Draft INDICATOR PASSPORT

For measurement of the indicators of the Better Regulation Strategy 2.0 (BRS) 2017-2021

The purpose of this Indicator Passport is to provide the detailed methodological description of measurement for all indicators that are included in the **Better Regulation Strategy 2.0 2017-2021** adopted in December 2016 by the Government of Kosovo.

The document serves to support with defining indicators to assess progress made regarding the specific objectives that were presented in the BRS. This includes identifying the necessary data to measure progress, the methodology of calculating, understanding and accurate interpreting of performance information data.

The document covers all indicators that are included in the Better Regulation Strategy 2.0 at the level of specific objectives. The framework includes both qualitative and quantitative indicators with at least one indicator identified to each specific objective. The detailed methodological description of measurements follows the structure of the strategy which includes two following General Objectives:

> General Objective 1: An Enabling Regulatory System
> General Objective 2: Effective Public Communication, Public Consultation and Participation of Stakeholders

Each indicator as formulated for the Better Regulation Strategy 2.0 2017-2021 includes the following elements:

- The specific objective to which the indicator corresponds;
- Brief description of the indicator;
- The source of information (data) that serves as the basis of measurement for the indicator;
- The institution responsible for gathering data for the measurement of the indicator, which includes providing the information for reporting/monitoring purposes and data quality control;
- The frequency of data publication (and/or data gathering);
- The data that is required to measure progress under the indicator;
- A methodological description of the measurement method, allowing for external checking and better understanding of how certain indicator values were developed;
- The baseline and target values (set in the adopted BRS).

Several indicators that are included in the BRS are SIGMA-indicators based on the Principles for Public Administration. The methodology developed for other indicators has been tailor-made to the needs for the indicator.

The information included in this Indicator Passport was developed under the leadership of the Office of the Prime Minister based on the information provided by the responsible institutions and their formulation bears the full consent of all responsible institution and with the support of OECD/SIGMA experts. This Indicator Passport is updated based on the commitments reflected in the Sector Reform Contract for Public Administration Reform that entered into force on 15 December 2017.

CONTENTS

GENERAL OBJECTIVE 1: AN ENABLING REGULATORY SYSTEM

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1.1: REFORMS OF EXISTING PRIMARY AND SECONDARY LEGISLATION TO ENHANCE COMPETITIVENESS

INDICATOR 1.1.1 ADOPTION OF CONCEPT DOCUMENT ON ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN REDUCTION PROGRAMME

Title of Indicator	1.1.1 Adoption of Concept Document on administrative burden reduction programme		
The corresponding sub-objective	1.1. Reforms of existing primary and secondary legislation to enhance competitiveness		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures whether the government has adopted the Concept Document on the possible implementation of an administrative burden reduction programme. The Concept Document will provide the policy analysis regarding the benefits and costs of implementing an administrative burden reduction programme. This analysis will include a comparison of potential project designs, the main requirements related to reducing administrative burdens against a set target and a budget assessment for each viable programme design option.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Decision of the Government on adoption of the Concept Document on Administrative Burden reduction program.		
Institution responsible for gathering data	Government Coordination Secretariat/OPM		
Frequency of data publication	Annually		
Data required	Decision of the Government regarding the adoption of the Concept Document on Administrative Burden Reduction		
A brief description of the methodology	It is checked whether the decision on the Concept Document on Administrative Burden reduction programme is approved in/before 2019 as reflected in the Better Regulation Strategy.		
Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	No effective programme design for administrative burden reduction exists	
Information on target values	Year	2018	2021

4

	Indicator value	The Concept Document is under development.	Concept document on administrative burden reduction is approved

