

# Implementation of Brussels Agreement and European Integration Prospects for Kosovo and Serbia

## Introduction

The Council for Inclusive Governance (CIG) organized a series of activities in February 2015 in Gracanica, Pristina, Istanbul, and Brussels on the implementation of the April 2013 Brussels Agreement—specifically on the establishment of the Association/Community of Serb-Majority Municipalities (hereinafter Association), dismantling the Civil Protection (CP) in Kosovo’s north—and on the EU integration prospects for Serbia and Kosovo. While there was solid agreement on the dismantling of CP, participants differed diametrically on the Association’s mandate. Kosovo Albanian participants said the Association should have a similar role as the existing Association of Kosovo Municipalities, which is simply a forum for discussions, but Kosovo Serb and Belgrade participants maintained that the Association should be a political institution with significant executive powers.

Six of fifteen points of the Brussels Agreement are about the establishment of the Association. Though the Agreement has some ambiguity, Kosovo Albanian speakers say it clearly does not provide for any executive powers. But Kosovo Serbs and Belgrade speakers indicated that an Association without significant powers is meaningless. Furthermore, the Serbs insist that the Association is formed before they dismantle the parallel system and implement other agreements, including the one regarding courts in the north. The Kosovo Albanian speakers say that the Association could be formed only after Serbia dismantles its parallel system in Kosovo.

The February CIG activities were part of a larger project on the normalization of relations between Kosovo and Serbia and integration of the Serb community in Kosovo. The project is funded by the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs.

This report offers a brief overview of the activities and outlines some of the major points on the establishment of the Association, the dismantling of the CP, and on the EU prospects for Kosovo and Serbia. To encourage frank discussions, the meetings were held under the Chatham House Rule, thus remarks have not been attributed to specific speakers. Participants took part in meetings in their personal capacities and their positions do not necessarily represent those of the institutions they represent.

## Intra-Serb Roundtable: What Association do Kosovo Serbs need?

Participants in the roundtable in Gracanica included mayors of Serb-majority municipalities, members of Kosovo Serb parties, and Serb representatives of civil society. They addressed the

forming of the Association and the role it should play for the Serb community. The participants were unanimous that the Association should be a political organization with executive powers in education, healthcare, urban planning, and economic development. Some speakers added some form of taxation to this list—sales tax and VAT—a prerogative of Kosovo’s central and municipal institutions.

Reportedly, two draft statutes of the Association exist: one prepared by Kosovo’s government and one prepared by a four-member Serb team appointed by the Kosovo government but directed by Belgrade. Those who have seen the drafts say that they are diametrically different. The Kosovo government version is based on the statute of Kosovo’s existing association of municipalities while the Serb draft offers substantial powers to the Association. The drafts have been shared with some members of the international community but have not been part of the negotiations between Pristina and Belgrade.

The major challenge of forming the Association will be satisfying Kosovo Serbs’ and Belgrade’s expectations for a strong institution and Kosovo Albanians’ proposals for an institution with simply a coordinating role, as well as satisfying the six points of the Brussels agreement on the Association, which foresee no executive powers.

Following are the main points from the Gracanica discussion.

- The Association should have executive powers in the four areas included in the Brussels agreement and should be funded by Belgrade. Pristina and the international community could contribute to its budget but would have no power over the spending.
- The Association should serve as a forum to discuss and articulate Serb interests and represent and unify the Serb community in Kosovo. As a forum for discussion, it would also contribute to political pluralism among Kosovo Serbs.
- The mayors of the Serb-majority municipalities should be included in the discussions on the Association’s draft statute since they will become its main representatives. Some of the mayors reported that neither Pristina nor Belgrade consults them.
- Education and healthcare systems serving Kosovo Serbs, including the Serbian curriculum and funding, should remain within Serbian system and should be managed by the Association, including distribution of salaries. Some, however, said that giving a political organization too much power over education might be counterproductive.
- Some speakers feared that the Association would be led by incompetent people with a mandate to decide about the future of the Serb community. They likened them with the Serb representatives in Kosovo’s parliament and government that, according to them, appeared to have been elected by voters but in effect were appointed by Belgrade, and thus represent those that appointed them rather than the Serb community in Kosovo. They also complained that Serbia’s Office for Kosovo has monopolized Kosovo Serb politics.

