic of North Macedonia	35	<b>LOW LEVEL OF TRANSPARENCY</b>
Court of Appeal Shtip	34	
Basic Court Krushevo	31	
Negotino Basic Court	30	
Basic civil Skopje	29,5	
Struga Basic Court	29	
Kocani Basic Court	28,5	
Basic Court Kriva Palanka the Republic of North Macedonia	28,5	
Administrative Court	28	
Basic Court Stip	27,5	
Kicevo Basic Court	26	
Gostivar Court of Appeal	25	
Basic Court Strumica	25	
Vinica Basic Court the Republic of North Macedonia	25	
Judicial Council	25	
Debar Basic Court	24,5	
Bitola Basic Court	24,5	
Kavadarci Basic Court	24	
Basic Court Veles	24	
Tetovo Basic Court	23	
Bitola Court of Appeal	22	
St. Nicholas Basic Court	21	<b>VERY LOW LEVEL OF TRANSPARENCY</b>
Basic Criminal Court Skopje	20	
Basic Court Ohrid	19	
Delchevo Basic Court	18	
Radovish Basic Court	18	
Court of First Instance Resen	18	
Kumanovo Basic Court	18	
Basic Court Gostivar	16,5	
Basic Court Berovo	11	



## ANNEX 2:

### COMPARISON TABLE 2024 / 2022

DO YOU HAVE:	2024 points:	2022 points:	Comparabl e results		Change in transparency
Basic Court Kratovo	50,5	31,5	19	↑	medium to high
the Republic of North Macedonia Administrative Court	28	28	0	↔	
Gevgelija Basic Court	39,5	27,5	12	↑	low to medium
Negotino Basic Court	30	27,5	2,5	↑	
Bitola Court of Appeal	22	27,5	-5,5	↓	
Kocani Basic Court	28,5	26,5	2	↑	
Higher Administrative Court of the Republic of North Macedonia	35	25,5	9,5	↑	
Basic Court Krushevo	31	25,5	5,5	↑	
the Republic of North Macedonia Judicial Council	25	25	0	↔	
Supreme Court of the Republic of North Macedonia	44	24,5	19,5	↑	low to high
Court of Appeal Shtip	34	24,5	9,5	↑	
Basic civil Skopje	29,5	24,5	5	↑	
St. Nicholas Basic Court	21	24,5	-3,5	↓	low to very low
Gostivar Court of Appeal	25	23,5	1,5	↑	
Basic Court Ohrid	19	23,5	-4,5	↓	low to very low
Court of Appeal Skopje	37,5	23	14,5	↑	low to medium
Prilep Basic Court	36,5	22,5	14	↑	low to medium
Kicevo Basic Court	26	22,5	3,5	↑	
Vinica Basic Court	25	22,5	2,5	↑	
Basic Court Kriva Palanka	28,5	21,5	7	↑	
Debar Basic Court	24,5	21,5	3	↑	
Court of First Instance Resen	18	21,5	-3,5	↓	low to very low
Basic Court Gostivar	16,5	21,5	-5	↓	low to very low
Basic Court Stip	27,5	20,5	7	↑	

Basic Court Strumica	25	20,5	4,5	↑	
Tetovo Basic Court	23	20,5	2,5	↑	
Bitola Basic Court	24,5	18,5	6	↑	very low in low
Basic Criminal Court Skopje	20	18,5	1,5	↑	
Struga Basic Court	29	17,5	11,5	↑	very low in low
Basic Court Veles	24	17,5	6,5	↑	very low in low
Kavadarci Basic Court	24	17,5	6,5	↑	very low in low
Delchevo Basic Court	18	17,5	0,5	↑	
Basic court Kumanovo	18	16,5	1,5	↑	
Radovish Basic Court	18	16,5	1,5	↑	
Basic Court Berovo	11	16,5	-5,5	↓	

