

The European Commission represented by  
the European Union Delegation to Serbia

**Support to Public Administration Reform  
under the PAR Sector Reform Contract**

***EuropeAid/137928/DH/SER/RS***

***Service contract number: CRIS 2018/395-584***

***External Evaluation of Serbian  
Public Administration Reform  
Strategy***

***- Report on Lessons Learned  
from the Evaluation -***

***04 November 2019***



This project is funded by  
the European Union

*'This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union: Its contents are the sole responsibility of GOPA Consultants and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union'*



European Union

## Lessons learned from the PARS evaluation



Republic of Serbia

The project is implemented led by:



in consortium with





## Report Control Path

<b>Document Title:</b>	<b>Report on Lessons Learned from the Evaluation of the Serbian PAR Strategy</b>
<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Support to Public Administration Reform under the PAR Sector Reform Contract</b>
<b>Contract No:</b>	<b>CRIS 2018/395-584</b>
<b>Country:</b>	<b>Serbia</b>
<b>Contractor:</b>	<b>GOPA Consultants</b>
<b>Address:</b>	<b>Hindenburgring 18 61348 Bad Homburg Germany</b>
<b>Tel Number:</b>	<b>+49 6172 930 561</b>
<b>Fax Number:</b>	<b>+49 6172 930 500</b>
<b>E-mail:</b>	<a href="mailto:ged@gopa.de">ged@gopa.de</a>
<b>Web site:</b>	<a href="http://public-administration-reform.euzatebe.rs/rs/o-projektu">http://public-administration-reform.euzatebe.rs/rs/o-projektu</a>
<b>Date of the Report:</b>	<b>04/11/2019</b>

### Developed by:

Thomas Kerscher, Key Expert

Mladen Momcilovic, Senior Non Key Evaluation Expert – Evaluation Team Leader

Quality Controller: Peter Vagi, Team Leader

---

Date: 04/11/2019



1	Purpose of this Report.....	5
2	Introduction.....	6
2.1	Strategic Context .....	6
2.2	Legal Context .....	6
2.3	Evaluation Planning .....	7
2.4	Evaluability .....	8
3	Evaluation Process.....	9
3.1	Preparatory Phase .....	9
3.1.1	Evaluation Manager .....	9
3.1.2	Evaluation Roadmap .....	10
3.1.3	Evaluation Questions .....	10
3.1.4	Terms of Reference .....	11
3.1.5	Evaluation Reference Group .....	11
3.1.6	Evaluation Team .....	12
3.1.7	Language.....	13
3.2	Inception Phase .....	13
3.3	Implementation Phase .....	14
3.4	Synthesis, Reporting and Dissemination Phase .....	14

#### **ANNEX I: SELECTED PROVISIONS OF THE LAW ON THE PLANNING SYSTEM AND ITS BY-LAWS IN THE AREA OF EVALUATION**

#### **ANNEX II: EVALUATION ROADMAP**

#### **ANNEX III: TERMS OF REFERENCE**

#### **ANNEX IV: LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE EVALUATION REFERENCE GROUP**



## 1 Purpose of this Report

This report captures the most important lessons from the Evaluation of the Serbian Public Administration Reform Strategy (PARS), which was carried out between August 2018 and April 2019. Although some knowledge about designing and implementing evaluations had accumulated in the Serbian administration in the context of donor funded projects, this evaluation was the first endeavour of the Serbian Government to submit one of its own strategies to an independent evaluation, carried out in accordance with international standards. Thus, the evaluation of the PARS was a new practice for which limited substantial prior experience existed. In order to review the lessons learned, this document seeks answers to the questions of what has and has not worked, and why, and which were the enabling and limiting factors. The lessons presented can be instrumental for a number of purposes:

- planning, designing and implementing **future evaluations** in the area of public administration reform (PAR), and in other policy fields;
- planning, designing and implementing **ex-post policy impact assessments**, as required by the Law on the Planning System (LPS) since October 2018;
- building **evaluation capacity** of state institutions, civil society organisations and evaluation practitioners;
- developing **policies and guidelines** for managing evaluation processes;
- further improving the **practice of self-assessments for PAR** under the PAR sector reform contract (SRC) concluded between Serbia and the EU;
- increasing the **awareness and acceptance of evaluation** as an integral and useful part of the policy cycle.



## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 Strategic Context

A well-functioning public administration directly impacts governments' ability to provide public services and to foster competitiveness and growth. Public Administration Reform (PAR) aims at enhanced transparency, accountability and effectiveness and greater focus on the needs of citizens and business. Adequate management of human resources, better policy planning, coordination and development, effective management of the civil service, sound administrative procedures and improved public financial management (PFM) are of fundamental importance for the functioning of the state.

PAR is an important part of political criteria for EU accession and has been continuously addressed in the enlargement process. It is also necessary in order to be able to implement the reforms needed for EU integration. The EU Enlargement Strategy 2014-2015 states that PAR is one of the three "fundamentals" of the strategy, together with rule of law and economic governance. The EU's 2018 Communication on EU Enlargement Policy reiterates that "[p]ublic administration reform is paramount to strengthening governance at all levels. This includes improving the quality and accountability of administration, increasing professionalism, de-politicisation and transparency, also in recruitment and dismissals, more transparent management of public finances, and better services for citizens [...]" Besides the need to advance on PAR, the European Commission's progress report for Serbia for 2018 reiterated the strengthening of the capacity for monitoring and evaluation.

The Government of the Republic of Serbia adopted the current PAR Strategy (PARS) in January 2014. The overall objective of the reform is the further improvement of the functioning of the public administration in accordance with the principles of the European Administrative Space, providing high quality services to citizens and businesses, and significantly contributing to economic stability and increasing the living standards of citizens. In March 2015, Government adopted the Action Plan (AP) for the implementation of the Strategy for the period 2015-2017. The second AP (2018-2020) was developed during 2017 and adopted in July 2018. The Serbian Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government (MPALSG) has the key role in the coordination, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the public administration reform process.

### 2.2 Legal Context

At the time of planning and designing the PARS evaluation, a domestic normative framework providing details on how to plan, design and conduct evaluations, and to communicate their findings and recommendations was not in place. For this reason, the evaluation design followed international standards for evaluations, such as those provided by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD-DAC)<sup>1</sup>, the European Commission (EC)<sup>2</sup> and SIGMA.<sup>3</sup>

The normative framework for policy management in Serbia has since developed further. A first step toward introducing systematic assessments of policies as part of the policy cycle was taken with adopting the Law on the Planning System (LPS) on 29 April 2018 (effective since 29 October 2018). The law has a number of provisions relevant to impact assessments and evaluations, summarised in Annex I to this document. According to Article 40 LPS, policy proposers shall conduct ex-post impact

---

<sup>1</sup> OECD (1991). [DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance](#).

<sup>2</sup> DG NEAR (2016). [Guidelines on linking planning/programming, monitoring and evaluation](#).

<sup>3</sup> OECD/SIGMA (2018). Toolkit for the preparation, implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of PAR and sector strategies. Guidance for SIGMA partners. ANNEX 5.



assessments for every policy adopted. “Based on findings obtained by the ex-post impact assessment, the authorised proposer [...] shall evaluate performance of the public policy and/or its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability with a view to revising and improving and/or reviewing and further planning the policy.”<sup>4</sup>

Two corresponding by-laws (regulations) to the LPS were adopted in late January and early February 2019, respectively. Annex 12 of the Regulation on the “Methodology of Public Policy Management, Impact Assessment of Public Policies and Regulations, and the Content of Individual Public Policy Documents” puts forward key questions for evaluating the impact of public policy documents in the areas of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.<sup>5</sup> During 2019, the Public Policy Secretariat (PPS) has been preparing a manual for assessing the impact of public policies and regulations, with support from the EU complementary support to PAR.

### 2.3 Evaluation Planning

In the absence of general instructions for planning evaluations, the PARS itself, and its APs, indicated the types and timing of evaluations that the PARS should undergo. More specifically, the PARS states that “[f]ollowing the collection and processing of data from the regular reports on performed activities, and/or the continuing monitoring process, it is necessary to prepare occasional (but regular and systemic, well-grounded) assessments of the reform implementation, more specifically, the evaluation of this complex process.”<sup>6</sup> For this purpose, according to the PARS, internal evaluations “should be accompanied with the independent external evaluation”.

