

**Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe  
MISSION IN KOSOVO**

**Municipal Responses to Security Incidents Affecting  
Communities in Kosovo  
and the role of Municipal Community Safety Councils**

December, 2011

*Disclaimer:*

The English language version of this publication is the official one. All other language versions of this publication are translations of the original English version and are not the official document.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
1. INTRODUCTION .....	2
2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK .....	4
3. SERIOUS SECURITY INCIDENTS AFFECTING NON-MAJORITY COMMUNITIES IN KOSOVO – A REGIONAL OVERVIEW .....	5
3.1. Gjilan/Gnjilane region .....	6
3.2. Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region.....	8
3.3. Pejë/Peć region.....	11
3.4. Prishtinë/Priština region.....	12
3.5. Prizren region.....	14
4. MUNICIPAL COMMUNITY SAFETY COUNCILS (MCSC) – INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO SECURITY INCIDENTS AFFECTING NON- MAJORITY COMMUNITIES .....	15
4.1. Gjilan/Gnjilane region .....	16
4.2. Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region.....	19
4.3. Pejë/Peć region.....	20
4.4. Prishtinë/Priština region.....	22
4.5. Prizren region.....	24
5. CONCLUSION.....	26
6. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	28
ANNEX I: OVERVIEW OF MUNICIPAL COMMUNITY SAFETY COUNCILS (MCSCS).....	31

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

EULEX	European Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo
FCNM	Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities
LPSC	Local public safety committee
MCSC	Municipal community safety council
MOCR	Municipal office for communities and return
MCO	Municipal communities office
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Mission in Kosovo
UAM	UNMIK Administration in Mitrovica
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNMIK	United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report documents and assesses the responses by municipalities to serious security incidents affecting non-majority communities<sup>1</sup>. A “serious security incident” is classified as one that has the potential to destabilize the security situation, and includes verbal or physical attacks on persons, private property and sites of cultural and religious significance.

Security incidents have an adverse impact on communities’ actual and perceived safety and security, and can restrict their freedom of movement and limit their access to essential rights and services. They also have the potential to increase inter-ethnic tensions, and to undermine relations between non-majority communities and municipal institutions. However, the findings of this report suggest that these negative effects can be mitigated if municipal institutions respond in an adequate and timely manner to the incident in question – for example, through dialogue in appropriate forums, public statements condemning acts of violence and outreach to the affected community.

During the reporting period, non-majority communities in Kosovo continued to be negatively affected by security incidents targeting persons, private property and sites of cultural and religious significance. Some municipalities have begun to adopt a proactive response to security incidents, primarily through official condemnation and outreach activities targeting the affected communities. Where these activities occurred, there was a clear positive correlation with the affected communities’ perceptions of their safety and security, with the affected communities reporting that their perception of security was improved.

Despite these positive examples, municipal responses to security incidents generally occurred on an ad hoc basis, with no consistency of approach between municipalities. Furthermore, many municipalities have not fulfilled their obligations towards the establishment and conduct of their Municipal Community Safety Council (MCSC), which is the municipal body that is best able to ensure appropriate responses to security incidents.

Where municipalities *did* respond to security incidents, community representatives noted a number of persistent problems. For example, in some cases public statements by municipal officials were not translated into non-majority community languages and thus were not accessible to the community affected by the incident. Furthermore, where municipal officials did condemn a security incident affecting a non-majority community, such action was regarded as largely symbolic by the affected community unless accompanied by outreach and dialogue activities.

Given the positive correlation between adequate and timely municipal responses to serious security incidents and perceptions of security among the affected community, stakeholders should work together to develop a consistent approach. This would be assisted by further development and full implementation of the legal and regulatory framework relating to security of communities, especially to MCSCs. Municipal officials should use the mechanism of the

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this report, non-majority refers to any community that is in a numerical minority in any given municipality. This report looks at serious security incidents affecting non-majority communities. In a majority of municipalities Kosovo Albanians are in the majority. The report also looks at serious security incidents in municipalities where Kosovo Serbs are in the majority, even if the victim is from the majority community.

MCSCs to implement a best practice approach in responding to security incidents through public condemnation and outreach to affected communities.

This Report is based on the regular monitoring activities of the OSCE Mission in Kosovo over the period of January to December 2010. The OSCE continues to monitor, report and follow-up on the responses of municipalities to security-related incidents affecting non-majority communities, with heightened attention following the events beginning in late July 2011.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report examines the responses by relevant municipal level community safety and security mechanisms to serious security incidents affecting non-majority communities in Kosovo. The focus is on Municipal Community Safety Councils (MCSCs).<sup>2</sup> Where these are in place, they are the primary municipal body mandated to address the security of non-majority communities outside regular security and justice actors such as Kosovo police and the judiciary. As the main consultative body of a municipality to address security issues affecting communities, MCSCs are to be established in every municipality and must ensure equitable representation of all “ethnic communities” residing in that municipality as well as other relevant stakeholders.<sup>3</sup>

For the purposes of the report, a “serious security incident” is classified as one that has the potential to destabilize the security situation by negatively affecting communities’ actual and/or perceived security, curtailing freedom of movement and consequently the enjoyment of other fundamental rights, and/or undermining inter-community relations. This includes verbal or physical attacks on persons, private property and sites of cultural and religious significance, regardless of whether the action amounts to a criminal offence as defined in the legal framework.

In terms of “responses”, this report sets out to address the “soft” responses of municipal safety mechanisms to serious security incidents, as opposed to responses by Kosovo police or judiciary.<sup>4</sup> These “soft” responses include, *inter alia*, statements of public condemnation, outreach visits to the affected community, and discussion of incidents by municipal safety mechanisms, amongst others.

The report focuses on the impact of the serious security incidents on the perceptions of the affected communities, without consideration of motive or ethnicity of the perpetrator(s), and on the responses by municipal community safety mechanisms. As such, it is guided by two central questions:

---

<sup>2</sup> MCSCs are mandatory municipal bodies, established under Law No. 03/L-035 on Police, 4 June 2008. According to Article 7(3), an MCSC is an “advisory body chaired by the municipal president, with membership representing all communities within the municipality”; Article 7(4) specifies that it is mandated “to develop awareness of the nature of crime, disorder and violent behavior in the local community, to identify the local concerns regarding public safety and security, and to recommend action plans to address those concerns locally through the cooperative efforts of municipal authorities, local communities and the Police”. More detailed discussion of the MCSC is contained in Section 4.

<sup>3</sup> See Articles 1 and 3 of Administrative Instruction No. 08/2009 MIA- 02/2009 MLGA for Municipal Community Safety Councils, 20 March 2009.

<sup>4</sup> The OSCE monitors and assesses inter-ethnic incidents, ethnically-motivated incidents and potential hate crimes on a continuous basis as part of its mandate to promote and protect the rights of all communities in Kosovo. Activities in this regard include the work of field-based teams who regularly meet with representatives of communities in Kosovo.

- First, are municipal security mechanisms fulfilling their obligations under the legal framework vis-à-vis the safety and security of non-majority communities following serious security incidents?
- Second, how effective are current municipal responses in promoting perceived safety and security among non-majority communities? To assess this, the report will draw on information gathered during interviews with victims of reported incidents and/or with representatives of the affected communities.

The structure of the report is as follows:

- Section Two outlines the relevant legal and institutional framework, identifying key municipal bodies which are tasked with promoting the safety and security of non-majority communities, of which the primary mechanism is the MCSCs.
- Section Three examines municipal responses to serious security incidents affecting non-majority communities in each of the five regions in Kosovo. It further examines communities' reactions to these responses, in order to gauge the effectiveness of municipal bodies in improving the perceived security situation of non-majority communities.
- Section Four assesses the functionality and performance of MCSCs through two key aspects of their work: 1) compliance with their obligations as set out in the legal framework, with particular emphasis on the participation of non-majority communities; and 2) their effectiveness in promoting perceptions of security among non-majority communities, notably through their capacity to address and respond to security incidents affecting communities.<sup>5</sup>

This report is based on the regular monitoring activities of the Organization for Security and Co-operation Mission in Kosovo (OSCE) between January and December 2010, as well as interviews conducted with municipal officials and community representatives during the same period, including with non-majority community representatives of all established MCSCs. As noted above, interviews were also conducted with victims of reported incidents and/or with representatives of the affected communities in order to identify the impact of the incidents on communities' safety and security as well as on inter-community relations. Although women from non-majority communities are significantly under-represented in municipal bodies and community leadership, the OSCE sought to include women's perspectives in the assessment whenever possible. Overall, 108 individual semi-structured interviews<sup>6</sup> were conducted, including 36 with victims of serious security incidents and/or representatives of communities who had been affected (two of whom were women), and 72 members of various municipal bodies from non-majority communities (five of whom were women).

The OSCE continues to monitor, report and follow-up on the responses of municipalities to security-related incidents affecting non-majority communities, with heightened attention following the events beginning in late July 2011.

---

<sup>5</sup> This report will not assess the role of local-level security forums such as local public safety committees (LPSCs), as regulated by Article 7(3) of Law Nr. 03/L-035 on Police, 4 June 2008; Community Safety Action Teams, which have been established in co-operation with the US State Department in some municipalities to promote community-based policing; or other security-related meetings hosted by security actors such as KFOR or EULEX.

<sup>6</sup> A semi-structured interview is a method of research used in the social sciences. While a structured interview has a formalized and limited set of questions, a semi-structured interview is flexible, allowing new questions to be brought up during the interview as a result of what the interviewee says.

## 2. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The European Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) sets out some of the key international normative standards for the protection and promotion of non-majority communities' rights.<sup>7</sup> It calls on responsible institutions to undertake “appropriate measures” to protect persons from threats, hostility, violence or discrimination as a result of their ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious identity while encouraging a spirit of tolerance and intercultural dialogue through “effective measures” to promote mutual respect, understanding and co-operation. Although the FCNM does not state what constitutes effective and/or appropriate measures, it does make the crucial link between the promotion of security and enhanced inter-community tolerance.<sup>8</sup> The FCNM is directly applicable under the legal framework in Kosovo,<sup>9</sup> The legal framework also includes special provisions urging Kosovo institutions to protect the security and safety of communities. For example, the Law on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Communities and their Members specifically tasks institutions to take “all necessary measures” to protect those who may be subject to threats, hostility or violence as a result of their national, ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious identity. The Law also requires institutions to promote peace, tolerance, inter-cultural and inter-religious dialogue, and to support reconciliation between communities.<sup>10</sup>

Although the legal framework makes the important connection between the promotion of security and the promotion of peace, it does not prescribe to institutions the kinds of measures or activities that would lead to the protection and promotion of the safety and security of non-majority communities, nor does it designate specific bodies or mechanisms to carry out such measures. While the Law on Local Self-Government determines competencies of municipalities<sup>11</sup>, it does not provide any specific guidance concerning the safety and security of non-majority communities. Furthermore, in summer 2011 the Ministry of Internal Affairs approved a “National Strategy and Action Plan for Community Safety”, covering the period 2011–2016. It provides a good framework and correctly identifies areas of intervention. Many of the activities it outlines remain vague and appear to be objectives instead of clear descriptions of concrete actions to be taken by responsible institutions.<sup>12</sup>

At the municipal level, the institutions with responsibilities vis-à-vis the protection and promotion of the safety and security of non-majority communities are found mainly in the executive branch. The mayor chairs the MCSC, which as noted above is a mandatory body that

---

<sup>7</sup> See European Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM), Council of Europe, February 1995. The FCNM aims to ensure that signatory states respect the rights of their national minorities within their domestic legal and political systems. By 2011 it had been ratified by 39 Member States of the Council of Europe. See FCNM and Explanatory report, <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/html/157.htm> (accessed 24 October 2011).

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, Article 6, FCNM.

<sup>9</sup> See Article 3(h) of UNMIK's Constitutional Framework For Provisional Self-Government, UNMIK Regulation No. 2001/9, promulgated on 15 May 2001 with subsequent amendments; Article 22 of the Kosovo constitution, adopted 9 April 2008, entered into force 15 June 2008; and Article 1 of Law No. 03/L-047 on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Communities and their Members in Kosovo, 13 March 2008.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, Article 3, Law No. 03/L-047.

<sup>11</sup> See Law No. 03/L-040 on Local Self-Government, 4 June 2008, Chapter 3 “Municipal Competencies”.