### Transparency

	very low
	low
	average
	high



## **ANNEX 3:**

### **DELIVERED/NOT DELIVERED SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRES**

Basic Court Kratovo	DELIVERED
Supreme Court of the Republic of North Macedonia	DELIVERED (20 days late)
Gevgelija Basic Court	DELIVERED
Court of Appeal Skopje	NON DELIVERY
Prilep Basic Court	DELIVERED
Higher Administrative Court of the Republic of North Macedonia	DELIVERED
Court of Appeal Shtip	DELIVERED
Basic Court Krushevo	DELIVERED
Negotino Basic Court	DELIVERED
Basic civil Skopje	DELIVERED
Struga Basic Court	NON DELIVERY
Kocani Basic Court	DELIVERED
Basic Court Kriva Palanka	DELIVERED
the Republic of North Macedonia Administrative Court	NON DELIVERY
Basic Court Stip	DELIVERED
Kicevo Basic Court	DELIVERED
Gostivar Court of Appeal	DELIVERED
Basic Court Strumica	DELIVERED
Vinica Basic Court	NON DELIVERY
the Republic of North Macedonia Judicial Council	NOT DELIVERED
Debar Basic Court	DELIVERED
Bitola Basic Court	DELIVERED
Kavadarci Basic Court	DELIVERED
Basic Court Veles	NON DELIVERY
Tetovo Basic Court	NON DELIVERY
Bitola Court of Appeal	DELIVERED
St. Nicholas Basic Court	NON DELIVERY
Basic Criminal Court Skopje	NON DELIVERY
Basic Court Ohrid	DELIVERED
Delchevo Basic Court	DELIVERED
Radovish Basic Court	DELIVERED
Court of First Instance Resen	NON DELIVERY

Kumanovo Basic Court

NOT DELIVERED

Basic Court Gostivar

NON DELIVERY

Basic Court Berovo

NON DELIVERY

## **ANNEX 4:**

### **LIST OF INFORMATION CATEGORIES FOR PROACTIVE TRANSPARENCY: JUDICIARY**

<b>First group ACCESS TO INFORMATION</b>
<b>1. Have you published the list of information on the home page?</b>
<b>2. Have you published anonymized requests/responses for free access to public information on the website?</b>
<b>2021</b>
<b>2022</b>
<b>2023</b>
<b>3. Data from your competences?</b>
<b>4. The basic data for contact with the holder of information and that</b>
<b>4.1. name</b>
<b>4.2 address</b>
<b>4.3 telephone number</b>
<b>4.4 email address</b>
<b>4.5 the address of the Internet site</b>
<b>5. The information about the official or the responsible person with the owner of the information</b>
<b>5.1 biography</b>
<b>5.2 contact details</b>
<b>6. Basic data for contact with an official person for mediating information and that</b>
<b>6.1 name and surname</b>
<b>6.2 Email Address</b>
<b>6.3 telephone number</b>
<b>7. Basic data for contact with a person authorized for protected internal reporting and that</b>
<b>7.1 name and surname</b>
<b>7.2 Email Address</b>
<b>7.3 telephone number</b>
<b>8. List of persons employed by the holder of the information by position</b>

<b>8.1 official email</b>
<b>8.2 business phone</b>
<b>9. Clarification of the method of submitting the request for access to information (method of submitting an oral, written request and electronically)?</b>
<b>10. A form for a request for free access to information of a public nature has been set up</b>
<b>11. Since what year have you uploaded the annual report on access to information. of public character</b>
<b>2022</b>
<b>2023</b>
<b>Second group ORGANIZATIONAL STABILITY</b>
<b>12. Laws relating to the jurisdiction of the holder of information</b>
<b>13. The regulations that the owner of the information adopts within his jurisdiction in the form of a by-law</b>
<b>13.1 internal organization rules</b>
<b>13.2 rulebook for the systematization of jobs</b>
<b>13.3 rules for protected reporting</b>
<b>13.4 decrees / orders / instructions</b>
<b>14. Organogram for internal organization</b>
<b>Third group OPERATIVE</b>
<b>15. Strategic plans for the work of information holders</b>
<b>16. Strategies for the work of information holders</b>
<b>17. Annual plans and work programs</b>
<b>18. Are proposals for documents posted on the website (proposals for programs, programs, views, opinions, studies)</b>
<b>19. Are the work reports that you submit to the supervisory authorities published?</b>
<b>20. Statistical data about the work, as well as other information</b>
<b>21. Published acts and measures resulting from the competence and work of the information holder</b>
<b>22. Indicate links where you publish the specific information (verdicts) about your institution</b>
<b>23. Are the types of services provided by the information holders published?</b>
<b>24. Tariffs for fees for issuing real deeds</b>
<b>Fourth group BUDGET, FINANCIAL OPERATION AND PUBLIC PROCUREMENT</b>
<b>25. Annual budget for the last three years</b>
<b>2024</b>
<b>2023</b>
<b>2022</b>

<b>26. Final account for the last three years</b>
<b>2023</b>
<b>2022</b>
<b>2021</b>
<b>27. Quarterly financial reports for the current year</b>
<b>28. Has your institution been audited?</b>
<b>28.1 Has the audit report been published</b>
<b>29. Has the annual public procurement plan been published?</b>
<b>30. Are public procurement announcements published?</b>
<b>31. Is the notice of concluded contract published?</b>
<b>32. Questionnaire for self-evaluation</b>