



BRIEF

ALERT



What Needs to Be Verified First in the Election Campaign Financing Reports

Belgrade, March 2024



Unresolved campaign finance issues

Early parliamentary, provincial and local elections that were held in Belgrade and 64 other cities and municipalities on 17 December 2023 were announced despite the fact that not a single problem related to campaign financing had been resolved. It was especially the organisation “[Transparency Serbia](#)”, a member of the prEUgovor coalition, that highlighted the problems in the domestic public, but other non-governmental organisations that monitor the election process (CESID, CRTA) referred to them as well. In its annual reports and the [reports on conducted control](#), the [Agency for the Prevention of Corruption](#) also pointed out some of the shortcomings contained in the [Law on the Financing of Political Activities](#). So did political parties, albeit much less frequently.

Not only were the messages from within the country insufficient for the Ministry of Finance, the Government and the National Assembly of Serbia to open a discussion on the need to improve the regulations, but this was not done even after Serbia received recommendations to the same effect from international organisations. A series of recommendations of the [ODIHR Mission](#) (Office of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights), which observed the previous parliamentary and presidential elections in 2022, undoubtedly referred precisely to the improvement of the Law on the Financing of Political Activities, with an important note that these changes should be made “well before the next elections” and “in a consultation process that will be open and transparent”. This Report was published on 19 August 2022, while the [joint Report](#) of the ODIHR and the Venice Commission on the legal framework for electoral laws and electoral administration appeared on 22 December 2022, containing similar messages. Despite calls for reform, the [Government’s Working Group charged with cooperation with OSCE and ODIHR](#) – judging by the website of this body – did not engage in any activities until 9 October 2023. After this date, it made no other statements regarding the above issue.

Consequently, Serbia officially went into another election campaign at the beginning of November, without having resolved, among other things, the following issues:

- The value of the election campaign per one election list was not limited, making it possible to increase the already present imbalance in the abilities related to the pre-election promotion, mainly based on the use of budget funds;
- The issue of “third parties” conducting a paid campaign remained unregulated;
- Budget funds for financing the campaign were once again distributed towards the end of the campaign

or after the election, instead of at the beginning of the campaign, when they were most needed; and

- No legal obstacles have been established to enable more effective supervision and punishment of detected irregularities.

All of this was the reason for ODIHR to remind Serbia of these omissions once again, in the [final Report](#) after the December elections.

The fulfilment of these recommendations is highly important also in the context of the European integration of Serbia, as can be seen in the European Commission’s last annual [Report](#).

The reason for this prEUgovor Brief Alert is the publication of the final reports on campaign expenses for the December 2023 parliamentary, provincial and local elections during the second half of February 2024. Transparency Serbia, member of the prEUgovor coalition, analysed certain parts of those reports. The goal of the analysis is to point out possible cases of campaign financing and reporting against the rules, both to the citizens of Serbia and to the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption, which currently controls these reports. In addition, the findings from this publication are also significant for the improvement of the rules on campaign financing, to which part of the ODIHR recommendations refer.

Incomplete and inaccurate preliminary reports

Political subjects (political parties, coalitions and citizens’ groups) are obliged to submit two election-related financial reports to the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption. The first report is “preliminary” and was supposed to cover approximately the first month of the campaign (which ended on 2 December 2023). The deadline for the submission of these reports was 10 December 2023, so they became visible only a few days prior to the onset of the “election silence” and there was consequently very little time to [discuss](#) them.

Thanks to the timely [instructions](#) of the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption, the quality of the reports is better than in 2022, when they were submitted for the first time. The instructions clarified that the election participants should report not only the expenses that have been paid, but also other expenses related to activities that were undertaken in the initial period of the campaign. This resulted in a significantly higher total amount of reported expenses now compared to the 2022 elections – approximately RSD 900 million (2023: EUR 7.7 million; 2022: EUR 2.8 million), including the reported advance payments.



However, there has been no progress regarding the control of preliminary reports. Since the law does not prescribe a time period within which control must be carried out, the Agency **controls** these reports together with the final report. In practice, this means that the control of the financial reports submitted at the beginning of December last year started, at best, no earlier than in the middle of February this year. As regards preliminary reports, the question of what the subject of control will be remains unresolved. From the point of view of the Law, there is no reason to “turn a blind eye” to the behaviour of a party that “forgets” to include in the preliminary report the income or expenses that occurred prior to 2 December 2023, even if it does present them in the final report. Situations where a party first reports that it had paid a certain expense from private sources, and then states – once it receives money from the budget based on its success in the elections – that it had allegedly paid for said expense using the budget funds, should be viewed as equally disputable.

