

# Area 3: Public Service and Human Resource Management

INDICATOR	TRANSPARENCY, OPENNESS AND MERITOCRACY OF CIVIL SERVICE AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
Sub-indicator 1	Transparency of statistics and reports on civil service
Sub-indicator 2	Transparency of temporary hiring in the civil service
Sub-indicator 3	Transparency and merit principle of recruitment process
Sub-indicator 4	Merit based selection and protection of top managers from undue political influence
Sub-indicator 5	Transparency and clarity of information on the civil service remuneration
Annexes	FOI requests; Questionnaire for key informants' interviews
SIGMA PRINCIPLES AND SUBPRINCIPLES MONITORED	
<p><b>P8. The employment framework balances stability and flexibility ensure accountability of public servants and protects them against undue influence and wrongful dismissal</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The government has a clear policy on public service, and the political-level responsibility for the area is established</li> <li>e. Public servants can only be dismissed or demoted based on objective criteria regulated by law, following a due process and subject to judicial review.</li> <li>f. The public administration uses temporary employment in justified situations and within reasonable time limits.</li> <li>g. A central body, sufficiently empowered, effectively leads and co-ordinates the human resource management (HRM) system for the public service, provides support to public administration bodies, and monitors implementation.</li> <li>h. Public administration bodies have sufficient capacities for professional HRM.</li> <li>i. An effective information system supports HRM processes and provides data allowing for evidence based public service policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>P9. Public administration attracts and recruits competent people based on merit and equal opportunities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The public administration analyses human resources (HR) and prepares and implements HR plans aligned with the budget to ensure the appropriate workforce size, mix of competencies, skills and expertise to fulfil its mission, considering both current and future needs.</li> <li>b. Public servants are recruited through transparent and open competitions, based on merit.</li> </ul>	

- c. Inclusive recruitment policies and practices support diversity and equal opportunities in the public administration.
- e. Recruitment is based on accurate job descriptions providing the required candidate profile (experience, knowledge, skills, competencies) for effective performance, reflected in vacancy announcements, along with work and salary conditions.
- f. Selection committees are composed of members qualified to perform the assessment of candidates against the job requirements, without any conflict of interest, and free from political influence.
- g. Selection methods provide fair and valid assessment of the experience, knowledge, skills and competencies necessary to perform the job and enable the selection of the most suitable candidates.
- h. Recruitment and selection processes are efficient, timely, user-friendly and supported by digital tools
- i. Applicants are informed of recruitment decisions in a timely manner and have the right to ask for justification and appeal through administrative and judicial channels.

**P10. Effective leadership is fostered through competence, stability, professional autonomy and responsiveness of accountable top managers**

- a. The law establishes top managers as a specific category. The scope of top management is adequately defined, ensuring that senior managerial positions in ministries and agencies are not treated as political offices.
- b. Top management positions are made attractive through fair recruitment, competitive remuneration, professional challenges, autonomy and mitigation of career risks.
- c. Recruitment procedures are merit-based, professionally led, impartial and transparent, allowing selection and appointment of top managers with sufficient high-level experience, knowledge, skills, and competencies to perform their job well against predefined standards.
- d. Recruitment policies and practices support equal opportunities, gender balance and non-discrimination in top managerial positions.
- e. Top managers in public administration have clearly defined objectives, aligned with the mission of the organisation and objectives of the government, and their performance is regularly assessed.
- f. Top managers in public administration have sufficient professional and managerial autonomy, enabling them to assume responsibility for the management of staff, resources, and work.

**P11. Public servants are motivated, fairly and competitively paid and have good working conditions**

- a. The public administration offers a competitive package of financial and non-financial compensation: remuneration and benefits, development and career opportunities, job security, and a respectful and inclusive work environment, to attract, motivate and retain employees and teams with the required skills and competencies.
- d. The salary system is transparent to employees and the public, while ensuring a sufficient degree of protection of sensitive personal data.

INDICATOR	TRANSPARENCY, OPENNESS AND MERITOCRACY OF CIVIL SERVICE AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT		
General methodological remarks	<p>The scope of the entire indicator is limited to civil service and central state administrations in the Western Balkans, meaning it does not cover sub-national administrations (local, provincial, regional etc.). For certain elements, and only exceptionally, wider public sector is referenced and should be considered to the extent it is methodologically covered.</p> <p>For the Outcome and Impact elements 1.8, 2.5, 3.11, 4.10 and 5.4, 3 interviews with key informants are envisaged as a rule and are used as a basis for point allocation. For the Outcome and Impact elements 3.12, 3.13 and 3.14, points are awarded based on the results of the public perception survey conducted within the scope and for the purpose of the monitoring cycle. The public perception survey was conducted from the 1<sup>st</sup> of February until the 26<sup>th</sup> of February across all six Western Balkans administrations on a representative sample.</p> <p>If no information which is critical for point allocation can be obtained either through the review of websites stated in the data sources, or through the submission of FOI requests, research should hold interviews with central state administration bodies responsible for civil service/HRM, or responsible ministries to obtain missing data (unless it is clear from point allocation guidelines that points are allocated solely on public availability of required information).</p> <p>For the temporary hiring in the sub-indicator 2, all engaged persons are considered that are not hired on an indefinite term – fixed-term civil servants, staff engaged on a basis of different types of fixed-term contracts (contracted staff).</p>		
	<b>Sub-indicator 1</b>		
	<b>Transparency of statistics and reports on civil service</b>		
	<b>Element 1.1</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>
	<i>SIGMA Principle P8. a</i>	Strategic framework envisages improvements in transparency of basic information on civil service	Strategy and Policy
		<b>Methodology</b>	<b>Data source</b>
		Review of a current government strategic document on civil service and human resource management (HRM) at the time of measurement to determine whether improvements in transparency of basic information on civil service are envisaged. Researchers identify relevant sections in the analysed strategic documents that contain information on specific measures or activities, with clear assignment of responsibilities. If no strategic document envisages actions towards more transparency and public availability of basic information on civil service, no points are awarded.	PAR Strategic documents
			<b>Point allocation</b>
			0.5 – Measures or activities for improving transparency of basic information envisaged, with clear assignment of responsibilities
			Maximum score: 0.5
	<b>Element 1.2</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>
	<i>SIGMA Principle P8. g, h, i</i>	Regulations stipulate that data on civil service and employees in the central state administration are publicly available	Legislation
		<b>Methodology</b>	<b>Data source</b>
			Law on administrative/civil/public servants Law on public sector employees
			<b>Point allocation</b>

	<p>Review of valid regulations at the time of measurement to determine whether there is a requirement on publishing data about civil service and employees in the central state administration, in the forms of reports on civil service policy or separate statistics.</p> <p>In addition, and for the purpose of analysis, researchers note whether regulations stipulate any exceptions to the obligation of publishing of information on civil service, and the justifications for those exceptions.</p>		<p>1 – publishing of basic statistics about the civil service and employees regulated, either through reports on civil service or as part of the other statistics publisher separately, and any exceptions are clearly defined and limited</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>0.5 – publishing of basic statistics about civil service and employees regulated, but exceptions exist and are not clearly defined and limited</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 1</i></p>
<b>Element 1.3</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P8. g, i</i>	The Government regularly publishes reports pertaining to the civil service	Practice	Government websites Websites of central state administration body responsible for civil service
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Review of websites of the Government, or central state administration body responsible for civil service, to determine whether reports dedicated to the civil service policy implementation are made publicly available.</p> <p>To qualify for point allocation under this Element, <b>a report for the last calendar year needs to be published</b>, in line with legal deadlines for producing and publishing. If legal deadline (due date) for producing of report for the last calendar year has not arrived, report for the year preceding the last calendar year is considered.</p> <p>For this Element, basic statistics means 1) total number of civil servants, 2) per state administration body, OR types/categories of bodies, 3) per ranks of civil servants, and 4) and total number divided by managerial and non-managerial positions.</p> <p>For full point allocation, <b>publishing needs to be regular, i.e., the last two reports in line with legal deadlines, need to be available online.</b></p>		<p>0.5 – the report for the last calendar year on civil service is published</p> <p>0.5 - the report for the last calendar year on civil service is published in line with legal deadline</p> <p>0.5 – the report for the last calendar year on civil service includes basic statistics</p> <p>0.5 – the report for the year preceding the last calendar year on civil service is published</p> <p>0.5 - the report for the year preceding the last calendar year is</p>