In conclusion, the participants had consensus that the Association should be a political body with executive powers in local affairs and specifically manage education and healthcare with funds from and in cooperation with Belgrade. Essentially, it would deal with all the issues that are currently under Belgrade’s authority. They foresee no role for Pristina in these areas although the

need to have a liaison mechanism between the Association and the Kosovo central institutions was mentioned.

## **Kosovo Albanian-Serb Roundtable: What Association is Possible According to Brussels Agreement?**

Participants in the Pristina roundtable included members of Kosovo Albanian and Serb parties, members of parliament, senior government officials, and civil society representatives. Kosovo Albanian speakers maintained that the Association will be formed according to Kosovo law, thus it will have no executive or supervising powers; only a coordinating role. They explained that the role of the Association is simply to “overview,” the term used in the Brussels Agreement, the four areas. Kosovo Serb speakers, on the other hand, argued that the Association should have executive powers in the four areas and also collect VAT and sales tax in the four municipalities in the north.

There is a mismatch of priorities as well—while Serbs want the formation of the Association first, the Albanians want the dismantling of parallel institutions and the implementation of the justice agreement first, and only then the formation of the Association. As a compromise, some suggested the implementation of these agreements in parallel. Participants agreed that holding a Kosovo election in the north was a success but it is not sufficient if the municipalities are not functional and the rest of the Agreement is not implemented. Some reported that non-implementation is the main reason the EU has not opened negotiations with Serbia in January 2015.

The CP remains a thorny issue. The Kosovo government has devised a roadmap to employ its members in a number of its institutions. There is, however, a disagreement on numbers. Belgrade claims the force has 751 members while Pristina has offered positions for about 550, where 400 would be employed in several institutions, 50 will be employed within three years but be paid in the meantime by the contingency fund, and 100 would be hired through projects funded by the Development Fund for the north which so far has a budget of 5 million euros. Kosovo officials also say that 88 would be retired and 150 CP members are not Kosovo citizens.<sup>1</sup>

A number of Albanian speakers said that the agreements are harmful to Kosovo and thus they should not be implemented and the dialogue should be stopped. A speaker said the dialogue is simply used as a tool to strengthen the government and weaken the opposition. Another speaker offered an example to illustrate why they believe Serbia benefits from the dialogue more than Kosovo. He reported that to drive to Serbia, he has to pay 130 euros in fees, take off his license plates, and get a temporary paper plate with a Serbian flag on it. Serbs, on the other hand, pay only 20 euros to enter Kosovo, and they don't need to change license plates and can use their IDs. A number of Albanian speakers said that Pristina should become tougher, including the application of reciprocity measures.

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the roundtable, Pristina and Belgrade have reached an agreement that foresees the employment of 483 CP members.

There was broad consensus that the Association could play an integrating role if politicians were not too much involved in its formation and later in management. The Albanian speakers said that it should be formed and run by the Kosovo Serbs, and not by Belgrade. The Serb speakers, however, said that Belgrade not only should be involved in forming but also in funding it. A group of speakers said that neither Belgrade nor Pristina care much about the Association or the Serbs in Kosovo; they are simply using it to score “patriotic points.”

The municipalities in the north should set up their departments and begin to offer services foreseen by local legislation. Apart from holding an election and electing mayors and assemblies, the four municipalities in the north are non-functional. They do not collect local taxes—property tax, car registration fees—or issue documents—ID cards, birth certificates and other documents. These services are still offered by the Office for Mitrovica North. The municipalities have also refused to adopt their budgets on the grounds that education and healthcare should not be their responsibility. (In response, the government froze their bank accounts a few weeks after the roundtable). They may have to organize new elections for the local assemblies. The participants called for a compromise, that the municipalities adopt the budgets but not use them until the role of the Association is clarified.

The Serb speakers said that Pristina is not implementing its own laws and this is the main reason they need the Association, to make sure the laws that impact them particularly are implemented as they should be. The Albanian speakers, however, argued that the objective of Kosovo Serbs and Belgrade is to make the Association a mechanism for undermining Kosovo’s constitutional order by forming a new level of government managed by Belgrade. The issue of lack of trust between the communities and specifically the lack of trust from the Serb side towards Kosovo institutions was also discussed. In this light, the Association was seen as a “protection mechanism” for the Serbs in Kosovo.

## **Workshop in Istanbul: How to Dismantle CP and Form Association?**

Participants in the Istanbul workshop included analysts, government advisors, and civil society representatives from Kosovo and Serbia. They specifically addressed ways to dismantle CP and establish the Association. There was broad agreement that CP should be dismantled and its members integrated into adequate Kosovo institutions. Regarding the Association, participants widely differed on its mandate.

