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## Introduction

The purpose of the Indicator Tools Annex is to provide:

* a template for the presentation of indicators in a PAR or sector strategy document, linked to the respective objectives;
* an example of how PAR indicators might be presented;
* a template for an indicator passport entry, where the details of a defined indicator (its title, short description, calculation formula, if applicable, data required for its calculation, frequency of calculation, etc.) can be summarised;
* an example of an actual indicator passport entry;
* a list of PAR-related indicators from various sources.

The list of indicators is intended to provide “food for thought” to the developers of PAR strategies when they think about what indicators to use in connection with the envisaged objectives of their PAR strategies.

All the templates and the list provided are to be used flexibly and in accordance with any national requirements and with the specificities of the PAR-related or sector strategy concerned.

## Template for the presentation of performance indicators in a PAR strategy

This template is an indicative framework on how to present the indicators of a PAR or sector strategy within the strategy document. The template can be adjusted based on country-specific needs.

This template does not include the operational-level indicators concerned with measuring the implementation of actions and their corresponding activities (such as programmes, projects, services or other kinds of intervention) through their delivered outputs (output, product or service). The template table can be easily adjusted to include these, but presenting everything in one table may make it complicated to read. For this reason, it may make sense to present the performance indicators at the impact or outcome level within the strategy document, separately from the output-level indicators, these being listed in the corresponding action plan of the strategy. In addition:

* If the strategy does not include general objectives, then the lines with general objectives should be deleted.
* If the strategy has more than two levels of objectives, additional lines should be added accordingly.
* The columns with targets can also be adjusted if the strategy envisages annual targets or other frequency.
* In addition, both the general objectives and the specific objectives may be named differently in the given national context or as defined in the national strategy development framework (if such exists).

Countries have differing approaches as to how to present the indicators they have defined to assess their performance and measure progress against their various objectives. Sometimes they are collected in a separate, comprehensive list, but often they are indicated one-by-one, next to the description of the objectives. In the latter case**,** it is still recommended that all the indicators be also separately summarised in one place (as in the following template), to make them easier to read.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Objective/Indicator** | **Baseline value (*year*)** | **Mid-term target (*year*)** | **Final year target (*year*)** |
| **I.** | **General objective 1:**  |
| 1. | *Title of indicator linked to general objective 1* | Value | Value | Value |
| 2. | *Title of indicator linked to general objective 1* | Value | Value | Value |
| **I. i.** | **Specific objective 1:**  |
| 3. | *Title of indicator linked to specific objective 1* | Value | Value | Value |
| 4. | *Title of indicator linked to specific objective 1* | Value | Value | Value |
| **I. ii.** | **Specific objective 2:**  |
| 5. | *Title of indicator linked to specific objective 2* | Value | Value | Value |
| 6. | *Title of indicator linked to specific objective 2* | Value | Value | Value |
| **II.** | **General objective 2:** |
|  | … |  |  |  |

## Example of indicators and links to objectives

The following is a hypothetical example of PAR-related indicators linked to objectives. In this example – for illustrative purposes – impact-level indicators are also included, as well as output-level indicators attached to certain actions (and activities). The purpose of the example is to illustrate the close links between the indicators and the level of objective or action they are connected to.

It is worth noting that the links between the actions (and the specific activities) and their corresponding output-level indicators may not be linear – several actions (and even sometimes separate activities) may have only one output-level indicator to measure what has been produced or delivered through their implementation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **General objective/Specific objective/Activity** | **Indicator** |
| **General objective** | **Create citizen-centric public administration** | Impact-level indicator: Percentage of citizens who trust in public administration institutions (%) |
| **Specific objective 1** | **Improve the quality and delivery of services** | Outcome-level indicator: Percentage of citizens who are satisfied with service delivery (%) |
| Outcome-level indicator: Percentage of services meeting service delivery standards (%) |
| **Action 1** | Review and re-engineer the service delivery process for the following priority services: ID documents, driving licenses, birth certificates | Output-level indicator: Percentage/number of re-engineered public services (%/#) |
| Output-level indicator: Financial/time savings for service users (euros/hours) |
| **Action 2** | Consolidate public services and establish a public service catalogue at local and central levels | Output-level indicator: Number of (consolidated) public services delivered by local and central public administration (#) |
|  **– Activity 1** | Develop a roadmap for public service consolidation and set the consolidation criteria |
| **– Activity 2** | Implement the public service consolidation roadmap |
| **– Activity 3** | Establish a catalogue of the consolidated services at local and central level |
| **Action 3** | Based on interational good practice, develop and adopt a framework methodology for measuring citizen satisfaction with services, to be further adopted by institutions | Output-level indicator: Percentage of institutions that have adopted the methodology for measuring citizen satisfaction (%) |
| **Action 4** | Develop and adopt framework citizen charters for municipalities | Output-level indicator: Percentage of municipalities that have adopted citizen charters (%) |

## Performance indicator passport template

The template performance indicator passport below is an example which is based on SIGMA work in various countries. The template is indicative and countries are free to include additional information or exclude information provided for in the template. However, experience shows that all the information covered by this template is needed for ensuring that all who are to provide the data for the developed indicators, and those who want to understand what is measured through a given indicator, and how, are given all the details necessary for their purposes.

