

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

**Assessment of municipal responses to informal settlements
in Kosovo**

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	3
1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK	6
3. MUNICIPAL RESPONSES TO INFORMAL SETTLEMENTS	7
3.1 Identification of informal settlements	7
<i>Prizren region</i>	8
<i>Pejë/Peć region</i>	8
<i>Prishtinë/Priština region</i>	9
<i>Gjilan/Gnjilane region</i>	10
<i>Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region</i>	11
<i>Conclusion</i>	12
3.2 Spatial planning and regularization practices	13
<i>Prizren Region</i>	14
<i>Pejë/Peć region</i>	15
<i>Prishtinë/Priština region</i>	16
<i>Gjilan/Gnjilane region</i>	16
<i>Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region</i>	17
<i>Conclusion</i>	18
3.3 Participation in spatial planning and regularization processes	20
<i>Prizren region</i>	20
<i>Pejë/Peć region</i>	20
<i>Prishtinë/Priština region</i>	21
<i>Gjilan/Gnjilane region</i>	21
<i>Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region</i>	22
<i>Conclusion</i>	23
4. CONCLUSION	23
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	25
Annex I: Informal settlements identified by municipalities	26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Informal settlements in Kosovo are widely characterized by a lack of access to basic infrastructure and social services. As such, inhabitants often live in very poor conditions and hold a marginalized position within society. A lack of security of tenure is also a prominent characteristic of informal settlements, which are typically not built in compliance with spatial plans, lack the necessary construction permits, and are not registered in the cadastral records. Notably, it can be particularly difficult to gain security of tenure in cases where homes are constructed on municipal or socially-owned property, which can leave inhabitants especially vulnerable to forced eviction.

While many municipal officials have a robust understanding of informal settlements, there is still a degree of misunderstanding with regards to the meaning and definition of the concept. A number of municipalities use either too restrictive or too broad a definition, which can be an obstacle to properly identifying all informal settlements in their areas of responsibility. As such, those settlements where inhabitants are most vulnerable might not be prioritized for regularization plans and projects.

Throughout Kosovo several municipalities are undertaking the drafting of spatial plans. This is one of the primary mechanisms through which municipalities can identify and regularize informal settlements in their areas of responsibility. Most municipalities did include the identified informal settlements in their spatial plans, which is an important step towards resolving security of tenure and access to basic infrastructure and social services. The policy framework foresees that regularization *in situ* should be the norm while regularization by relocation should only be a last resort pursued in exceptional circumstances where security of tenure or adequate housing cannot be met in place. In line with this, municipalities generally opt for *in situ* regularization. However, there are some exceptions in which relocation of inhabitants occurred because security of tenure could not be provided or the settlement is located in an environmentally hazardous area. Such a strategy of relocation has been shown to work well in cases where inhabitants are empowered through effective consultation with the municipality and participation in decision-making.

The importance of participation and inclusion of informal settlement inhabitants in the processes of identification, spatial planning and regularization should not be underestimated. Where formal mechanisms for participation exist (such as committees established for the purpose of including all stakeholders in the regularization process), the affected communities generally feel more positive towards their respective municipalities, more informed about municipal initiatives affecting their homes, and more included in the decision-making processes. Conversely, where no such formal or informal mechanisms exist, inhabitants are often ill-informed and feel that their opinions and concerns are disregarded by the municipality.

All informal settlements throughout Kosovo should be identified and included in municipal spatial plans, and *in situ* regularization should be undertaken where possible. Moreover, it is of paramount importance that local institutions develop means to include inhabitants in the processes related to the regularization of informal settlements. Furthermore, municipalities should look for ways to establish mechanisms to exchange information and best practices regarding regularization. To support these processes, there is an evident need for continued technical and financial support to local-level institutions throughout the identification, spatial planning and regularization processes.

1. INTRODUCTION

The issue of informal settlements is widespread throughout Kosovo. The lack of authoritative census data, together with the fact that identifying informal settlements is an ongoing process, makes it impossible to accurately gauge the number of persons residing in informal settlements. However, at the time of reporting, officials from 19 municipalities have identified a total of 95 informal settlements throughout Kosovo.¹ These settlements can take a wide variety of forms and may consist of a few homes or they can form entire neighbourhoods or villages with several hundred – or even thousands – of inhabitants each. Kosovo’s temporary collective centres for displaced persons have in some cases also been identified as informal settlements by Kosovo officials.

A definition of informal settlements in Kosovo is provided by the Law on Spatial Planning² while policy documents that apply in Kosovo³ provide slight variations of this definition. In general, the main elements can be summarized as follows:

1. A lack of secure property tenure;
2. Inadequate enjoyment of basic services, infrastructure and humanitarian standards;
3. Inadequate or non-participation in governance.

These definitional criteria are closely linked to the right to adequate housing, which is the “right to live somewhere in security, peace and dignity”.⁴ The first criterion, security of tenure, is one of the cornerstones of the right to adequate housing as it protects people against arbitrary or forced eviction, harassment and other threats.⁵ Informal settlements can be constructed on private property, or municipal or socially-owned land. In the latter case, security of tenure can be particularly difficult to achieve as the municipality may not be able to grant a right of use over the land. However, some dwellings are constructed on private property of the inhabitants but are not built in compliance with spatial plans and thus lack the necessary permits. This can also leave residents vulnerable to eviction or other interference

¹ See Annex I for a full list of informal settlements as identified by municipal officials.

² See Article 2 of Law No. 2003/14 on Spatial Planning, as amended by Law No. 03/L-106 Amending Law on Spatial Planning No. 2003/14, 10 November 2008, which defines informal settlements as “settlements which are inhabited by individuals and which does [*sic*] not enable the inhabitants to enjoy the appropriate living standard, respectively appropriate accommodation. As such, the informal settlements can have the following characteristics: a) Informal ownership of property; b) Inadequate or privation in elementary services; c) Inadequate participation or non participation in governance; and d) High dangerousness.”

³ The Vienna Declaration on Informal Settlements in South Eastern Europe (Vienna Declaration), signed in Prishtinë/Priština on 17 March 2005, stipulates that informal settlements are “mainly characterised by informal or insecure land tenure, inadequate access to basic services, both social and physical infrastructure and housing finance” (page 1). The Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning (MESP) guidelines for spatial planning of informal settlements, 2005, states that “Informal settlements are human settlements that do not enable inhabitants to enjoy their right to an adequate standard of living, particularly to adequate housing. As such, informal settlements may possess the following characteristics: Informal or insecure property tenure; Inadequate infrastructure; Unhealthy environment; Uncontrolled population density; Unsuitable accommodation; Inadequate access to, or deprivation of basic services; Inadequate or non-participation in government; Vulnerability of discrimination” (section on ‘Definition’).

⁴ See Paragraph 7, General Comment 4: The right to adequate housing, UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 13 December 1991. In Paragraph 8, the UN Committee further stipulates several criteria that must be taken into account when determining if particular forms of shelter can be considered as adequate housing: legal security of tenure; availability of services, materials, facilities and infrastructure; affordability; habitability; accessibility; location; cultural adequacy. The right to adequate housing is contained in Article 11 of the International Convention on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). While not directly applicable in Kosovo, the ICESCR remains an important instrument as it establishes an internationally recognized norm.

⁵ See paragraph 8, *Ibid*.

with their properties. Without security of tenure, inhabitants are vulnerable to forced eviction and it can also place the right to return of displaced persons in jeopardy. This also entails rights under the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR), that is, the right to property and the right to respect for private and family life and one's home.⁶

The second criterion is also connected to the right to adequate housing. It is linked to the fact that informal settlements are also characterized by a lack of acceptable or adequate housing standards, such as a lack of access to public infrastructure⁷ and social services,⁸ poor quality of housing and/or a hazardous living environment.

The third criterion, inadequate or non-participation in governance is linked with the fact that communities inhabiting informal settlements are often marginalized and lack representation in and access to decision-making bodies. The right of persons to participate in affairs that affect them is being increasingly established by international law.⁹

Regularization of informal settlements means providing secure property tenure and adequate housing standards to all inhabitants of informal settlements in which these two criteria are not met. Spatial planning can go a long way towards helping regularize informal settlements as municipal spatial plans determine where physical infrastructure and social services will be located. Spatial planning is also linked to security of tenure as it is the process which establishes residential zones, thus determining where one can or cannot obtain construction permits for private homes.

Increasingly, the development of social and affordable housing schemes is also recognized as a means to remedy the issue of informal settlements. Hence, it should prevent the development of future informal settlements by providing affordable access to adequate housing.

This report looks at the approach that municipalities take towards dealing with the issue of informal settlements and also identifies some of the main shortcomings and challenges faced by municipalities. It first outlines the policy and institutional framework in Kosovo relating to informal settlements. It then assesses municipal officials' understanding of the concept of informal settlements and how they identify them in their respective areas of responsibility. Subsequently, the report looks at spatial planning and regularization practices in municipalities and how these align with the policy framework. Finally, it provides an evaluation of the level of participation of informal settlement inhabitants in the decision-making processes relating to identification and regularization of these settlements. The findings of the report are based on information provided by municipal officials and informal

⁶ The right to property is contained in Article 1, Protocol 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR) while the right to private and family life and one's home is contained in Article 8 of ECHR. In accordance with article 22 of the constitution, the ECHR is directly applicable in Kosovo.

⁷ Public services encompass facilities such as, water supply, sewage and drainage, paved or asphalted roads, electricity supply, public transport and waste disposal.