Large Expenses that Were Not Reported in December Either

Some of the preliminary reports concerning these elections are obviously incomplete. In financial terms, the biggest violation was probably the one the SNS committed by not reporting the costs of transporting participants to the meeting that was held on 2 December 2023 in the Belgrade Arena, which required several hundred buses. Since the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption had field observers, as well as the authority to initiate proceedings due to suspected violations of the Law *ex officio*, it was possible to officially establish the existence of this violation of the legal obligation. The fact that this expense was not shown in the final report either, makes the violation of the Law even more serious. For the aforementioned meeting in Belgrade, the SNS reported only the cost of renting the space, in the amount of RSD 4.2 million, while travel expenses were not reported – not only for this meeting, but for none of the 13 reported conventions and two manifestations that were organised in Serbia either. We remind that, according to the Law on the Financing of Political Activities, a political entity is obliged to also report the services that were provided without seeking compensation.

As regards the same electoral list (“Aleksandar Vučić – Serbia Must Not Stop”), not a single item from the report, either preliminary or final, shows that the reported expenses are related to the operation of a call centre. In the proceedings that were carried out upon a filed report, the SNS **denied** that it had anything to do with the call centre CINS wrote about, but **confirmed** the use of this form of communication with citizens. The report form does not contain a separate column which would refer to the operation of “call centres”, but there is certainly an obligation to report such costs in one of the existing columns. However, neither the preliminary

nor the final report of this political entity mentions any communication costs, costs of renting office space, or costs of hiring staff for the purpose of running the campaign.

Costs That Were Understated or Overstated in the Preliminary Report

While there is no doubt that the last two weeks of the campaign (not included in the preliminary reports) were the most intense, the differences in the scope of reported expenses in some cases raise doubts about their credibility. In the preliminary report, the Serbian Radical Party listed only money that was spent on collecting signatures as an expense, while in the final report it also listed other expenses in the total amount of RSD 26.2 million, which means that all of 99.5% of this party’s campaign expenses was incurred in the period from 3 to 15 December. The list “Serbia against Violence” reported only RSD 9.2 million in the first part of the campaign, while in the final report the amount was increased several times – to approximately RSD 236 million, which means that only 3.9% of the reported expenses refer to the first month of the campaign. There is a large disproportion in the case of the “We – Voice of the People” list as well (only 7.5% of the expenses that were reported in the final report can be found in the preliminary report).

On the other hand, in the preliminary report, the list “Serbia in the West” reported expenses in the amount of RSD 24.3 million. However, these expenses went “missing” in the final report and were reduced to only RSD 533 thousand. The submitters of this list, it seems, counted that they would cover the initially reported costs with a portion from the budget, but these expenses suddenly disappeared when it became clear that due to the poor result in the elections (less than 1%), they would not be entitled to budget funds. An illogicality of a similar kind, but far smaller in scope, was noted in the case of the coalition of “Zavetnici” and “Dveri” as well. They reported RSD 71.8 million in expenses in the preliminary report, but in the final report this amount was reduced to approximately RSD 2.5 million.

The “Missing” Income

Several parties stated in their preliminary reports that they financed the campaign expenses incurred until 2 December 2023 from their own funds; then, after receiving money from the budget for campaign financing, they stated in the final report that these same expenses were in fact paid from the budget funds. Obviously, the reason for this was their desire to keep the money they received. Namely, the law stipulates the obligation to return unspent budget funds to the budget of Serbia, while if a party does not spend the money it had transferred from its permanent account, it is allowed to return the surplus to its own account once the campaign ends.



In these elections, the Party of Vojvodina Hungarians initially reported spending RSD 12,338,972 from its own account, while in the final report it showed only RSD 503,462. Similarly, according to the first report, the Party of Justice and Reconciliation spent RSD 10,128,344 of its own funds, but according to the final report the amount was only RSD 4,531. It is therefore obvious that these parties broke the law by providing incorrect information in one of these two reports.

Comparing the Expenses

A comparison of funds spent for similar activities that were reported by the lists offer even more reason for suspicion, especially after the publication of the final reports.

Thus, expenses related to public opinion surveys, as at 2 December 2023, were reported by only one list ("National Gathering", which, however, omitted this expense in its final report(!)), followed by the coalition "Serbia against Violence", the Russian Party, the Party of Democratic Action of Sandžak, and "Usame Zukorlić – United for Justice". It is quite unlikely that other parties, including the winners of these elections (SNS), did not explore their chances in the elections this way.