In accordance with the PAR AP (2015-2017), an ex-post evaluation of the PAR AP (2015-2017) and, in parallel, a mid-term evaluation of the PAR Strategy were to be begin in mid-2017. This evaluation was to be financed by the project of another donor, whose pledge, however, was eventually withdrawn. The evaluation was subsequently postponed. According to the second AP (2018-2020), the evaluation was to start in mid-2018, once more as a combined ex-post evaluation of the implementation of the PAR AP (2015-2017), and a midterm evaluation of the PAR Strategy, based on which, if necessary, revisions of the PAR Strategy and AP would be prepared: “The draft evaluation report would thus be prepared by the end of 2018, and submitted to the Council for PAR Strategy for consideration. In order for the evaluation to be as objective as possible, external independent evaluators shall be engaged, through the complementary support of the Sector Budget Support for the PAR EU.”<sup>7</sup> Given delays in the inception of the complementary support project, the original target for completing the evaluation by the end of 2018 could not be met. As a result, the nature of the evaluation shifted more toward an ex-post evaluation. Based on these developments, one may conclude that **making evaluations depend on specific project funds carries a risk of delays**. To avoid this risk, it is advisable to include the funding of such (policy) evaluations in the Government budget.

Another challenge in planning the PARS evaluation was that, at the time of the evaluation, a number of other strategies and programmes had emerged that covered parts of the PAR agenda, such as the Public Finance Management Reform Programme (2016-2020), the Regulatory Reform Programme (2016-2020), or the e-Government Strategy (2015-2018). While these policies generally supported the achievement of PARS objectives, they followed their own time frames. Given that those more recent strategic documents did not go through evaluations, while monitoring information on them

---

<sup>4</sup> Law on the Planning System (Art. 40). Although, in variation of the OECD criteria for development evaluations, “impact” – meaning long-term impact on the society in the field of the policy action - is not a specific assessment criterion in the LPS, a main purpose of the law is to measure the impact of policies.

<sup>5</sup> The question if the criteria and specific questions listed in Annex 12 are mandatory requires further review.

<sup>6</sup> Government of Serbia (2014). Public Administration Reform Strategy in the Republic of Serbia, p57.

<sup>7</sup> Government of Serbia (2018). Action Plan for implementation of the Public Administration Reform Strategy of the Republic of Serbia for the period 2018-2020.



was limited, the PARS evaluation could not build on comprehensive data and findings on the implementation of lower-level policies in a systematic way. For future reference, two alternative responses to this scenario should be considered from an evaluation perspective: (i) align the timelines between closely related policies and evaluate them individually, prior to the evaluation of the umbrella strategy, or (ii) widen the scope of the PAR evaluation to encompass all relevant interventions in the area of PAR.

## 2.4 Evaluability

The extent to which the evaluation of a policy is useful and feasible (evaluability) should be reviewed early on in the evaluation process, in order to define the expectations toward the evaluation results, make the evaluation more realistic and to set aside adequate resources. If reviewed timely, evaluability can be increased by ensuring clarity of interventions and objectives, availability of data, and stakeholder interest. In the case of the PARS evaluation, **evaluability was examined more closely in the inception phase, which is rather late in the process**. The evaluability was constrained by the facts that the PARS is not time-bound, there was insufficient consideration of capacities and resources required for its implementation and that baselines and progress reporting against outcome level indicators were initially not enabled. These shortcomings were mitigated to some extent in the PAR AP (2015-2017), and to a larger extent in the AP (2018-2020). In future, full compliance of policy documents with the LPS should further improve their evaluability.

Given the nature of PAR and progress in developing the PAR framework in recent years, future evaluations should put more emphasis on outcomes. This approach needs to be **reflected in the design of the evaluation TOR**. In drafting the TOR, the evaluation manager should check the evaluability of the PARS, and the AP(s) by applying the following rationale, as indicated in the previous section: if the implementation periods of sub-strategies have been synchronised with one another, and the sub-strategies monitored and evaluated as planned, the evaluation of the PARS may be based on its own primary findings on the PAR strategy and action plans, and the (secondary) results of the evaluation of the sub-strategies/programmes. If this is not the case, then the scope of the PARS evaluation should be widened, encompassing the whole PAR “sector”.

The evaluation of cost-effectiveness requires the existence of alternative scenarios and advanced analytical instruments, such as modelling, or counterfactuals. Moreover, results chains included in APs must be adequately designed in terms of their inputs-outputs-outcomes logic for the PARS to be evaluated against cost effectiveness. In the PARS evaluation, the **absence of full reporting on expenditures was a challenge**. To get credible and useful findings and recommendations from the evaluation process, there is a need for an examination if these conditions for financial reporting are met, before including cost-effectiveness in the TOR for future evaluations. More financial transparency and reporting of disaggregated costs per interventions, measures, outcomes, institutions, etc. would be necessary. If the evaluation manager comes to the conclusion that there is no sufficient capacity to assess cost-effectiveness, then it may be appropriate to exclude this criterion from the evaluation.





