



Humanitarian Law Center

## Serbia 2017 Report

### The Humanitarian Law Center's Contribution

#### 1. Prosecution of War Crimes

[a] The key progress that has been made in regards to prosecution of war crimes is the final **appointment of the new War Crimes Prosecutor**, Snežana Stanojković. The election of the new WCP enabled the implementation of a number of activities set forth in the Action Plan for Chapter 23 and the National Strategy for the Prosecution of War Crimes (National Strategy), including: the adoption of the prosecutorial strategy for the prosecution of war crimes, improving the capacities of the Office of the War Crimes Prosecutor (OWCP), and employing psychologists at the OWCP. However, none of these activities have been implemented since the new prosecutor's appointment.

The failure of the Republic Public Prosecutor to act in accordance with the Law on Public Prosecution Service and appoint an acting war crimes prosecutor put the ongoing war crimes trials in jeopardy. On July 5, 2017, the Court of Appeal in Belgrade ruled to reject the indictment in the *Srebrenica* case on the grounds that it was not filed by an authorized prosecutor. This decision made it possible to challenge the legality of OWCP's work in that period in all other war crimes cases too. Following this case, in October 2017 the Court of Appeal in Belgrade ruled to reject also the indictment in the *Štrpci* case, and the last example is the *Bosanska Krupa* case, where the Higher court in Belgrade dismissed the indictment, on the same grounds.

[b] The **Working body for monitoring the Implementation of the National Strategy for the Prosecution of War Crimes was established** on September 19, 2017, after one and a half years of the deadline that was determined in the National Strategy. On the first meeting the Rules of Procedure of the Working body were adopted and the dynamics of further work was agreed.

[c] In April 2017, the **Victim and Witness Information and Support Service (VWISS) was established** at the OWCP as part of the process of establishing the nationwide network of victim and witness information and support services at public prosecutor's offices. The Service has two staff members and a coordinator, all of whom already worked for the OWCP.

[d] **Lack of political support for the fight against impunity for war crimes** remains to be the key limiting factor for more efficient prosecutions. According to the National Strategy, following its

adoption, the highest State officials were supposed to publicly declare their support for the work of all domestic authorities dealing with the war crimes issues, for the fight against impunity and for the respect for the rule of law. During the reporting period, the highest State officials did not publicly support the domestic prosecution of war crimes, nor the implementation of the National Strategy.

Tendencies are even the opposite, since the process of glorification of war criminals continued. ICTY convicted war criminal Veselin Sljivancanin held numerous promotions of his book in towns in Serbia during 2017. Some of these promotions were organized by the ruling Serbian Progressive Party. Momcilo Krajsnik, another ICTY convicted war criminal, met with the former President of Serbia, Tomislav Nikolic, in the building of the Presidency of the Republic of Serbia, in January 2017. In October 2017, General Vladimir Lazarevic, former Commander of the Pristina Corps of the Army of Yugoslavia and Nikola Sainovic, former Deputy Prime Minister of the FRY, both convicted by the ICTY for war crimes and crimes against humanity during the Kosovo war, attended a gathering of senior officers of the Third Battalion, that was engaged in the war in Kosovo. In his speech at the event, the defence minister Aleksandar Vulin especially emphasized "Gone are the days of shame, this is a time of quiet dignity" and "the attitude towards these people is the relation of our self-esteem."<sup>1</sup> Following this event, Serbia's defence minister announced that Lazarevic will teach cadets at the Military Academy, since he should be a 'role model'.<sup>2</sup> "We made a rule to make room at the Military Academy for the most prominent commanders from the wars gone by... This is a great turning point and a way to correct the injustice that was inflicted on them in the past years" Vulin said.<sup>3</sup>

The mentioned examples show that revisionism slowly became accepted practice by official institutions. Another illustrative example has also been the attempt to deny the responsibility of VRS General Novak Đukić for the crime in Tuzla's Kapija [Gate]. In a final judgment passed by the Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Novak Đukić, in his capacity as the Commander of the Ozren Tactical Group of the VRS, was sentenced to 20 years imprisonment for ordering an artillery strike on Tuzla on 25 May 1995, which killed 71 civilians. During 2017, the Higher Court in Belgrade was supposed to conduct proceedings for the recognition and enforcement in Serbia of the judgment passed on Novak Đukić (Case of *Novak Đukić*). Đukić did not appear for a series of hearings in 2017, because he was admitted to the Military Medical Academy hospital in Belgrade. His absence is constantly justified on the basis of medical records issued by the Medical Academy hospital.

