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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.

**WeBER Indicator**

**PFM_P16_I1: Supreme Audit Institution’s communication and cooperation with the public pertaining to its work**

**Indicator approach**

The indicator considers following elements of external communication and cooperation of SAIs: existence of strategic approach, allocation of job positions, and means of communication used, citizen-friendliness, use of data visualisation, existence of channels for reporting on issues identified by external stakeholders, and consultations with civil society.

Combination of expert analysis, analysis of websites, and interviews is used for measuring elements of this indicator. Researchers perform interview(s) with selected SAI staff to collect additional information (one or more interview depending on information gathered in each country) and collect documents not available online.

**Summary of the findings**

The SAI develops a communication strategy for reaching out to the public. The State Audit Office (SAO) has developed Strategic plan for 2018-2022, which has five strategic goals, the last one being for "Promotion of the communication system and exchange of information with domestic and international legal entities and informing the public on the work of the SAO". It has a defined goal with a set of activities that are clearly stated.

In terms of proactive communication and provision of feedback, there's a section "on the SAO" with the subsection "Employees" on the main page and it acts as a systematisation of employees. However, there is no mention at all for a position specifically designed for communication with the public. Only in the "Development strategy of the State Audit Office" is it stated that a person is appointed for public relations, although that person can't be found on the website.

In terms of having a varied means of communication, only one press-conference regarding the last Annual Report (2017) is held. SAO don't have any kind of social network account (Facebook, Twitter or LinkedIn). They do release announcements on some activities regarding their work, but it is not properly communicated with the public. This may be because they are responsible only to the Parliament, so they don’t feel the need to communicate with the public. In terms of communicating with the SAO, there are two channels - - the first channel is for asking Questions and the second one is for giving Suggestions to the SAO. They can be found right under the channel for FOI. Test messages were sent, with no response.

The Annual Report for 2017 is citizen friendly, written in a fine manner with shortened and concise explanation of the findings and conclusions, free from the highly technical language, however no separate reports are published on their website, and in the annual report it is stated how many audits they have conducted and published. Lastly, there is no evidence that any kind of joint event/consultation was held between SAI and CSOs within the two calendar years prior to the measurement period.

**Specific observations**

None.

**Indicator score**

1 (out of 18 points)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Final indicator value</strong></th>
<th>0 (scale 0-5)¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement period</strong></td>
<td>28 June 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Conversion of points: 0-3 points = 0; 4-5 points = 1; 6-7 points = 2; 8-11 points = 3; 12-15 points = 4; 16-18 points = 5.