Almost all the reports contain incomplete descriptions of expenses and numerous situations where costs are not shown by item, but rather aggregately or in the column dedicated to "Other Costs". Also, most political subjects failed to enter adequate data in the "Comments" column, which makes it even more difficult to identify the purpose of the expenses.

Final reports

Late Submission and Two Lists that Did Not Even Submit Reports

The deadline for submitting the report was 12 February 2024, after which date the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption has 120 days to conduct control and publish its findings. The deadline for initiating criminal and misdemeanour proceedings due to established irregularities is, however, not prescribed.

Failure to submit financial reports within the legal time frame is the most serious type of violation of the Law, which ought to be a reason for examining criminal liability as it indicates a desire to conceal sources of income or campaign expenses. According to the data published to date (13/3/2024), electoral lists "Čedomir Jovanović – Things Must be Different" [Mora drugačije] and "Albanian Democratic Alternative – United Valley" did not submit final reports concerning this year's elections (they did not submit preliminary ones either). The "Coalition for Peace and Tolerance" did submit the

report, but it did not contain any information on income or expenses. It is interesting that the "Democratic Union of Roma" submitted to the Agency an (empty) report for the parliamentary elections although this party did not have an electoral list at all.

According to data from the register of the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption, two out of 16 reports were submitted a few days after the deadline – those of the "Hope for Serbia" coalition (18 February 2024) and the coalition "Serbia Against Violence" (13 February 2024). When it comes to the assessment of the timeliness of the submission of reports, what is particularly confusing is the fact that the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption published some of the duly submitted reports 10 days later, and that the order of their publication was not completely in line with the order of their submission. A possible reason is that some of the reports were initially not submitted in the prescribed form.

Television Advertising – Hidden Expenditures or Below-the-Market-Value Discounts?

As part of its own [monitoring, which covered national and main cable operators](#), organisation "Transparency Serbia" monitored television advertising, which – as usual – represented the largest expenditure item in these elections. According to their findings, out of a total of EUR 9 million worth of broadcast commercials, and with maximum discounts taken into account, 81% had to do the SNS list and 14% with the SPS, while the remaining five electoral lists participated with a total of 5%. The disproportion is even more pronounced if the value of aired leased slots and broadcasted party meetings is added to it (approximately EUR 1.7 million in the case of SNS and EUR 220,000 in the case of SPS).

When these findings are compared with data that were reported by the submitters of the electoral lists, it is noticeable that SNS did not report any expenses although – according to the findings of Transparency Serbia – it advertised on TV stations *Kurir*, *Euronews*, *Klasik*, *K1* and *Blic* in the amount of approximately EUR 645,000. It is possible however that some of these costs were shown under "Marketing Agency Costs", where "Ringier", "Mondo" and "Tačno d.o.o." were listed as recipients. The People's Party did not report any advertising on television, although it did advertise on TV RTS in the last week before the elections. According to Transparency Serbia, the amount they spent was approximately EUR 10,000.

Financially, far more significant discrepancies were observed in the price the SNS reported for advertising on private TV stations with a national frequency. For the parliamentary elections, the SNS reported TV advertising worth slightly less than EUR 4.5 million, while some of the costs (for TV *PINK* and TV *Superstar*) were shown in the report for the Belgrade elections (app. EUR



440,000). RSD 6.9 million that was spent for advertising on TV *RTV* was presented in the report related to the provincial elections. All this amounts to a total of about EUR 5 million, for advertising on 6 TV stations¹ – that is, approximately EUR 2.5 million less than the estimated minimum value of this list's TV campaign that was calculated by Transparency Serbia – and that is only for broadcast commercials, without special shows and broadcasts of party meetings.

In connection with the above, it is important to emphasise that the same methodology for evaluating the value of advertising was applied to all the lists; however, in others, except for the SNS, there were no reported costs for TV commercials in the party reports that significantly deviated from the estimations of Transparency Serbia. The SPS' advertising costs, when it comes to the main stations with a national frequency, were thus between 2% and 20% higher than the TS estimated they should be, even with the application of the maximum discounts. Also, the list of "Zavetnici" and "Dveri" reported 3-4% higher costs for commercial on national broadcasters than estimated. The numbers are the same when it comes to commercials of "Serbia against Violence" on TV *RTS*, while the list "NADA" reported higher costs than estimated.

