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## Introduction

This Annex describes the framework for prioritisation and the steps needed to assess, discuss, set the scope, prioritise and agree on the core issues of an envisaged public administration reform. The framework follows *The Principles of Public Administration[[1]](#footnote-1)* (the Principles) and covers all areas of public administration reform (PAR) as defined in the Principles. The purpose of this Prioritisation Tool is to structure and guide the self-assessment and identification of the core issues in each PAR area, as well as the grading of these aspects using a simple scale, and to suggest possible actions to address the identified problems or challenges. The Prioritisation Tool also suggests steps towards conducting a facilitated discussion on the current state of play and key challenges, using the results of self-assessment and other inputs, in order to reach agreement on the most pressing issues and how to address them.

While this Tool has been developed for the purpose of assisting in setting the scope and prioritisation of public administration-related reforms, the same approach can be used to set the scope and prioritise reforms in other sectors. The use of a simple self-assessment questionnaire to guide a facilitated discussion on the key reform challenges and the corresponding reforms is universally applicable.

The end result of the application of this Tool will be an agreed scope and key priorities of the envisaged reform, expressed through an indicative draft list of objectives which express the reform ambitions and the directions of actions to implement them – in other words, a “skeleton” of a draft strategy.

The intended users of the Tool are the institutions within a country administration in charge of co-ordinating and/or implementing the reform. While it can be used also to widen the circle of participants to include other, external stakeholders and to ensure citizens’ involvement in setting the reform priorities, it does not specifically detail how to ensure a targeted involvement of the wider stakeholder audience in the prioritisation process.

### The benefits of using this Tool

The Prioritisation Tool provides a good starting point for users to:

1. Understand what key issues should be covered by the envisaged strategic framework of public administration reform or sector within an agreed scope;
2. Identify the key characteristics of the current situation in each area and sub-area or aspect of the public administration or sector, and come to a view on which issues need further improvement;
3. Prioritise reform areas according to the views of responsible institutions and a wider range of stakeholders;
4. Sequence interventions within and between sub-areas and establish a co-ordinated reform framework for public administration.

The major benefit of the Tool is that it allows a **facilitated and structured discussion** on the key challenges, objectives and activities, during which all participating institutions have the chance to voice their opinion, with an opportunity to reach a **joint agreement** on the skeleton of the PAR or sector reform strategic framework.

While the application of this Tool might be most useful in those cases where a comprehensive situation analysis has not yet been developed, it can also be of use where a good situation analysis is already available. In this latter case, it is important to use the results of the existing situation analysis (and other available external analyses, such as EC progress reports and SIGMA monitoring assessment reports), rather than trying to repeat the problem identification from scratch. Nevertheless, there is added value when the results of this self-assessment tool are compared with the results of any existing situation analyses to come to a joint agreement on the most pressing issues requiring reform from a strategic perspective.

In the case of PAR, an alternative to the application of the Prioritisation Tool, and especially to its self-assessment part, can be the commissioning of a country monitoring assessment (using the measurement framework developed by SIGMA) to assess the current functioning of a country public administration against the Principles of Public Administration. When applied in this way, the country monitoring report can provide a comprehensive overview of the public administration, and analysis of the key challenges and recommendations for short- and medium-term actions for the setting of strategic scope and priorities of a PAR framework.

### Steps in applying the Prioritisation Tool

The application of this Tool is quite easy, but, in order to produce the intended results, various stakeholders need to be involved to arrive at a common understanding on what the key problems are, what areas of intervention should be prioritised, and thereafter what actions are necessary to improve the situation and resolve outstanding issues. All in all, this Tool provides a structured way of getting from identifying problems to introducing solutions. The following table sets out the recommended steps with an indication of the key responsible institutions:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Step** | **Institution** |
| **1.** | Review of the questionnaire to adjust it to country-specific conditions; decision on participating institutions. | PAR/sector lead institution |
| **2.** | Launch of the self-assessment process. This step may involve organising a joint workshop to explain the purpose of the assessment and how to answer the questions, or alternatively this can be done via a circular letter. | PAR/sector lead institution |
| **3.** | Carry out self-assessment: | Participating institutions |
| **3.1.** | Assess the current state of play. |
| **3.2.** | Provide a quantitative evaluation of the current state of play. |
| **3.3.** | Identify main actions. |
| **4.** | Analysis and summary of self-assessment results. | PAR/sector lead institution (with external assistance if required) |
| **5.** | Organise a workshop(s) to discuss and agree the ‘skeleton’ PAR or sector strategy: |  |
| **5.1.** | Facilitate a high-level workshop to discuss and agree on the core problems and the relative urgency of the PAR or sector interventions and actions. | Organiser – PAR/sector lead institution  Participants – ministers, other senior-level management |
| **5.2.** | Facilitate an additional operational-level workshop to agree on further details of the agreed actions. | Organiser – PAR/sector lead institution  Participants – participating institutions |

