

# ■ PAR Monitor Methodology

FINAL DRAFT

**Author: WeBER Research Team**

**Date: June 2020**

# I. Context and Rationale

## I.1 WeBER as the Background

The Public Administration Reform (PAR) Monitor Methodology has been developed as part of the Western Balkans Enabling Project for Civil Society Monitoring of Public Administration Reform – WeBER – a project implemented by the Think for Europe Network (TEN), gathering think tanks from six WB countries focusing strongly on the EU accession process and good governance in the region. As such, WeBER has adopted a markedly evidence based approach in its endeavour to *increase the relevance, participation and capacity of civil society organisations and media in the Western Balkans to advocate for and influence the design and implementation of public administration reform.*

## I.2 Role and Approach to PAR in EU Accession Context

The PAR Monitor methodology is one of the main project results, which seeks to facilitate civil society monitoring of PAR based on evidence and analysis. In line with the TEN's and WeBER's focus on the region's EU accession process, the monitoring methodology has also been developed with the view to help guide the governments in the region towards successful EU accession and membership. That is why the entire monitoring approach has been devised around the PAR requirements defined under the EU's enlargement policy.

The European Commission in 2014 defined the scope of PAR through six key areas:

1. the strategic framework for public administration reform
2. policy development and co-ordination
3. public service and human resource management
4. accountability
5. service delivery
6. public financial management.

This scope of PAR has been adopted in the *Principles of Public Administration*, a new framework for guiding and monitoring administrative reforms in the Western Balkan countries and Turkey.<sup>1</sup> The Principles of PA were developed and published in 2014, by OECD/SIGMA,<sup>2</sup> and in close co-operation with the European Commission. Their purpose is described as follows:

*The Principles define what good governance entails in practice, and outline the main requirements to be followed by countries during the EU integration process. The*

<sup>1</sup> A separate document entitled *The Principles of Public Administration: A Framework for ENP Countries* has been developed for the countries encompassed by the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP): <http://bit.ly/2fsCaZM>.

<sup>2</sup> SIGMA (Support for Improvement in Governance and Management) is a joint initiative of the OECD and the European Union. Its key objective is to strengthen the foundations for improved public governance, and hence support socio-economic development through building the capacities of the public sector, enhancing horizontal governance and improving the design and implementation of public administration reforms, including proper prioritisation, sequencing and budgeting. More information available at: <http://www.sigmaweb.org/>

*Principles also feature a monitoring framework to enable regular analysis of the progress made in applying the Principles and setting country benchmarks.*

*EU acquis requirements, guidelines and instructions are the core of the Principles in relevant areas. In other areas, the Principles are derived from international standards and requirements, as well as good practices in EU member states and OECD countries. As a minimum benchmark of good administration, countries should ensure compliance with these fundamental Principles.<sup>3</sup>*

Based on these Principles, SIGMA conducts regular assessments of the progress made by the WB countries' governments in fulfilling them. Across-the-board assessments (for all the six key areas) are conducted once every two years, whereas in-between smaller scale assessments are done for specific chapters evaluated as critical by SIGMA. For more information on SIGMA assessments, visit [www.sigmaweb.org](http://www.sigmaweb.org).

### I.3 PAR Monitor Methodology Rationale

Following this overall approach of the European Commission and SIGMA, WeBER has adopted the Principles of PA as the main building block of the PAR Monitor Methodology. The rationale behind this approach is twofold:

1. The Principles represent the only common denominator for PAR reforms for all Western Balkan countries, which is of major importance for WeBER (as a project covering all these countries), in order to allow for regional comparability and regional peer learning and peer pressure.
2. The Principles represent a normative PAR framework which guides the governance reforms in these countries in the direction of compliance with EU standards and requirements, thus also supporting their transformation into future EU member states.

Finally, the methodology also has as its background the wider WeBER rationale that the implementation of the often painful and inconvenient administrative reforms is more likely to continue after the moment of EU accession (when the hard EU conditionality disappears) if the local actors, including non-governmental ones, are empowered to keep pushing for such reforms to continue. This empowerment needs to include the improvement of their awareness, knowledge and other capacities, such as research and analytical skills and tools. It is precisely these elements that the WeBER project and the PAR Monitor Methodology aim to create.

### I.4 PAR Monitor Methodology and Contribution of the Civil Society

PAR Monitor Methodology was developed by the research and expert team of WeBER. It was widely consulted among all relevant WeBER associates and stakeholders – SIGMA/OECD, European Commission (DG NEAR), Regional Cooperation Council (RCC), Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA), WeBER Advisory Council, WeBER Platform members, as well as members of National Working Groups on PAR (NWGs) constituted in every WeBER country. PAR Monitor reports - six national reports and a regional report, will be the main products based on the application of this methodology. However, having in mind WeBER rationale, and the idea of PAR Monitor Methodology

<sup>3</sup> Principles of Public Administration for EU Enlargement countries, SIGMA, <http://bit.ly/2fOWLfg>.

as the methodology “by the civil society and for the civil society”, PAR resource centre will be established containing of research, analytical, and monitoring work of member organisations of the WeBER Platform, and NWGs in each country, for the purpose of contribution to the PAR Monitor reports. Relevant studies, policy papers, and other publications, on topics of importance for key areas of SIGMA Principles will be timely collected and one element of PAR Monitor reports will have as the focus the work of member organisations – regional report for the work of WeBER Platform members, and national reports for the work of members of NWGs for each country. The regional PAR Monitor report will particularly focus on the regional comparative reports relevant to SIGMA principles and WeBER monitoring (whether they pertain to all WB countries or a subset of them), whereas the national reports will provide more space to national reports (those which are available for just one country and thus do not allow for regional comparability).

## II. Approach

### II.1 Overall approach and synergies with SIGMA/OECD and SEE2020 Strategy

As mentioned above, the overall approach to monitoring of PAR developed by WeBER is based in research and evidence. One of the main considerations underpinning the development of the methodology is to ensure complementarity with the monitoring work conducted by SIGMA/OECD. This approach acknowledges that SIGMA’s comprehensive approach cannot and should not be replicated by local actors, as it already represents an independent monitoring source (in the sense of independence from local governments in the WB). In that sense, WeBER does not seek to present a contesting (competitive) assessment of how the principles are fulfilled in the WB countries, but rather offer a complementary view, based in local knowledge and complementary research approaches.

Moreover, the resources that SIGMA has at its disposal allow it to take a comprehensive view on the Principles of PA and monitor all (or almost all) aspects of the individual principles in each of the six chapters. The local civil society actors do not have such resources at their disposition. Moreover, their projects and initiatives are as a rule fragmented and based on individual ad-hoc approaches. WeBER seeks to overcome this problem by creating a Platform through which civil society in the region will conduct consultations and attempt to coordinate these individual, fragmented efforts. The PAR Monitor, as one of the Platform’s main deliverables, is envisaged as a report which will encompass both the findings of the core methodology produced by the WeBER project and the key results and findings of a major part of the individual CSOs’ (or indeed, other networks’) research and analyses in the PAR area. This latter endeavour is an ambitious one, and it is understood that both the PAR Monitor Methodology and its wider structure and approach to incorporating other CSOs’ findings will be work in progress in the years to come. The Think for Europe Network (TEN) – as the core WeBER partnership – and its other partners comprising the WeBER Platform will regularly work on incorporating feedback, updating and improving the methodology and the approach.

