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**SIGMA Principle**

5. Regular monitoring of the government’s performance enables public scrutiny and supports the government in achieving its objectives.

---

**WeBER Indicator**

**PDC_PS_I1: Public availability of information on Government performance**

**Indicator approach**

This indicator focuses on the extent of openness and availability of information about the government’s performance to the public. It consists of 7 elements (sub-indicators), which assess relevant government websites and the reports published on these websites. Researchers provide expert opinion on whether the information provision is regular, whether it includes assessment of government performance and gender segregated data, whether the information is understandable, sufficiently detailed, and available in an open data format. The share of reports on government strategies and plans which are available online is also included. Only the most comprehensive pages through which the government communicates its activities are considered for point allocation. For the element on share of reports, only central planning documents for the whole of Government are taken into account, and websites of relevant centre of government institutions analysed.

**Summary of the findings**

Written information on activities of the Government is not regularly published. Whereas the Government of Serbia publishes weekly press releases on its website (mostly through the Press Releases section), annual reports on performance are not regularly published online, although annual reporting obligation is stipulated by the Rules of Procedure - RoP (last two consecutive years were observed – reports for 2015 and 2016). Annual reports on the Government Annual Work Plan (GAWP) were published online in the past years (for 2013 and 2014), but they were only made available on the Parliament’s website, and for 2016 on the website of Ministry of Finance. Likewise, despite the requirements in RoP for reporting on the Action Plan for Implementation of the Government Programme (APIGP), these reports are not available online. In that regard, only the Government press releases were assessed in terms of how understandable they are to the citizens, and there is a trend of publishing them in a citizen friendly way.\(^1\) Furthermore, due to the lack of practice of online report publishing, assessment of depth and quality of information in annual reporting on the Government’s performance did not result in any points allocated either. In other words, the level of detail of information, type of data and its properties, could not be assessed for the period observed. Basic content analysis of the earlier annual reports on the GAWP (done purely for the purposes of narrative analysis) shows that these reports are based on a compilation of activities of individual central administration bodies with no references to the achievements of the Government as a whole. Lastly, the share of reports available online for central planning documents is below fifty percent, as only two reports for 2016 are available for whole-of-government planning documents (out of five such documents), i.e. for the Economic Reform Programme (ERP) and the Fiscal Strategy. No reports are available for GAWP, NPAA and APIGP.

**Specific observations**

None.

---

**Indicator score**

0 (out of 20 points)

**Final indicator value**

0 (scale 0-5)\(^2\)

**Measurement period**

October 11\(^{th}\) – 17\(^{th}\), 2017

---

\(^1\) Yet, overall, as the availability of press releases and reports is assessed cumulatively in the first two elements, they did not score any points.  
\(^2\) Conversion of points: 0-4 points = 0; 5-8 points = 1; 9-11 points = 2; 12-14 points = 3; 15-17 points = 4; 18-20 points = 5.