[e] **The implementation of the National Strategy is non-transparent** - in many segments, there are no official information about whether an activity is realized or not, because the data are not publicly announced. Since there are no official reports on the implementation of the strategy, some information can be obtained on the basis of requests for access to information of public importance.

---

<sup>1</sup> „Vulin: Prošlo je vreme stida, ovo je vreme tihog ponosa“, RTS, 07 October 2017, available in Serbian [here](#).

<sup>2</sup>“Freed Serbian War Criminal to Teach at Military Academy”, article, Balkan Insight, 18 October 2017, available [here](#).

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*

Despite this mechanism, state authorities still make it difficult to access information of public importance by delaying responses or outright denying access.<sup>4</sup>

[f] In the reporting period, the OWCP has continued with its **policy of prosecuting less demanding cases** involving fewer victims, cases involving isolated and less serious incidents, and not prosecuting cases against high-level perpetrators. **Serbia is the only country in the region that has never indicted a high-ranking war crimes suspect of its own nationality.** The only investigation against a high-ranking Serbian suspect (the Živanović case – former commander of the 125<sup>th</sup> motorized brigade in Kosovo) was secretly dropped in March 2017 despite numerous requests for information by the media and the HLC about the case, and even without notifying the victims' lawyers, thereby denying them access to legal remedies. The National Strategy envisaged adopting the OWCP's strategy, as a tool for increasing the war crimes trials efficiency through defining criteria for selecting war crimes cases that should be given priority in prosecution – including the criteria of rank. Until October 2017 the prosecutorial strategy had not been adopted.

[g] **Only one indictment for war crimes** has been confirmed in 2017 (Case *Sanski most - Lušci*<sup>5</sup>). There are still no indictments against high ranking officers, and command responsibility has not yet been applied in a single case. In over three years **the OWCP has not issued a single indictment for crimes committed in Kosovo** and it is *de facto* unable to investigate Kosovo cases because of the blockade of the EULEX mission since 2014. Currently, the only way for the OWCP to investigate Kosovo cases is by cooperation with Kosovo prosecutors, which will not happen due to Serbia's non-recognition.

[h] Another long-lasting problem that has become the hallmark of war crimes cases in Serbia are **delays in proceedings.** From January till October 2017, only 39 trial days were held in all ongoing war crimes trials (in the first and second instances), and 47 scheduled trial days were adjourned for various reasons. This should be compared with e.g. 2011 when **over 50 hearing days would take place in just one trial.**

[i] One problem besetting the OWCP ever since its establishment is the **insufficient number of deputy prosecutors,** expert advisors and investigators. The Action Plan for Chapter 23, referenced in the National Strategy, foresees a gradual strengthening of the OWCP's capacity through the hiring of additional staff including eight deputy prosecutors and seven assistant prosecutors in the period 2015-2018, and the potential hiring of military experts. However, the OWCP's capacity has not been strengthened during 2017. At the time of this writing, the OWCP had only five deputy war crimes prosecutors instead of eight as envisaged in its staffing plan. Moreover, two more deputy prosecutors will retire by April 2018.

---

<sup>4</sup>"Action Plan for Chapter 23 and the National Strategy for the Prosecution of War Crimes – dead letters", HLC press release, 20 July 2017, available here. <http://www.hlc-rdc.org/?p=34064&lang=de>

<sup>5</sup>"Ex-police reservist under charges for a 1992 war crime against civilians in Sanski Most", OWCP press release, 04 April 2017, available [here](#).

[j] National Strategy for the Prosecution of War Crimes states as one of its goals „support to the judiciary through the promotion of **regional cooperation**”, and foresees a number of activities in the field of regional cooperation. Despite that, OWCP did not participate in an annual regional conference of war crimes prosecutors since 2015.

Regarding the cooperation with Kosovo, the OWCP still doesn't have direct contact with the representatives of the Kosovo judiciary. Bearing in mind that EULEX will finish its work in 2018, direct cooperation with the Kosovo Public Prosecutor's Office (PPO) should be established. Direct contact between the Serbian and Kosovo prosecutors' offices is crucial for prosecuting the crimes committed during and in the context of the war in Kosovo 1998-1999, and for searching for missing persons and the overall normalisation of relations between the two countries.