## 3 Evaluation Process

### 3.1 Preparatory Phase

The preparatory phase is of critical importance in any evaluation. Most of the challenges encountered in later stages can be traced back to mistakes made in the preparatory phase. This section of the report is therefore also the longest. The **large number of evaluation indicators (95)**, originating from the initial evaluation design, resulted in burdening the evaluation in the implementation phase, and in identifying too many findings. This approach contributed to ineffective analysis in terms of distilling the data and information into a more coherent overall analysis and a plausible and useful narrative. Moreover, methodologically, there were too many questionnaires, with overlapping questions, and rather small samples. The **stakeholders were unnecessarily burdened**, the process prolonged and resources consumed, with limited marginal benefit. These issues could have been addressed most effectively in the preparatory phase. The same is true for a number of other issues faced during implementation:

- The proposed evaluation matrix was more ambitious than expected, resulting in the need to collect and process more data;
- The number of proposed focus groups (nine) for generating data and the need to manage nine tailored questionnaires required more time for data collection and processing than originally anticipated;
- Stakeholder expectations assessed in the inception phase indicated that the evaluation was expected to entail combinations of multiple evaluation types, i.e. summative and process, ex-post and ex-ante, outcome and efficiency evaluations. The mix of evaluation types led to a more complex evaluation process and should be kept within limits in the future.

#### 3.1.1 Evaluation Manager

In the course of planning, designing and carrying out evaluations, evaluation managers perform important tasks, which are summarised in Annex III to this document (Terms of Reference). In the preparatory phase, evaluation managers typically sets up the necessary institutional arrangements (Evaluation Reference Group), define the main features of the evaluation (roadmap for strategic evaluations, terms of reference), and select the evaluators.

Based on the assumption that MPALSG might lack sufficient capacity to manage the PARS evaluation, in addition to its regular work, the bulk of management-related tasks was initially delegated to the project team. This arrangement was also integrated into the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation. As the evaluation evolved, the unit in charge in MPALSG (PAR Group) increasingly took on managerial responsibilities. Despite this positive development, in view of future evaluations in other sectors, where capacity for reform management is limited, the **approach by which projects offer support in evaluation management should be maintained**, as a mitigating measure, so long as capacity building remains an integral part of the evaluation design.

These conclusions underline once more **the need to establish and develop analytical units** in all institutions managing policies. In order to comply with the LPS and the SIGMA principles, substantial investments should be made in strengthening the **capacities of the public administration to plan, design, perform and communicate evaluations** in all sectors, through guidelines, training and practical implementation. Until these capacities have been developed, the ambition of evaluations should remain proportionally modest.



### 3.1.2 Evaluation Roadmap

In order to facilitate consultations and agreements with MPALSG on the main parameters of the evaluation, the project team drew up an „evaluation roadmap“, following the format used by the European Commission for strategic evaluations.<sup>8</sup> The final roadmap for the PARS evaluation is attached as Annex II to this report, and provides the following details:

- ☐ the subject of the evaluation, its purpose and scope, including draft evaluation questions;
- ☐ the background and original objectives of the PARS intervention being evaluated (including a short description of how these were expected to be achieved);
- ☐ the questions covering the five mandatory evaluation criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability); and
- ☐ the evidence base for the evaluation, covering both data already available and data which will be collected during the evaluation.

In the case of the PARS evaluation, the roadmap did not include information on two critical aspects:

- ☐ the budget required to carry out the evaluation;
- ☐ key expected dates including the start of the evaluation, the timing of consultations and the publication of the final report.

**Such information should be included in the future**, regardless of the source of funding, in order to avoid delays and keep the evaluation within the limits of the budget. A key question to be answered in the future is **whether the evaluation questions must always cover all five evaluation criteria** (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability). A principle for evaluations is that **knowledge should be generated in order to use it**. If there is a general consensus that it is highly unlikely that findings on a certain criterion will be acted upon, it may be appropriate either to exclude it from the evaluation, or to avoid labelling the assessment as an evaluation.

### 3.1.3 Evaluation Questions

Formulating evaluation questions (EQs) is a **joint responsibility of stakeholders in a given policy area**. In the case of the PARS evaluation, this principle was not adequately adhered to. The formulation process started with a long list of questions which was then further reduced in consultation with MPALSG. **Insufficient consultation with a wider set of stakeholders in developing the evaluations questions** was likely a main factor for bottlenecks encountered in the implementation phase, such as low turnout in some of the focus groups, or delayed or incomplete data retrieval. The following considerations should be observed when developing evaluation questions:

- ☐ EQs should not exceed a manageable number that can be covered within the limits of available resources and time. For this purpose, EQs should only focus on the most pressing issues; the DG NEAR evaluation guidelines sets the limit to (ideally) ten EQs. While this limit was kept, the large breadth of the evaluation (16 key implementers) should have asked for **fewer evaluation questions**, in order for the process to remain manageable with the resources available;
- ☐ EQs should be linked to the evaluation criteria used in a given evaluation;
- ☐ EQs are considered useful by stakeholders that have some degree of responsibility for, or an interest in, a given policy area; therefore, in the PARS evaluation, the EQs **should have been defined in close consultation with the key stakeholders** of the evaluation;
- ☐ EQs should request for an informed, evidence-based, value judgment;
- ☐ EQs should emerge from the reconstructed intervention logic;
- ☐ EQs should include both elements that are within the sphere of control of the responsible authorities and elements which are at least partially out of the control of the authorities (outcomes and impact);

<sup>8</sup> More details on evaluation roadmaps can be reviewed in the European Commission's [Better Regulation Guidelines](#).



- ☐ EQs should consider issues of the management structure for the policy, and the way it has been used;
- ☐ EQs should explore the link between monitoring and evaluation.<sup>9</sup>

### 3.1.4 Terms of Reference

The TOR largely built on the evaluation roadmap. Faithful to the PARS and PAR APs, the TOR were designed as an “external and independent” assessment, which envisaged the recruitment of a three-member team. In this context, it should be understood that **outsourcing evaluations to external consultants does not ensure independence**. Independence results from institutional arrangements that allow both freedom to conduct research and express judgments, and the absence of interferences and pressures. Such arrangements were provided for in the TOR, and observed during implementation, so that the **independence of the evaluators could be ensured**.

A second aspect that requires attention is that external assessments are most useful when the quality of implementation management is to be evaluated. The reason for this argument is that stakeholders are usually too involved in management to properly evaluate it. On the other hand when the emphasis is not on management (including monitoring and coordination), the MPALSG and stakeholders in the PARS may in future **make more use of internal evaluations**, which is a practice already foreseen in the PARS. Internal evaluations more readily mobilise existing expertise available among the stakeholders and thus are more cost-effective and less intrusive. In addition, the transfer of knowledge gained through internal evaluations is usually more effective than when this knowledge is presented from the outside.

After consulting with MPALSG, the draft TOR were shared with the European Union Delegation (EUD) and the European Commission in Brussels for comments, which the project team received and addressed in the final version of the TOR. The **TOR should already include draft judgment criteria** for evaluation questions, to be finalised by the evaluation team in the inception phase. Jointly identifying judgment criteria may also help with re-formulating EQs or eliminating some questions, in order to make the evaluation more focused and manageable. This approach was not observed in the PARS evaluation.

### 3.1.5 Evaluation Reference Group

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) usually ensures the respect of evaluation principles, such as:

- ☐ independence and objectivity<sup>10</sup>;
- ☐ openness/knowledge sharing;
- ☐ transparency;
- ☐ evidence-based conclusions;
- ☐ usefulness, i.e. having an impact on decision-making; and
- ☐ participation.

In addition to making sure that these evaluation principles are observed, ERGs have a number of other important functions:

- ☐ steering the evaluation exercise in all key phases;
- ☐ providing quality control on the different deliverables;
- ☐ interacting with evaluators on preliminary and final findings;

<sup>9</sup> DG NEAR (2016). [Guidelines on linking planning/programming, monitoring and evaluation](#). p 18. In the PARS evaluation, EQ7 aimed to provide conclusions on the functioning of the monitoring system and findings that may be used to enhance its capacities.

<sup>10</sup> An evaluation can be considered independent when evaluators: (i) carry out their tasks without influence or pressure from the organisation launching the evaluation or being evaluated; (ii) are given full access to all relevant information; and (iii) have full autonomy in conducting and reporting their findings.



- ☐ ensuring a proper follow-up action plan after the completion of the evaluation.

Given that the PARS stakeholders generally consider themselves already overcommitted with memberships in too many groups, the TOR did not require the establishment of an ERG. Instead, they suggested that the project team, in close consultation with MPALSG and the EUD organise, on a needs basis, **purpose driven meetings of stakeholders** that could fulfill the roles typically taken on by reference groups. Although not required by the TOR, an ERG was established in the inception phase (a list of members as provided in Annex IV) and met four times during the evaluation. In the first meeting, the group discussed the draft inception report and finalisation of the evaluation methodology in September 2018. The second meeting discussed the key findings of the implementation phase in December 2018. In the third meeting, the group, in February 2019, deliberated on the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. The final meeting took place in September 2019, to discuss the lessons learned from the evaluation. Every meeting invited all PARS implementers, and a number of civil society organisations and donor agencies.

Against the principles and functions listed above, the meetings were relatively effective. Generally, ownership of key stakeholders increased over time. The peak was reached at the stage of commenting on the draft final PAR Evaluation Report, when several members took more active roles and contributed significantly to the process and the quality of the final report. While the ERG was nominally a large group, attendance was limited and especially poor among the selected CSOs. Their inclusion in the ERG ensured the transparency of the process, low attendance prevented the process from benefitting from important concerns of CSOs, which are otherwise very present in the public discourse.

Given the novelty of the ERG, however, and the busy schedules of participants, clarity of the mandates and roles of ERG participants in the evaluation process was insufficient. Some were active and took the issues back to their institutions and returned with responses, while others were not. In future, the participating institutions should **delegate specific individuals mandated to perform the ERG's functions** throughout the evaluation process. Given its pilot character, the role of providing access to data was performed by the ERG only to a limited extent. Consequently, the evaluation team was forced to collect much of the needed data and information on its own and in an ad hoc manner. The expectation that **ERG members should facilitate access to data** should be made clearer in future.

While the PAR Group at MPALSG fully owned the evaluation process, the ERG only slowly and to a limited extent developed a group identity to find and build on common ground and ownership for steering the evaluation process. In order to strengthen ownership and reflect diverse perspectives in an evaluation, evaluation managers should in future opt to **involve ERG members already in the preparatory phase** for drafting the evaluation roadmap and/or TOR, as suggested in the DG NEAR Guidelines.<sup>11</sup> This approach would likely also increase the ERG's contributions in the inception phase, which is critical for defining the evaluation process. If this approach is deemed to be too demanding, the evaluation manager may opt to constitute a small working group from 3 – 5 stakeholder groups, to support decision-making.

### 3.1.6 Evaluation Team

The independent evaluation team consisted of a team leader, an evaluation specialist, and a quality controller. The profile for the team leader required at least five and preferably seven years of professional experience in evaluation and monitoring of programmes or policies as well as proven experience as team leader or senior evaluator for at least three evaluations. Further requirements were at least one year of working experience in the field of PAR, excellent drafting skills in English, and freedom from conflicts of interest. Working knowledge of Serbian was identified as a distinct advantage. Given the relative novelty of evaluation practice in the Serbian and regional context, the

<sup>11</sup> DG NEAR (2016). [Guidelines on linking planning/programming, monitoring and evaluation](#). p 106.



combination of **experience and skills required from an evaluation team leader, as defined above, is in short supply**. In the short-term, this bottleneck may be overcome by lowering some of the qualification requirements, such as language skills. In the medium to long term, this bottleneck may be overcome by a more extensive use of assessments and evaluations resulting from the enforcement of the LPS.

The main tasks of the evaluation specialist was to support the team leader in developing the evaluation methodology and with collecting, refining and analysing data. The profile of the evaluation specialist required significantly less professional experience (see the annexed TOR for details). Given the scope of the PAR evaluation and challenges in obtaining sufficient data, however, it was fortunate that the candidate selected for this role substantially exceeded the minimum requirements. Therefore, for future reference, in similar circumstances, the **requirements of evaluation specialists other than the team leader could be increased**.