## STEP 1: Reviewing the questionnaire to adjust it to country-specific conditions

The questionnaires provided in both Annex A and Annex B include categories and statements corresponding to the SIGMA Principles of Public Administration for EU Enlargement candidadte countries and potential canditates and for the European Neighbourhood, correspondingly, ensuring the areas and issues that are crucial for an effective public administration are included in the framework. However, it is not always necessary to assess of all these aspects. In addition, the drafters of a new or revised PAR strategy may want to concentrate on some areas in more depth. Hence, the questionnaire is designed to be easily adjusted to the specific needs of a particular administration. This adjustment can also happen based on any prior problem analysis to ensure full alignment between the questionnaire and the problem analysis and allow the focus to be on those issues already identified as the key challenges.

Similarly, a questionnaire of the same depth and complexity can be developed for assisting self-assessment for any sector or policy area. In such a case the drafters of the questionnaire should use their current state analysis framework, the questions used for the analysis as well as corresponding strategic documents, to come up with the set of questions necessary to get a sound impression through self-assessment about the most important aspects relevant for the reform of the given sector. The Principles can be used as a reference conceptual framework that covers a wide policy area (the setup and functioning of the public administration) through well-defined areas, key requirements and key defining aspects.

Before launching the self-assessment component, the PAR or sector lead institution shall review the questionnaire to adjust it to the administration-specific conditions (including alignment to the results of a prior problem analysis) as necessary. The options are to:

1. Omit statements not relevant in the given context;
2. Develop and add new statements to meet the specific conditions (a new questionnaire is to be developed if a different sector is to be addressed than PAR);
3. Reword statements to allow better understanding and reflection of the local context and specifics;
4. Merge categories covered by only one or few statements in the framework questionnaire provided.

In addition to the questionnaire review, the PAR or sector lead institution has to **map all key stakeholders** and decide on who will be requested to fill out what set of statements. This is particularly important, as not all participating institutions will have a relevant opinion on every aspect covered in the self-assessment component. The PAR or sector lead institution may decide to send the full questionnaire to some institutions (usually to those with wider, horizontal responsibilities over PAR or the sector) and only certain parts to institutions in charge of one or other area covered under the questionnaire.

In the case of PAR, the typical set-up of responsible involved institutions for each area is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Areas of PAR as in the Principles of Public Administration** | | **Institutions typically involved** |
| **Policy Co-ordination** Functioning of the centre of government (CoG) | | All CoG institutions: Office of Prime Minister or similar, Ministry of Justice (MoJ), Ministry of Finance (MoF), Ministry of European Integration or similar |
| **Policy Development** Evidence-based policy making Legal drafting | | All CoG institutions plus key players in policy development. Usually includes the Ministry of Economy |
| **Public Service and HRM**  Legal framework  HRM practices, merit-based recruitment, remuneration policies, integrity | | Key institutions responsible for Civil Service: Ministry of Justice/Labour/Public Administration MoF, Training Institution, Anti-corruption Agency, Civil Service Commissioner |
| **Accountability** Organisation of public administration, Administrative procedures, Access to public information | | Key institutions responsible for accountability: MoJ or other CoG body, Ombudsman for Access to Information, body responsible for organisation of the administration |
| **Service Delivery** e-Government, service modernisation | | Key institutions responsible for service delivery: e-Service institution(s), Ministry for Innovation and IT or Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Public Administration |
| **PFM:** | **Financial Management** | MoF, Treasury, Ministry of Development/ Economy, as well as selected line ministries and the Office of the Prime Minister or similar |
| **Public Procurement** | MoF, Procurement Review Body, body responsible for public-private partnership(s) (PPP), anti-corruption Agency |
| **External** **Audit** | Supreme Audit Institution, MoF |
| **Strategic Management of PAR** | | Key PAR co-ordination institution, such as Ministry of Public Administration |

## STEP 2: Launching the self-assessment process

When applying the Prioritisation Tool, it is important to remember that the self-assessment component and the facilitated discussion together comprise its framework. As with any initiative involving a larger number of individuals and institutions, it is critical to set out in advance the purpose of the exercise, the steps in the process and the technical details related to the different aspects of the process. Launching the self-assessment is usually the first instance when institutions, other than the PAR or sector lead institution, are asked for their input into the design of the PAR or sector strategy.

