

Area 2: Policy Development and Co-ordination

INDICATOR	TRANSPARENCY & INCLUSIVENESS OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATION
Sub-indicator 1	Transparency and inclusiveness of government decision-making process
Sub-indicator 2	Transparency of government planning and reporting
Sub-indicator 3	Transparency and inclusiveness of policy making and legislation development process
Sub-indicator 4	Transparency and inclusiveness of policy implementation, evaluation, and parliamentary scrutiny
Annexes	FOI requests; Questionnaire for key informants' interviews

SIGMA PRINCIPLES AND SUBPRINCIPLES MONITORED

P2. Public policies are coherent and effectively co-ordinated by the centre of government; decisions are prepared and communicated in a clear and transparent manner

c. Government decisions are prepared, approved, and followed up in a transparent, effective, and timely manner, based on clear rules and procedures, through the relevant decision-making structures, including government sessions.

P3. The government plans and monitors public policies in an effective and inclusive manner, in line with the government fiscal space.

d. Policy planning documents meet quality requirements and contain adequate analysis and information, including on policy objectives, indicators with targets and monitoring framework. They are developed in a participatory manner and are publicly available.

f. Performance and results, including achievement of policy objectives and outcome indicators, are regularly monitored, and reported on; monitoring reports are published on time to enable public scrutiny.

i. The government effectively implements EI plans through prioritising and costing of EI related commitments, taking into consideration the available resources and capacities of the administration

P4. Public policies are developed based on evidence and analysis, following clear and consistent rules for law making; laws and regulations are easily accessible

a. A whole of government policy to promote better regulation, evidence-based and inclusive policymaking is established and applied in practice during policy development and legislative drafting.

c. Regulatory impact assessment (RIA), or other similar tool(s), is adopted and systematically used to support policy development, facilitate consultation, and inform decision-making at all key stages of policymaking, covering both primary and secondary legislation, including the impact on the environment and climate where necessary.

i. All primary and secondary legislation, including consolidated versions, is easily accessible and available free of charge through a central online database(s). Administrative guidance documents, forms, and materials essential for complying with regulations are easily available for businesses and citizens.

P5. All key external and internal stakeholders and the general public are actively consulted during policy development

- a. Procedures are in place and consistently applied and monitored to enable pro-active and effective public consultations with stakeholders and the general public, allowing businesses, non-governmental organisations and citizens, including from vulnerable groups to participate in and inform government policymaking.
- b. Consultation with the general public is conducted in an accessible and transparent manner.
- c. Ministries hold constructive dialogue with key external stakeholders and collect, analyse, and use all responses when finalising the policy proposal. They transparently report on the outcome of the public consultation process and how consultees' views have shaped and influenced policy.

P6. Public policies are effectively implemented and evaluated, enhancing policy outcomes, and reducing regulatory costs and burdens

- b. Businesses and citizens receive advance notification about upcoming changes in the rules and regulations that will affect them, and sufficient time is allowed for the affected groups to adjust to and align with the new regulatory framework.
- c. The responsible institutions effectively monitor policy implementation and ensure regulatory compliance, based on robust and relevant data, including evidence gathering through direct feedback and consultations with affected stakeholders.
- d. Ex post evaluation of major laws and policies is an integral part of the better regulation agenda and is linked to the analysis conducted during the development of the policy. The public administration makes evaluation results publicly available and uses them to inform future policy.
- g. Compliance with existing regulations is promoted through provision of information, guidance, checklists, and other tools. Enforcement actions take into account the profile and behaviour of specific regulated entities.

P7. The parliament effectively scrutinises the government policymaking and ensures overall policy and legislative coherence.

- b. Parliamentary committees debate and scrutinise legislative initiatives, with active participation of government ministers and senior public servants, and ensure consultation with key stakeholders, while also minimising any risks of undue external influence
- h. The parliamentary services provide expert advice and support to members of parliament for initiating and drafting new laws based on evidence and with input from key stakeholders.

INDICATOR	TRANSPARENCY & INCLUSIVNESS OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATION		
General methodological remarks	The estimated duration for monitoring in the PDC area is approximately three months (PDC monitoring window). This period encompasses data collection through desk research, interviews, and FOI requests.		
	For the Outcome and Impact elements 1.6, 2.15, 3.22 and 4.12, 3 interviews with key informants are envisaged as a rule. The same 3 interviews with key informants should be used to allocate points in Elements 1.6 and 2.15. For elements 3.22 and 4.12, separate interviews need to be organised in line with stated methodological instructions. For the Outcome and Impact element 3.25, 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 1st of February until the 26th of February across all six Western Balkans administrations on a representative sample.		
	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 relevant central state administration bodies or responsible institutions to obtain missing data (unless it is clear from point allocation guidelines that points are allocated solely on public availability of required information).		
Sub-indicator 1	Transparency and inclusiveness of government decision-making process		
Element 1.1	Formulation	Type	Data source
SIGMA Principle P2.a	There is a strategic document in force that envisages improvement of transparency of government decision-making process	Strategy and Policy	PAR Strategic framework, or other strategic documents that foresee reforms in government decision making and communication
	Methodology Review of valid government strategic document at the time of measurement (strategy, programme or similar) to determine whether improvements or enhancements of transparency of government decision-making process are foreseen. Researchers identify relevant sections in the analysed strategic documents that contain information on goals, and specific measures or activities, with clear assignment of responsibilities. If no strategic document envisages actions towards more transparency of government decision-making process, no points are awarded.		Point allocation 0.5 – Measures or activities for improving transparency envisaged, with clear assignment of responsibilities Maximum score: 0.5
Element 1.2	Formulation	Type	Data source
SIGMA Principle P2.c	Regulations stipulate transparency of government decision-making process	Legislation	Law on Government (Council of Ministers) Rules of Procedure of the Government
	Methodology Review of valid regulations at the time of measurement to determine whether there is a requirement on publishing key information from the Government sessions online, i.e., a) agenda items, b) minutes from sessions, c) decisions (adopted acts and other documents), and d) press releases. Researchers cite sections/articles/paragraphs that pose such requirements, if any.		Point allocation 0.25 – publishing of agenda items regulated 0.25 - publishing of minutes from the sessions regulated

	In addition, and for the purpose of analysis, researchers note any exceptions to the publicity of any piece of information or material mentioned and the justifications for those exceptions.		0.25 – publishing of decisions taken at the sessions regulated 0.25 – publishing of a press release for every session regulated <i>Maximum score: 1</i>
Element 1.3	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P2.c</i>	Government regularly publishes agenda items, minutes, and press releases from its sessions online	Practice	Government websites (Council of Ministers, General Secretariat of the Government, Prime Minister's Office, and equivalent)
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of relevant government websites to determine if the Government makes the materials related to its sessions publicly available. Websites will be analysed for availability of a) agendas, b) minutes, and c) press releases. Researchers observe each government sessions that are taking place within the PDC monitoring window (period of 3 months in real time). Publication of agenda items, either ahead or after individual session, is accepted for point allocation, as long as they are published within the monitoring period. However, if agenda items are published in advance of sessions additional points are allocated. Researchers check regularly relevant data sources during monitoring window to establish the exact time of publishing. <i>[auxiliary tracking file to be used]</i>		0.5 – regular publishing of agenda items (in at least 80% of cases/sessions) 0.5 – regular publishing of minutes from the sessions (in at least 80% of cases/sessions) 0.5 – regular publishing of press releases for the sessions (in at least 80% of cases/sessions) 0.5 – if agenda items are published in advance of sessions (in at least 80% of cases/sessions) <i>Maximum score: 2</i>
Element 1.4	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P2.c</i>	Government regularly publishes decisions from its sessions online	Practice	Government websites Freedom of information request
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of the same government websites to determine if the Government regularly publishes adopted decisions (all adopted acts and documents, those not formally labelled as confidential). Researchers determine whether decisions (acts and documents adopted at government sessions observed in Element 1.3) are made publicly available via Government websites one week after each observed session at latest . In case it cannot be determined on how many items in total did the government decide during sessions in the monitoring period, and how many of them were labelled as confidential (due to unavailability of agenda items or minutes, or any other reason), a freedom of information request is		1.25 – at least 80% of decisions taken, and not labelled as confidential, are available online 1.25 - at least 80% of decisions taken, and not labelled as confidential, are available online and published a week after a session of adoption, at latest <i>Maximum score: 2.5</i>