### *Dismantle Civil Protection*

The Brussels Agreement says that members of parallel security structures in the north should be integrated into Kosovo’s equivalent institutions. The parallel police force has already been integrated into Kosovo Police. Unlike members of the police, the CP members are offered positions in about 15 Kosovo civilian institutions. Kosovo representatives reported that Belgrade claims that the CP has over 751 members. Pristina has offered jobs for about 550 members. Bargaining over the numbers will continue. The remaining members should be accommodated through allocation of other funds.

The participants agreed on the following points:

- Employ CP members in Kosovo's institutions. Belgrade should submit the actual list of CP members in the north and offer proof that they have not been added to these lists at the last minute.
- Professional background of CP members should be matched to the new jobs offered to them. Trainings should be offered when necessary.
- Employ the remaining members through allocation of other funds. The Development Fund for the North could be used to create jobs for some of the members that cannot be integrated in Kosovo institutions. Belgrade could also provide funds to the Development Fund or other sources but it should not insist in paying salaries directly.
- Belgrade should take CP in Kosovo out of its legislation. The CP is currently an institution within Serbia's ministry of defense. The integration of CP should, however, take place even if Belgrade refuses to change its law.
- Pristina and Belgrade should not use the existence of CP as an excuse to prolong the implementation of other points of the agreement.

### *Establish the Association*

Six of the fifteen points of the Belgrade-Pristina April 2013 Agreement are dedicated to the Association. Pristina and Belgrade have offered different and often conflicting interpretations of these points while the international community is so far not willing to provide any clarifications regarding the Agreement. Yet uncertainties persist: The word "overview" is the most ambiguous. The phrase "the Association will have full overview over" is not quite clear, even in English. One could "give" or "offer" an overview, but not "have overview." The same goes for the Albanian translation of overview, "vështrim". One cannot "have vështrim;" one can offer vështrim. The Serbian translation "nadležnost" (competence) is closer to the Serbian interpretation of the mandate of the Association but it is not a correct translation of "overview." "Pregled" is a more accurate translation.

As seen from the following points, the participants widely differed on the mandate of the Association.

- Albanian speakers strongly rejected any executive powers for the Association. They said the six points of the Brussels Agreement are the basis of the Association's mandate. Serb participants, on the other hand, said the Association should have substantial executive powers, including its own budget and staff.
- Serb participants said that the responsibilities of the Association should also include privatization of public companies in Serb-majority municipalities. Albanian speakers said the six points of the Brussels Agreement concerning the Association should not be re-negotiated, thus the Association can have a monitoring role in the agreed areas.
- Albanian speakers said that Belgrade could offer financial support to the Association through the Development Fund for the North or through some other source, but it cannot pay salaries of the Association's employees. They argued that the Association will become a Kosovo institution and its staff members are considered Kosovo public employees, which, according to Kosovo law, cannot receive salaries from another state. Serb speakers were adamantly against Pristina's financial control over the Association.

- Education and healthcare remain thorny issues. Mayors in the north and Belgrade want the education and health to be run by the Association. Kosovo’s government says these are under municipal management. As a result, the Albanian participants suggested that the municipalities should accept the budgets provided by Pristina but not use the portion of funds dedicated for education and healthcare until the Association is formed. The Serb speakers, however, disagreed. They said such funds should not be included in the budget at all until the Association is formed.

Participants had broad consensus on dismantling CP but did not agree on the Association’s mandate. The main contentious issue is whether the Association should have executive powers or not. Albanians are strongly against such powers while Serbs say a toothless institution would be useless.

### **Roundtable in Brussels: Association and European Integration**

Participants included ministers and senior members of Kosovo’s and Serbia’s governments, members of parliaments, representatives of civil society from Serbia and Kosovo, European Commission officials, members of European Parliament, and a number of other European diplomats. Participants addressed the implementation of the Brussels Agreement—focusing on the Association—and European integration prospects for Serbia and Kosovo.

Like in other meetings, Serbs and Albanians held irreconcilable differences on the Association. While the Kosovo Albanian speakers held to their view of the Association as detailed above, a Serbian speaker said that the Association will be based on “Kosovo law, but not on Kosovo’s existing law,” suggesting that Belgrade expects Pristina to change a number of laws to accommodate Belgrade’s request for executive powers for the Association. Kosovo’s representatives explained that both Pristina and Belgrade have committed to change some laws but only to accommodate the Brussels agreement as it is.