In order to set the scene for the successful application of this Tool, the PAR or sector lead institution should either organise an introductory workshop or send out a circular or other explanatory document when starting the self-assessment. Either method should cover details of the following aspects:

* The ultimate ***purpose*** of the initiative (its role in the formulation of the PAR or sector strategy);
* The ***reason for selection*** of the participating institutions, and the whole list of participating institutions;
* The ***key* *steps*** in the process (both the self-assessment and the subsequent facilitated discussion);
* ***How to* *complete*** the self-assessment questionnaire;
* Emphasis on the need for answers to be ***representative*** of the participating institution (i.e. its management have agreed that they represent the views of the organisation);
* Additional details of how the results of this initiative will be ***translated*** in the PAR or sector strategy drafting process;
* Provision of anyadditional ***supporting* *information*,** especially any existing situation analysis and/or external analyses.

If the self-assessment is launched by circular or other written form only, this should be accompanied by the relevant customised questionnaire(s).

It is important that the PAR or sector lead institution remains helpful throughout the self-assessment process and assists the responsible institutions in completing the questionnaires, should further help or additional explanations be requested by them.

## STEP 3: Carry out self-assessment

### State of play

The application of the Tool starts with a light self-assessment in different public administration reform sub-areas (or aspects of the given sector). The PAR or sector lead institution sends questionnaires relating to the selected areas to the relevant institutions. Upon receiving the selected templates (note that not all institutions involved receive the same templates and statements), responsible institutions should start by filling in the column headed “State of Play”.

When completing the questionnaire, institutions should remember, that:

* State of play answers should be as ***analytica****l* as possible and descriptive narrative should be avoided;
* The assessment of the state of play regarding the ***legal* *framework*** in different PAR or sector areas should focus on the analysis of ***gaps and inconsistency***, rather than listing the existing laws, by-laws or regulations;
* The assessment of the state of play regarding ***institutional set-up*** should focus on the analysisof ***capacity***, rather than confirming the existence of the institutions;
* The assessment of the state of play regarding ***implementation*** should focus on the analysis of ***bottlenecks, impediments or strengths***, rather than a description of processes and practices;
* Information about ***latest achievements*** or actions that have been taken in implementing previous PAR-related or sector-specific initiatives, should also be taken into account. If the accomplishment and execution of actions is not complete, this should be highlighted;
* Use various sources to give a ***snapshot*** of the current state of play, including externally produced assessments and analyses, by development partners, International Organisations and non-governmental organisations, for example. Here it is of paramount importance that results of the previously developed situation/problem analysis are used. Hence, the lead institution may take the opportunity to apply this Tool to also provide a summary of the key findings of the problem analysis in advance;
* It is recommended that any ***conflicting* *assessments*** be reflected in the description of the state of play (for example, where institutions and internal reports record positive achievements, but international sources record a negative state of play, or vice versa);
* The description of the state of play for every statement should be ***brief*:** between two and five concise, well-formulated sentences.

### Evaluating the situation

The next step in the application of the Tool would be to provide a **quantitative evaluation** of the current state of play. For this, each institution should choose one score that would most precisely describe the current status for each statement. In the case of conflicting assessments by different sources, it is recommended that the representatives of a responsible institution completing the template discuss these conflicting assessments internally and make a final decision on the quantitative evaluation to be chosen. As described below, “5” is the highest evaluation reflecting an assessment of no problems with the situation, while “1” means the area is assessed as being totally underdeveloped.