<sup>12</sup> See “National Strategy and Action Plan for Community Safety 2011–2016”, approved by the Kosovo government in June 2011. As the report is based on the regular monitoring activities of the OSCE Mission in Kosovo (OSCE) over the period of January to December 2010, the strategy was outside the reporting period and hence not part of the analysis.

constitutes a vital mechanism in this respect.<sup>13</sup> Other relevant actors include the deputy mayor for communities<sup>14</sup>, the deputy chairperson of the municipal assembly for communities<sup>15</sup>, the communities committee<sup>16</sup> and the municipal office for communities and return (MOCR)<sup>17</sup>. Although these have no explicit mandate for addressing safety and security issues, they play a significant role in promoting inter-community tolerance and implementing confidence- and trust-building measures, as well as forming a link between communities and other municipal institutions.

It is worth mentioning that serious security incidents can have an adverse impact on communities' actual and perceived safety and security, and in some cases can limit their freedom of movement and hinder their access to essential rights and services. It is important that municipalities respond effectively to such incidents. This may be done through dialogue in appropriate municipal security forums, such as MCSCs, with public condemnation or outreach activities, or all three. These activities may help to restore affected communities' confidence in authorities to deal with serious security incidents. This in turn may lead to the strengthening and promotion of dialogue among communities, municipal institutions and the police, and eventually to protection against such serious security incidents in the future.

### **3. SERIOUS SECURITY INCIDENTS AFFECTING NON-MAJORITY COMMUNITIES IN KOSOVO – A REGIONAL OVERVIEW<sup>18</sup>**

Safety and security remain key matters of concern for members of non-majority communities. Although crime and violence negatively affect all communities in Kosovo, security incidents can impact heavily on non-majority communities' enjoyment of many basic human rights.<sup>19</sup> Security incidents increase both the actual and perceived vulnerability of victims and even their surrounding community, and this is often exacerbated when victims are members of a non-majority community living in a heavily majority-populated area within a municipality. Moreover, communities' *perceptions* of their security are strongly linked to their ability and willingness to move freely; if freedom of movement is compromised this in turn jeopardises other human rights, such as access to services and places of employment or

---

<sup>13</sup> See note 2, *supra*.

<sup>14</sup> In those municipalities where at least 10% of the population belong to non-majority communities, the post of deputy mayor for communities shall be established to assist, guide and advice the mayor on issues related to non-majority communities. See Law on Local Self-Government, note 11, *supra*, Article 61(1).

<sup>15</sup> In those municipalities where at least 10% of the population belong to non-majority communities, the post of the deputy chairperson for communities of the municipal assembly shall be established. Amongst other duties the deputy chairperson for communities of the municipal assembly is responsible for the promotion of inter-community dialogue. See Law on Local Self-Governance, note 11, *supra*, Articles 54(1) and 55(1).

<sup>16</sup> The communities committee is a mandatory mechanism entrusted to promote the rights and interests of the communities residing in the municipalities, and is composed of members of the municipal assembly as well as representatives of communities. See Law on Local Self-Governance, note 11, *supra*, Articles 51 and 53.

<sup>17</sup> The MOCR is mandated to protect and promote the rights of communities, including the provision of equal access to public services and creating conditions for the sustainable return of displaced persons and repatriated persons. See Government Regulation No. 02/2010 for the Municipal Offices for Communities and Return, 17 August 2010.

<sup>18</sup> This section is divided into regions which are not official regions of Kosovo but rather an OSCE organizational regional division as of the reporting period. The different OSCE organizational regional divisions are Gjilan/Gnjilane; Mitrovicë/Mitrovica; Pejë/Peć; Prishtinë/Priština and Prizren region. Furthermore, each region discusses each municipality on an individual basis. This approach has been taken for ease of reading.

<sup>19</sup> For detailed demographic information about all communities in Kosovo see OSCE Report *Kosovo Communities Profiles* (2010). <http://www.osce.org/kosovo/75450> (accessed 23 December 2011).



education, and participation in public life. Security incidents have the potential to increase inter-ethnic tensions, and to undermine relations between non-majority communities and institutions, particularly if municipal institutions fail to respond effectively in the aftermath of such incidents.

This section identifies serious security incidents affecting non-majority communities that occurred during the reporting period in various municipalities throughout Kosovo. It gives details of municipal responses to the most significant examples and explores communities' reactions to those responses in order to assess municipal effectiveness in enhancing the perceived safety and security of non-majority communities.

### **3.1. Gjilan/Gnjilane region**

In the region of Gjilan/Gnjilane, Kosovo Serbs – who constitute the second largest community in the region – reported the highest number of security incidents. Incidents included attacks on persons, private property and sites of cultural and religious significance. On 18 February 2010, the grave of the first Kosovo Serb to be buried in the Serbian Orthodox cemetery of Gjilan/Gnjilane town since 1999 was desecrated. At the request of the family, the body was exhumed and transferred to a Serbian Orthodox cemetery in a nearby Kosovo Serb-majority village. The mayor of Gjilan/Gnjilane promptly condemned the incident through a statement to the media posted on the municipal website; however, the statement was issued only in the Albanian language, making it difficult to access for the Kosovo Serb community. The case also prompted engagement by high-profile central-level actors: the Prime Minister and the Minister for Communities and Return visited the cemetery on 21 February 2010 and publicly condemned the desecration.<sup>20</sup>

No direct outreach to the affected family was carried out by municipal institutions. Members of the Kosovo Serb community expressed their sense of dismay and described the negative impact of the incident on their perceptions of security. The OSCE interviewed a member of the Orthodox Church Board in Gjilan/Gnjilane town who reiterated that municipal institutions needed to do more to proactively tackle prejudice amongst the majority community and to complement public statements of condemnation which, according to the interviewee, were perceived by the affected community as “reactive and mostly symbolic in nature”.<sup>21</sup>

Three separate assaults against Kosovo Serbs took place during the reporting period in or near the Kosovo Serb-majority village of Paralovo/Parallovë, located in the Kosovo Serb-majority municipality of Novo Brdo/Novobërdë. On 15 March 2010, a Kosovo Serb was reportedly assaulted when stopped by a group of Kosovo Albanians who had blocked his vehicle.<sup>22</sup> On 30 November 2010, a Kosovo Albanian male allegedly assaulted a Kosovo Serb male during a dispute over property. On 28 December 2010, a Kosovo Serb male was allegedly attacked by a Kosovo Albanian male, also in connection with a property dispute. These three incidents had a negative impact on the freedom of movement of the Kosovo Serb community, as many began to avoid the area where the assaults had taken place. While the municipal institutions promptly condemned the first incident through a public statement issued to the local press in both Albanian and Serbian on 18 March 2010, no statements were released after the second and

---

<sup>20</sup> For further reference to this incident please see OSCE Report *Kosovo Communities Profiles* (2010), Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Kosovo Serb member of the Orthodox Church Board, Gjilan/Gnjilane municipality, personal interview, 14 January 2011.

<sup>22</sup> See note 20, *supra*

third assaults. Moreover, no outreach was conducted to reassure either the victims or the broader community.

The OSCE interviewed the victim of the 30 November 2010 attack who noted that the absence of condemnation or outreach by municipal institutions was regrettable and that the impact of such measures on inter-community relations would have been positive. The victim of the 28 December 2010 incident also expressed his disappointment that no public statement or outreach had taken place, although he noted that the mayor telephoned the village leader following the incident to enquire about the community's reaction to the event. In an additional interview, the Kosovo Serb representative in Paralovo/Parallovë village reiterated the importance of outreach following these incidents, stating that condemnations alone would not reassure his community, whose members were increasingly concerned about their safety and security, including their freedom of movement.<sup>23</sup>

A series of lootings of returnee housing in Ferizaj/Uroševac municipality took place between October and December 2010. According to community leaders in the area, the recurring offences have negatively affected perceptions of security within the small Kosovo Serb community, hampering the sustainability of their return. On 8 October 2010, an uninhabited house was targeted in the village of Bablak/Babljak and the owner reported the incident to the police. On 26 October 2010, four uninhabited houses owned by Kosovo Serbs were broken into and looted in the village of Srpski Babuš/Babush i Serbëve. In the same village a house was broken into on 29 November 2010. Another Kosovo Serb reported to the police that, on 2 December 2010, his house in Babljak/Bablak village was burgled. In all cases household items went missing. No condemnation or outreach by municipal institutions was forthcoming.

The OSCE interviewed a community representative who had approached the mayor after the incidents, but was told that outreach was the responsibility of the police.<sup>24</sup> The Kosovo Serb representative of the Ferizaj/Uroševac MCSC noted that the looting negatively affected potential returns to the area. Despite the apparent material motivation behind the crimes, he insisted that the ethnicity of the victims made the houses an "easier target" and that condemnation and outreach by municipal officials would be welcomed by the community.<sup>25</sup> It is worth mentioning that while serious security incidents continued in 2011, the OSCE has observed that the municipality has begun to take some significant steps in responding to such incidents

The Serbian Orthodox church in the village of Donja Budriga/Budrikë e Poshtme in Parteš/Partesh municipality was burgled on 2 December 2010, and copper was removed from the structure of the building. This was the second such incident, following an earlier burglary on 6 November 2009. Despite the fact that both cases were immediately reported to the police and that the church in question was included in a police regional operational plan for the protection of cultural heritage<sup>26</sup>, the community felt that the police were still unable to prevent recurrent burglaries due to the lack of increase in patrols. The OSCE contacted a Serbian

---

<sup>23</sup> Victims of the 30 November and 28 December 2010 attacks in Paralovo/Parallovë and the Kosovo Serb representative of the community in Paralovo/Parallovë, Paralovo/Parallovë village, personal interview, 11 January 2011.

<sup>24</sup> Kosovo Serb resident of Talinoc/Talinovac village, Ferizaj/Uroševac municipality, personal interview, interviewed at his home on 19 January 2011.

<sup>25</sup> Kosovo Serb representative to the Ferizaj/Uroševac MCSC, Ferizaj/Uroševac municipality, personal interview, 19 January 2011.

<sup>26</sup> Kosovo Serb Orthodox priest in Donja Budriga/Budrikë e Poshtme village, Parteš/Partesh town, personal interview, 17 January 2011.

Orthodox priest, who expressed his dismay at the absence of a municipal response to the incidents, particularly the lack of condemnation and outreach to the community.

Other communities were also subject to security incidents in the region of Gjilan/Gnjilane in 2010. Kosovo Ashkali, who reside mainly in the municipality of Ferizaj/Uroševac, continued to be affected by security incidents. For example, on 23 January 2010 a juvenile Kosovo Ashkali male from the Sallahane/Salahane neighbourhood in Ferizaj/Uroševac town was stabbed.<sup>27</sup> Although the incident was discussed at a meeting of the Ferizaj/Uroševac MCSC on 2 March 2010, community leaders approached by the OSCE appeared reluctant to speak openly about the stabbing; the community itself tended to downplay the significance and impact of the attack.<sup>28</sup>

However, the deputy mayor for communities, a Kosovo Ashkali representative who was appointed after the incident, regretted the lack of condemnation or outreach after the incidents by the municipality. On the other hand, an officer from the MOCR noted that the limited impact of the incident on inter-community relations did not warrant condemnation by the municipality. The officer interviewed felt that an outreach visit by the head of the MOCR after the incident had been sufficient. He also noted the need to allocate specific funds for municipal outreach and assistance following significant security incidents.<sup>29</sup>

Also in the Gjilan/Gnjilane region, the small and mostly elderly Kosovo Croat community in Viti/Vitina municipality continued to experience frequent verbal and physical harassment and intimidation by Kosovo Albanian neighbours and ethnic Albanians from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, who occupy empty Kosovo Croat homes in the area.<sup>30</sup> During MCSC meetings both the mayor and the Kosovo police station commander assessed the security situation in Viti/Vitina as calm, without any reported incidents affecting non-majority communities. Community representatives consulted by the OSCE after the assault expressed their concerns about reporting incidents to the police due to fear of retaliation and affirmed that their freedom of movement continued to be curtailed.

### **3.2. Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region**

The security of non-majority communities in Mitrovicë/Mitrovica in 2010 reflected the overall deterioration of the security situation in the northern municipalities of the region, with an increased number of inter-community security incidents involving Kosovo Albanians and Kosovo Serbs, both as alleged perpetrators and victims. Such incidents were reported in Tre Rrokaqejt/Tri Solitera (the “Three Towers” neighbourhood), Mikronaselje/Kodra e Minatorëve, Suhodoll/Suvi Do (upper and lower) and Lagja e Doktorëve/Dolina Doktora (“Doctors’ Valley”), Bosniak Mahalla, and the area near the main bridge on the river Ibar. In these areas, attacks by groups of Kosovo Serbs against Kosovo Albanians were frequent and varied widely from offensive graffiti and verbal harassment, to stoning of persons and/or vehicles, assaults, occasional shootings and/or explosive devices being placed on private property. Arrests were rare and retaliatory incidents often followed.