A Serbian representative said that the Association should take over some of the responsibilities of the parallel institutions, including making spatial planning decisions, decide on financial borrowing, establish agencies and public institutions, as well as opening and awarding tenders. There are over five thousand employees in the parallel system in Kosovo, and Belgrade would want some of these employees to be transferred to the Association. The speaker said that this is in line with EU standards. He admitted that an institution with such powers could be “sui generis,” but said it should not be a problem. Laws can be changed, for example, the speaker reported that Belgrade too would have to make some legislative changes to accommodate the recent agreement on courts in the north.

A Kosovo speaker familiar with the dialogue suggested to his Belgrade colleagues “not to raise expectations of the Serbs in Kosovo through such impossible demands.” “Such an institution is equivalent to an autonomous status and as such it does not stand a chance,” another Kosovo speaker argued. Upon which a Serbian speaker proposed that Belgrade and Pristina “sit together and see what institutions they can build.”

On the EU integration process, Kosovo and Serbian representatives agreed that the two governments should cooperate in areas where it is possible, and where cooperation is not probable because of status issues, they should not obstruct each other. There was broad agreement that they have an interdependent relation, both need each other for substantial progress. Serbia would not be able to move fast without substantial improvement of its relations with Kosovo. Even the full implementation of the Brussels Agreement would not be sufficient. An international speaker said that complete implementation of the Agreement would be sufficient to begin negotiations but there would have to be “more Brussels-type agreements with Kosovo before full membership.”

Serbian representatives argued that the negotiations should be opened as soon as possible “as Serbia has met the conditions by reaching a number of agreements with Kosovo.” But Kosovo representatives and a number of international speakers said that the “agreements without implementation are not useful.” A Kosovo speaker said that Pristina had to renegotiate the agreement on courts in the north, even though they had agreed to implement it by the end of 2013, and complained that now Serbia is trying to sell it to the international community as a new agreement.

A number of international speakers and Kosovo representatives called on the five EU members that have not recognized Kosovo’s independence to do so. They said that the non-recognitions represent a constant obstacle in Kosovo’s path to EU integration. They also called on Belgrade not to obstruct Kosovo’s membership in international organizations.

Serbian speakers reported that over sixty percent of the population in Serbia supports the Brussels dialogue and the agreement. They said that Serbia wants to make faster progress but it is conditioned in every step with Chapter 35 (Kosovo). They complained that Belgrade is put under more pressure than Pristina, and added that, “Pristina is not fully respecting the spirit and the provisions of the Brussels agreement.” A Serbian speaker argued that the dialogue is gaining support in Serbia but it is losing it in Kosovo, noting a number of protests against the dialogue in Pristina.

The dialogue shows that there is substantial political will in Kosovo and Serbia, a Kosovo speaker noted. Serbia engaged in the dialogue to primarily advance its EU integration process while Kosovo engaged to integrate its northern municipalities and move on with EU integration. Kosovo speakers complained that the EU has been too lenient towards Serbia, as “it does not condition negotiations with taking Kosovo out of the Serbian constitution.” One speaker added that Serbia gets rewarded more than Kosovo: Serbia received candidate status and the opening of negotiations while Kosovo did not even get the integration of the north, since Serbia still keeps its parallel institutions there. “Kosovo is a bit disappointed with the EU.” The agreement had been reached in 2013 and two years later the implementation is far behind. “Let’s not continue to manipulate each other and the international community.” According to him, this explains why the dialogue is becoming more and more unpopular in Kosovo, “if such empty dialogue goes on for too long, it will lose all public support.”

Serbia advanced at record speed in its EU integration, an international speaker said. According to the agreed action plan, the Brussels agreement should have been implemented at the end of 2013.

“But energy, transparency of financial flows, telecommunication, courts, not one of these have been implemented.” Serbia still has its parallel institutions in Kosovo and some heads of these institutions were just reappointed. He reported that, “the candidacy status was given to Serbia in the belief that it would implement the agreement in full and according to schedule.”

## **Conclusion**

The four activities—intra-Serb meeting in Gracanica, Serb-Albanian roundtable in Pristina, workshop in Istanbul, and roundtable in Brussels—addressed the formation of the Association/Community of the Serb-Majority Municipalities, the Civil Protection, and the path of Kosovo and Serbia towards European Union membership.