	to be submitted to the relevant government office at the end of the PDC monitoring window asking for: - the list of all agenda items per sessions held during monitoring window, with clear indications which items were put on the agenda with a confidentiality label - the list of all decisions taken in the same observed period, with clear indications which decisions are labelled as confidential, and - dates of publishing of each individual decision not labelled as confidential, in the observed period. Researchers review received data, and determine the number of adopted decisions, that are not formally labelled as confidential, that are published online. It is accepted for point allocation if decisions are made publicly available in the official gazette website; however, the government website's section where information on sessions is uploaded, needs to contain redirecting links to the location of published decisions. Also, access/subscription to the official gazette websites needs to be payment free. If decision are available only at the Official Gazette website and the access to this website is not free of charge, this element is automatically zero. <i>[auxiliary tracking file to be used]</i>		
Element 1.5	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P2.c</i>	Key non-state actors consider the Government's decision-making process as transparent	Outcomes and Impact	Key informant interviews with civil society representatives and other non-state actors
	Methodology		Point allocation
	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 the Government's decision-making practices. Researchers conduct minimum 3 such interviews. 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 the issue of transparency of government's decision making, using a four-point scale - fully agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree, fully disagree. Point allocation will be		0.75 – all interviewees agree that agenda items for the sessions of the government are transparent 0.75 – all interviewees agree that minutes of the sessions of the government are transparent 0.75 – all interviewees agree that decisions of the sessions of the government are transparent

	determined based on the ratio of positive responses. Interviewees respond to the following statements: 1. Agenda items for the Government’s sessions are transparent. 2. Minutes of the Government’s sessions are transparent. 3. Decisions from the Government’s sessions are transparent. 4. The Government publicly informs on its decisions via press releases. <i>The interview with same key informants will be used for other elements in this indicator that are measuring outcomes and impact, unless otherwise specified.</i>		0.75 – all interviewees agree that the government publicly informs on its decision making via press releases <i>Maximum score: 3</i>
SUBTOTAL POINTS			9
Sub-indicator 2	Transparency of government planning and reporting		
Element 2.1	Formulation	Type	Data source
SIGMA Principle P3.d, f	There is a strategic document in force that envisages improvement of government planning and reporting practice	Strategy and Policy	PAR Strategic framework
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of valid government strategic document at the time of measurement (strategy, programme or similar) to determine whether improvements or enhancements of government planning and reporting practices are foreseen. Researchers identify relevant sections in the analysed strategic documents that contain information on goals, and specific measures or activities, with clear assignment of responsibilities. If no strategic document envisages actions towards improved planning and reporting, no points are awarded.		0.25 – Measures or activities for improving government planning practices, with clear assignment of responsibilities 0.25 - Measures or activities for improving government reporting practices, with clear assignment of responsibilities <i>Maximum score: 0.5</i>
Element 2.2	Formulation	Type	Data source
SIGMA Principle P3.d, f	Regulations stipulate public availability of government planning documents and reports on their implementation	Legislation	Law on Government (Council of Ministers) Rules of Procedure of the Government Other relevant regulations
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of regulations valid at the time of measurement to determine whether there is a requirement on publishing Government planning documents as well as on publishing reports on their implementation. Researchers, first, cite sections/articles/paragraphs that establish what planning and reporting mechanisms exist, and secondly, provisions that pose publicity requirements and timeline of publishing. Government programme/multi-year plan, and an annual work plan, and reports on their implementation are considered for point allocation.		0.25 – publishing of Government’s planning documents regulated (Government’s programme, and annual work plan) 0.25 – publishing of reports on the implementation of planning documents regulated (for Government’s programme, and annual work plan)

			<i>Maximum score: 0.5</i>
Element 2.3	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P3. I</i>	Regulations stipulate public availability of government's European integration plans and reports on their implementation	Legislation	Law on Government (Council of Ministers) Rules of Procedure of the Government Other relevant regulations
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of regulations valid at the time of measurement to determine whether there is a requirement on publishing Government's European integration planning documents (national plans or programmes for the adoption of the acquis), as well as on publishing reports on their implementation. Researchers, first, determine whether such planning and reporting mechanisms exist by citing relevant sections/articles/paragraphs, and secondly, they cite provisions that pose publicity requirements and timeline of publishing.		0.25 – publishing of Government's European integration plans regulated 0.25 – publishing of reports on the implementation of European integration plans regulated <i>Maximum score: 0.5</i>
Element 2.4	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P3. D</i>	Government regularly and timely publishes its annual work plans	Practice	Government websites Freedom of information requests
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Regular and timely publishing means whether the last two annual work plans (for the year in which the monitoring is conducted and the year preceding the year in which the monitoring is conducted) are available online, at the official websites of the Government (not individual state administration bodies) in line with legal deadlines for their publication. If there are no legally set deadlines for public disclosure of annual work plans, it is considered timely if they were published a week after their adoption. If the official government websites do not indicate clearly dates of their adoption and publication, a freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on 1) dates of adoption of observed work plans, and 2) dates when they were posted online.		0.75 – publication is fully regular 0.75 - publication is fully timely, i.e., in line with legal deadlines <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 2.5	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P3. D</i>	Government publishes its programme in a timely manner	Practice	Government websites Freedom of information requests
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Timely publishing of the current Government's programme means whether it is available online, at the official websites of the Government (not individual state administration bodies), in line with legal deadlines for their publication.		0.75 – the current programme/multi-annual planning document is publicly available 0.75 - publication is fully timely, i.e., in line with legal deadlines

	If there are no legally set deadlines for public disclosure of programmes/, multi-annual planning documents it is considered timely if it was published a week after their adoption . If the official government websites do not indicate clearly dates of their adoption and publication, a freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on 1) date of adoption of observed programme, and 2) date when they were posted online.		<i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 2.6	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P3. D</i>	Government's programmes and work plans contain performance indicators for monitoring achievement of results	Practice	All plans observed in Element 2.4 and 2.5
	Methodology		Methodology
	This element looks at whether the Government planning documents (all planning documents observed in Elements 2.4 and 2.5), contain performance indicators for monitoring achievement of results (either output or outcome indicators). Researchers assess all the documents observed in Elements 2.4 and 2.5.		0.75 – all work plans contain performance indicators 0.75 – Government programme contains performance indicators <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 2.7	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P3. F</i>	Government regularly and timely publishes reports on the implementation of its work plans	Practice	Government websites Freedom of information requests
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Regular and timely publishing of the Government's reports on implementing work plans means whether reports are available online at the official websites of the Government (not individual state administration bodies), for the last two reporting cycles in line with legal deadlines for their publication . If there are no legally set deadlines for public disclosure of reports on implementation of work plans, it is considered timely if they were published a week after their adoption . If the official government websites do not indicate clearly dates of their adoption and publication, a freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on 1) dates of adoption of observed reports, and 2) dates when they were posted online.		0.75 - publication is fully regular 0.75 - publication is fully timely, i.e., in line with legal deadlines <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 2.8	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P3. F</i>	Government regularly and timely publishes reports on the implementation of its programme	Practice	Government websites Freedom of information requests
	Methodology		Point allocation