⁸ Such as access to education, health care, social welfare services, and emergency services (fire, ambulance, police services).

⁹ See Article 15 of the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM). Like the ECHR, the FCNM is directly applicable in Kosovo based on article 22 of the constitution. The right is also contained in the 1998 Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention).

settlement inhabitants during interviews that were conducted by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe Mission in Kosovo (OSCE) in late 2010.

2. POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The legal and policy framework in Kosovo reaffirms the obligations placed on local institutions to identify and regularize all informal settlements. Regularization should be done with a view to improve the living conditions of inhabitants and to prevent the formation of future informal settlements.

Several policy documents and strategies relating to informal settlements have been adopted in Kosovo. They provide an institutional framework for managing the process of regularization and for protecting the rights of informal settlement inhabitants. In 2005, the Vienna Declaration on Informal Settlements in South Eastern Europe (Vienna Declaration) was signed in Prishtinë/Priština.¹⁰ Its objective is to agree on actions that would regularize and legalize informal settlements in a sustainable way and that will prevent future informal settlements. Moreover, the document reaffirms the right of all inhabitants to an adequate standard of living and to have equal access to services. To this end, it provides that *in situ* regularization and upgrading should be undertaken as far as possible¹¹, that is, if the definitional criteria of security of tenure and inadequate access to basic services and humanitarian standards can be improved in the place where the inhabitants live. In some instances, this is not possible and relocation must occur, for example, if security of tenure cannot be guaranteed in place or if the settlement is located in an environmentally hazardous area. The Vienna Declaration also specifies that regional resolution of informal settlements should be completed by 2015.

The Kosovo Standards Implementation Plan (KSIP) and the Kosovo Action Plan for the Implementation of European Partnership (EPAP)¹² establish detailed obligations for the institutions in Kosovo to regularize informal settlements and to find sustainable solutions for communities living in camps and displaced persons living in temporary centres.¹³

Following the signing of the Vienna Declaration, the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning (MESP) developed guidelines¹⁴ to assist municipalities to use spatial planning as a means to integrate informal settlements. The guidelines reaffirm the right of inhabitants to

¹⁰ This declaration was originally signed in 2004 by Albania, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, and Serbia.

¹¹ See page 2, “The National and Regional Representatives from South Eastern Europe have agreed on the following... To undertake in-situ regularization and upgrading to the maximum extent.”

¹² KSIP was launched by the UN Special Representative of the Secretary General and Kosovo Prime Minister on 10 December 2003. It was agreed between the Kosovo provisional institutions of self-government and UNMIK and was approved by the United Nations Security Council. KSIP is a detailed plan that describes concrete actions needed to meet a set of standards in eight areas, including property rights, with a view to Kosovo becoming a functional and stable society. In October 2005, the European Commission, UNMIK and the Office of the Prime Minister agreed to bring the KSIP in to the long term European Integration process by developing the EPAP. EPAP was adopted by the Kosovo government on 9 August 2006, and it outlines measures that Kosovo institutions intend to take to reach the priorities set out in the European Partnership. It reconfirms obligations stemming from KSIP, including the need to legalize and regularize informal settlements.

¹³ Action 31 of Kosovo Action Plan for the Implementation of European Partnership 2006.

¹⁴ Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning, Guidelines for Spatial Planning of Informal Settlements, 2005.

have access to basic infrastructure and social services and to have security of tenure. The main principles of the guidelines are: 1) improvement of conditions within informal settlements should be the objective of spatial planning; 2) active participation of informal settlements inhabitants in the planning process and; 3) greater participation of all communities and civil society in spatial planning.

The Law on Spatial Planning sets out the obligations of municipalities and the MESP with regards to drafting spatial plans. Some of the principles around which the Law is based are to promote participation of all communities and transparency in the planning processes.¹⁵ According to the Law, municipalities are responsible for drafting spatial plans which should identify all informal settlements. Furthermore, municipalities should establish how they are to be regularized by addressing problems of access to infrastructure and social services and also by addressing issues relating to property tenure. Although the Law on Spatial Planning did not originally provide a definition of informal settlements, the Amending Law on Spatial Planning did provide such a definition.¹⁶

In accordance with this legal and policy framework, regularization of informal settlements should be done in a transparent and participatory manner to ensure access to adequate housing and security of tenure for all communities in Kosovo. Moreover, municipalities have a duty to involve informal settlement inhabitants in the planning process, and to identify these settlements in spatial plans with the goal of their eventual regularization.

EPAP also obliges the government to design and implement a strategy and action plan on regularizing informal settlements and preventing the development of future informal settlements. In this respect, MESP has drafted a strategy and action plan for the prevention and regularization of informal settlements in Kosovo (MESP draft strategy), which is expected to be approved in 2011. This strategy should further assist and encourage municipalities to regularize and integrate informal settlements in a sustainable way and to prevent future informal settlements. Again, the MESP draft strategy emphasizes the need for a participatory approach.

Notably, both EPAP and the MESP draft strategy recognize the importance of access to social housing to combat and prevent the problem of informal settlements through providing access to adequate accommodation for those who could not otherwise afford it. In line with the EPAP recommendations, a new law on social housing was adopted in 2010.¹⁷

3. MUNICIPAL RESPONSES TO INFORMAL SETTLEMENTS

3.1 Identification of informal settlements

Pursuant to the Vienna Declaration and the MESP guidelines, municipalities should identify any and all informal settlements in existence in their territories with the eventual aim of formalizing or regularizing the settlements and improving living conditions for inhabitants.

¹⁵ See Article 3.

¹⁶ See Article 2.

¹⁷ Law No. 03/L-164 on Housing Financing Specific Programs, 25 February 2010.

Prizren region

During interviews with municipal officials in the Prizren region, only officials in Prizren municipality definitively identified the existence of three informal settlements.¹⁸ The official interviewed stated that a lack of secure tenure is the most apparent characteristic for the identified informal settlements. The “Farmakos” and “Ramiz Sadiku” settlements are both public premises (an ex-student dormitory and ex-socially owned workers’ barracks), which are currently occupied by rural families who sought temporary shelter immediately after 1999. According to the municipality, the occupants have not been granted any right of use of the premises. The inhabitants are mainly Kosovo Albanians and many still have properties in their villages of origin. The availability of infrastructure (potable water, sewage, electricity, roads) and of social services (health, education, public transport) are considered to be adequate. However, the municipality notes that the housing conditions are poor and generally the economic situation of the inhabitants revolves around a combination of temporary employment and social assistance.

The third settlement in Prizren, “Jeta e Re”, is inhabited by Roma. Generally, access to infrastructure and social services are adequate and comparable to other urban areas in Prizren. Most of the houses are constructed by the owners on their own private properties, except for few which are partly built on municipal land. The only major outstanding issue is that the houses are built without construction permits, which is similar to many other suburban and rural areas in Prizren.

Municipal officials in Malishevë/Mališevo municipality were unsure if the village of Stapanicë/Stepanica qualifies as an informal settlement. Presumably, officials were unsure because they lack a degree of understanding of informal settlements and how to identify them. The houses here are also constructed on the owners’ private properties.

Pejë/Peć region

In the Pejë/Peć region, two out of six municipalities identified informal settlements: four in Pejë/Peć municipality¹⁹ and three in Gjakovë/Đakovica²⁰. According to officials in Pejë/Peć municipality, the informal settlements are generally characterized by a lack of secure tenure. “7 Shtatori”, “Kristali” and “Asllan Çeshme” neighbourhoods have a mixed ethnic composition of Kosovo Albanian and Roma, Ashkali or Egyptians while “Zatra” neighbourhood is inhabited by Kosovo Albanians. For each of the settlements, some of the residences are constructed on municipal land while others are constructed on the inhabitants’ own private land, although few have registered property titles. Officials noted that “Kristali” and “Zatra” are better off in terms of tenure as most of the properties are built on privately-owned land, with only a few built on municipally-owned land. The informal settlements here also lack proper access to public services and infrastructure, such as water, electricity and waste services. In “7 Shtatori” and “Kristali” the economic situation largely revolves around a combination of employment and social assistance and the housing conditions are rather poor. Reportedly, the economic situation and housing conditions in “Zatra” and “Asllan Çeshme” fare better in terms of economic situation and housing conditions.

In Gjakovë/Đakovica municipality the informal settlements identified by municipal officials are mainly inhabited by Kosovo Roma, Ashkali or Egyptians and some Kosovo Albanians.

¹⁸ “Farmakos”, “Ramiz Sadiku” and “Jeta e Re” neighbourhoods.

¹⁹ “7 Shtatori”, “Kristali”, “Zatra”, and “Asllan Çeshme” neighbourhoods.

²⁰ “Kolonija”, “Brekoc”, and “Piskota” neighbourhoods.

Officials here note a distinct problem regarding security of tenure where it is estimated that only around 20 per cent of inhabitants have private property while others live on plots belonging to a socially-owned enterprise or on municipal land with no right of use granted²¹. Furthermore, “Kolonia” and “Brekoc” settlements have considerable problems in relation to access to basic services such as water, electricity and sewage. More concerning is the case of “Kolonia”, which is located next to the municipal dump, subjecting the inhabitants to considerable air pollution and hazardous waste. Access to basic social services is also considered to be poor in each of the settlements. Housing conditions are also considered to be inadequate, with the exception of “Piskote” settlement where, reportedly, economic conditions are better.