The following table may be used for grading/evaluation:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Meaning** | **Comment** |
| **1** | **POOR** | The overall situation within the particular statement area is very bad and no previous reform initiatives have either taken place or been successfully implemented, or the issue is something very new for the country. Urgent reforms are needed. There will generally be very few cases where a score of “1” is given. It is suggested that a **maximum of three statements** should take a score of “1” within a full questionnaire or in a wider PAR or sector area. |
| **2** | **FAIR** | The overall situation for the particular statement requires substantive reforms, due to previous reforms being either fragmented and poorly planned, not previously targeted, or postponed for some reason. The key issues are probably well known to all stakeholders and already raised by international assessments. A score of “2” means that a planned approach towards reforms in this particular aspect is needed. |
| **3** | **AVERAGE** | The overall situation for the particular statement aspect is neither critically bad nor particularly satisfying. Some reforms have already taken place, but they have not fully achieved the intended policy objectives and further improvement is needed. The key issues are probably well known to stakeholders and already raised by international assessments. A score of “3” means that further steps need to be included in the next PAR or sector strategy and elaborated in its Action Plan. |
| **4** | **GOOD** | The overall situation for the particular statement is quite good and simply requires fine-tuning. There have been previous reform efforts in this area and most of the outstanding issues identified by internal and external analyses have been dealt with good results. A score of “4” means that limited reform steps are needed, but they are not considered to be urgent and can even be carried out without explicit coverage in the new PAR or sector strategy. |
| **5** | **EXCEPTIONAL** | The overall situation for a particular statement is very good and does not require any further reform efforts. In general, this is quite rare. It is suggested that a **maximum of three statements** should take a score of “5” within a questionnaire or wider PAR or sector area. |

### Defining main reform actions

After identifying the current status both qualitatively and quantitatively, responsible institutions should complete the column headed “Main actions for the future”. Under this the key future reform steps – corrective actions or new initiatives – that need to be taken in order to solve the identified problems, should be detailed. Ideally **not more than** **three or four** key reform steps (i.e. groups of actions) should be mentioned for each statement. Once agreement on the main policy objectives has been reached, these main action inputs will be used and further elaborated in a more detailed manner for the purposes of drawing up the Action Plan for the implementation of the new PAR or sector strategy.

### The completed templates

Once all the fields of the templates have been filledby the responsible institutions, they should be returned to the PAR or sector lead institution.

The following is a PAR-related example of acomplete answer to one statement within the template:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | **State of play** | **Main actions for the future** |
| **CATEGORY: Centre of government institutions and functioning** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Centre of government institutions fulfil all functions critical to a well-organised, consistent and competent policy-making system. | 1 | **2** | 3 | 4 | 5 | The legal framework for carrying out the critical functions is in place, but the exact mandate for policy planning and quality assurance of policy proposals is not properly defined. There are too many units of the Prime Minister’s Office monitoring the work of the ministries, but the reports are overlapping and not streamlined. For new proposals, only coverage by the budget is checked and financial sustainability and effects on the citizens are not analysed. | Revision of the Rules of Procedure to establish the mandate for planning and for checking policy content as well as the wider financial aspects of new proposals.  Consolidation of monitoring initiatives and streamlining of reporting to the Government. |

## STEP 4: Analyse and summarise the assessment results

Once all the completed templates have been received back, the PAR or sector lead institution has to start analysing the information to arrive at aggregate evaluations(where several bodies evaluate the same field) and then identify the most critical areas of the public administration reform. The analysis should aim to:

* calculate aggregate ***average* *scoring*** for each ***category*** of question (***not*** for every statement);
* identify and ***summarise*** the main answer patterns and description of the state of play;
* identify and collect specific state-of-play answers that ***deviate*** from the main theme or pattern for each statement;
* collect the list of all ***potential* *proposals*** for main actions.

In addition, the analysis phase should be used to also summarise the key findings of existing prior analyses and assessments (both internal situation analysis and external reports) in accordance with the self-assessment categorisation.

The PAR or sector lead institution should summarise all this information in some type of **discussion material,** preferably a presentation, to be used to facilitate the joint discussion later on.

This presentation should highlight the **average score**, the **state of play summary** and any **additional insight** (including any evaluations which contradict the main pattern and average score for a specific statement or category as a whole) for each area covered under the self-assessment by category of statement. It is not recommended to do a detailed summary for each statement, as it is highly unlikely that participants can cover every statement in detail during the joint discussion.

When analysing the self-assessment results, the PAR or sector lead institution should focus on identifying the **most pressing issues** amongst all the statements covered in the questionnaires. To this end it is recommended that focus is given to those aspects with an **average score of 3 or lower**. It can be assumed that those with the lowest scores are seen as priority areas for intervention by the responsible institutions.

Aspects with higher scores should also be further discussed if there is a **number of contradicting self-assessments** (for example, the group average is above 3, but two or more respondents gave a score of 2 or lower). In such cases the joint discussion should be used to give voice to the more critical assessor institutions and to come to a conclusion as to whether they were too critical in light of the other pressing issues within the wider country context, or whether they are right to say that the particular aspect requires more reform than would be anticipated based purely on the average score.