Developing these details for each indicator helps drafters and those who are in charge of data collection or calculation to identify potential gaps and challenges, which in turn helps to ensure the sustainable and regular provision of information through the envisaged indicators. The realisation that such data-related challenges exist often leads to the definition of additional actions to be taken, in order to ensure the availability of the necessary data. It thereby contributes to the effective functioning of the whole PAR or sector reform management and monitoring framework.

The indicator passport should include a separate table like the one below for every impact- or outcome-level indicator set for measuring the progress against the objectives of the PAR or sector strategy. However, it is not necessary (and not recommended) to develop such detailed tables for the measurement of actions and activities at the output level. The output indicators should be rather more simple, and self-evident from the way the respective actions and activities are formulated.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Brief title of indicator** |  |
| **Link to PAR/sector strategy objective** |  |
| **Brief definition of the indicator** |  |
| **Data to be collected** |  |
| **Source of data**  |  |
| **Institution and department responsible for gathering data** |  |
| **Frequency of data collection** |  |
| **Frequency of data publication** |  |
| **A brief description of the methodology** |  |
| **Information on trend and baseline value** | **Year** | **Trend [year]** | **Trend [year]** | **Baseline [Year]**  |
| **Value** |  |  |  |
| **Information on target values** | **Year** | **Target [year]** | **Target [year]** | **Target [year]** |
| **Target value** |  |  |  |

## Performance indicator passport examples

The two examples below are from real-life experience in countries where SIGMA has supported the development of the PAR strategy monitoring framework, and the development of the supporting indicator passport. They have, however, been generalised so that their content can be applied to any country’s PAR-related strategies. The first example shows an indicator whose value is calculated from collected raw data using a predefined formula. The second example is for an indicator where this type of additional calculation is not required to arrive at the indicator value.

An example of a PAR-related performance indicator passport (using formula)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Brief title of indicator** | ***Percentage deviation between approved and actual capital expenditure***  |
| **Link to PAR strategy objective** | Objective 3: Improve budget planning process and outcomes |
| **Brief definition of the indicator** | This indicator measures whether the capital expenditure has been executed as planned and approved. It shows the quality of capital expenditure planning, as well as helping identify problems related to implementation. |
| **Data to be collected** | The amount of approved capital expenditure as presented in the annual budget [year]The amount of executed capital expenditure as presented in the budget balance documents [year] |
| **Source of data**  | Annual Budget LawGovernment Annual Financial StatementURL: [www…...com](http://www.mpa.com) |
| **Institution and department responsible for gathering data** | Ministry of Finance, Budget Department |
| **Frequency of data collection** | Annual |
| **Frequency of data publication** | Annual |
| **A brief description of the methodology** | This indicator measures the effectiveness of capital expenditure planning as well as the management of the capital expenditure programme and separate projects.The indicator is measured as the difference between the total amount of outturn capital expenditures, as presented in the government financial statements at the end of the budget year, and the total amount of the capital expenditures planned in the Annual Budget Law adopted by the Parliament for that specific year. D stands for deviation, CE for capital expenditure.**DCE** = $\frac{Total Value of Actual Capital Expenditure }{Total Value of Planned Capital Expenditure }$ x 100% - 100% |
| **Information on trend and baseline values** | **Year** | **Trend 2014** | **Trend 2015** | **Baseline 2016** |
| **Value** | 9% | 7% | 7% |
| **Information on target values** | **Year** | **2018** | **2020** | **2022** |
| **Target value** | 0% | 0% | 0%  |

An example of a PAR-related performance indicator passport (without formula)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Brief title of indicator** | ***Extent to which the performance appraisal system of public servants is in place and applied in practice*** |
| **Link to PAR strategy objective** | **General Objective 1, Specific Objective 1:** Implementation of a fair and transparent salary system for civil servants that is based on the principle of ‘equal pay for equal work’ |
| **Source of data**  | Annual accountability report of the Ministry of Public AdministrationURL: [www…...com](http://www.mpa.com) |
| **Institution and department responsible for gathering data** | Ministry of Public Administration, Department of Civil Service |
| **Frequency of data publication** | Annual data is collected through administrative procedures of the Ministry of Public Administration to provide input into an annual accountability report. Data is collected during the 1st quarter after the close of the year. The accountability report is published on the Ministry website at [www…..com](http://www.mpa.com). |
| **A brief description of the methodology** | This is a qualitative indicator and will be measured by assessing the presence of the following three elements: 1) an established performance appraisal system for civil servants; 2) regular performance appraisals using fair and transparent assessment tools; 3) the right of civil servants to appeal unfair performance appraisal decisions.A three-point assessment is used for each element: 1 point is allocated for having primary legislation in place, 2 points are allocated for having it enforced through secondary legislation and or relevant guidance, and 3 points for the element being applied in practice with no or only minor shortcomings (based on a random sample of five cases from different central institutions).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| None of the elements are met | 1-2 points | 3-4 points | 5-6 points | 7-8 points | 9 points |

The indicator is applied for civil servants as defined by the Law on Civil Service.  |
| **Information on trend and baseline value** | **Year** | **Trend (2014)** | **Trend (2015)** | **2016 (baseline)** |
| **Value** | NA | 3 | 3 |
| **Information on target values** | **Year** | **2018** | **2020** | **-** |
| **Target value** | 4 | 4 |  |