	<p>If no reports are publicly available, researchers review the same websites to determine whether basic statistics on civil service is published separately and whether it covers the last calendar year (either monthly, quarterly, biannual, or annual statistical data as long as it covers last calendar year time span).</p>		<p>published in line with legal deadline 0.5 – the report for the year preceding the last calendar year on civil service includes basic statistics</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>2 – no reports on civil service are publicly available, but there is basic statistics on civil service online, that covers the last calendar year</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 3</i></p>
<b>Element 1.4</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P8. i</i>	Published reports include data on employees other than civil servants in the central state administration	Practice	Government websites Websites of central state administration body responsible for civil service
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Review of the relevant websites to determine if the published reports on civil service, include information on employees other than civil servants in the central state administration. These categories may include general state employees (ancillary employees), staff hired on contracts outside of the scope of civil service laws (contracted staff, temporary employments).</p> <p>Researchers first review the legislation to establish the categories of employees within the civil service regime and the types of contracts on which staff can be hired outside the civil service legislation. The published reports are then analysed against the established categories.</p> <p>For this element, a <b>report for the last calendar year is observed</b>, in line with legal deadlines for producing and publishing. If legal deadline (due date) for producing of report for the last calendar year has not arrived, report for the year preceding the last calendar year is considered.</p>		<p>1.5 - published reports on civil service or special reports contain data on employees other than civil servants, per state administration body</p> <p>1.5 - published reports on civil service or special reports contain data on employees other than civil servants, per category of employment</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>1 – no reports on civil service are publicly available, but there is basic statistics on civil service</p>

			online, that includes data on employees other than civil servants  <i>Maximum score: 3</i>
<b>Element 1.5</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P8. i</i>	Published reports segregate data based on gender, age, and education	Practice	Government websites; Websites of central state administration body responsible for civil service
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Review of the relevant websites to determine if published reports on civil service include information on employees' gender, age, and education. Additionally, it is reviewed whether such data is additionally broken down either per civil service ranks/title or central state administration bodies.</p> <p>For this element, a <b>report for the last calendar year is observed</b>, in line with legal deadlines for producing and publishing. If legal deadline (due date) for producing of report for the last calendar year has not arrived, report for the year preceding the last calendar year is considered.</p>		<p>1.5 – published reports include cumulative data on gender structure, age, and education of employees 1.5 – published reports include data on gender, age and education structure that is broken down per civil service ranks or central state administration bodies</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>0.5 – no reports on civil service are publicly available, but there is basic statistics on civil service online, that includes cumulative data on gender, age, and education of employees</p> <p>0.5 - no reports on civil service are publicly available, but there is basic statistics on civil service online, that includes data on gender, age, and education structure that is broken down per</p>



			civil service ranks/titles OR central state administration bodies  <i>Maximum score: 3</i>
<b>Element 1.6</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P8. g, h, i</i>	Civil service data is available in open format(s)	Practice	Government websites; Websites of central state administration bodies responsible for civil service National Open Data Portal
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Review of the relevant websites to determine if any dataset on civil service is available in open, machine-readable format.</p> <p>For this element, “machine-readable format means a file format structured so that software applications can easily identify, recognise and extract specific data, including individual statements of fact, and their internal structure”.<sup>1</sup> File formats include common open data formats with highest openness rating i.e., that are adjustable such as xml, xlsx, xls, ods, csv, tsv, json.<sup>2</sup></p> <p>To qualify for maximum point allocation, any such dataset should be available at the national (government-sponsored) open data portal. If data is published as part of annual reports on civil service, it is accepted as long as it is published in open format as defined above.</p> <p>For this element, the last available/updated datasets are considered, if not older than two calendar years preceding the measurement.</p>		<p>1.5 – civil service data is available in open, machine-readable format, and published at the website of responsible institution or the Government</p> <p>1.5 – available civil service data in open, machine-readable format, is published on the national open data portal</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 3</i></p>
<b>Element 1.7</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P8. g, h, i</i>	The government comprehensively reports on the key elements of civil service policy and HRM	Practice	Government websites; Websites of central state administration body responsible for civil service
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>

<sup>1</sup> Directive (EU) 2019/1024 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 June 2019 on open data and the re-use of public sector information (recast).

<sup>2</sup> See more: [https://data.europa.eu/sites/default/files/data\\_formats\\_v1.pdf](https://data.europa.eu/sites/default/files/data_formats_v1.pdf).

	<p>Review of the relevant websites to determine if reports dedicated specifically to civil service policy implementation are comprehensive. For this element, the last available report on civil service is considered, if it is not older than two calendar years preceding the measurement.</p> <p>Comprehensiveness is understood to mean coverage of the following key elements: 1. planning, 2. recruitment, 3. performance appraisal, 4. career development (promotions and demotions), 5. professional development (trainings), 6. remuneration (salaries), 7. disciplinary responsibility and ethics and integrity issues and measures. To award maximum points, all key issues need to be identified in published reports.</p> <p>For this element, <b>a report for the last calendar year is observed</b>, in line with legal deadlines for producing and publishing. If legal deadline (due date) for producing of report for the last calendar year has not arrived, report for the year preceding the last calendar year is considered.</p>		<p>0.50 – published report(s) cover key issue 1 0.50 – published report(s) cover key issue 2 0.50 – published report(s) cover key issue 3 0.50 – published report(s) cover key issue 4 0.50 – published report(s) cover key issue 5 0.50 – published report(s) cover key issue 6 0.50 – published report(s) cover key issue 7</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 3.5</i></p>
<b>Element 1.8</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P8. g, h, i</i>	Key non-state actors consider reports on civil service policy as transparent and comprehensive	Outcomes and Impact	Key informant interviews
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Key informant interviews with civil society representatives, and other non-state actors (from academic community, professional organisations, media associations, investigative journalism outlets, thematic experts etc.) are conducted to gain insight into perspectives and experiences of participants on public availability and coverage of basic statistic and reports on civil service policy implementation. <b>Researchers conduct minimum 3 such interviews.</b></p> <p>In addition to the conversation, result of which will be used to complement the assessment with qualitative insights, interview participants will be asked to fill in a short survey on the spot to express their position on transparency, regularity in publishing and comprehensiveness of civil service reports, using a four-point scale - fully agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree, fully disagree. Point allocation will be determined based on the ratio of positive responses – fully and tend to agree. Interviewees respond to the following statements:</p> <p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Publicly available reports and statistics on civil service are transparent</li> </ol>		<p>1.25 – all interviewees agree that reports on civil service are transparent 1.25 – all interviewees agree that reports are comprehensive</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 2.5</i></p>