INDICATOR 1.1.2: DEVELOPING SCM CAPACITIES

Title of Indicator	1.1.2 Developing SCM capacities
The corresponding sub-objective	**1.1. Reforms of existing primary and secondary legislation to enhance competitiveness**
Description of the Indicator	The Indicator aims to measure the increase of capacities, namely through training, in the Office of the Prime Minister and line ministries to apply the Standard Cost Model (SCM) during policy development.
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	1) Attendance lists for SCM trainings 2) Training reports
Institution responsible for gathering data	Government Coordination Secretariat (main responsible) with support from KIPA
Frequency of data publication	*Annually*
Data required	1. Number of staff that is trained on the SCM in OPM and line ministries 2. Number of staff that needs to be trained in the OPM and line ministries
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is measured by referencing the number of staff that is trained on applying the SCM versus the total number of OPM and line ministry staff for who the training on the SCM is relevant. The ministerial divisions that are relevant with regards to the implementation of the SCM and preventing administrative burdens for companies are those divisions that are responsible for legislation that directly affects business activities and imposes Information Obligations on companies. The SCM-relevant ministerial divisions are listed in the Annex on training numbers attached to this Indicator Passport. Per relevant policy division, one person needs to be trained. In addition, one staff member from the Legal Department and Department for European Integration and Policy Coordination at the line ministries needs to be trained. The offices within the OPM that have a central coordinating and quality assurance role, need to have all or a majority of staff trained. The total number of relevant staff that needs to be trained on SCM application is 183 officials. The formula for assessing progress under this indicator is as follows:

	SCM Training $\% = \dfrac{Number\ of\ staf\ that\ is\ trained\ on\ the\ SCM\ in\ CoG\ and\ line\ ministries}{Number\ of\ staff\ that\ \ needs\ to\ be\ trained\ on\ the\ CoG\ and\ line\ ministries} x100$		
Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	No SCM trainings exist	
Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	20% of relevant staff at OPM and line ministries trained	Capacities fully developed (90% of relevant staff at OPM and line ministries are trained)

Title of Indicator	1.1.3 Increased training capacities on applying the Standard Cost Model		
The corresponding sub-objective	**1.1. Reforms of existing primary and secondary legislation to enhance competitiveness**		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator aims to measure the level of the increase of capacities of institutions at central and ministerial level on applying the Standard Cost Model by establishing a pool of trainers that will deliver trainings to relevant staff identified for these areas.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Training reports		
Institution responsible for gathering data	Government Coordination Secretariat (main responsible) with support from KIPA		
Frequency of data publication	Annual		
Data required	The data that should be provided for this indicator is the information on the pool of trainers that have been certified to provide trainings on applying the Standard Cost model		
A brief description of the methodology	The number of trainers that are certified to provide trainings on applying the Standard Cost Model must be stated.		
Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	0	
Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	5	Unchanged compared to 2018 target

Title of Indicator	1.1.4 Integration of SCM into policy development
The corresponding sub-objective	**1.1. Reforms of existing primary and secondary legislation to enhance competitiveness**
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures the prevention of administrative burdens through application of the SCM measurement methodology. It will measure the number of Concept Documents that contain a section on administrative burdens with SCM measurement that are adopted per year.
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Annual Government Report on Concept Documents approved by the Government
Institution responsible for gathering data	Government Coordination Secretariat
Frequency of data publication	Annually
Data required	1 Number of Concept Documents approved by the Government that have a section administrative burden with SCM measurement 2. Assessment whether an adopted Concept Document is relevant 3. Total number of relevant Concept Documents approved by the government
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is measured by following two steps: First, from all Concept Documents that are approved by the Government within the reporting year, the number of Concept Documents that are relevant are selected. A Concept Document is relevant when that Concept Document addresses the organization of business activities through government interventions and deals with Information Obligations that businesses have to fulfil.[1] Second, the indicator is measured by calculating the ratio of the number of Concept Documents approved by the Government that have the section on administrative burdens with SCM measurement compared with the total number of SCM-relevant Concept Documents approved by the Government per year. CD-SCM measurement % = $\frac{Number\ of\ CDs\ with\ SCM\ measurement}{Number\ of\ relevant\ CDs}$ x 100
Information on baseline values	**Year**	**2016**

---

[1] Concept Documents that are not regarded as relevant are those that regulate issues that affect only government activities and have no impact on how businesses have to organize their activities; examples of topics that such Concept Documents address are (1) the establishment, merger and/or abolishment of organizations such as government agencies; (2) the organization of work processes of the administration; and (3) the rights and responsibilities of citizens.

