



■ WeBER Indicator Summary

AREA: Strategic Framework of PAR

SERBIA

- Author: European Policy Centre – CEP
- Date: 14 June 2018

PAR Area	STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK OF PAR	Country	SERBIA
SIGMA Principle	1. The government has developed and enacted an effective public administration reform agenda that addresses key challenges		

WeBER Indicator	SFPAR_P1_I1: Use of participatory approaches in the development of key strategic PAR documents.
Indicator approach	
<p>The indicator focuses on the existence and quality of the consultative process in the development of key strategic PAR documents. Key strategic documents include official strategies/strategic plans (and their action plans), plans/programmes (and their action plans), and any other type of PAR planning document developed for a period of at least two years, formally approved/adopted by the Government or parliament. For all elements under this indicator the incumbent documents are analysed (previous documents or previous versions of documents are not considered).</p> <p>Key strategic PAR documents monitored in Serbia include: 1) PAR Strategy 2014 (including Action plan for 2018-2020), 2) PFM Reform Programme 16-20, 3) E-government Development Strategy 15-18, and 4) Strategy for Regulatory Reform and Improvement of Policy Management System.</p> <p>For all elements under this indicator, focus groups with representatives of CSOs who participated in the consultation process were conducted to gain first-hand qualitative data. Focus groups included representatives of not less than 6 different CSOs that regularly follow the PAR policy.</p>	
Summary of the findings	
<p>Out of the four examined documents, the Government consulted CSOs during the drafting of PAR Action Plan 2018-2020, the E-government Development Strategy and the Regulatory Reform Strategy. There were no consultations during the development of the PFM Reform Programme, but the Government only presented the draft through the National Convention on the EU. In the case of PAR Action Plan 2018-2020 and the E-government Development Strategy, CSOs had the chance to participate in early drafting, since working groups tasked to draft these documents included members from civil society. For the E-gov Strategy, however, the consultations did not fulfil all the examined criteria, i.e. webpage of the responsible institution (the Office for IT and E-government, including the archive of the former E-government directorate) does not contain a public call or a proactive invitation to CSOs.</p> <p>Nevertheless, invitations to CSOs to participate in the consultations for the PAR Action Plan, the Regulatory Reform Strategy and the E-government Development Strategy were open, with civil society being provided with complete information to prepare for the consultations. Only for E-government Strategy and the Regulatory Reform Strategy there exist written reports on the consultations, providing feedback to the participants. The report on the comments received on the Regulatory Reform Strategy was publicly available, but it was partial in content (e.g. senders were not clearly indicated). A focus group with CSO representatives revealed a general dissatisfaction with the feedback mechanisms. On the other side, in the case of the PAR action plan, the responsible institution (Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government) showed the commitment to deal with the contested questions through a dialogue with CSOs.</p> <p>Besides CSOs, consultations were also open for the public, except for the PFM Reform Programme, although the consultations for the E-government Strategy were not advertised through the responsible body's web page. Finally, there was no proactivity on the part of responsible government bodies to ensure that a wide range of external stakeholders (such as trade unions, business associations, gender-oriented CSOs or those dealing with the people with disabilities) become involved in the process.</p>	
Specific observations	
<p>E-government Directorate, the agency subordinated to the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government, was the original designated authority for drafting the E-government Development Strategy. After the formation of the new Government in 2017, the Directorate ceased to exist, and the Government Office for Information Technologies and E-Government was established assuming part of the competences once belonging to the Directorate. For these reasons, pieces of data and information could be lost (confirmed in the field research) with potential influence on the scores for this Strategy.</p>	

Indicator score	<i>11 (out of 30 points)</i>
Final indicator value	<i>2 (scale 0-5)¹</i>
Measurement period	<i>May-June 2018</i>

¹ Conversion of points: 0-5 points = 0; 6-10 points = 1; 11-15 points = 2; 16-20 points = 3; 21-25 points = 4; 26-30 points = 5.