	2. Publicly available reports and statistics on civil service are comprehensive enough.		
The same interviews will be used for other elements in this indicator that are measuring outcomes and impact, unless otherwise specified.			
SUBTOTAL POINTS			19.5
Sub-indicator 2	Transparency of temporary hiring in the civil service		
Element 2.1	Formulation	Type	Data source
SIGMA Principle P8. f	Regulations stipulate conditions and limitations for hiring temporary staff	Legislation	Laws on civil service/civil servants including relevant bylaws; Labour codes
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of the valid regulations at the time of measurement (laws and bylaws) to determine whether conditions and limitations (in volume and time) for the temporary hiring are regulated.		For fixed-term civil servants: 0.25 – conditions for temporary hiring regulated 0.25 – limitations in real number or percentage of temporary hirings compared to the overall civil service regulated 0.25 – time limitations (duration) for temporary hirings regulated 0.25 – limitations of renewal of the contract with the same individual regulated
	For this sub-indicator, temporary hiring in the civil service will be interpreted to mean: 1. civil servants hired on a fixed term basis, and 2. contracted staff through service, temporary, consultancy or other contracts that fall outside of the civil service merit-based regime.		For contracted staff: 0.25 – conditions for temporary hiring regulated 0.25 – limitations in real number or percentage of temporary hirings compared to the overall civil service regulated 0.25 – time limitations (duration) for temporary hirings regulated 0.25 – limitations of renewal of the contract with the same individual regulated
	If temporary hiring is limited for the entire central state administration or the wider public sector, this is accepted for point allocation.		

			<i>Maximum score: 2</i>
<b>Element 2.2</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P8. f</i>	Regulations stipulate openness and application of merit-principle when hiring temporary staff	Legislation	Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws Labour codes
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>This element seeks to establish if the laws stipulates that the procedures for temporary hirings in the central state administration are transparent i.e. that hiring is based on a transparent, competitive process, including publication of vacancy announcements and a selection procedure which tests skills and competencies, enabling selection of the most competent candidates for the jobs.</p> <p>If more than one regime for hiring temporary staff is envisaged by regulations, and some of those are not open and merit-based, fewer points are allocated according to the point allocation criteria. If no open and merit-based regime is regulated at all, for both categories of temporary employees, no points are awarded.</p>		<p>For fixed-term civil servants: 0.5 – only open and merit-based procedure regulated <b>OR</b> 0.25 – more than one hiring regime regulated, and at least one is not open and merit-based</p> <p>For all contracted staff: 0.5 – only open and merit-based procedure regulated <b>OR</b> 0.25 – more than one hiring regime regulated, and at least one is not open and merit-based</p>
<b>Element 2.3</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P8. f</i>	Procedure for hiring temporary staff is open and transparent	Practice	Websites of the ministries and other central state administration bodies; Central institutions responsible for HRM; FOI requests to 5 sample institutions
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	Focus of this element is on open and merit-based hiring regimes only, as defined in the Element 2.2. <b>If regulations, analysed under the Element 2.2, include another regime that is not open and merit-based, for each of the two categories of temporary staff, 0.5 points are deducted for each category. If no open and merit-based regime is</b>		<p>For fixed-term civil servants (5 procedures in total) 0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures</p>

	<p><b>regulated at all, for both categories of temporary employees, no points are awarded.</b></p> <p>Researchers review websites of ministries, other central state administration bodies, including central institutions responsible for HRM in civil service (depending on whether the recruitment procedures in the country are centralised or decentralised), <b>to identify most recently completed competitions for hiring temporary staff in five different central state administration bodies – sample of 5 competition procedures for hiring fixed-term civil servants (one per body), and a sample of 5 competition procedures for hiring contracted staff (one per body) - 10 in total.</b></p> <p>If information is not available online and the legislation <u>does</u> stipulate publication of vacancies announcements, <b>FOI requests are sent to institutions with high number of employees, asking separately for fixed-term civil servants, and for contracted staff</b>, following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did you hire temporary staff the in last two years?</li> <li>- Did you hire temporary staff through open vacancies?</li> <li>- Please submit recruitment files, for the last hiring, for each category (fixed-terms civil servants, and contracted staff).</li> </ul> <p>To establish full transparency and openness, researchers need to determine if all the necessary elements of a public call/announcements are present (vacancy announcement, requirements/ competencies, job description, basic information on remuneration, selection procedure, deadlines for submission and clear information on documents to be submitted).</p>	<p>vacancy announcements published 0.25 – for 4 out of observed procedures requirements/competencies provided 0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures job description provided 0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures remuneration information provided 0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures, selection procedure elaborated 0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures, deadlines for submission of applications provided 0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures, clear information on documents to be submitted provided</p> <p>For all contracted staff (5 procedures in total) 0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures, vacancy announcements published 0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures requirements/competencies provided 0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures, job description provided</p>
--	--	--

			<p>0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures remuneration information provided</p> <p>0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures selection procedure elaborated</p> <p>0.25 – for 4 out of 5 observed procedures, deadlines for submission of applications provided</p> <p>0.25 - for 4 out of 5 observed procedures clear information on documents to be submitted provided</p> <p><b>If regulations, analysed under the Element 2.2, include another regime that is not open and merit-based, for each of the two categories of temporary staff, 0.5 points are deducted for each category.</b></p> <p><i>Maximum score: 3.5</i></p>
<b>Element 2.4</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P8. f</i>	Temporary hirings are limited in practice	Practice	FOI requests to central institutions responsible for HRM in civil service
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Review of the established practice on temporary hiring in the civil service, to determine whether they are in practice limited in scope.</p> <p>Researchers send FOI request to five different central state administration bodies in the sample as in the Element 2.3, <b>asking separately for fixed-term civil servants, and for all contracted staff</b>, data on:</p> <p>A. Current number of civil servants and general employees</p> <p>B. Current number of temporarily hired persons.</p>		<p>For fixed-term civil servants: 1.5 – limited in scope -&gt; B is within the legally set limits</p> <p>For all contracted staff: 1.5 – limited in scope -&gt; B is within the legally set limits</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 3</i></p>

	Researchers calculate the number of temporary hired per each category and assess whether results of calculation are within the legally set limits.		
Element 2.5	Formulation	Type	Data source
SIGMA Principle P8. f	Key non-state actors consider the use of temporary hiring as transparent, limited and purposeful	Outcomes and Impact	Key informant interviews with civil society representatives and other non-state actors
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Attitudes of key informants on transparency, limitedness, and purposefulness of the use of temporary hiring are assessed <b>via the same key informant interviews, and using the same methodological approach, from the Element 1.8.</b> Interviewees respond to the following statements:  To what extent do you agree or disagree with following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Use of temporary hiring in civil service, such as fixed-term employment of civil servants, and hiring of contracted staff, is transparent.</li><li>2. Use of temporary hiring in civil service is, in practice, limited.</li><li>3. Use of temporary hiring in civil service is purposeful.</li></ol>		1 – all interviewees agree that the use of temporary hiring is transparent 1 – all interviewees agree that the use of temporary hiring is limited 1 – all of interviewees agree that the use of temporary hiring is purposeful  <i>Maximum score: 3</i>
SUBTOTAL POINTS			12.5
Sub-indicator 3	Transparency and merit principle of recruitment process		
Element 3.1	Formulation	Type	Data source
SIGMA Principle P9. a, h	Strategic framework envisages improvements of openness, transparency and merit principle of the recruitment process	Strategy and Policy	PAR Strategic documents
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of valid government strategic documents at the time of measurement (strategy, programme or similar) to determine whether they envisage improvements of openness, transparency and merit principle of the recruitment process for civil service jobs. Researchers identify relevant sections in the analysed strategic documents that contain information on specific measures or activities, with clear assignment of responsibilities. If no strategic document envisages actions in that regard, no points are awarded.		0.25 – Measures for improvement of openness, of the recruitment process are envisaged, with clear assignment of responsibilities 0.25 - Measures for improvement of transparency of the recruitment process are envisaged, with clear assignment of responsibilities 0.25 – Measures for improvement of merit principle of the