[k] **Public knowledge on war crimes trials** and judicially established facts is one of the key prerequisites for an objective assessment of the past. It also represents the state's obligation to ensure the public's right to know what happened in the recent past and who is responsible for that. The importance of raising public awareness on the wartime events has also been recognized in the National Strategy.

The reality, however, is that out of the rights stated within the law, only the right to access the courtroom and monitor the trials is strictly adhered to. The right to access the documentation of war crimes cases is limited in practice by the refusal of courts to deliver judgments from proceedings that are not final and by excessive anonymisation of data. The right to record a trial for the purpose of public presentation has not been achieved by any media or NGO so far, and until present day the public in Serbia has not had the opportunity to see a single testimony of the victims, perpetrators or witnesses.<sup>6</sup> An illustrative example is that 68% of Serbian citizens are not well informed about national war crimes trials.<sup>7</sup>

#### **Recommendations:**

- Provide public support of the highest State officials for domestic war crimes trials, including for the implementation of the National Strategy;
- Implement fully and in good faith the National Strategy for the Prosecution of War Crimes for the period 2016-2020, including:
  - o Urgently adopt the OWCP's strategy for the prosecution of war crimes;
  - o Strengthen capacities of the OWCP by increasing the number of deputy prosecutors and other staff;
  - o Improve regional cooperation with the prosecutorial offices in Croatia and BiH through regional meetings, and by establishing joint investigation teams and a regional war crimes database.
- Ensure full transparency of the implementation of the National Strategy (making available all relevant documents submitted by the state authorities to the Working Body for the purpose

---

<sup>6</sup> „Public's Right to Know of War Crimes Trials in Serbia“, HLC, 2017, available [here](#).

<sup>7</sup> From an unpublished public poll opinion, conducted during 2017, by the HLC and the daily newspaper „Danas“.

- of reporting, regular info sessions/meetings/consultations of the Working Body and civil society and expert public, etc.);
- Implement fully and in good faith all the measures envisaged within the section 1.4. of the Chapter 23 Action Plan;
  - Prosecute and try individuals for crimes against humanity and command responsibility;
  - Establish direct cooperation between the OWCP and Kosovo Public Prosecutor's Office;
  - Timely and widely inform the public on war crimes trials;
  - Ensure that all interested stakeholders have access to relevant documentation in relation to war crimes trials, and that the right to record the trial is being exercised in accordance with the law.

## 2. Providing the victims and their families with the right to reparations

Access to justice for victims of war crimes and other serious war-related human rights abuses, and their family members, as set out in the EU Common Position for Chapter 23, is still not fully ensured. Victims are being denied compensation in Serbian courts, while at the same time most of them cannot qualify for victim status and appropriate benefits under discriminatory provisions of the existing legislation.

Aside from activities aimed at strengthening procedural guarantees within criminal proceedings, Serbia's Action Plan for Chapter 23 prescribes only one measure to redefine the concept of victims in domestic legislation in accordance with relevant international treaties (measure 3.7.1.23). Although the latest report on the implementation of the Action Plan states that this activity is being successfully implemented, to date, no amendments in legislation have been made, although the period for realization was set for the third quarter of 2016 and the first quarter of 2017.

While the Action Plan mentions certain rights for victims, it does not articulate any specific requirements for compensation or provision for government obligation to promote compensation. **Contrastingly, Montenegro in its Action Plan has a measure on reporting on cases for compensation to civilian victims** (measure 1.5.6).<sup>8</sup> Thus, with no measure in Serbia's Action Plan relating to keeping track of cases of victims receiving compensation in court, there is no requirement for courts or other government institutions to dispose of such information, which in effect does not contribute to carrying out the overall government's obligation to provide compensation to civilian victims.

[a] **Civilian victim status under current legislation.** The retrograde and discriminatory Law on Civilian Invalids of War, adopted in 1996, is still in force, denying the right to assistance and support to a large number of victims who live in Serbia (e.g. families of missing persons, victims of sexual violence, victims who suffer from the psychological consequences of the violence sustained, victims with physical disabilities of less than 50%, victims of Serbian armed forces etc.). Even the territorial

---

<sup>8</sup> Government of Montenegro, Action Plan for Chapter 23 Semi-annual Report – July-December 2016, January 2017.

application of the Law remains an issue, as the Ministry of Labor interprets it in the manner which excludes all victims who were killed or suffered injuries in the territories of other former Yugoslav republics, effectively denying access to thousands of potential beneficiaries. The Ministry is persistent in its interpretation, despite the fact that no such provision exists in the Law and contrary to the Constitutional Court's explicit decision. Finally, relatives of persons killed are eligible for monetary benefits only if they prove that they are unemployed and incapable of work, in addition to having no other source of income. Imposing such conditions reduces their rights to welfare, and disrespects their victim status.