	Baseline value	- SCM not part of policy development	
Information on target values	**Year**	**2018**	**2021**
	Indicator value	SCM introduced in guidelines for policy development (30% of relevant CDs contain section on administrative burden with SCM measurement)	SCM introduced in guidelines for policy development (100% of relevant CDs contain section on administrative burden with SCM measurement)

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1.2. INTRODUCING IMPACT ASSESSMENT

INDICATOR 1.2.1 INCREASED CAPACITIES FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT AT CoG INSTITUTIONS AND LINE MINISTRIES

Title of Indicator	1.2.1 Increased capacities for policy development at CoG institutions and line ministries
The corresponding sub-objective	**1.2. Introducing Impact Assessment**
Description of the Indicator	The indicator aims to measure the level of increase of capacities on policy development in the Office of the Prime Minister Government and line ministries mainly through trainings to relevant policy development staff.
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	1) Attendance lists for policy development trainings 2) Training reports
Institution responsible for gathering data	Government Coordination Secretariat (main responsible) with support from KIPA
Frequency of data publication	Annual
Data required	1. Number of staff trained on policy development in OPM and line ministries 2. Number of staff relevant to be trained on policy development in OPM and line ministries
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is measured by calculating the number of staff that is trained on policy development (developing Concept Documents and Impact Assessments) in relation to the total number of OPM and line ministries staff that are relevant to be trained on policy development. All ministerial departments and divisions that develop policies and legislation are relevant, as are department/divisions that fulfill a coordination of quality scrutiny function. The staff numbers for which policy development training is relevant are presented in the Annex on training numbers attached to this Indicator Passport. On the level of each ministerial department and each ministerial division, one person needs to be trained. In addition, staff at the Legal Departments; Departments for European Integration and Policy Coordination; Budget divisions; and Communication divisions at the line ministries that is involved in policy development needs to be trained. The offices within the OPM that have a central coordinating and quality assurance role, need to have all or a majority of staff trained. The total number of relevant staff that needs to be trained on policy development is 545 officials. The formula for assessing progress under this indicator is as follows: Policy Development training % = $\frac{\text{Number of staff trained on policy development}}{\text{Number of staff relevant to be trained on policy development}} \times 100$
Information on baseline values	**Year**	**2016**

	Baseline value	0	
	Year	**2018**	**2021**
Information on target values	**Indicator value**	25% of relevant CoG and line ministry staff is trained	75% of relevant staff at CoG and line ministries trained;

Title of Indicator	1.2.2 Increased training capacities on Impact Assessment		
The corresponding sub-objective	**1.2. Introducing Impact Assessment**		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator aims to measure the level of the increase of capacities of institutions at central and ministerial level on the policy development/impact assessment by establishing a pool of trainers that will deliver trainings on policy development/impact assessment to relevant staff.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Training reports		
Institution responsible for gathering data	Government Coordination Secretariat (main responsible) with support from the Legal Office of the OPM and KIPA		
Frequency of data publication	Annual		
Data required	The data that should be provided for this indicator is the information on the pool of trainers that have been certified to provide trainings on policy development/impact assessment.		
A brief description of the methodology	The number of trainers that are certified to provide trainings on policy development/impact assessment must be stated.		
Information on baseline values	**Year**	**2016**	
	Baseline value	10	
Information on target values	**Year**	**2018**	**2021**
	Indicator value	10	25

Title of Indicator	1.2.3 Preparation and adoption RoP to replace Concept Documents with Impact Assessment		
The corresponding sub-objective	1.2. Introducing Impact Assessment		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures the preparatory work necessary to introduce Impact Assessment as the methodology for ex-ante policy analysis.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Rules of Procedures of the Government		
Institution responsible for gathering data	Government Coordination Secretariat		
Frequency of data publication	Annual		
Data required	Provisions within the RoP that introduce the IA system		
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is assessed with Yes or No to achieve the target for 2021. YES – If the Rules of Procedures of Government are changed and if changes contain sufficient basis to introduce the IA system in the policy development process. No – If the Rules of Procedures are not changed or the new RoP does not provide sufficient basis for application of IA in the policy development process.		
Information on baseline values	**Year**	**2016**	
	Baseline value	System for developing Concept Documents instead of IA	
Information on target values	**Year**	**2018**	**2021**
	Indicator value	Line ministries are obliged to develop Concept Documents based on updated Guidelines for Developing Concept Documents.	IA is embedded in RoP and IAs are produced by line ministries

Title of Indicator	1.2.4 Policy development will become more evidence-based and IA will be used regularly by line ministries
The corresponding sub-objective	**1.2.** Introducing Impact Assessment
Description of the Indicator	This indicator measures how the preconditions for ensuring evidence-based policy making are established and assesses the level of quality of analysis in policy proposals.
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	SIGMA Assessment for Kosovo
Institution responsible for gathering data	SIGMA (occurs independently from the Government of Kosovo)
Frequency of data publication	Bi-annual
Data required	See relevant SIGMA indicator
A brief description of the methodology	This Indicator will be measured using the same methodology that has been used by SIGMA in the indicator "Extent to which policy development process makes the best use of analytical tools'. The measuring methodology available on www.sigmaweb.org .

Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	Value 3 on SIGMA indicator 'Extent to which policy development process makes the best use of analytical tools'	

Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	Value 3	Value 4

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1.3: IMPROVED DATA/STATISTICS

INDICATOR 1.3.1: STANDARDISED DATA FOR SCM CALCULATIONS IS AVAILABLE

Title of Indicator	1.3.1 Standardised data for SCM calculations is available		
The corresponding sub-objective	1.3. Improved data/statistics		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures whether the standardised data necessary to apply the SCM are available so that the SCM can be applied by all line ministries and used during policy development.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	The document that establishes the Standardized data for SCM		
Institution responsible for gathering data	Government Coordination Secretariat		
Frequency of data publication	Annually		
Data required	Standardized data on wages and company statistics necessary to apply the SCM in the 'SCM Manual for Kosovo'		
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is measured with 'yes' if standardized SCM data fully available or 'no' if the Standardized SCM data is not yet established		
Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	No standardized SCM data exists	
Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	Standardized SCM data fully available	Standardized SCM data fully available

INDICATOR 1.3.2: IA DATABASE IS DEVELOPED

Title of Indicator	1.3.2 IA database is developed
The corresponding sub-objective	**1.3. Improved data/statistics**
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures whether the Impact Assessment Database to be used by line ministries during policy development (data will thus be reflected in the analysis) is established and whether it is based on an overview of statistics and information necessary to better conduct Impact Assessment.
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	The report on establishment of the database as part of BRS monitoring. The IA database itself.
Institution responsible for gathering data	Government Coordination Secretariat
Frequency of data publication	Annual
Data required	The report on setup of the database
A brief description of the methodology	There are two steps to measure this indicator: - The first step is that LO and GCS decide on the set-up of the IA **Database** Database when the electronic system has been developed (this included its structure, design, content), installed and made use in the OPM and all line ministries and other relevant institutions. The design of this database needs to be defined by 2018 through a Blue Print that shows how the database should look like. - The second step is for GCS and LO to assess the extent to which the **Database is used.** This is the target to be achieved by 2021. The level is usage of the Database will be assessed by calculating the 1. Total number of IA approved by the Government during the reporting year. 2. Number of IA that indicates which information has been used from the database and/or which information needs to be added. Database used %=$\frac{Nr\ of\ IA\ approved}{Nr\ of\ IAs\ with\ dtabase-information\ used\ or\ description\ of\ information\ gap} x100$

Information on baseline values	**Year**	**2016**
	Baseline value	No IA database exists

Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	Blue print for the IA Database is ready	IA database exists and is used; 80% of all Impact Assessment indicate what information from the database was used and which information should be added

INDICATOR 1.4.1: EVALUATIONS ARE CONDUCTED ANNUALLY

Title of Indicator	Evaluations are conducted annually		
The corresponding sub-objective	1.4. Evaluation		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures the performance of the government on conducting evaluations for legislation as foreseen under the Guidelines on Ex-Post Evaluation of Legislation and evaluations of policies and strategic documents for which the framework for Evaluation has yet to be developed.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Evaluations conducted		
Institution responsible for gathering data	Legal Office of the OPM		
Frequency of data publication	Annually		
Data required	1. Number of evaluations planned to be conducted during the reported year 2. Number of evaluations conducted during the reported year		
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is measured by comparing the number of evaluations to be conducted every year with the number of evaluations that are planned within the Better Regulation Strategy. The Better Regulation Strategy 2.0 foresees completing: • At least 3 evaluations in 2017 • At least 5 evaluations in 2018 • At least 5 evaluations in 2019 • At least 7 evaluations in 2020 • At least 7 evaluations in 2021		
Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	No evaluations completed and adopted	
Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	8 evaluations (adding up 2017 and 2018 numbers)	19 evaluations (adding up 2019, 2020 and 2021 numbers)