			recruitment process are envisaged, with clear assignment of responsibilities  <i>Maximum score: 0.75</i>
<b>Element 3.2</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. b</i>	Regulations stipulate openness, transparency, and merit principle of the recruitment process	Legislation	Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	Review of valid regulations at the time of measurement to determine whether there are provisions that stipulate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. filling in vacancies using public competition announcements,</li> <li>2. openness of public competition process through different nation-wide means for advertising vacancies (at least three),</li> <li>3. transparency or public competition/selection results, including list of successful candidates determined by the selection panels, selected candidates for hiring, and decisions for annulling competition procedures.</li> </ul>		0.25 – use of public competitions to fill in vacancies regulated 0.25 – openness of public competition process through different nation-wide means of advertising vacancies (at least three) regulated 0.25 – publication of list of successful candidates regulated 0.25 - publication of information on selected candidate (unique codes or names) regulated 0.25 - publication of decision for annulling competition procedure regulated  <i>Maximum score: 1.25</i>
<b>Element 3.3</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. b, c</i>	Vacancy announcements for public competitions are made broadly publicly available	Practice	Websites of the central institutions responsible for civil service/HRM; Websites of five sample central state administration bodies; FOI requests
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	Broad public availability is understood as requiring publication through at least 3 different means of advertising that are available nation-wide, including a single portal/website for all recruitments in the central state administration and social media.		0.75 – vacancy announcements for 4 out of 5 observed public competitions are advertised through a single portal for all



	<p>The same five ministries/central state administration bodies are observed <b>as in the Element 2.3</b>, and for each body, a vacancy announcement for the most recently completed public competition procedure is analysed (<i>top managerial/senior civil service positions are not included in samples</i>).</p> <p>Researchers perform a review of websites of the central institution responsible for HRM, as well websites of the five ministers/central state administration bodies whose vacancy announcements are assessed. In addition, FOI requests are sent to either the central institution responsible for HRM, or bodies in the sample, or both (depending on the level of (de)centralisation of recruitment process), to obtain information on the ways of advertising observed public competitions. If vacancy announcements are not available online in the moment of measurement, FOI requests are submitted to the responsible bodies, to obtain texts of the announcements, too.</p> <p>Additional 0.5 points are awarded if more than 3 means of advertisement were used.</p>		<p>recruitments in civil service/central state administration</p> <p>0.75 – vacancy announcements for 4 out of 5 observed public competitions are advertised through hiring bodies' social media</p> <p>0.75 – vacancy announcements for 4 out of 5 observed public competitions are advertised through hiring bodies' website</p> <p>0.75 – vacancy announcements for 4 out of 5 observed public competitions are advertised through additional means</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 3</i></p>
<b>Element 3.4</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. b, c, e</i>	Vacancy announcements for public competitions are presented in a way to motivate and attract external candidates	Practice	Websites of the central institutions responsible for HRM; Websites of five sample central state administration bodies
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Researchers review texts of 5 vacancy announcements <b>from the Element 3.3</b>, to determine whether they are presented in a way to motivate and attract external candidates to apply.</p> <p>Points are awarded if at least a single vacancy announcement, observed under the Element 3.3. was made more attractive through visuals or other visually appealing formats (infographics, images, charts and graphs, and similar). Maximum points are awarded if more than one vacancy announcement is presented in such as way.</p>		<p>1 – At least single vacancy announcement is made more attractive to external candidates</p> <p>2 - More than one vacancy announcement is made more attractive to external candidates</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 2</i></p>
<b>Element 3.5</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. b, c,</i>	Responsible institution provides support and guidance to applicants	Practice	Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws Websites of the central institutions responsible for HRM

	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Researchers review data sources to determine whether central institution responsible for HRM provides support and guidance to applicants in the recruitment process. Support to the candidates should include the following mandatory requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Guide/roadmap through the public competition process</li> <li>2. Materials for the preparation of candidates (such as test examples, useful sources and similar)</li> <li>3. Frequently asked questions, and answers</li> <li>4. Information on how applicants, and candidates in the process can request and obtain clarifications.</li> </ol> <p>For narrative purposes under point 4, researchers review primary and secondary legislation, to establish if it is possible to request additional information and clarifications. <b>If there is no possibility to request clarifications, according to the law, no points are allocated under the point 4.</b></p> <p>Also, researchers not if there are any additional types of support, not listed above.</p>		<p>0.75 – Guide/roadmap through the public competition process available</p> <p>0.75 – Materials for the preparation of candidates available</p> <p>0.75 – Frequently asked questions, and answers available</p> <p>0.75 – Information on the way of requesting and obtaining clarification available</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 3</i></p>
<b>Element 3.6</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. g, h</i>	There are no unreasonable barriers for external candidates which make public competitions more easily accessible to internal candidates	Practice	<p>Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws;</p> <p>Websites of the central institutions responsible for HRM;</p> <p>Websites of five sample central state administration bodies</p>
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Researchers first perform expert review of the requirements established in the relevant legislation (primary and secondary).</p> <p>Next, the same sample of 5 vacancy announcement, <b>used in the Element 3.3</b>, is reviewed for supporting documents requested from candidates, and specifically to identify requirements that are a special burden to external candidates (such as, proof of passing a state exam before application, proof of attendance/certificates of specific courses/technical skills available only to civil servants or costly to take, medical certificates, certified translations, and similar) or those that could only reasonably be</p>		<p>3 – No unreasonable barriers identified for 4 out of 5 vacancy announcements</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 3</i></p>

	expected from an existing civil servant (e.g. very specific information on the tasks and duties of the job position to which they are being recruited).		
<b>Element 3.7</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. g, h</i>	The application procedure imposes minimum administrative/paperwork burden on candidates	Practice	Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws; Websites of the central institutions responsible for HRM; Websites of five sample central state administration bodies; FOI requests
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>For the same sample of vacancy announcements <b>as in the Element 3.3</b>, researchers review the list of documents requested from candidates when applying for public competitions, in the initial phase of submission of mandatory documents.</p> <p>Submission of maximum 3 easily obtainable documents is considered as minimum burden in the initial phase of submission of mandatory documents - initial application phase (this does not preclude any requirements to submit additional documentation later in the process).</p> <p>Easily obtainable types of documents are documents such as proofs, certificates and similar, which do not pose a significant financial burden (administrative fees are not considered as significant financial burden, but costs such as official translations of certificates, notarisation of documents and similar).</p> <p><b>Submission of an application form does not count as a mandatory document in the initial phase of application.</b> If application is possible only with submission of application form, maximum score for the first point allocation criterion will be awarded.</p> <p>For point allocation purpose, same types of documents are counted once if applicable, e.g., if language certificates for two foreign languages were submitted, they will be counted as a single type of document.</p> <p>If in the recruitment procedure, the administration collects all data and information from the registries and databases it keeps/collects (e.g. birth certificates, citizenship certificates, state examination certificates, etc.), additional points are awarded.</p>		<p>2 – for 4 out of 5 vacancy announcements, maximum 3 easily obtainable types of documents were requested in the initial phase of submission of mandatory documents</p> <p>2 – the hiring bodies themselves collect necessary data and information about the candidates from the state-kept registries</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 4</i></p>