	Regular and timely publishing of the Government's programme means whether reports are available online at the official websites of the Government (not individual state administration bodies), for the last two reporting cycles in line with legal deadlines for their publication. If there are no legally set deadlines for public disclosure of reports on implementation of programme/multi-annual work plans, it is considered timely if they were published a week after their adoption. If the official government websites do not indicate clearly dates of their adoption and publication, a freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on 1) dates of adoption of observed reports, and 2) dates when they were posted online.		0.75 – publication of reports for the programme/multi-annual work plans is fully regular 0.75 - publication of reports for the programme/multi-annual work plans is fully timely, i.e., in line with legal deadlines <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 2.9	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P3. I</i>	Government regularly and timely publishes its European integration plans	Practice	Government websites Website of administration body responsible for EU integration policy (i.e., ministry, government office etc.) Freedom of information requests
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Regular and timely publishing of the Government's European integration plans means whether last two plans are available online (the current and the previous plan), at the official websites of the Government or state administration body responsible or EU integration policy, in line with legal deadlines for their publication. If there are no legally set deadlines for public disclosure of European integration plans, it is considered timely if they were published a week after their adoption. If the official government websites do not indicate clearly dates of their adoption and publication, a freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on 1) dates of adoption of observed plans, and 2) dates when they were posted online.		0.75 – publication is fully regular 0.75 - publication is fully timely, i.e., in line with legal deadlines <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 2.10	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P3. i</i>	Government regularly and timely publishes reports on implementation of its European integration plans	Practice	Government websites Website of administration body responsible for EU integration policy (i.e., ministry, government office etc.) Freedom of information request
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Regular and timely publishing of the Government's reports on implementing EU planning documents means whether reports are available online, at the official websites of the Government		0.75 – publication is fully regular 0.75 - publication is fully timely, i.e., in line with legal deadlines

	or state administration body responsible for EU integration policy, for the last two reporting cycles in line with legal deadlines for their publication. If there are no legally set deadlines for public disclosure of reports on implementation of European integration plans, it is considered timely if they were published a week after their adoption. If the official government websites do not indicate clearly dates of their adoption and publication, a freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on 1) dates of adoption of observed reports, and 2) dates when they were posted online.		Maximum score: 1.5
Element 2.11	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P3. f</i>	Government's reports on implementing its programmes and work plans include assessments of achievement of key results and performance indicators	Practice	All reports observed in Element 2.7 and 2.8
	Methodology		Point allocation
	This element looks at whether the Government reports on implementation of work plans (all reports observed in Element 2.7 and 2.8), inform on achievement of key results (not just activities, i.e., direct outputs) and on achievement of specific performance indicators. Researchers assess all the reports observed in the Element 2.7 and 2.8. <i>Example: number of study visits, number of trainings and trainees, etc., are considered activity information. Assessment/analysis of the improvement of the skillset of the civil service or a calculation of the level at which a specific target for training of civil servants has been met, can constitute performance/result information.</i>		1 – all observed reports inform on achievement of key results (qualitative/narrative assessment) 1 – all observed reports inform on achievement of performance indicators Maximum score: 2
Element 2.12	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P3.d, f, i</i>	Government plans and reports are citizen friendly	Practice	All planning documents and reports observed in Elements 2.4, 2.5 2.7 - 2.10 (number can vary per country)
	Methodology		Point allocation
	This element looks at whether the Government planning documents, and reports on implementing them (all documents observed in Elements 2.4, 2.5 2.7 - 2.10) are citizen-friendly, presenting key information in simplified fashion, and devoid of bureaucratic language. Specifically, it will be determined whether planning documents and reports contain introductions or summaries, or other textual or graphical parts, that present succinct and easy-to-understand key information.		0.5 – All Government work plans are citizen friendly 0.5 – All reports on implementing government work plans are citizen friendly 0.25- All European integration plans of the Government are citizen friendly 0.25 – All reports on implementing European integration plans of the Government are citizen friendly

			<i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 2.13	Formulation	Type	Data source
	Data contained in the government's reports on implementing planning documents are available in open format	Practice	Government websites National open data portal
	Methodology		Point allocation
	This element looks at whether at least some data contained in any of the Government reports on implementation of planning documents (all reports observed in Element 2.7, 2.8 and 2.10) are available in open, machine-readable format. 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".¹ 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.² To qualify for maximum point allocation, any such dataset should be available at the national (government-sponsored) open data portal. If such portal does not exist, any such dataset should be available at the official government website.		0.75 – some data contained in the Government reports on implementation of planning documents are available in open, machine-readable format, and published at the official government website 0.75 – available open datasets are published on the national open data portal <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 2.14	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P3.d, f, i</i>	Key non-state actors consider the Government's planning and reporting activities as transparent, timely and citizen friendly	Outcomes and Impact	Key informant interviews with civil society representatives and other non-state actors
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Attitudes of key informants on transparency, timeliness, and citizen friendliness of Government's planning and reporting activities are assessed via the same key informant interviews, and using the same methodological approach, from the Element 1.5. Interviewees respond to the following statements: 1. Government's planning and reporting activities are transparent 2. Government's planning and reporting activities are timely 3. Government's planning and reporting activities are citizen friendly.		1 – all interviewees agree that planning and reporting activities of the government are transparent 1 – all interviewees agree that planning and reporting activities of the government are timely 1 – all interviewees agree that planning and reporting activities of the government are citizen friendly <i>Maximum score: 3</i>
SUBTOTAL POINTS			20
Sub-indicator 3	Transparency and inclusiveness of policy making and legislation development process		

¹ 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).

² See more: https://data.europa.eu/sites/default/files/data_formats_v1.pdf.

Element 3.1	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P4. a, P5.a</i>	There is a strategic document in force that envisages improvement in transparency and inclusiveness of policy making and legislation development process	Strategy and Policy	PAR Strategic framework
	Methodology Review of government strategic documents valid at the time of measurement (strategy, programme or similar) to determine whether transparency and inclusiveness of policy making, and legislation development process are foreseen. Researchers identify relevant sections in the analysed strategic documents that contain information on goals, and specific measures or activities, with clear assignment of responsibilities. If no strategic document envisages actions towards transparency and inclusiveness of policy making and legislation development process, no points are awarded.		Point allocation 0.25 – Measures or activities for improving transparency envisaged, with clear assignment of responsibilities 0.25 – Measures or activities for improving inclusiveness envisaged, with clear assignment of responsibilities <i>Maximum score: 0.5</i>
Element 3.2	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P5. a</i>	Regulations envisage transparency and inclusiveness of policy making and legislative development process	Legislation	Laws and bylaws regulating policy development process
	Methodology Review of regulations valid at the time of measurement to determine whether there are provisions that stipulate transparency and inclusiveness of the policy development process. Researchers cite sections/articles/paragraphs that pose such requirements and timeline of publishing. Specifically, researchers identify whether there are provisions for the development of policy planning documents adopted by the Government, of primary legislation proposed by the Government, and of normative secondary legislation adopted by the government, on: 1. Consultations with stakeholders, and targeted groups during policy development (early consultations), including transparency of consultation results (reports) 2. Public consultations on the draft proposals (consultations at the end of the process, for anyone interested), including transparency of consultation results (reports) 3. Transparency of work of working groups for policy development, including composition and results of their work 4. Inclusiveness of work of working groups, i.e., involvement of non-state actors, including transparency of selection process. If provisions on transparency and inclusiveness of development of policy planning documents (strategies, programmes etc.) and of primary legislation proposed by the government and normative secondary legislation adopted by the government are stipulated by separate regulations, researchers review all relevant regulations.		Point allocation For policy documents (strategies, programmes etc.), maximum 1 point is allocated for each criterion being met: - 4 criteria x 0.25 points = 1 For primary legislation proposed by the government maximum 1 point is allocated for each criterion being met: - 4 criteria x 0.25 points = 1 For normative secondary legislation adopted by the government maximum 1 point is allocated for each criterion being met: - 4 criteria x 0.25 points = 1 <i>Maximum score: 3</i>

	For normative secondary legislation, it will be considered sufficient if provisions on transparency and inclusiveness refer only to the cases of secondary legislative acts which are likely to have the significant (substantive) regulatory impact, and not to all secondary legislation adopted by the government.		
Element 3.3	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P5. a</i>	Regulations stipulate minimum consultation requirements	Legislation	Laws and bylaws regulating policy development process
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of regulations valid at the time of measurement to determine whether there are provisions that stipulate minimum requirements for public consultations on all policy and legislative acts observed in the Element 3.2 (policy documents, primary legislation proposed by and normative secondary legislation adopted by governments). Specifically, researchers identify whether there are provisions on: 1. Minimum duration of consultations 2. Timeliness of informing stakeholders and the public on holding consultations (advance notifications) 3. Documents to be published alongside drafts or materials under consultation 4. Minimum two channels of consultations (submission via email, via post, through consultation portals, or websites of responsible authority, etc.) 5. Mandatory reporting on implemented consultations, and mandatory provision of feedback on consultees' inputs. Minimum consultation requirements refer to consultations with stakeholders during development process (if regulated) as well as to consultations on the draft proposals with interested public (public debates).		For policy documents maximum 1.25 point is allocated for each criterion being met: - 5 criteria x 0.25 points = 1.25 For primary legislation proposed by the government maximum 1.25 point is allocated for each criterion being met: - 5 criteria x 0.25 points = 1.25 For normative secondary legislation adopted by the government maximum 1.25 point is allocated for each criterion being met: - 5 criteria x 0.25 points = 1.25 <i>Maximum score: 3.75</i>
Element 3.4	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P4. i</i>	Regulations envisage online and free of charge access to consolidated versions of all policy documents and legislation	Legislation	Laws and bylaws regulating policy development process, official gazette etc.
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of valid regulations at the time of measurement to determine whether there are provisions that mandate online publication and free of charge access to consolidated versions of all legislation in force (primary and secondary, as a minimum), and policy documents. Researchers cite sections/articles/paragraphs that pose such requirements.		0.25 – online access to policy documents regulated 0.25 – online access to consolidated versions of primary legislation regulated