---

<sup>27</sup> Kosovo Ashkali representative Deputy Municipal Mayor for Communities, 28 December 2010.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> Municipal official, MOCR in Ferizaj/Uroševac municipality, personal interview, 28 December 2010.

<sup>30</sup> See OSCE Report *The Kosovo Croats of Viti/Vitina Municipalities: A Vulnerable Community*. <http://www.osce.org/kosovo/83789> (accessed 23 December 2011).

A significant incident took place on 9 June 2010, when a group of Kosovo Serb youths allegedly attacked a group of Kosovo Albanian youths at a local playground in the “Three Towers” neighbourhood, a mixed community area, resulting in the hospitalization of five injured Kosovo Albanians. Both Kosovo Albanian and Kosovo Serb residents of Mikronaselje/Kodra e Minatoreve and the “Three Towers” condemned the attack and asked for an increased police presence, which was granted. However on 10 June 2010 a group of Kosovo Albanian youth reportedly assaulted three Kosovo Serb males in what appeared to be a retaliatory attack. The municipal institutions based in southern Mitrovicë/Mitrovica condemned the violence and met with Kosovo Albanian leaders in the northern part of the city. UNMIK Administration in Mitrovica (UAM), which is currently responsible for municipal service provision in northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë, did not release any statement or conduct any follow-up outreach activities. One of the Kosovo Albanian youths targeted in the incident of 9 June 2010 noted that he was not satisfied with the response of the Mitrovicë/Mitrovica municipality. He was of the opinion that the municipality had done little to help the victim, their families and the community following the incident. He added that this was in contrast to the Kosovo Serb community representatives and his Kosovo Serb neighbours who had offered the Kosovo Albanian victims a lot of support.<sup>31</sup>

The Kosovo Bosniak community is occasionally affected by the tension and frequent inter-community violence in northern Kosovo.<sup>32</sup> Following such cases, the Kosovo Bosniak community have not been happy with the response of the municipality. Furthermore, the community stressed that they regretted that more attention had been paid to incidents involving Kosovo Albanians and Kosovo Serbs. A particularly prominent case was the killing of a Kosovo Bosniak during a demonstration on 2 July 2010 against the opening of a civil registration centre by Kosovo institutions, when a hand grenade was thrown into the crowd. The incident was condemned both by the Mitrovicë/Mitrovica municipal committee for public safety<sup>33</sup>, which held an extraordinary session on the same day, and the Serbia-run municipal structures in northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë. However, a Kosovo Bosniak representative from the neighbourhood regretted that public statements by Kosovo Albanian and Kosovo Serb officials were of a highly political nature, and that no outreach was conducted with the community.<sup>34</sup>

Perceptions of safety and security among Kosovo Albanians living in the Kosovo Serb-majority municipalities of Zubin Potok, Leposavić/Leposaviq and Zvečan/Zveçan was affected when the humanitarian bus service<sup>35</sup> was reportedly stoned on the 14 May 2010 and then again on 10 June 2010. The service transports Kosovo Albanians from Koshtovë/Košutovo,

---

<sup>31</sup> Kosovo Albanian youth targeted in the 9 June 2010 incident, OSCE Regional Centre Mitrovicë/Mitrovica, personal interview, 25 January 2011.

<sup>32</sup> For example on 17 January 2010, a Kosovo Bosniak male was allegedly intimidated and insulted by a Kosovo Serb over a property dispute. On 9 April 2010, another Kosovo Bosniak female was allegedly harassed by a Kosovo Albanian female who threatened to kill her and her son if they did not leave northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë. On 14 May 2010, a Kosovo Bosniak male reported threats by a Kosovo Serb male against his family. On 4 June 2010, a Kosovo Bosniak female reported that she was threatened by a Kosovo Albanian male in an attempt to force her to sign over a property she owned in northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë.

<sup>33</sup> On 11 February 2008, the Mitrovicë/Mitrovica municipality established a “committee for protection and rescue”, with the aim of reviewing and closely monitoring the overall security and political situation in the municipality. It has since changed its name to the “municipal committee for public safety”, under which it continues to perform similar tasks.

<sup>34</sup> Kosovo Bosniak representative of Bosniak Mahalla, personal interview, 18 January 2011.

<sup>35</sup> Humanitarian bus transportation services operate across Kosovo, connecting non-majority-inhabited areas. The service, originally set up by UNHCR, was administered by UNMIK until 2007 when it was transferred to the Kosovo Ministry of Transport and Communications.

Bistricë/Bistrica and Cerajë/Ceranje villages in Leposavić/Leposaviq municipality to southern Mitrovicë/Mitrovica. According to community representatives, such stonings happen frequently but are not always reported to the police.

The most prominent security incident in these municipalities was the repeated targeting of the Kosovo Albanian-run bakery in Zvečan/Zveçan town. In the second half of 2010 the premises were targeted eight times, including one occasion when two assailants physically assaulted the owner. On that occasion the assailants, allegedly Kosovo Serbs, entered the bakery, told the owner to throw away his cigarette and asked him to pronounce the Serbian letter “Č”. When he did, they said he had mispronounced it and assaulted him. Municipal structures in Zvečan/Zveçan municipality which are supported by the Republic of Serbia publicly condemned all these incidents but did not conduct any outreach with the victim. When interviewed by the OSCE the victim signalled his intention to leave Zvečan/Zveçan due to ongoing security concerns and the lack of municipal support and outreach.<sup>36</sup>

In the municipalities south of the river Ibar, incidents targeting Kosovo Serb property were prevalent. For example, thefts and land usurpation involving mostly uninhabited returnee properties were reported in Svinjarë/Svinjare, Mitrovicë/Mitrovica municipality, between January and February 2010, while several incidents were reported in Vushtrri/Vučitrn municipality in March 2010.<sup>37</sup> In all cases the respective municipalities failed to condemn the incident either publicly or during municipal meetings, or to conduct any outreach activities.

The representative of the Kosovo Serb-inhabited village of Gojbulja/Gojbulë in Vushtrri/Vučitrn municipality expressed his frustration about the lack of municipal responses to security incidents.<sup>38</sup> On 17 February 2010 a humanitarian bus service travelling from Osojan/Osojane in Istog/Istok municipality, Pejë/Peć region, to northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë and carrying about 50 Kosovo Serbs was stoned by school children as it passed through the Kosovo Albanian-inhabited town of Runik/Rudnik in Skenderaj/Srbica municipality. By way of response, the Skenderaj/Srbica community policing unit<sup>39</sup> increased patrols in the area and organized meetings with the director of the local school, some of the teachers, students and the parents’ council.<sup>40</sup> However no public statements were issued by Istog/Istok municipality (where the targeted Kosovo Serbs come from) or Skenderaj/Srbica municipality. In addition,

---

<sup>36</sup> Kosovo Albanian bakery owner from Zvečan/Zveçan town, OSCE premises in southern Mitrovicë/Mitrovica, personal interview, 16 December 2010 and 25 January 2011.

<sup>37</sup> On 8 March 2010 Kosovo Serb returnee homes were looted in Maxhunaj/Novo Selo village, Vushtrri/Vučitrn municipality; on 18 March 2010, the windows of a building on the premises of Saint Elija’s Orthodox church in Vushtrri/Vučitrn town were defaced; on 26 March 2010, Kosovo Serbs residing in Gojbulja/Gojbulë village reported theft of agricultural equipment and harassment by a number of Kosovo Albanian youths from a neighbouring village.

<sup>38</sup> Kosovo Serb representative of village Gojbulja/Gojbulë, Vushtrri/Vučitrn municipality, telephone interview, 21 January 2011.

<sup>39</sup> Community policing units were formerly units established within the Kosovo police targeting community-specific security issues. However, they were dissolved in spring 2010 and their duties transferred to project officers within the Kosovo police.

<sup>40</sup> See note 20, *supra*.

the Kosovo Serb head of the Skenderaj/Srbica municipal communities office<sup>41</sup> lamented the lack of outreach to the affected community.<sup>42</sup>

### 3.3. Pejë/Peć region

In the Pejë/Peć region – where Kosovo Serbs constitute the fourth largest community – attacks against them and their property increased in early 2010, with a negative effect on their perceptions of safety and security.<sup>43</sup> Between January and March 2010, a house in Klinë/Klina town belonging to an elderly Kosovo Serb returnee couple was repeatedly stoned over a period of three days. On 24 February 2010, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister for Communities and Return met with the mayor of Klinë/Klina municipality and issued a joint public statement condemning the incidents. The delegation then conducted an outreach visit to the family, while the municipality later funded all repair work. The community policing unit conducted outreach with the targeted family. When interviewed by the OSCE, the victim commended the response of the municipal institutions and added that it not only reassured his family but also the community at large. A Kosovo Serb employed by the municipality also praised municipal responses to this and other security incidents affecting his community, which he believed contributed positively to improving inter-community relations in Klinë/Klina town.<sup>44</sup>

Throughout 2010, security incidents targeting Kosovo Serb returnees were frequently reported in the ethnically-mixed village of Zallq/Žać in Istog/Istok municipality.<sup>45</sup> On 17 August, a returnee house under construction was damaged, while on 18 August a field of dry grass close to returnee tents was set on fire. The most significant took place on 20 February 2010, when a Kosovo Serb returnee was attacked while he was walking from Zallq/Žać to the Kosovo Serb village of Osojane/Osojan, Istog/Istok municipality, suffering bodily injuries. Two official statements of condemnation were released by municipal officials. The first was made by the Kosovo Serb head of the municipal communities' sub-office in Osojane/Osojan, who gave several interviews to the Serbian media and condemned the attack. She added that the incident had triggered negative reactions amongst the Kosovo Serb community and that it may negatively affect the ongoing return process to the municipality. The second statement was

---

<sup>41</sup> The Municipal Communities Office (MCO) is responsible for enhancing the protection of community rights and ensuring equal access of communities to public services at the municipal level. Government Regulation No. 02/2010 for the Municipal Offices for Communities and Return merges the Municipal Office for Communities with the Municipal Office for Return.

<sup>42</sup> Kosovo Serb head of Skenderaj/Srbica MCO, Banja/Bajë village, personal interview at the MCO premises, 12 January 2011.

<sup>43</sup> Significant incidents included the repeated slashing of tires of Kosovo Serb vehicles in Videjë/Vidanje village, Klinë/Klina municipality, between January and March 2010. During the same period frequent looting of empty properties of displaced Kosovo Serbs in Belo Polje/Bellopojë village near Pejë/Peć town took place, with no significant municipal response. An empty house in the Kosovo Serb returnee village of Gremnik/Grebnik, Klinë/Klina municipality, was set on fire. In May 2010 a Kosovo Serb-driven bus was stoned in Shtupel/Štupelj village, Klinë/Klina municipality.. In June 2010 three Kosovo Serb houses were burgled in Berkovë/Berkovo village, also in Klinë/Klina municipality.

<sup>44</sup> Kosovo Serb owner of house repeatedly stoned in Klinë/Klina town and Kosovo Serb employee of Klinë/Klina municipality, personal interviews at their respective homes, 5 January 2011.

<sup>45</sup> Between 19 April and 23 August 2010, thirteen separate incidents were reported to the police, including the stoning of a Kosovo Serb returnee, the stoning of returnees' temporary tent accommodation, damage caused to returnee housing under construction, an allegedly deliberate burning of a field of dry grass which is approximately 200–300 meters away from the tents of the non-majority returnee community and gun shots fired in the vicinity.

made by the Kosovo Egyptian municipal return officer, who visited Kosovo Serb returnees in Zallq/Žać village and also condemned the attack.