Element 3.8	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. g, h, i</i>	Candidates can supplement missing documentation within a reasonable timeframe	Practice	Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws; Websites of the central institutions responsible for HRM; Websites of five sample central state administration bodies; FOI requests
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>This element determines if failure to submit all requested documents means automatic disqualification from the procedure. <b>A reasonable timeframe is understood to mean at least 5 working days. Submission of an application form does not count as submission of mandatory documents.</b></p> <p>Researchers first perform a review of legislation (laws and bylaws) regulating recruitment of civil servants to determine if the formal procedure allows for this. Subsequently, FOI requests are sent to the central institution responsible for HRM and, where needed due to the nature of the procedure, to five sample central state administration bodies, <b>that advertised the same sample of vacancy announcements as in the Element 3.3</b>, to obtain information and evidence regarding possibility of supplementing documents.</p>		<p>1.5 – for 4 out of 5 vacancy announcements candidates were allowed to supplement missing documentation</p> <p>1.5 – for 4 out of 5 vacancy announcements time allowed was at least five working days</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 3</i></p>
Element 3.9	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. b, g, h</i>	Decisions and reasoning of the selection panels are made publicly available, with due respect to the protection of personal information	Practice	Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws; Websites of the central institutions responsible for HRM; Websites of five sample central state administration bodies
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>This element analyses the transparency of the outcome of the selection process, i.e. if the decisions are made publicly available, and if reasoning for the decisions is provided. Reasoning is interpreted to mean publication of score obtained by each candidate, or another type of reasoning (e.g., how candidate scored in different phases of selection procedure).</p> <p>Researchers perform a review of the website of the central institution responsible for HRM, and five sample central state administration bodies, to determine whether</p>		<p>2 – for 4 out of 5 vacancy announcements, a decision of selection panel was made publicly available</p> <p>2 – for 4 out of 5 vacancy announcements decision was followed by points obtained, or other type of reasoning</p>

	<p>decisions (outcomes) of selection processes, <b>for the same sample of vacancy announcements as in the Element 3.3</b>, were made publicly available.</p> <p>Researchers note whether personal information of candidates is respected in publishing selection decisions/acts (not used for point calculation but will be notified in the narrative report).</p> <p>Researchers note any requirements to record sessions of selection panels, for accountability purposes (does not affect point allocation).</p>		Maximum score: 4
<b>Element 3.10</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. G, h</i>	Information about annulled public competitions, including reasoning for the annulment, is made publicly available	Practice	Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws; Websites of the central institutions responsible for HRM; Websites of five sample central state administration bodies
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>This element further analyses the transparency of the outcome of the selection process, i.e. if information and reasoning is published when public competitions are annulled. Researchers first perform review of relevant legislation, followed by a review of the website of the central institution responsible for HRM, and the same five central state administration bodies, in search for the information pertaining to the cases of annulled competitions.</p> <p>A period of two years preceding the measurement is observed to identify all cases of annulled competitions. In case fewer than 2 competitions were annulled by the five sample central state administration bodies within two-year period, an additional past year is observed.</p> <p>If there were no annulled announcements in the observed period, <b>maximum points are allocated</b>.</p>		<p>2 – information on all annulled vacancy announcements in the observed period was made publicly available</p> <p>2 – information on annulment was complemented with a reasoning</p> <p>Maximum score: 4</p>
<b>Element 3.11</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. g, h</i>	Key informants consider recruitment into civil service as transparent and merit-based	Outcomes and Impact	Key informant interviews with civil society representatives and other non-state actors
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>

	<p>Attitudes of key informants on meritocracy, and transparency of recruitment into civil service are assessed <b>via the same key informant interviews, and using the same methodological approach, from the Element 1.8.</b> Interviewees respond to the following statements:</p> <p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Process of recruitment into civil service is based on merit</li> <li>2. Process of recruitment into civil service is transparent.</li> </ol>		<p>1.25 – all interviewees agree that the recruitment process is merit based</p> <p>1.25 – all interviewees agree that the recruitment process is transparent</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 2.5</i></p>
<b>Element 3.12</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. g</i>	Citizens' perception of merit-based civil service recruitment	Outcomes and Impact	Public perception survey
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>The results of the public perception survey are used as a basis for point allocation under this element. Researchers award points under this element based on the percentage of citizens who responded with “agree” and “strongly agree” to the following statement:</p> <p><b>Public servants are recruited through public competitions based on merit (i.e. best candidates are enabled to get the jobs).</b></p>		<p>0.5 – 20%-40% of respondents responded with “agree” or “strongly agree”</p> <p>OR</p> <p>1 – 40%-60% of respondents responded with “agree” or “strongly agree”</p> <p>OR</p> <p>1.5 – 60%-80% of respondents responded with “agree” or “strongly agree”</p> <p>OR</p> <p>2 – more than 80% of respondents responded with “agree” or “strongly agree”</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 2</i></p>
<b>Element 3.13</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. g</i>	Citizens' perception of the influence of personal connections in civil service recruitment	Outcomes and Impact	Public perception survey
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>The results of the public perception survey are used as a basis for point allocation under this element. Researchers award points under this element based on the</p>		<p>0.5 – 20%-40% of respondents responded with “disagree” or “strongly disagree”</p> <p>OR</p>



	percentage of citizens who responded with “disagree” and “strongly disagree” to the following statement:  <b>One needs personal connections to get a job in the public administration in my country (i.e., family ties, kinship, friendship and similar).</b>		1 – 40%-60% of respondents responded with “disagree” or “strongly disagree” OR 1.5 – 60%-80% of respondents responded with “disagree” or “strongly disagree” OR 2 – more than 80% of respondents responded with “disagree” or “strongly disagree” <i>Maximum score: 2</i>
<b>Element 3.14</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P9. g</i>	Citizens' perception of the influence of political connections in civil service recruitment	Outcomes and Impact	Public perception survey
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	The results of the public perception survey are used as a basis for point allocation under this element. Researchers award points under this element based on the percentage of citizens who responded with “disagree” and “strongly disagree” to the following statement:  <b>One needs political connections to get a job in the public administration (i.e., membership in political party/organisation, personal ties with political parties).</b>		0.5 – 20%-40% of respondents responded with “disagree” or “strongly disagree” OR 1 – 40%-60% of respondents responded with “disagree” or “strongly disagree” OR 1.5 – 60%-80% of respondents responded with “disagree” or “strongly disagree” OR 2 – more than 80% of respondents responded with “disagree” or “strongly disagree” <i>Maximum score: 2</i>
<b>SUBTOTAL POINTS</b>			<b>36.5</b>
<b>Sub-indicator 4</b>	<b>Merit based selection and protection of top managers from undue political influence</b>		
<b>Element 4.1</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>