			0.25 – online access to consolidated versions of secondary legislation regulated 0.25 – free of charge access to policy documents regulated 0.25 – free of charge access to consolidated versions of primary legislation regulated 0.25 – free of charge access to consolidated versions of secondary legislation regulated <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 3.5	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P4. c</i>	Regulations stipulate mandatory ex ante assessment of impacts - including on gender equality - during policy making, and publication of IA reports	Legislation	Laws and bylaws regulating policy development process
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of regulations valid at the time of measurement to determine whether there are provisions that stipulate mandatory application of ex ante impact assessments, including gender impact assessment, during the development of policy documents, primary and secondary legislation as well as public availability of reports on implemented ex ante impact assessments. Researchers cite sections/articles/paragraphs that pose such requirements and note exceptions, if any. Mandatory application of either full or “light” IA will be considered sufficient for the purpose of this element.³ Gender impact assessment may or may not be part of the ex-ante impact assessment. For secondary legislation, it will be considered sufficient if provisions on mandatory IA refer only to the cases of secondary legislative acts which are likely to have the significant (substantive) regulatory impact, and not to all secondary legislation adopted by the government.		0.25 – mandatory application of ex ante impact assessments when developing policy documents regulated 0.25 – mandatory application of ex ante impact assessments when drafting laws regulated 0.25 – mandatory application of ex ante impact assessments when drafting secondary legislation regulated 0.25 – mandatory assessment of impact on gender equality regulated (for policy documents, laws and secondary legislation) 0.25 – publication of report on implemented ex ante impact assessment when developing policy documents regulated 0.25 – publication of report on implemented ex ante impact assessment when drafting laws regulated

³ A set of minimum requirements for ex ante assessment system for developing countries that excludes several components considered as key and integral parts of a well-functioning ex ante assessment system. See more in *Making it Work: 'RIA Light' for Developing Countries*, International Finance Corporation; Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency; World Bank. 2010, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/b67f5bff-723a-5c43-8f5b-c360b4b02bf4>.

			0.25 – publication of report on implemented ex ante impact assessment when drafting secondary legislation is regulated <i>Maximum score: 1.75</i>
Element 3.6	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P5. a, b, c</i>	There is a designated government institution for checking compliance with consultations requirements	Institutional setup	Laws and bylaws regulating policy development process Acts on organisation of centre-of-government bodies and their organisational structures
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of regulations and acts on organisation of centre-of-government bodies and their organisational structures, valid at the time of measurement, to determine whether function of checking compliance with requirements on external consultation processes is assigned to a centre-of-government body.		0.75 – assigned function of checking compliance with requirements on external consultation processes <i>Maximum score: 0.75</i>
Element 3.7	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P4. c</i>	Ex ante impact assessments – including on gender equality - are consistently applied during the development of policy documents	Practice	Government websites Central e-consultation portal Websites of ministries Freedom of information request
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Consistency in applying ex ante impact assessments is measured by identifying the share of policy documents (strategies, programmes, and other applicable documents) that have been adopted in the observed period and subject to ex ante impact assessments. For calculating share, researchers first establish the total number of policy documents adopted by the government in the observed period (A) and, second, the number of policy documents for which ex ante impact assessment was conducted (B). Share is expressed as percentage (B/A*100). Observed period of measurement is 12 months preceding the monitoring. For the purpose of this element, as ex ante impact assessments are considered either full or partial IAs, or assessments of additional expenditure needs for all planned activities including funding for costed activities. Only those policy documents for which ex ante impact assessments are mandatory, are considered for point allocation. If ex ante impact assessments are not regulated, this element is automatically zero.		0.75 – Ex ante impact assessments conducted for more than 80% of adopted policy documents 0.75 – impact on gender equality addressed for more than 80% of adopted policy documents <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>

	<i>[auxiliary tracking file to be used]</i>		
Element 3.8	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P4. c</i>	Ex ante impact assessments – including on gender equality - are consistently applied during the development of primary legislation	Practice	Government websites Central e-consultation portal Websites of ministries Freedom of information request
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Consistency in applying ex ante impact assessments is measured by identifying the share of laws that have been subject to ex ante assessments. For calculating share, researchers first establish the total number of laws enacted in the parliament in the observed period (A) and, second, the number laws for which ex ante impact assessments was conducted (B). Share is expressed as percentage (B/A*100). The share of laws enacted in parliament (A), includes amendments to the primary legislation. Observed period of measurement is 12 months preceding the monitoring (same as in the Element 3.7). For point allocation, the entire sample of laws from the observed period is considered regardless of who the official proposer was. For reporting purposes, researchers separately determine numbers and shares as indicated above, for different categories of authorised law proposers (government, MPs, other bodies where applicable). National provisions on exceptions/exclusions from conducting ex ante impact assessments are not considered to ensure comparability. <i>[auxiliary tracking file to be used]</i>		1 – ex ante impact assessments conducted for more than 80% of adopted primary legislation 1 - impact on gender equality addressed for more than 80% of adopted primary legislation <i>Maximum score: 2</i>
Element 3.9	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P4. C</i>	Reports on implemented ex ante impact assessments during the development of primary legislation are regularly published online, together with the draft documents	Practice	Government websites Central e-consultation portal Websites of ministries
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Researchers determine whether results of conducted ex ante impact assessments are published online for the entirety of observed laws, as determined in Element 3.8 (and laws enacted in the parliament in the same observed period of 12 months). For each law enacted in the parliament in the observed period, it will be checked whether report was published in two crucial stages:		0.75 – reports published for all ex ante impact assessments for the consultation process 0.75 - reports published for all ex ante impact assessments during the Government's approval of the law proposal

	- Report is published as part of the documents for consultation processes (see the Element 3.13 below), and - Where the government was official law proposer, report is published with the approved law proposal.		<i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 3.10	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P4. c, e</i>	Published reports on implemented ex ante impact assessments during the development of primary legislation contain key information	Practice	Information on implemented ex ante assessments that is available online
	Methodology		Point allocation
	From the publicly available reports on implemented ex ante impact assessments determined in Element 3.9, researchers select a sample of 5 to determine whether they contain and elaborate on key elements: - Problem analysis - Policy objectives - Justification of government intervention/explanatory note - Policy options, including mandatory status quo option, and preferred option with justification - Affected groups - Assessment of all relevant impacts of intervention - Estimate of costs of preferred option, at least - Policy implementation and enforcement mechanisms - Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms - Use of external sources of information and data (at least a single, clear reference to third party's reports, analyses and similar, e.g., publication title, with authors) Sample selection is based on estimate of significance of impact of laws on society/affected groups, and five cases which are likely to have significant impact are chosen. Research team will consult internally for ensuring consistency in approaches.		0.25 points for each report meeting criteria 1-7; 5 x 0.25 = 1.25 0.25 points for each report meeting criteria 8-10; 5 x 0.25 = 1.25 <i>Maximum score: 2.5</i>
Element 3.11	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P4. b, c</i>	Non-state actors participate in the Government-led working groups for policy and legislative development	Practice	Government websites Central e-consultation portal Websites of ministries Freedom of information request
	Methodology		Point allocation
	For the sample of 2 policy documents and 3 laws (5 in total), researchers use publicly available information, and free access to information requests where needed, to identify whether non-state actors participated as members in the Government-led working groups for developing sampled		For policy documents, maximum 0.5 points are allocated for participation of non-state actors in working groups:

	policy documents adopted by the government, and laws enacted in the parliament. Membership will be determined against formal decisions on working group members' appointments (to be obtained via freedom of information right, if not accessible publicly). Sample selection is based on estimate of significance of impact of policy documents and laws on society/affected groups, and five cases which are likely to have significant impact are chosen. Research team will consult internally for ensuring consistency in approaches. If no working groups were formed for all 5 sample units, researchers choose another process for policy or legislation development within the observed period, using the same logic of sample selection. Laws that were part of the sample in the Element 3.10, can be considered (reused) for the purpose of analysing this Element.		- 0.25 points for each working group having a non-state actor as official member, $2 \times 0.25 = 0.5$ For laws, maximum 1.5 points are allocated: - 0.5 points for each working group having a non-state actor as official member, $3 \times 0.5 = 1.5$ <i>Maximum score: 2</i>
Element 3.12	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P4. b, c</i>	Procedures and decisions of working groups are transparent	Practice	Government websites Central e-consultation portal Websites of ministries Freedom of information requests
	Methodology		Point allocation
	For the same sample of policy documents (2) and laws (3) (see Element 3.11, 5 in total), researchers review publicly available sources to check whether key documents on the work of working groups are available online for the interested public. These include 1) decisions on establishing working groups with lists of formal members, and 2) conclusions/minutes/reports on working group meetings. Points are allocated solely on the transparency requirement; however, freedom of information requests are sent to obtain these documents, for additional insight and reporting purposes.		For policy documents, maximum 1 point is allocated for the transparency of working groups: - 0.25 points for public availability of decisions on establishing of working groups for each policy document, $2 \times 0.25 = 0.5$ - 0.25 points for public availability of conclusions/minutes/reports on working group meetings for each policy document, $2 \times 0.25 = 0.5$ For laws, maximum 1.5 points are allocated for the transparency of working groups: - 0.25 points for public availability of decisions on establishing of working groups for each law, $3 \times 0.25 = 0.75$

			- 0.25 points for public availability of conclusions/minutes/reports on working group meetings for each law, 3 x 0.25 = 0.75 <i>Maximum score: 2.5</i>
Element 3.13	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P5.b, c</i>	Public consultations on policy documents and primary legislation are regularly held	Practice	Government websites Central e-consultation portal Websites of ministries
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Regularity is measured by calculating share of all policy documents adopted by the government (strategies, programmes, action plans and similar) and laws enacted in the parliament that have undergone external consultations in the observed period (documents and laws adopted/enacted in the observed period of 12 months preceding the monitoring, same as in Elements 3.7-8). For calculating share, researchers divide the number of policy documents and laws that have undergone external consultations (B) with the total number of policy documents adopted and laws enacted (A). Share is expressed as percentage (B/A*100). <i>Note: For this element, public consultations will refer to any form of consultations that took place during policy development (early in the process of development or on the final draft policy documents/law proposals) with external stakeholders (citizens, businesses, CSOs etc). In cases where more than one consultation round took place during the development of a policy document/law, it will be considered as single consultation for the purpose of this element (consultation held early in the development process are analysed in a separate Element).</i> <i>[auxiliary tracking file to be used]</i>		For policy documents: 0.5 – if public consultations were held in 50-89.99% of observed cases OR 1 – if public consultations were held in 90% or more of observed cases For laws: 0.5 – if public consultations were held in 50-89.99% of observed cases OR 1 – if public consultations were held in 90% or more of observed cases <i>Maximum score: 2</i>
Element 3.14	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P5.b, c</i>	Public consultations are conducted in an early phase of policy development	Practice	Government website E-consultation portal (where applicable) Websites of lead ministries FOI requests
	Methodology		Point allocation

	Researchers review publicly available information to determine how many consulted policy documents and primary legislation, identified in the previous Element 3.13 were held in an early phase, before production of drafts of legislative or policy documents, regardless of whether early phase of consultations is legally required. For calculating share, researchers divide the number of public consultations implemented early in the process (B)(A) with the total number of consulted policy documents and primary legislation (A). Share is expressed as percentage (B/A*100). Publicly available information for this purpose includes, but is not limited to, consultation reports, ex ante assessment reports that are publicly available, information/announcements on websites of lead ministries/responsible bodies etc. In cases no information can be obtained from publicly available sources, FOI requests are sent. <i>Note: baseline documents, policy or legislative evaluations, impact assessments, annotations or other materials are not considered as drafts of legislative or policy documents, but as preparatory, ex ante materials that can be used as a basis for organising consultations in the early stages.</i> <i>[auxiliary tracking file to be used]</i>		0.75 – In the development of policy documents, early public consultations were held in more than 90% of observed cases 0.75 – In the development of laws, early public consultations were held in more than 90% of observed cases <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 3.15	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P5. c</i>	Reports on public consultations on policy documents are publicly available	Practice	Government website E-consultation portal (where applicable) Websites of ministries
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Researchers check if all reports on public consultations on policy documents, identified in Element 3.13, are publicly available. For implemented public consultations on policy documents (A), identified in Element 3.13, share of reports that were made publicly available upon finalisation of the process (B) is calculated, and expressed as percentage (B/A*100). In cases publication of separate reports on public consultations is not legally required, but the results of consultations are reported within another document, such as report on implemented ex ante assessments, it is accepted for point allocation. <i>Note: For this element, if public consultation process was implemented in stages (e.g., early, and later in the process), and resulted in more than one report, the most final report will be considered. However, if a single consultation process was organised in different formats (online, email submission, roundtables etc.), reports need to encompass the entirety of inputs submitted by stakeholders participating in different formats.</i>		0.75 – all reports were made publicly available (if not met this element is automatically zero) 0.75 – all reports are comprehensive, encompassing stakeholders' inputs from different formats of participation <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 3.16	Formulation	Type	Data source

<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P5. c</i>	Reports on public consultations on primary legislation are publicly available	Practice	Government website E-consultation portal (where applicable) Websites of ministries
	Methodology Researchers check if all reports on public consultations on primary legislation, identified in Element 3.13, are publicly available. For implemented public consultations on primary legislation (A), identified in Element 3.13, share of reports that were made publicly available upon finalisation of the process (B) is calculated, and expressed as percentage ($B/A \times 100$). <i>Note: For this element, if public consultation process was implemented in stages (e.g., early, and later in the process), and resulted in more than one report, the most final report will be considered. However, if a single consultation process was organised in different formats (online, email submission, roundtables etc.), reports need to encompass the entirety of inputs submitted by stakeholders participating in different formats.</i>		Point allocation 0.75 – all reports were made publicly available (if not met this element is automatically zero) 0.75 – all available reports are comprehensive, encompassing stakeholders' inputs from different formats of participation <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 3.17	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P5. c</i>	Public consultation reports contain all elements of the implemented consultation process	Practice	Government website E-consultation portal (where applicable) Websites of ministries
	Methodology For the sample of policy documents (2) and laws (3) used in Elements 3.10-12 (5 in total), researchers review reports on conducted public consultations. A report is considered to contain all elements if the following conditions are met: 1) All comments and proposals submitted during the public consultation process are listed individually i.e., they are not aggregated. 2) There is clear information on the feedback to each individual proposal - i.e., proposal is accepted, rejected, or partially accepted/rejected. For partially accepted comments, clear information needs to be given on which part is accepted and which is not. Ambiguous answers such as that a comment will be considered, or taken into consideration subsequently or similar, are not accepted as clear information. 3) There is rationale for the rejection, or partial approval/rejection, of each individual proposal submitted.		Point allocation For policy documents, maximum 1.5 points are allocated: - 0.25 points for meeting the first criterion, $2 \times 0.25 = 0.5$ - 0.25 points for meeting the second criterion, $2 \times 0.25 = 0.5$ - 0.25 points for meeting the third criterion, $2 \times 0.25 = 0.5$ For laws, maximum 2.25 points are allocated: - 0.25 points for meeting the first criterion, $3 \times 0.25 = 0.75$ - 0.25 points for meeting the second criterion, $3 \times 0.25 = 0.75$ - 0.25 points for meeting the third criterion, $3 \times 0.25 = 0.75$