The events in Zallq/Žać over the course of 2010 caught the attention of central-level officials and international organizations who condemned the incidents in local Albanian- and Serbian-language media. The deputy mayor for communities issued a press statement strongly condemning incidents that occurred in August 2010. The communities committee of Istog/Istok convened on 25 August 2010 and condemned the incidents through a public statement, and on 2 September 2010 the mayor and police commander of Istog/Istok visited the Kosovo Serb returnees and the receiving community to promote dialogue. The Kosovo Serb representative in Zallq/Žać commended the public statements and outreach visits conducted by municipal officials, adding that they had had a positive impact on security perceptions amongst returnees.<sup>46</sup> However, the victim of the 20 February 2010 attack was only visited by Kosovo Serb municipal officers working for the MOCR, which in his view reduced the positive impact of the outreach.<sup>47</sup>

Other communities<sup>48</sup> were also affected by security incidents in the Pejë/Peć region in 2010, especially Kosovo Bosniaks.<sup>49</sup> Although many of the incidents targeting Kosovo Bosniaks led to the arrest of alleged perpetrators, in most cases there was no municipal condemnation of the incident or any outreach. An exception followed the most serious incident, which took place on 26 October 2010 in the village of Zllapek/Zlopek, Pejë/Peć municipality, when a Kosovo Bosniak male was attacked in his own yard by four Kosovo Albanians. The Pejë/Peć mayor condemned the incident and visited the victim and his family, accompanied by the deputy chairperson for communities of the municipal assembly and other municipal officials; however, the incident was never discussed during MCSC sessions. In an interview with the OSCE the victim noted that the outreach conducted by the municipality had been very positively received, not only by him but also by the rest of the Kosovo Bosniak community in the area.<sup>50</sup> However, despite this and efforts by the police he decided to leave the village permanently in January 2011 due to his ongoing security concerns.

### **3.4. Prishtinë/Priština region**

In the Prishtinë/Priština region security incidents targeting Kosovo Serbs – who constitute the second largest community – continued to occur, undermining the community's safety and

---

<sup>46</sup> Kosovo Serb representative, personal interview at his newly-reconstructed home in the village of Zallq/Žać, 10 January 2011.

<sup>47</sup> Kosovo Serb victim of the 20 February 2010 attack, personal interview at his home in the village of Zallq/Žać, 10 January 2011.

<sup>48</sup> Two attacks against Kosovo Egyptians were reported in Pejë/Peć and Gjakovë/Đakovica towns on 1 March and 8 May 2010 respectively; two Kosovo Egyptian men were assaulted in the village of Novosellë/Novo Selo in Pejë/Peć municipality, a Roma was assaulted on 26 February 2010 in Pejë/Peć town.

<sup>49</sup> On 14 January 2010, threatening text messages were sent by an unknown person to a Kosovo Bosniak male in Pejë/Peć town; on 1 March 2010, another Kosovo Bosniak male was assaulted and robbed in Pejë/Peć town, allegedly by a Kosovo Albanian male who was later detained and questioned by the Kosovo police; on 22 March 2010 a Kosovo Bosniak female student at a technical secondary school in Pejë/Peć was assaulted, allegedly by two Kosovo Albanian male fellow students who were later questioned by police; on 26 April 2010 a Kosovo Bosniak man was assaulted in Pejë/Peć town, allegedly by a group of Kosovo Albanians; on 15 May 2010, a group of Kosovo Albanian males were arrested in the act of assaulting a Kosovo Bosniak male in Gjakovë/Đakovica town; on 1 July 2010 the house of a Kosovo Bosniak was set on fire in Vitomiricë/Vitimirica in Pejë/Peć municipality.

<sup>50</sup> Kosovo Bosniak attacked on 26 October 2010 in the village of Zllapek/Zlopek, personal interview at his home, 29 December 2010.

security. Kosovo Serbs, their private property and their sites of cultural and religious significance were targeted throughout 2010.<sup>51</sup> Between December 2009 and January 2010 the Serbian Orthodox graveyard in Lismir/Dobri Dub village, Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje municipality, was damaged. The incident was discussed during a municipal meeting in which the chairperson of the municipal assembly expressed his regret about the incident. However, no official statement was released and no outreach was conducted. A second Serbian Orthodox graveyard was desecrated on 21 October 2010 in the main town in Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje municipality.. Four days later municipal officials visited the site and their initial assessment was that the damage had been caused by cattle. However, footprints were noted amongst the damaged tombstones and the gate to the graveyard had been stolen during the same incident.<sup>52</sup> No public condemnation or outreach was ever carried out by the municipality. The local Kosovo Serb Orthodox priest conveyed the community's frustration, noting that the initial municipal assessment reinforced the negative impact of the incident on perceptions of security among the community.<sup>53</sup>

On 15 January 2010, twenty gravestones at the Serbian Orthodox cemetery in Laplje Selo/Llapllasellë village, Gračanica/Graçanicë municipality were damaged. The Kosovo Serb Orthodox priest interviewed by the OSCE praised the work of the police investigating the case.<sup>54</sup> However, there was neither municipal condemnation of the incident nor outreach to the community, and the damage was repaired by the families of the deceased. Another Serbian Orthodox graveyard was desecrated on 30 March 2010 in the ethnically-mixed village of Rubovc/Rubovce in Lipjan/Lipljan municipality, an act that was publicly condemned by the Kosovo President and Prime Minister. The mayor also publicly condemned the incident through a press statement to local media, while the municipality funded the repair of damaged gravestones.<sup>55</sup> The Kosovo Serb representative from Rubovc/Rubovce lamented the delay in repairing the damage, but praised the prompt condemnation and the comprehensive outreach by the mayor and the MOCR.<sup>56</sup> Finally, the Serbian Orthodox church "Sveti Andrea" in Podujevë/Podujevo town was defaced on 27 June 2010, when oil was thrown over its external walls.<sup>57</sup> Although municipal officials did not publicly condemn the incident or conduct outreach to the community, in November 2010 the church was repaired with municipal funds.

---

<sup>51</sup> For example, on 11 March 2010, an elderly Kosovo Serb male was physically assaulted and robbed in the ethnically-mixed village of Čaglavica/Çagllavicë, Gračanica/Graçanicë municipality, with no official response or outreach by the municipality; on 23 April 2010 the house and car windows of a Kosovo Serb family in Kishnicë/Kišnica village, Gračanica/Graçanicë municipality, were stoned with no response from municipal institutions; on August 14 2010 a Kosovo Serb house was targeted with an explosive device in Donja Budriga/Budrikë e Poshtme village, Prishtinë/Priština municipality; on 25 November 2010 in Metergoc/Medregovac village, Podujevë/Podujevo municipality, an elderly Kosovo Serb woman was assaulted, when she attempted to prevent illegal logging in the vicinity of her family house.

<sup>52</sup> Site visited by the OSCE following the incident.

<sup>53</sup> Kosovo Serb Orthodox priest, Lismir/Dobri Dub village, Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje municipality, telephone interview, 13 January 2011.

<sup>54</sup> Kosovo Serb Orthodox priest of Laplje Selo/Llapllasellë village, Gračanica/Graçanicë municipality, personal interview at his home, 24 January 2011.

<sup>55</sup> A commission to assess the damage was established shortly after the incident took place but never met. The OSCE advocated twice with the mayor with regard to the repairs, which took place in November 2010.

<sup>56</sup> Kosovo Serb representative from Rubovc/Rubovce village, personal interview in Lipjan/Lipljan town, 21 January 2011.

<sup>57</sup> This church was severely damaged during the March 2004 riots and later completely repaired by the Reconstruction Implementation Commission in 2008. However, additional refurbishment following vandalism in June 2010 was carried out by the municipality with funds from its goods and services budget.



A series of incidents targeting the homes of Kosovo Ashkali (the third largest community in the region) were reported in Nakaradë/Nakarade village in Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje municipality on 3 and 26 March and on 10 April 2010. The windows of four returnee houses were damaged during and after their reconstruction, with the families also reporting experiencing intimidation and pressure by Kosovo Albanian neighbours to sell their properties at low prices. These incidents were not followed by public statements or outreach by municipal officials. Although broken windows were replaced by the municipality after the first incident, no such action was taken after the second and third. The incidents were raised in the MCSC during its 23 April 2010 session by the Kosovo Ashkali representative, who expressed his satisfaction with the response of the municipality. According to him the incidents had had no discernible impact on the community's perceptions of security. However, it should be noted that eventually two out of the four families targeted sold their homes and moved away from the area.<sup>58</sup>

### 3.5. Prizren region

The region of Prizren experienced the lowest number of security incidents affecting non-majority communities in Kosovo, although some attacks were reported in 2010. The most prominent incidents targeted Kosovo Serb private property and sites of religious significance. On 28 January 2010, unknown persons damaged the doors and windows of a health centre, school and house in the Kosovo Serb returnee village of Novake/Novak, Prizren municipality. Four Kosovo Albanian youths were detained in connection to the case, all of whom approached the Kosovo Serb village leader along with their parents to apologize for the incident. In February 2010, the house of a Kosovo Serb in Rahovec/Orahovac town was damaged. Sometime between 13 and 16 April 2010, the church bell was stolen from the Serbian Orthodox church "Sveti Vrač" on the outskirts of the Kosovo Serb-inhabited village of Novake/Novak, Prizren municipality. The municipality did not issue a public statement of condemnation in relation to these events or implement any outreach activities.<sup>59</sup>

Fires of unknown origin broke out in empty properties of Kosovo Serbs who had been displaced from Prizren town; two properties were damaged on 30 May 2010 and another on 31 July 2010.<sup>60</sup> No discussion of the incidents took place in any municipal forum, nor did the municipality issue a statement or conduct any outreach to the affected community. On 15 November 2010, the windows of empty returnee homes in the village of Zoçishtë/Zociste in Rahovec/Orahovac municipality were broken. Again, no response, such as condemnation of the incident, was forthcoming from municipal institutions, and no outreach or repairs were undertaken.

---

<sup>58</sup> Kosovo Ashkali representative in the MCSC, the municipal building in Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje town, personal interview, 13 January 2011.

<sup>59</sup> Kosovo Serb representative of Novake/Novak village and MCSC member, Prizren municipal building, personal interview, 14 January 2011.

<sup>60</sup> The incident of 30 May 2010 was initially classified as suspected arson by the police, although the fire department's report later suggested that it was accidental. The case of 31 July 2010 was not recorded by the police and therefore no investigation was ever undertaken.

#### 4. MUNICIPAL COMMUNITY SAFETY COUNCILS (MCSC) – INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO SECURITY INCIDENTS AFFECTING NON-MAJORITY COMMUNITIES

The only mechanism currently mandated to articulate and guide municipal responses to serious security incidents are MCSCs, which are “the main consultative body of a municipality for security issues which, in cooperation with police, reviews and resolves all security issues for communities in the interest of everybody within the municipality”<sup>61</sup>. An MCSC must be established in every municipality<sup>62</sup>, and include equitable representation of all “ethnic communities” residing in that municipality as well as other relevant stakeholders<sup>63</sup>. The MCSC shall be chaired by the mayor<sup>64</sup> and will “identify concerns related to public safety and recommend [municipal community safety] action plans [...] in cooperation with [...] local communities to address, not only crime, but also ‘the fear of crime’”<sup>65</sup>. It is also mandated to build confidence between the police and residents “through establishing partnerships and joint initiatives to resolve security problems in every community”, and to draft an “annual action plan” for community safety.<sup>66</sup>

MCSCs are supposed to meet at least ten times a year, and to keep and send minutes of all meetings to the relevant ministries (the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry for Local Government Administration) to facilitate their monitoring activities<sup>67</sup>, while the mayor is supposed to report on MCSC activities to the municipal assembly<sup>68</sup>. The MCSC must consult with local safety forums when established<sup>69</sup> and hold two public consultation meetings with communities a year to discuss and address their safety and security concerns<sup>70</sup>. Furthermore, MCSCs are supposed to draft an annual action plan for community safety. Finally, municipalities have an obligation to ensure that non-majority communities’ representatives at the MCSCs receive adequate translation support to ensure their full and unimpeded participation in the body.<sup>71</sup> Invitations, agenda and materials issued in relation to the work of MCSCs should be made available at least in Albanian and Serbian along with translation services to ensure that speakers of either language can communicate freely in meetings.

---

<sup>61</sup> See note 3, *supra*, Article 3(2)

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid*, Article 1.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid*, Article 3.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid*, Article 8.1.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid*, Article 4

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid*, Article 11.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid*, Article 7.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid*, Article 8.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid*, Article 10.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid*, Article 11.

<sup>71</sup> Law No. 02/L-37 on Use of Languages, 27 July 2006, Article 7.2 states that “[e]very municipal representative [...] has a duty to ensure that every person can communicate with, and can obtain available services and public documents from, any municipal institution or organ in any official language”. Article 7.4 states that, “records of meetings [...] shall be kept and issued in all official languages of the municipality”. Albanian and Serbian are the official languages in Kosovo, and therefore of each of its municipalities. Additionally, Bosnian is an official language in Dragash/Dragaš and Prizren municipalities, and Turkish is an official language in Mamuša/Mamushë/Mamuš and Prizren municipalities. Languages in official use have a similar status to that of official languages but interpretation and translation must be requested and are not automatically provided. Bosnian is a language in official use in Istog/Istok and Pejë/Peć towns; Turkish is a language in official use in Gjilan/Gnjilane, Mitrovicë/Mitrovica, Vushtrri/Vučitrn and Prishtinë/Priština municipalities.

