



# ■ PAR Monitor Methodology

FINAL DRAFT

**Author: WeBER Research Team**

**Date: June 2017**

# I. Context and Rationale

## I.1 WeBER as the Background

The Public Administration Reform (PAR) Monitor Methodology has been developed as part of the Western Balkans Enabling Project for Civil Society Monitoring of Public Administration Reform – WeBER – a project implemented by the Think for Europe Network (TEN), gathering think tanks from six WB countries focusing strongly on the EU accession process and good governance in the region. As such, WeBER has adopted a markedly evidence based approach in its endeavour to *increase the relevance, participation and capacity of civil society organisations and media in the Western Balkans to advocate for and influence the design and implementation of public administration reform.*

## I.2 Role and Approach to PAR in EU Accession Context

The PAR Monitor methodology is one of the main project results, which seeks to facilitate civil society monitoring of PAR based on evidence and analysis. In line with the TEN's and WeBER's focus on the region's EU accession process, the monitoring methodology has also been developed with the view to help guide the governments in the region towards successful EU accession and membership. That is why the entire monitoring approach has been devised around the PAR requirements defined under the EU's enlargement policy.

The European Commission in 2014 defined the scope of PAR through six key areas:

1. the strategic framework for public administration reform
2. policy development and co-ordination
3. public service and human resource management
4. accountability
5. service delivery
6. public financial management.

This scope of PAR has been adopted in the *Principles of Public Administration*, a new framework for guiding and monitoring administrative reforms in the Western Balkan countries and Turkey.<sup>1</sup> The Principles of PA were developed and published in 2014, by OECD/SIGMA,<sup>2</sup> and in close co-operation with the European Commission. Their purpose is described as follows:

*The Principles define what good governance entails in practice, and outline the main requirements to be followed by countries during the EU integration process. The*

---

<sup>1</sup> A separate document entitled *The Principles of Public Administration: A Framework for ENP Countries* has been developed for the countries encompassed by the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP):

<http://bit.ly/2fsCaZM>.

<sup>2</sup> SIGMA (Support for Improvement in Governance and Management) is a joint initiative of the OECD and the European Union. Its key objective is to strengthen the foundations for improved public governance, and hence support socio-economic development through building the capacities of the public sector, enhancing horizontal governance and improving the design and implementation of public administration reforms, including proper prioritisation, sequencing and budgeting. More information available at:

<http://www.sigmaweb.org/>

*Principles also feature a monitoring framework to enable regular analysis of the progress made in applying the Principles and setting country benchmarks.*

*EU acquis requirements, guidelines and instructions are the core of the Principles in relevant areas. In other areas, the Principles are derived from international standards and requirements, as well as good practices in EU member states and OECD countries. As a minimum benchmark of good administration, countries should ensure compliance with these fundamental Principles.<sup>3</sup>*

Based on these Principles, SIGMA conducts regular assessments of the progress made by the WB countries' governments in fulfilling them. Across-the-board assessments (for all the six key areas) are conducted once every two years, whereas in-between smaller scale assessments are done for specific chapters evaluated as critical by SIGMA. For more information on SIGMA assessments, visit [www.sigmaweb.org](http://www.sigmaweb.org).

### 1.3 PAR Monitor Methodology Rationale

Following this overall approach of the European Commission and SIGMA, WeBER has adopted the Principles of PA as the main building block of the PAR Monitor Methodology. The rationale behind this approach is twofold:

1. The Principles represent the only common denominator for PAR reforms for all Western Balkan countries, which is of major importance for WeBER (as a project covering all these countries), in order to allow for regional comparability and regional peer learning and peer pressure.
2. The Principles represent a normative PAR framework which guides the governance reforms in these countries in the direction of compliance with EU standards and requirements, thus also supporting their transformation into future EU member states.

Finally, the methodology also has as its background the wider WeBER rationale that the implementation of the often painful and inconvenient administrative reforms is more likely to continue after the moment of EU accession (when the hard EU conditionality disappears) if the local actors, including non-governmental ones, are empowered to keep pushing for such reforms to continue. This empowerment needs to include the improvement of their awareness, knowledge and other capacities, such as research and analytical skills and tools. It is precisely these elements that the WeBER project and the PAR Monitor Methodology aim to create.

### 1.4 PAR Monitor Methodology and Contribution of the Civil Society

PAR Monitor Methodology was developed by the research and expert team of WeBER. It was widely consulted among all relevant WeBER associates and stakeholders – SIGMA/OECD, European Commission (DG NEAR), Regional Cooperation Council (RCC), Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA), WeBER Advisory Council, WeBER Platform members, as well as members of National Working Groups on PAR (NWGs) constituted in every WeBER country. PAR Monitor reports - six national reports and a regional report, will be the main products based on the application of this methodology. However, having in mind WeBER rationale, and the idea of PAR Monitor Methodology

<sup>3</sup> Principles of Public Administration for EU Enlargement countries, SIGMA, <http://bit.ly/2fOWLfg>.

as the methodology “by the civil society and for the civil society”, PAR resource centre will be established containing of research, analytical, and monitoring work of member organisations of the WeBER Platform, and NWGs in each country, for the purpose of contribution to the PAR Monitor reports. Relevant studies, policy papers, and other publications, on topics of importance for key areas of SIGMA Principles will be timely collected and one element of PAR Monitor reports will have as the focus the work of member organisations – regional report for the work of WeBER Platform members, and national reports for the work of members of NWGs for each country. The regional PAR Monitor report will particularly focus on the regional comparative reports relevant to SIGMA principles and WeBER monitoring (whether they pertain to all WB countries or a subset of them), whereas the national reports will provide more space to national reports (those which are available for just one country and thus do not allow for regional comparability).

## II. Approach

### II.1 Overall approach and synergies with SIGMA/OECD and SEE2020 Strategy

As mentioned above, the overall approach to monitoring of PAR developed by WeBER is based in research and evidence. One of the main considerations underpinning the development of the methodology is to ensure complementarity with the monitoring work conducted by SIGMA/OECD. This approach acknowledges that SIGMA’s comprehensive approach cannot and should not be replicated by local actors, as it already represents an independent monitoring source (in the sense of independence from local governments in the WB). In that sense, WeBER does not seek to present a contesting (competitive) assessment of how the principles are fulfilled in the WB countries, but rather offer a complementary view, based in local knowledge and complementary research approaches.

Moreover, the resources that SIGMA has at its disposal allow it to take a comprehensive view on the Principles of PA and monitor all (or almost all) aspects of the individual principles in each of the six chapters. The local civil society actors do not have such resources at their disposition. Moreover, their projects and initiatives are as a rule fragmented and based on individual ad-hoc approaches. WeBER seeks to overcome this problem by creating a Platform through which civil society in the region will conduct consultations and attempt to coordinate these individual, fragmented efforts. The PAR Monitor, as one of the Platform’s main deliverables, is envisaged as a report which will encompass both the findings of the core methodology produced by the WeBER project and the key results and findings of a major part of the individual CSOs’ (or indeed, other networks’) research and analyses in the PAR area. This latter endeavour is an ambitious one, and it is understood that both the PAR Monitor Methodology and its wider structure and approach to incorporating other CSOs’ findings will be work in progress in the years to come. The Think for Europe Network (TEN) – as the core WeBER partnership – and its other partners comprising the WeBER Platform will regularly work on incorporating feedback, updating and improving the methodology and the approach.

As a monitoring methodology “for the civil society and by the civil society”, the PAR Monitor Methodology seeks to utilise to the maximum extent possible the knowledge and experience accumulated within the civil sector in the WB countries, while seeking to further expand them and make them even more relevant through the application of robust research methods. For that reason, a number of indicators contained in the PAR Monitor Methodology actually rely on the civil society as

one of the core sources of knowledge. Compared to SIGMA's approach which rests more on the administrative sources (although it admittedly does account for perceptions and local experts' knowledge in several indicators), this approach promises to offer an additional, complementary view.

Finally, an important consideration in designing the monitoring approach lies in the understanding that all until the WB countries' EU accession moment SIGMA/OECD will be engaged in the region, relying also on the hard EU conditionality as an external driving force of reforms. In that period, the local civil society should deliver complementary, add-on findings in the areas of its strength, while gradually expanding the scope and seeking ways to continue with the external monitoring in a more holistic way once SIGMA is no longer there to perform its external assessments. By then, the local civil society actors should have a developed approach in identifying the critical areas of intervention on which to focus their monitoring efforts. In that sense, the PAR Monitor Methodology presented in this document can be regarded as a core selection to be monitored continuously, whereas in the future other critical areas could be added to its scope (in line with capacities and funding).

Finally, each after the indicators were developed, each of them was analysed for relevance against the regional strategy SEE 2020,<sup>4</sup> in order to determine whether they can serve for the purposes of its monitoring as well. Therefore, each indicator which has been determined as relevant for the monitoring of the SEE 2020 Strategy has been marked accordingly and the link to the specific dimension of that strategy has been stated.

## II.2 Structure and Selection Criteria

In line with the abovementioned considerations, the PAR Monitor Methodology maintains a basic structure which follows the six chapters of the Principles of PA and of the individual principles under each of the chapters. However, it does not attempt to cover all the principles nor does it seek to cover them in a holistic manner. It adopts a more focused and selective approach, which was defined at the very beginning of the process of development of the Methodology.

Considering that the empowering of the civil society in the region to monitor PAR in line with the Principles' structure will need to be a gradual process, the criteria for selecting the principles were developed with three main considerations in mind:

1. That there are certain areas/aspects of the Principles in which civil society is more active and consequently has more knowledge and experience;
2. That in order to gain momentum the PAR Monitor will need to acquire the interest of the wider public in the region;
3. That the Methodology should ensure an add-on approach to SIGMA's and not duplicate it.

Accordingly, the key criteria which have been designed to lead the process of selecting the principles on which the Methodology will focus are:

1. Relevance of the principle (and its sub-principles) to the work and interests of the civil society;
2. Relevance of the principle (and its sub-principles) to the interests and concerns of the wider public (i.e. to what extent does the principle address and outward-facing element of the administration's work);

---

<sup>4</sup> South East Europe 2020 Strategy of the Regional Cooperation Council: <http://www.rcc.int/pages/62/south-east-europe-2020-strategy>

3. Potential for bringing added-value to SIGMA’s work by focusing on a specific principle (and its sub-principles).

## II.3 Selection and Approach to Individual Principles

The abovementioned selection criteria were applied to each of the six areas of the Principles. To test the criteria, each of the WeBER partners was allocated one of the areas (based on their comparative advantage in terms of experience). After the testing, which confirmed that criteria could be applied consistently, the evaluation process was organised for all the principles in the framework. This evaluation was done at the level of sub-principles, which was ensure a thorough approach and deeper understanding of each principle. Using online evaluation forms, 1-2 representatives (experts) in each of the WeBER partner organisations evaluated the principles, scoring them from 1 (not relevant) to 5 (highly relevant) to the abovementioned criteria. These evaluations were finalised in August 2016.

The scores given in the evaluations were turned into Excel sheets showing both the individual scores and the averages and medians for each of the sub-principles. Based on how high the scores were (medians of 4 and 5 and averages of over 3.5) the initial selection of the principles was made. The criterion of added value was then once again applied by the researchers from each of the partner organisations, which helped exclude some of the principles (and especially sub-principles) which seemed as highly relevant at first sight, but where additional analysis of added value showed there was little that civil society could add compared to SIGMA’s assessments.

The principles in which none of the sub-principles received sufficiently high scores were completely removed from the focus, whereas for the remaining principles their focus was adjusted based on the specific sub-principles which were score the highest.

It should be noted here that in some cases SIGMA’s principles vary considerably in terms of specificity of the wording of the principles and sub-principles. Also, some principles combine very different issues, which has necessitated an approach which to an extent cut into the principles and took out some aspects while keeping others in the focus. One such example is Principle 11 in Chapter 2 – Policy Development and Coordination, which encompasses both external consultations (public consultations), which were evaluated as particularly important from WeBER’s perspective, and internal (intra-governmental) consultations, which the WeBER selection criteria did not capture as relevant. In such cases, the Methodology focuses only on the part of the principle assessed as relevant.

*Table 1: Example of Excel sheet with selection of sub-principles*

| Public Service and Human Resource Management   |                                      |                                      |                                      |                                       |                                      |                                      |                                      |                                       |                                      |         |        |  |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|--------|--|--|
| Timestamp  | 2016/07/26<br>5:47:55<br>PM<br>GMT+2 | 2016/07/27<br>3:00:27<br>PM<br>GMT+2 | 2016/07/28<br>6:04:26<br>PM<br>GMT+2 | 2016/07/29<br>12:00:27<br>AM<br>GMT+2 | 2016/07/29<br>1:56:06<br>PM<br>GMT+2 | 2016/07/29<br>4:23:19<br>PM<br>GMT+2 | 2016/08/01<br>5:27:40<br>PM<br>GMT+2 | 2016/08/02<br>11:09:18<br>AM<br>GMT+2 | 2016/08/06<br>3:34:20<br>PM<br>GMT+2 | average | median | Comment/note   | Proposed indicators for selected (sub) principles  |
| <b>Principle 4: Direct or indirect political influence on senior managerial positions in the public service is prevented.</b>  |                                      |                                      |                                      |                                       |                                      |                                      |                                      |                                       |                                      |         |        |  |  |
| 1. The category/class/level of senior managerial positions in the public service, at the interface of politics and administration, is included into the scope of public service (usually the positions of secretary-general of the ministry and director-general of the administrative body determine the upper dividing line between public servants and political appointees). | 2                                    | 5                                    | 1                                    | 2                                     | 4                                    | 2                                    | 5                                    | 5                                     | 5                                    | 3.44    | 4      | Highly relevant. We could calculate the layers of hierarchy over the top civil service positions in the administration and use that as indicator.                                | Number of layers of political hierarchy above the top level civil servants in ministries and in CoG institutions.  |
| 2. The criteria for recruiting persons to the senior managerial positions are clearly established and disclosed.   | 2                                    | 5                                    | 1                                    | 4                                     | 5                                    | 5                                    | 5                                    | 4                                     | 5                                    | 4.00    | 5      | Here we should "dig deeper". Our focus should be on the reality of the criteria, not formality. It will need to be a qualitative indicator.                                      | Extent to which criteria for recruitment to senior positions are clear, transparent and applied as stipulated by legislation. (3-5)  |
| 3. The recruitment and selection process to the senior managerial positions, either external or internal, is based on merit, equal opportunities and open competition.   | 4                                    | 5                                    | 1                                    | 4                                     | 5                                    | 5                                    | 5                                    | 5                                     | 5                                    | 4.33    | 5      | Merit and equal opportunities are important to monitor here.   | We could extend the above indicator to cover both SPs  |
| 4. The termination of employment of public servants holding senior managerial positions is only admissible in cases explicitly provided for, and under the procedural provisions established in, the law. These provisions are applied in practice.  | 4                                    | 5                                    | 1                                    | 4                                     | 5                                    | 2                                    | 4                                    | 4                                     | 5                                    | 3.78    | 4      | Highly relevant, too. This would be suitable for qualitative research, e.g. through focus groups with dismissed/former top managers in civil service. Could be biased, though... | Extent to which criteria for termination of employment on top public service management positions are explicitly and clearly enshrined in law and applied in practice (1-5). |

## II.4 Detailed Indicator Tables

Whereas this document provides the selection of the principles of PA which the WeBER project monitors and the formulations of indicators with the basic methodological approaches, the detailed information needed for the measurement of each indicator is provided in separate detailed indicator tables. Each detailed indicator table contains the formulation and focus of a specific indicator, as well as the following information for each of the indicator elements:

- Formulation
- Weigh
- Data Sources
- Detailed methodology
- Point allocation rules

The last part of the detailed indicator tables provides the information on how the total points for all elements are turned into the final indicator values which are expressed as whole numbers on the scale from 0 to 5 (in the same manner as is done in SIGMA assessment methodology, for comparability purposes).

Table 2. Structure of the detailed indicator table

| <b>INDICATOR no.</b>         | [wording of the specific indicator from the methodology]  |  |               |               |  |               |
|------------------------------|---|--|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|
| <b>Indicator focus</b>       | [short description of the exact focus of the indicator – what does it measure]                                    |  |               |               |  |               |
| <b>INDICATOR ELEMENTS</b>    |   |  |               |               |  |               |
| <b>Element #</b>             | <b>Element formulation</b>  | <b>Weight</b>                                    |               |               | <b>Element data source</b>   |               |
| <b>E.1</b>                   | [wording of the specific indicator element, from the methodology]   | [weight assigned to the element – numeric value] |               |               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list of data sources to be used for assessing the element]</li> <li>•</li> </ul> |               |
|                              | <b>Element methodology</b>  | <b>Point allocation</b>                          |               |               | [description of how points are allotted for the element]   |               |
|                              | [concise, but detailed description of how the element will be measured, including the specific research approach] |  |               |               |  |               |
| <b>Element #</b>             | <b>Element formulation</b>  | <b>Weight</b>                                    |               |               | <b>Element data source</b>   |               |
| <b>E.2</b>                   | [wording of the specific indicator element, from the methodology]   | [weight assigned to the element – numeric value] |               |               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[list of data sources to be used for assessing the element]</li> <li>•</li> </ul> |               |
|                              | <b>Element methodology</b>  | <b>Point allocation</b>                          |               |               | [description of how points are allotted for the element]   |               |
|                              | [concise, but detailed description of how the element will be measured, including the specific research approach] |  |               |               |  |               |
| <b>Element #</b>             | <b>Element formulation</b>  | <b>Weight</b>                                    |               |               | <b>Element data source</b>   |               |
| <b>Etc...</b>                |   |  |               |               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>  |               |
|                              | <b>Element methodology</b>  | <b>Point allocation</b>                          |               |               |  |               |
|                              |   |  |               |               |  |               |
| <b>TOTAL POINTS</b>          | [point range]   | [point range]                                    | [point range] | [point range] | [point range]  | [point range] |
| <b>FINAL INDICATOR VALUE</b> | <b>0</b>  | <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b>      | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>      |

### III. Process of Developing the Methodology

PAR Monitor Methodology development is a cornerstone activity for the entire WeBER project as it will represent the foundation for all activities of the regional WeBER Platform and its national and local extensions (see the WeBER Platform Concept Note). Therefore, the process of its development features an extensive consultations process with several iterations at the regional and national level respectively. Such participatory process is designed in a way to provide room for robust inputs of experts and facilitate intensive consultations between all key stakeholder groups. It also serves to create ownership over the monitoring process and results within the region, so that CSOs would gradually adopt this or similar approaches and intensify their work on PAR monitoring in accordance with the EU criteria for good administration.

The process was initiated at the internal workshop of the WeBER partners in Pristina in June 2016. The purpose of that workshop was to develop and agree on the selection criteria and test the agreed criteria on one of the areas of the Principles. The result of that workshop was a clear list of criteria (mentioned in the previous section) agreed by all WeBER partners, accompanied by a justification for their selection.

Following the internal workshop for the methodology development, the WeBER partners engaged in consultations with CSOs in each WB country which are most active in the PAR area to discuss the initial approaches undertaken in the development process. Moreover, the main idea behind these early consultation rounds at the national level is to start creating space for synergies and linkages early on with the already existing PAR related initiatives and projects in the civil society, and to ensure methodological complementarities and avoid overlapping with similar actions, in case such actions exist. Also, in this early round of consultations, first steps are taken for developing local ownership within the civil society over PAR Monitor and for generating motivation to participate in the implementation later on.

Following early consultation rounds, as well as evaluation of the Principles by the WeBER partners, as described in the previous section, the process is highly intensified with drafting of the PAR Monitor Methodology based on the conducted analysis (2-3 months of intensive drafting).

Regional-level round of consultations that follows, involve the WeBER Platform members of all WB countries with full-fledged draft methodology on the agenda. This round of consultation is organised within the same event for the WeBER Platform establishment, which is also the first meeting of the Platform (mid-November 2016 in Podgorica). It is preceded with national meetings with CSO's who are members of the Platform in each country respectively, to ensure that they are familiar with the draft document and ensuing process, before the Platform convenes for the first time. Following this round of consultations at the Platform meeting in Podgorica, draft PAR Monitor Methodology is subject to revisions that will be based on the received inputs.

For the final stage in consultation process, each WeBER partner organises a national round table for discussion with the wider circle of CSO's. Participation of those CSO's who are interested in joining the process and the PAR Monitor, but have not previously worked on PAR, is welcome at this stage as well. After the events, the WeBER experts and research team will perform necessary fine-tuning based on the inputs, and finalise the PAR Monitor Methodology. However, before finalising it, PAR Monitor will need to be checked and tested by research teams of all WeBER partners, to ensure consistency in approach and to maximise quality of measurement.

## IV. Limitations

As with every research project, the research-based PAR Monitor Methodology also has its limitations. The main limitation stems from the fact that – for reasons which were elaborated above – the Methodology does not cover the entire framework of principles, but adopts a selective approach based on the outlined criteria. In that sense, the Methodology does not attempt to enable the monitoring of all reform processes covered by the Principles of PA, but only those in which the interest and the added value of the civil society is the strongest in the pre-accession period.

Moreover, the principles which are targeted by the Methodology are not always covered in all of their facets, i.e. the Methodology does not approach them always in their entirety, but rather covers specific aspects which have been determined by the authors as the most relevant from the perspective of civil society monitoring. In all such cases, the specific WeBER approach is described in the respective fields of the tables on the pages laying out the Methodology.

Lastly, some of the principles are approached from a rather perception based point of view. This is mainly the case where SIGMA monitors a specific principle very thoroughly, so the most useful way to complement its approach was deemed to be by monitoring perceptions of certain key stakeholder groups (public servants, CSOs, etc.). This is a deliberate part of the WeBER approach and those indicators should be looked at as complementary to the assessments done by SIGMA for the same principles.

The timeframes for the monitoring of specific indicators are set within the detailed indicator tables which are based on this methodology document and set out the details of the methodological approaches and point allocation for each indicator. The monitoring work is initiated in the second half of the calendar year and proceeds into the first half of the following year, which will reflect on the timelines of specific indicators. Also, monitoring work will be implemented over a period of 9-10 months due to the size of the WeBER team, which makes it impossible to measure all indicators within a short period of time. These timeframe related limitations will be clearly stipulated with the provision of the results.

## V. Monitoring Methodology

### Area 1: Strategic Framework of PAR

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <p><b>Principle 1</b></p>   | <p><b>The Government has developed and enacted an effective public administration reform agenda which addresses key challenges</b></p>   |
| <p><i>Approach</i></p>      | <p>The indicator focuses on the existence and quality of the consultative process in the development of key strategic PAR documents.</p> <p>Key strategic PAR documents will be interpreted to mean:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overall PAR strategic document;</li> <li>2. PFM reform document;</li> <li>3. Service delivery reform document (if applicable);</li> <li>4. E-government reform document (if applicable);</li> <li>5. Regulatory reform document (if applicable), and</li> <li>6. HRM reform document (if applicable).</li> </ol> <p>Key strategic documents include official strategies/strategic plans (and their action plans), plans/programmes (and their action plans), and any other type of PAR planning document developed for a period of at least two years and that have been formally approved/adopted.</p> |
| <p><i>Indicator 1.1</i></p> | <p>Extent to which key strategic PAR documents are developed in a manner which ensures meaningful involvement and contribution of the public and especially the civil society.</p> <p>Elements outlined below are combined to create a scale of measurement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public consultations are conducted when the document(s) are developed</li> <li>2. Public consultations are conducted in an early phase of the development of the document(s)</li> <li>3. Invitations to the public and civil society to participate in the consultations are open</li> <li>4. Responsible government bodies are proactive in ensuring that a wide range of external stakeholders become involved in the process<sup>5</sup></li> </ol>  |

<sup>5</sup> In particular, diverse interests, such as gender/women organisations, disabled persons' organisations, minority rights groups, etc.

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
|                             | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The public and the most relevant stakeholders (civil society) are informed on the public consultation process in a manner that allows for timely preparation and meaningful contribution</li> <li>6. Comments and inputs received in the public consultation are considered by the responsible government bodies</li> <li>7. Responsible government bodies provide feedback on the treatment of received comments</li> <li>8. Justification is provided for the comments that are not accepted</li> <li>9. Responsible government bodies engage in open dialogue with civil society on contested questions</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i> | <p>Qualitative data collection and analysis:</p> <p>Official reports from public consultations;</p> <p>Websites and official data of responsible government bodies (institutions);</p> <p>Focus groups with CSOs;</p> <p>Interviews with relevant government institutions;</p>  |

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>Principle 2</b> | <b>Public administration reform is purposefully implemented; reform outcome targets are set and regularly monitored</b>  |
| <b>Principle 4</b> | <b>Public administration reform has robust and functioning management co-ordination structures at both the political and administrative levels to steer the reform design and implementation process</b>   |
| <i>Approach</i>    | <p>The focus of measurement for this indicator is on quality of PAR implementation, coordination and monitoring from the perspective of civil society engagement.</p> <p>Strategic PAR document whose coordination and monitoring structured will be monitored, and measured by this indicator, is the overall PAR strategic document. In case there is no overall PAR strategy, the most comprehensive strategic document that has been formally approved and has the duration of at least two years is considered.</p> |
| <i>Indicator</i>   | <p>The extent to which PAR monitoring and coordination structures allow for effective and meaningful involvement and contribution of the civil society.</p> <p>Elements given below are combined to create a scale of measurement.</p>   |

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
|                                    | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administrative structures for PAR coordination and monitoring foresee an involvement of CSOs</li> <li>2. Political level structures for PAR coordination foresee an involvement of CSOs</li> <li>3. Format of CSO involvement allows for substantive participation and contribution by CSOs</li> <li>4. Involvement of CSOs is achieved based on an open competitive process</li> <li>5. Meetings of structures which involve CSOs are held regularly</li> <li>6. The format of meetings allows for discussion, contribution and feedback from CSOs</li> <li>7. CSOs get consulted on the specific measures of PAR financing (both domestic funding and funding from external assistance)?</li> </ol> |
| <p><i>Research Methodology</i></p> | <p>Qualitative data collection and analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall strategic PAR document;</li> <li>Websites of PAR coordinator and reports from meetings;</li> <li>Analysis of official documents pertaining to the organisation and functioning of PAR coordination and monitoring structures;</li> <li>Focus groups with CSOs;</li> <li>Interviews with relevant government institutions.</li> </ul>  |

## V.2 Policy Development and Co-ordination

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>Principle 5</b>          | <b>Regular monitoring of the government’s performance enables public scrutiny and supports the government in achieving its objectives.</b>   |
| <i>Approach</i>             | The approach to the monitoring of this principle focuses on measuring the extent to which the information about Government performance is open and publicly available and the extent to which CSOs consider that the Government pursues and achieves its objectives. It includes two indicators which look at openness and availability of information on government performance as well as the perceptions in the civil society regarding the extent to which the government pursues and achieves its objectives.   |
| <i>Indicator 1</i>          | <p>Extent to which the information about performance of government is open and publicly available.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The government regularly publishes written information on its activities</li> <li>2. The information issued by the Government on its activities is written in an understandable way</li> <li>3. The information issued by the Government is sufficiently detailed, including both quantitative data and qualitative information and assessments</li> <li>4. The information issued by the Government includes also assessments of the achievement of concrete results, in addition to activities</li> <li>5. The information issued by the Government about its activities and results is available in open data format(s)</li> <li>6. Share of reports on government plans which are available online</li> <li>7. Share of reports on government strategies which are available online</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i> | <p>Expert analysis of relevant government websites and reports. The websites to be analysed include Government (Council of Ministers) website, General Secretariat of the Government (Prime Minister’s Office, Cabinet Office, etc.) or – where and if applicable – specialised portals/websites for Government communication with the public.</p> <p>The elements above will be weighed and the last point on open data will just be an extra point, to encourage open data policies.</p>   |

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
|                             | The measurement of the indicator will cover the last year and a half of reporting cycles (calendar years or otherwise), including the one in which the measurement is done (if reports are already available).   |
| <i>Indicator 2</i>          | <p>Extent to which CSOs consider that the Government pursues and achieves its objectives.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Government Programme and/or Work Plan are relevant for the actual developments/results/outcomes in specific policy areas</li> <li>2. The Government Programme and/or Work Plan are regularly and actively monitored and reported on</li> <li>3. Sector strategies in selected policy areas are relevant for the actual policy developments/results/outcomes</li> <li>4. Sector strategies in selected policy areas are regularly and actively monitored and reported on by the relevant Government institution(s)</li> <li>5. The Government integrates EU accession related plans into the central governmental and sectoral planning</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i> | Survey of CSOs in each country as the main data source for calculating the value of the indicator. To triangulate the data and for the purpose of the narrative report, focus groups with CSOs may be organised in each country (for elements 3-4, the focus will be on three selected policy areas and CSOs will be targeted to cover those policy areas). For elements 1-2 the focus will be on the central Government's Programme (mid-term or mandate-long) and the detailed Work Plan (usually annual).   |

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>Principle 6</b> | <b>Government decisions are prepared in a transparent manner and based on the administration's professional judgement; legal conformity of the decisions is ensured</b>   |
| <i>Approach</i>    | The aim of this indicator is to measure the extent to which the process of government decision-making as well as its direct outputs (decisions) are transparent, including the external communication function. Elements of transparency that are analysed include timeliness, clarity, coherence. The indicator combines expert review/analysis of relevant evidence with perceptions by citizens and CSOs, to establish a balanced judgment. Other aspects of the principle are not looked at, as they are either outside of the WeBER scope or analysed systematically by SIGMA. |
| <i>Indicator</i>   | <p>Extent to which Government's decision-making is transparent.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p>  |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Relevant to SEE 2020</i>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSOs consider government decision-making to be generally transparent</li> <li>2. CSOs consider the exceptions to the rules of publishing Government’s decisions to be reasonable and limited</li> <li>3. The Government communicates its decisions in a citizen-friendly manner</li> <li>4. The Government communicates its decisions in a timely manner</li> </ol>                         |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>  | <p>Survey of CSOs in each country as the main data source for calculating the value of the indicator. To triangulate the data and for the purpose of the narrative report, focus groups with CSOs may be organised in each country.</p> <p>To be cross-referenced with an expert analysis of the Government website and decision-making documents for a certain number of Government sessions (or over a certain period of time).</p> |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension O “Anti-corruption”, Key Strategy Measure O1. Transparent rules: move away from discretion to rule-based political and administrative decision making by conducting risk assessment actions and adopting public, simple and enduring rules.</p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Principle 10</b>                             | <b>The policy making and legal drafting process is evidence-based, and impact assessment is consistently used across ministries</b>  |
| <i>Approach</i>                                 | <p>In view of SIGMA’s comprehensive assessment of this principle, the WeBER approach to monitoring this principle will focus on how the policy research and advice accrued outside of the administration is used to support evidence based policymaking.</p>   |
| <i>Indicator</i><br><i>Relevant to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Extent to which evidence (the data collected and research) delivered by think tanks, independent institutes and other CSOs are consulted and examined in policy development.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ministries or other government institutions invite or commission CSOs, think tanks and/or institutes to prepare policy studies, papers or impact assessments for specific policy problems or proposals</li> <li>2. Representatives of relevant ministries participate in policy dialogue (discussions, round tables, closed door meetings, etc.) pertaining to specific policy research products</li> <li>3. Representatives of CSOs, think tanks and/or institutes are invited to participate in working groups/ task forces for drafting policy or</li> </ol> |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <p>legislative proposals when they have specific proposals and recommendations based on evidence</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Ministries provide feedback on the evidence based proposals and recommendations of the CSOs, think tanks and institutes which have been accepted or rejected, justifying either action</li> <li>5. Ministries take into considerations CSOs policy proposals</li> </ol>   |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>  | <p>Online anonymous surveys and focus groups with think tanks, other CSOs and research institutes. The research will be performed on a sample of policy areas in each country (3 policy areas in each country where a substantial number of CSOs/think tanks actively work and perform research and analyses), ensuring that policy areas where institutes and think tanks are active are picked.</p>  |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension N “Effective Public Services”, Key Strategy measure N.6: Set-up and operate regional benchmarking and certification system in SEE contributing to a business-friendly environment and evidence-based policies</p> <p>Dimension O “Anti-corruption”, Key Strategy measure O.4 Public Awareness: researchers, whistle-blowers, media and other agencies should be actively supported and their findings considered and given ample publicity.</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Principle 11</b>                             | <p><b>Policies and legislation are designed in an inclusive manner that enables the active participation of society and allows for co-ordination of different perspectives within the government</b></p>  |
| <i>Approach</i>                                 | <p>The approach to the monitoring of this principle entails a focus on external consultation processes and leaves out the internal (intra-governmental or cross-ministerial) coordination and consultation processes. The complex indicator combines a number of elements and a 5-point scale will be designed. The approach is fully perception-based, given that SIGMA already conducts an in-depth legal and expert assessment.</p>  |
| <i>Indicator</i><br><b>Relevant to SEE 2020</b> | <p>Extent to which CSOs confirm that consultation processes enable a meaningful and timely involvement/contribution of the public to the policy making process</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Formal procedures create space for effective public consultation</li> <li>2. Formal consultation procedures are applied consistently</li> <li>3. Opportunities for comment and involvement exist in the early phases of the policy process, to enable genuine dialogue and real effect on policy development</li> </ol> |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Consultees are provided with clear information on issues and questions at stake</li> <li>5. Public consultation procedures and mechanisms include prior notification to those likely to be affected by policy changes</li> <li>6. Public consultation procedures and mechanisms are consistently followed in the consultation processes</li> <li>7. Sponsoring ministries take actions to ensure that diversity of interests are represented in the consultation processes (women’s groups, minority rights groups, trade unions, employers’ associations, etc.)</li> <li>8. Ministries (sponsors of policy and legislative proposals) analyse and provide feedback on consultees' inputs/comments</li> <li>9. Ministries (sponsors of policy and legislative proposals) use/accept consultees' inputs/comments</li> <li>10. Ministries establish and maintain lists of CSOs interested and active in their policy area, and take proactive action to involve them in the consultation processes. Lists are sufficiently broad and include a diversity of interest groups</li> <li>11. Ministries (sponsors of policy and legislative proposals) proactively liaise and hold constructive discussions on how the consultees' views have shaped and influenced policy and final decision of Government</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>  | <p>For those elements that are already analysed by the monitoring matrix of the BCSDN, their evaluations/analyses will be used to inform the assessment, which will then be turned into a 5-point scale based on the detailed methodology for the indicator which will be developed.</p> <p>For the remaining elements (those not covered by the BCSDN), questions will be included in the surveys and focus groups with CSO representatives in a sample of municipalities.</p>  |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension N “Effective Public Services”, Key Strategy measure N.5 Upgrading policy and regulatory capacities</p>  |

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| <b>Principle 12</b> | <b>Legislation is consistent in structure, style, and language; legal drafting requirements are applied consistently across ministries; legislation is made publicly available</b>  |
| <i>Approach</i>     | The approach to monitoring this principle focuses on its last element, i.e. the question of whether legislation is made publicly available. In addition, it also looks at how available and user-friendly the various explanatory documents |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | linked to legislation are. I.e. accessibility is approached from the perspectives of ease of access and ease of understanding.   |
| <p><i>Indicator</i></p> <p><i>Relevant to SEE 2020</i></p> | <p>Extent to which citizens and CSOs consider legislation and related explanatory materials to be available and accessible</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Citizens and CSOs know where they can find and access legislation free of charge</li> <li>2. Citizens and CSOs are aware of existence of a register of legal texts</li> <li>3. Citizens and CSOs confirm that they have used/accessed the register of legal texts</li> <li>4. Citizens and CSOs know where they can find and access explanatory materials relevant to the legislation</li> <li>5. Citizens and CSOs consider the explanatory materials as easily accessible online</li> <li>6. Citizens and CSOs consider the explanatory materials to be easy to understand and written in a user-friendly manner</li> <li>7. Citizens and CSOs confirm that legislation and explanatory materials are available and accessible in all official languages.</li> </ol> |
| <p><i>Research Methodology</i></p>                         | <p>Survey of CSOs</p> <p>Focus groups with CSOs, to be organised regionally, in a few towns/municipalities within each country, so as to avoid only capital-based CSOs</p>   |
| <p><i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i></p>                        | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension O "Anti-corruption", Key Strategy Measure O1. Transparent rules: move away from discretion to rule-based political and administrative decision making by conducting risk assessment actions and adopting public, simple and enduring rules.</p>   |

## V.3 Public Service and Human Resource Management

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Principle 2</b></p>                                    | <p><b>The policy and legal frameworks for a professional and coherent public service are established and applied in practice; the institutional set-up enables consistent and effective human resource management practices across the public service</b></p>  |
| <p><i>Approach</i></p>                                       | <p>The monitoring approach for this principle is based on identified elements which SIGMA is not focusing on (sufficiently) in its monitoring and which is interesting in regards to the information about the scope and size of public service that the public can access. Similarly to SIGMA, WeBER also focuses on central administration in this principle (a separate local-level methodology has been prepared by WeBER for the purposes of the Small Grants Facility).</p>  |
| <p><i>Indicator 1</i></p>                                    | <p>Extent to which government regularly publishes reports about the public service, including up-to-date information on the number of employees in the public service</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Government regularly produces reports pertaining to the public service</li> <li>2. Such Government reports are available online and easily accessible</li> <li>3. Such Government reports promoted on social media and through other suitable channels (press releases, etc.)</li> <li>4. Such Government reports include up-to-date quantitative data, especially on the number of employees in the public service</li> <li>5. The data on the number of employees in the public service clearly distinguishes between professional public servants, general employees and contracted agents/temporary public servants</li> <li>6. Gender segregated data and data on ethnic balance in the public service is provided in the reports</li> <li>7. Such Government reports include qualitative data concerning the quality and outcomes of the public service work</li> </ol> |
| <p><i>Research Methodology</i></p>                           | <p>Document analysis of available information in reports, websites of institutions responsible for PAR and HRM</p> <p>Document analysis of responses to requests for free access for information</p>   |
| <p><i>Indicator 2</i></p> <p><b>Relevant to SEE 2020</b></p> | <p>Extent to which engagement to positions which effectively perform the work of public servants is performed outside of the public service merit-based regime.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p>   |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contract-based appointments and engagements of individuals (outside of the civil service regime – i.e. externally contracted), to perform expert and technical work characteristic for civil service positions are an exception.</li> <li>2. The externally contracted individuals are selected based on specific criteria (e.g. competences that are equal to those required for civil servants performing similar complexity of work).</li> <li>3. The engagement process for externally contracted individuals is open and transparent (public competitions are announced).</li> <li>4. Externally contracted appointments are limited in terms of their duration.</li> <li>5. The formal rules established for externally contracted appointments are observed in practice.</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>  | Qualitative research (interviews, desk research) about such engagements/appointments in the central state administration, to positions in which the jobs of public servants are effectively performed, combining some elements of quantitative analysis (to the extent available). Some questions can be integrated into the public service survey.  |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i> | Pillar 5 Governance for Growth<br>Dimension N “Effective Public Services”, Key Strategy Measure N.2 Professionalisation: introduce a procedure for continuous improvement of the competence of public officials; introduce the curricula that support meritocratic capacities of the administration  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Principle 3</b>                                | <b>The recruitment of public servants is based on merit and equal treatment in all its phases; the criteria for demotion and termination of public servants are explicit.</b>   |
| <i>Approach</i>                                   | The approach to the monitoring of this indicator is mainly based on looking at the perceptions of the general public, of the civil society and the public servants themselves pertaining to some of the key aspects covered by the principle and its subprinciples.   |
| <i>Indicator 1</i><br><b>Relevant to SEE 2020</b> | Extent to which public competitions for public service positions are open, transparent and incentivise external candidates to apply<br><br>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information about public competitions is made broadly publicly available (using at least 3 different means of advertising, including social media, available nation-wide)</li> </ol> |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Information about public competitions (announcements and other information) is written so as to incentivise external candidates and make the job positions clear and understandable to them</li> <li>3. During the public competition procedure, interested candidates can request clarifications and replies are made publicly available at a clearly designated online location</li> <li>4. There are no unreasonable barriers for external candidates which make the public competitions more easily accessible to internal candidates</li> <li>5. The application procedure is organised so as to minimise the administrative and paperwork burden on external candidates, especially in the first stage of application</li> <li>6. The application procedure allows candidates to supplement missing documentation within a reasonable timeframe (i.e. failure to submit all documents does not automatically mean disqualification from the procedure)</li> <li>7. Selection process is transparent and decisions/reasoning of the selection panels are made publicly available, with due respect to the protection of personal information</li> <li>8. Public servants perceive the public competition process as based on merit</li> <li>9. Public servants perceive the public competition process as based on equal opportunity</li> <li>10. The public perceives the public competition process as based on merit and equal opportunity</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Analysis of data on individual, selected public competition procedures, based on FOIA requests sent to relevant authorities</li> <li>■ Analysis of websites, publicly available data and reports</li> <li>■ Survey of public servants</li> <li>■ Public perception survey</li> </ul>   |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension N “Effective Public Services”, Key Strategy Measure N.2 Professionalisation: introduce a procedure for continuous improvement of the competence of public officials; introduce the curricula that support meritocratic capacities of the administration</p>  |
| <i>Indicator 2</i>           | <p>Extent to which the criteria for demotion and termination of employment of public servants ensure protection from undue political interference and are applied in practice</p>   |

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p><i>Relevant to SEE 2020</i></p>  | <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Procedures for demotion and termination are clear and explicit</li> <li>2. Procedures for demotion and termination do not leave room for undue political interference</li> <li>3. Percentage of appeals procedures against recruitment decisions which are upheld by the responsible authority</li> <li>4. Public servants perceive the criteria for demotion of employment of public servants to ensure protection from undue political interference</li> <li>5. Public servants perceive the criteria for termination of employment of public servants to ensure protection from undue political interference</li> <li>6. Public servants consider the criteria for demotion to be consistently and fairly applied in practice</li> <li>7. Public servants perceive the criteria for termination of employment of public servants to ensure protection from undue political interference</li> </ol> |
| <p><i>Research Methodology</i></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Analysis of SIGMA’s findings for elements 1-4</li> <li>■ Detailed analysis of the legislative procedures (primary and secondary legislation)</li> <li>■ Detailed analysis of specific (landmark) cases of demotion/termination of public servants, i.e. looking at the procedures, practice and outcomes of cases of appeals against recruitment decisions</li> <li>■ Survey of public servants</li> </ul>  |
| <p><i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i></p> | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension N “Effective Public Services”, Key Strategy Measure N.2 Professionalisation: introduce a procedure for continuous improvement of the competence of public officials; introduce the curricula that support meritocratic capacities of the administration</p>   |

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <p><b>Principle 4</b></p> | <p><b>Direct or indirect political influence on senior managerial positions in the public service is prevented.</b></p>  |
| <p><i>Approach</i></p>    | <p>Given that senior managers in the public service represent the interface or borderline between politics and professional public service, monitoring this principle was evaluated as particularly relevant by the WeBER partners. The approach to monitoring seeks – as elsewhere – to ensure complementarity with SIGMA’s approach. It therefore combines perceptions (by the public servants) with expert analysis and quantitative data analysis, to create a</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>more balanced overall approach. There is a total of 4 indicators for this principle.</p>   |
| <p><i>Indicator</i></p> <p><b>Relevant to SEE 2020</b></p> | <p>Extent to which the position of senior public servants is effectively protected from unwanted political interference.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Law prescribes competitive, merit-based procedures for the selection of senior managers in the public service</li> <li>2. The Law clearly and explicitly prescribes the duration of the mandate and legal bases for unilateral termination of a mandate of senior public servants by the minister or Government</li> <li>3. Renewal of the mandate of senior managers is regulated in a manner which prevents loopholes and undue political interference</li> <li>4. Acting senior managers can only be appointed from within the public service ranks and the duration of such appointments is clearly limited by the Law (also excluding renewals of acting statuses).</li> <li>5. Senior managers are obliged to undergo performance appraisal and attend professional development (training) programmes</li> <li>6. The average number of candidates that apply to the senior managerial positions per public announcement / call</li> <li>7. The average number of candidates which go through the entire selection process for the senior managerial positions</li> <li>8. Public servants consider the public competition procedures for senior public servants to ensure that the best candidates get the jobs</li> <li>9. CSOs perceive the public competition procedures to ensure that the best candidates get the jobs</li> <li>10. Governmental, political level commissions/bodies dealing with appointments do not interfere in the appointments of senior public servants</li> <li>11. Work of Governmental, political level commissions/bodies dealing with appointments is transparent</li> <li>12. Senior public servants consider that they can always reject an illegal order from a minister or another political appointee without consequences for his/her position</li> <li>13. Coalition agreements are publicly available and distribution of senior public service positions is not a subject of coalition agreements among the ruling political parties</li> <li>14. Public servants perceive the criteria for demotion and termination of employment of public servants holding senior managerial positions as ensuring protection from undue political interference</li> </ol> |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15. Public servants consider the criteria for demotion and termination of employment to be consistently and fairly applied in practice</li> <li>16. Public servants consider that distribution of senior public service positions is not subject to political agreements</li> <li>17. Ratio of competitively selected persons on senior managerial public service positions to the politically appointed individuals (including acting positions outside of public service scope)</li> <li>18. CSOs consider senior managerial public servants to be professionalised in practice</li> <li>19. Lower level (non-managerial) public servants consider senior managerial public servants to be professionalised in practice</li> <li>20. Occurrence of active political engagement of senior managerial public servants</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Analysis of reports from selection procedures (based on FOIA requests)</li> <li>■ Survey of public servants</li> <li>■ Analysis of the legislation and reports from selected public competitions/ selection processes</li> <li>■ Analysis of political (coalition or other) agreements</li> </ul>  |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension N “Effective Public Services”, Key Strategy Measure N.2 Professionalisation: introduce a procedure for continuous improvement of the competence of public officials; introduce the curricula that support meritocratic capacities of the administration</p>  |

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>Principle 5</b> | <b>The remuneration system of public servants is based on the job classification; it is fair and transparent.</b>  |
| <i>Approach</i>    | The approach to monitoring this principle picks up the question of transparency of the public servants’ salary/remuneration systems. It analyses transparency by looking at clarity and simplicity of the system (as a precondition for transparency), existence of clear legal boundaries to exceptions, its availability/accessibility to the public, but it also looks at how the existing discretionary powers of managers pertaining to remuneration are applied in practice. |
| <i>Indicator</i>   | <p>Extent to which salary/remuneration system for public servants (including discretionary supplements) is transparent, clear and accessible</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p>  |

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
|                             | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The public service salary/remuneration system is simply structured</li> <li>2. The public service salary/remuneration system foresees limited and clearly defined options for salary supplements (e.g. supplements for overtime work) additional to the basic salary</li> <li>3. All legislation (primary and secondary) related to the public service salary/remuneration system is available online, in consolidated versions (on the government website or website of the responsible ministry)</li> <li>4. Explanatory information and formal opinions about the public service salary/remuneration system are easily accessible/available to the public (esp. online)</li> <li>5. Discretionary supplements are limited by legislation and cannot comprise a major part of a public servant’s salary/remuneration</li> <li>6. Public servants consider the discretionary supplements to be used for their intended objective of stimulating and awarding performance, rather than for political or personal favouritism</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Analysis of SIGMA’s findings for elements 2 and 5</li> <li>■ Review and expert analysis of available legal documents, reports and other documents, focusing on transparency, as well as clarity of the salary system</li> <li>■ Survey of public servants</li> <li>■ Focus groups with former public servants</li> </ul>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Principle 7</b>                                | <b>Measures for promoting integrity, preventing corruption and ensuring discipline in the public service are in place</b>   |
| <i>Approach</i>                                   | The approach to monitoring this principle is based on looking at perceptions by public servants and CSOs related to the impartiality and effectiveness of the integrity measures and, without looking at the disciplinary measures at this stage.   |
| <i>Indicator 1</i><br><b>Relevant to SEE 2020</b> | <p>Extent to which the measures for promoting integrity and preventing corruption in the public service are effective and ensure impartiality</p> <p>Elements to be combined for scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Integrity and anti-corruption measures for the public service are in place (formally established across the administration)</li> <li>2. Integrity and anti-corruption measures for the public service are applied across the administration</li> </ol> |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Public servants consider the integrity and anti-corruption measures as effective (achieving their purpose and objectives)</li> <li>4. CSOs consider the integrity and anti-corruption measures as effective (achieving their purpose and objectives)</li> <li>5. Public servants consider that the integrity and anti-corruption measures ensure impartiality (protection against discrimination)</li> <li>6. CSOs consider that the integrity and anti-corruption measures ensure impartiality (protection against discrimination)</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>  | <p>Analysis of SIGMA's findings for the sub-indicators 1-4</p> <p>Survey of public servants</p> <p>Focus groups or interviews with former public servants</p> <p>Interviews with members of anti-corruption bodies</p> <p>Focus groups with CSOs dealing with the prevention of corruption</p>   |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension O "Anti-corruption", Key Strategy measure O.4 Public Awareness: researchers, whistle-blowers, media and other agencies should be actively supported and their findings considered and given ample publicity.</p>  |

## V.4 Accountability

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Principle 2</b></p>                                    | <p><b>The right to access public information is enacted in legislation and consistently applied in practice</b></p>  |
| <p><i>Approach</i></p>                                       | <p>The approach to monitoring this principle tackles both the reactive and proactive information by the government. For the former, the approach is embedded in the CSOs' experience with the enforcement of the legislation on access to public information, considering that the civil society is among the largest "consumers" of this right. The analysis of the proactive information is based on direct analysis of the websites of government institutions. Monitoring is done through 2 indicators.</p>  |
| <p><i>Indicator 1</i></p> <p><b>Relevant to SEE 2020</b></p> | <p>Extent to which CSOs consider the right to access public information to be sufficiently broadly legislated and consistently applied in practice.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSOs consider that the information recorded and documented by public authorities is sufficient for the proper application of the right to access public information<sup>6</sup></li> <li>2. CSOs consider exceptions to the presumption of public character of information to be adequately defined</li> <li>3. CSOs consider exceptions to the presumption of public character of information to be adequately applied</li> <li>4. CSOs confirm that information is provided in the requested format</li> <li>5. CSOs confirm that information is provided within prescribed deadlines</li> <li>6. CSOs confirm that information is provided free of charge</li> <li>7. CSOs confirm that the person requesting access is not asked to provide reasons for requests for public information;</li> <li>8. CSOs confirm that in practice the non-classified portions of otherwise classified materials are released;</li> <li>9. CSOs consider that when only portions of classified materials are released, it is not done to mislead the requesting person with only bits of information</li> </ol> |

<sup>6</sup> FOI requests can only be sent for information which already exists in some recorded format (written, audio, video, etc.). Hence, if certain information is not recorded, the right to access that information cannot be fulfilled. This element looks at whether the administration records the information to an extent which allows for this right to be fulfilled.

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>10. CSOs consider that the designated supervisory body<sup>7</sup> has, through its practice, set sufficiently high standards of the right to access public information</p> <p>11. CSOs consider the soft measures issued by the designated supervisory body to public authorities to be effective;</p> <p>12. CSOs consider that the supervisory authority's power to impose sanctions leads to sufficiently grave consequences for the responsible persons in the noncompliant authority</p>   |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>                 | <p>Online survey of CSOs</p> <p>Focus groups with CSOs and experience with obtaining requested information as part of the monitoring done in the project will be used to triangulate the information for the purpose of the narrative parts of the reports.</p>   |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i>                | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension O "Anti-corruption", Key Strategy measure O.1 Transparent rules: move away from discretion to rule-based political and administrative decision-making by conducting risk assessment actions and adopting public, simple and enduring rules</p>   |
| <i>Indicator 2<br/>Relevant to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Extent to which proactive informing of the public is fulfilled in practice by public authorities.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Websites of public authorities contain comprehensive, accurate, up to date and user-friendly information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ scope of work</li> <li>■ accountability (who they are responsible to)</li> <li>■ policy and legal acts and plans</li> <li>■ studies and analyses relevant to policies under competence, including regulatory impact assessments and policy papers</li> <li>■ public services</li> <li>■ annual reports</li> <li>■ budget</li> <li>■ detailed contact information (including e-mail addresses)</li> <li>■ organisational charts with names and positions of individuals</li> <li>■ ways in which they cooperate with civil society and other external stakeholders, including public consultation processes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

<sup>7</sup> By "designated supervisory body" is meant an institution set up by the FOIA to supervise the application of the law and issue recommendations and other measures pertaining to its application by public authorities.

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CSOs consider that the information by public authorities through their websites is sufficiently proactive</li> <li>- Public authorities proactively pursue open data policy.</li> </ul>   |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>  | <p>Desk analysis of the websites of a sample of seven public authorities (belonging to the public administration scope, combining 4 ministries and 3 agencies/offices, including centre of government institutions), with an analytical checklist for each of the elements listed in the indicator methodology. Each element would be evaluated based on the extent to which is complete, up-to-date, accessible and citizen friendly.</p> <p>The last two elements will be included in the online survey with CSOs.</p> |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension O "Anti-corruption", Key Strategy measure O.1 Transparent rules: move away from discretion to rule-based political and administrative decision-making by conducting risk assessment actions and adopting public, simple and enduring rules</p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Principle 3</b>                              | <b>Functioning mechanisms are in place to protect both the rights of the individual to good administration and the public interest</b>   |
| <i>Approach</i>                                 | The approach to monitoring this principle entails a strong focus on the experiences and perceptions of the CSOs that are active in this area and that have a track record in cooperating with the Ombudsman, improving the oversight function of the Parliaments, etc.   |
| <i>Indicator</i><br><b>Relevant to SEE 2020</b> | <p>Extent to which the mechanisms for protecting the right to good administration and the public interest are operational and effective</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSOs consider the independence of the Ombudsman institution to be ensured in practice;</li> <li>2. Government has created mechanisms for reporting and responding to the Ombudsman's recommendations;</li> <li>3. The Government implements the Ombudsman's recommendations as a rule;</li> <li>4. The Ombudsman involves a wide range of CSOs and consults them in its work;</li> <li>5. The Parliament involves a wide range of CSOs in its work (e.g. hearings on the Ombudsman's or SAI's reports)</li> </ol> |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The Government responds and takes corrective actions based on SAI's reports</li> <li>7. The Parliament discusses and makes recommendations to the Government based on SAI's reports</li> <li>8. CSOs perceive the administrative inspection (or another body of internal oversight) as an effective actor of internal oversight over state administration bodies</li> <li>9. CSOs perceive media as effective actors of independent external oversight over state administration bodies</li> <li>10. CSOs perceive courts as effective actors of independent external oversight over state administration bodies</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>  | <p>Online survey of CSOs</p> <p>FOI requests and analysis of the Parliament's reports from hearings; interviews with the Ombudsman institutions</p> <p>FOI request and analysis of the reports and internal structures (incl. job descriptions) in a sample of institutions</p> <p>FOI requests and analyses of any legal or other acts (government decisions, for example) which address the issue of Government's cooperation with the Ombudsman</p> <p>Reports of the ombudsman institutions</p> <p>Focus groups with CSOs active in the area of government accountability – for triangulation and inclusion in the narrative report only</p>                      |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension N "Effective Public Services", Key Strategy measure N.5 Upgrading policy and regulatory capacities</p>   |

## V.5 Service Delivery

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Principle 1</b>  | <b>Policy for citizen – oriented state administration is in place and applied</b>  |
| <i>Approach</i>   | Under this principle, WeBER monitoring focuses on two interrelated aspects: public perception regarding the citizen-oriented service delivery of their public administration, and the extent to which information on the price of administrative services is publicly available  |
| <i>Indicator 1</i><br><br><b>Relevant to<br/>SEE 2020</b> | <p>Extent to which citizens consider/think that state administration is citizen oriented in practice</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Citizens are aware of government administrative simplification initiatives and projects</li> <li>2. Citizens confirm that administrative simplification initiatives or projects have improved service delivery</li> <li>3. Citizens confirm that dealing with the administration has become easier</li> <li>4. Citizens confirm that time needed to obtain administrative services has decreased</li> <li>5. Citizens consider that administration is moving towards digital government</li> <li>6. Citizens are aware about the availability of e-services</li> <li>7. Citizens are knowledgeable about ways on how to use e-services</li> <li>8. Citizens use e-services</li> <li>9. Citizens consider e-services to be user-friendly</li> <li>10. Citizens confirm that the administration seeks feedback from them on how services can be improved</li> <li>11. Citizens confirm that the administration uses their feedback on how administrative services can be improved</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>                               | Perceptions will be explored using a survey targeting the general public (aged 18 and older). The public perception survey will employ a multi-stage probability sampling and will be administered in face-to-face interviews using a standardized questionnaire.  |
| <i>Relevance to<br/>SEE 2020</i>                          | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension N “Effective Public Services”, Key Strategy measure N3. E-governance: introduce as extensively as possible the use of faster and more</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | efficient electronic access to public Service, and N4. Improve quality of public services.   |
| <i>Indicator 2</i><br><i>Relevant to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Extent to which pricing of administrative services are clearly presented and publicly available</p> <p>The following transparency elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Individual institutions providing administrative services at the central level publish information on the price of services offered</li> <li>2. The information on the prices of administrative services differentiates between e-services and in-person services</li> <li>3. A central governmental body website publishes information about the price of administrative services</li> <li>4. Information about the price of administrative services is available in an open data format.</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>                       | <p>Expert review of a sample of 5 official websites to determine whether information on how much they charge for administrative services is provided.</p> <p>The standard is met if this information is available in no more than 3 clicks from the home page of the institution.</p>  |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i>                      | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension N "Effective Public Services", Key Strategy measure N3. E-governance: introduce as extensively as possible the use of faster and more efficient electronic access to public Service, and N4. Improve quality of public services.</p>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Principle 3</b>                              | <b>Mechanisms for ensuring the quality of public services are in place</b>  |
| <i>Approach</i>                                 | Under this principle, WeBER monitoring focuses on the perceptions and experiences of citizens with regard to how responsible the public authorities are in redesigning administrative services based on their feedback.   |
| <i>Indicator</i><br><i>Relevant to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Extent to which citizens and CSOs consider the quality of administrative services to depend on their satisfaction and feedback</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extent to which citizens are informed on feedback mechanisms</li> <li>2. Extent to which citizens perceive feedback mechanisms easy to use</li> <li>3. Extent to which citizens and CSOs are involved in monitoring and assessment of administrative services</li> </ol> |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Extent to which re-design occurs as a result of monitoring and assessment by citizens</li> <li>5. Extent to which performance data on administrative services is publicly available</li> </ol>  |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>  | Perceptions will be explored using a survey targeting the general public (aged 18 and older). The public perception survey will employ a multi-stage probability sampling and will be administered in face-to-face interviews using a standardized questionnaire.                       |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i> | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension N “Effective Public Services”, Key Strategy measure N3. E-governance: introduce as extensively as possible the use of faster and more efficient electronic access to public Service, and N4. Improve quality of public services.</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Principle 4</b>                                | <b>The accessibility of public services is ensured</b>  |
| <i>Approach</i>                                   | Under this principle, WeBER monitoring focuses on the perceptions and experiences of CSOs dealing with issues of access, especially for disabled persons and other vulnerable groups. It includes both the analysis of physical accessibility and online accessibility.   |
| <i>Indicator 1</i><br><b>Relevant to SEE 2020</b> | <p>Extent to which relevant CSOs confirm that public services are accessible to disabled persons, persons in remote areas and ethnic minority groups</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Relevant CSOs confirm adequacy of territorial network for access to administrative services</li> <li>2. Relevant CSOs confirm that one-stop-shops and points of single contact (PSCs) are made accessible to all</li> <li>3. Extent to which relevant CSO confirm that institutions which provide public services are physically accessible</li> <li>4. Relevant CSOs consider administrative services to be provided in a manner that meets the individual needs of persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups</li> <li>5. Relevant CSOs confirm that administrative service providers are trained to communicate with different categories of people with disabilities</li> <li>6. Relevant CSOs confirm that public administration provides different channels of choice for obtaining administrative services</li> <li>7. Relevant CSOs confirm that e-channels are available for persons with disabilities</li> </ol> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | 8. Relevant CSOs confirm that persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups use e-channels   |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>                       | Perceptions will be explored using a survey targeting CSOs with focus on disabled people, minority rights along with CSOs working in remote areas. The survey with CSOs will employ a convenience sampling and will use an online standardized self-administered questionnaire (SAQ). Triangulation using 3 FGDs with CSOs (1 with CSOs in the capital and 2 with CSOs outside the capital) will be employed to validate the quantitative findings and will be analysed accordingly in the narrative report. FGDs will use purposive sampling.   |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i>                      | Pillar 5 Governance for Growth<br>Dimension N “Effective Public Services”, Key Strategy measure N3. E-governance: introduce as extensively as possible the use of faster and more efficient electronic access to public Service, and N4. Improve quality of public services.   |
| <i>Indicator 2</i><br><i>Relevant to SEE 2020</i> | Extent to which websites of service providers offer clear and user-friendly information on provision of administrative services:<br>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Websites of administrative service providers include contact information</li> <li>2. Websites of administrative service providers include clear advice and guidance on accessing administrative services</li> <li>3. Websites of administrative service providers include information on the rights and obligations of users</li> </ol>  |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>                       | Expert review and web content analysis of a sample of websites of 5 individual service providers to determine whether information on the provision of administrative services is available and user-friendly, including contact information.<br>The standard is met if this information is available in no more than 3 clicks from the home page of the institution.<br>The following institutions will be analysed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Agency responsible for property registration/ issuing property certificates etc.</li> <li>■ Agency responsible for company (business) registration</li> <li>■ Agency responsible for vehicle registration</li> <li>■ Agency responsible for issuing passports/ID cards</li> <li>■ Agency responsible for tax administration</li> </ul> |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i>                      | Pillar 5 Governance for Growth<br>Dimension N “Effective Public Services”, Key Strategy measure N3. E-governance: introduce as extensively as possible the use of faster and more  |



|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | efficient electronic access to public Service, and N4. Improve quality of public services. |
|--|--|



## V.6 Public Financial Management

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Principle 5</b>                              | <b>Transparent budget reporting and scrutiny are ensured.</b>  |
| <i>Approach</i>                                 | The monitoring approach to this principle focuses on segments of transparency and accessibility of the budget documentation and data: ease of access to reports on budget realisation, and availability of budgetary information in the format that allows for easier understanding and scrutiny by external stakeholders (citizens, research organisations etc.).   |
| <i>Indicator</i><br><b>Relevant to SEE 2020</b> | Extent to which budgetary documents are transparent and accessible<br>Elements given below are combined to create a scale of measurement: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enacted annual budget is easily accessible online</li> <li>2. In-year monthly budget execution reports are easily accessible online</li> <li>3. Mid-year budget execution reports are easily accessible online</li> <li>4. Budget execution reports (in-year, mid-year, year-end) contain data on budget execution in terms of functional, programme, organization and economic classification</li> <li>5. Official reader-friendly presentation of the annual budget (Citizen Budget) is regularly produced and published online</li> <li>6. Annual data on budget (enacted budget and year-end report) is published in open data format</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>                     | Analysis of available documentation at the MoF website as well as bylaws regulating budget classification and financial reporting;   |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i>                    | Pillar 5 Governance for Growth<br>Dimension O "Anti-corruption", Key Strategy measure O.1 Transparent rules: move away from discretion to rule-based political and administrative decision-making by conducting risk assessment actions and adopting public, simple and enduring rules   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Principle 6</b></p> <p><b>Principle 8</b></p>        | <p>The operational framework for internal control defines responsibilities and powers, and its application by the budget organisations is consistent with the legislation governing public financial management and the public administration in general.</p> <p>The operational framework for internal audit reflects international standards, and its application by the budget organisations is consistent with the legislation governing public administration and public financial management in general.</p>  |
| <p><i>Approach</i></p>                                     | <p>The monitoring approach to this principle focuses on transparency of public internal financial control (PIFC) developments within public sector (including internal audit), as well as on the role of Parliaments' scrutiny of the PIFC system and its results.</p>  |
| <p><i>Indicator</i></p> <p><b>Relevant to SEE 2020</b></p> | <p>Extent to which the progress in PIFC is reported to the public and used by the Parliament.</p> <p>Elements given below are combined to create a scale of measurement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consolidated annual report on PIFC is regularly produced and published online</li> <li>2. Quality review reports/analysis of internal audit functioning within spending units are regularly produced by the CHU and published online</li> <li>3. Spending units regularly publish information related to internal control online</li> <li>4. CHU proactively engages with the public</li> <li>5. The Parliament regularly deliberates on/reviews the consolidated report on PIFC</li> </ol> |
| <p><i>Research Methodology</i></p>                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Review of official parliamentary documentation;</li> <li>■ Analysis of available documentation (websites of the Government, MoF and CHU);</li> <li>■ Analysis on a sample of spending units on the functioning of PIFC;</li> <li>■ Analysis of the consolidated reports on PIFC;</li> <li>■ Interviews with a sample of CHU representatives, as well as a sample of senior managers.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i></p>                        | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension N "Effective Public Services", Key Strategy measure N.5 Upgrading policy and regulatory capacities</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Principle 11</b>                             | <b>There is central institutional and administrative capacity to develop, implement and monitor procurement policy effectively and efficiently</b>   |
| <i>Approach</i>                                 | The monitoring approach to this principle is to measure the extent of satisfaction with transparency of the public procurement process, mainly in the way the public procurement portal is used.   |
| <i>Indicator</i><br><b>Relevant to SEE 2020</b> | Extent of satisfaction of users with the usability and comprehensiveness of the information on the public procurement e-portal.<br>Elements given below are combined to create a scale of measurement. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Users are satisfied with the comprehensiveness of the data published on the portal</li> <li>2. Users are satisfied with the accuracy of the data published on the portal</li> <li>3. Users are satisfied with the timeliness of the publishing of data on the portal</li> <li>4. Users are satisfied with the functionality of the portal</li> <li>5. Users are satisfied with the ease of use of the portal</li> </ol> |
| <i>Research Methodology</i>                     | Conducting a survey of the (sample of randomly selected or the most active) bidders on the usability of the portal on public procurement e-portal and its comprehensiveness.<br><br>The survey could be extended to journalists from economic sections and CSOs to include the civil society's take on the data availability.  |
| <i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i>                    | Pillar 5 Governance for Growth<br><br>Dimension O "Anti-corruption", Key Strategy measure O.2 Competitive procedures: make as mandatory as possible for all government procurement to be competitive with as few barriers to participation as possible (given the nature of the tender) by unifying standards.   |

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| <b>Principle 16</b> | <b>The supreme audit institution applies standards in a neutral and objective manner to ensure high-quality audits, which positively impact on the functioning of the public sector.</b>  |
| <i>Approach</i>     | The monitoring approach to this principle is to measure the extent to which SAIs' external communication allows for better information and engagement of all interested stakeholders outside of the parliament in monitoring government performance and accountability. |
| <i>Indicator</i>    | Extent to which SAIs communicate their work to the public and cooperate with external stakeholders.<br><br>Elements given below are combined to create a scale of measurement:  |

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p><i>Relevant to SEE 2020</i></p>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SAI develops a communication strategy for reaching out to the public (could be part of the wider development strategy, and similar).</li> <li>2. SAI has dedicated at least one job position for proactive communication and provision of feedback towards public.</li> <li>3. SAI utilises additional means of communication with public (such as social media, press conferences etc.).</li> <li>4. SAI produces reader-friendly summaries of audit reports.</li> <li>5. SAI utilises data visualization, and other user-friendly techniques, in presenting results of its work.</li> <li>6. SAI has developed channels for reporting on issues within its purview by external stakeholders (wider public, CSOs).</li> <li>7. SAI regularly consults CSOs and their work for the purpose of identifying risks in the public sector.</li> </ol> |
| <p><i>Research Methodology</i></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Analysis of SAI audit reports and annual reports;</li> <li>■ Analysis of SAI websites;</li> <li>■ Interviews with members of SAI councils/collegiate bodies and/or auditors;</li> <li>■ Interviews (or focus groups) with CSOs active in the areas of PFM and government accountability.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><i>Relevance to SEE 2020</i></p> | <p>Pillar 5 Governance for Growth</p> <p>Dimension O "Anti-corruption", Key Strategy measure O.3 Revision and control: introduce regular audits by independent agencies and require ex-ante and ex-post evaluations.</p>   |