If SNS did report all the advertising costs on these TV stations, it means that discounts it received were far greater than those that were officially published: about 25% on TV *RTS* (instead of the maximum 20%), 75% on televisions *Prva* and *B92* (the highest published discount was 50%), and a full 80% on TV *Happy* (instead of the maximum 50%).

The Serbian Radical Party did not have a discount for advertising on TV *Happy*, but its report contains an outstanding debt to that television station in the amount of approximately RSD 495,000, and to TV *Informer* in the amount of nearly RSD 382,000. It is currently unknown when these invoices will be paid, and from which sources.

How Will "Leased Time Slots" Be Treated?

"Leased time slots" were reported by SNS, SPS, the "Dveri"/"Zavetnici" coalition, SVM, Zukorlić's SPP and PDD. The Serbian Progressive Party reported its television advertising by TV station, in total amounts, in the column entitled "Leased Time Slots", but it is obvious that these were mostly broadcast commercials. The Socialist Party of Serbia reported one "leased time slot" on TV *Tanjug* (for the broadcast of the convention) while others were on local stations. "Dveri"/"Zavetnici", SVM, SPP and PDD advertised in this way only in local media. Given that this type of advertising is not legally allowed, the media did not even publish price lists for it

as part of political advertising, which is otherwise a legal obligation. Therefore, the only way to calculate the value of the leased slots in accordance with the regulations is to apply the advertising price lists for certain slots (as if we were talking about broadcast advertisements).

When it comes to "leased time slots", the promotional show of the list of Aleksandar Vučić (which was entitled "Interview with the President of Serbia"), broadcast on the eve of the election silence on TV *Pink*, attracts particular attention. In the proceedings that took place before the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption regarding the above, representatives of the party [stated](#) that it was an expense that was yet to be paid, but the amount was not examined at the time. Based on the duration of the show and the published price lists, and with the calculated maximum discount, the full price should amount to EUR 704,820, although the real market value was probably several times lower. The costs of this show were not presented separately in the SNS report. If the leased time slots were paid to TV *Pink* together with advertisements, then the SNS received a discount between 63% and 75% for that broadcast, while the maximum discount, according to the price list, was 50%.

In the course of the proceeding, the Agency should collect data from the parties and the television stations (and then present them to the public) as to which advertisements and leased time slots were included in the financial reports, and what their value is without discounts, and determine whether the party has possibly received a below-the-market-value discount, which would have had to be reported as a contribution to the election campaign. The REM report, once it is finally published, will be highly significant for this control because this body also records how many commercials were broadcast on national TV stations.

Elusive Facebook Ads

The reporting form does not contain a column that specifically refers to advertising on social media, so it is not possible to determine with certainty whether parties have reported these costs. According to the data published by Facebook, SNS had advertisements worth about EUR 160,000 on this social network, while from the final report on the financing of the campaign it can be concluded that this cost may have been included in the RSD 45 million that were paid to the company "Max Strategic" for promotional services on internet portals and social networks.

That amount certainly does not include approximately EUR 40,000 which Aleksandar Šapić paid for his own advertising, or the far more modest sum of EUR 869 invested by Minister Goran Vesić. Namely, based on

1 Of those six TV stations, the monitoring of Transparency Serbia did not include TV *Studio B*, where this list advertised in the amount of more than EUR 200,000.



several reports filed by Transparency Serbia, the Agency took the position that there is no obligation to record these expenses as party expenses, or as contributions to the election campaign. In the absence of rules on the financing of campaign that is carried out by "third parties", such an interpretation of existing statutory norms opens up space for circumventing the prescribed prohibitions regarding the sources of party financing and limitations on the amount of contributions given by a single person or company.

Other political entities also reported costs that were potentially related to social networks, doing so through specialised agencies: "Serbia against Violence", SPP, the Russian Party, "NADA", "WE – Voice of the People", SDA and SPS). On the other hand, the People's Party, the "National Gathering" coalition and coalition "Good Morning Serbia" listed expenses that were paid to companies that are owned by social networks (Meta, Google, Twitter). Therefore, while conducting control, it should be determined precisely whether the reported costs match at least with those that "Meta" company published regarding advertising on Facebook.