			<i>Maximum score: 3.75</i>
Element 3.18	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P5. B, c</i>	Online, central consultation portal for the implementation of consultations is regularly used	Practice	E-consultation portal
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Regularity in using central consultation portal is measured by checking whether all consultation processes identified under element 3.13 were announced on the portal. To be considered for point allocation: 1. Consultation processes need to be announced on the portal, together with relevant documents (baseline documents, reports on implemented ex ante assessments, drafts/proposals of documents under consultations) 2. Comments need to be collected online through the portal 3. Final consultation reports need to be published. <i>Note: In cases where more than one consultation round took place for a single policy document or legal act, it will be assessed as sufficient if it was announced on the portal only once.</i> <i>[auxiliary tracking file to be used]</i>		0.75 – at least 90% of consultation processes met criterion 1 0.75 – at least 90% all consultation processes met criterion 2 0.75 – at least 90% all consultation processes met criterion 3 <i>Maximum score: 2.25</i>
Element 3.19	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P5.a, b, c</i>	Designated government institution regularly checks compliance with public consultation requirements	Practice	Website of designated government institution Freedom of information request
	Methodology		Point allocation
	For all public consultations implemented on adopted policy documents and enacted primary legislation, identified in the Element 3.13, researchers verify whether designated centre-of-government institution checked compliance with consultation requirements. In cases no information can be obtained from publicly available sources, FOI requests are sent. Zero points in Element 3.4 automatically means zero points in this element.		1.5 – compliance with consultation requirements checked for all consultation processes conducted in the observed period <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 3.20	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P5. B</i>	Lead ministries proactively inform on public consultations	Practice	E-consultation portal Websites of lead ministries/responsible bodies Websites of government offices Social media of the government institutions Online media Freedom information requests for evidence

	Methodology Proactive informing on public consultation considers the communication channels that lead ministries/responsible bodies use to disseminate information on holding public consultations and to engage external stakeholders. For the sample of policy documents (2) and laws (3) used in Elements 3.11 and 3.12 (5 in total), researchers review information from indicated data sources to determine whether following communication means are used when announcing public consultations: 1) Websites of lead ministries/responsible bodies and/or relevant government offices 2) Social media of the government institutions (of relevant government offices, or lead ministries/responsible bodies under 1) 3) E-consultation portal 4) Printed or online media 5) Email communication. <i>Note: This element measures proactiveness in informing on public consultations and is not limited to mandatory communication means defined by regulations. However, if use of communication channels other than those listed is regulated, researchers will check if those were used and consider them for point allocation if their use can be verified.</i>	Point allocation 0.5 - for law 1, minimum 3 communication means were used 0.5 – for law 2, minimum 3 communication means were used 0.5 – for law 3, minimum 3 communication means were used 0.5 – for policy document 1, minimum 3 communication means were used 0.5 – for policy document 2, minimum 3 communication means were used <i>Maximum score: 2.5</i>	
Element 3.21	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P4. I</i>	Consolidated versions of primary and secondary legislation are easily accessible online, and available free of charge	Practice	Government websites Official Gazette website
	Methodology Researchers review websites indicated in data sources to determine whether consolidated versions of primary and secondary legislation in force are easily accessible online, and available free of charge. For full point allocation, legislative acts need to be: 1) searchable per at least two categories (such as policy area, key word, type of act, name of act, period of adoption etc.) 2) consolidated, i.e., initial versions of acts and later amendments are publicised as integral versions 3) free of subscription fees. For secondary legislation, only general normative secondary legislative acts adopted by the government, that set universal rules for a whole or parts of society are observed, and not to all secondary legislation adopted by the government.		Point allocation 0.5 – criterion 1 met 0.5 – criterion 2 met 0.5 – criterion 3 met <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>

Element 3.22	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P5. b, c</i>	Public consultation results have impact on final policy and legislative proposals	Outcomes and Impact	Government website E-consultation portal Websites of ministries
	Methodology		Point allocation
	For the sample of policy documents (2) and laws (3) used in Elements 3.11 and 3.12 (5 in total), researchers review reports on conducted public consultations to determine the total number of comments received (A), and the number of comments that were accepted (B). Researchers determine the share of accepted comments for each sample unit separately – $B/A \times 100$. Partially accepted comments will be counted as 0.5 for the purpose of identifying share. <i>[auxiliary tracking file to be used]</i>		For policy documents, maximum 1.5 points are allocated: - 0.75 point if more than 60% of comments were accepted when developing sample policy document 1 - 0.75 point if more than 60% of comments were accepted when developing sample policy document 2 For laws, maximum 2.25 points are allocated: - 0.75 point if more than 60% of comments were accepted when developing sample law 1 - 0.75 point if more than 60% of comments were accepted when developing sample law 2 - 0.75 point if more than 60% of comments were accepted when developing sample law 3 <i>Maximum score: 3.75</i>
Element 3.23	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P4. b, c</i>	Key non-state actors consider the work of the Government-led working groups as transparent and inclusive	Outcomes and Impact	Key informants' interviews
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Researchers conduct interviews with key informants to establish whether, in practice, lead ministries give proper procedural consideration to contributions of non-state actors in the Government-led working group, i.e., whether they take on board or reject their inputs, and whether they provide reasons. In addition, selected key informants will be asked to provide opinion on whether all decisions and documents that came as the result of working groups' proceedings were available to them.		1 – all interviewees agree that lead ministries consider/decide on their proposals (accept or reject them) 1 – all interviewees agree that lead ministries provide reasons for decisions to accept or reject proposals

	Researchers identify 3 interlocutors, from among those who have participated in the Government-led working groups (see Element 3.11). 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 the subject, 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. Interviewees respond to the following statements: 1. In the work of the working groups, lead ministries decide on my proposals/proposals of my organisation (accept them or reject them) 2. In the work of the working groups, lead ministries provide reasons for decisions to accept or reject my proposals/proposals of my organisation 3. In the work of the working groups, decisions and documents that came as the result of working groups' proceedings are available to me/my organisation.		1 –all interviewees agree that decisions and documents that came as the result of working groups' proceedings were available to them <i>Maximum score: 3</i>
Element 3.24	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P5.a, b, c</i>	Citizens' perception of their opportunity to participate in the development of laws and strategies	Outcomes and Impact	Public perception survey
	Methodology		Point allocation
	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: I have the opportunity to participate in developing laws and strategies of the [country name].		0.5 – 20%-40% of respondents responded with "agree" or "strongly agree" OR 1 – 40%-60% of respondents responded with "agree" or "strongly agree" OR 2 – 60%-80% of respondents "agree" or "strongly agree" OR 4 – more than 80% of respondents responded with "agree" or "strongly agree" <i>Maximum score: 4</i>
SUBTOTAL POINTS			52
Sub-indicator 4	Transparency and inclusiveness of policy implementation, evaluation, and parliamentary scrutiny		
Element 4.1	Formulation	Type	Data source

<i>SIGMA Principle P6. c, d</i>	There is a strategic document in force that envisages transparency and inclusiveness of policy monitoring and evaluation practices	Strategy and Policy	PAR Strategic framework
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of valid government strategic document at the time of measurement (strategy, programme or similar) to determine whether transparency and inclusiveness of policy monitoring and evaluation practices are foreseen. Researchers identify relevant sections in the analysed strategic documents that contain information on goals, and specific measures or activities, with clear assignment of responsibilities. If no strategic document envisages actions towards transparency and inclusiveness of policy monitoring and evaluation practices, no points are awarded.		0.25 – Measures or activities for improving transparency of policy monitoring and evaluation practices envisaged, with clear assignment of responsibilities 0.25 – Measures or activities for improving inclusiveness of policy monitoring and evaluation practices envisaged, with clear assignment of responsibilities <i>Maximum score: 0.5</i>
Element 4.2	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P6. b</i>	Regulations envisage sending advance notifications to affected groups on the upcoming changes to the legal framework	Legislation	Laws and bylaws regulating policy development process
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of valid regulations at the time of measurement to determine whether there is a requirement on publishing/sending advance notifications to affected groups on the upcoming changes to the legal framework by lead ministries/responsible bodies at any point before the enforcement (on adoption of new primary legislation, and on amending laws already in force). Researchers cite sections/articles/paragraphs that pose such requirements, if any. In addition, and for narrative purposes, researchers note any exceptions to such requirements if they exist.		0.5 – publishing advance notifications on the adoption and changes to the legal framework regulated <i>Maximum score: 0.5</i>
Element 4.3	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P7. b</i>	Parliamentary rules of procedure envisage participation of interested parties in parliamentary discussions, in the form of public hearings	Legislation	Parliamentary rules of procedure
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of parliamentary rules of procedure valid at the time of measurement to determine whether participation of interested parties in public hearings is allowed. Researchers cite sections/articles/paragraphs that pose such requirements, if any. In addition, and for narrative purposes, researchers note any exceptions/conditions if they exist.		0.5 – Involvement of interested parties in parliamentary public hearings envisaged <i>Maximum score: 0.5</i>
Element 4.4	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P6. b</i>	Lead ministries provide advance notifications to the affected groups on the upcoming changes to the legal framework	Practice	Website of ministries Free access to information requests