INDICATOR 1.4.2: INCREASED TRAINING CAPACITIES ON EVALUATION

Title of Indicator	1.4.2 Increased training capacities on Evaluation		
The corresponding sub-objective	1.4 Evaluation		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator aims to measure the level of the increase of capacities of institutions at central and ministerial level on Evaluation by establishing a pool of trainers that will deliver trainings on Evaluation to relevant staff.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Training reports		
Institution responsible for gathering data	Legal Office of the OPM and KIPA		
Frequency of data publication	Annual		
Data required	The data that should be provided for this indicator is the information on the pool of trainers that have been certified to provide trainings on Evaluation.		
A brief description of the methodology	The number of trainers that are certified to provide trainings on Evaluation must be stated.		
Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	0	
Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	5[2]	10

---

[2] Targets were not defined in the BRS where only reference was made to the organization of a ToT. The target numbers of '5' and '10' are selected based on the assumption that each ToT will provide at least five people to be certified as trainers.

INDICATOR 1.4.3: INCREASED CAPACITIES FOR EVALUATION AT CoG INSTITUTIONS AND LINE MINISTRIES

Title of Indicator	1.4.3 Increased capacities for Evaluation at CoG institutions and line ministries	
The corresponding sub-objective	1.4 Evaluation	
Description of the Indicator	The indicator aims to measure the level of increase of capacities in Evaluation in the Office of the Prime Minister Government and line ministries mainly through trainings to relevant policy development staff.	
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	1) Attendance lists for Evaluation trainings 2) Training reports	
Institution responsible for gathering data	Legal Office	
Frequency of data publication	Annual	
Data required	1. Number of staff trained on Evaluation in OPM and line ministries 2. Number of staff relevant to be trained on Evaluation in OPM and line ministries	
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is measured by calculating the number of staff that is trained on Evaluation in relation to the total number of OPM and line ministries staff that are relevant to be trained on Evaluation. All ministerial divisions that develop policies and legislation are relevant, as are departments/divisions that fulfill a coordination of quality scrutiny function. One staff member for each of these departments and divisions needs to be trained. The staff numbers for which evaluation training is relevant are presented in the Annex on training numbers attached to this Indicator Passport. The total number of relevant staff that needs to be trained on policy development is 262 officials. The formula for assessing progress under this indicator is as follows: Evaluation training % = $\frac{\text{Number of staff trained on Evaluation in OPM and line ministries}}{\text{Number of staff relevant to be trained on Evaluation in OPM and line ministries}} \ x \ 100$	

Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	0	

Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	Training of relevant staff on legislative evaluation has started, at least 10% of relevant staff at each line ministry and each	Capacities for legislative evaluation are developed (75% of relevant staff at line ministries and CoG trained by 2021) - 40% of relevant staff at CoG institutions and line ministries trained

		relevant CoG institutions have been trained)	on evaluation of strategies and policies[3]

[3] This is a target that will be worked out during the implementation of the Better Regulation Strategy. The approach to evaluating strategies and policies needs to be worked out first. Since this objective is stated in the strategy, it is presented here as well. This indicator passport will be updated in the future to reflect upon this issue in more detail.

INDICATOR 1.4.4: THE PROCESS OF USING EVALUATION FINDINGS TO IMPROVE EXISTING LEGISLATION IS ESTABLISHED

Title of Indicator	1.4.4 The process of using evaluation findings to improve existing legislation is established
The corresponding sub-objective	1.4. Evaluation
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures if the system to use the conducted evaluations in the new drafted legislation is setup. The set-up of the system means that requirements to use evaluation are included in the new RoP of the Government and all evaluations are published with an explanation regarding the future steps that will be taken. These future steps are also implemented.
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Rules of Procedures, Evaluations that are conducted.
Institution responsible for gathering data	Legal Office of the OPM
Frequency of data publication	Annually
Data required	• List of identified Evaluations to be conducted every year included on the GAWP • Information on the relevant staff trained within OPM and line ministries on evaluation of legislation. Relevant under this indicator means the persons involved in conducting Evaluations: Legal Departments, Departments for European Integration and Policy Coordination and members of Working Groups for Evaluation at the ministries that conduct Evaluations. • Evaluations Conducted • Evaluations published • The new Rules of Procedures with provisions related to evaluations
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is measured by scoring each element that is done with 10 or 20% each. 0 % is provided for each element that is not fulfilled at all. | 1.	List of identified Evaluations to be conducted every year included as part of the GAWP	10%
---	---	---
2.	Evaluations are conducted	20%
3.	Finished Evaluations are published	20%
4.	Evaluation Guidelines reflect all requirements for Evaluation	10%
5.	Rules of Procedures list provisions related to conducting Evaluation	20%
6.	Evaluation findings are used to improve legislation and/or its implementation.	20%	

