



# ■ WeBER Indicator Summary

AREA: POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATION

## ALBANIA

- Author: Institute for Democracy and Mediation - IDM
- Date: 22.06.18

|                        |   |                |                |
|------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|
| <b>PAR Area</b>        | <b>POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATION</b>  | <b>Country</b> | <b>ALBANIA</b> |
| <b>SIGMA Principle</b> | <b>10. The policy-making and legal-drafting process is evidence-based, and impact assessment is consistently used across ministries</b> |                |                |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>WeBER Indicator</b>   | <b>PDC_P10_I1: Use of evidence created by think tanks, independent institutes and other CSOs in policy development</b> |
| <b>Indicator approach</b>  |  |
| <p>This indicator focuses on the extent to which government institutions invite CSOs to prepare evidence-based policy documents and the extent to which evidence produced by them (the data collected and research) is consulted and used in policy development process. Measurement of elements of this indicator combines expert analysis of relevant government documents and an online perception survey of CSOs.</p> <p>The indicator covers a wide range of CSOs working at policy level, such as think tanks, independent institutes, as well as locally-based organisations which declare themselves as working on the policy level.</p> <p>In addition, to complement survey results with narrative, qualitative inputs, focus groups with CSOs with relevant expertise are conducted based on same questions, on a sample of 3 policy areas in each country where a substantial number of CSOs actively work and perform research and analyses. However, only survey results are used for point allocation for those elements.</p>   |  |
| <b>Summary of the findings</b>   |  |
| <p>Evidence-based findings produced by CSOs can be considered to be regularly referenced in the sample of adopted government strategies, as 69% (9 out of 13) of examined strategies contain reference to CSO findings. Regarding ex-ante impact assessments and ex-post analyses, for the examined policy areas*, they were either not publicly available or not being produced.**</p> <p>Regarding CSOs perceptions on evidence-based policy-making, 39.6% of surveyed CSOs that produce inputs for the decision-making processes at the central level "agree" (33.3%) or "strongly agree" (6.3%) that government institutions invite them to prepare or submit policy papers, studies or impact assessments when addressing policy problems. In the same proportion, 39.6% state that either "often" (29.2%) or "always" (10.4%) representatives of relevant government institutions participate in the events organized to promote their policy products.</p> <p>Regarding civil society participation in working groups for drafting policy/legislative proposals, some 27.1% report that relevant ministries "often" (20.8%) or "always" (6.3%) invite them to participate. While 37.5% report this to happen either rarely or never. Furthermore, during the participation in working groups, only 12.5% of surveyed CSOs state that relevant ministries often provide feedback on their inputs. 29.2% state that this happens sometimes, whilst 45.8% rarely or never. On the other hand, 20.9% of state that either "often" (18.8%) or "always" (2.1%) relevant ministries consider the policy proposals made by their organisation. The majority or 45.9% states that this happens "rarely" (41.7%) or "never" (4.2%).</p> |  |
| <b>Specific observations</b>   |  |
| <p>*Policy areas for Albania included anti-discrimination, social protection and anti-corruption.</p> <p>**FOI requests did not return an official response.</p> <p>For Albania, a total of 93 CSOs were surveyed. The data collection method included a self-administered questionnaire (web SAQ). The base for the elements in this indicator was n=48 respondents. Only CSOs that confirmed that they produce proposals, recommendations or other inputs for the decision-making processes at the central/national level were asked the above-mentioned series of questions.</p>  |  |
| <b>Indicator score</b>   | 6 (out of 24 points)   |
| <b>Final indicator value</b>   | 1 (scale 0-5) <sup>1</sup>   |

<sup>1</sup> Conversion of points: 0-5 points = 0; 6-8 points = 1; 9-12 points = 2; 13-16 points = 3; 17-19 points = 4; 20-24 points = 5.

**Measurement period**

*May – June 2018*

*Survey of CSOs: April 23<sup>rd</sup> – May 28<sup>th</sup> 2018*