



Republika e Kosovës
Republika Kosova – Republic of Kosovo
ORGANI SHQYRTUES I PROKURIMIT
TELO ZA RAZMATRANJE NABAVKE
PROCUREMENT REVIEW BODY

Psh. No.0006/25

The Review Panel, appointed by the President of the PRB, pursuant to Article 105, 106, and 117 of the Law on Public Procurement of the Republic of Kosova (LPP) composed of Kimete Gashi Brajshori-President, Isa Hasani and Batisha Ibrahim -Members of the Review Panel, deciding upon the complaint of EO “TONI O.P”, against the Decision to award a contract or a design competition of the “MINISTRY OF CULTURE YS AND ÇJK ” in the capacity of Contracting Authority (CA) regarding the procurement activity “Restoration and conservation interventions in Cultural Heritage objects throughout the Republic of Kosova - Fourth Phase” with procurement number 207-24-10543-5-1-1, on the 17.03.2025, has issued this:

DECISION

1. Approved, as partly grounded the complaint of the EO “TONI O.P”, with no. 2025/0006 dated 03.01.2025 regarding the procurement activity “Restoration and conservation interventions in Cultural Heritage objects throughout the Republic of Kosova - Fourth Phase” with procurement number 207-24-10543-5-1-1.
2. Remains in force, Notice of the Contracting Authority's Decision regarding the procurement activity described in point 1 of this provision.
3. Within 10 days, the CA must inform the PRB of all actions taken regarding this procurement activity, otherwise, for non-compliance with the decision, the PRB may take measures against the CA as provided for in the provisions of Article 131 of the LPP.
4. Since the complaint of the complaining EO is approved as grounded, the complaint fee is refunded in the amount deposited when submitting the complaint. The complaining EO is obliged, in accordance with Article 31, point 6 of the Rules of Procedure of the PRB, to make a request for the return of the complaint security within a period of sixty (60) days, otherwise the deposit will be confiscated, and these funds will go to the Budget of the Republic of Kosova.

REASONING

-Procedural facts and circumstances -

On 08.10.2024, the “MINISTRY OF CULTURE YS AND ÇJK” in the capacity of the Contracting Authority has published the Contract Notice B05 regarding the procurement activity with “Restoration and conservation interventions in Cultural Heritage objects throughout the Republic of Kosova - Fourth Phase” with procurement no.: 207-24-10543-5-1-1. While on 19.12.2024 the Notice on the decision of the Contracting Authority for the award of the contract.,

The contracting authority has implemented an open procedure, type of contract: - services, estimated value of the contract: LOT 2: 452,778.28 Euro.

On the 23.12.2024, EO “TONI O.P.” has submitted a request for reviewing against the above-mentioned decision of the CA. On 24.12.2024, the Contracting Authority has rejected as unfounded the request for reviewing.

On the 03/01/2025, the PRB received the complaint from the EO “TONI O.P.” with no. 2025/0006 regarding the activity “Restoration and conservation interventions in Cultural Heritage objects throughout the Republic of Kosovo - Fourth Phase” with procurement no.: 207-24-10543-5-1-1.

-At the preliminary review stage-

The Procurement Review Body has found that the complaint contains all the elements specified in Article 111 of the LPP and as such was submitted within the legal deadline in accordance with Article 109 paragraph 1 of the LPP after the preliminary procedure for the resolution of disputes in the sense of Article 108/A of the LPP, by the economic operator that is an interested party according to Article 4 paragraph 1 sub-paragraph 26 of the LPP. In this way, the Procurement Review Body has concluded that it is competent to review this complaint under Article 105 of the LPP and that there is no procedural obstacle to continuing with the review of the complaint on its merits.