Kosovo Serbs and Serbian participants had almost full consensus that the Association should become a political institution with solid executive powers in education, healthcare, urban planning, and economic development, and some speakers suggested that the institution should also collect taxes, a sole responsibility of central government and municipalities. Kosovo Albanian participants said the Association will be based on the Brussels Agreement, which, according to them, foresees a monitoring or supervisory role for the institution in only education, healthcare, urban planning, and economic development.

Participants had broad consensus on the dismantling of the CP. The actual number of CP members remains a contentious issue<sup>2</sup>. However solutions to address these discrepancies can be found.

Membership in the European Union remains a strong aspiration of both Serbia and Kosovo. Apart from the regular reforms that need to be undertaken on the path to EU integration, Serbia needs to address its relations with Kosovo. International representatives explained that even if Serbia meets all the conditions, the EU-membership would be subject to Serbia resolving its dispute with Kosovo. The implementation of the Brussels Agreement, or “Brussels-I” as a speaker called it, would be sufficient to start opening the negotiation chapters but not for full membership. There will also probably be a “Brussels II and III” as Belgrade gets closer to membership.

Kosovo, on the other hand, needs to engage in reform processes but is also confronted with the obstacle of the five EU members that have not recognized its independence. Furthermore, Serbia’s attitude regarding Kosovo’s membership in international organization might also need further clarifications. Kosovo is expected to sign in June 2015 the Stabilization Association Agreement, which is the first step towards membership and serves as a basis for implementation of the accession process. However, there is no clear roadmap on how Kosovo will move from this first step towards EU-integration. Kosovo speakers asked for clear commitment from the EU that the SAA would quickly be followed by other steps. They added that Kosovo has met the conditions for visa liberalization and expect the Europeans to grant it to Kosovo by the end of the year.

---

<sup>2</sup> Belgrade has asked to accommodate to new jobs 751 members while Pristina has offered positions for about 550.

Participants agreed that despite their status disputes, Belgrade and Pristina should not hamper each other's paths toward EU membership. If they cannot help each other, at least they should not harm each other.

## Participants

### *Roundtable in Gracanica*

**Jelena Djokic**, Adviser to Mayor of Zvecan  
**Natasa Elezovic**, Adviser to Mayor of North Mitrovica  
**Marko Jaksic**, Analyst, North Mitrovica  
**Dalibor Jevtic**, Former Minister for Communities and Return of Kosovo  
**Vesna Jovanovic**, Director for Education, Health and Social Welfare, Municipality of Partes  
**Dragisa Krstovic**, Former Member of Parliament of Kosovo  
**Ljubisa Mijacic**, Analyst, Zubin Potok  
**Petar Miletic**, Former Deputy speaker of the Parliament of Kosovo  
**Branislav Nesovic**, Program Director, Aktiv  
**Dragan Nikolic**, Mayor of Partes  
**Randjel Nojkic**, Former Member of Parliament of Kosovo  
**Nenad Radosavljevic**, Director, RTV Mir, Leposavic  
**Goran Rakic**, Mayor of North Mitrovica  
**Zivojin Rakocevic**, Director, Cultural Center, Gracanica  
**Rada Trajkovic**, Former Member of Parliament of Kosovo  
**Shpetim Gashi**, Vice President, Council for Inclusive Governance  
**Alex Roinishvili Grigorev**, President, Council for Inclusive Governance  
**Arber Kuci**, Associate in Kosovo, Council for Inclusive Governance  
**Krystyna Marty**, Ambassador of Switzerland to Kosovo  
**Saskia Salzmann**, First Secretary-Human Security Adviser, Embassy of Switzerland in Kosovo

### *Roundtable in Pristina*

**Ardian Arifaj**, Adviser to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Kosovo  
**Iilir Deda**, Member of Parliament of Kosovo, Self-Determination Movement  
**Ardian Gjini**, Deputy Chairman, Alliance for the Future of Kosovo  
**Dukagjin Gorani**, Chair, Common Voice Forum  
**Adrijana Hodzic**, Principal Executive Officer, Mitrovica North Administrative Office  
**Vesna Jovanovic**, Director for Education, Health and Social Welfare, Municipality of Partes  
**Adriatik Kelmendi**, Editor-in-Chief, Kohavision  
**Dragisa Krstovic**, Former Member of Parliament of Kosovo  
**Leon Malazogu**, Executive Director, Democracy for Development Institute  
**Ljubisa Mijacic**, Analyst, Zubin Potok  
**Petar Miletic**, Former Deputy Speaker of the Parliament of Kosovo  
**Valon Murtezaj**, Advisor to Prime Minister of Kosovo  
**Dragan Nikolic**, Mayor of Partes  
**Besnik Osmani**, Secretary General, Ministry of Local Government Administration of Kosovo  
**Gazmir Raci**, Adviser to Minister without portfolio in the Government of Kosovo responsible for dialogue with Serbia  
**Nenad Radosavljevic**, Director, RTV Mir, Leposavic  
**Besa Shahini**, Senior Analyst, European Stability Initiative  
**Edita Tahiri**, Minister without Portfolio in the Government of Kosovo responsible for dialogue with Serbia  
**Rada Trajkovic**, Former Member of Parliament of Kosovo