Unknown Call Centre with a Known Address

The best known case involving a suspicion of illegal campaign financing refers to the call centre of the Serbian Progressive Party, based on the story and evidence that were [collected](#) directly by a CINS journalist. Instead of a reasonable explanation for the (documented) engagement of workers in that call centre and payments made in cash, SNS, the agency that hired the workers, and the non-governmental organisation in whose premises the payments were being made, all denied any mutual connection, as well as any connection with the "call centre in question". Based on this, the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption [concluded](#) that "there is no basis for determining whether there was any violation of the Law". However, there is no obstacle for the Agency to subsequently collect additional data, without which the control it performs would not be complete, or to request data collected by public prosecutors for the purposes of control, since criminal charges have also been filed in connection with this case.

Who Else Should the Agency Request Additional Data From?

In these elections, too, many reports were not populated correctly, as expenses were listed in aggregate form instead of being sorted by category, or were presented without including all the mandatory details (e.g. the number of leased billboards).

Also, the parties once again placed the costs in the columns "Other" or "Other Advertising Expenses", instead of classifying them where they belonged. In the case of the list "Aleksandar Vučić – Serbia Must Not

Stop", this was particularly noticeable on the example of the expenses "Lease of Advertising Space" from the companies "Mondo", "Ringier Axel" and "Internet Group", which were listed under the heading "Other Campaign Expenses" instead of in the "Advertising Expenses" column. Another example was the list "Usama Zukorlić-SPP", where the "cost of fuel [for the trip] Sjenica-Novı Pazar on the day of the main meeting" was listed under "Other Campaign Expenses" instead of under "Public Events Expenses/Travel Expenses". Marketing costs listed under "Other Expenses" could also be found in the reports of the People's Party and "Enough is Enough", while the coalition "Serbia against Violence" listed a marketing agency's commission under "Other Expenses". In several reports, the purpose of the payments listed in the "Other Expenses" column remained completely unknown, because the column intended for comments was left unpopulated and the name of the recipient does not make it possible to even guess what kind of service was involved.

Possible Adjustment of Expenditures to Avoid Returning Funds to the Budget

"Traditionally", parties that pass the electoral threshold and thus acquire the right to additional budget support, always show campaign costs that are slightly higher than the received budget funds. The reason for this is easy to understand: otherwise, they would have to return the unspent part of the money to the budget. However, there is a reason why such financial reports cannot be considered completely reliable. Namely, none of the participants in the election can know in advance with any kind of certainty how many mandates they will win, and how much money they will consequently receive once the election campaign is over (RSD 2,742,600, i.e. slightly more than EUR 23,000 for each mandate).

Exaggeration of costs, or inclusion of expenses that are not necessarily related to the campaign in the campaign costs, has not been the focus of control by the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption to date – or, let us put it another way, no violations of this type have ever been established. Control of this type cannot be performed only by comparing the reported expenses of one party with the remainder of its financial documentation; it must be done by cross-comparing the financial reports of various political entities.

In these elections, the budget was the only, or almost the only source of reported income of several lists that managed to pass the census. Among them is the SDA, which returned only RSD 620 to the budget while reporting the rest as expenses. The minority list of Albanians, led by Shaip Kamberi, reported expenses that were about RSD 86,000 lower than the total funds it received from the budget (that surplus is not shown to have been returned). The SPP and DSHV list spent the amount that was almost equal to the funds it received,



and returned RSD 3,100 to the budget. The Russian Party returned RSD 220,992 of unspent funds to the budget. Having settled its accounts, the coalition "Serbia against Violence" returned an even smaller amount to the budget: RSD 128,551 dinars, while their report incorrectly stated that they also spent RSD 19.5 million that were transferred from one of the permanent party accounts of members of this coalition.

The information provided by the group of citizens "WE – Voice of the People" is obviously incorrect. In the final report, this list reported that it spent RSD 7 million, and that it had no income whatsoever from public funds. Since RSD 67,650,800 dinars from the budget were transferred to this group's account on 22 January 2024, the final report had to show which part of this money was spent, and when the rest was returned to the budget, since this is a legal obligation.

Unknown Sources of Funds

Some of the parties ended the campaign "in the red"; namely, we already mentioned the SRS's debt to certain television stations.

In the case of the coalition Dveri / Zavetnici, as well as SRS, the submitted reports do not show where the money to pay for a large part of the campaign costs will be coming from, considering that they did not pass the census and will not be able to count on funds from the budget during the work of the new convocation of the National Assembly.

The above-mentioned coalition reported an income of RSD 29 million (the first tranche from the budget; 3.4 million transferred from 10 accounts, where it is not visible which of the parties these accounts belong to; plus, RSD 230,000 in donations from natural persons), so it can be concluded that these parties now owe their suppliers a sum amounting to approximately RSD 40 million.

