WeBER Indicator Summary

AREA: PUBLIC SERVICE AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

SERBIA

- **Author: European Policy Centre - CEP**
- **Date:** 28.12.2016.

PAR Area	**PUBLIC SERVICE AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**	**Country**	**SERBIA**
SIGMA 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		

WeBER Indicator	**PSHRM_P2_I1: Public availability of official data and reports about the civil service and employees in central state administration**

Indicator approach

This indicator measures the extent and the quality of the information that the government produces and provides to the public related to the state of public service in general, and statistical data on employees in public service.[1] It is done through the review of government information, reports and other documents available online (or accessed through FOI request if not available online). Websites reviewed include an authority in charge of public administration or a central HRM agency or office, depending on each country case, but also review of websites of the governments and the general secretariats (government offices). The indicator consists of 9 elements (sub-indicators) focusing on publishing of official data on number of employees online and its structure, as well as existence and regularity of reporting practices on the state of public service. Only for the first element, the score of the relevant SIGMA sub-indicator is taken.[2] For elements seeking to measure regularity of information provision to the public, the timeline covers the last three years prior to the measurement.

Summary of the findings

According to SIGMA's 2017 monitoring report, the database on human resources in central state administration (Central Personnel Registry – CPR) is not regularly updated nor connected to other relevant databases. Moreover, SIGMA states that the HRM Service (HRMS) does not have the authority to ensure its accuracy.

Analysis of relevant websites shows that no data on the number and structure of the civil service was published online in the period 2015-2017. Response to FOI request shows that data on full time civil servants and general state employees in central administration is stored within CPR, including total number of employees, divided per professional civil servants and full-time employees, functions and ranks, whereas data on employees other than full time civil servants is not (except for trainees). Moreover, based on same response, it is ascertained that CPR keeps gender segregated data – for the total number of employees, and for certain managerial positions. Nevertheless, as data from CPR is not made available online, it could not be further analysed, and no points were awarded for data on number of employees.

When it comes to reporting on the public service in Serbia, some issue-specific reports are regularly produced and published at the HRMS website. Analysis has shown that these reports cover three key issues for public service: professional development and training, disciplinary procedures, and integrity/anti-corruption. HRMS regularly reports on training programme implementation, but also on training evaluations, and training needs assessment. High Civil Service Council reports on the other two key issues, through the reports on adherence to Code of Conduct for civil servants which sets integrity standards (yet, available only for 2015 and 2016). It should be noted, though, that the latter two issues are reported only from the perspective of the Code of Conduct, and not in a holistic manner. Thus, publicly available reporting on public service policy is assessed as moderately comprehensive and irregular. Content wise, reports on these key issues unevenly provide information on the quality and outcomes for public service, with mainly general qualitative statements and, in some cases, relevant statistics. Finally, no data or the issue-specific reports were actively promoted to the public in 2017.

Specific observations

None.

Indicator score	*4 (out of 25 points)*
Final indicator value	*0 (scale 0-5) [3]*
Measurement period	*November 20th – December 6th, 2017*

---

[1] 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.

[2] 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.

[3] Conversion of points: 0-5 points = 0; 6-9 points = 1; 10-13 points = 2; 14-17 points =3; 18-21 points = 4; 22-25 points = 5.