In order to ensure a balanced analysis, and where the analytical capacities of the PAR lead institution need to be enhanced, external support might also be required to identify the patterns and the contradicting responses and to develop the discussion material. SIGMA or other experts can be of particular help at this stage.

## STEP 5: Organisation of a workshop (or series of workshops)

After the analysis is carried out, the PAR or sector lead institution should organise aworkshop to discuss the aggregate results of the self-assessment, agree on the scope of the envisaged PAR or sector strategy and prioritise the identified problems that will then be translated into the clear (SMART) policy objectives of the next PAR or sector strategy. These draft objectives are to be agreed in order to improve the situation in each of the prioritised categories or aspects.

Similarly, if a SIGMA country monitoring assessment has been conducted, the workshop should be organised to discuss its key findings and the developed recommendations with the same purpose: to jointly develop the draft objectives based on an agreed scope and prioritisation of reforms.

**The participants of the workshop** are representatives of the participating institutions with a clear mandate to speak on behalf of the institution. For this reason **high-level representatives** of the responding institutions (i.e. ministers, heads of institutions or senior managers in charge of the various areas) should attend the workshop. Depending on the number of participating institutions, several representatives of a single organisation may be invited. Note that for a workshop to be effective and constructive the number of participants should be limited to a maximum of 30. The workshop should be moderated by a representative(s) of the PAR or sector lead institution.

**The purpose of the workshop** is to discuss and identify the areas that require improvement and to discuss and clarify the discrepancies in the assessments. Therefore the workshop should mainly focus on:

1. those areas where the scores are the lowest;
2. those areas where divergent assessments were provided through the self-assessment;
3. the results of any prior situation analysis and external analyses (e.g. EC progress report, SIGMA assessments), in particular any discrepancies between the findings of external analyses and the self-assessment results.

In addition, the workshop should also be used to create a consensus around the overall need and purpose of the reform, including why the government is proposing to engage in a reform process and what are the fundamental objectives that the government is trying to achieve through these reforms.

Overall, the workshop is a platform to discuss the most pressing issues in the areas of public administration and to hear and discuss different opinions. This approach should allow the scope of the new PAR or sector strategy to become focused, the identified problems to be prioritised according to their agreed importance, and a limited number of policy objectives to be arrived at.

While the **workshop arrangements** are rather flexible, the workshop should involve all the relevant institutions. The workshop is usually a two-day event:

1. The first day is devoted to the ***presentation and discussion of the results*** of the assessment, area by area, focusing on the lowest scores and discrepancies between assessments. It is here that the conflicting views should be discussed and clarified. This day should be supported by the analysis summary presentation developed by the PAR or sector lead institution. The outputs of this day should be decisions on the ***scope*** and the selection of ***priorities*** and ***draft objectives***.
2. The second day should be allocated to discussions to kick-startthe process of ***action planning***. Only major actions to address the core problems should be presented, along with any that would require political support or greater investment. This will be based mainly on the analysis summary presentation developed by the PAR or sector lead institution for the selected scope and priorities, as agreed the previous day. The output of this day should be the ***first draft list of major actions*** to address the selected priorities.

While it is essential to have decision makers for the first day, the second day may involve lower-level representatives of the key involved institutions, if the highest-level decision makers cannot participate. On both days a mixture of **joint discussions** and work in **smaller groups** can be used to allow the participants to discuss the discrepancies and their causes and come up with joint conclusions.

As indicated above, the keyoutput of the workshop is the “skeleton” of the new PAR or sector strategywith a defined scope, prioritised problems to address, draft objectives of the various reform areas and a list of key actions to achieve these objectives.Performance indicators and targets may be proposed as well, if time allows.

Overall, based on the aggregate information and discussions during the workshop, the key stakeholders of the whole development process – the PAR or sector lead institution and participating institutions – should be able to develop and present to the highest-level political decision makers (usually the government) a comprehensive reform plan (“skeleton” of the strategy) in the field of public administration reform or any other sector or policy area.

Due to the inclusive processes of problem identification, prioritisation, and solution finding, this approach should ultimately provide for better results than a typical top-down planning process.

Nevertheless, stakeholder engagement to test the vision and priorities in a PAR or sector strategy and to validate the choices/trade-offs once it is designed are essential when the prioritisation is being carried out.