Prishtinë/Priština region

In Prishtinë/Priština region, six out of eight municipalities identified informal settlements: three in Prishtinë/Priština municipality²²; two in Podujevë/Podujevo municipality²³; eight in Obiliq/Obilić municipality²⁴; seven in Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje municipality²⁵; three in Glllogovc/Glogovac municipality²⁶; and 15 in Gračanica/Graçanicë municipality²⁷. The settlements in Glllogovc/Glogovac municipality have existed since 1999 while all the others have existed for a number of decades. In most municipalities the settlements identified by officials are inhabited by Kosovo Albanians and/or Kosovo Roma, Ashkali and Egyptians. In Obiliq/Obilić officials noted that many settlements also have Kosovo Serbs residing there while in Gračanica/Graçanicë the settlements are inhabited by Kosovo Serbs and/or Kosovo Roma, Ashkali and Egyptians.

For the settlements in Glllogovc/Glogovac municipality and “Obiliqi i Ri” neighbourhood and Plemetina/Plemetinë camp in Obiliq/Obilić municipality, officials identified both a lack of security of tenure as well as a lack of access to basic utilities and infrastructure as the main characteristics of the identified informal settlements. Most of the inhabitants here live on municipally-owned land and are economically dependant on social welfare so they cannot afford better housing conditions. According to municipal officials, informal settlements identified in Podujevë/Podujevo and Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje municipalities, and “Kodra e Trimave/Vranjevac” and “Ramiz Sadiku” neighbourhoods in Prishtinë/Priština municipality are characterized mainly by a lack of security of tenure. The “Ashkali neighbourhood” in Podujevë/Podujevo and the settlements in Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje, are primarily constructed on the private property of the inhabitants, while “Kuwaiti village” in Podujevë/Podujevo is on municipal land. For the latter, officials stated that residents have the right of use of the properties through contracts with the municipality. However, for

²¹ According to municipal officials, “Kolonia” settlement is mostly socially-owned land while “Brekoc” and “Piskote” settlements are a mix of municipally-owned and privately-owned land.

²² “Ramiz Sadiku”, “Dodona”, (formerly “Moravska”), and Kodra e Trimave/Vranjevac neighbourhoods.

²³ One “Ashkali” neighborhood in Podujevë/Podujevo town and “Kuwaiti village” (a settlement close to the Podujevë/Podujevo - Merdar/Merdare road).

²⁴ “Subotiq”, “Azotika” and “Obiliqi i Ri” neighbourhoods, Plemetina/Plemetinë village, “Plemetina/Plemetinë camp”, Janina Voda village, Dardhishta village, and a settlement in Babin Most/Babimoc village.

²⁵ Bresje village, Henc/Ence village, Lismir/Dobri Dub village, “Settlement 02”, “Settlement 07”, “Settlement 028”, and, “Settlement 029”.

²⁶ “Poklek i Ri”, and “Feronikeli” neighbourhoods and Komoran/Komorane village.

²⁷ The “Roma area”, “Padalište” and “Voçar” neighbourhoods in Gračanica/Graçanicë town, and the villages of: Laplje Selo/Lapllasellë, Preoce/Preoc, Badovac/Badoc, Sušica/Sushicë, Lepina/Lepi, Skulanevo/Skullan, Radevo/Radevë, Dobrotin/Dobratin, Donja Gušterica/Gushtericë e Ulet, Gornja Gušterica/Gushtericë e Epërme, Livade/Livagjë, Suhodoll/Suvi Do, Batuse/Batushë, and, Ugljare/Uglar.

Prishtinë/Priština municipality, officials reported that the settlements are constructed partly on the inhabitants' private property and partly on municipal or socially-owned lands. Some inhabitants have gained a right of use over certain parcels of land through individual contracts with the respective socially-owned enterprise (in the case of the "Ramiz Sadiku" neighbourhood) or with the municipality.

In the case of Gračanica/Graçanicë municipality, municipal officials noted a lack of infrastructure and access to basic services were the main characteristics which identified informal settlements. It is interesting to note that in the case of Gračanica/Graçanicë, the municipality went further in highlighting that many of its informal settlements lack access to social infrastructure such as kindergartens, youth centres and elderly care centres, which indicates a more extensive concept of informal settlements than most of the municipalities. The majority of buildings in Gračanica/Graçanicë are constructed on private property and are registered in the name of the inhabitants themselves. Gračanica/Graçanicë uses a particularly broad concept of informal settlements which has led them to consider nearly all of the villages in Gračanica/Graçanicë as informal settlements. Most of the settlements in Obiliq/Obilić municipality²⁸ also lack access to infrastructure and basic services while the settlements are constructed mainly on municipal land with some parts on inhabitants' own private property.

Gjilan/Gnjilane region

In the Gjilan/Gnjilane region, 6 out of 11 municipalities identified informal settlements: 11 in Gjilan/Gnjilane municipality²⁹; six in Viti/Vitina³⁰; six in Ferizaj/Uroševac³¹; five in Kaçanik/Kaçanik³²; four in Kamenicë/Kamenica³³; and just one in Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Janković³⁴. Throughout the Gjilan/Gnjilane region, most of the settlements identified are inhabited by Kosovo Albanians, with a few inhabited by Kosovo Roma, Ashkali or Egyptians³⁵ and Kosovo Serbs³⁶. A lack of security of tenure was a characteristic identified in all municipalities. Some informal settlements are constructed on the inhabitants' private property while others are on municipal or socially-owned lands. Other settlements are spread partly on the inhabitants' private property and partly on municipal or socially-owned land.

²⁸ "Azotika" and "Subotiq" neighbourhoods, Plemetina/Plemetinë village, Janina Voda village, Dardhishta village, and the settlement in Babin Most/Babimoc village.

²⁹ "Arbëria/Qenar qeshme" neighbourhood; "Dheu i Bardh/Belo Zemlje" neighbourhood; "Ivo Lola Ribar" neighbourhood; "Zabeli" area (Agriculture Factory); "Abdullah Presheva" neighbourhood; Unnamed neighbourhood near the sports hall; unnamed settlement along the Malishevë/Mališevo road; unnamed area along the Gllama road; unnamed alongside ring road; unnamed between Pasjak and Livoc i Epërm/Gornji Livoc villages; and unnamed area alongside the Prishtinë/Priština road.

³⁰ "Vitia 1", "Vitia 2" and, "Vitia 3" neighbourhoods, Radivojc/Radivojce village, Drobesh/Drobeš village, and, Binçë/Binaç village.

³¹ "Koçi Xoxe", "Sallahane/Salahane", "Halit Ibishi", "Fabrika e tubave" (Pipe factory), and "Rrr. I. Rugova" neighbourhoods, and Dubravë/Dubrava village.

³² Part of "Agim Bajrami" street, "Dushkaja 1 and 2" neighbourhood, "Ramadan Agushi" neighbourhood, Kashan/Kaşan village, and Straža/Strazhë village.

³³ Roma mahalla (Kamenicë/Kamenica town), Roma mahalla (Berivojcë/Berivojce village), Roma mahalla (Hogoshtë/Ogošte village), and, a settlement in Bosce/Boscë village.

³⁴ In the area of Brava to the north-west of Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Janković.

³⁵ "Abdullah Presheva" and "Ivo Lola Ribar" neighbourhoods (Gjilan/Gnjilane municipality); Radivojc/Radivojce village (Viti/Vitina municipality); "Sallahane/Salahane" and "Halit Ibishi" neighbourhoods and Dubravë/Dubrava village (Ferizaj/Uroševac municipality); and, Roma mahalla in Kamenicë/Kamenica town, Roma mahalla in Berivojcë/Berivojce village, Roma mahalla in Hogoshtë/Ogošte village (Kamenicë/Kamenica municipality).

³⁶ Binçë/Binaç village (Viti/Vitina municipality) and the settlement in Bosce/Boscë village (Kamenicë/Kamenica municipality).

Throughout the region it was generally noted by officials that many inhabitants of the settlements do not understand the importance of following administrative procedures on legal construction nor do they possess the necessary finances to undertake the proceedings. Most inhabitants throughout the region are economically dependant on social welfare.

For all municipalities in the Gjilan/Gnjilane region, a lack of access to basic infrastructure and utilities, such as, water, electricity, sewage, and asphalted roads was identified by municipal officials as a concern. Access to social infrastructure, such as emergency, education and health services, was also a characteristic identified by many municipalities³⁷. In Kaçanik/Kaçanik and Kamenicë/Kamenica municipalities housing conditions in the settlements are mostly assessed as poor while for other municipalities the conditions are generally adequate.

Gjilan/Gnjilane, Viti/Vitina and Kamenicë/Kamenica municipalities further identified informal settlements as areas where there is an absence of recognition by municipal authorities as an integral and equal part of the municipal unit. Gjilan/Gnjilane and Viti/Vitina municipalities also stated that they were areas where there is a risk of discrimination, presumably due to the presence of non-Albanian communities in informal settlements.

According to municipal officials, many of the identified informal settlements in Gjilan/Gnjilane, Viti/Vitina, Kaçanik/Kaçanik, and Kamenicë/Kamenica municipalities were established after the 1998–1999 conflict³⁸. Most of these are occupied by people who moved from other areas or who have been displaced from homes where they previously enjoyed better security of tenure and cannot now access affordable formal housing in their current locations.

*Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region*³⁹

At the time of interview, four out of six municipalities in the Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region identified informal settlements: three in Mitrovicë/Mitrovica municipality⁴⁰; six in Skenderaj/Srbica⁴¹; and three in Vushtrri/Vučitrn⁴². In addition, one informal settlement was identified in Laposavić/Leposaviq⁴³ while northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë identified two

³⁷ Kamenicë/Kamenica, Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Janković, and Kaçanik/Kaçanik municipalities.