As a monitoring methodology “for the civil society and by the civil society”, the PAR Monitor Methodology seeks to utilise to the maximum extent possible the knowledge and experience accumulated within the civil sector in the WB countries, while seeking to further expand them and make them even more relevant through the application of robust research methods. For that reason, a number of indicators contained in the PAR Monitor Methodology actually rely on the civil society as

one of the core sources of knowledge. Compared to SIGMA's approach which rests more on the administrative sources (although it admittedly does account for perceptions and local experts' knowledge in several indicators), this approach promises to offer an additional, complementary view.

Finally, an important consideration in designing the monitoring approach lies in the understanding that all until the WB countries' EU accession moment SIGMA/OECD will be engaged in the region, relying also on the hard EU conditionality as an external driving force of reforms. In that period, the local civil society should deliver complementary, add-on findings in the areas of its strength, while gradually expanding the scope and seeking ways to continue with the external monitoring in a more holistic way once SIGMA is no longer there to perform its external assessments. By then, the local civil society actors should have a developed approach in identifying the critical areas of intervention on which to focus their monitoring efforts. In that sense, the PAR Monitor Methodology presented in this document can be regarded as a core selection to be monitored continuously, whereas in the future other critical areas could be added to its scope (in line with capacities and funding).

Finally, each after the indicators were developed, each of them was analysed for relevance against the regional strategy SEE 2020,<sup>4</sup> in order to determine whether they can serve for the purposes of its monitoring as well. Therefore, each indicator which has been determined as relevant for the monitoring of the SEE 2020 Strategy has been marked accordingly and the link to the specific dimension of that strategy has been stated.

## II.2 Structure and Selection Criteria

In line with the abovementioned considerations, the PAR Monitor Methodology maintains a basic structure which follows the six chapters of the Principles of PA and of the individual principles under each of the chapters. However, it does not attempt to cover all the principles nor does it seek to cover them in a holistic manner. It adopts a more focused and selective approach, which was defined at the very beginning of the process of development of the Methodology.

Considering that the empowering of the civil society in the region to monitor PAR in line with the Principles' structure will need to be a gradual process, the criteria for selecting the principles were developed with three main considerations in mind:

1. That there are certain areas/aspects of the Principles in which civil society is more active and consequently has more knowledge and experience;
2. That in order to gain momentum the PAR Monitor will need to acquire the interest of the wider public in the region;
3. That the Methodology should ensure an add-on approach to SIGMA's and not duplicate it.

Accordingly, the key criteria which have been designed to lead the process of selecting the principles on which the Methodology will focus are:

1. Relevance of the principle (and its sub-principles) to the work and interests of the civil society;
2. Relevance of the principle (and its sub-principles) to the interests and concerns of the wider public (i.e. to what extent does the principle address and outward-facing element of the administration's work);

<sup>4</sup> South East Europe 2020 Strategy of the Regional Cooperation Council: <http://www.rcc.int/pages/62/south-east-europe-2020-strategy>

3. Potential for bringing added-value to SIGMA’s work by focusing on a specific principle (and its sub-principles).

## II.3 Selection and Approach to Individual Principles

The abovementioned selection criteria were applied to each of the six areas of the Principles. To test the criteria, each of the WeBER partners was allocated one of the areas (based on their comparative advantage in terms of experience). After the testing, which confirmed that criteria could be applied consistently, the evaluation process was organised for all the principles in the framework. This evaluation was done at the level of sub-principles, which was to ensure a thorough approach and deeper understanding of each principle. Using online evaluation forms, 1-2 representatives (experts) in each of the WeBER partner organisations evaluated the principles, scoring them from 1 (not relevant) to 5 (highly relevant) to the abovementioned criteria. These evaluations were finalised in August 2016.

The scores given in the evaluations were turned into Excel sheets showing both the individual scores and the averages and medians for each of the sub-principles. Based on how high the scores were (medians of 4 and 5 and averages of over 3.5) the initial selection of the principles was made. The criterion of added value was then once again applied by the researchers from each of the partner organisations, which helped exclude some of the principles (and especially sub-principles) which seemed as highly relevant at first sight, but where additional analysis of added value showed there was little that civil society could add compared to SIGMA’s assessments.

The principles in which none of the sub-principles received sufficiently high scores were completely removed from the focus, whereas for the remaining principles their focus was adjusted based on the specific, the highest scored sub-principles.

It should be noted here that in some cases SIGMA’s principles vary considerably in terms of specificity of the wording of the principles and sub-principles. Also, some principles combine very different issues, which has necessitated an approach which to an extent cut into the principles and took out some aspects while keeping others in the focus. One such example is Principle 11 in Chapter 2 – Policy Development and Coordination, which encompasses both external consultations (public consultations), which were evaluated as particularly important from WeBER’s perspective, and internal (intra-governmental) consultations, which the WeBER selection criteria did not capture as relevant. In such cases, the Methodology focuses only on the part of the principle assessed as relevant.

*Table 1: Example of Excel sheet with selection of sub-principles*

Public Service and Human Resource Management													
Timestamp	2016/07/26 5:47:55 PM GMT+2	2016/07/27 3:00:27 PM GMT+2	2016/07/28 6:04:26 PM GMT+2	2016/07/29 12:00:27 AM GMT+2	2016/07/29 1:56:06 PM GMT+2	2016/07/29 4:23:19 PM GMT+2	2016/08/01 5:27:40 PM GMT+2	2016/08/02 11:09:18 AM GMT+2	2016/08/06 3:34:20 PM GMT+2	average	median	Comment/note	Proposed indicators for selected (sub) principles
Principle 4: Direct or indirect political influence on senior managerial positions in the public service is prevented.													
1. The category/class/level of senior managerial positions in the public service, at the interface of politics and administration, is included into the scope of public service (usually the positions of secretary-general of the ministry and director-general of the administrative body determine the upper dividing line between public servants and political appointees).	2	5	1	2	4	2	5	5	5	3.44	4	Highly relevant. We could calculate the layers of hierarchy over the top civil service positions in the administration and use that as indicator.	Number of layers of political hierarchy above the top level civil servants in ministries and in CoG institutions.
2. The criteria for recruiting persons to the senior managerial positions are clearly established and disclosed.	2	5	1	4	5	5	5	4	5	4.00	5	Here we should "dig deeper". Our focus should be on the reality of the criteria, not formality. It will need to be a qualitative indicator.	Extent to which criteria for recruitment to senior positions are clear, transparent and applied as stipulated by legislation. (1-5)
3. The recruitment and selection process to the senior managerial positions, either external or internal, is based on merit, equal opportunities and open competition.	4	5	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	4.33	5	Merit and equal opportunities are important to monitor here.	We could extend the above indicator to cover both SPs
4. The termination of employment of public servants holding senior managerial positions is only admissible in cases explicitly provided for, and under the procedural provisions established in, the law. These provisions are applied in practice.	4	5	1	4	5	2	4	4	5	3.78	4	Highly relevant, too. This would be suitable for qualitative research, e.g. through focus groups with dismissed/former top managers in civil service. Could be biased, though.	Extent to which criteria for termination of employment on top public service management positions are explicitly and clearly enshrined in law and applied in practice (1-5).