Information on baseline values	Year	2016 0%	
	Baseline value	Evaluations not used systematically in policy development	
Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	40%	100%

GENERAL OBJECTIVE 2: EFFECTIVE PUBLIC COMMUNICATION, PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND PARTICIPATION OF STAKEHOLDERS

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 2.1: IMPROVED POLICY COMMUNICATION

INDICATOR 2.1.1: ACTION PLAN FOR IMPROVING POLICY COMMUNICATION IS DEVELOPED

Title of Indicator	2.1.1 Action Plan for improving policy communication is developed		
The corresponding sub-objective	**2.1. Improved Policy Communication**		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures the work of government to improve policy communication. It will measure whether the implementation plan on improving policy communication has been developed based on the analysis presented in Concept Document.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Action plan on policy communication		
Institution responsible for gathering data	Public Communication Office/OPM		
Frequency of data publication	Annually		
Data required	1. Action Plan for Policy Communication		
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator measures whether the Action plan for policy communication has been developed		
Information on baseline values	**Year**	**2016**	
	Baseline value	No Action Plan to improve Policy Communication	
Information on target values	**Year**	**2018**	**2021**
	Indicator value	Action plan for policy communication developed	Unchanged compared to 2018 target

INDICATOR 2.1.2: INCREASED TRAINING CAPACITIES ON POLICY COMMUNICATION

Title of Indicator	2.1.2 Increased training capacities on Policy Communication		
The corresponding sub-objective	**2.1 Improved Policy Communication**		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator aims to measure the level of the increase of capacities of institutions at central and ministerial level on Policy Communication by establishing a pool of trainers that will deliver trainings on Policy Communication to relevant staff.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Training reports.		
Institution responsible for gathering data	Public Communication Office within the OPM (main responsible) with support from KIPA		
Frequency of data publication	Annual		
Data required	The data that should be provided for this indicator is the information on the pool of trainers that have been certified to provide trainings on Policy Communication.		
A brief description of the methodology	The number of trainers that are certified to provide trainings on Policy Communication must be stated.		
Information on baseline values	**Year**	**2016**	
	Baseline value	0	
Information on target values	**Year**	**2018**	**2021**
	Indicator value	5	Unchanged compared to 2018 target

INDICATOR 2.1.3: CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT FOR POLICY COMMUNICATION

Title of Indicator	2.1.3 Capacity development for policy communication
The corresponding sub-objective	2.1. Improved Policy Communication
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures the work on capacity development about policy communication in the Office of Prime Minister and line ministries mainly through training of relevant staff that are responsible to conduct policy communication in the government.
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	1) Attendance lists for Policy Communication trainings 2) Training reports
Institution responsible for gathering data	Public Communication Office (main responsible) with support from KIPA
Frequency of data publication	Annual
Data required	1. Number of staff trained on Policy Communication in OPM and line ministries 2. Number of staff relevant to be trained on Policy Communication in OPM and line ministries
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is measured by calculating the number of staff that is trained on policy communication set against the total number of OPM and line ministry staff identified as relevant to be trained on policy communication. All ministerial divisions that develop policies and legislation are relevant, as are departments/divisions that fulfill a coordination of quality scrutiny function. One staff member for each of these departments and divisions needs to be trained. The staff numbers for which policy communication training is relevant are presented in the Annex on training numbers attached to this Indicator Passport. The total number of relevant staff that needs to be trained on policy communication is 303 officials. The formula for assessing progress under this indicator is as follows: $$CommTraining \% = \frac{number\ of\ staff\ trained\ on\ policy\ communication\ during\ the\ year}{number\ of\ staff\ relevant\ to\ be\ trained\ on\ policy\ communication} \ x\ 100$$

Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	staff not trained	

Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	50% of relevant communication staff at CoG and line ministries trained	75% of relevant policy development staff at CoG and line ministries trained