**Serbia practically remains the only country in the region which has not improved its legislation on civilian victims of war.** Other former Yugoslav republics have either adopted special legislation that refers to specific categories of victims (Law on victims of sexual violence in Croatia, Law on missing persons in Bosnia and Herzegovina), or have amended their existing legislation to include such categories (Kosovo).

The Draft Law on the Rights of Veterans, Disabled Veterans, Civilian Invalids of War, and Their Family Members, although published by the competent Ministry for Labor, Employment, Veteran and Social Affairs at the end of 2014, still hasn't been forwarded as an official proposal on behalf of the Government, nor submitted to the National Assembly for adoption. While the reasons for this inaction on the side of the Ministry remain unclear, the HLC and other civil society organizations from Serbia maintain their previous position that the Draft Law should be completely withdrawn and replaced by a new legislative solution, as it retains the same legal regime for civilian victims as the current legislation.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the drafting process lacked transparency and consultation with the expert community and notably with victims' associations.<sup>10</sup> The concern about the decision makers' moves with respect to civilian victims of war was also expressed by Council of Europe Human Rights Commissioner in his letter to the Government in September 2016.<sup>11</sup>

At the end of 2016, the HLC was communicating with the former Ombudsman, who was willing to form a working group for the development of a new proposal of the law on civilian victims of war, which would be based on applicable international standards and a model previously elaborated by the HLC.<sup>12</sup> After the election of Mr. Zoran Pašalić for the new Ombudsman, the HLC had a meeting with him which, however, did refused to cooperate on the development of a new proposal of the law on civilian victims of war.

[b] **Compensation Lawsuits.** Efforts to achieve the right to material compensation in court proceedings against the Republic of Serbia are faced with obstacles which are connected to the reluctance of courts to connect Serbia with the responsibility for grave human rights abuses during

---

<sup>9</sup> "To Withdraw Discriminatory Bill on Rights of Civilian Victims of War", press release, Coalition Against Discrimination and Coalition for Access to Justice, December 2015, available [here](#).

<sup>10</sup> "Bill on Rights of Civilian Victims of War Still Hidden from Public Eye", press release, Humanitarian Law Center, December 2015, available [here](#).

<sup>11</sup> "Council of Europe Concerned for the Position of Civilian Victims of War in Serbia", September 2016, available [here](#).

<sup>12</sup> Humanitarian Law Center and Center for Advanced Legal Studies, "Model law on the rights of civilian victims of human rights violations committed during and in connection with armed conflicts in the period 1991-2001", April 2015.

the wars. These cases are governed by the general rules of civil procedure, in which the victim is in the position of a prosecutor who must bear the burden of proof entirely. In most cases, the courts dismiss the victims' compensation claims because of an alleged statute of limitations, interpreting the relevant legal norms to the detriment of the victims. This has been largely instigated by the Supreme Court, which in more than one case intervened in quashing otherwise final judgments.<sup>13</sup> In the rare cases where the claims are granted, they result in minimum compensation amounts, much lower than in all neighboring countries. The procedures in these cases last on average over five years.

### Recommendations:

- Withdraw the current Draft law on veterans and civilian victims, and start a new series of public consultations with relevant stakeholders, especially civilian victims' associations
- Adopt legislation on civilian victims of war that would not discriminate against those categories of victims currently excluded from the law, *or alternatively*
- Adopt special legislation on specific categories of victims (e.g. missing persons, victims of sexual violence), following the examples from Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Kosovo
- Accelerate proceedings in compensation cases, or otherwise prioritize them
- Align court practice with international standards on reparation for victims of serious violations of humanitarian law (in terms of burden of proof, application of statutes of limitations, and fair compensation amounts)

### 3. Search for missing persons

[a] Serbia has not yet fully demonstrated its **resolve to determine the fate of persons** who are still listed as missing or to discover the locations of mass graves on its own territory. One of the key source of information about the circumstances relating to the disappearance and the locations of individual or mass graves are the archives of the Serbian army and police. These archives have remained secret to date and responsible institutions have been actively opposing all efforts to make them accessible to the public.<sup>14</sup>

[b] Serbia has **not adopted a law on missing persons**, which would regulate the legal situation of missing persons and their families in the areas of welfare, finance, property, and family rights. This law was also demanded by associations of families of the missing and relevant international actors such as the UN Committee for Enforces Disappearances.