## II.4 Detailed Indicator Tables

Whereas this document provides the selection of the principles of PA which the WeBER project monitors and the formulations of indicators with the basic methodological approaches, the detailed information needed for the measurement of each indicator is provided in separate detailed indicator tables. Each detailed indicator table contains the formulation and focus of a specific indicator, as well as the following information for each of the indicator elements:

- Formulation
- Weight
- Data Sources
- Detailed methodology
- Point allocation rules

The last part of the detailed indicator tables provides the information on how the total points for all elements are turned into the final indicator values which are expressed as whole numbers on the scale from 0 to 5 (in the same manner as is done in SIGMA assessment methodology, for comparability purposes).

Table 2. Structure of the detailed indicator table

<b>INDICATOR no.</b>	[wording of the specific indicator from the methodology]						
<b>Indicator focus</b>	[short description of the exact focus of the indicator – what does it measure]						
<b>INDICATOR ELEMENTS</b>							
<b>Element #</b>	<b>Element formulation</b>		<b>Weight</b>		<b>Element data source</b>		
<b>E.1</b>	[wording of the specific indicator element, from the methodology]		[weight assigned to the element – numeric value]		• [list of data sources to be used for assessing the element] •		
	<b>Element methodology</b>				<b>Point allocation</b>		
	[concise, but detailed description of how the element will be measured, including the specific research approach]				[description of how points are allotted for the element]		
<b>Element #</b>	<b>Element formulation</b>		<b>Weight</b>		<b>Element data source</b>		
<b>E.2</b>	[wording of the specific indicator element, from the methodology]		[weight assigned to the element – numeric value]		• [list of data sources to be used for assessing the element] •		
	<b>Element methodology</b>				<b>Point allocation</b>		
	[concise, but detailed description of how the element will be measured, including the specific research approach]				[description of how points are allotted for the element]		
<b>Element #</b>	<b>Element formulation</b>		<b>Weight</b>		<b>Element data source</b>		
<b>Etc...</b>					•		
	<b>Element methodology</b>				<b>Point allocation</b>		
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>		[point range]	[point range]	[point range]	[point range]	[point range]	[point range]
<b>FINAL INDICATOR VALUE</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>



### III. Process of Developing the Methodology

PAR Monitor Methodology development is a cornerstone activity for the entire WeBER project as it will represent the foundation for all activities of the regional WeBER Platform and its national and local extensions (see the WeBER Platform Concept Note). Therefore, the process of its development features an extensive consultations process with several iterations at the regional and national level respectively. Such participatory process is designed in a way to provide room for robust inputs of experts and facilitate intensive consultations between all key stakeholder groups. It also serves to create ownership over the monitoring process and results within the region, so that CSOs would gradually adopt this or similar approaches and intensify their work on PAR monitoring in accordance with the EU criteria for good administration.

The process was initiated at the internal workshop of the WeBER partners in Pristina in June 2016. The purpose of that workshop was to develop and agree on the selection criteria and test the agreed criteria on one of the areas of the Principles. The result of that workshop was a clear list of criteria (mentioned in the previous section) agreed by all WeBER partners, accompanied by a justification for their selection.

Following the internal workshop for the methodology development, the WeBER partners engaged in consultations with CSOs in each WB country which are most active in the PAR area to discuss the initial approaches undertaken in the development process. Moreover, the main idea behind these early consultation rounds at the national level is to start creating space for synergies and linkages early on with the already existing PAR related initiatives and projects in the civil society, and to ensure methodological complementarities and avoid overlapping with similar actions, in case such actions exist. Also, in this early round of consultations, first steps are taken for developing local ownership within the civil society over PAR Monitor and for generating motivation to participate in the implementation later on.

Following early consultation rounds, as well as evaluation of the Principles by the WeBER partners, as described in the previous section, the process is highly intensified with drafting of the PAR Monitor Methodology based on the conducted analysis (2-3 months of intensive drafting).

Regional-level round of consultations that follows, involve the WeBER Platform members of all WB countries with full-fledged draft methodology on the agenda. This round of consultation is organised within the same event for the WeBER Platform establishment, which is also the first meeting of the Platform (mid-November 2016 in Podgorica). It is preceded with national meetings with CSOs who are members of the Platform in each country respectively, to ensure that they are familiar with the draft document and ensuing process, before the Platform convenes for the first time. Following this round of consultations at the Platform meeting in Podgorica, draft PAR Monitor Methodology is subject to revisions that will be based on the received inputs.

For the final stage in consultation process, each WeBER partner organises a national round table for discussion with the wider circle of CSOs. Participation of those CSOs who are interested in joining the process and the PAR Monitor, but have not previously worked on PAR, are welcome at this stage as well. After the events, the WeBER experts and research team will perform necessary fine-tuning based on the inputs, and finalise the PAR Monitor Methodology. However, before finalising it, PAR Monitor will need to be checked and tested by research teams of all WeBER partners, to ensure consistency in approach and to maximise quality of measurement.

## IV. Limitations

As with every research project, the research-based PAR Monitor Methodology also has its limitations. The main limitation stems from the fact that – for reasons which were elaborated above – the Methodology does not cover the entire framework of principles, but adopts a selective approach based on the outlined criteria. In that sense, the Methodology does not attempt to enable the monitoring of all reform processes covered by the Principles of PA, but only those in which the interest and the added value of the civil society is the strongest in the pre-accession period.

Moreover, the principles which are targeted by the Methodology are not always covered in all of their facets, i.e. the Methodology does not approach them always in their entirety, but rather covers specific aspects which have been determined by the authors as the most relevant from the perspective of civil society monitoring. In all such cases, the specific WeBER approach is described in the respective fields of the tables on the pages laying out the Methodology.

Lastly, some of the principles are approached from a rather perception based point of view. This is mainly the case where SIGMA monitors a specific principle very thoroughly, so the most useful way to complement its approach was deemed to be by monitoring perceptions of certain key stakeholder groups (public servants, CSOs, etc.). This is a deliberate part of the WeBER approach and those indicators should be looked at as complementary to the assessments done by SIGMA for the same principles.

The timeframes for the monitoring of specific indicators are set within the detailed indicator tables which are based on this methodology document and set out the details of the methodological approaches and point allocation for each indicator. The monitoring work is initiated in the second half of the calendar year and proceeds into the first half of the following year, which will reflect on the timelines of specific indicators. Also, monitoring work will be implemented over a period of 9-10 months due to the size of the WeBER team, which makes it impossible to measure all indicators within a short period of time. These timeframe related limitations will be clearly stipulated with the provision of the results.