*The claims of the complaining economic operator “TONI O.P.” are presented as follows:
"Because the CA- MINISTRY OF CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORTS: - has illegally eliminated us from this procurement activity after we have fulfilled all the requirements of the CA set out in the contract notice and in the tender dossier. We explain in detail: The Contracting Authority - CA MINISTRY OF CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORTS has illegally eliminated us from this procurement activity, stating the following as the reason for the elimination: While in the CN and in the TD it has requested in the Requirements on technical and/or professional capabilities 9.1 & 9.2 Technical and professional capacity: while in the request e.) Request for LOT 1, 2, 3 and 4 List of professional staff 2.1 One (1) Graduated Engineer of Architecture (or Master) 2.2. One (1) 1 Graduated Engineer of Construction (or Master) 2.3 One (1) 1 Graduated Engineer of Construction (or Master) in Hydrotechnical Direction 2.4 One (1) 1 Graduated Engineer of*

Electrical Engineering (or Master) 2.5 One (1) 1 Graduated Engineer of Machinery (or Master)
The entire list of staff requested in request number 2 by the Contracting Authority must have;e.
At least one of them presented in the list of professional staff must be licensed with an A1 license.
In case of possession of an A1 License, the architectural engineer must present only the
notarized copy of the license or the notarized copy of the decision of the Licensing Board that he
is licensed in category A-1 and the Contract with the O.E. stamped and signed by both parties.
So as can be seen from the request itself and from the reason for the elimination by the CA, the
CA is in contradiction with itself since it did not request that the Architectural Engineer be a
separate request. So the CA has eliminated us in violation of the LPP since one of the reasons for
the elimination for which the CA eliminated us was not a request from the CA in the CN and TD.
With this action, the CA has acted in violation of Article 56.3 of the LPP which states: "The
tenderer, during open procedures, or the candidate, during restricted procedures and
competitive procedures with negotiations, shall not be disqualified or excluded from such
procedures on the basis of any requirement or criterion that is not stated in the contract notice
and in the tender dossier". We have two architects on our list of professional staff: 1. Mr. Emin
Demaku and 2. Mr. Muzafer Asllani, where if such a request were in the CN and DT we could
very easily appoint Mr. Muzafer Asllani as Contract Manager but such a request was not in
either the UJK or DT. But the request was that at least one of them presented in the list of
professional staff must be licensed with an A1 license where we also have one of the staff with an
A1 as follows; We as Economic Operators are damaged by this decision of the CA which is
illegal and an attempt to damage the Kosovo Budget in an illegal manner since we have fulfilled
all the requirements of the CA set in the CN and TD and we are freer. We have also submitted
this claim as above in the request for reconsideration dated 23.12.2024 and the CA on
24.12.2024 responds to us in the decision where it rejects our request for reconsideration with
the same reasoning as in the standard letter for elimination, so the CA insists that the request for
the file was a special one, which is not true because the CA has requested that one of the staff
have an A1 license as per the CA's request. At least one of them presented on the list of
professional staff must be licensed with an A1 license. So it is clear that the CA has unlawfully
harmd us since we have met all their requirements set out in the NJK and DT and have offered
the lowest price. We also did not raise claims against the EOs that were more expensive than us
since we had the lowest price and met all the requirements. If we had been more expensive, we
would have had our claims, but we did not need to deal with the other EOs since legally Lot 2
belongs to us. If the CA had evaluated according to the law and PPRC procedures, we would
have been declared the winner.

Ultimately: We as Economic Operators are harmed by this decision of the CA which is illegal
and an attempt to harm the Kosovo Budget in an illegal manner as we are the only operator with
the cheapest price that we have bid with a responsible tender as we have met all the
requirements of the CA while the EOs recommended for the contract are hundreds of thousands
of euros more expensive and have not met the requirements of the CA set out in the CN and DT.
The contracting authority in this procurement activity did not take into consideration Article 1 of
the LPP, since it is known that the purpose of this law is to ensure the most efficient, transparent
and fair way of using public funds, public resources and all other funds and resources of
contracting authorities in Kosovo. Also, the contracting authority did not act in accordance with

Article 6 of the LPP, where contracting authorities are obliged to ensure that public funds and public resources are used in the most economical way, simultaneously taking into account the purpose and subject matter of the procurement as provided for in Article 6 of the LPP.

The contracting authority in this procurement activity did not take into consideration Article 7 Equality of Treatment/Non-Discrimination, where the purpose of this article is that the contracting authority will treat economic operators equally and non-discriminatory and will act in a transparent manner. The contracting authority in this procurement activity did not conduct the examination, evaluation and comparison of tenders in accordance with Article 59 of the LPP and at the same time the main criterion for awarding the contract was not respected, which was the responsive tender with the lowest price, where the CA acted in violation of Article 60 of the LPP, where the main criterion for awarding the contract was: The responsive tender with the lowest price, where we have bid with a responsive tender and with the lowest price.