[c] Regional cooperation in search for missing persons is in place and regulated with bilateral agreements. Nevertheless, there is a lot to be **improved in the regional cooperation**. The Protocol between Serbia and Bosnia and Hercegovina, which governs the cooperation in search for missing

---

<sup>13</sup> "Case Study: Courts in Serbia in Service of Abolition of State's Responsibility", Humanitarian Law Center, June 2016, available [here](#).

<sup>14</sup>"Minister of Defence Declared Documents on Activities of the 37th Motorized Brigade of the Yugoslav Army in Kosovo Top Secret", HLC, press release, June 2015, available [here](#).



persons, is not applied in full capacity. The cooperation with Kosovo could be strengthened with including the missing persons issue on the agenda of the Belgrade-Pristina EEAS mediated negotiations. Although the search for missing persons must not be a matter of negotiations, because of the humanitarian aspect of the issue, it must be resolved at the highest political level. The cooperation with Croatia is very often burdened with political issues, rather than technical ones.

#### **Recommendations:**

- Open and declassify the archives of the former Yugoslav National Army and the Serbian Ministry of Interior;
- Adopt a Law on missing persons;
- Strengthen the cooperation with the institutions responsible for the missing in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Kosovo;
- Include the issue of missing persons on the agenda of the Brussels negotiations;
- Design and implement a mechanism or tool which encourages giving valuable information on secret location of mass graves.

#### **4. Reform of the institutions**

[a] Institutional reforms in the form of **lustration and vetting have not been carried out in Serbia**. The result is that a huge number of persons who were involved in planning and committing war crimes are still holding important positions within the civilian and security services. The recent HLC's research illuminated the fact that dozens of security forces members who participated in unlawful detainment and torture against civilians during 1995, were allowed to obtain their positions within security forces.<sup>15</sup>

[b] The Action Plan for Chapter 23 and the National Strategy foresee that the analysis of the legal and factual situation of the War Crimes Investigation Service (WCIS) should pay special attention to the issue of reforming the hiring process in order to prevent hiring people who have been involved in the armed conflicts.<sup>16</sup>

The second report on the implementation of the Action Plan for 2017 states that rules preventing hiring ex-combatants at the WCIS have been adopted. The report also states that none of the persons currently working for the WCIS participated in the armed conflicts in the former Yugoslavia. However, by looking at the rulebooks it cannot be concluded that the prescribed procedures for selecting new candidates can really prevent hiring those candidates who have participated in the armed conflicts. Namely, the rulebooks' provisions prescribe how vacancies are to be announced internally, the application process, the selection process, verification and evaluation of candidates etc., but **do not envisage mandatory checks into candidates' wartime backgrounds**.

---

<sup>15</sup>See: "Dossier: Šljivovica and Mitrovo Polje", available [here](#).

<sup>16</sup>Action Plan for Chapter 23, pp. 113-114, Activity 1.4.1.7. The Action Plan is available [here](#).



[c] Action Plan for Chapter 23 and National Strategy<sup>17</sup> also foresee conducting an analysis of the status and needs of the Witness Protection Unit (WPU) with special emphasis on the need for “corrective measures” in the process of hiring staff in order to determine whether participation of the candidates in armed conflicts in former Yugoslavia should be regarded as obstacle for their hiring.<sup>18</sup> According to Report 2/2017 on implementation of Action Plan for Chapter 23, the analysis was completed. However, no specific information has been released about the analysis and its findings or whether any measures have been taken to reform the WPU. The HLC has not been given an opportunity to see the analysis, despite two requests for access to it made to Ministry of Internal Affairs, which is responsible to respond to requests for access to public information related to the work of the WPU.<sup>19</sup>

### **Recommendations:**

- Fully implement measures 1.4.1.7. and 1.4.4.2. of the Action Plan for Chapter 23;
- The Rulebook on internal job postings at MUP and the Rulebook on competencies of MUP employees should explicitly forbid the hiring of participants in war operations;
- Check the wartime past of candidates for employment in WCIS and WPU;
- Adopt similar measures of checking wartime past as vetting procedures in other security forces;
- Adopt new Law on Lustration, which will proscribe a removal from public office those persons who were involved in human rights violations during the armed conflicts in the former Yugoslavia.