³⁸ Unnamed neighbourhood near the sports hall, unnamed settlement along the Malishevë/Mališevo road, “Zabeli” area, unnamed settlement along the Gllama road, “Dheu i Bardh/Belo Zemlje” neighbourhood, unnamed settlement alongside ring road, unnamed settlement between Pasjak and Livoc i Epërm/Gornji Livoc villages (Gjilan/Gnjilane municipality – all are Kosovo Albanian-inhabited). Binçë/Binaç and Radivojc/Radivojce villages (Viti/Vitina municipality). Part of “Agim Bajrami” street, “Dushkaja 1 and 2”, and “Ramadan Agushi” neighbourhoods and Strazhë village (Kaçanik/Kaçanik municipality). According to the municipality, all the settlements in Kamenicë/Kamenica municipality have existed since 2000.

³⁹ Neither northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë, which is under the UNMIK Administration in Mitrovica, nor the Serbian-run structures in the northern municipalities (Leposavić/Leposaviq, Zvečan/Zvečan and Zubin Potok) recognize or implement laws of the Assembly of Kosovo or sub-legal acts issued by the Kosovo government ministries. Consequently, they would not recognize documents such as the MESP guidelines or Law No. 03/L-106 Amending Law on Spatial Planning No. 2003/14. Nevertheless, the municipal officials gave comprehensive definitions of informal settlements and the Zvečan/Zvečan officials also referred to the Vienna Declaration.

⁴⁰ Mahalla e Romëve/Roma Mahala, Dy Korriku/Sitničko Naselje, and Brđjani/Kroi i Vitakut neighbourhoods.

⁴¹ Klinë e Epërme/Gornja Klina, Turiqec/Turičevac, Runik/Rudnik, Çirez/Ćirez, Prekaz i Epërm/Gornje Prekaze, and Kopiliq i Epërm/Gornji Obilić villages.

⁴² “Ambullanta e Vjetër”, “Baraka” and Ko-operativa/Preduzeća settlements.

⁴³ A camp for displaced persons.

informal settlements⁴⁴. The settlements identified by officials in Leposavić/Leposaviq and northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë are temporary camps for persons displaced as a result of the 1998–1999 conflict.

In Mitrovicë/Mitrovica municipality, the “Mahalla e Romëve/Roma Mahala”, inhabited by Kosovo Roma and Ashkali, has been partly reconstructed with financial support from a number of international organizations⁴⁵ and there have been many initiatives to reintegrate the former inhabitants⁴⁶. According to officials, the “Brdjani/Kroi i Vitakut” neighbourhood is inhabited by Kosovo Serbs, Kosovo Bosniaks and Kosovo Albanians and has also seen considerable reconstruction works and efforts to legalize premises.

According to municipal officials, all the informal settlements in Skenderaj/Srbica municipality are inhabited by Kosovo Albanians and all are considered to have adequate infrastructure and access to services. Moreover, most houses are constructed on private property and are undergoing a legalisation process. Reportedly, the conditions in Vushtrri/Vučitrn municipality, where the settlements are also Kosovo Albanian-inhabited, are worse. There is limited access to potable water and sewage works and the housing conditions are considered to be poor. Furthermore, the properties are constructed on either municipal or socially-owned lands and lack security of tenure. The situation is similar for “Dy Korriku/Sitničko Naselje” neighbourhood in Mitrovicë/Mitrovica municipality, which is inhabited by Kosovo Albanians and Ashkalis. The difference here is that most of the constructions are on private property but inhabitants have failed to register their title.

The displaced persons camp in Leposavić/Leposaviq municipality was established for Roma and Ashkali persons displaced from “Mahalla e Romëve/Roma Mahala” in southern Mitrovicë/Mitrovica in June 1999. According to officials, the camp is located on municipal land and is marked by inadequate access to basic infrastructure such as water and sewage. Moreover, the barracks in the settlement are inadequate for residence and fail to meet the criteria for adequate housing.

Conclusion

Throughout Kosovo, municipal officials in 19 municipalities identified a total of 95 informal settlements. Many of the municipal officials interviewed expressed a good understanding of the concept of informal settlements and made references to most of the definitional criteria. In line with this, the informal settlements identified by municipal officials generally fulfil these criteria, particularly in relation to a lack of security of tenure, basic utilities and infrastructure as well as a lack of access to social infrastructure. Typically, they are not built in compliance with urban plans and, thus, have no building permits. They can be built on the private land of the inhabitants themselves or they can be constructed on public or socially-

⁴⁴ “Česmin Lug” and “Osterode” displaced persons’ camps. Since the time of reporting, “Česmin Lug” has closed and most of the inhabitants have returned to Mahalla e Romëve/Roma Mahala or have temporarily resettled to “Osterode” camp.

⁴⁵ Including European Commission Liaison Office (ECLo), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the European Agency for Reconstruction (EAR) and the Swedish and Norwegian governments. Implementing partners have included the Danish Refugee Council, Norwegian Church Aid, and Mercy Corps.

⁴⁶ Reintegration activities have been an integral part of all returns projects in Mahalla e Romëve/Roma Mahala. As part of the reintegration process and in order to provide security of tenure, the municipality allocated land for long term use and there are also tripartite agreements signed by the beneficiaries, the municipality and the donors that envisage a 99-year right to use the reconstructed houses.

owned land where the inhabitants lack registered property titles. In the latter case there is a particular risk of eviction if they have not been granted any right of use.⁴⁷

However, some municipalities still show a degree of misunderstanding of the definitional criteria. Most did not refer to the third definitional criterion of inadequate or non-participation in governance. Moreover, some municipalities have a very restrictive concept of informal settlements and focus only on the criteria of a lack of security of tenure. This was the case for Vushtrri/Vučitrn and Prizren municipalities. Prizren municipality went further in associating informal settlements with municipal land and premises that had been usurped, which prevents the municipality from enjoying the benefits of offering that land to private companies for construction of residence/business premises. Other municipalities (Dragash/Dragaš, Istog/Istok and Gjakovë/Đakovica), while referencing some of the definitional criteria, also adopted a narrow concept of informal settlements by linking them to the presence of Kosovo Roma, Ashkali and Egyptian communities. This can be misleading as the definitional criteria do not make any reference to ethnicity. Gračanica/Graçanicë municipality, on the other hand, holds too broad a concept of informal settlements and listed all the villages and a number of areas of the town itself as informal settlements.

The danger of using too strict an understanding of the definitional criteria is that certain areas may remain unidentified as informal settlements and thus may be left out of regularization and improvement processes and projects. On the other hand, using too broad a definition may lead to a municipality including areas that enjoy better conditions than others and not adequately prioritizing those areas that are most in need. Consequently, municipalities may not adequately fulfil their obligations under the Vienna Declaration and the MESP guidelines.

In several instances, temporary collective centres for persons displaced as a result of the 1998–99 conflict have also been defined under the umbrella of informal settlements.⁴⁸ Some of the characteristics of these centres overlap with those of informal settlements, and displaced persons residing in these centres enjoy the same right to adequate housing as residents of informal settlements. However, temporary collective centres are established as a temporary solution to displacement. It must be emphasized that displaced persons residing in these temporary collective centres have other internationally recognized rights and the intention should always be to assist those persons to return to their places of origin or original homes (where desired and where feasible), or to find alternative permanent and sustainable solutions outside of those temporary centres.⁴⁹

3.2 Spatial planning and regularization practices

In Kosovo, there are three main types of spatial plans at the municipal level⁵⁰:

⁴⁷ The formal right to usage of land can be legally granted to parties who do not have ownership of the land itself. See Law No.03/L-226 on Allocation and Exchange of Immovable Property of Municipality, 28 October 2010.

⁴⁸ Plemetina/Plemetinë camp, Obiliq/Obilić municipality; a displaced persons camp in Leposavić/Leposaviq municipality; “Česmin Lug” and “Osterode” camps, Mitrovicë/Mitrovica municipality; “Vočar” and “Padalište” neighbourhoods, Gračanica/Graçanicë town.

⁴⁹ See United Nations Principles on Housing and Property Restitution for Refugees and Displaced Persons (2005) (‘Pinheiro Principles’), United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (1998), and United Nations Framework on Durable Solutions for Internally Displaced Persons.(2009).

⁵⁰ According to the Law on Spatial Planning.

- Municipal development plan (MDP): sets out the long-term goals of economic, social and spatial development for the municipality for a period of at least five years.
- Urban development plan (UDP): determines the long-term projections for development and management of urban areas for a period of at least five years.
- Urban regulatory plan (URP): defines construction zones and determines detailed conditions for regulation of space and rules for location of buildings on urban land plots. It should be reviewed every five years.

The MDP covers the entire territory of the municipality while the UDP covers just the urban area (usually just the main city or town of the municipality). With these in place, the municipality should then develop a number of URPs in order to regulate specific zones or areas within the main city or town. These spatial plans are the main municipal mechanism that can be used to address the issue of informal settlements. Firstly, they establish which kind of buildings can be constructed in certain areas.⁵¹ As such, they are essential for addressing the definitional criterion of security of tenure. Secondly, they determine where basic infrastructure and social services will be located and they project where development of these services will take place in the future. In this regard, they are indispensable in addressing and improving access to services – the second definitional criterion of informal settlements.