## V. Monitoring Methodology

### Area 1: Strategic Framework of PAR

<b>Principle 1</b>	<b>The Government has developed and enacted an effective public administration reform agenda which addresses key challenges</b>
<b>Approach</b>	The monitoring approach for this principle entails focus on the involvement of the civil society organisations and public, as external stakeholders in the development of the key strategic documents on PAR (those that constitute PAR agenda).
<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Use of participatory approaches in the development of key strategic PAR documents.</p> <p>Elements outlined below are combined to create a scale of measurement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultations with civil society are conducted when the document(s) are developed</li> <li>2. Consultations are conducted in an early phase of the development of the document(s)</li> <li>3. Invitations to civil society to participate in the consultations are open</li> <li>4. Responsible government bodies are proactive in ensuring that a wide range of external stakeholders become involved in the process<sup>5</sup></li> <li>5. Civil society is provided complete information for preparation for consultations</li> <li>6. Comments and inputs received in the consultation process are considered by the responsible government bodies in charge of developing key PAR strategic documents</li> <li>7. Responsible government bodies provide feedback on the treatment of received comments</li> <li>8. Responsible government bodies engage in open dialogue with civil society on contested questions</li> </ol>

<sup>5</sup> In particular, diverse interests, such as gender/women organisations, disabled persons' organisations, minority rights groups, etc.

	9. Consultations in the development of strategic PAR documents are open to the public
<b>Research Methodology</b>	Qualitative data collection and analysis: Official reports from public consultations; Websites and official data of responsible government bodies (institutions); Focus groups with CSOs; Interviews with relevant government institutions;

<b>Principle 2</b>	<b>Public administration reform is purposefully implemented; reform outcome targets are set and regularly monitored</b>
<b>Principle 4</b>	<b>Public administration reform has robust and functioning management co-ordination structures at both the political and administrative levels to steer the reform design and implementation process</b>
<b>Approach</b>	The focus in the measurement of these two principles is on the extent and quality of involvement and contribution of the civil society in the structures and processes for implementation (management and coordination) and monitoring of PAR.
<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Civil society involvement in the PAR monitoring and coordination structures.</p> <p>Elements given below are combined to create a scale of measurement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administrative structures for PAR coordination and monitoring foresee an involvement of CSOs</li> <li>2. Political level structures for PAR coordination foresee an involvement of CSOs</li> <li>3. Format of CSO involvement in administrative structures for PAR coordination and monitoring</li> <li>4. Format of CSO involvement in political structures for PAR coordination and monitoring</li> <li>5. Involvement of CSOs is achieved based on an open competitive process</li> <li>6. Meetings of the PAR coordination and monitoring structures are held regularly with CSO involvement</li> </ol>

	<p>7. The format of meetings allows for discussion, contribution and feedback from CSOs</p> <p>8. CSOs get consulted on the specific measures of PAR financing</p>
<i><b>Research Methodology</b></i>	<p>Qualitative data collection and analysis:</p> <p>Overall strategic PAR document;</p> <p>Websites of PAR coordinator and reports from meetings;</p> <p>Analysis of official documents pertaining to the organisation and functioning of PAR coordination and monitoring structures;</p> <p>Focus groups with CSOs;</p> <p>Interviews with relevant government institutions.</p>

## Area 2: Policy Development and Co-ordination

<b>Principle 5</b>	<b>Regular monitoring of the government's performance enables public scrutiny and supports the government in achieving its objectives.</b>
<b>Approach</b>	WeBER focuses on whether the government's performance is open and publicly available with the ability for the government to achieve its objectives. Thus, the monitoring approach for this principle focuses on measuring the extent to which the information about government performance is open and publicly available and the extent to which CSOs consider that the government pursues and achieves its objectives.
<b>Indicator 1</b>	<p>Public availability of information on Government performance.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The government regularly publishes written information about its activities</li> <li>2. The information issued by the government on its activities is written in an understandable way</li> <li>3. The information issued by the Government is sufficiently detailed, including both quantitative data and qualitative information and assessments</li> <li>4. The information issued by the Government includes assessments of the achievement of concrete results</li> <li>5. The information issued by the Government about its activities and results is available in open data format(s)</li> <li>6. The information issued by the government about its activities and results contains gender segregated data</li> <li>7. Share of reports on government strategies and plans which are available online</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<p>Expert analysis of relevant government websites and reports. The websites to be analysed include Government (Council of Ministers) website, General Secretariat of the Government (Prime Minister's Office, Cabinet Office, etc.) or – where and if applicable – specialised portals/websites for Government communication with the public.</p> <p>The elements above will be weighed and the last point on open data will just be an extra point, to encourage open data policies.</p>

	The measurement of the indicator will cover the last year and a half of reporting cycles (calendar years or otherwise), including the one in which the measurement is done (if reports are already available).
<b>Indicator 2</b>	<p>Civil society perception of the Government's pursuit and achievement of its planned objectives.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSOs consider government's formal planning documents as relevant for the actual developments in the individual policy areas</li> <li>2. CSOs consider that the Government regularly reports to the public on progress against the set objectives</li> <li>3. CSOs consider that official strategies determine governments' or ministries' action in specific policy areas</li> <li>4. CSOs consider that the ministries regularly publish monitoring reports on their sectoral strategies</li> <li>5. CSOs consider that EU accession priorities are adequately integrated into the government's planning documents</li> <li>6. CSOs consider that the Government's reports incorporate adequate updates on the progress against the set EU accession priorities</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	Survey of CSOs in each country as the main data source for calculating the value of the indicator. To triangulate the data and for the purpose of the narrative report, focus groups with CSOs may be organised in each country (for elements 3-4, the focus will be on three selected policy areas and CSOs will be targeted to cover those policy areas). For elements 1-2 the focus will be on the central Government's Programme (mid-term or mandate-long) and the detailed Work Plan (usually annual).

<b>Principle 6</b>	<b>Government decisions are prepared in a transparent manner and based on the administrations' professional judgement; legal conformity of the decisions is ensured</b>
<b>Approach</b>	<i>WeBER focuses on whether the Government decisions are prepared in a transparent manner.</i> The approach to this principle is to measure the extent to which the process of government decision-making as well as its direct outputs (decisions) are transparent, including the external communication function.
<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Transparency of the Government's decision-making.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSOs consider government decision-making to be generally transparent</li> <li>2. CSOs consider the exceptions to the rules of publishing Government's decisions to be appropriate</li> <li>3. The Government makes publicly available the documents from its sessions</li> <li>4. The Government communicates its decisions in a citizen-friendly manner</li> <li>5. The Government publishes adopted documents in a timely manner</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<p>Survey of CSOs in each country as the main data source for calculating the value of the indicator. To triangulate the data and for the purpose of the narrative report, focus groups with CSOs may be organised in each country.</p> <p>To be cross-referenced with an expert analysis of the Government website and decision-making documents for a certain number of Government sessions (or over a certain period of time).</p>

<b>Principle 10</b>	<b>The policy-making and legal-drafting process is evidence-based, and impact assessment is consistently used across ministries</b>
<b>Approach</b>	In view of SIGMA's comprehensive assessment of this principle, the WeBER approach to monitoring this principle will focus on how the policy research and advice accrued outside of the administration, in the policy research community, is used to support evidence based policymaking.
<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Use of evidence created by think tanks, independent institutes and other CSOs in policy development.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Frequency of referencing of evidence-based findings produced by CSOs in the adopted government policy documents</li> <li>2. Frequency of referencing of evidence-based findings produced by CSOs in policy papers and ex ante impact assessments</li> </ol>



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Share of evidence-based findings produced by wide range of CSOs, such as think tanks, independent institutes, locally-based organisations, referenced in ex post policy analyses and assessments of government institutions</li> <li>4. Relevant ministries or other government institutions invite or commission wide range of CSOs, such as think tanks, independent institutes, locally-based organisations, to prepare policy studies, papers or impact assessments for specific policy problems or proposals</li> <li>5. Representatives of relevant ministries participate in policy dialogue (discussions, round tables, closed door meetings, etc.) pertaining to specific policy research products.</li> <li>6. Representatives of wide range of CSOs, such as think tanks, independent institutes, locally-based organisations are invited to participate in working groups/task forces for drafting policy or legislative proposals when they have specific proposals and recommendations based on evidence</li> <li>7. Relevant ministries in general provide feedback on the evidence based proposals and recommendations of the wide range of CSOs, such as think tanks, independent institutes, locally-based organisations which have been accepted or rejected, justifying either action</li> <li>8. Ministries accept CSOs' policy proposals in the work of working groups for developing policies and legislation</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	Online anonymous surveys and focus groups with think tanks, other CSOs and research institutes. The research will be performed on a sample of policy areas in each country (3 policy areas in each country where a substantial number of CSOs/think tanks actively work and perform research and analyses), ensuring that policy areas where institutes and think tanks are active are picked.