Referring to the above allegations, "TONI O.P." considers that the Contracting Authority has acted in violation of Article 1 Purpose, Article 6 Economy and Efficiency, Article 7 Equality of Treatment/Non-Discrimination, Article 56 General Provisions on the Selection of Participants and the Award of Contracts. Article 59 Examination, Evaluation and Comparison of Tenders, Article 60 Contract Award Criteria, Article 65 Eligibility of Candidates or Tenderers, Article 66 Professional Suitability The CA has also violated the relevant provisions of the PPRC. We believe that we have elaborated more than necessary the violations of the CA in this Procurement activity, therefore, we request the PRB to oblige the CA to strictly respect the provisions of the public procurement law and also to respect its own requirements which it has set in the contract notice and in the tender dossier and to issue; a decision to APPROVE as grounded the complaint of the Economic Operator: OUR O.P. Regarding the procurement activity:

Restoration and conservation interventions in Cultural Heritage objects throughout the Republic of Kosovo - Fourth Phase For Lot 2, Restoration and conservation interventions in Cultural Heritage objects throughout the Republic of Kosovo - Fourth Phase in the Prizren Region with procurement no.: 207-24-10543-5-2-1 and Internal No.: 207-24-094-5-2-1 initiated by AK-MINISTRY OF CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORTS The contract award notice is CANCELLED Regarding the procurement activity: Restoration and conservation interventions in Cultural Heritage objects throughout the Republic of Kosovo - Fourth Phase For Lot 2, Restoration and conservation interventions in Cultural Heritage objects throughout the Republic of Kosovo - Fourth Phase in the Prizren Region. with no. Procurement No.: 207-24-10543-5-2-1 and Internal No.: 207-24-094- 5-2-1 initiated by AK- MINISTRY OF CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORTS and the case is returned to Re-evaluation for Lot 1, Lot 2, Lot 3 and Lot 4, and after the re-evaluation we are awarded the contract for Lot 2, since we have bid in accordance with Article 60 of the LPP with a responsible tender and the lowest price"

CA's response to the request for reconsideration: Response - Complaint claim 1: "The claim is unfounded because the criteria used for the procedure: Restoration and conservation interventions in Cultural Heritage objects throughout the Republic of Kosova - Fourth Phase with number 207-24-10543-5-1-1 and 207-24-094-5-1-1.

CA has submitted: Request for LOT 1,2,3 and 4 Criterion number 2. Appointment of the Contract Manager Decision on the appointment of the contract manager, who must be a Master or an Architectural or Civil Engineering Engineer. The decision must contain basic data on the application procedure (Name of the Authority, Name of the procedure, procurement number). The contract manager must present a. Notarized university diploma. b. Employment contract (signed by both parties and stamped by the EO). c. Evidence of work experience of at least 5 years in the field of cultural heritage or similar work (to be proven with a signed CV and a diploma after the title of Master or Engineer), d. At least one reference of work in contract management - supervision of the implementation of similar projects;

Special criteria in addition to staff, the CA has requested a Manager who is not required in this license. The Economic Operator has presented Mr. Emin Demaku as the Contract Manager who has an AL License. However, in the criteria: Request for LOT 1,2,3 and 4 List of professional staff 2.1 One (1) Architectural Engineer (or Master) 2.2. One (1) 1 Structural Engineer (or Master) 2.3 One (1) 1 Structural Engineer (or Master) in Hydrotechnical Engineering 2.4 One (1) 1 Electrical Engineer (or Master) 2.5 One (1) 1 Mechanical Engineer (or Master) The entire list of staff requested in request number 2 by the Contracting Authority must have; a. Notarized university diploma. b. Employment contract (signed by both parties and sealed by the EO). c. Proof of work experience of at least 5 years in the field of cultural heritage or similar work (to be proven with a CV signed by the person engaged), with the exception of points 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 where the work experience can be a minimum of 2 years. d. Proof that each of them has at least one work reference related to one of the natures of work in restoration or conservation or renovation of cultural heritage objects, with the exception of points 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 where no proof was required, e. At least one of them presented in the list of professional staff must be licensed with an Al. In case of possession of the Al License, the architectural engineer must present only a notarized copy of the license or a notarized copy of the decision of the Licensing Board that he is licensed in category A-1 and the Contract with the O.E. stamped and signed by both parties. Economic Operator TONI OP / on the staff list 2.1 One (1) Graduated Architectural Engineer (OSC Master) 2.2. One (1) 1 Graduated Structural Engineer (or Master) 2.3 One (1) 1 Graduated Structural Engineer (or Master) in Hydrotechnical Direction 2.4 One (1) 1 Graduated Electrical Engineer (or Master) 2.5 One (1) 1 Graduated Mechanical Engineer (or Masler) None of them has managed to fulfill the criterion e). At least one of them presented in the list of professional staff must be licensed with an Al license. In case of possession of an Al License, the architectural engineer must present himself with a notarized copy of the license or a notarized copy of the decision of the Licensing Board that he is licensed in category A-1 and the Contract with the EO stamped and signed by both parties. This is clearly seen since the EO itself admits such a thing in the Request for Reconsideration: So as is seen from the request itself and from the reason for elimination by the CA, the CA is in contradiction with itself since it did not request that the Architectural Engineer be a separate request. So, we submit that Criterion 1. Regarding the Manager c Contract is a special criterion and not a criterion of professional staff.