#### 4.1. Gjilan/Gnjilane region

MCSCs were established in ten out of eleven municipalities<sup>72</sup> in Gjilan/Gnjilane region, with varying degrees of compliance with the applied standards. For example, in Ferizaj/Uroševac the MCSC only met five times out of the mandatory ten; in Gjilan/Gnjilane four times; in Viti/Vitina six times; in the Kosovo Serb-majority municipality of Klokot/Klllokot five times; and in Kamenicë/Kamenica twice. The MCSC in the Kosovo Serb-majority municipality of Štrpce/Shtërpçë only held its inaugural meeting in September 2010, and municipal officials consulted by the OSCE explained the lack of compliance by noting that the lack of inter-ethnic incidents in the municipality did not warrant prioritization of the MCSC.<sup>73</sup> The predominately Kosovo Albanian-inhabited municipalities of Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Janković and Kaçanik/Kaçanik were the only two in the Gjilan/Gnjilane region where MCSCs convened the required ten meetings in 2010. The Kosovo Serb-majority municipality of Novo Brdo/Novobërdë first established an MCSC 2008. However, it failed to meet in 2010 and hence to comply with any prescribed obligations during the reporting period. Three Kosovo Serb women in Kamenicë/Kamenica and Klokot/Klllokot municipalities are the only female representatives of MCSCs in the region.

In most municipalities the mayors chaired few, if any, of the MCSC sessions, often delegating their duties to the deputy mayor or other officials, with the exception of the municipalities of Ferizaj/Uroševac, Štrpce/Shtërpçë and Viti/Vitina where the mayor chaired the few meetings that took place. Minutes of the MCSC sessions, crucial to enable the relevant ministries to oversee their work, were only recorded and sent by Ferizaj/Uroševac, Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Jankovic, Kaçanik/Kaçanik, Klokot/Klllokot, and Viti/Vitina municipalities. Only the Ferizaj/Uroševac MCSC reported to the municipal assembly about its activities on a regular basis, while Klokot/Klllokot MCSC did so only once. All other MCSCs in the region failed to comply with this important aspect of legislative oversight.

Municipal community safety action plans were drafted in the municipalities of Ferizaj/Uroševac, Gjilan/Gnjilane, Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Jankovic, Kaçanik/Kaçanik, Klokot/Klllokot, Štrpce/Shtërpçë and Viti/Vitina. Mandatory public consultation meetings, important for raising awareness of the work of the MCSCs, were not held in any of the municipalities where these bodies were established. Language interpretation during meetings and translated materials, including agenda and minutes, were not regularly provided in all MCSCs, hampering the ability of some of their representatives to adequately prepare for meetings and to participate effectively and actively.

In the Gjilan/Gnjilane region, local public safety committees (LPSCs) have been established in Gjilan/Gnjilane, Kamenicë/Kamenica, Novo Brdo/Novobërdë, Klokot/Klllokot and Viti/Vitina municipalities. Representatives from the four LPSCs in the municipality of Gjilan/Gnjilane<sup>74</sup> regularly participated in MCSC meetings. The LPSC in Vrbovac/Vërboç is represented by one member in the MCSC in the Kosovo Serb-majority municipality of Klokot/Klllokot. In the municipality of Viti/Vitina, all three LPSCs in the area were

---

<sup>72</sup> At the time of reporting, Ranilug/Ranillug has not established an MCSC, although the OSCE continues regular advocacy in this regard. Parteš/Partesh municipality established an MCSC in 2011.

<sup>73</sup> Kosovo Albanian deputy mayor for communities and Kosovo Albanian head of municipal emergency office, Štrpce/Shtërpçë municipal building, personal interviews, 19 January 2011.

<sup>74</sup> LPSCs, see note 5, *supra*, are established in the villages of Abdullah Presheva/Abdula Preševo, Livoç i Ēperm/Gornji Livoç, Parteš/Partesh, and Poneš/Ponesh.

represented at the MCSC.<sup>75</sup> The Kamenicë/Kamenica MCSC includes representatives from the five existing LPSCs in the municipality, who attend on a rotational basis as agreed by the LPSC representatives themselves.<sup>76</sup>

The representation and effective participation of non-majority communities in the region's MCSCs varied from municipality to municipality, which in turn impacted upon the capacity of the MCSCs to effectively address their safety and security concerns. In Ferizaj/Uroševac municipality the Kosovo Serb representative noted that Serbian translation services were available, which allowed him to participate fully in the proceedings<sup>77</sup>, and the Kosovo Ashkali member noted the effectiveness of the mechanism<sup>78</sup>. However, the MCSC has failed to include representatives of all non-majority communities that are present in the municipality: while Kosovo Serb, Kosovo Roma, Kosovo Ashkali and Kosovo Egyptian community representatives all participated in the meetings, there was no Kosovo Bosniak representative. The MCSC session of 2 March 2010 discussed the abovementioned incident of 23 January 2010, when a juvenile Kosovo Ashkali male in Ferizaj/Uroševac town was stabbed.<sup>79</sup> At the next MCSC session the police discussed the issue of violence in schools and reported on their responsive operation to search for and confiscate knives. However, at the November session of the MCSC no mention was made of the looting of Kosovo Serb houses which had been ongoing since October 2010.<sup>80</sup>

In Gjilan/Gnjilane municipality the MCSC successfully included all non-majority communities, with regular attendance by Kosovo Serb, Kosovo Turk and Kosovo Roma community representatives. The OSCE interviewed Kosovo Roma<sup>81</sup> and Kosovo Serb<sup>82</sup> representatives, who all praised the mechanism. However the Kosovo Turk member criticized the fact that the MCSC had only met four times<sup>83</sup>, and noted that this was insufficient to effectively address community security and safety concerns in the municipality. Moreover, although it regularly provided invitations to meetings and agendas in Serbian, during the session of 28 October 2010 no translation was provided, despite the presence of several Kosovo Serb community representatives and municipal officials who did not speak Albanian. The desecration of the Kosovo Serb graveyard in Gjilan/Gnjilane town Serbian Orthodox cemetery on 18 February 2010<sup>84</sup> was never discussed in the MCSC, as no session was held between the 20 January 2010 inaugural session and the next meeting on 15 July 2010. A member of the Serbian Orthodox Church Board in Gjilan/Gnjilane town noted that the failure by the MCSC to convene and address the desecration casts doubt over the usefulness of the mechanism.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> LPSCs, *ibid*, are established in the villages of Pozharanë/Požaranje, Smirë/Smira, and Vërban/Vrban. LPSC Vrbovac/Vërboc is now represented in the MCSC of the new municipality of Klokot/Kllokot.

<sup>76</sup> LPSCs, *ibid*, are established in the villages of Berivojçe/Berivojcë, Karaçevë/Karačevo, Kololeç/Kolloleç, Muçivërc/Muçivrcë, and Shipashnicë e Epërme/Gornja/Šipašnica.

<sup>77</sup> Kosovo Serb MCSC member, Ferizaj/Uroševac town, personal interview, 19 January 2011.

<sup>78</sup> Kosovo Ashkali MCSC member, Ferizaj/Uroševac municipality, personal interview, 20 January 2011.

<sup>79</sup> See p. 9, *supra*.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>81</sup> Two Kosovo Roma representatives of the Gjilan/Gnjilane MCSC, personal interviews in the Roma Community Center and Gjilan/Gnjilane municipal building respectively, 18 January 2011.

<sup>82</sup> Kosovo Serb member of the Gjilan/Gnjilane MCSC, Gjilan/Gnjilane municipal building, personal interview, 18 January 2011.

<sup>83</sup> Kosovo Turk member of the Gjilan/Gnjilane MCSC, Gjilan/Gnjilane municipal building, personal interview, 19 January 2011.

<sup>84</sup> See pp. 7–8 *supra*.

<sup>85</sup> Kosovo Serb member of the Orthodox Church Board, Gjilan/Gnjilane town premises of the Board, personal interview, 14 January 2011.

In Viti/Vitina municipality, Kosovo Serb community representatives regularly participated in MCSC meetings. However, the failure to provide Serbian translation for most relevant materials and meetings hampered their effective participation in the mechanism.<sup>86</sup> The Kosovo Serb municipal returns officer complained about this issue during the MCSC session of 27 September 2010; however, the problem persisted. The lack of a Kosovo Croat representative is also a matter of concern, with community representatives claiming that they had never been invited to attend MCSC meetings and that ongoing security concerns within this vulnerable community<sup>87</sup> had been left unaddressed by the mechanism.<sup>88</sup>

In the predominantly Kosovo Albanian-inhabited municipality of Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Jankovic there was no representation in the MCSC of the small Kosovo Bosniak community.<sup>89</sup> The five Kosovo Roma residing in the Kosovo Albanian-inhabited municipality of Kaçanik/Kaçanik claimed that they had not been invited to attend MCSC meetings.<sup>90</sup> In the Kosovo Serb-majority municipality of Klokot/Klllokot, Albanian translation of minutes and agenda was provided in four of the five meetings held, though Kosovo Albanian representatives noted that they had been able to participate fully in all sessions.<sup>91</sup>

During the MCSC meeting on 26 July 2010, Kosovo Serb representatives of Klokot/Klllokot and Grncar/Gërncar village complained about incidents of harassment by individuals – allegedly Kosovo Albanians – driving through their villages. The Kosovo police station commander promised to increase the number of patrols in the area, while the MCSC co-ordinator promised to hold weekly meetings with residents to monitor the situation. However, there was no follow-up in subsequent MCSC sessions.

The MCSC of the Kosovo Serb-majority municipality of Novo Brdo/Novobërdë includes representatives from all communities. However, the fact that it did not meet at all in 2010 meant that three assaults on Kosovo Serbs in and around the village of Paralovo/Parallovë on 15 March, 30 November and 28 December 2010<sup>92</sup> were not addressed through the council. In the Kosovo Serb-majority municipality of Štrpce/Shtërpçë, Kosovo Albanians participated in the only MCSC meeting held, nobody from the small Kosovo Roma community was appointed. In Kamenicë/Kamenica Kosovo Serb representatives attended the two meetings held, but there was again no representative of the small Kosovo Roma community. Kosovo Serb representatives noted that translation was provided in both meetings, allowing them to participate fully in the proceedings. However, two noted that the effectiveness of the mechanism could be increased if it held more frequent meetings, and

---

<sup>86</sup> Kosovo Serb MCSC member, Viti/Vitina municipal building, personal interview, 17 January 2011.

<sup>87</sup> See note 31, *supra*.

<sup>88</sup> Kosovo Croat community representative, Viti/Vitina municipality, personal interview at his home in Lletnicë/Letnica village, 28 December 2010.

<sup>89</sup> The Kosovo Bosniak community is broadly integrated in the majority community and has not sought participation in mechanisms established to protect and promote non-majority communities' rights.

<sup>90</sup> The five members of the Kosovo Roma community who reside in the municipality of Kaçanik/Kaçanik are broadly integrated with the majority Kosovo Albanian community.

<sup>91</sup> Four Kosovo Albanian MCSC representatives, Klokot/Klllokot municipal building, personal interviews, 17 January 2011.

<sup>92</sup> See p. 8, *supra*.

addressed the communities' specific security and safety concerns instead of focusing on general public safety issues.<sup>93</sup>

#### 4.2. Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region

In the region of Mitrovicë/Mitrovica, only the MCSC in Vushtrri/Vučitrn municipality was functional throughout 2010. MCSCs are not in place in the municipalities of Laposavić/Leposaviq, Zubin Potok/Zubin Potok and Zvečan/Zveçan.<sup>94</sup> The municipality of Mitrovicë/Mitrovica established an MCSC in April of 2009 but it only met once, and never in 2010. Similarly an MCSC was established in the municipality of Skenderaj/Srbica in January 2010, but it failed to hold any other meetings during the reporting period.