**Shpetim Gashi**, Vice President, Council for Inclusive Governance  
**Alex Roinishvili Grigorev**, President, Council for Inclusive Governance  
**Arber Kuci**, Associate, Council for Inclusive Governance  
**Saskia Salzmann**, First Secretary-Human Security Adviser, , Embassy of Switzerland in Kosovo

### ***Workshop in Istanbul***

**Dugagjin Gorani**, Chair, Common Voice Forum  
**Mirjana Kosic**, Executive Director, TransConflict  
**Dusan Kozarev**, Deputy Director, Office for Kosovo and Metohija, Government of Serbia  
**Leon Malazogu**, Executive Director, Democracy for Development Institute  
**Qemajl Marmullakaj**, Director of Office of Strategic Planning, Government of Kosovo  
**Ljubisa Mijacic**, Analyst, Zubin Potok  
**Petar Miletic**, Former Deputy Speaker, Parliament of Kosovo  
**Branislav Nesovic**, Program Director, Aktiv  
**Besnik Osmani**, Secretary General, Ministry of Local Government Administration of Kosovo  
**Gazmir Raci**, Adviser to Minister without portfolio responsible for dialogue with Serbia, Government of Kosovo  
**Naim Rashiti**, Project Director, Balkans Group  
**Shpetim Gashi**, Vice President, Council for Inclusive Governance  
**Alex Roinishvili Grigorev**, President, Council for Inclusive Governance  
**Igor Novakovic**, Associate in Serbia, Council for Inclusive Governance

### ***Roundtable in Brussels***

**Arnaldo Abruzzini**, Secretary General, Eurochambres  
**Mimoza Ahmetaj**, Ambassador of Kosovo to Belgium  
**Bekim Collaku**, Minister of European Integration of Kosovo  
**Marko Djuric**, Director of Office for Kosovo and Metohija, Government of Serbia  
**Labinot Hoxha**, First Secretary, Embassy of Kosovo in Belgium  
**Jadranka Joksimovic**, Minister without portfolio responsible for European Integration, Government of Serbia  
**Sonja Licht**, President, Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence  
**Ulrike Lunacek**, MEP, Vice President and Rapporteur for Kosovo, European Parliament  
**Ljubomir Maric**, Minister of Local Government Administration of Kosovo  
**David McAllister**, MEP, Rapporteur for Serbia, European Parliament  
**Jugoslav Milacic**, Adviser to the Minister without Portfolio in the Government of Serbia responsible for European Integration  
**Pierre Mirel**, Honorary Director General, European Commission  
**Tanja Miscevic**, Chief Negotiator of the Government of Serbia  
**Ernst Reichel**, Special Envoy of Germany for Western Balkans, Turkey and EFTA States  
**Fisnik Rexhepi**, Senior Political Advisor to the Minister of European Integration of Kosovo  
**Teuta Sahatqija**, Chair, Committee for European Integration, Parliament of Kosovo  
**Besa Shahini**, Senior Analyst, European Stability Initiative  
**Natasa Vuckovic**, Member of the Parliament of Serbia (Democratic Party)  
**Laura Trimajova**, Parliamentary Assistant to MEP Kukan  
**Catherine Wendt**, Director, Unit for Kosovo, DG NEAR, European Commission

**Roberto Balzaretto**, Ambassador of Switzerland to the European Union  
**Shpetim Gashi**, Vice-President, Council for Inclusive Governance  
**Alex Roinishvili Grigorev**, President, Council for Inclusive Governance  
**Pauline Menthonnex Gacafferri**, Political Advisor to the Special Representative of the OSCE  
Chairperson for the Western Balkans, Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs  
**Rascha Osman**, First Secretary, Mission of Switzerland to the European Union  
**Talia Wohl**, Program Officer, Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs