# Principle 2

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.

## Principle approach

The monitoring approach for this principle is based on identified elements which SIGMA does not strongly focus on in its monitoring, pertaining 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.

## INDICATOR 1

**Public availability of official data and reports about the civil service and employees in central state administration**

This indicator measures the extent and the quality of the information produced and provided by the Government to the public, regarding the number of employees in the public service and its structure. The focus is on the central government public (civil) service, as defined by the relevant legislation (Civil Service Law) as well as other categories of employees in central state administration.

The measurement for this indicator is based on the review of government information, reports and other documents, which is searched for online and requested based on FOI requests, if not available online. The websites to be reviewed differ from one country to another and can range from a Ministry in charge of public administration to a central HRM agency or office (referred to as “relevant institutions”). To ensure comprehensiveness, the researchers also review websites of the governments and the general secretariats (government offices). Where necessary, FOI requests are sent to the responsible central governmental body for public service and HRM.

The timeline of measurement covers the last three years prior to the measurement, given that the indicator seeks to measure regularity of provision of the information in question, not only its existence.

If monitoring of the indicator takes place before the official deadlines for producing reports for the last reporting year and the last year’s report(s) are not yet available (in case there is no statutory deadline, this pertains to measurement in the first half of a calendar year), the previous three reporting periods are considered.
SIGMA’s methodology states that it performs expert review of regulations and reports produced by the civil service central co-ordination unit. On-site review of the central HR database/registry, with sample printouts as appropriate. Interviews with the staff of the civil service central co-ordination unit and with heads of HRM units. Availability of data is also verified through quality and timeliness of responses to SIGMA requests. Immediate availability will be checked for at least the following reports: division of public servants by categories and administrative bodies; annual turnover for the different staff categories/administrative bodies; and average total yearly salary for different staff categories.

**Area V.3: Public Service and Human Resource**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element #</th>
<th>Element formulation</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Element data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E.1       | The Government keeps reliable data pertaining to the public service | 2      | • Websites of relevant institutions  
• Government reports on the public service (if available)  
• FOI requests |

**Element methodology**

This element seeks to establish if data on public service is kept by the government and regularly updated, regardless of whether they are published or not. Existence of such data can be considered as the first precondition for obtaining it and making it available to the public.

As SIGMA performs a thorough on-site review of the official databases, the latest results provided by SIGMA are taken over for the purposes of this element. More specifically, the values of sub-indicator 7 of the indicator 3.2.1 - *Adequacy of the policy, legal framework and institutional set-up for professional human resource management in public service* – are taken.

In cases where SIGMA’s assessment was performed over a year before the WeBER monitoring, researchers seek to perform the same type of review of the database (sending the FOI request with the relevant questions first, followed by a request to conduct on-site reviews).

The specific elements that SIGMA checks for the databases and for which it awards points are:

1. Database(s) interoperate with other relevant systems (at least with the payroll system) (1 point).
2. Data is updated in real time (0.5 points).
3. Database(s) and data encompass all job positions and institutions required by the relevant regulations (1 point).
4. Database(s) and data allow quick reporting on all relevant HR areas (0.5 points).
5. Database includes at least the following information on public servants: name, date of birth, gender, current position, public service positions held, education, salary, bonuses and benefits, performance appraisal results.

**Point allocation**

0 if below 1.5 points on SIGMA sub-indicator  
1 if between 1.5 and 3 points on SIGMA sub-indicator  
2 if 3-4 on SIGMA sub-indicator

**Maximum points: 4**

---

1 SIGMA’s methodology states that it performs expert review of regulations and reports produced by the civil service central co-ordination unit. On-site review of the central HR database/registry, with sample printouts as appropriate. Interviews with the staff of the civil service central co-ordination unit and with heads of HRM units. Availability of data is also verified through quality and timeliness of responses to SIGMA requests. Immediate availability will be checked for at least the following reports: division of public servants by categories and administrative bodies; annual turnover for the different staff categories/administrative bodies; and average total yearly salary for different staff categories.
SIGMA’s methodology also states that when there is no central database, maximum points can still be awarded if datasets are standardised and the decentralised architecture provides the functionality described above (except for criterion 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element #</th>
<th>Element formulation</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Element data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>The Government regularly publishes basic official data pertaining to the public service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Websites of the central HRM institution and other relevant institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Element methodology**

This element determines whether the data from the database is published online. For this element, it is irrelevant if the data is published directly on the website or as part of a separate document or a report.

Basic official data means:

1. Number of public (civil) servants per type of institution or per institution of the central state administration;
2. Number of public servants according to the basic ranks/functions of the public service.

Regular publishing is understood to mean at least one update annually, for the last three years preceding the measurement.

**Point allocation**

0 if no data is published, if incomplete data is published

1 if data is published, but not fully regularly, i.e. if there were one or two annual updates in the last three years preceding the measurement; in case there was only one annual update, a point is allocated only if it was in the last year preceding the measurement (i.e. there is evidence that it is a newly established practice)

2 if basic official data is published regularly, as described in the methodology

*Maximum points: 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element #</th>
<th>Element formulation</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Element data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.3</td>
<td>Published official data includes data on employees other than full-time civil servants in the central state administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Websites of the central HRM institution and other relevant institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Element methodology**

This element establishes if the published official data includes other categories of employees in central state administration, in addition to full-time civil servants. These categories can include: general state employees (ancillary employees), civil servants on fix-term contracts, staff hired on contracts outside of the scope of civil service law (contracted staff).

**Point allocation**

0 if there is no data on employees other than full-time civil servants

1 if there is data on general state employees and/or temporary staff, but not other contracted staff
Researchers first review the legislation to establish the categories of employment within the civil service regime and the types of contracts on which staff can be hired outside of the civil service legislation.

The published official data is then analysed against the established categories of employment.

Staff (experts) engaged on technical assistance projects (IPA, Twinnings, etc) who do not have contracts with the administration/government are not covered by this element.

For the purpose of this element, official data for the last calendar year is observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element #</th>
<th>Element formulation</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Element data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.4</td>
<td>Published official data on public service is segregated based on gender and ethnic structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Websites of the central HRM institution and other relevant institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element methodology</th>
<th>Point allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This element looks at the structure of the data in terms of gender and ethnic structure (the latter – where applicable).

Researchers perform content review of the data published by the Government, to determine if it is segregated according to gender. Where ethnic balance is a requirement (BiH, Macedonia and Kosovo), countries receive points only if both grounds are covered.

For maximum point allocation, researchers determine if gender and, where applicable, ethnic data is fully segregated i.e. for all categories of public service (ranks or positions). If data published provides just cumulative figures e.g. data on number of men and women per institution or type of institution, it will be considered as partial data segregation.

For the purpose of this element, official data for the last calendar year is observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element #</th>
<th>Element formulation</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Element data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.5</td>
<td>Published official data is available in open data format(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Websites of the central HRM institution and other relevant institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Area V.3: Public Service and Human Resource

#### Element methodology

This element seeks to verify if the official data that the government publishes is available in open (machine readable) format(s).

Publishing in open format means that official data is:

- Downloadable by different users;
- Free of charge;
- Published in a format which renders this data machine-readable (CSV, XLS, XML, JSON, RDF, TXT etc.).

For the purpose of this element, official data for the last calendar year is observed.

#### Point allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 if data is not available in open data format(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 if data is available in open data format(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximum points: 1**

### Element 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element #</th>
<th>Element formulation</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Element data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E.6       | The government comprehensively reports on the public service policy | 2      | • FOI requests  
• Websites of the central HRM institution and other relevant institutions |

#### Element methodology

This element seeks to establish if comprehensive reports pertaining public service are produced and published. Such reports can be issue-specific, within the public service policy (such as recruitment reports, training reports, performance appraisal reports, disciplinary sanctions reports, etc.) or they can be made as a single, comprehensive report.

Comprehensiveness is understood to mean existence of one report which covers key issues or several separate reports on the following key issues:

1. planning and recruitments, 2. appraisals, 3. career development (promotions and demotions), 4. trainings (professional development programmes), 5. salaries/wages, 6. disciplinary procedures and decisions and 7. corruption/integrity issues and measures.

Researchers first perform a review of websites of relevant Government institutions to determine if reports are available. If not available, they send FOI requests, in order to establish if such reports are even produced – as this information is necessary for the narrative report.

Points are only awarded in cases when reports are published on websites and pages where an interested party could reasonably expect to find such information (researchers will collaborate and agree on a common approach in all borderline cases, e.g. where reports are

#### Point allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 if no reports are produced OR if they cover fewer than 3 key issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 if reporting is moderately comprehensive, i.e. 3-4 issues are covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 if reporting is highly comprehensive, i.e. covers at least 5 out of 7 key issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximum points: 4**
found, but are hidden on pages that are not easily accessible or where a reader would not be likely to look for them).

For the purpose of this element, only the last available reporting period is observed (i.e. last calendar year’s report if the measurement is performed in the second half of the year).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element #</th>
<th>Element formulation</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Element data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E.7       | The government regularly reports on the public service policy | 1      | • FOI requests  
• Websites of the central HRM institution and other relevant institutions |

**Element methodology**

This element seeks to establish if reports pertaining public service are produced and published regularly. As with the previous element, such reports can be issue-specific, within the public service policy (such as recruitment reports, training reports, performance appraisal reports, disciplinary sanctions reports, etc.) or they can be made as a single, comprehensive report.

Regularity is understood to mean at least one reporting cycle annually, looking at the period of last three reporting cycles. This element is only assessed if in the assessment of the previous element it is determined that reports are published for the last year. Either a single comprehensive report or individual reports covering at least three of the seven key issues need to be identified to award points within this indicator.

The researchers first perform a review of websites of relevant Government institutions to determine if reports for the last three years are available. If not available, they send FOI requests, in order to establish if such reports are even produced – as this information is necessary for the narrative report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element #</th>
<th>Element formulation</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Element data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.8</td>
<td>Reports on the public service include substantiated information concerning the quality and/or outcomes of the public service work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Government reports on the public service (if available)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Element methodology**

Content review of the reports on the public service by researchers to determine if in addition to the quantitative numbers they contain assessment of the overall state of play and quality of work of the public service, assessments whether the public service has

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element methodology</th>
<th>Point allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 if no reports are published or if they do not include information on quality and outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximum points: 2**
become more or less professionalised, depoliticised, as well as whether capacity has improved or not.

For this element, only the last year’s report (last reporting cycle) is analysed. If no report is available for that period, the score is 0. Either one comprehensive report or individual reports covering at least three key issues (listed in E.6) need to be available online for this element to be scored.

1 if reports include only general statements on quality and outcomes (either one comprehensive report or individual reports covering at least three key issues); also, any combination of required information present in some reports but not all of them can generate a score of 1.

2 if all available reports include substantial information on quality and outcomes substantiated with data and/or findings from independent sources (either one comprehensive report for each year or individual reports covering at least three key issues).

Maximum points: 2

### Element #

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element #</th>
<th>Element formulation</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Element data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E.9       | Data and information about the public service are actively promoted to the public | 1      | • Online media portals and websites  
                      • Social media accounts |

### Element methodology

This element measures the extent to which the relevant Government institutions are proactive in informing the public about the state of the public service through their regular reporting.

Researchers perform review of websites, social media channels of relevant Government institutions, as well as online media search, to determine if any official data that is published online and/or any data from the report(s) have been promoted additionally in the last calendar year. Hence, in this element the focus is not on regularity and points are awarded if such promotion has happened in the last calendar year (the year in which monitoring is done – where it is done in the second half of the calendar year; otherwise, the preceding reporting year is observed).

0 if data is not promoted

1 if published official data or data from report(s) are promoted through either press releases, press conferences, media statements or through social media (at least one of the aforementioned channels)

2 if published official data or data from report(s) are promoted through two or more of the aforementioned channels

Maximum points: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL POINTS</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-9</th>
<th>10-13</th>
<th>14-17</th>
<th>18-21</th>
<th>22-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINAL INDICATOR VALUE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>