<b>Principle 11</b>	<b>Policies and legislation are designed in an inclusive manner that enables the active participation of society</b>
<b>Approach</b>	The approach to the monitoring of this principle entails a focus on external consultation processes and leaves out the internal (intra-governmental or

	cross-ministerial) coordination and consultation processes. The complex indicator combines a number of elements and a 5-point scale will be designed. The approach is fully perception-based, given that SIGMA already conducts an in-depth legal and expert assessment.
<i>Indicator</i>	<p>Civil society perception and scope of involvement in policymaking</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scope of public consultations on policy documents in central administration</li> <li>2. Scope of public consultations on legislation in central administration</li> <li>3. Availability of reporting on public consultations on policy documents by central administration</li> <li>4. Availability of reporting on public consultations on legislation by central administration</li> <li>5. Basic functionality of a national public consultation portal</li> <li>6. Advanced functionality of a national public consultation portal</li> <li>7. Proactiveness of informing on public consultations</li> <li>8. Embeddedness of early public consultations in practice</li> <li>9. Quality of reporting on public consultations</li> <li>10. Impact of public consultation results on policy making</li> <li>11. CSOs consider formal consultation procedures create preconditions for effective inclusion of the public in the policy-making process.</li> <li>12. CSOs consider formal consultation procedures are applied consistently</li> <li>13. CSOs consider that they are consulted at the early phases of the policy process</li> <li>14. CSOs consider consultees are timely provided with information on the content of legislative or policy proposals</li> <li>15. CSOs consider consultees are provided with adequate information on the content of legislative or policy proposals</li> <li>16. CSOs consider sponsoring ministries take actions to ensure that diversity of interests is represented in the consultation processes (women's groups, minority rights groups, trade unions, employers' associations, etc.).</li> <li>17. CSOs consider ministries (sponsors of policy and legislative proposals) provide written feedback on consultees' inputs/comments.</li> </ol>

	<p>18. CSOs consider ministries (sponsors of policy and legislative proposals) accept consultees' inputs/comments.</p> <p>19. CSOs consider ministries (sponsors of policy and legislative proposals) hold constructive discussions on how the consultees' views have shaped and influenced policy and final decision of Gov.</p>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<p>The indicator measures the extent and the quality of involvement/contribution of the public to the policy making process through public consultations.</p> <p>Measurement of all elements of this indicator is based on a widely disseminated online survey of CSOs to collect their perception by answering questions for each element below. The survey is performed on a sample which aims to ensure a representation of CSOs working in as many research areas as possible, so the sample is as representative as possible.</p> <p>Focus groups are used to inform the narrative report with qualitative findings, but not for the calculation of indicator values. They are conducted on a sample of 3 policy areas in each country where a substantial number of CSOs/think tanks actively work and perform research and analyses, ensuring that policy areas where institutes and think tanks are active are picked.</p>

## Area 3: Public Service and Human Resource Management

<b>Principle 2</b>	<b>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</b>
<b>Approach</b>	The monitoring approach for this principle is based on identified elements which SIGMA does not strongly focus on in its monitoring, pertaining to the information about the scope and size of public service that the public can access. Similarly to SIGMA, WeBER also focuses on central administration in this principle.
<b>Indicator 1</b>	<p>Public availability of statistics and reports about the civil service and employees in central state administration.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Government keeps reliable data pertaining to the public service</li> <li>2. The Government regularly publishes basic statistical data pertaining to the public service</li> <li>3. Published official data includes data on employees other than full-time civil servants in the central state administration</li> <li>4. Published official data on public service is segregated based on gender and ethnic structure</li> <li>5. Published official data is available in open data format(s)</li> <li>6. The government comprehensively reports on the public service policy</li> <li>7. The government regularly reports on the public service policy</li> <li>8. Reports on the public service include substantiated information concerning the quality and/or outcomes of the public service work</li> <li>9. Data and information about the public service are actively promoted to the public</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<p>Document analysis of available information in reports, websites of institutions responsible for PAR and HRM</p> <p>Document analysis of responses to requests for free access for information</p>
<b>Indicator 2</b>	<p>Performance of tasks characteristic for civil service outside of the civil service merit-based regime</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The number of temporary engagements for performance of tasks characteristic of civil service in the central state administration is limited by law</li> <li>2. There are specific criteria determined for the selection of individuals for temporary engagements in the state administration.</li> <li>3. The hiring procedure for individuals engaged on temporary contracts is open and transparent</li> <li>4. Duration of temporary engagement contracts is limited</li> <li>5. Civil servants perceive that temporary engagements in the administration are an exception</li> <li>6. Civil servants perceive that performance of tasks characteristic of civil service by individuals hired on a temporary basis is an exception</li> <li>7. Civil servants perceive that appointments on a temporary basis in the administration are merit-based</li> <li>8. Civil servants perceive that the formal rules for appointments on a temporary basis are applied in practice</li> <li>9. Civil servants perceive that individuals hired on a temporary basis go on to become civil servants after their contracts end</li> <li>10. Civil servants perceive that contracts for temporary engagements are extended to more than one year</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	Qualitative research (interviews, desk research) about such engagements/appointments in the central state administration, to positions in which the jobs of public servants are effectively performed, combining some elements of quantitative analysis (to the extent available). Some questions can be integrated into the public service survey.