1 It is clear that the EO has understood that the Contract Manager (where a license is not required) is a special criterion and the staff where one of them must be licensed is another special criterion. All Economic Operators have understood such an issue since the CA always sets clear criteria and does not leave confusion for Economic Operators. 1 It is clear that the Request for Reconsideration is an unfounded request."

Administration and evaluation of evidence —

Based on Article 111 paragraph 5 in connection with Articles 113 and 114 of the LPP, the Procurement Review Body on 13.01.2025 authorized the review expert to conduct the initial review of the file and claims according to the complaint with no. 0006/2025, while on 24.01.2025 the review expert's report with no. 0006/2025 was submitted with the following recommendations: Based on the above-mentioned clarifications, the review expert proposes to the review panel that the complaint of the complaining EO be approved as grounded, the notice for awarding the contract for LOT 2 be canceled and it recommends that the case be returned for re-evaluation.

Regarding the claims of EO "TONI O.P." the review expert through report no. 2025/0006 has assessed as follows: "Claim of the complaining EO: The complaining EO in the complaint claims that it meets the requirements of the CA, because in the list of professional staff there are two architectural engineers, and that the request was at least one of them presented in the list of professional staff to be with the A1 license, and if it were a special engineer as the CA insisted, then we could have easily changed it before the bidding, but the CA in the DT did not request a special engineer, but at least one of them. Therefore, the CA did not evaluate the bids according to article 56.3 of the LPP.

Response to the complaining claim of the complaining EO: "The review expert, after analyzing and reviewing the case files documented in E-procurement, clarifies that the CA's request in DT 9.1 & 9.2- Technical and professional skills is: Request for LOT 1, 2, 3 and 4 Criterion number 2. Appointment of the Contract Manager Required evidence: Decision to determine the contract manager, who must be a Master or Architectural or Construction Engineer.

The decision must contain basic data on the application procedure (Name of the Authority, Title of the procedure, procurement number). The contract manager must present a. Notarized university diploma. b. Employment contract (signed by both parties and stamped by the EO). c. Proof of work experience of at least 5 years in the field of cultural heritage or similar work (to be proven with a signed CV and diplomas after the title of Master or Engineer). d. At least one reference of work in contract management - supervision of the implementation of similar projects; Request for LOT 1, 2, 3 and 4 List of professional staff 2.1 One (1) Graduated Architectural Engineer (or Master) 2.2. One (1) 1 Graduated Structural Engineer (or Master) 2.3 One (1) 1 Graduated Structural Engineer (or Master) Hydrotechnical Direction 2.4 One Graduated Electrical Engineer (or Master) 2.5 One (1) 1 Graduated Mechanical Engineer (or