## Annex A: Framework Questionnaire for self-assessment for PAR in the EU Enlargement context

**POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-ORDINATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | | | | | | **State of play** | | **Main actions for the future** | |
| **CATEGORY: Centre of government institutions and functioning** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Centre of government institutions fulfil all functions critical to a well-organised, consistent and competent policy-making system. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 2. | Clear horizontal procedures for governing the national European integration process are established and enforced under the co-ordination of the responsible body. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| **CATEGORY: Policy planning and monitoring at the Centre of government** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Harmonised medium-term policy planning, with clear whole-of-government objectives, exists and is aligned with the financial circumstances of the Government; sector policies meet the Government objectives and are consistent with the medium-term budgetary framework. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 4. | A harmonised medium-term planning system for all processes relevant to European integration exists and is integrated into domestic policy planning. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 5. | Regular monitoring of the Government’s performance enables public scrutiny and ensures that the Government is able to achieve its objectives. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| **CATEGORY: Government decision making and Parliamentary scrutiny** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Government decisions are prepared in a transparent manner and based on the administration’s professional judgement; the legal conformity of the decisions is ensured. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 7. | The Parliament scrutinises government policy making. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| **CATEGORY: Policy development structures, processes (evidence-based policy making; consultation; quality of legal drafting)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | The organisational structure, procedures and staff allocation of the ministries ensure that developed policies and legislation are implementable and meet Government objectives. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 9. | The European integration procedures and institutional set-up form an integral part of the policy development process and ensure systematic and timely transposition of the acquis. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 10. | The policy-making and legal drafting process is evidence-based and impact assessment is regularly used across ministries. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 11. | Policies and legislation are designed in an inclusive manner that enables the active participation of society and allows for co-ordinating perspectives within the Government. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 12. | Legislation is consistent in structure, style, and language; legal drafting requirements are applied consistently across ministries; legislation is made publicly available. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |

**PUBLIC SERVICE AND HRM**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | **State of play** | **Main actions for the future** | |
| **CATEGORY: Scope, policy, legal framework and institutional set-up** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | The scope of public service is adequate, clearly defined and applied in practice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 2. | Policy and legal frameworks for professional and coherent public service, based on administrative law principles, are established and implemented; the institutional set-up enables consistent and effective human resource management practices across the public service. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| **CATEGORY: Professionalisation, recruitment and dismissal** | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | The recruitment of public servants is based on merit and equal treatment in all its phases; the criteria for demotion and termination of public servants are explicit. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 4. | Direct or indirect political influence on senior managerial positions in the public service is prevented. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 5. | The system for remuneration of public servants is based on job classification; it is fair and transparent. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 6. | The professional development of public servants is ensured; this includes regular training, fair performance appraisal, and mobility and promotion based on objective and transparent criteria and merit. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 7. | Measures for promoting integrity, and preventing corruption and ensuring discipline in the public service are in place. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | **State of play** | **Main actions for the future** | |
| **CATEGORY: Organisational set-up of the administration, right to access to information, protection of good administration and liabilities against wrongdoing** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | The overall organisation of central government is rational, follows adequate policies and regulations and provides for appropriate internal, political, judicial, social and independent accountability. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 2. | The right to access public information is enacted in legislation and consistently applied in practice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 3. | Functioning mechanisms are in place to protect both the rights of the individual to good administration and the public interest. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 4. | Fair treatment in administrative disputes is guaranteed by internal administrative appeals and judicial reviews. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 5. | The public authorities assume liability in cases of wrongdoing and guarantee redress and/or adequate compensation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |

**SERVICE DELIVERY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | | **State of play** | | **Main actions for the future** | |
| **CATEGORY: Policy of service delivery, quality insurance, access to services** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | | Policy for citizen-oriented state administration is in place and applied. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |  | |  |
| 2. | | Good administration is a key policy objective underpinning the delivery of public service, enacted in legislation and applied consistently in practice. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |  | |  |
| 3. | | Mechanisms for ensuring the quality of public service are in place. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |  | |  |
| 4. | | The accessibility of public services is ensured. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |  | |  |

**PUBLIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | | | | | | **State of play** | | **Main actions for the future** | |
| **CATEGORY: Budget formulation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | The Government publishes a medium-term budgetary framework on a general government basis that is founded on credible forecasts and covers a minimum time horizon of three years; all budget organisations operate within it. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 2. | The Budget is formulated in line with the national legal framework, with comprehensive spending appropriations that are consistent with the medium-term budgetary framework and are observed. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| **CATEGORY: Accounting and reporting; cash and debt management** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | The Ministry of Finance, or authorised central treasury authority, centrally controls disbursement of funds from the treasury single account and ensures cash liquidity. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 4. | There is a clear debt management strategy in place and implemented so that the country’s overall debt target is respected and debt servicing costs are kept under control. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 5. | Budget transparency and scrutiny are ensured. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| **CATEGORY: Financial management and control** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | The operational framework for financial management and control defines responsibilities and powers, and its application by the budget organisations is consistent with the legislation governing public financial management and public administration in general. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 7. | Each public organisation implements financial management and control in line with the overall financial management and control policy documents. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| **CATEGORY: Internal audit** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | The operational framework for internal audit reflects international standards and its application by the budget organisations is consistent with the legislation governing public administration and public financial management in general. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 9. | Each public organisation implements internal audit in line with the overall internal audit policy documents as appropriate to the organisation. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| **CATEGORY: Public procurement policy and institutional set-up** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. | Public procurement regulations (including public-private partnerships and concessions) are aligned with the acquis, include additional areas not covered by the acquis, are harmonised with corresponding regulations in other fields, and are duly enforced. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 11. | There is central institutional and administrative capacity to develop, implement and monitor procurement policy effectively and efficiently. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| **CATEGORY: Public procurement remedy system** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. | The remedies system is aligned with the acquis standards of independence, probity and transparency and provides for rapid and competent handling of complaints and sanctions. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| **CATEGORY: Public procurement in practice, capacities of contracting authorities** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. | Public procurement operations comply with basic principles of equal treatment, non-discrimination, proportionality and transparency, while ensuring the most efficient use of public funds and making best use of modern procurement techniques and methods. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 14. | Contracting authorities and entities have the appropriate capacities and practical guidelines and tools to ensure professional management of the full procurement cycle. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| **CATEGORY: External audit** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15. | The independence, mandate and organisation of the Supreme Audit Institution are established and protected by the constitutional and legal framework and are respected in practice. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 16. | The Supreme Audit Institution applies standards in a neutral and objective manner to ensure high quality audits, which positively impact on the functioning of the public sector. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |

**STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REFORM**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | **State of play** | **Main actions for the future** |
| **PAR Strategic Framework, policy** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | The Government has developed and enacted an effective public administration reform agenda which addresses key challenges. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |
| 2. | Public administration reform is purposefully implemented; reform outcome targets are set and regularly monitored. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |
| 3. | Financial sustainability of public administration reform is ensured. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |
| **PAR Management and co-ordination structures** | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Public administration reform has robust and functioning co-ordination structures at both the political and administrative level to steer and manage the reform design and implementation process. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |

## Annex B: Framework Questionnaire for self-assessment for PAR in the European Neighborhood context

**POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-ORDINATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | | | | | | **State of play** | | **Main actions for the future** | |
| **CATEGORY: Policy planning and monitoring at the Centre of government** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Medium-term policy planning is harmonised, with consistent system-wide objectives, and is aligned with the financial circumstances of the state; sector policies meet the overall objectives set by the leadership and are consistent with the medium-term budgetary framework. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 2. | Regular monitoring of performance against the plans enables public scrutiny and ensures the achievement of stated objectives. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| **CATEGORY: Government decision making and Parliamentary scrutiny** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Policy and legislative decisions are prepared in a transparent manner and based on the administration’s professional judgement. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 4. | The parliament oversees government policy making. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| **CATEGORY: Policy development structures, processes (evidence-based policy making; consultation; quality of legal drafting)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | The organisational structure, procedures and staff allocation of the responsible state institutions ensure the capacity to develop and implement policies and legislation that meet medium-term and annual objectives and plans. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 6. | The policy-making and legal-drafting process is evidence-based, and impact assessment is regularly used across ministries. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 7. | Policies and legislation are designed in an inclusive manner that enables the active participation of society and allows for co-ordinating perspectives within the administration. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 8. | Legislation is consistent in structure, style, and language; legal drafting requirements are applied consistently across ministries; legislation is made publicly available. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |

**PUBLIC SERVICE AND HRM**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | **State of play** | **Main actions for the future** | |
| **CATEGORY: Scope, policy, legal framework and institutional set-up** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | The policy and legal frameworks for a professional and coherent public service are in place; the institutional set-up enables consistent and effective human resource management practices across the public service. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 2. | The scope of public service is adequate and clearly defined. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| **CATEGORY: Professionalisation, recruitment and dismissal** | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | The recruitment of public servants, including those holding senior managerial positions, is based on merit and equal treatment in all its phases; the criteria for demotion and termination are explicitly stipulated by law and limit discretion. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 4. | The remuneration system of public servants is based on the job classification; it is fair and transparent. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 5. | The professional development of public servants is ensured; this includes regular training, fair performance appraisal, and mobility and promotion based on objective and transparent criteria and merit. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 6. | Measures for promoting integrity, preventing corruption and ensuring discipline in the public service are in place. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | **State of play** | **Main actions for the future** | |
| **CATEGORY: Organisational set-up of the administration, right to access to information, protection of good administration and liabilities against wrongdoing** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | The overall organisation of central government is rational, follows adequate policies and regulations, and provides for appropriate independent accountability. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 2. | Functioning mechanisms are in place to protect both the rights of the individual to good administration and the public interest. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 3. | The right to access public information is enacted in legislation and consistently applied in practice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 4. | Fair treatment in administrative disputes is guaranteed by internal administrative appeals and judicial reviews. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |
| 5. | The public authorities assume liability in cases of culpable breach of duty of a public servant and guarantee redress and/or adequate compensation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | |  |

**SERVICE DELIVERY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | | **State of play** | | **Main actions for the future** | |
| **CATEGORY: Policy of service delivery, quality insurance, access to services** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | | Policy for service delivery-focused state administration is in place and applied. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |  | |  |
| 2. | | Good administration is a key policy objective underpinning the delivery of public service, enacted in legislation and applied consistently in practice. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |  | |  |
| 3. | | Mechanisms for ensuring the quality of public service are in place. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |  | |  |
| 4. | | The accessibility of public services is ensured. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |  | |  |

**PUBLIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | | | | | | **State of play** | | **Main actions for the future** | |
| **CATEGORY: Budget formulation** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | The government publishes a medium-term budgetary framework on a general government basis that is founded on credible forecasts and covers a minimum period of three years; all budget institutions operate within it. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 2. | The budget is formulated in line with the national legal framework, with comprehensive spending appropriations that are consistent with the medium-term budgetary framework and are observed. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| **CATEGORY: Accounting and reporting; cash and debt management** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. | The central budget authority, or authorised treasury authority, centrally controls disbursement of funds from the treasury single account and ensures cash liquidity. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 4. | There is a clear debt management strategy in place and implemented so that the country’s overall debt target is respected and debt servicing costs are kept under control. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 5. | Budget transparency and scrutiny are ensured. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| **CATEGORY: Internal control and audit** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | The operational framework for internal control defines responsibilities and powers, and is implemented by general budget institutions in line with the overall internal control policy. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| 7. | The operational framework for internal audit reflects international standards and is applied consistently by government institutions. | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  | |
| **CATEGORY: Public procurement policy and institutional set-up** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | Public procurement regulations are aligned with internationally recognised principles of economy, efficiency, transparency, openness and accountability; there is central institutional and administrative capacity to develop, implement and monitor procurement policy effectively and efficiently. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 9. | The remedies system is aligned with applicable agreements and international regulations and with internationally recognised good practice of independence, probity and transparency and provides for rapid and competent handling of complaints and sanctions. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 10. | Public procurement operations comply with basic principles of equal treatment, non-discrimination, proportionality and transparency, and ensure the most efficient use of public funds; contracting authorities have appropriate capacities and use modern procurement techniques. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| **CATEGORY: External audit** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. | The independence, mandate and organisation of the supreme audit institution are established and protected by the constitutional and legal frameworks and are respected in practice. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |
| 12. | The supreme audit institution applies standards in a neutral and objective manner to ensure high-quality audits, which positively impact on the governance and functioning of the public sector. | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  | |  |

**STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REFORM**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **State of play statement** | **Assessment of current situation** | | | | | **State of play** | **Main actions for the future** |
| **PAR Strategic Framework, policy and management** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | An effective public administration reform agenda is developed which addresses key challenges and is systematically implemented and monitored. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |
| 2. | The financial sustainability of public administration reform is ensured. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |
| 3. | Institutions involved in public administration reform have clear responsibility for reform initiatives and the capacity to implement them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  |

1. OECD (2017), The Principles of Public Administration, OECD Publishing, Paris, <http://sigmaweb.org/publications/Principles-of-Public-Administration_Edition-2017_ENG.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)