The Vushtrri/Vučitrn MCSC convened a total of ten times in 2010, which was fully in compliance with its prescribed obligations. Meetings were regularly chaired by the mayor, minutes of the meetings were kept and sent to relevant ministries, and all meetings were regularly attended by Kosovo Serb (a woman), Kosovo Turk, Kosovo Roma and Kosovo Ashkali community representatives. MCSC representatives of the latter three communities praised the effectiveness of the mechanism and their ability to actively participate in it.<sup>95</sup> However, the Kosovo Serb representative felt that the contribution of the MCSC remained largely symbolic and that it had a limited capacity to resolve issues, although she acknowledged that she was able to participate fully.<sup>96</sup> A Kosovo Serb resident in Gojbulja/Gojbulë village complained to the OSCE that reported security incidents were not discussed by the MCSC, while incidents reported in other areas of the municipality<sup>97</sup> were also left unaddressed.<sup>98</sup> Serbian translation was provided on a regular basis, but minutes were only produced in Albanian. The MCSC failed to report its activities to the municipal assembly, did not draft a municipal community safety action plan, and did not hold the two mandatory public consultation meetings in 2010.

Significant security incidents affecting non-majority communities were reported in all of the municipalities in the region of Mitrovicë/Mitrovica. The failure of municipalities to comply with legislative requirements on MCSCs<sup>99</sup> where they are applied has left a significant vacuum in their capacity to effectively respond to these incidents and to protect and promote the security and safety of non-majority communities. Furthermore, existing LPSCs in the region<sup>100</sup> have been unable to discharge their functions due to the lack of MCSCs.

---

<sup>93</sup> Kosovo Serb representatives of the Kamenicë/Kamenica MCSC, Kamenicë/Kamenica town, personal interview, 18 January 2011.

<sup>94</sup> MCSCs are not in place in the municipalities of Laposavić/Leposaviq, Zubin Potok/Zubin Potok and Zvečan/Zveçan due to the fact that these municipalities apply Serbian law.

<sup>95</sup> Kosovo Turk, Kosovo Roma and Kosovo Ashkali representatives of the Vushtrri/Vučitrn MCSC, personal interviews, 20, 21 and 26 of January 2011 respectively.

<sup>96</sup> Kosovo Serb member of the Vushtrri/Vučitrn MCSC, personal interview, 18 January 2011.

<sup>97</sup> See p. 12, *supra*.

<sup>98</sup> Kosovo Serb resident of Gojbulja/Gojbulë village, Vushtrri/Vučitrn municipality, telephone interview, 21 January 2011.

<sup>99</sup> See p. 10–12, *supra*.

<sup>100</sup> LPSCs, see note 5, *supra*, are established in the villages of Suvo Grlo/Syriganë (Skenderaj/Srbica municipality), Çaber/Çabra (Zubin Potok), and Lipe/Lipa (Zvečan/Zveçan).

### 4.3 Pejë/Peć region

In the region of Pejë/Peć all six municipalities established MCSCs in 2010, which complied with relevant standards to varying degrees. In Deçan/Deçane four out of ten mandatory MCSC meetings were held in 2010, in Gjakovë/Đakovica two, in Istog/Istok six, in Klinë/Klina five, in Pejë/Peć eight, and in Junik only one was held. In Deçan/Deçane, Gjakovë/Đakovica and Junik the few meetings convened were chaired by the respective mayors. In Istog/Istok and Klinë/Klina the mayor only chaired some of the meetings, while in Pejë/Peć the mayor did not chair any, with deputy mayors often replacing mayors as chairpersons. Minutes were only kept and sent to the relevant ministries for review in Gjakovë/Đakovica and Klinë/Klina. In Istog/Istok and Pejë/Peć, minutes of the MCSCs meetings were kept but they were mistakenly sent to the Association of Kosovo Municipalities instead of the relevant ministries. In Junik minutes of the one MCSC meeting, which was chaired by the mayor, were kept but were never sent to the relevant ministries. Only the Istog/Istok MCSC reported its activities to the municipal assembly while the other five MCSCs failed to observe its obligations in this respect.

The Istog/Istok and Pejë/Peć MCSCs drafted municipal community safety action plans for 2010. At the time of writing, the action plan prepared by Gjakovë/Đakovica MCSC was awaiting final drafting and approval, while Junik and Deçan/Deçane did not take any action in this respect. Only the Pejë/Peć MCSC held the two mandatory public consultation meetings in 2010, while the other five MCSCs failed to take this opportunity to raise the profile of their activities amongst the public. Translation of materials and during meetings was not always provided for MCSC representatives, which negatively affected their ability to adequately prepare for and to effectively and actively participate in meetings. No women from non-majority communities were represented among the region's MCSCs.

Representation and effective participation of non-majority communities in the region's MCSCs varied from municipality to municipality, which in turn impacted upon the capacity of the bodies to effectively address the security and safety concerns of these communities. In the Deçan/Deçane MCSC the head of the MOCR – a Kosovo Bosniak – was appointed by the municipality to represent the interests of all non-majority communities, including Kosovo Serbs, Kosovo Egyptians, Kosovo Ashkali and Kosovo Roma, a decision taken in contravention of relevant standards. The Kosovo Bosniak representative noted his ability to fully participate in discussions, as he speaks Albanian and translation services are generally provided. He suggested that an increase in the information flow between the MCSC and the communities would strengthen the work of this body, and believed information campaigns to raise awareness about its existence and mandate would also improve its effectiveness.<sup>101</sup> A Kosovo Serb employee in the MOCR conveyed the frustration of other communities' lack of representation in the MCSC, specifically Kosovo Montenegrins and Kosovo Serbs, and noted that they would like to see more engagement of the MCSC in addressing their communities' safety and security concerns.<sup>102</sup>

In Gjakovë/Đakovica municipality, Kosovo Egyptians were the only non-majority community to be represented in the MCSC through the deputy chairperson of the municipal assembly; no Kosovo Roma, Kosovo Ashkali or Kosovo Bosniak representatives were

<sup>101</sup> Kosovo Bosniak head of the Deçan/Deçane MOCR and member of the MCSC, Deçan/Deçane municipal building, personal interviews, 10 January 2011..

<sup>102</sup> Kosovo Serb officer in the Deçan/Deçane MOCR, Deçan/Deçane municipal building, personal interview, 10 January 2011.

appointed. A Kosovo Albanian civil society member claims to represent the interests of non-majority communities in the municipality because he has previous experience working on community rights issues with a civil society organization.<sup>103</sup> Lack of communities' representation may explain why in an MCSC meeting on 7 July 2010, only public safety issues were discussed and no mention was made of the security incidents affecting Kosovo Egyptian and Kosovo Bosniak communities reported in March and May 2010.<sup>104</sup> No translation into Serbian was provided at the MCSC as all representatives are Albanian-speaking. Although the Kosovo Egyptian representative strongly believes that the MCSC has the potential to effectively address communities' safety and security concerns, his request to hold an MCSC meeting to discuss security issues affecting non-majority communities in the municipality was never granted.<sup>105</sup>

In Istog/Istok municipality, Kosovo Serb, Kosovo Bosniak, Kosovo Egyptian and Kosovo Roma community representatives were appointed and participated in almost all MCSC meetings. However, the Kosovo Montenegrin community was not represented. The meetings of the MCSC addressed security incidents reported in the Kosovo Serb return site at Zallq/Žaç<sup>106</sup>, a fact praised by the Kosovo Serb MCSC member<sup>107</sup>. However, Kosovo Serbs targeted in some of the incidents in Zallq/Žaç village were unaware that the MCSC had discussed the events, and complained that their representative had not carried out any outreach following the incidents.<sup>108</sup> Although translation into Serbian was available during meetings, materials were mainly issued in Albanian. The Kosovo Egyptian member commended the MCSC for allowing him to participate fully in proceedings, but noted the need to deliver materials well in advance to enable representatives to prepare for meetings, and for consistent follow-up of issues raised.<sup>109</sup>

In Klinë/Klina municipality, Kosovo Ashkali, Kosovo Egyptian and Kosovo Roma community representatives regularly attended meetings of the MCSC and praised the effectiveness of the mechanism.<sup>110</sup> However, not all non-majority communities in the municipality were represented in the MCSC: no representative from the one remaining Kosovo Montenegrin family in Klinë/Klina town was appointed, and the Kosovo Serb representative and communities committee member was also not in attendance. The MCSC addressed a diverse range of issues, from public safety to security concerns regarding the return of Kosovo Serbs to a village in the municipality. However, the stoning of Kosovo Serb returnee homes in Klinë/Klina town in January 2010<sup>111</sup> was not addressed by the MCSC as it was not established until July. A representative of the only LPSC in the area – in the village

---

<sup>103</sup> Kosovo Albanian member of the Gjakovë/Đakovica MCSC, Gjakovë/Đakovica town, personal interview, 11 January 2011.

<sup>104</sup> See note 51 and 52, *supra*.

<sup>105</sup> Kosovo Egyptian deputy chairperson of the municipal assembly and member of the MCSC, Gjakovë/Đakovica town, personal interview, 12 January 2011.

<sup>106</sup> See p.13, *supra*.

<sup>107</sup> Kosovo Serb member of the Istog/Istok MCSC, personal interview in his home in the village of Čerkolez/Crkolez,, 13 January 2011.

<sup>108</sup> Kosovo Serb returnees in the village of Zallq/Žaç, Zallq/Žaç and Osojane/Osojan villages, personal interviews, 10–11 January 2011.

<sup>109</sup> Kosovo Egyptian member of the Istog/Istok MCSC, interviewed by the OSCE on 11 January 2011 in Istog/Istok town.

<sup>110</sup> Kosovo Ashkali, Kosovo Roma and Kosovo Egyptian Klinë/Klina MCSC representatives, interviewed separately by the OSCE on 12–13 January 2011 at their homes in villages of Klinavc/Klinavac, Dollovë/Dollovo, and Shtupel/Stupelj respectively.

<sup>111</sup> See p. 12-13, *supra*.



of Dollc-Dresnik/Dolac-Dresnik – was appointed to the MCSC. Nevertheless, the municipality did not have his contact details and found it difficult to send him invitations.

In Pejë/Peć municipality, Kosovo Serb, Kosovo Bosniak, Kosovo Egyptian and Kosovo Roma were represented in the MCSC but failed to attend regularly, while the Kosovo Gorani and Kosovo Montenegrin communities were not represented at all. Simultaneous translation into Albanian and Serbian was provided regularly, but the Kosovo Serb representative noted that the agenda and minutes were only issued in Albanian.<sup>112</sup> The LPSC in the Kosovo Serb-inhabited village of Ljevoša/Levoshë appointed a representative who attended most of the meetings, although he complained that the invitation and agenda were sent late and were only in Albanian, which hampered his ability to prepare in advance.<sup>113</sup> During the meetings a diverse range of public safety issues were discussed, but these did not include security incidents affecting non-majority communities in the municipality, and which particularly affected Kosovo Bosniaks, Kosovo Egyptians and Kosovo Roma.<sup>114</sup> The Kosovo Bosniak MCSC member complained that meetings addressed public safety and security issues in general with no focus on non-majority communities, which may explain why the attack on a Kosovo Bosniak in the village of Zllapek/Zlopek on 26 October 2010<sup>115</sup> was not discussed at the next MCSC meeting held on 2 December 2010.<sup>116</sup> Moreover, a Kosovo Serb representative noted poor follow-up in relation to specific issues he raised at MCSC meetings and the low level of awareness amongst communities about the existence and mandate of the mechanism.<sup>117</sup>

#### 4.4. Prishtinë/Priština region

In the region of Prishtinë/Priština, seven out of eight municipalities had established MCSCs; only Gračanica/Gracanicë had not. In 2010, the Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje MCSC held just two meetings out of the mandatory ten, while Lipjan/Lipljan convened eight meetings, Obiliq/Obilić and Podujevë/Podujevo three, Prishtinë/Priština five, Glllogovc/Glogovac four, and Shtime/Štimlje sixteen. The mayors of Podujevë/Podujevo and Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje chaired the few meetings held, while in the other five MCSCs mayors only chaired some meetings, often delegating this responsibility to their deputy mayors and/or chairpersons of the municipal assemblies. Most MCSCs kept and sent minutes of their proceedings to the relevant ministries for review, with Obiliq/Obilić doing so only once and Glllogovc/Glogovac failing to do so altogether. Only the Obiliq/Obilić MCSC reported its activities to the municipal assembly, while all others failed to comply with this legal requirement. Lipjan/Lipljan and Obiliq/Obilić were the only MCSCs to draft a municipal community safety action plan for 2010, while the two mandatory MCSC public meetings were held only in Shtime/Štimlje and Lipjan/Lipljan. Two women participated in the Obiliq/Obilić MCSC, one Kosovo Serb and one Kosovo Bosniak.

---

<sup>112</sup> Kosovo Serb member of the Pejë/Peć MCSC, interviewed by the OSCE on 29 December 2010 at his home in Belo Polje/Bellopojë village.

<sup>113</sup> Kosovo Serb representative of Ljevoša/Levoshë LPSC and member of the Pejë/Peć MCSC, interviewed by the OSCE on 11 January 2011 at his home in Ljevoša/Levoshë village.

<sup>114</sup> See note 51, 52, *supra*.

<sup>115</sup> See p. 14, *supra*.

<sup>116</sup> Kosovo Bosniak member of the Pejë/Peć MCSC, interviewed by the OSCE on 14 January 2011 at his home in Vitomiricë/Vitomirica village.

<sup>117</sup> Kosovo Serb member of the Pejë/Peć MCSC, Goraždevac/Gorazhdec village, personal interview at his home, 30 December 2010.

Representation and effective participation of non-majority communities in the region's MCSCs varied from municipality to municipality, impacting on the capacity of these mechanisms to effectively respond to the communities' safety and security concerns. Six out of seven MCSCs included representatives of non-majority communities; only Glllogovc/Glogovac did not, but it should be noted that the municipality is inhabited solely by Kosovo Albanians.

In Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje, Kosovo Serb, Kosovo Egyptian, Kosovo Roma and Kosovo Ashkali representatives participated in MCSC meetings. Representatives from the small Kosovo Bosniak or Kosovo Gorani communities had not been appointed, but municipal officials consulted by the OSCE stated that they were unable to identify individuals for the positions, as the communities were small and highly integrated into the majority community. Translation into Serbian was provided. The MCSC discussed public safety issues as well as security incidents affecting non-majority communities. For example, during its session of 23 April 2010 the Kosovo Ashkali member raised the issue of broken windows in four houses belonging to Kosovo Ashkali returnee families in Nakaradë/Nakarade village.<sup>118</sup> However, despite Kosovo Serb representation in the MCSC, there was no discussion of the desecration of Serbian Orthodox graveyards in the municipality in January and October 2010.<sup>119</sup>

In Lipjan/Lipljan, all non-majority communities in the municipality were approached to participate in the MCSC, namely Kosovo Serbs, Kosovo Turks, Kosovo Roma, Kosovo Ashkali, Kosovo Montenegrins and Kosovo Croats. However, a number non-majority community representatives did not attend the meetings.<sup>120</sup> Serbian translation was provided regularly, and representatives for the LPSC in Janjevo/Janjevë routinely attended. The MCSC convened regularly and discussed a number of safety and security issues affecting all communities, although it did not address the desecration of the Serbian Orthodox graveyard in Rubovce/Rubovc village on 30 March 2010. Instead, this incident was discussed during a monthly security meeting hosted by the Kosovo police in the premises of the MOCR, during which it was agreed that police patrols would be increased. The Kosovo Serb MCSC member claimed that he had not participated in MCSC meetings at the time of the incident.<sup>121</sup> The Kosovo Ashkali MCSC member praised the mechanism as a useful means of sharing information about the security concerns of other communities in the municipality while allowing his community to interact with the institutions.<sup>122</sup>

In Obiliq/Obilić, Kosovo Serb, Kosovo Bosniak, Egyptian, Roma and Ashkali community representatives participated in MCSC meetings, although the small Kosovo Montenegrin community was not represented. Serbian translation was provided. The MCSC did not specifically discuss security issues, focusing instead on public safety matters, but MCSC representatives praised its effectiveness in addressing issues of common concern.<sup>123</sup> However one of the two women in the MCSC, the Kosovo Bosniak representative, noted that more

---

<sup>118</sup> See p. 15–16, *supra*

<sup>119</sup> See p. 14–15, *supra*

<sup>120</sup> In the case of the Kosovo Montenegrin community, a representative was asked to become a member of the MCSC but declined, while the Kosovo Croat member has been officially appointed but was absent from meetings.

<sup>121</sup> Kosovo Serb member of the Lipjan/Lipljan MCSC, OSCE premises in Lipjan/Lipljan town, personal interview, 28 January 2011.

<sup>122</sup> Kosovo Ashkali member of the Lipjan/Lipljan MCSC, Gadime/Gadimlje village, personal interview at his home, 18 January 2011.

<sup>123</sup> Kosovo Serb and Kosovo Ashkali representatives of the Obiliq/Obilić MCSC, OSCE premises in Obiliq/Obilić town and Plementin/Plementina village respectively, personal interviews, 12 January 2011.

commitment and political will were needed to improve follow-up and resolve issues raised by communities in meetings.<sup>124</sup>

In Podujevë/Podujevo, Kosovo Roma and Kosovo Ashkali representatives residing in the main town regularly attended MCSC meetings and expressed satisfaction with the effectiveness of the mechanism.<sup>125</sup> Although there is a small Kosovo Serb community in the municipality, they did not participate in the proceedings largely due to distance and travel costs. The MCSC discussed broad public safety issues, but did not discuss the defacing of a Serbian Orthodox church in Podujevë/Podujevo town on 27 June 2010<sup>126</sup> at its meeting on 15 October 2010, the first since the incident.

In Prishtinë/Priština, although all non-majority communities in the municipality were represented – namely Kosovo Serb, Kosovo Bosniak, Kosovo Egyptian, Kosovo Turk, Kosovo Roma, Kosovo Ashkali and Kosovo Gorani – they did not attend meetings regularly. The Kosovo Serb and Kosovo Turk representatives complained of not receiving invitations on time<sup>127</sup>, while the Kosovo member stated that the issues raised were not always adequately addressed by the MCSC<sup>128</sup>. The only LPSC in the municipality, in the mixed Kosovo Albanian and Kosovo Serb village of Donja Brnjica/Bërnice e Poshtme, was represented. General safety and security issues were discussed, but there was no mention of incidents specific to non-majority communities. Serbian translation of materials was provided regularly.

In Shtime/Štimlje, Kosovo Ashkali and Kosovo Roma representatives were appointed to the MCSC, but their attendance was irregular. The Kosovo Roma MCSC representative, who participated in only 4 out of 16 meetings, claimed not to have received official invitations to all the meetings held. However, he noted that issues of public safety affecting his community had been successfully addressed.<sup>129</sup> The Kosovo Ashkali MCSC member attended most of the meetings and praised its value as a participation mechanism.<sup>130</sup> The MCSC in Shtime/Štimlje was very active, calling sixteen meetings during 2010, which goes beyond the mandatory ten meetings a year. However, the MCSC failed to focus on specific issues affecting non-majority communities, focusing more on issues such as traffic accidents.

#### 4.5. Prizren region

In the region of Prizren an MCSC was established in five out of six municipalities. In Rahovec/Orahovac municipality, although the MCSC was formally established, no meetings actually took place in 2010. In Mamuša/Mamushë/Mamuša a meeting was held in September 2010 to discuss the establishment of an MCSC but there was no follow-up. The four

---

<sup>124</sup> Kosovo Bosniak member of the Obiliq/Obilić MCSC, OSCE premises in Obiliq/Obilić town, personal interview, 12 December 2010.

<sup>125</sup> Kosovo Ashkali and Kosovo Roma representatives of the Podujevë/Podujevo MCSC, Podujevë/Podujevo town, personal interviews, 14 January 2011.

<sup>126</sup> See note 61, *supra*.

<sup>127</sup> Kosovo Turkish and Kosovo Serb representatives of the Prishtinë/Priština MCSC, OSCE premises in Prishtinë/Priština municipality, personal and telephone interviews respectively, 18 January 2011.

<sup>128</sup> Kosovo Ashkali representatives of the Prishtinë/Priština MCSC, OSCE premises in Prishtinë/Priština municipality, personal interview, 17 January 2011.

<sup>129</sup> Kosovo Roma member of the Shtime/Štimlje MCSC, Shtime/Štimlje town, personal interview, 11 January 2011.

<sup>130</sup> Kosovo Ashkali member of the Shtime/Štimlje MCSC, Shtime/Štimlje town, personal interview, 19 January 2011.

functional MCSCs conducted their duties with varying degrees of compliance with applicable standards. The Dragash/Dragaš MCSC only met once in 2010, Malishevë/Mališevo held nine meetings, Prizren and Suharekë/Suva Reka held five. The Prizren, Dragash/Dragaš and Suharekë/Suva Reka MCSC meetings were chaired by the respective mayors, while in Malishevë/Mališevo these duties were delegated to other municipal officials. Only Prizren and Suharekë/Suva Reka MCSCs sent minutes of their meetings to the relevant ministries for review, and only Prizren MCSC reported to the municipal assembly, albeit on an ad hoc basis. None of the MCSCs in the region drafted a municipal community safety action plan for 2010. The Suharekë/Suva Reka MCSC held one of two mandatory public consultation meetings, while the other three functional MCSCs did not hold any. Only one woman participated in the mechanism, representing the Kosovo Bosniak community in the Prizren MCSC.

Representation of non-majority communities in the region's MCSCs and their effective participation varied from municipality to municipality, impacting on the capacity of the mechanism to effectively tackle their security and safety concerns. In the Dragash/Dragaš MCSC all non-majority communities in the municipality were represented, and one Kosovo Bosniak and one Kosovo Gorani representative attended the only meeting held in 2010. However the fact that the Kosovo Bosniak MCSC representative also happens to be the municipal translator gives rise to questions about potential conflict of interest, given that he is on the municipal payroll. Translation was provided by this individual, as Bosnian is an official language of the municipality, and both the non-majority community representatives were able to contribute and participate fully. Nevertheless, concerns were raised about the need to hold meetings more frequently and to carry out more systematic follow-up on safety and security issues affecting non-majority communities.<sup>131</sup> The only LPSC in the municipality, in the ethnically-mixed village of Krushevë/Kruševo, is represented at the MCSC.

In Malishevë/Mališevo municipality the MCSC included one Kosovo Roma representative. The Kosovo Ashkali community was not represented. The MCSC dealt with issues of public safety and health, but no specific security issues affecting the small Kosovo Roma community were discussed.<sup>132</sup> This may be partly explained by the lack of non-majority community representation in the mechanism.

The Prizren MCSC includes representatives from Kosovo Serb, Kosovo Bosniak, Kosovo Turk and Kosovo Roma communities, but these only attended meetings irregularly. No Kosovo Ashkali and Kosovo Egyptian representatives were appointed. Similar to the situation in Dragash/Dragaš, most of the MCSC non-majority community representatives were also municipal officials. Prizren MCSC dealt primarily with general public safety issues, and awareness of its work was low amongst non-majority communities. The Kosovo Serb representative noted that poor follow-up on issues raised during MCSC meetings had impacted negatively upon its effectiveness, and felt that issues pertaining to his community were not given due attention. For example, there was no discussion of the robbery at the Serbian Orthodox church in Novake/Novak village in April 2010<sup>133</sup> or fires affecting Kosovo Serb houses in Prizren town in May and July 2010<sup>134</sup>. He added that Serbian translation

---

<sup>131</sup> Kosovo Gorani and Kosovo Bosniak representatives of the Dragash/Dragaš MCSC, Dragash/Dragaš town, personal interviews, 12 and 13 January 2011 respectively.

<sup>132</sup> According to OSCE regular monitoring of the MCSC in Malishevë/Mališevo municipality.

<sup>133</sup> See p. 16, *supra*.

<sup>134</sup> See note 64, *supra*.

during meetings was not always adequate, although this did not significantly impact upon his ability to participate.<sup>135</sup> A Kosovo Bosniak female representative noted that there was no Bosnian translation of materials due to an alleged lack of resources, despite the fact that this was an official language in the municipality. She also noted the lack of systematic follow-up by the MCSC of issues raised during the proceedings.<sup>136</sup> A second Kosovo Bosniak MCSC representative noted that simultaneous translation into Bosnian and Turkish was provided.<sup>137</sup> The Kosovo Roma representative noted that the MCSC has adequately followed up on issues which affected his community, but added that there was a need to encourage more proactive and effective community participation in the mechanism.<sup>138</sup> The only LPSC in the municipality, located in the ethnically-mixed village of Mushnikovë/Mušnikovo, was not represented in the MCSC.

In Suharekë/Suva Reka, a Kosovo Ashkali represented the interests both of his own community and of the small Kosovo Roma community in the municipality, leaving the latter without adequate representation. The MCSC dealt with several non-majority communities' issues in 2010, including the security implications of ongoing and planned Kosovo Serb return-related activities, and public safety issues affecting the Ashkali community. The Ashkali MCSC member, a regular and active participant, noted the need to strengthen the mechanism. In particular he highlighted the lack of a municipal community safety action plan, which he believed had reduced the MCSC to an information-sharing, as opposed to an effective problem-solving, mechanism.<sup>139</sup>

## 5. CONCLUSION

Non-majority communities in Kosovo continue to be negatively affected by serious security incidents targeting persons, private property and sites of cultural and religious significance. Such incidents often have an adverse impact on communities' actual and perceived safety and security, and in some cases can limit their freedom of movement and hinder their access to essential rights and services.