Master) Required Evidence: The entire list of staff requested in request number 2 by the Contracting Authority must have; a. Notarized university diploma. b. Employment contract (signed by both parties and stamped by the EO). c. Proof of work experience of at least 5 years in the field of cultural heritage or similar work (to be proven by a CV signed by the person engaged), with the exception of points 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 where the work experience may be a minimum of 2 years. d. Proof that each of them has at least one work reference related to one of the natures of work in the restoration or conservation or renovation of cultural heritage objects, with the exception of points 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 where proof is not required. e. At least one of them presented in the list of professional staff must be licensed with an A1 license. In case of possession of the A1 License, the architectural engineer must present only the notarized copy of the license or the notarized copy of the decision of the Licensing Board that is licensed in the A-1 category and the Contract with the O.E. stamped and signed by both parties. In addition, the offer of the complaining EO contains the list of professional staff, which includes the contract manager with the profession of Architectural Engineer, who possesses the A1 License, and in this specific case, the request of the CA is the List of professional staff in which the contract manager is also included, because the request in criterion number 2 "Appointment of the contract manager" is the request to appoint a contract manager which is attached to the list of professional staff. Therefore, as such, the claim of the complaining EO is found to be grounded.

In conclusion, according to the explanations above, the claim of the complaining EO is found to be well-founded and in accordance with the complaint of the complaining EO for LOT 2, it is recommended that LOT 2 be returned for re-evaluation, in order to respect articles 1, 6, 7, 56 and 59 of the LPP.

The Panel found that there are no elements for preventing conflict of interest, as required in the sense of Article 11 of the Rules of Procedure of the PRB, in connection with paragraph 1.75, Article 4 of the LPP, and at the same time analyzed all the documents of this case, including all the acts and actions of the parties, and considered that there is no need to convene a hearing with the parties, since the submissions of the parties and their actions constitute a sufficient basis to decide on the merits as provided for in paragraph 1, Article 24 of the Rules of Procedure of the PRB, and that there is no need to require the contracting authority and/or the complainant to provide additional information and/or explanations, within the meaning of paragraph 3, Article 116 of the LPP.

-Findings of the Review Panel -

The Review Panel, after evaluating and administering the evidence according to the submitted complaint, clarifies that the findings in the report of the review expert for this case are partially consistent. Consequently, the Review Panel regarding the claims of the complaining economic operator has not granted credence to the findings regarding the first claim to the review expert regarding the findings regarding the second claim.

It is worth noting that for the Review Panel, the findings and recommendations of the review experts are not binding, but serve only as evidence among all other evidence that it evaluates in each case separately. The Review Panel decides independently, objectively and with due professional care, always protecting the public interest through the LPP and the secondary legislation in force for public procurement.

The review panel, independently and objectively, with due diligence and professional care, has evaluated all the evidence in the case and considers that the Contracting Authority, during the examination, evaluation and comparison of the bids, has acted in accordance with the applicable LPP.

In order to fully establish the factual situation, the review panel has administered as evidence the Report of the Review Expert, the opinions of the parties regarding the expert report, the submissions and documents of the complaining economic operator and the winning economic operator, the letters and documents of the Contracting Authority, other relevant documents related to the procurement activity, as well as all evidence proposed by the procedural parties.

Regarding the first complaint claim, the review panel did not agree with the finding of the review expert since the reasoning by the CA on the elimination of the complaining EO was not analyzed in relation to the complaint claim and the requests submitted in the DT. The SP during the entire elaboration of the documentation noticed that in the DT, among other things, two requests were submitted which were separate from each other, the first one requested the Appointment of the Contract Manager, more precisely the Decision on the appointment of the contract manager and the second request was the list of professional staff, therefore the SP has addressed, to:

Requirements on technical and/or professional capabilities 9.1 & 9.2:

Technical and professional capacity Requirements for LOT 1,2,3 and 4 Criterion number 2. Appointment of the Contract Manager Required documentary evidence: Decision on the appointment of the Contract Manager, who must be a Master or an Architectural or Civil Engineer. The decision must contain basic data on the application procedure (Name of the Authority, Name of the procedure, procurement number). The Contract Manager must present a. Notarized university diploma. b. Employment contract (signed by both parties and stamped by the EO). c. Proof of work experience of at least 5 years in the field of cultural heritage or similar work (to be proven with a signed CV and a diploma after the title of Master or Engineer), d. At least one reference of work in contract management - supervision of the implementation of similar projects. Technical and professional capacity: Request for LOT 1,2,3 and 4 List of professional staff 2.1 One (1) graduate engineer of architecture (or Master) 2.2. One (1) 1 graduate engineer of construction (or Master) 2.3 One (1) 1 graduate engineer of construction (or Master) hydrotechnical direction 2.4 One (1) I graduate engineer of electrical engineering (or Master) 2.5 One (1) I graduate engineer of machinery (or Master). Required documentary evidence: The entire list of staff requested in request number 2 by the Contracting Authority