INDICATOR 2.1.4: POLICY COMMUNICATION INTEGRATED INTO POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Title of Indicator	2.1.4 Policy communication integrated into policy development		
The corresponding sub-objective	2.1. Improved Policy Communication		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures the integration of communication activities into the implementation plans for Concept Documents that are adopted by the Government in a given year.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Adopted Concept Documents in a given year.		
Institution responsible for gathering data	Public Communication Office		
Frequency of data publication	Annual		
Data required	Implementation plans for Concept Documents adopted in a given year.		
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is measured by assessing the number of Concept Documents that are adopted in a given year that have integrated communication activities into the Implementation Plan. This number is then divided by the total number Concept Documents adopted in that year and turned into a percentage. For 2018, the number of Concept Documents that is used for the calculation is the number of Concept Documents that have been developed under the new Guidelines and Manual for Developing Concept Documents in line with the decision to grant ministries the possibility to finish CDs that have been started under the previous guidelines. For subsequent years, all adopted CDs will be used for the calculation. $CD\ Pol\ Comm\ \% = \frac{number\ of\ CDs\ with\ clear\ reference\ to\ communication\ activities}{number\ of\ CDs\ adopted\ by\ the\ Government} \ x\ 100$		
Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	Policy communication not part of Concept Documents or Implementation Plans	
Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	15% of adopted Concept Documents contain clear references to communication activities	100% of adopted Concept Documents contain clear references to communication activities

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 2.2: IMPROVED CONSULTATION

INDICATOR 2.2.1: INCREASE STAFF CAPACITIES ON CONSULTATION

Title of Indicator	2.2.1 Increase staff capacities on consultation	
The corresponding sub-objective	2.2. Improved consultation	
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures the work on capacity development on the public consultation in the Office of Prime Minister and line ministries mainly through training of the relevant staff that are responsible to conduct public consultation.	
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	1) Attendance lists for Policy Communication trainings 2) Training reports	
Institution responsible for gathering data	Office of Good Governance, Office of the Prime Minister; KIPA	
Frequency of data publication	Annual	
Data required	1. Number of staff trained on public consultations per year 2. Number of staff that are identified relevant to be trained for the public consultations in Government and Line Ministries 3. Division/department at which the trained individual is working	
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is measured by calculating the number of staff that is trained on public consultation set against the total number of OPM and line ministry staff identified as relevant to be trained on policy communication. All ministerial divisions that develop policies and legislation are relevant, as are departments/divisions that fulfill a coordination of quality scrutiny function. One staff member for each of these departments and divisions needs to be trained. The staff numbers for which public consultation training is relevant are presented in the Annex on training numbers attached to this Indicator Passport. The total number of relevant staff that needs to be trained on public consultation is 303 officials. The formula for assessing progress under this indicator is as follows: $$ConsultTraining\ \% = \frac{number\ of\ staff\ trained\ on\ public\ consultation\ during\ the\ year}{number\ of\ staff\ relevant\ to\ be\ trained\ on\ public\ consultation}\ x\ 100$$	

Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	48 staff trained	

Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	At least 10% of relevant staff members from each	At least 75% relevant staff members from each line

		line ministry and all relevant CoG-staff have been trained on consultation	ministry have been trained on consultation

INDICATOR 2.2.2: LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE WITH MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR ALL RELEVANT GOVERNMENT
DECISIONS

Title of Indicator	Level of compliance with Minimum Standards for all relevant government decisions
The corresponding sub-objective	2.2. Improved consultation
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures the level of application of provisions on the Regulation 05/2016 on Minimum Standards of Public Consultation for the most important decisions taken by the government.
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	1) Reports on consultations held 2) Reports on strategies, Concept Documents and primary laws adopted by the government
Institution responsible for gathering data	OGG (main responsible and responsible for reporting on the implementation of the Minimum Standards for Consultation) GCS on Concept Documents SPO on strategies LO on primary laws
Frequency of data publication	Annually
Data required	Overview of primary laws adopted Primary laws submitted for public consultation Overview of Concept Documents adopted Concept Documents submitted for public consultation Overview of strategies adopted Strategies submitted for public consultation
A brief description of the methodology	For this indicator, relevant government decisions captures the following decisions: adoption of strategies, adoption of Concept Documents and adoptions of primary laws. The Better Regulation Strategy did set the 100% target for 2019. However, no intermediate targets were set for 2017 and 2018. This passport covers this omission and sets the intermediate target for 2018 at 50%. The target for 2021 equals the intended target for 2019. Strategies, Concept Documents and primary laws for which the government – in line with the regulatory framework and the Rules of Procedure of the Government – decides that public consultation has not to be conducted, are excluded from calculating the percentages. The ratio is calculated by setting the relevant proposals that were submitted for public consultation against the total number of relevant proposals that were required to be submitted for public consultation. For the purpose of meeting the consultation requirement, a draft law is considered fully publicly consulted when either the Concept Document that is made for that law or the proposed law is submitted for public consultation.