## **5. Establishing RECOM<sup>20</sup> as key mechanism of regional reconciliation**

The Coalition for RECOM advocates for establishing of a regional, inter-governmental fact-finding commission about war crimes and other serious violations of human rights committed on the territory of the former Yugoslavia in the period 1991-2001. Alongside with criminal prosecutions, the fact-finding commission remains the key mechanism for regional reconciliation, required as safeguard of sustainability of both regional security and economic or any other cooperation.

The initiative to set up RECOM was supported by the signatures of 580,000 citizens of all post-Yugoslav states. It has been officially endorsed by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the COE’s Commissioner for Human Rights, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, the UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and CIS, and the ICTY Chief Prosecutor Mr. Serge Brammertz. The Initiative was also repeatedly mentioned in European Commission’s and European Parliament’s

---

<sup>17</sup>*National Strategy for the Prosecution of War Crimes*, p. 23; *Action Plan for Chapter 23*, pp. 133-134, Activity 1.4.4.2.

<sup>18</sup>*Action Plan for Chapter 23*, p. 133, Activity 1.4.4.2.

<sup>19</sup>First request (HlclIndexOut: 170-F129658) was sent on 19 April 2017 and the second (HlclIndexOut: 170-F130522) on 13 June 2017.

<sup>20</sup> Full title: *Regional commission for the establishment of the facts about the war crimes and other serious violations of human rights committed in the former Yugoslavia between January 1, 1991 and December 31 2001*

Country reports. Finally, the RECOM Initiative has been supported by the presidents of Serbia, Croatia, Kosovo, Montenegro and members of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, **the concrete measures to establish the regional commission (RECOM) and complete the fact-finding in the projected 3-year period, have not taken place as yet.**

Ever since the initial Summit of the Berlin Process, in 2014, reconciliation was listed as one of the priorities, with resolution of bilateral disputes and “real progress” in reforms. In 2017, the Berlin Process actors recognized RECOM as a unique regional mechanism to provide reconciliation, as a precondition to the fully-fledged regional cooperation and Europeanization of the region, by including the initiative to establish RECOM in the agenda of the Civil Society Forum of the Western Balkan Summit Series. Also, the final Declaration of the Summit held in Trieste in July 2017 emphasised the link between regional cooperation and reconciliation, as well as the requirement to solve pending issues and avoid nationalistic rhetoric, and recognized the role of RECOM. However, for the Commission (RECOM) to start fulfilling its role in the much-needed reconciliation process, it is necessary to take practical steps – to sign an inter-governmental Agreement on the Commission setup, and to follow it with ratification of its Statute by all post-Yugoslav countries. The Draft Statute of RECOM is already in place, prepared upon 4-year long and broadly inclusive consultative process, and with participation of Special envoys of the presidents of the post-Yugoslav states<sup>21</sup>.

Considering that reconciliation is a prerequisite to both the success of the connectivity agenda in the Western Balkans and to making the region stable and resilient to security threats, both being at the core of the Berlin Process, and given the priorities of the Berlin Process, the Coalition for RECOM and the Civil Society Forum of the Western Balkan Summit Series propose that an intergovernmental Agreement setting up the RECOM is signed at the final meeting of the Berlin Process, in London 2018.

#### **Recommendations:**

- To post-Yugoslav countries
  - To set off the work of RECOM and to advance regional reconciliation, sign the intergovernmental Agreement setting up the RECOM at the final meeting of the Berlin Process, in London 2018 and follow it with ratification of the RECOM Statute
- To Serbia:
  - Effectuate the publicly declared standpoint that it will continue to pursue reconciliation in the Western Balkans region, by taking the lead in ratifying the RECOM Statute;
- To the European Union and the EU member states:

---

<sup>21</sup> Coordinated through the Coalition for RECOM

- Continue to support and endorse the initiative for establishing RECOM during regular communications with the Western Balkans decision-makers, and in public communications.