must have; a. Notarized university diploma.b. Employment contract (signed by both parties and stamped by the EO).c. Proof of work experience of at least 5 years in the field of cultural heritage or similar work (to be proven with a CV signed by the person engaged), with the exception of points 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 where the work experience may be a minimum of 2 years.d. Proof that each of them has at least one work reference related to one of the natures of work in the restoration or conservation or renovation of cultural heritage objects, with the exception of points 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 where no proof was required,e. At least one of them presented in the list of professional staff must be licensed with an AI. In case of possession of the AI License, the architectural engineer must personally present the notarized copy of the license or the notarized copy of the decision of the Licensing Board that he is licensed in category A-1 and the Contract with the O.E. stamped and signed by both parties.

Based on the description of the requests submitted in the DT, it is concluded that the requests in the DT have been divided according to documented evidence and with specific conditions for each request. The PS evaluates the fact that the CA in the submitted requests the required evidence is specified and clarified in a correct manner, the PS also evaluates the fact that the CA has implemented the legal provisions of Article 7 of the L.P.P by compiling the requests and technical specifications in a fair and equal manner, not being discriminatory and in favor of or against one or more economic operators. With this clarification, the PS finds that the CA, by compiling the same requirements, has specified that at least one of them presented in the list of professional staff must be licensed with an AI license, in this case, in this request, the CA has given the economic operators bidding the opportunity that any person from the list of professional staff can have an AI license, but this possibility according to the requirements in the DT was not foreseen for the manager, which the PS assesses that the requirements, in addition to being clear and non-discriminatory, are also at the discretion of the CA, which, in accordance with the legal provision from Article 9 of the L.P.P., is able to assess/determine whether one of the professional staff must have a license or whether the project manager must have a license, when we are aware that the position of the manager is the one that manages, administers and directs the entire project in order to achieve the goal of that project while the professional staff is the one that deals with the specific tasks presented in that project. Therefore, based on the elaborations provided above, the PSH finds that the complaint claim submitted by the complaining EO is unfounded.

The review panel, after administering and evaluating the evidence, fully ascertaining the factual situation, relying on the LPP as the applicable material law, after reviewing the complaint claims, taking into account all the case files and the recommendations of the review expert, has found that the complaint of the Economic Operator is partially grounded, which claimed that the same has the right to replace the position of manager with the position of professional staff, while the Notice on the Decision of the Contracting Authority "MINISTRY OF CULTURE YS AND " regarding the activity "Restoration and conservation interventions in Cultural Heritage objects throughout the Republic of Kosova - Fourth Phase" with procurement no.: 207-24-10543-5-1-1 should remain in force. since there are no sufficient legal arguments to order the CA

to return the procurement activity for re-evaluation, for the reasons elaborated above in this decision.

The Review Panel has decided in accordance with the legal powers in terms of Article 104, paragraph 1, in conjunction with Article 103, Article 105, Article 109 (right to appeal) and Article 117 of the LPP to implement the procurement review procedure in a prompt, fair, non-discriminatory manner, with the aim of resolving the case legally and effectively.

The Review Panel requests the Contracting Authority to be vigilant during public procurement procedures by acting in full compliance with the LPP and other applicable legislation on public procurement and to act in harmony with the findings of this decision. Otherwise, the PRB may initiate disciplinary proceedings against procurement officials.

For points I and II of the decision, it was decided based on articles 109 and 117 of the LPP

For point III of the decision, it was decided based on article 118 of the LPP.

From what was said above, it was decided as in the provision of this decision.

President of the Review Panel

Mrs. Kimete Gashi Brajshori

Legal advice:

An appeal is not allowed against this decision, but the dissatisfied party can appeal to the Commercial Court, to the Department for Administrative Affairs for annulment of the decision within 30 days from the date of acceptance of the decision.

Decision to be submitted to:

1x1 CA – **MINISTRY OF CULTURE YS AND ÇJK;**
1x1EO–**“TONI O.P”;**
1x1 Archive of the PRB;