The MESP guidelines were issued in 2005 after the signing of the Vienna Declaration, in order to ensure its progressive implementation. The aim of the MESP guidelines is to assist municipalities to use spatial planning as a means to integrate informal settlements and improve inhabitants' living conditions. To that end, they provide some directions on how to conduct a preliminary situation analysis and how to draft an action plan to address the informal settlements at the municipal level through spatial planning.

One of the main principles of the MESP guidelines and the Vienna Declaration is that improvements should be done within existing informal settlements. That is, *in situ* regularization should be the norm, while relocation should be the last resort except in certain exceptional cases – such as when basic adequate housing standards cannot be met or when secure property tenure cannot be achieved on site – where authorities may have to pursue a strategy of relocation. In some situations, it can be very difficult for municipalities to address security of tenure, for example, if they have no authority to transfer land-ownership or to grant the right of use over socially-owned property. Even in the case of municipally-owned land, they can only grant the right of use for a limited period of time.⁵²

Prizren Region

All the municipalities in Prizren region declared that they were aware of the MESP guidelines, except for Prizren municipality, which was the only municipality to definitively identify informal settlements. At the time of interview, Prizren municipality's MDP was in the final stages of being drafted while it has already prepared a UDP. Furthermore, Prizren has adopted many URPs since 1999. Prizren received assistance from several international organizations throughout the spatial plan drafting process⁵³, yet the municipality did not use

⁵¹ According to Article 36 of Law No. 2004/15 on Construction, as promulgated by UNMIK Regulation 2004/37, 14 October 2004, an "Urban permission" is required in order to legally construct in Kosovo. This document shows that the construction or building complies with the MDP, UDP and URP.

⁵² Article 5 of the Law on Allocation and Exchange of Immovable Property of Municipality sets a 10 year limit for the allocation for use of immovable property. This period may be extended up to 40 years with the approval of central authorities.

⁵³ UN Habitat, the International Civilian Office, and Cultural Heritage without Borders.

the MESP guidelines during the spatial planning process as they claim they did not receive them. However, they stated that they used similar principles as contained in the guidelines as they were advised by UN Habitat throughout the drafting process and they participated in the MESP-organized workshops on the matter in 2010. Prizren municipality has, on the other hand, developed a specific regularization plan for the identified informal settlements. The municipality's main concern regarding regularization is whether the inhabitants have ownership title for the premises they occupy (that is, if they are illegally occupying public/municipal property). According to the officials, the identified settlements are public premises that were occupied by rural families after the 1998–99 conflict and, apparently, most of them still have properties in their villages of origin. They have access to basic infrastructure but the residences themselves are in poor condition. In this case, regularization by relocation is Prizren's preferred option in order to make land available for construction of block-buildings by private companies. According to the official interviewed, those currently illegally occupying municipal property would be offered accommodation in the new buildings.

Pejë/Peć region

All the municipalities in the Pejë/Peć region confirmed that they used the MESP guidelines when drafting their spatial plans. However, as noted above, only Pejë/Peć and Gjakovë/Đakovica municipalities identified informal settlements. For both, the MDP and UDP were finalized and approved by MESP. Moreover, both municipalities included all of the identified informal settlements in their spatial plans. Gjakovë/Đakovica municipality approved the URPs concerning informal settlements while Pejë/Peć municipality is currently drafting them and they should be finalised in 2011. Most municipalities in the Pejë/Peć region outsourced the drafting of spatial plans to international and local companies.⁵⁴ A number were also supported by international organizations in drafting their spatial plans.⁵⁵

In situ regularization is the favoured option for both Pejë/Peć and Gjakovë/Đakovica municipalities. The exception is “Kolonija” settlement in Gjakovë/Đakovica, where relocation to a nearby site was chosen, because a land swap⁵⁶ agreement between the Privatization Agency of Kosovo⁵⁷ and the municipality could not be reached. Also, the settlement is located next to the municipal dump, which causes considerable pollution in the area and negatively impacts the health of the inhabitants. According to officials, the municipality has allocated land nearby for which the displaced families will be granted right of use.⁵⁸ For the other settlements, the improvements mainly concern upgrading the infrastructure by constructing road networks and improving access to potable water and sewage.

⁵⁴ Pejë/Peć outsourced to the international DHV Group, Istog/Istok and Klinë/Klina municipality to Urban Plus company, Junik to MetroPolis company, and Dečan/Dečane to Terrasystems Austrian Geotechnik.

⁵⁵ UN Habitat supported Pejë/Peć and Gjakovë/Đakovica while Cultural Heritage without Borders supported Junik.

⁵⁶ Land swap refers to the procedure by which lands under the administration of the Privatization Agency of Kosovo can be allocated to municipalities for the purpose of public benefit. Article 9 of the Law on Allocation for Use and Exchange of Immovable Property of Municipality .

⁵⁷ Law No. 03/L-067 on the Privatization Agency of Kosovo, 21 May 2008, establishes the agency as an independent public body responsible for the administration, privatisation and liquidation of socially-owned enterprises. Since the time of reporting this law has been superseded by Law No. 04/L-034 on the Privatization Agency of Kosovo, 21 September 2011.

⁵⁸ Reportedly, the project is ongoing and the first tender for construction of 29 houses was published in September 2010, while the construction of a further 91 houses will be subject to potential donations and is likely to be implemented by 2011.

Although the “Rudesh/Rudeš” informal settlement in Istog/Istok municipality had been regularized by relocation before the time of reporting, it is worthwhile mentioning as it provides insight into different scenarios that reflect a positive response by the municipality. According to municipal officials, “Rudesh/Rudeš” was inhabited by Kosovo Roma and Egyptians who were displaced as a result of the 1998–1999 conflict. The majority of land parcels were socially-owned⁵⁹ and, to further complicate matters, the area was also within the special protective zone of Serbian Orthodox Monastery of Gorioč, thus restricting construction activities⁶⁰. Consequently, although the municipality was willing to support returns to this informal settlement, it was not able to as it could not provide security of tenure in that particular area. However, in December 2008 the municipal assembly approved the allocation of municipally-owned land in Serbobran/Srbobran village to potential returnees originating from “Rudesh/Rudeš” settlement, while United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) provided funding for the construction of houses. The beneficiaries gained ownership over the houses, which are registered in their names in the cadastre, while they were granted right of use of the land on which the houses are constructed for 10 years. The municipality is seeking ways to extend this period of right of use.

Prishtinë/Priština region

In the Prishtinë/Priština region, at the time of interview, Obiliq/Obilić and Glogovac/Glogovac municipalities had approved MDPs and UDPs while the others were in the drafting phase. Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje municipality also approved its UDP, which dates from 2005. Gračanica/Graçanicë, Prishtinë/Priština and Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje municipalities approved URPs but, again, Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje’s dates from 2005. Except for Glogovac/Glogovac and Gračanica/Graçanicë, all municipalities received support from external organizations for the spatial planning process.⁶¹

According to officials, all of the municipalities included each of the identified informal settlements in their spatial plans. Moreover, all of the municipalities stated that they used the MESP guidelines but that this was for the purpose of identification of informal settlements. Gračanica/Graçanicë municipality has begun preparing, while Glogovac/Glogovac municipality plans to prepare, separate regularization plans.

All municipalities stated that they intend to regularize the informal settlements *in situ*. However, they also stated that a lack of funding for the required construction and infrastructure works is a major obstacle to the realization of these intentions.

Gjilan/Gnjilane region

In the Gjilan/Gnjilane region, at the time of interview, only Gjilan/Gnjilane and Ferizaj/Uroševac municipalities had approved their MDPs and UDPs. The other municipalities in the region are currently drafting their MDP and UDP, except for Klokot/Klllokot municipality, which has not yet started the process. All the municipalities are

⁵⁹ According to municipal officials, they were registered in the name of the socially-owned enterprise “Forest Economy”.

⁶⁰ Law No. 03/L-039 on Special Protective Zones, 20 February 2008.

⁶¹ Podujevë/Podujevo received support from EULOG (an EU funded project managed by ECLo assisting municipalities to design their MDPs and to develop competencies necessary to implement them). Prishtinë/Priština received support from German, English and Slovenian companies (though the municipal official did not specify which companies). Obiliq/Obilić and Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje also received support, although the municipal officials could not specify from whom. UN Habitat and UNDP expressed interest in supporting Gračanica/Graçanicë but at the time of the interview, the municipality had not yet responded to their proposals.

drafting URPs, except Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Janković and Štrpce/Shtërpçë which have not started. According to municipal officials, with the exception of Ferizaj/Uroševac, Kačanik/Kaçanik⁶² and Klokot/Kllokot, all the municipalities received some support from external organizations⁶³.

Most municipalities that identified informal settlements included all of them in their spatial plans. However, Ferizaj/Uroševac did not include two of its six settlements⁶⁴ while Kamenicë/Kamenica did not include any. According to Kamenicë/Kamenica municipality, they have not yet been included because the plans are in the drafting phase. All of those who identified informal settlements stated that they used the MESP guidelines during the spatial plan drafting phase. The four municipalities that did not identify any informal settlements⁶⁵ stated that they were unaware of or did not receive the MESP guidelines.

For those municipalities that have identified informal settlements, only Gjilan/Gnjilane and Viti/Vitina have developed separate regularization plans and both are using four criteria to prioritize settlements for regularization: 1) lack of security of tenure; 2) inadequate access to basic services and infrastructure; 3) absence of recognition by municipal authorities as an integral and equal part of the municipal unit and; 4) risk of discrimination. These criteria also mirror both municipalities' definition of informal settlements.

All the municipalities in the Gjilan/Gnjilane region have chosen *in situ* regularization as the preferred option. In fact, most stated that it is the only option that they consider. The only exception to this is Kamenicë/Kamenica municipality, which has not decided on regularization *in situ* or regularization by relocation because, according to the municipality, the spatial plans are in the drafting phase and the informal settlements have not yet been included in the plans. Each municipality stated that improving access to public services and infrastructure was the priority while Kačanik/Kaçanik also specifically referred to improving access to health and education services. The municipalities of Ferizaj/Uroševac and Viti/Vitina also noted that resolving tenure issues was a priority. Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Janković municipal officials stated that they have no clear idea of how to improve the situation in the informal settlement they identified, especially as landslides are a serious risk in that location.

Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region

In the southern municipalities, at the time of interview, Mitrovicë/Mitrovica and Skenderaj/Srbica municipalities were at varying stages of developing their MDPs, UDPs and URPs. Vushtri/Vučitrn municipality has finalized its MDP and UDP for 2009–2014. They all received some support from external organizations.⁶⁶ Each of these municipalities stated

⁶² According to the municipality, they requested support from UN Habitat but the request was not granted.

⁶³ According to municipal officials, UN Habitat assisted Gjilan/Gnjilane and Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Janković; UNDP assisted Ranilug/Ranillug; Swiss-Kosovo Local Governance and Decentralization Support Project (LOGOS) assisted Štrpce/Shtërpçë, Kamenicë/Kamenica, and Novo Brdo/Novobërdë; and, NGO “Elita”, NGO “Altenativa” and OSCE assisted Viti/Vitina.

⁶⁴ “Koçi Xoxe” neighbourhood and Dubravë/Dubrava village were not included in the spatial plans of Ferizaj/Uroševac. This is particularly surprising in the case of Dubravë/Dubrava village where conditions were generally assessed as quite poor.

⁶⁵ Štrpce/Shtërpçë, Novo Brdo/Novobërdë, Klokot/Kllokot, and Ranilug/Ranillug.

⁶⁶ According to municipal officials, UN Habitat assisted Mitrovicë/Mitrovica and Skenderaj/Srbica with trainings on strategic urban development. Vushtri/Vučitrn employed the “INTEG” bureau for urbanism from Prishtinë/Priština to develop its plans.

that they included all of the identified informal settlements in their plans and that they used the MESP guidelines during the drafting phase.

Mitrovicë/Mitrovica municipality has already developed, while Skenderaj/Srbica and Vushtrri/Vučitrn municipalities are in the process of drafting, separate regularization plans for their informal settlements which aim to resolve the more urgent cases first. *In situ* regularization is the chosen option for Mitrovicë/Mitrovica and Skenderaj/Srbica, both of which intend to: 1) map the affected areas; 2) carry out zoning of the areas to allow for residential constructions and; 3) regularize or legalize the settlements. However, Vushtrri/Vučitrn municipality would also prefer to relocate the inhabitants to social housing because they consider that their current homes (a former health house, a former barracks, and former co-operative) are not built for residential purposes, residents have very poor access to basic infrastructure and they have no right of use of the land.

Each of the northern municipalities in the Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region are working with spatial plans that have been in place since the 1990s, although Zvečan/Zveçan and Zubin Potok municipalities have developed some newer urban regulatory plans. None of the northern municipalities use the MESP guidelines.⁶⁷

As noted previously, northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë and Leposavić/Leposaviq municipalities were the only northern entities to identify informal settlements, which are also temporary collective centres for displaced persons. Although the collective centres in northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë have been the focus of international programmes to facilitate resettlement and reintegration⁶⁸, as yet there are no solutions envisaged for those persons residing in the camp in Leposavić/Leposaviq.

Conclusion

At the time of interview, municipal assemblies in just 12 municipalities⁶⁹ had approved MDPs. Most others were in the drafting phase, while five municipalities⁷⁰ have yet to begin. Two of these MDPs are being implemented without prior approval by MESP.⁷¹ In 17 municipalities, the UDP has been approved by the municipal assemblies.⁷² Besides the

⁶⁷ The municipalities of Leposavić/Leposaviq, Zubin Potok, and Zvečan/Zveçan only apply Republic of Serbia legislation and some UNMIK regulations while the administration for the northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë applies exclusively UNMIK regulations and Kosovo laws promulgated by the SRSG.

⁶⁸ See footnote 46, *supra*.

⁶⁹ Glogovc/Glogovac, Shtime/Štimlje, Obiliq/Obilić, Pejë/Peć, Gjakovë/Đakovica, Deçan/Deçane, Istog/Istok, Gjilan/Gnjilane, Ferizaj/Uroševac, Vushtrri/Vučitrn, Lipjan/Lipljane, and Suharekë/Suva Reka municipalities. Since the time of interview a further six municipalities have approved MDPs: Mitrovica/Mitrovicë, Junik, Podujevë/Podujevo, Viti/Vitina, Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Janković, and Kaçanik/Kaçanik.

⁷⁰ Prishtinë/Priština, Klokot/Kllklot, Leposavić/Leposaviq, Zubin Potok, and Zvečan/Zveçan. Since the time of interview, Klokot/Kllklot has begun the drafting process for its MDP.

⁷¹ Suharekë/Suva Reka and Lipjan/Lipljane municipalities. According to Article 13.9 of the Law on Spatial Planning, prior to final approval by the municipal assembly, MDPs should be submitted to MESP to verify compliance with the spatial plan of Kosovo.

⁷² Glogovc/Glogovac, Shtime/Štimlje, Obiliq/Obilić, Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje, Lipjan/Lipljane, Gjilan/Gnjilane, Ferizaj/Uroševac, Kaçanik/Kaçanik, Pejë/Peć, Gjakovë/Đakovica, Deçan/Deçane, Istog/Istok, Suharekë/Suva Reka, Mitrovica/Mitrovicë, Vushtrri/Vučitrn, Prizren and Malishevë/Mališevo municipalities. Since the time of interview a further three municipalities have approved UDPs: Viti/Vitina, Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Janković, and Skënderaj/Srbica.

northern municipalities in Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region, five municipalities⁷³ stated that they were not aware of the MESP guidelines, and consequently they were not utilized in the spatial plan drafting processes. This may partly explain why four of these municipalities⁷⁴ did not identify any informal settlements in their areas of responsibility.

Where municipalities did identify informal settlements, most municipalities opt for *in situ* regularization, which is in line with the Vienna Declaration and MESP guidelines. That is, they prefer to find ways to ensure security of tenure and improve access to infrastructure in the location where inhabitants currently reside. However, there are some notable exceptions to this. In the case of “Kolonia” settlement in Gjakovë/Đakovica municipality, the municipality had to adopt a strategy for relocation because security of tenure could not easily be provided in light of the fact that the homes are on socially-owned property. Moreover, the settlement is also located in an environmentally hazardous area beside the municipal dump. The specific circumstances in “Kolonia” meant that the municipality had no alternative but to relocate the inhabitants in order to provide them with secure tenure, better access to infrastructure and a more healthy living environment. In light of the consultative approach adopted by the municipality with the community, the case of “Kolonia” can be viewed as a positive method for regularization when relocation is the only viable option.⁷⁵

Similarly, security of tenure for the “Rudesh/Rudeš” informal settlement in Istog/Istok municipality could not easily be achieved as most of the land parcels were on socially owned-property and the area was also within the special protective zone of Serbian Orthodox Monastery of Gorioč. As such, the municipality had little option but to opt for regularization by relocation.

In Prizren, the municipality has stated that if it develops the area in the future, it would prefer to relocate the inhabitants of “Farmakos” and “Ramiz Sadiku” to make way for private development. The municipality stated that their objective would be to make the land available for construction of block-buildings by private companies and that those currently occupying the municipal properties would be offered accommodation in the new buildings. Vushtrri/Vučitrn has also chosen relocation through construction of social housing in an alternative location. They consider that this would better meet the needs of the inhabitants of the informal settlements as their current homes were not constructed for residential purposes, they have poor access to basic infrastructure and lack security of tenure. In the case of these two municipalities, offering accommodation to residents in any new apartments constructed in the respective areas would inarguably improve the living conditions of the inhabitants. However, the municipalities must take into account the importance of consulting the residents in a meaningful way and involving them in the planning of any development projects to ensure that their needs and concerns are taken into account.

⁷³ Prizren, Štrpce/Shtërpçë, Novo Brdo/Novobërdë, Klokot/Kllokot, and Ranilug/Ranillug. Furthermore, the northern municipalities in Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region, (Leposavić/Leposaviq, Zvečan/Zveçan and Zubin Potok) do not use the MESP Guidelines as they operate according to Serbian legislation and UNMIK regulations.

⁷⁴ Štrpce/Shtërpçë, Novo Brdo/Novobërdë, Klokot/Kllokot, and Ranilug/Ranillug.

⁷⁵ Discussion of aspects of community participation in decision-making is included in more detail in Section 3.3 of this report.

3.3 Participation in spatial planning and regularization processes

The right of members of any community to participate in decision-making processes that affect them is recognized in the legal and policy framework in Kosovo. This right is also linked to the third definitional criterion of informal settlement, which identifies them as areas where inhabitants have inadequate or non-participation in governance. The legal and policy framework tries to address this shortcoming. One of the main principles underpinning the MESP guidelines and the Vienna Declaration is that inhabitants should be involved throughout the entire planning process, from identification of informal settlements to their regularization. Furthermore, there should be participation of all communities and civil society in spatial planning. The Law on Spatial Planning also obliges institutions to “[P]romote an inclusive and participatory process of formulating development strategies and physical plans, which includes all stakeholders and communities without discrimination.”⁷⁶ The amended Law on Spatial Planning further recognizes the importance of participation as one aspect of its definition of informal settlements: “Inadequate participation or non-participation in governance.”⁷⁷ The MESP guidelines also try to address this issue through emphasizing the need to involve inhabitants in the identification and regularization processes.

Prizren region

In Prizren municipality, there is no particular mechanism developed in order to involve inhabitants of the identified informal settlements in the regularization process. According to the municipality, the inhabitants address their concerns directly to the municipality and their participation is, in theory, provided for during public discussions which take place during the process of preparing municipal spatial plans. The Roma who inhabit the “Jeta e Re” neighbourhood have a representative based in the municipal office for communities and return, who is in a position to address issues of their concern through that office. Furthermore, as noted in the previous section, if Prizren municipality undertakes activities to develop identified informal settlements, it should ensure full and effective participation of the inhabitants in the planning process.

Pejë/Peć region

All of the identified informal settlements in the Pejë/Peć region have representatives who are generally responsible for interacting with municipal authorities and local and international organizations. However, according to the informal settlement representatives, communication with the municipality in relation to decision-making processes is generally limited to public meetings. This mechanism is inadequate for promoting participation by the inhabitants, as notification is generally just posted on the municipal notice board and, consequently, the information fails to reach the inhabitants. Those interviewed suggested that it would be more fruitful if notification were to reach the area of the settlements itself. Their lack of engagement in the decision-making process was confirmed by their lack of knowledge about the process of spatial planning and the benefits they could derive from being actively engaged in this process. This was even the case for URPs that were drafted and which specifically target informal settlement areas.

The exception to this evident lack of consultation with inhabitants is the “Kolonia” settlement in Gjakovë/Đakovica municipality, where the community representative is engaged with municipal officials and sits on the steering committee for relocation of the informal

⁷⁶ See Article 3 of the Law on Spatial Planning. .

⁷⁷ See Article 2 *ibid*.

settlement. The positive level of engagement between “Kolonia” inhabitants and the municipality is largely due to the continued presence and support of the international NGO “Bethany Christian Service,” which has established a support service within the community and has persistently advocated on behalf of the inhabitants. Caritas Switzerland is also involved in the relocation process from a technical and financial perspective. Their involvement was notable because gaining consent from the inhabitants in the form of a tripartite agreement⁷⁸ before beginning any relocation/reconstruction project was an important pre-condition for the involvement of Caritas Switzerland in the project.

Prishtinë/Priština region

Throughout the Prishtinë/Priština region, most of the settlements have a community representative who deals with the general concerns of the inhabitants; however, they report that they have mostly not been included in the identification and regularization processes. Furthermore, the interviewees did not identify any local or international organizations dealing specifically with informal settlements.⁷⁹ The only exception is for “Kuwaiti village” in Podujevë/Podujevo municipality where one representative of the village and one representative of the NGO “Kuwait”⁸⁰ deal with the municipality on a regular basis. In the cases of Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje, Podujevë/Podujevo and Obiliq/Obilić municipalities, engagement with the municipality is through the community’s representation on municipal bodies, such as the municipal assembly and communities committee.

According to community representatives, outside of the required public hearings for spatial planning, there is no particular mechanism developed in any municipality in the region to involve informal settlement inhabitants in decision-making processes. In Glogovc/Glogovac, Obiliq/Obilić, Gračanica/Gračanicë and “Kodra Trimeve/Vranjevac” neighbourhood in Prishtinë/Priština, inhabitants stated that they were not consulted for the spatial planning processes. The inhabitants of settlements in Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje, Podujevë/Podujevo and “Dodona” in Prishtinë/Priština said that they participated in the public meetings. It is important to note that both Fushë Kosovë/Kosovo Polje and Podujevë/Podujevo municipalities have community representatives on the municipal communities committees, which provides a direct mechanism through which community members can be informed about ongoing developments and can address their concerns to the municipality.

Gjilan/Gnjilane region

In Ferizaj/Uroševac and Kamenicë/Kamenica municipalities, the settlements inhabited by Kosovo Roma, Ashkali or Egyptians are represented by municipal assembly members, community committee members, or municipal community office officials coming from their communities. In Gjilan/Gnjilane, Kaçanik/Kaçanik, Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Janković and Viti/Vitina municipalities the settlements have nominated village or community representatives who are in contact with municipal officials. In Ferizaj/Uroševac and Gjilan/Gnjilane municipalities those settlements inhabited by Kosovo Albanians have not identified representatives. In Gjilan/Gnjilane, Ferizaj/Uroševac and Kamenicë/Kamenica

⁷⁸ Between Swiss Caritas, the municipality and the community.

⁷⁹ In Obiliq/Obilić, Gračanica/Gračanicë and Fushë Kosovë/ Kosovo Polje there are some NGOs and international organizations dealing with returns-related issues and humanitarian assistance but not specifically with informal settlements.

⁸⁰ “Kuwait” is a local NGO dealing with housing and social welfare-related issues.

municipalities, inhabitants have received information and advice regarding housing rights from several international organizations.⁸¹

According to informal settlement representatives, in most municipalities in the region there is no particular mechanism to involve informal settlement inhabitants in decision-making processes outside of the required public hearings for spatial planning. However, in most instances municipal officials did pay initial visits to the sites for identification purposes or to collect information regarding the conditions in the settlements. In Ferizaj/Uroševac, Gjilan/Gnjilane and Kaçanik/Kaçanik municipalities, inhabitants reported to be generally satisfied with their participation in the public debates. It is evident that having representatives in the municipal bodies or having community representative in regular contact with municipal officials helps to keep inhabitants better informed and engaged in the decision-making processes.

In Hani i Elezit/Đeneral Janković municipality an informal mechanism also exists as four municipal employees live in the only informal settlement there. Consequently, exchange of information or advocacy to the municipality on behalf of the inhabitants can occur informally. Through this channel, the municipality distributed questionnaires to the informal settlement inhabitants in order to provide the municipality with relevant information about the area. In the case of Viti/Vitina municipality, the company hired to draft the spatial plans visited the sites to collect detailed information and inhabitants here were informed about regularization and spatial planning processes. It should be noted that the local NGO “Elita” actively advocates for improvement of living conditions in informal settlements in Viti/Vitina and they have also organized a number of public debates on this issue.

However, in the case of Kamenicë/Kamenica municipality, no proper consultation or any kind of communication mechanism has been established. Inhabitants stated that they were not consulted during the identification process nor do they feel that their opinions or concerns have been taken into account by the municipality. The lack of efforts by the municipality to include the inhabitants in the planning process has contributed to them feeling uninformed and left out of the planning processes.

Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region

According to community representatives, all of the identified informal settlements in the Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region have representatives who are generally responsible for interacting with municipal authorities and local and international organizations. In most cases they are community representatives whereas in Skenderaj/Srbica the inhabitants are represented through their elected officials in the municipal assembly. In general, inhabitants have the opportunity to interact with municipal officials through public debates and advisory councils.

In Mitrovicë/Mitrovica municipality, the international community has been instrumental in funding the works done in “Mahalla e Romëve/Roma Mahala” and “Brdjani/Kroi i Vitakut” neighbourhoods. This has also seen the closure of “Česmin Lug” displaced persons camp where most of the inhabitants have returned to “Mahalla e Romëve/Roma Mahala”. The international community and local authorities involved in the projects established committees

⁸¹ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Development Program, United States Agency for International Development, the Open Society Foundation, and the local NGO, Civil Rights Program/Kosovo.

dealing largely with issues such as health, education, income generation, and community relations.

According to officials in Skenderaj/Srbica municipality, the six Kosovo Albanian-inhabited informal settlements are in an advantageous position as they are represented through elected municipal assembly members. Consequently, advocacy on behalf of the settlements has led to some improvements in living conditions, such as road works and access to education. This is supported by the fact that inhabitants in these informal settlements reported their satisfaction with the level of consultation by the municipality. While the inhabitants of the settlements in Vushtrri/Vučitrn municipality, also Kosovo Albanians, reported good communication with municipal officials, they have not benefited from concrete improvements as much due to a lack of available funds to construct social housing, which is the municipality's preferred regularization strategy.

Conclusion

Contrary to the principle of participation contained in the MESP guidelines, the Vienna Declaration and the amended Law on Spatial Planning, most municipalities have not established any formal mechanism through which they ensure the participation of informal settlement inhabitants in the spatial planning processes. It is clear from interviews with informal settlement inhabitants, that this can leave them uninformed about the identification, planning and regularization processes that directly affect their lives. It can also leave them feeling that their concerns are not taken into account by the municipality. However, some positive examples of the establishment of participatory mechanisms include "Kolonija" settlement in Gjakovë/Đakovica municipality and some of the displaced persons camps in Mitrovicë/Mitrovica, where steering committees for relocation were created. The committees includes community representatives, and ensures regular communication between the municipalities and the inhabitants.

It is also important to recognize the essential role of members of municipal bodies⁸² as well as other municipal employees who reside in informal settlements in representing their communities' needs and concerns directly to the municipality. In general, where members of these municipal bodies reside in the informal settlements or have close links with their community members, the inhabitants report being better informed about ongoing developments and have a greater tendency to be aware of and participate in public meetings. As such, they are more included in and feel more positive about decision-making processes regarding regularization. However, development of these informal participation mechanisms should not diminish the municipalities' obligation to develop specific mechanisms to facilitate participation of residents in planning and development projects for informal settlements.

4. CONCLUSION

At the time of interview, 19 municipalities throughout Kosovo identified 95 informal settlements. Some inhabitants of informal settlements have constructed their homes on their own private land while others are residing on municipal or socially-owned land. In the latter case, security of tenure can be particularly difficult to achieve, thus leaving the inhabitants in a particularly vulnerable situation and subject to forced eviction. A lack of access to basic

⁸² The municipal office for communities and return, the municipal assembly and the communities committee.

infrastructure as well as a lack of access to social services is also a prominent feature of many of the identified informal settlements, which leaves inhabitants living in very poor conditions. Moreover, many informal settlements are marked by a distinct lack of participation in local government and decision-making.

This report has shown that there continues to be some confusion amongst municipal officials in Kosovo in understanding the concept of informal settlements. While most municipalities demonstrated apt knowledge of criteria in terms of lack of secure tenure and inadequate access to infrastructure and social services, most did not make any reference to the third criterion of inadequate or non-participation in local government. Some municipalities use too restrictive a concept of informal settlement by characterizing them only in terms of a lack of secure tenure or by associating them with the presence of Kosovo Roma, Ashkali and Egyptians. This has the potential to exclude some areas that should otherwise be considered as informal settlements. Consequently, these areas may not receive the necessary support for regularization. Conversely, one other municipality uses too broad a definition, thereby including all villages in the municipality. In this case, the municipality might include areas that have better conditions than those usually associated with informal settlements. As such, it might not prioritize those areas where the inhabitants are most vulnerable and most in need of assistance.

A number of municipalities also identified temporary collective centres as informal settlements. While identifying them as such is an acknowledgement that their residents have a right to improved living conditions, it must also be stressed that the inhabitants have other rights as displaced persons which require sustainable solutions. These include the right to return to their place of origin or to find alternative permanent housing solutions outside of the temporary collective centres.

Municipalities play a central role in dealing with the issue of informal settlements. They are primarily responsible for drafting spatial plans, which provide the opportunity to identify informal settlements and address some issues relating to security of tenure. It also provides an opportunity to devise strategies for improving access to infrastructure and social services. In line with the policy framework, most municipalities opt for regularization *in situ*. However, in some instances, where security of tenure could not be provided in place, a strategy of relocation was chosen as the preferred option. In the case of “Kolonija” in Gjakovë/Đakovica municipality, this strategy was successful and well-accepted by the community on account of the effective communication and consultation between the municipality and the inhabitants.

In contrast however, it is of concern that in general there is a distinct lack of participation of inhabitants of informal settlements in decision-making processes. In most municipalities, the only mechanism for informal settlement inhabitants to participate in the planning and regularization processes is through the legally-required public debates. In most cases where the inhabitants have close links to representatives in municipal bodies, they are satisfied with the level of information they have regarding the planning processes and tend to feel that their concerns have been taken up by the municipality. However, where inhabitants do not have such links, they have more of a tendency to be uninformed of ongoing developments and to feel left out of the decision-making processes. In such cases, there is a more pressing need for municipalities to take the initiative of reaching out to these communities and establishing formal mechanisms for inclusion and participation in decision-making processes.

As many municipalities are in the drafting phase of spatial planning⁸³, this presents an opportune moment for responsible institutions to consider the issue of informal settlements more closely, with a view to regularizing those that exist and to prevent the emergence of future informal settlements. This would inarguably improve realization of the rights to adequate housing and participation.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

To the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning (MESP):

- In order to identify and regularize the existing informal settlements through the spatial planning process, the MESP should provide targeted technical support and training to the municipalities;
- The MESP should facilitate an exchange of information and best practices among municipalities on regularization of informal settlements.

To municipalities:

- Municipalities facing difficulties in identifying informal settlements, should seek support from and make use of available resources, including the MESP guidelines and the Vienna Declaration;
- The practice of *in situ* regularization when conditions related to security of tenure and adequate living standards are met should be continued as the most efficient way to regularize informal settlements.
- Municipalities should ensure active participation of the inhabitants, civil society and municipal institutions in informal settlements regularization processes and such participation should be formalized.
- Exchange of information and best practices regarding regularization of informal settlements among municipalities should be established and strengthened.
- Plans for handling temporary collective centres for displaced persons should ensure that the rights to return to their place of origin or to find alternative permanent accommodation outside of the temporary collective centres of the inhabitants of those be adequately upheld.

To the international community:

- The international community should continue to provide financial and technical support for initiatives addressing the issue of informal settlements based on the existing good practices and should further strengthen the capacity at the municipal level.

⁸³ At the time of interview, just 12 out of 37 municipalities had final and approved MDPs, while 20 were in the drafting phase and five had yet to begin the process. Since that time, a further six municipalities have approved MDPs. Also, at the time of interview 17 municipalities had approved UDPs and since then a further three have approved UDPs. See footnotes 69, 70 and 72.

Annex I: Informal settlements identified by municipalities

Municipality	Informal settlements identified by municipal officials	
Prizren	1	Farmakos
	2	Ramiz Sadiku
	3	Jeta e Re
Pejë/Peć	1	7 Shtatori
	2	Kristali
	3	Zatra
	4	Asllan Çeshme
Gjakovë/Đakovica	1	Kolonia
	2	Brekoc
	3	Piskota
Prishtinë/Priština	1	Ramiz Sadiku
	2	Dodona (formerly Moravska)
	3	Kodra e Trimave/Vranjevac
Podujevë/Podujevo	1	Ashkali neighborhood
	2	Kuwaiti village
Obiliq/Obilić	1	Subotiq neighbourhood
	2	Azotika neighbourhood
	3	Plemetina/Plemetin village
	4	Plemetina/Plemetin camp
	5	Janina Voda
	6	Obiliqi i Ri
	7	Dardhishta village
	8	Neighbourhood in Babin Most/Babimoc village
Fushë Kosovë/ Kosovo Polje	1	Bresje village
	2	Henc/Ence village
	3	Lismir/Dobri Dub village
	4	Settlement 02
	5	Settlement 07
	6	Settlement 028
	7	Settlement 029
Gllgovc/Glogovac	1	Poklek i Ri
	2	Feronikeli
	3	Komorani/Komorane
Gračanica/Gračanicë	1	Roma area, Padalište and Voćar areas of Gračanica/Gračanicë town
	2	Laplje Selo/Llapllasellë
	3	Preoce/Preoc
	4	Badovac/Badoc
	5	Sušica/Sushicë
	6	Lepina/Llepi
	7	Skulanevo/Skullan
	8	Radevo/Radevë
	9	Dobrotin/Dobratin
	10	Donja Gušterica/Gushtericë e Ulet

	11	Gornja Gušterica/Gushtericë e Eprëme
	12	Livadë/Livadje
	13	Suvi Do/Suhodoll
	14	Batuse/Batushë
	15	Ugljare/Uglar
Gjilan/Gnjilane	1	Unnamed neighbourhood near the sports hall
	2	Unnamed along the Malishevë/Malisevo road
	3	Arbëria/Qenar qeshme
	4	Zabeli (Agriculture Factory)
	5	Abdullah Presheva
	6	Unnamed along the Gllama road
	7	Dheu i Bardhë/Belo Zemblje
	8	Unnamed alongside ring road
	9	Unnamed between Pasjak and Livoc i Epërm/Gornji Livoc
	10	Unnamed alongside the Prishtinë/Priština road
	11	Ivo Lola Ribar
	12	Zabeli
Viti/Vitina	1	Vitia 1
	2	Vitia 2
	3	Vitia 3
	4	Radivojc/Radivojce
	5	Drobesh/Drobeš
	6	Binçë/Binaç
Ferizaj/Uroševac	1	Koci Xoxe/Koce Xoxe
	2	Dubrava
	3	Sallahane
	4	Halit Ibishi
	5	Fabrika e tubave (Pipe factory)
	6	Rrr. I. Rugova
Kaçanik/Kaçanik	1	Kashan
	2	Strazhë
	3	Part of Agim Bajrami street
	4	Dushkaja 1 and 2
	5	Ramadan Agushi
Kamenicë/Kamenica	1	Roma mahalla (Kamenicë/Kamenica town)
	2	Roma mahalla (Berivojcë/Berivojce village)
	3	Roma mahalla (Hogoshtë/Ogošte village)
	4	Settlement in Bosce/Boscë village
Hani i Elezit/ Đeneral Janković	1	Brava
Northern Mitrovica/Mitrovicë	1	Česmin Lug*
	2	Osterode
Mitrovicë/Mitrovica	1	Mahalla e Romëve/Roma Mahala
	2	Dy Korriku/Sitničko Naselje
	3	Brdjani/Kroi i Vitakut
Skenderaj/Srbica	1	Klinë e Epërme/Gornja Klina
	2	Turiqec/Turićevac
	3	Runik/Rudnik

	4	Çirez/Ćirez
	5	Prekaz i Epërm/Gornje Prekaze
	6	Kopiliq i Epërm/Gornji Obilić
Vushtrri/Vučitrn	1	Ambullanta e Vjetër
	2	Baraka
	3	Kooperativa/Preduzeća
Leposavić/Leposaviq	1	Camp for displaced persons

* Since the time of reporting, “Çesmin Lug” camp for displaced persons has closed down and the inhabitants have mostly returned to “Mahalla e Romëve/Roma Mahala” or have temporarily resettled to “Osterode” camp.