	Methodology		Point allocation
	For the same sample of laws used for the Element 3.10 (3 in total), researchers determine whether lead ministries have informed affected groups on the upcoming changes to the legal framework via their websites. If information is unavailable online, free access to information requests are sent to responsible ministries, to inquire whether other means of notifying were used (direct contact or through representative associations, via emails, phone etc.). To be considered for point allocation, advance notifications need to be submitted by the day of starting the formal legal drafting process at latest.		Maximum 1.5 points are allocated: - 0.5 point if advance notifications were published/sent for law 1 - 0.5 point if advance notifications were published/sent for law 2 - 0.5 point if advance notifications were published/sent for law 3 <i>Maximum score: 1.5</i>
Element 4.5	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P6. c</i>	Lead ministries regularly publish monitoring reports on implementation of policy documents	Practice	Websites of ministries Websites of relevant CoG institutions
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of websites of line ministries responsible for the implementation of sectoral policy documents (sector strategies, programmes etc.) to determine whether they regularly publish monitoring reports on implementation. Researchers choose 5 out of the following 7 policy areas as framework of observation: 1) Rule of law and fundamental rights, 2) Environment and climate action, 3) Transport, 4) Energy, 5) Competitiveness and innovation, 6) Education, employment, and social policies, and 7) Agriculture and rural development. <i>Note: PAR area is observed within the separate indicator.</i> Policy documents need to be adopted three years prior to the year of monitoring or earlier and need to be implemented/valid in the year prior to the monitoring. Reports for the last two consecutive calendar years are observed, in line with legal deadlines for their publishing. If legal deadline (due date) for publishing monitoring report for the last calendar year has not arrived, reports for the year preceding the last calendar year are considered only (<i>example for monitoring cycle 2024/2025: if measurement year is 2025, policy documents adopted in 2021 or earlier, and that are valid until the end of 2024 at least are selected; publishing of monitoring reports for 2023 and 2024 is observed and in case legal deadline for 2024 monitoring report is not due, only 2023 monitoring report is considered</i>). Regularity means publishing monitoring reports on an annual basis at least (in case half-yearly reports are published they are considered for point allocation if they cover the entire calendar year).		0.5 – monitoring reports in selected area 1 regularly published 0.5 - monitoring reports in selected area 2 regularly published 0.5 - monitoring reports in selected area 3 regularly published 0.5 - monitoring reports in selected area 4 regularly published 0.5 - monitoring reports in selected area 5 regularly published <i>Maximum score: 2.5</i>
Element 4.6	Formulation	Type	Data source

<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P6. c</i>	Monitoring reports on implementation of policies are citizen friendly	Practice	Website of ministries
	Methodology		Point allocation
	This element looks at whether monitoring reports on implementing policy documents (all monitoring reports observed in the Element 4.5) are presented in a citizen-friendly fashion, that allows easy informing on key results by interested parties. Specifically, it will be determined whether reports contain summaries, with textual or graphical parts (such as infographics, graphs, other visualisations, summary tables etc.), that present key results in a succinct and easy-to-understand manner.		0.25 - monitoring reports in selected area 1 are citizen friendly 0.25 - monitoring reports in selected area 2 are citizen friendly 0.25 - monitoring reports in selected area 3 are citizen friendly 0.25 - monitoring reports in selected area 4 are citizen friendly 0.25 - monitoring reports in selected area 5 are citizen friendly <i>Maximum score: 1.25</i>
Element 4.7	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P6. d</i>	Lead ministries publish ex-post evaluations on implementation of policies	Practice	Website of ministries
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of websites of line ministries responsible for the implementation of sectoral policy documents (sector strategies, programmes etc.), in five policy areas selected in the Element 4.6, to check whether they have published online in the last three calendar years, including the year of measurement, at least one ex-post evaluation report on implementation of policy documents under their purview. <i>Note: the ex-post evaluations are conducted after the completion of policy interventions to assess the impacts on stakeholders, target groups and public, and inform future policies, and are different documents from monitoring reports on implementing policies (observed in Element 4.5-6).</i>		0.5 – ex post evaluation reports in selected area 1 published 0.5 - ex post evaluation reports in reports in selected area 2 area published 0.5 - ex post evaluation reports in selected area 3 published 0.5 - ex post evaluation reports in selected area 4 published 0.5 - ex post evaluation reports in selected area 5 published <i>Maximum score: 2.5</i>
Element 4.8	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle</i> <i>P6. d</i>	Ex-post evaluations on implementation of policies use external data and information produced by non-state actors	Practice	Website of ministries
	Methodology		Point allocation

	Researchers analyse ex-post evaluation reports, identified in the previous Element to determine whether they contain: 1) data produced by non-state actors - civil society organisations, international organisations, professional and media associations, universities, and other relevant stakeholders 2) feedback from affected/target groups.		For 5 selected policy areas, maximum 1.25 points are allocated per criterion: - 0.25 points if at least single ex post evaluation report for single policy area contains data produced by non-state actors, 5 x 0.25 = 1.25 points maximum - 0.25 points if at least single ex post evaluation report for single policy area contains feedback from affected/targeted groups, 5 x 0.25 = 1.25 points maximum <i>Maximum score: 2.5</i>
Element 4.9	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P7. h</i>	Parliament involves stakeholders, affected groups, and other non-state actors in public hearings	Practice	Website of parliament Free access to information requests
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Review of information on the work of parliament in the 12 months preceding the monitoring to determine whether stakeholders, affected groups, and other non-state actors participated in public hearings on proposed acts (laws and policy documents enacted in the parliament). Researchers first determine the number of public hearings held in the observed period, and second, in how many of them such involvement was practiced. If information is not publicly available, researchers submit a freedom of information request to the relevant parliamentary service in order to determine whether stakeholders, affected groups, and other non-state actors participated in public hearings on proposed acts. If there were no public hearings organised in the 12 months preceding the monitoring period, this element is automatically zero.		0.75 – non-state actors involved in at least one public hearing in the observed period 0.75 – non-state actors involved in more than one public hearing in the observed period, but all public hearings were organised by single parliamentary committee 0.75 - non-state actors involved in more than one public hearing in the observed period, that were organised by at least two different parliamentary committees <i>Maximum score: 2.25</i>
Element 4.10	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P7. h</i>	Information on the work of parliaments is available online	Practice	Website of parliament
	Methodology		Point allocation

	Review of websites of parliaments at the time of monitoring to determine whether there is a practice of publishing key documentation on law making online, to allow for public scrutiny: 1. All draft laws in the parliamentary procedure – proposed by the Government, by members of parliament, and other official law proposers 2. Justification of the draft laws under point 1 3. Ex ante impact assessment reports/results for the draft laws under point 1, where applicable in line with regulations. 4. Public consultation reports for the draft laws under point 1, where applicable in line with regulations. Researchers observe all the draft laws that are in parliamentary procedure at the time of analysis of this Element and note the number of acts in point 1, and number of available items for points 2 to 4. If no information on draft laws in procedure is available online, zero points are automatically awarded.		0.5 – draft laws in procedure are available online 0.5 – for all draft laws available online justification is published 0.5 – for all draft laws available online reports/results on implemented ex ante impact assessments are published, where applicable 0.5 – for all draft laws available online public consultation reports are published, where applicable <i>Maximum score: 2</i>
Element 4.11	Formulation	Type	Data source
<i>SIGMA Principle P7. h</i>	Key non-state actors consider involvement of stakeholders in public hearings as effective	Outcomes and Impact	Key informants' interviews
	Methodology		Point allocation
	Researchers conduct interviews with key informants to establish whether, in practice, their participation in public hearings on proposed acts is effective, i.e., whether parliamentary committees consider their opinions. Researchers identify 3 interlocutors, from among those who have participated in public hearings in the 12 months preceding the monitoring (see Element 4.9). Zero points in the Element 4.9 automatically means zero points in this element. 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 the subject, 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. Interviewees respond to the following statement: 1. During public hearings, parliamentary committees consider my proposals/proposals of my organisation.		3 – all interviewees agree that their participation in public hearings is effective, i.e., that parliamentary committees consider their proposals during public hearings <i>Maximum score: 3</i>
SUBTOTAL POINTS			19
TOTAL POINTS			100

Annexe 1: Key informant interviews

➤ Element 1.5

The following questions are used for point allocation for element 1.5. 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, 0.75 points are allocated.