<b>Principle 3</b>	<b>The recruitment of public servants is based on merit and equal treatment in all its phases; the criteria for demotion and termination of public servants are explicit.</b>
--------------------	---

<b><i>Approach</i></b>	WeBER focuses particularly on the openness and transparency of the recruitment process, as a particularly critical aspect of HRM in the public administration, due to its public facing character.
<b><i>Indicator</i></b>	<p>Openness, transparency and fairness of recruitment into the civil service</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information about public competitions is made broadly publicly available.</li> <li>2. Public competition announcements are written in a simple, clear and understandable language.</li> <li>3. During the public competition procedure, interested candidates can request and obtain clarifications, which are made publicly available</li> <li>4. There are no unreasonable barriers for external candidates which make public competitions more easily accessible to internal candidates.</li> <li>5. The application procedure imposes minimum administrative and paperwork burden on candidates.</li> <li>6. Candidates are allowed and invited to supplement missing documentation within a reasonable timeframe.</li> <li>7. Decisions and reasoning of the selection panels are made publicly available, with due respect to the protection of personal information.</li> <li>8. Information about annulled announcements is made publicly available, with proper reasoning provided.</li> <li>9. Civil servants perceive the recruitments into the civil service as based on merit.</li> <li>10. Civil servants perceive the recruitment procedure to ensure equal opportunity.</li> <li>11. The public perceives the recruitments done through the public competition process as based on merit.</li> </ol>
<b><i>Research Methodology</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Analysis of data on individual, selected public competition procedures, based on FOIA requests sent to relevant authorities</li> <li>■ Analysis of websites, publicly available data and reports</li> <li>■ Survey of public servants</li> <li>■ Public perception survey</li> </ul>

<b>Principle 4</b>	<b>Direct or indirect political influence on senior managerial positions in the public service is prevented.</b>
<b>Approach</b>	<p>It is understood that formally prescribed procedures often allow for some level of political influence on the recruitment of senior managers in the public administration (e.g. the minister makes the final selection from a list of candidates). It is also indisputable that senior public servants need to ensure that the administration implements the policies of the incumbent government all the while ensuring that ministers receive professional, impartial advice and opinion. Nevertheless, in reality the limits of legally prescribed and legitimate political influence can be breached and political influence may occur in an illegal or otherwise undue form. WeBER seeks to grasp this “grey area” and establish the extent to which there is effective prevention of unwanted political influence on the work of senior managers in the public service.</p>
<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Effective protection of senior civil servants’ position from unwanted political interference</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Law prescribes competitive, merit-based procedures for the selection of senior managers in the public service</li> <li>2. The law prescribes objective criteria for the termination of employment of senior civil servants</li> <li>3. The merit-based recruitment of senior civil servants is efficiently applied in practice</li> <li>4. Acting senior managers can by law, and are, only appointed from within the public service ranks for a maximum period limited by the law</li> <li>5. Ratio of eligible candidates per senior-level vacancy</li> <li>6. Civil servants consider that the procedures for appointing senior civil servants ensure that the best candidates get the jobs</li> <li>7. CSOs perceive the procedures for appointing senior civil servants ensure the best candidates get the jobs</li> <li>8. Civil servants perceive that senior civil servants are appointed based on political support</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Existence of vetting or deliberation procedures on appointments of senior civil servants outside of the scope of the civil service legislation</li> <li>10. Civil servants consider that senior civil servants would not implement and can effectively reject illegal orders of political superiors</li> <li>11. Civil servants consider that senior civil service positions are not subject of political agreements and “divisions of the cake” among the ruling political parties</li> <li>12. Civil servants perceive that senior civil servants are not dismissed for political motives</li> <li>13. Civil servants consider the criteria for dismissal of senior public servants to be properly applied in practice</li> <li>14. CSOs consider senior managerial civil servants to be professionalised in practice</li> <li>15. Civil servants perceive that senior civil servants do not participate in electoral campaigns of political parties</li> <li>16. Share of appointments without a competitive procedure (including acting positions outside of public service scope) out of the total number of appointments to senior managerial civil service positions</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Analysis of reports from selection procedures (based on FOIA requests)</li> <li>■ Survey of public servants</li> <li>■ Analysis of the legislation and reports from selected public competitions/ selection processes</li> <li>■ Analysis of political (coalition or other) agreements</li> </ul>

<b>Principle 5</b>	<b>The remuneration system of public servants is based on the job classification; it is fair and transparent.</b>
<b>Approach</b>	The monitoring approach for this principle is based on identified elements which SIGMA does not strongly focus on, but which is interesting in regards to the information about the public service that the public can access. Similarly to SIGMA, WeBER also focuses on central administration in this principle.



<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Transparency, clarity and public availability of information on the civil service remuneration system.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The civil service remuneration system is simply structured</li> <li>2. The civil service salary/remuneration system foresees limited and clearly defined options for salary supplements additional to the basic salary</li> <li>3. Information on civil service remuneration system is available online</li> <li>4. Citizen friendly explanations or presentations of the remuneration information are available online</li> <li>5. Discretionary supplements are limited by legislation and cannot comprise a major part of a civil servant's salary/remuneration</li> <li>6. Civil servants consider the discretionary supplements to be used for their intended objective of stimulating and awarding performance, rather than for political or personal favouritism</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Analysis of SIGMA's findings for elements 2 and 5</li> <li>■ Review and expert analysis of available legal documents, reports and other documents, focusing on transparency, as well as clarity of the salary system</li> <li>■ Survey of public servants</li> <li>■ Focus groups with former public servants</li> </ul>

<b>Principle 7</b>	<b>Measures for promoting integrity, preventing corruption and ensuring discipline in the public service are in place</b>
<b>Approach</b>	The monitoring approach for this principle is based on a combination of SIGMA's findings and own research through a public servants and CSO's surveys. Similarly, to SIGMA, WeBER also focuses on central administration in this principle.
<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Effectiveness of measures for the promotion of integrity and prevention of corruption in the civil service.</p> <p>Elements to be combined for scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Integrity and anti-corruption measures for the civil service are formally established in the central administration</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Integrity and anti-corruption measures for the civil service are implemented in central administration</li> <li>3. Civil servants consider the integrity and anti-corruption measures as effective</li> <li>4. CSOs consider the integrity and anti-corruption measures as effective</li> <li>5. Civil servants consider that the integrity and anti-corruption measures are impartial</li> <li>6. CSOs consider that the integrity and anti-corruption measures in state administration are impartial</li> <li>7. Civil servants feel they would be protected as whistle blowers</li> </ol>
<i><b>Research Methodology</b></i>	<p>Analysis of SIGMA's findings for the sub-indicators 1-4</p> <p>Survey of public servants</p> <p>Focus groups or interviews with former public servants</p> <p>Interviews with members of anti-corruption bodies</p> <p>Focus groups with CSOs dealing with the prevention of corruption</p>

## Area 4: Accountability

<b>Principle 2</b>	<b>The right to access public information is enacted in legislation and consistently applied in practice</b>
<b>Approach</b>	The approach to monitoring this principle tackles both the reactive and proactive information by the government. For the former, the approach is embedded in the CSOs' experience with the enforcement of the legislation on access to public information, considering that the civil society is among the largest "consumers" of this right. The analysis of the proactive information is based on direct analysis of the websites of government institutions. Monitoring is done through 2 indicators.
<b>Indicator 1</b>	<p>Civil society perception of the quality of legislation and practice of access to public information.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSOs consider that the information recorded and documented by public authorities is sufficient for the proper application of the right to access public information<sup>6</sup></li> <li>2. CSOs consider exceptions to the presumption of public character of information to be adequately defined</li> <li>3. CSOs consider exceptions to the presumption of public character of information to be adequately applied</li> <li>4. CSOs confirm that information is provided in the requested format</li> <li>5. CSOs confirm that information is provided within prescribed deadlines</li> <li>6. CSOs confirm that information is provided free of charge</li> <li>7. CSOs confirm that the person requesting access is not obliged to provide reasons for requests for public information;</li> <li>8. CSOs confirm that in practice the non-classified portions of otherwise classified materials are released;</li> <li>9. CSOs consider that requested information is released without portions containing personal data</li> </ol>