Through systematic monitoring and a series of interviews with relevant stakeholders, this report has tracked municipal responses to serious security incidents affecting non-majority communities across Kosovo.<sup>140</sup> The findings show a clear correlation between municipal responses and communities' perceptions of their safety and security. In municipalities where relevant mechanisms, offices and officials actively responded to security incidents with

---

<sup>135</sup> Kosovo Serb member of the Prizren MCSC, Prizren municipal building, personal interview, 14 January 2011.

<sup>136</sup> Kosovo Bosniak member of the Prizren MCSC, Prizren municipal building, personal interview, 18 January 2011.

<sup>137</sup> Kosovo Bosniak member of the Prizren MCSC, Prizren municipal building, personal interview, 20 January 2011.

<sup>138</sup> Kosovo Roma member of the Prizren MCSC, Prizren municipal building, personal interview, 20 January 2011.

<sup>139</sup> Kosovo Ashkali member of the Suharekë/Suva Reka MCSC, Suharekë/Suva Reka town, personal interview, 19 January 2011.

<sup>140</sup> Although the OSCE actively seeks to mainstream women's perspectives into its monitoring and reporting activities, women from non-majority communities are not only heavily under-represented in municipal bodies but are also largely unrepresented in village and community leadership forums. Moreover, the sensitivity of safety and security issues made wider consultation on these issues particularly challenging. It should also be noted that both the victims and the alleged perpetrators of most of the reported security incidents affecting non-majority communities were male.

public condemnation or outreach or both, the affected communities reported that their perceptions of security were improved.

Given this important correlation, greater efforts should be made to ensure that effective municipal responses to serious security incidents are not only formally prescribed by the legal and regulatory framework, but are effectively and consistently implemented at the municipal level.

The current legal framework does not prescribe specific municipal responses to security incidents. The legislative framework requires that MCSCs be established in all municipalities of Kosovo<sup>141</sup>, and their mandate calls for them, in co-operation with the police, to review and resolve all security issues for communities<sup>142</sup>. However, there is no guidance as to how this should be done. Instead, these decisions are left to the discretion of municipal officials, which results in varied practice across Kosovo. The correlation between municipal responses and non-majority communities' perceptions of their security and safety makes clear the vital role that such mechanisms can and should play across Kosovo. As mentioned previously, the Ministry of Internal Affairs has approved the "National Strategy and Action Plan for Community Safety 2011–2016"<sup>143</sup>. The document does not provide any detailed guidance on how a municipality should respond in the aftermath of a security incident.<sup>144</sup>

The assessment highlighted that in many cases where municipalities responded to serious security incidents affecting non-majority communities through outreach activities, public condemnation or discussion in municipal security forums, or a mixture of all three, this impacted positively on the affected communities' perceptions of their safety and security. However, the report also found that many MCSCs failed to comply with their obligation to ensure comprehensive community representation, which might explain the general lack of focus among MCSCs on security incidents affecting non-majority communities. Amongst the MCSCs which failed to provide for full representation, the assessment found that smaller communities such as Kosovo Croats, Kosovo Bosniaks, Kosovo Montenegrins, Kosovo Egyptians, Kosovo Roma, Kosovo Ashkali and Kosovo Gorani were most often under- or unrepresented. Moreover, even where security incidents affecting non-majority communities were addressed, the irregularity of MCSC meetings, and in some cases the irregular attendance of non-majority community representatives – which was often due to factors such as difficulties in transportation or non-receipt of invitations – further reduced opportunities for responding to such incidents in a systematic and timely manner. It should also be noted that, in contravention of legal provisions, in some cases individual MCSC representatives – often Kosovo Serbs – were appointed to represent several non-majority communities. These factors might partly explain why the rate of responses to security incidents was significantly higher when these affected Kosovo Serbs; overall, incidents targeting other communities – such as Kosovo Croats, Kosovo Bosniaks, Kosovo Egyptians, Kosovo Roma and Kosovo Ashkali – received less attention.

Moving from the issue of legislative and policy compliance to the second question of practical operation of MCSCs, the assessment found that, despite the absence of a concrete legal obligation to do so, there were some examples of proactive municipal responses to

---

<sup>141</sup> Article 1, Administrative Instruction No. 08/2009 MIA, see note 3, *supra*; Law on Police, Article 7.2., see note 5, *supra*

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid*, Article 3(2), Administrative Instruction No. 08/2009. .

<sup>143</sup> See p. 4, *supra*.

<sup>144</sup> See p. 5, *supra*.

serious security incidents affecting non-majority communities. These took the form of public condemnation in local media, on municipal websites or during municipal meetings; and of outreach activities to affected communities.

As noted above, where a municipality publicly condemned a serious security incident, the positive impact on the perceived security of the affected community was consistently noted by community representatives. However the issue of accessibility was sometimes problematic: for example where press releases were only issued in Albanian-language or Serbian-language media outlets and not in the language of the affected community, this limited their positive impact on the affected community.

Community representatives also noted that public condemnation was significantly less effective in cases where it was not accompanied by follow-up outreach activities to the affected community. Representatives repeatedly identified the need for institutions to implement outreach activities and encourage genuine dialogue with affected communities, in addition to issuing public statements of condemnation.

Despite the varying levels of effectiveness of MCSCs in responding to serious security incidents affecting non-majority communities, all interviewees agreed upon the general value of the mechanism and the need to strengthen its capacity. It falls to the municipalities themselves to develop and implement community-based responses to security incidents which are both systematic and inclusive. In contrast to best practice emerging from this report, these responses have not always included unequivocal statements of condemnation which are accessible to all affected communities. In addition, municipalities have not consistently conducted outreach that brings together non-majority and majority communities and addresses actual and perceived aspects of security and safety for all municipal residents. By making full and efficient use of the MCSCs as forums to facilitate dialogue between institutions and communities, meaningful and consistent responses to security incidents can be developed that will build trust amongst communities in Kosovo, and work towards a sustainable peace.

## **6. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **To mayors/chairpersons of MCSCs:**

- Promptly establish an MCSC in the municipalities where they remain to be established
- Where an MCSC has been established, ensure that this main municipal consultative body:
  - ensures gender equality and equitable representation of all non-majority communities residing in that municipality as well as other relevant stakeholders;
  - is regularly chaired by the mayor of the municipality;
  - meets at least ten times per year, and keeps and sends the minutes of all meetings to relevant ministries to facilitate their monitoring activities, while the mayor reports on its activities to the municipal assembly;
  - consults with Local Public Safety Committees and Community Safety Action Teams;
  - holds at least two public consultation meetings with communities per year to discuss and address safety and security concerns;

- provides adequate translation support for non-majority communities to ensure their full and unimpeded participation in the body (including language interpretation during meetings and translated invitation, agenda and materials);
- drafts an annual action plan for community safety to be presented to the municipal assembly;
- carries out systematic follow-up on safety and security issues affecting non-majority communities.
- Ensure adequate financial support for MCSCs through submission of funding requests to the municipal assembly or other governmental and non-governmental organizations for projects and activities related to community safety;
- Conduct outreach, information and public awareness raising activities in relation to the existence and mandate of the MCSCs;
- Ensure effective co-operation and co-ordination between MCSCs and other municipal actors responsible for promoting inter-community tolerance and implementing confidence- and trust-building measures, as well as forming a link between communities and other municipal institutions, including: the deputy mayor for communities, the deputy chairpersons of the municipal assembly for communities, the communities committee and the municipal offices for communities and return;
- Demonstrate their commitment to protecting and promoting the safety and security of non-majority communities by devising and implementing systematic responses to significant security incidents affecting *all* non-majority communities, including by:
  - Issuing public statements of condemnation that reach all communities, including in non-majority communities' languages and in local non-majority community media;
  - Implementing meaningful outreach activities in close co-operation with relevant municipal officials and the affected communities in order to promote dialogue both between communities as well as between communities and institutions, including the police;
  - Ensuring that MCSCs systematically and effectively address all security incidents affecting non-majority communities.
- Facilitate exchange of information and good practices in relation to proactive municipal responses to serious security incidents affecting non-majority communities members among municipalities (e.g., in the form of public condemnation in local media, on municipal websites or during municipal meetings; and outreach activities to affected communities);
- Actively seek further guidance from relevant ministries in relation to the implementation of the legislative framework regulating the work of MCSCs.

**To MCSC non-majority communities' representatives:**

- Regularly attend all meetings and include in the agenda security and safety issues affecting their community;
- Proactively initiate and fully participate in discussions relating to their community's security and safety;
- Represent the security and safety concerns of their community throughout the municipality and regularly consult with them on matters relating to their security and safety.



**To international and local security actors:**

- Encourage, support and co-ordinate appropriate and timely responses to significant incidents affecting all non-majority communities with municipal institutions.
- Systematically raise serious incidents affecting all non-majority communities in any interaction with municipal institutions, particularly during MCSC proceedings.

## Annex I: Overview of Municipal Community Safety Councils (MCSCs)

REGION	MUNICIPALITY	ESTABLISHED	MEETINGS IN 2010	NON-MAJORITY COMMUNITIES REPRESENTED	NON-MAJORITY COMMUNITIES NOT REPRESENTED
Gjilan/Gnjilane	Ferizaj/Uroševac	Yes	5	Serb, Roma, Ashkali, Egyptian	Bosniak
	Gjilan/Gnjilane	Yes	4	Serb, Turk, Roma	All represented
	Han i Elezit/Đeneral Janković	Yes	10	None	Bosniak
	Kaçanik/Kaçanik	Yes	10	None	Roma
	Kamenicë/Kamenica	Yes	2	Serb	Roma
	Klokot/Kllokot	Yes	5	Albanian	All represented
	Novo Brdo/Novobërdë	Yes	0	N/A	N/A
	Parteš/Partesh	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Ranilug/Ranillug	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Štrpce/Shtërpçë	Yes	1	Albanian	Roma
Viti/Vitina	Yes	6	Serb	Croat	
Mitrovicë/Mitrovica	Leposavić/Leposaviq	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mitrovicë/Mitrovica	Yes	0	Not convened	Not convened
	Skenderaj/Srbica	Yes	0	Serb, Ashkali	Bosniak
	Vushtrri/Vučitrn	Yes	12	Serb, Turk, Roma, Ashkali	All represented
	Zubin Potok	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Zvečan/Zvečan	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pejë/Peć	Deçan/Deçane	Yes	4	Bosniak	Serb, Egyptian, Roma
	Gjakovë/Đakovica	Yes	2	Egyptian	Bosniak, Ashkali, Roma
	Istog/Istok	Yes	6	Serb, Bosniak, Egyptian, Roma	Montenegrin
	Junik	Yes	1	None residing	N/A
	Klinë/Klina	Yes	5	Serb, Ashkali, Egyptian, Roma	Montenegrin
	Pejë/Peć	Yes	8	Serb, Bosniak, Egyptian, Roma	Gorani, Montenegrin
Pristinë/Priština	Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje	Yes	2	Serb, Egyptian, Roma, Ashkali	Bosniak, Gorani
	Gllgoc/Glogovac	Yes	4	None residing	N/A
	Gračanica/Gračanicë	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Lipjan/Lipljan	Yes	8	Serb, Turk, Roma, Ashkali, Montenegrin, Croat	All represented
	Obiliq/Obilić	Yes	3	Serb, Bosniak, Egyptian, Roma, Ashkali	Montenegrin
	Podujevë/Podujevo	Yes	3	Roma, Ashkali	Serb
	Pristinë/Priština	Yes	5	Serb, Bosniak, Egyptian, Roma, Ashkali, Turk, Gorani	All represented
	Shtime/Štimlje	Yes	16	Roma, Ashkali	All represented
Prizren	Dragash/Dragaš	Yes	1	Bosniak, Gorani	All represented
	Malishevë/Mališevo	Yes	9	Roma	Ashkali
	Mamuša/Mamushë/Mamuša	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	<b>Prizren</b>	Yes	5	Serb, Bosniak, Turk, Roma	Egyptian, Ashkali
	<b>Rahovec/Orahovac</b>	Yes	0	Not convened	Not convened
	<b>Suharekë/Suva Reka</b>	Yes	5	Ashkali	Serb, Roma