<i>SIGMA Principle P10. a</i>	Strategic framework envisages strengthening of professionalism of the civil service top management	Strategy and Policy	PAR Strategic framework
	<b>Methodology</b> Review of a current government strategic document at the time of measurement to determine whether strengthening of professionalism of the civil service top management is envisaged.  Researchers identify relevant sections in the analysed strategic documents that contain information on specific measures or activities, with clear assignment of responsibilities. If no strategic document envisages actions towards strengthened professionalism of the civil service top management, no points are awarded.		<b>Point allocation</b> 0.5 – Measures or activities for strengthening the professionalism of the civil service top management envisaged, with clear assignment of responsibilities  <i>Maximum score: 0.5</i>
<b>Element 4.2</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P10. a</i>	Regulations stipulate competitive, merit-based procedures for the recruitment of civil service top management	Legislation	Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws
	<b>Methodology</b>  Review of valid regulations at the time of measurement to determine whether there are provisions that stipulate merit-based procedures for the recruitment of top management positions in the civil service. Based on the review of regulations, researchers also list all top managerial positions in the civil service.		<b>Point allocation</b> 0.5 – mandatory vacancy announcement for hiring top managers regulated 0.5 - testing of competencies/skills in the selection procedure for hiring top managers regulated 0.5 – mandatory selection of one of the first three most successful candidates is legally required  <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
<b>Element 4.3</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P10. a</i>	Regulations stipulate that acting appointments to top management positions are only made from within the civil service, for a limited period	Legislation	Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws
	<b>Methodology</b>  Review of valid regulations at the time of measurement to determine whether there are provisions that stipulate appointment of acting appointments top management positions are made only from among the pool of existing civil servants, and for a maximum period limited by the law which cannot be longer than 12 consecutive months, including any potential extensions of acting appointments.		<b>Point allocation</b> 0.5 – regulations allow acting appointments only from the pool of existing civil servants OR no acting appointments legally possible

	If no acting appointments are legally allowed, maximum points are awarded.		0.5 – regulations allow acting appointments for a period not longer than 12 consecutive months, including any potential extension of such appointments OR no acting appointments possible  <i>Maximum score: 1</i>
<b>Element 4.4</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P10. a</i>	Regulations stipulate objective criteria for the termination of hiring of top management positions	Legislation	Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	Review of valid regulations at the time of measurement to determine whether there are provisions that stipulate objective criteria for the termination of hiring of the top managers, including unsatisfactory performance appraisal, necessity for restructuring or downsizing, or other objectively verifiable reasons. In cases where dismissal criteria include possibilities for discretionary decision by political managers (e.g., for “failure of cooperation”), points are allocated if the application of such measures is clearly time-limited.		0.5 – termination of hiring allowed due to recurrent negative performance appraisals 0.5 – termination of hiring allowed due to restructuring and downsizing for objective technical, financial, economic, or organisational reasons 0.5 – termination allowed in other objectively verifiable circumstances such as due to a final court ruling for a criminal offense, losing citizenship, permanent incapacity for work, etc. 0.5 – objectively verifiable ethics-related reasons and disciplinary responsibility  <i>Maximum score: 2</i>
<b>Element 4.5</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P10. a</i>	Existence of procedures on appointments to top management positions outside of the scope of the civil service legislation	Legislation	Laws on civil service/civil servants, including relevant bylaws;

			Laws on government/parliament/central state administration; Government of parliamentary rules of procedures
	<b>Methodology</b> Review of relevant websites and regulations to determine the existence of any deliberation or vetting mechanism/procedure which is political in nature, i.e., beyond what is regulated by the civil service legislation, and which interferes with the top management positions appointment processes.  Such mechanisms can include permanent or ad-hoc governmental working bodies (committees, commissions, etc.), or bodies established by the parliaments or other types of bodies established by legal acts other than civil service law. <b>Where such mechanisms exist, no points are awarded</b> , and for narrative purposes, researchers analyse relevant sources to obtain essential information regarding their deliberations and decisions.		<b>Point allocation</b>  3 - No such political deliberation mechanism exists  <i>Maximum score: 3</i>
<b>Element 4.6</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P10. b, c, d, e, f</i>	The merit-based recruitment for top management positions is applied in practice	Practice	Websites of five sample central state administration bodies; Websites of ministry responsible for civil service, of central institution responsible for HRM in civil service, or of responsible body for selection of top managers; FOI requests
	<b>Methodology</b> The same five ministries/central state administration bodies are observed as in the Element 2.3. For each body, the entire file from the most recently completed selection procedure from internal or public competition process for filling top management vacancy is analysed - from vacancy announcement to selection procedure result.  Researchers perform a review of websites of the central institution responsible for HRM/selection of top managers, as well websites of the five central state administration bodies. In addition, FOI requests are sent to either central institutions, or bodies in the sample, or both. <b>FOI requests are sent for those selection procedures that are completed at least six months before FOIs submission.</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>  1 – Skills and competences of candidates were tested through written tests or simulations or essays in 4 out of 5 competition procedures observed 1 - Skills and competences of candidates were tested verbally, through structured interviews or simulations, in 4 out of 5 competition procedures observed

	If no vacancy announcement is published, a procedure in question is not considered for point allocation.		2 – One of the three most successful candidates from the list was appointed, in 4 out of 5 competition procedures observed  <i>Maximum score: 4</i>
<b>Element 4.7</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P10. b, c, d, e, f</i>	Acting appointments are, in practice, only made from within the civil service	Practice	FOI requests
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Submission of FOI requests to central institution responsible for HRM/selection of top managers, to obtain the data on all active acting appointees. Specifically, FOI requests are sent asking for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Number of acting appointees on the day of request</li> <li>B. Number of acting appointees under A, who were already hired as civil servants on the day appointment.</li> </ul> <p>The share is expressed as <math>B/A \times 100</math>. If the share is 100%, an additional FOI request is submitted asking for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C. Acts/decisions on acting appointments for the last 10 cases, or other supporting evidence clearly indicating that appointees in question were civil servants on the day of appointment (e.g., decision on appointment to a previous civil service position or any other proof).</li> </ul> <p>Received information is analysed to determine whether in all last 10 cases existing civil servants were appointed. If analysis under C results in at least 1 appointee who was not civil servant on the day of appointment, no points are allocated.</p> <p>If no acting appointments are legally allowed, maximum points are awarded.</p>		<p>3 – According to the official response, and analyses of 10 last cases, 100% of acting appointees were civil servants OR no acting appointments possible</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 3</i></p>
<b>Element 4.8</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P10. b, c, d, e, f</i>	Ratio of eligible candidates per top managerial-level vacancy	Practice	Websites of ministry responsible for civil service, of central institution responsible for HRM in civil service, or of responsible body for selection of top managers FOI requests
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>

	Review of data from relevant websites to determine the ratio of eligible candidates per top management vacancies in civil service bodies, including both internal and public competition procedures, <b>for the last 12 months</b> . If no information is available online, researchers send FOI request to responsible body. Only completed competition procedures (internal and public) are observed.		<p>1.5 – at least 3 eligible candidates participate in competition process for top management civil service positions, on average</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>2.5 - at least 5 eligible candidates participate in competition process, on average</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 2.5</i></p>
<b>Element 4.9</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P10. b, c, d, e, f</i>	Share of non-merit-based appointments to top management positions	Practice	Websites of ministry responsible for civil service, of central institution responsible for HRM in civil service, or of responsible body for selection of top managers; FOI requests
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Review of websites of responsible bodies to obtain the data on the share of appointments to top management positions that were not based on the assessment of requirements and testing of competencies, out of the total number of appointments to these positions <b>for the last 12 months</b>.</p> <p>If information is not available online, an FOI request is sent to responsible body/ies asking for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Total number of appointments to top management positions in the last 12 months.</li> <li>B. Number of appointments without the assessment of requirements and testing of competencies through either internal or external competition procedure, in the same period, excluding legally allowed internal mobility mechanisms/transfers. Such appointments may include, for example, acting appointments from outside of the civil service, purely political appointments etc.</li> <li>C. Number of acting appointments from within the pool of existing civil servants, previously competitively hired.</li> </ul>		<p>2.5 – share is less than 5%</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 2.5</i></p>