<sup>6</sup> FOI requests can only be sent for information which already exists in some recorded format (written, audio, video, etc.). Hence, if certain information is not recorded, the right to access that information cannot be fulfilled. This element looks at whether the administration records the information to an extent which allows for this right to be fulfilled.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. CSOs consider that when only portions of classified materials are released, it is not done to mislead the requesting person with only bits of information</li> <li>11. CSOs consider that the designated supervisory body<sup>7</sup> has through its practice, set sufficiently high standards of the right to access public information</li> <li>12. CSOs consider the soft measures<sup>8</sup> issued by the supervisory authority to public authorities to be effective</li> <li>13. CSOs consider that the supervisory authority's power to impose sanctions leads to sufficiently grave consequences for the responsible persons in the noncompliant authority</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<p>Online survey of CSOs</p> <p>Focus groups with CSOs and experience with obtaining requested information as part of the monitoring done in the project will be used to triangulate the information for the purpose of the narrative parts of the reports.</p>
<b>Indicator 2</b>	<p>Proactive informing of the public by public authorities.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Websites of public authorities contain complete and up to date information on scope of work</li> <li>2. Websites of public authorities contain easily accessible and citizen-friendly information on scope of work</li> <li>3. Websites of public authorities contain complete and up to date information on accountability (who they are responsible to)</li> <li>4. Websites of public authorities contain complete and up to date information on relevant policy documents and legal acts</li> <li>5. Websites of public authorities contain accessible and citizen friendly information on relevant policy documents and legal acts</li> </ol>

<sup>7</sup> By “designated supervisory body” is meant an institution set up by the FOIA to supervise the application of the law and issue recommendations and other measures pertaining to its application by public authorities.

<sup>8</sup> Prescriptions, recommendations and other non-binding measures

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Websites of public authorities contain complete and up to date information on policy papers, studies and analyses relevant to policies under competence</li> <li>7. Websites of public authorities contain accessible and citizen-friendly information on policy papers, studies and analyses relevant to policies under competence</li> <li>8. Websites of public authorities contain complete and up to date annual reports</li> <li>9. Websites of public authorities contain accessible and citizen friendly annual reports</li> <li>10. Websites of public authorities contain complete and up to date information on the institution's budget</li> <li>11. Websites of public authorities contain accessible and citizen-friendly information on the institution's budget</li> <li>12. Websites of public authorities contain complete and up to date contact information (including e-mail addresses)</li> <li>13. Websites of public authorities contain accessible and citizen friendly contact information (including e-mail addresses)</li> <li>14. Websites of public authorities contain complete and up to date organisational charts which include entire organisational structure</li> <li>15. Websites of public authorities contain accessible and citizen friendly organisational charts which include entire organisational structure</li> <li>16. Websites of public authorities contain complete and up to date information on contact points for cooperation with civil society and other external stakeholders, including public consultation processes</li> <li>17. Websites of public authorities contain accessible and citizen friendly information on ways in which they cooperate with civil society and other external stakeholders, including public consultation processes</li> <li>18. Public authorities proactively pursue open data policy</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<p>Desk analysis of the websites of a sample of seven public authorities (belonging to the public administration scope, combining 4 ministries and 3 agencies/offices, including centre of government institutions), with an analytical checklist for each of the elements listed in the indicator methodology. Each element would be evaluated based on the extent to which is complete, up-to-date, accessible and citizen friendly.</p>

## Area 5: Service Delivery

<b>Principle 1</b>	<b>Policy for citizen – oriented state administration is in place and applied</b>
<b>Approach</b>	Under this principle, WeBER monitoring focuses on two interrelated aspects: public perception regarding the citizen-oriented service delivery of their public administration, and the extent to which information on the price of administrative services is publicly available.
<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Public perception of state administration's citizen orientation</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Citizens are aware of government administrative simplification initiatives and projects</li> <li>2. Citizens confirm that administrative simplification initiatives or projects of the government have improved service delivery</li> <li>3. Citizens confirm that dealing with the administration has become easier</li> <li>4. Citizens confirm that time needed to obtain administrative services has decreased</li> <li>5. Citizens consider that administration is moving towards digital government</li> <li>6. Citizens are aware about the availability of e-services</li> <li>7. Citizens are knowledgeable about ways on how to use e-services</li> <li>8. Citizens use e-services</li> <li>9. Citizens consider e-services to be user-friendly</li> <li>10. Citizens confirm that the administration seeks feedback from them on how administrative services can be improved</li> <li>11. Citizens confirm that the administration uses their feedback on how administrative services can be improved</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	Perceptions will be explored using a survey targeting the general public (aged 18 and older). The public perception survey will employ a multi-stage probability sampling and will be administered in face-to-face interviews using a standardized questionnaire.

<b>Principle 3</b>	<b>Mechanisms for ensuring the quality of public services are in place</b>
<b>Approach</b>	Under this principle, WeBER monitoring focuses on the perceptions and experiences of citizens with regard to how responsible the public authorities are in redesigning administrative services based on their feedback.
<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Public perception and availability of information on citizen feedback regarding the quality of administrative services.</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Citizens consider they have the possibility to provide feedback on the quality of administrative services</li> <li>2. Citizens perceive feedback mechanisms as easy to use</li> <li>3. Citizens perceive themselves or civil society as involved in monitoring and assessment of administrative services</li> <li>4. Citizens perceive that administrative services are improved as a result of monitoring and assessment by citizens</li> <li>5. Basic information regarding citizens' feedback on administrative services is publicly available</li> <li>6. Advanced information regarding citizens' feedback on administrative services is publicly available</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<p>Perceptions will be explored using a survey targeting the general public (aged 18 and older). The public perception survey will employ a multi-stage probability sampling and will be administered in face-to-face interviews using a standardized questionnaire.</p> <p>Availability of information and data is measured using content analysis of relevant official websites, for a sample of services.</p> <p>In addition to websites of institutions delivering these services, websites of a body with central authority for service delivery (if it exists) or central website/portal on service delivery (including e-government portal) will be analysed, where applicable.</p>

<b>Principle 4</b>	<b>The accessibility of public services is ensured</b>
--------------------	--

<b>Approach</b>	Under this principle, WeBER monitoring focuses on the two interrelated aspects: the perceptions and experiences of CSOs dealing with issues of access, especially for disabled persons and other vulnerable groups (it includes both the analysis of physical accessibility and online accessibility), and existence and online accessibility of basic information on administrative services including online availability of information on price of administrative services, as precondition for citizen-oriented service delivery of administration. In that sense, SIGMA Principle 1 in Service Delivery area - <i>Policy for citizen-oriented state administration is in place and applied</i> , is also relevant with for the indicator below.
<b>Indicator 1</b>	<p>CSOs' perception of accessibility of administrative services</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CSOs confirm the adequacy of territorial network for access to administrative services</li> <li>2. CSOs confirm that one-stop-shops are made accessible to all</li> <li>3. CSOs consider administrative services to be provided in a manner that meets the individual needs of vulnerable groups</li> <li>4. CSOs confirm that administrative service providers trained on how to treat vulnerable groups</li> <li>5. CSOs confirm that the administration provides different channels of choice for obtaining administrative services</li> <li>6. CSOs confirm that e-channels are easily accessible for persons with disabilities</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	Perceptions will be explored using a survey targeting CSOs with focus on disabled people, minority rights along with CSOs working in remote areas. The survey with CSOs will employ a convenience sampling and will use an online standardized self-administered questionnaire (SAQ). Triangulation using 3 FGDs with CSOs (1 with CSOs in the capital and 2 with CSOs outside the capital) will be employed to validate the quantitative findings and will be analysed accordingly in the narrative report. FGDs will use purposive sampling.
<b>Indicator 2</b>	<p>Availability of information regarding the provision of administrative services on the websites of service providers:</p> <p>The following elements are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p>