	Formula for Consultation % = $$\frac{\text{Number of relevant proposals that were submitted for public consultation}}{\text{Total number of relevant proposals that were required to be submitted for public consultation}} x100$$		
Information on baseline values	**Year**	**2016**	
	Baseline value	0%	
Information on target values	**Year**	**2018**	**2021**
	Indicator value	50%	100%

INDICATOR 2.2.3: EFFECTIVENESS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION IN DEVELOPING POLICIES AND LEGISLATION INCREASES

Title of Indicator	Effectiveness of public consultation in developing policies and legislation increases (SIGMA indicator)		
The corresponding sub-objective	2.2. Improved consultation		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures the level of application of provisions on the Regulation 05/2016 on Minimum Standards of Public Consultation Process by the Government during the development of the Public Documents that are specified by the article 5.2 of the Regulation.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	SIGMA Indicator: Effectiveness of public consultation in developing policies and legislation		
Institution responsible for gathering data	SIGMA		
Frequency of data publication	Bi-annually		
Data required	SIGMA Assessment		
A brief description of the methodology	The measuring methodology will be found in www.sigmaweb.org.		
Information on baseline values	**Year**	**2016**	
	Baseline value	3 (SIGMA)	
Information on target values	**Year**	**2018**	**2021**
	Indicator value	4	5

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 2.3: IMPROVED WORK PLANNING

INDICATOR 2.3.1: DEVELOP AND ADOPT CD ON IFWP

Title of Indicator	2.3.1 Develop and adopt CD on IFWP		
The corresponding sub-objective	**2.3. Improved work planning**		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures fulfilling the commitment of the government to develop and approve the Concept Document on the Indicative Forward Work Planning		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	The Government Decision on the approval of the Concept Document on the Indicative Forward Work Planning		
Institution responsible for gathering data	GCS/OPM		
Frequency of data publication	Annual		
Data required	Adoption of the Concept Document on the Indicative Forward Work Plan		
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator measures the approval or not approval of the Concept Document on IFWP		
Information on baseline values	**Year**	**2016**	
	Baseline value	0	
Information on target values	**Year**	**2018**	**2021**
	Indicator value	Concept Document Approved	Unchanged compared to 2018 target

INDICATOR 2.3.2: DEVELOP THE IFWP

Title of Indicator	Develop the IFWP		
The corresponding sub-objective	2.3. Improved Work Planning		
Description of the Indicator	The indicator measures the design and development of the IFWP by the Government as foreseen in the BRS strategy.		
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	Indicative Forward Work Plan		
Institution responsible for gathering data	GCS/OPM		
Frequency of data publication	Annually		
Data required	Indicative Forward Work Plan		
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator measures the development or not the IFWP exists		
Information on baseline values	Year	2016	
	Baseline value	No IFWP exists	
Information on target values	Year	2018	2021
	Indicator value	IFWP is under development in line with the decision adopted in the Concept Document on IFWP.	IFWP is developed

INDICATOR 2.3.3: INCREASE QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT WORK PLANNING

Title of Indicator	2.3.3 Increase quality of Government work planning	
The corresponding sub-objective	2.3. Improved Work Planning	
Description of the Indicator	The Indicator measures the extent to which the government work planning is improved mainly by increasing the rate of implementation of the Government Annual Work Plan	
Source of data for monitoring of performance indicator	• Government Annual Work Plan (priority items) • Annual Government Report • Indicative Forward Work Plan	
Institution responsible for gathering data	GCS	
Frequency of data publication	Annual	
Data required	1. Number of Activities planned in the table A of GAWP 2. Number of Activities of the table A of GAWP implemented	
A brief description of the methodology	The indicator is measured by calculating the number of activities of the Government Annual Work Plan that have been implemented and compared with the planned activities in the Government Annual Work Plan. Implementation GAWP $\% = \frac{Number\ of\ priority\ activities\ of\ GAWP\ implemented}{Number\ of\ priority\ activities\ of\ GAWP\ planned} \times 100$	
Information on baseline values	**Year**	**2016**
	Baseline value	68%
Information on target values	**Year**	**2018** | **2021**
	Indicator value	75 % | 85%

36