	The share is expressed as (B-C)/A*100.		
Element 4.10	Formulation	Type	Data source
SIGMA Principle P10. b, c, d, e, f	Key non-state actors consider that the selection and appointment process of top managers is merit-based and that they are protected from undue political influence	Outcomes and Impact	Key informant interviews with civil society representatives and other non-state actors
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Attitudes of key informants on meritocracy and protection of top managers from undue political influence are assessed <b>via the same key informant interviews, and using the same methodological approach, from the Element 1.8.</b> Interviewees respond to the following statements:  To what extent do you agree or disagree with following: 1. Top managers (senior civil servants) are selected and appointed based on merit. 2. Top managers (senior civil servants) are sufficiently protected from undue political influences.		1.25 – all interviewees agree that the selection and appointment of top managers is merit based 1.25 – all interviewees agree that top managers are sufficiently protected from undue political influence  Maximum score: 2.5
SUBTOTAL POINTS			22.5
Sub-indicator 5	Transparency and clarity of information on the civil service remuneration		
Element 5.1	Formulation	Type	Data source
SIGMA Principle P11, a	Regulations define a simply structured remuneration system	Legislation	Legislation on civil service remuneration
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Researchers perform a review of primary and secondary legislation on civil service remuneration. Simple structure of a remuneration system means existence of a tabular presentation with clearly provided coefficients or other numerical values per civil service rank/position (or ranges of coefficients), and a clear and limited set of rules for calculating supplements (both statutory and discretionary).  In addition, researchers perform review of the legislation to determine if there are clear legal provisions on:  1. Amounts of supplements to the basic salary (supplements for overtime/night/weekend/field work etc.) as a share of basic salary or otherwise		0.25 – table with clear coefficients or other numerical values per civil service rank/position defined 0.25 – amounts of salary supplements regulated 0.25 – conditions and/or limits to the use of salary supplements regulated 0.25 – options for combination of different salary supplements regulated

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Conditions and/or limits to the use of supplements to the basic salary</li> <li>3. the mutual exclusiveness and/or combining of salary supplements from the point 1.</li> <li>4. Limits and clear criteria for the performance-related discretionary supplements (performance bonuses or similar), so that they do not comprise major part of a civil servant's salary.</li> </ol> <p><b>To allocate points under this element, the base for calculating the salaries must be provided in the legislation, and thus publicly available.</b></p>		<p>0.25 – limits to the amounts of performance related discretionary supplements regulated</p> <p>0.25 – clear criteria for performance related discretionary supplements regulated</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 1.5</i></p>
<b>Element 5.2</b>	<b>Formulation</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Data source</b>
<i>SIGMA Principle P11.d</i>	Information on civil service remuneration system is available online	Practice	<p>Government websites;</p> <p>Websites of ministries responsible for civil service policy, and ministries of finance;</p> <p>Websites of central institutions responsible for HRM in civil service</p>
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	<p>Review of official websites to verify if the information on salaries in civil service is available for the candidates for job positions and interested public.</p>		<p>0.5 – general information on salaries in the entire civil service is publicly available (for example, average, median, minimum, maximum)</p> <p>0.5 – detailed information on salaries, broken down per civil service ranks/positions, is publicly available</p> <p>0.5 – information on salaries for specific job positions available in vacancy announcements (both internal and external) for filling civil service jobs</p> <p>0.5 – gender-sensitive information on salaries or information on the gender pay gap is available</p> <p><i>Maximum score: 2</i></p>

Element 5.3	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P11. d</i>	Citizen friendly explanations or presentations of the remuneration information exist	Practice	Government websites; Websites of ministries responsible for civil service policy, and ministries or finance; Websites of central institutions responsible for HRM in civil service
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	This element looks at whether the information on the remuneration system is citizen-friendly, meaning its key aspects are simply presented, and devoid of bureaucratic language. Specifically, researchers review websites stated in data sources to determine whether it is presented succinctly and in easy-to-understand language or graphical tools (tables, graphs, charts etc.).		2 – information on the remuneration system is citizen-friendly  <i>Maximum score: 2</i>
Element 5.4	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P11. d</i>	Key informants consider information on the civil service remuneration system as transparent and clear	Outcomes and Impact	Key informant interviews with civil society representatives and other non-state actors
	<b>Methodology</b>		<b>Point allocation</b>
	Attitudes of key informants on the transparency, clarity, and public availability of information on the civil service remuneration system are assessed <b>via the same key informant interviews, and using the same methodological approach, from the Element 1.8.</b> Interviewees respond to the following statements:  To what extent do you agree or disagree with following: 3. Civil service remuneration (salary) system is transparent. 4. Civil service remuneration system (salary) is sufficiently clear.		1.75 – all interviewees agree that the civil service remuneration system is transparent 1.75 – all interviewees agree that the civil service remuneration system is clear  <i>Maximum score: 3.5</i>
<b>SUBTOTAL POINTS</b>			<b>9</b>
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>			<b>100</b>

## Annex 1: Key informant interviews

### ➤ Element 1.8

The following questions are used for point allocation for the element 1.8. Point allocation is determined based on fully agree/tend to agree responses. For each question where all key informants fully agree/tend to agree with the statement, 1 point is allocated.

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Publicly available reports and statistics on civil service are transparent.**
  - a) fully disagree
  - b) tend to disagree
  - c) tend to agree
  - d) fully agree
  
2. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Publicly available reports and statistics on civil service are comprehensive enough.**
  - a) fully disagree
  - b) tend to disagree
  - c) tend to agree
  - d) fully agree

Additional guiding questions (not used for point allocation, but relevant for providing qualitative insight necessary for the assessment):

1. How would you assess the quality and reliability of data published in official civil service reports?
2. Can citizens, the media, and civil society easily find and understand these reports?
3. Do the reports and statistics cover all relevant aspects of the civil service (such as recruitment, promotion, and staff turnover)?
4. Are there any critical data points missing from publicly available civil service reports? If so, which ones?
5. To what extent are the published data used to improve human resource management policies in the public administration?
6. How would you assess the usability and structure of the reports – are the data clearly presented and tailored to different audiences?
7. Is there room for improvement in the comprehensiveness and level of detail in these reports? If so, how?

### ➤ Element 2.5

The following questions are used for point allocation for the element 2.5. Point allocation is determined based fully agree/tend to agree responses. For each question where all key informants fully agree/tend to agree with the statement, 1 point is allocated.

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Use of temporary hiring in civil service, such as fixed-term employment of civil servants, and hiring of contracted staff, is transparent.**
  - a) fully disagree
  - b) tend to disagree
  - c) tend to agree
  - d) fully agree
2. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Use of temporary hiring in civil service is, in practice, limited.**
  - a) fully disagree
  - b) tend to disagree
  - c) tend to agree
  - d) fully agree
3. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Use of temporary hiring in civil service is purposeful.**
  - a) fully disagree
  - b) tend to disagree
  - c) tend to agree
  - d) fully agree

Additional guiding questions (not used for point allocation, but relevant for providing qualitative insight necessary for the assessment):

1. In your opinion, is there sufficient publicly available information about temporary hiring in civil service?
2. Are there clear criteria and procedures for hiring temporary civil servants and contracted staff?
3. Do you think the selection process for temporary positions is adequately documented and communicated to the public?
4. In your opinion, what are the most common problems with using temporary hiring in civil service?
5. In your opinion, how frequently are fixed-term and contracted positions used compared to permanent employment? Are temporary positions primarily used to address short-term needs, or are temporary engagements sometimes becoming permanent roles instead?
6. Are there cases where temporary hiring is used beyond its intended scope?
7. What measures, if any, are in place to prevent excessive reliance on temporary staff in public administration?