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Websites of administrative service providers include contact information for provision of services</li> <li>2. Websites of administrative service providers include basic procedural information on how to access administrative services</li> <li>3. Websites of administrative service providers include citizen-friendly guidance on accessing administrative services</li> <li>4. Websites of administrative service providers include information on the rights and obligations of users</li> <li>5. Individual institutions providing administrative services at the central level publish information on the price of services offered</li> <li>6. The information on the prices of administrative services differentiates between e-services and in-person services</li> <li>7. Information on administrative services is available in open data formats</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<p>Expert review and web content analysis of a sample of websites of 5 individual service providers to determine whether information on the provision of administrative services is available and user-friendly, including contact information.</p> <p>The standard is met if this information is available in no more than 3 clicks from the home page of the institution.</p> <p>The following institutions will be analysed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Agency responsible for property registration/ issuing property certificates etc.</li> <li>■ Agency responsible for company (business) registration</li> <li>■ Agency responsible for vehicle registration</li> <li>■ Agency responsible for issuing passports/ID cards</li> <li>■ Agency responsible for tax administration</li> </ul>

## Area 6: Public Financial Management

<b>Principle 5</b>	<b>Transparent budget reporting and scrutiny are ensured.</b>
--------------------	---

<b><i>Approach</i></b>	The monitoring approach to this principle focuses on segments of transparency and accessibility of the budget documentation and data: ease of access to reports on budget realisation, and availability of budgetary information in the format that allows for easier understanding and scrutiny by external stakeholders (citizens, research organisations etc.).
<b><i>Indicator</i></b>	<p>Transparency and accessibility of budgetary documents</p> <p>Elements given below are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enacted annual budget is easily accessible online</li> <li>2. In-year budget execution reports are easily accessible online</li> <li>3. Mid-year budget execution reports are easily accessible online</li> <li>4. Budget execution reports (in-year, mid-year, year-end) contain data on budget spending in terms of functional, organisational and economic classification</li> <li>5. Annual year-end report contains non-financial information about the performance of the Government</li> <li>6. Official reader-friendly presentation of the annual budget (Citizen Budget) is regularly published online</li> <li>7. Budgetary data is published in open data format</li> </ol>
<b><i>Research Methodology</i></b>	Analysis of available documentation at the MoF website as well as bylaws regulating budget classification and financial reporting;

<b>Principle 6</b>	The operational framework for internal control defines responsibilities and powers, and its application by the budget organisations is consistent with the legislation governing public financial management and the public administration in general.
<b>Principle 8</b>	The operational framework for internal audit reflects international standards, and its application by the budget organisations is consistent with the legislation governing public administration and public financial management in general.
<b>Approach</b>	The monitoring approach to this principle focuses on transparency of public internal financial control (PIFC) developments within public sector (including internal audit), as well as on the role of Parliaments' scrutiny of the PIFC system and its results.
<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Public availability of information on public internal financial controls and the parliamentary scrutiny.</p> <p>Elements given below are combined to create a scale of measurement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consolidated annual report on PIFC is regularly produced and published online</li> <li>2. Quality reviews of internal audit reports are regularly produced and published online.</li> <li>3. Ministries publish information related to financial management and control</li> <li>4. CHU proactively engages with the public</li> <li>5. The Parliament regularly deliberates on/reviews the consolidated report on PIFC</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Review of official parliamentary documentation;</li> <li>■ Analysis of available documentation (websites of the Government, MoF and CHU);</li> <li>■ Analysis on a sample of spending units on the functioning of PIFC;</li> <li>■ Analysis of the consolidated reports on PIFC;</li> <li>■ Interviews with a sample of CHU representatives, as well as a sample of senior managers.</li> </ul>

<b>Principle 11</b>	There is central institutional and administrative capacity to develop, implement and monitor procurement policy effectively and efficiently
<b>Principle 13</b>	Public procurement operations comply with basic principles of equal treatment, non-discrimination, proportionality and transparency, while ensuring the most efficient use of public funds and making best use of modern procurement techniques and methods.
<b>Approach</b>	<p><i>Indicator is focused on the availability and accessibility of information about the annual public procurement process to the public. It looks in detail whether the central procurement authority and key contracting authorities publish annual plans and reports, as well as how informative for the interested public is the central public procurement portal. Additionally, it looks into the percentage of public procurement processes done in an open and competitive procedure.</i></p> <p><i>The indicator is based on review of official documentation.</i></p>
<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Availability of public procurement related information to the public</p> <p>Elements given below are combined to create a scale of measurement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Central procurement authority regularly reports to the public on implementation of overall public procurement policy</li> <li>2. Central review body regularly reports to the public on procedures for protection of rights of bidders in public procurement</li> <li>3. Reporting on public procurement by the central procurement is citizen-friendly and accessible</li> <li>4. Public procurement portal is user-friendly</li> <li>5. Central-level contracting authorities regularly publish annual procurement plans</li> <li>6. Central-level contracting authorities regularly publish annual procurement reports</li> <li>7. Central procurement authority publishes open procurement data</li> <li>8. Open and competitive procedures are the main method of public procurement</li> </ol>

<b>Research Methodology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review of annual plans and reports of the central procurement authority</li> <li>▪ Review of annual plans and reports of key contracting authorities</li> <li>▪ Review of official documentation</li> <li>▪ Analysis of percentage of public procurement processes done in an open and competitive procedure</li> <li>▪ Assessment of how informative for the interested public is the central public procurement portal</li> </ul>
-----------------------------	--

<b>Principle 16</b>	<b>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.</b>
<b>Approach</b>	The monitoring approach to this principle is to measure the extent to which SAIs' external communication allows for better information and engagement of all interested stakeholders outside of the parliament in monitoring government performance and accountability.
<b>Indicator</b>	<p>Supreme Audit Institution's communication and cooperation with the public pertaining to its work.</p> <p>Elements given below are combined to create a scale of measurement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SAI develops a communication strategy for reaching out to the public.</li> <li>2. SAI has dedicated at least one job position for proactive communication and provision of feedback towards the public.</li> <li>3. SAI utilises various means of communication with the public.</li> <li>4. SAI produces citizen-friendly summaries of audit reports.</li> <li>5. Official channels for submitting complaints or initiatives to SAI by external stakeholders are developed (wider public, CSOs).</li> <li>6. SAI consults CSOs and their work for the purpose of identifying risks in the public sector.</li> </ol>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<p>Analysis of SAI audit reports and annual reports;</p> <p>Analysis of SAI websites;</p> <p>Interviews with members of SAI councils/collegiate bodies and/or auditors;</p> <p>Interviews (or focus groups) with CSOs active in the areas of PFM and government accountability.</p>