What is Certainly Missing from the Reports

Campaign expense reports certainly did not include expenses that were incurred for prohibited purposes, such as bribing voters and using the work of public sector employees for party purposes. Since suspicions of the existence of such unlawful behaviour were published prior to these elections as well, and in some cases criminal charges were filed, the control of the campaign expense reports, which is carried out by the Agency, cannot be considered fully completed until the data established in the above cases by the public prosecutor's offices, and then by the courts, are also considered.



Recommendations

- By holding a public hearing, and without delay, the new convocation of the National Assembly should open a debate on amending the Law on the Financing of Political Activities based on the recommendations of international organisations and domestic observers;
- The Agency for the Prevention of Corruption should present the findings of its monitoring. In the report on the control it carried out, it should also present information on the method of establishing the credibility of the reports, with regard to at least the greatest campaign expenses if not all;
- The control of reports and the initiation of proceedings due to observed violations of the law should be completed by the time the control report is published; if this is not possible, e.g. due to waiting for information from criminal proceedings, additional reports should be published thereon;
- In each specific case, when it determines a violation of the financing rules, the Agency should inform the public about it without waiting for the completion of the entire control procedure;
- The Agency should examine situations where different political entities were charged significantly different prices for certain promotional materials where this cannot be explained by the number of purchased and distributed copies;
- Control should also include compliance with the obligation to submit a complete report on campaign expenses in situations where some political entities have listed a certain expense related to the campaign and others have not, although it is certain or very likely that they all must have had them (e.g. the costs of telephone communication, bank commissions, additional engagement of workers for specific purposes);
- The Agency should determine the value of the leased time slots for advertising on TV, and inform the REM and the market inspection about advertisements that were not marked correctly;
- The Agency should verify whether all the costs of advertising on the social network Facebook have been shown, as well as the sources of funding for the promotion that was carried out through users' private accounts;
- The Agency should take a clear position regarding the differences in the presentation of the same income and expenses in the preliminary and final reports;
- Bearing in mind the numerous omissions and inconsistencies that occurred when filling out reports on election campaign expenses, the Agency should ask political entities to submit and publish amended and supplemented reports, or publish reports on campaign expenses itself once the corrections have been made, based on the data it obtained or established while conducting control (all the expenses should be presented in appropriate columns of the report form, and not in those in which they were entered by mistake; the expenses that are currently shown aggregately should be classified by item; the data that is currently missing should be provided, especially the unit prices and prices of promotional material per piece, the number of billboards that were leased from suppliers, the type of promotional material; all the costs of the election campaign that have remained outstanding should be accompanied by comments);
- The Agency should improve the content of the report on campaign expenses and the software solution so as to enable downloading and search of data in accordance with the obligations from Article 27, paragraph 1 of the Law on Electronic Administration, which would make it easier to establish whether a report is complete or not.

About prEUgovor

Coalition prEUgovor is a network of civil society organisations formed in order to monitor the implementation of policies relating to the accession negotiations between Serbia and the EU, with an emphasis on Chapters 23 and 24 of the Acquis. In doing so, the coalition aims to use the EU integration process to help accomplish substantial progress in the further democratisation of the Serbian society.

Members of the coalition are:

Anti-Trafficking Action (ASTRA)

www.astra.rs

Autonomous Women's Centre (AWC)

www.womenngo.org.rs

Belgrade Centre for Security Policy (BCSP)

www.bezbednost.org

Centre for Applied European Studies (CPES)

www.cpes.org.rs

Centre for Investigative Journalism in Serbia (CINS)

www.cins.rs

Group 484

www.grupa484.org.rs

Transparency Serbia (TS)

www.transparentnost.org.rs



PrEUgovor's key product is the [semiannual report](#) on the progress of Serbia in Cluster 1.

Follow prEUgovor activities on:



www.preugovor.org



prEUgovor



prEUgovor



EUROPEAN
ENDOWMENT FOR
DEMOCRACY



#EY
3A TEBE

This publication has been produced with the support of the European Endowment for Democracy (EED) and funded by the European Union. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of EED or the EU. Responsibility for the information and views expressed in this publication lies entirely with the coalition prEUgovor.



Ministero degli Affari Esteri
e della Cooperazione Internazionale

This publication is part of the project financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation of the Italian Republic. The content of this publication represents the views of its authors and in no way represents the position of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.