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **Agenda items for the Government's sessions 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: **Minutes of the Government's sessions are transparent.**
 - 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: **Decisions from the Government's sessions are transparent.**
 - a) fully disagree
 - b) tend to disagree
 - c) tend to agree
 - d) fully agree
4. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **The Government publicly informs on its decisions via press releases.**
 - 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 are agenda items for Government sessions typically made known to the public or stakeholders?
2. Who usually has access to agenda items before sessions take place, and how does that affect transparency or participation?
3. How useful are the existing records of meeting minutes for understanding how decisions were reached? Additionally, does the current level of transparency of meeting minutes contribute to accountability?
4. Do you find that the decisions made at Government sessions are presented clearly and understandably to the public?
5. Are there types of decisions that are more or less transparent than others? If so, why do you think that is the case?
6. How would you describe the tone and level of detail of Government press releases — are they informative, selective, or general?
7. Do you think the press releases reflect the actual content and rationale of Government decisions?
8. In your opinion, what should a fully transparent and accountable Government decision-making process look like?

➤ Element 2.14

The following questions are used for point allocation for element 2.14. 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: **Government's planning and reporting activities 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: **Government's planning and reporting activities are timely.**
 - 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: **Government's planning and reporting activities are citizen friendly.**
 - 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 Government planning documents explain and present clearly Government priorities, objectives, and expected results?
2. Are there opportunities for external stakeholders or the public to provide input during the planning stage? Does this practice vary among planning documents?
3. When it comes to timeliness, are there mechanisms to ensure that planning and reporting cycles are respected and aligned with budgetary or policy cycles?
4. Can you recall a case where the timeliness of reporting (or lack of it) had an impact on policy follow-up or accountability?
5. How effectively does the Government communicate the outcomes of its planning and reporting to citizens, in terms of conveying key messages and results? How do you assess citizens' awareness or interest in these documents?

➤ Element 3.23

The following questions are used for point allocation for element 3.23. 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: **In the work of the working groups, lead ministries decide on my proposals/proposals of my organisation (accept them or reject them).**
 - 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: **In the work of the working groups, lead ministries provide reasons for decisions to accept or reject my proposals/proposals of my organisation.**
 - 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: **In the work of the working groups, decisions and documents that came as the result of working groups' proceedings are available to me/my organisation.**
 - 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. Reflecting on your experience in participating in working groups, how would you describe the overall atmosphere and dynamics of cooperation?
2. What was the usual process after you submitted a proposal, how was it recorded or followed up?
3. Can you recall examples of proposals that were accepted and others that were not? If there were examples of your proposals being rejected, can you identify if the reasons for rejecting proposals were usually linked to policy priorities, legal constraints, or other factors?
4. Did you feel that your input was considered equally to the inputs provided by representatives of government bodies?
5. Did you find that the lead ministry/institution was open to alternative perspectives or critical feedback?
6. Were there topics or issues where discussion seemed less open or pre-decided?
7. When it comes to decisions and outputs of the working group, when did you usually receive the documents (draft laws/policy documents, meeting minutes, preparatory material, conclusions, etc.): during the process, after each meeting, or only once the final product was published?
8. Were the documents clear enough to understand how different inputs were reflected in the final version?
9. What would you say distinguishes a genuinely inclusive working group from one that is only formally inclusive?

➤ **Element 4.11**

The following questions are used for point allocation for element 4.11. Point allocation is determined based on fully agree/tend to agree responses. If all key informants fully agree/tend to agree with the statement, 3 points are allocated.

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: **During public hearings, parliamentary committees consider my proposals/proposals of my organisation.**
 - 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 often have you or your organisation taken part in such hearings, and in what policy areas?
2. In your experience, do all participants have equal opportunities to express their opinions?
3. When you or your organisation submitted comments or recommendations, how were they received and treated by members of the committee?
4. After a hearing, do you receive any follow-up information on how your contributions were treated?

5. Do you think that the current feedback mechanisms are sufficient to ensure accountability of parliamentary committees?

Annexe 2: FOI requests

FOI requests are used to gather data necessary for point allocation for elements 1.4, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 3.7, 3.8, 3.11, 3.12, 3.14, 3.19, 3.20, 4.4 and 4.9. **Researchers send FOI requests to relevant institutions only if data requested under the methodology for these elements are not publicly available.**

➤ Element 1.4

A freedom of information request is to be submitted to the relevant government office **at the end of the PDC monitoring window** asking for:

- a) the list of all agenda items per sessions held during the monitoring window, with clear indications which items were put on the agenda with a confidentiality label
- b) the list of all decisions taken in the same observed period, with clear indications which decisions are labelled as confidential, and
- c) dates of publishing of each individual decision not labelled as confidential, in the observed period.

➤ Element 2.4

A freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on:

- a) dates of adoption of observed government work plans, and
- b) dates when they were posted online.

➤ Element 2.5

A freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on:

- a) date of adoption of observed government programme, and
- b) date when they were posted online.

➤ Element 2.7

A freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on:

- a) dates of adoption of observed reports, and
- b) dates when they were posted online.

➤ Element 2.8

A freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on:

- a) dates of adoption of observed reports, and
- b) dates when they were posted online.

➤ Element 2.9

A freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on:

- a) dates of adoption of observed plans, and
- b) dates when they were posted online.

➤ **Element 2.10**

A freedom of information request is submitted to a relevant government office with questions on:

- a) dates of adoption of observed reports, and
- b) dates when they were posted online.

➤ **Element 3.7**

A freedom of information request is sent to institutions in charge of developing policy documents observed within this sub-indicator, requesting **ex ante impact assessments** conducted for those policy documents. Only those documents for which ex ante impact assessments are mandatory are observed.

➤ **Element 3.8**

A freedom of information request is sent to relevant institutions, requesting the **ex-ante impact assessments** for laws observed within this sub-indicator. This includes amendments to the primary legislation.

➤ **Elements 3.11 and 3.12**

A freedom of information request is sent to institutions in charge of developing policy documents and laws that make up the sample for this element, requesting data on:

- a) decisions on establishing working groups with lists of formal members, and
- b) conclusions/minutes/reports on working group meetings.

➤ **Element 3.14**

A freedom of information request is sent to institutions in charge of developing policy documents and laws that make up the sample for this element, requesting data on:

- a) conducting consultations in the early phase, before a draft document was produced, and
- b) reports on the early phase of consultations.

➤ **Element 3.19**

For all public consultations implemented on adopted policy documents and enacted primary legislation, researchers send a request, requesting data on **whether the designated centre-of-government institution checked compliance with consultation requirements**.

➤ **Element 3.20**

A freedom of information request is sent to institutions in charge of developing policy documents and laws that make up the sample for this element, requesting data on **email communication used to disseminate information on holding public consultations and to engage external stakeholders**.

➤ **Element 4.4**

A freedom of information request is sent to institutions in charge of developing sample laws observed under this element, requesting data on the **means of notifying which were used to inform affected groups on the upcoming changes to the legal framework** (direct contact or through representative associations, via emails, phone, etc.).

➤ **Element 4.9**

A freedom of information request is sent to the relevant parliamentary service, requesting data on the **participation of stakeholders, affected groups, and other non-state actors in public hearings on proposed acts** (laws and policy documents enacted in the parliament).