### ➤ Element 3.11

The following questions are used for point allocation for the element 2.5. Point allocation is determined based on fully agree/tend to agree responses. For each question where all key informants fully agree/tend to agree with the statement, 1 point is allocated.

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Process of recruitment into civil service is based on merit.**
  - a) fully disagree
  - b) tend to disagree
  - c) tend to agree

d) fully agree

2. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Process of recruitment into civil service is transparent.**

- a) fully disagree
- b) tend to disagree
- c) tend to agree
- d) fully agree

Additional guiding questions (not used for point allocation, but relevant for providing qualitative insight necessary for the assessment):

1. Do you think the merit-based recruitment process in civil service is consistently applied in practice?
2. Do you consider the mechanisms in place to ensure that recruitment decisions are based on merit to be adequate and of sufficient quality?
3. Are there any factors that undermine merit-based recruitment in civil service?
4. How transparent are the selection criteria and procedures for civil service recruitment?
5. Do you consider that candidates have access to clear and detailed information about job openings and selection processes?
6. What challenges exist in making civil service recruitment fully transparent and merit-based?
7. How effective are appeal mechanisms for candidates who believe the recruitment process was unfair?
8. What improvements could be made to enhance both transparency and meritocracy in civil service recruitment?

#### ➤ **Element 4.10**

The following questions are used for point allocation for the element 2.5. Point allocation is determined based on fully agree/tend to agree responses. For each question where all key informants fully agree/tend to agree with the statement, 1 point is allocated.

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Top managers (senior civil servants) are selected and appointed based on merit.**
  - a) fully disagree
  - b) tend to disagree
  - c) tend to agree
  - d) fully agree
2. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Top managers (senior civil servants) are sufficiently protected from undue political influences.**
  - a) fully disagree
  - b) tend to disagree
  - c) tend to agree
  - d) fully agree



Additional guiding questions (not used for point allocation, but relevant for providing qualitative insight necessary for the assessment):

1. How do you assess the process of selecting and appointing top managers in civil service?
2. Do you believe that the selection of senior civil servants is consistently based on merit rather than political considerations? How could the selection and appointment process for top managers be improved to ensure greater merit-based decision-making?
3. What safeguards are in place to ensure that top managers in civil service are selected based on their qualifications and experience?
4. In your opinion, is the current system for appointing senior civil servants transparent and fair?
5. In your opinion, how would you assess mechanisms for protection of top managers from undesirable political interference, if any?

#### ➤ **Element 5.4**

The following questions are used for point allocation for the element 2.5. Point allocation is determined based on fully agree/tend to agree responses. For each question where all key informants fully agree/tend to agree with the statement, 1 point is allocated.

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Civil service remuneration (salary) system is transparent.**
  - a) fully disagree
  - b) tend to disagree
  - c) tend to agree
  - d) fully agree
2. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Civil service remuneration system (salary) is sufficiently clear.**
  - a) fully disagree
  - b) tend to disagree
  - c) tend to agree
  - d) fully agree

Additional guiding questions (not used for point allocation, but relevant for providing qualitative insight necessary for the assessment):

1. How would you assess the transparency of the civil service remuneration system?
2. Do you consider the current salary system in civil service to be clear? Are the criteria for determining salaries and bonuses in civil service publicly available and easily accessible?
3. How do you evaluate the fairness of the civil service salary structure in relation to the duties and responsibilities of different positions?
4. In your opinion, is the civil service remuneration system regularly updated to reflect changes in the cost of living or other economic factors?
5. Are there mechanisms in place to ensure that the salary system remains equitable across different levels of civil service?
6. How is the transparency of the civil service remuneration system communicated to both current employees and potential candidates?
7. Do you think that the public is adequately informed about how civil service remuneration is structured and allocated?

8. What improvements, if any, would you suggest to make the civil service remuneration system more transparent and clearer for all stakeholders?

## Annex 2: FOI requests

FOI requests are used to gather data necessary for point allocation for elements 2.3, 2.4, 3.3, 3.7, 3.8, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9. Researchers would send FOI requests to relevant institutions only if data requested under the methodology for these elements are not publicly available.

➤ **Element 2.3.**

**FOI requests to institutions with high number of employees, asking separately for fixed-term civil servants, and for contracted staff, following Documents and information related to:**

- Did you hire temporary staff the in last two years?
- Did you hire temporary staff through open vacancies?
- Please submit recruitment files, for the last hiring, for each category (fixed-terms civil servants, and contracted staff).

➤ **Element 2.4.**

**FOI request to five different central state administration bodies in the sample as in the Element 2.3, asking separately for fixed-term civil servants, and for all contracted staff, documents and information related to:**

- A. Current number of civil servants and general employees
- B. Current number of temporarily hired persons.

➤ **Element 3.3.**

The same five ministries/central state administration bodies are observed **as in the Element 2.3**, and for each body, a documents and information related to vacancy announcement for the most recently completed public competition procedure (*top managerial/senior civil service positions are not included in samples*).

FOI requests are sent to either the central institution responsible for HRM, or bodies in the sample, or both (depending on the level of (de)centralisation of recruitment process), to obtain information on the ways of advertising observed public competitions. If vacancy

announcements are not available online in the moment of measurement, FOI requests are submitted to the responsible bodies, to obtain texts of the announcements, too.

➤ **Element 3.7.**

For the same sample of vacancy announcements **as in the Element 3.3:** documents and information related to documents requested from candidates when applying for public competitions, in the initial phase of submission of mandatory documents.

➤ **Element 3.8.**

FOI requests are sent to the central institution responsible for HRM and, where needed due to the nature of the procedure, to five sample central state administration bodies, **that advertised the same sample of vacancy announcements as in the Element 3.3**, to obtain information and evidence regarding possibility of supplementing documents.

➤ **Element 4.6.**

Documents and information related to information on the **entire file from the most recently completed selection procedure from internal or public competition process for filling top management vacancy is analysed** - from vacancy announcement to selection procedure result.

FOI requests are sent to either central institutions, or bodies in the sample, or both. **FOI requests are sent for those selection procedures that are completed at least six months before FOIs submission.**

Same five ministries/central state administration bodies are observed **as in the Element 2.3.**

➤ **Element 4.7.**

Submission of FOI requests to central institution responsible for HRM/selection of top managers, to obtain the data on all active acting appointees. Documents and information related to information on:

- A. Number of acting appointees on the day of request
- B. Number of acting appointees under A, who were already hired as civil servants on the day appointment.

The share is expressed as  $B/A \cdot 100$ . **If the share is 100%**, an additional FOI request is submitted for documents and information related to:

- C. Acts/decisions on acting appointments for the last 10 cases, or other supporting evidence clearly indicating that appointees in question were civil servants on the day of appointment (e.g., decision on appointment to a previous civil service position or any other proof).

➤ **Element 4.8.**

Researchers send FOI request to responsible body. Only completed competition procedures (internal and public) are observed. Documents and information related to information to the ratio of eligible candidates per top management vacancies in civil service bodies, including both internal and public competition procedures, **for the last 12 months.**

➤ **Element 4.9.**

Documents and information related to:

- A. Total number of appointments to top management positions in the last 12 months.
- B. Number of appointments without the assessment of requirements and testing of competencies through either internal or external competition procedure, in the same period, excluding legally allowed internal mobility mechanisms/transfers. Such appointments may include, for example, acting appointments from outside of the civil service, purely political appointments etc.
- C. Number of acting appointments from within the pool of existing civil servants, previously competitively hired.