The role of the external quality controller was mainly to coach the evaluators working in the field through targeted feedback on the main intermediary outputs (methodology, inception report, interim report) as well as the final evaluation report. Although the input allocated to this role was limited (five working days), the benefit of the feedback received, as experienced by the evaluators and the project team, was significant. Particularly critical for the usefulness of the quality controller were short turnaround times, which helped to avoid that ensuring quality was perceived as a cause of delay. Since the quality controller was a non-Serbian speaker, drafting documents in English was an advantage in keeping turnaround times low. Thus, responses from the quality controller were usually received on the following business day. Such short feedback cycles are possible only when a quality controller has substantial evaluation experience which, at least, matches the experience of the evaluation team leader. Quality control is also a key function of an ERG. Once the concept of ERG is integrated in the Serbian system, one may consider conducting evaluations without an external quality controller.

### 3.1.7 Language

The main documents developed in the course of the evaluation (inception report, interim report and final report) were drafted in English and translated into Serbian after their approval. While this approach facilitated discussions with donors in general, and the EU in particular, as well as the selected quality assurer, it undermines ownership. In addition, there have been concerns raised in the past by the public administration about the quality of translations, and the use of correct technical terms in Serbian. If the language skills of the evaluators allow it, future reports may better be drafted in Serbian, reviewed by an editor familiar with the Serbian terminology, and then translated into English.

## 3.2 Inception Phase

Even if evaluation TOR are developed thoroughly and in a participative fashion, as recommended above, the inception phase will usually lead to new insights on the exact purpose, scope and feasibility of the evaluation. In order to take new insights into account, **the expectations from an inception phase should be made clear and explicit**. The expectations in the case of the PARS evaluation were, among others, the “completion of the assessment approach and methodology: scope, evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators”, but a critical review of the evaluation questions was not explicitly requested or encouraged. **In order to clearly spell out the expectations**, involvement of an ERG already in drafting of the TOR would be beneficial.

The mixed ex-post and mid-term evaluation design did not work well as the focus was so much shifted to the ex-post perspective that mid-term findings became almost redundant. In addition, the following conclusions can be drawn from the inception phase:





- The number of stakeholders in the evaluation process and outcome was larger than expected, requiring more time input for consultations (e.g. more communications, more interviews, more meetings) and for processing of comments and suggestions;
- Given that the PARS evaluation was the first such examination of a national strategy in Serbia (and the region), building awareness and ownership of the evaluation process among the stakeholders required a more extensive participatory process that originally envisaged;
- The interest among stakeholders in participating in the evaluation process, as well as their expectations toward the evaluation outcomes, significantly increased during the inception phase, thus indicating a need for more intensive consultations during the implementation and synthesis phases;
- During the inception phase, the key beneficiary (MPALSG) started to assume greater responsibility for the evaluation process than required by the TOR (e.g. by setting up a full Evaluation Reference Group), which helped to substantially increase the quality of the evaluation, but required more expert input into role clarification;

### 3.3 Implementation Phase

Besides the conclusions that could be drawn from the inception phase, the evaluation team faced a number of unforeseeable challenges during the implementation phase, which required more input than originally anticipated:

- Major inconsistencies in the data provided by different sources – in the absence of a unified data platform - led to a more time-consuming process of data reconciliation;
- Limited accessibility of some data (e.g. data on the actual reductions of the number of public administration employees - a key theme of the evaluation) required more efforts in acquiring data, identification and exploitation of alternative sources, and time-consuming reconstruction of information from primary data;
- A lower than anticipated response rate and limited involvement of some stakeholders in the process of generating data, through interviews, focus groups, and surveys, required more time to be invested in individual follow-up;
- Instead of the evaluation team reviewing five specific objectives and/or 19 measures, as originally envisaged, the team needed to assess the results chain more deeply at the level of 49 results and over 220 activities.<sup>12</sup>

In order to avoid or manage these difficulties, the evaluation managers should **design the data collection and methods in the planning and preparation phases**. In future, data collected by the new Unified Information System (UIS) and the Online Monitoring Tool (OMT) are expected to improve the availability of data, in PAR and in other policy areas.

### 3.4 Synthesis, Reporting and Dissemination Phase

The evaluation team presented its findings and conclusions to ERG, the Inter-Ministerial Project Group (IMPG) and the Council for Public Administration Reform (PARC).<sup>13</sup> Based on the final evaluation report, IMPG and PARC concluded that **a new PARS should be developed** without delay.

<sup>12</sup> Given the enlarged scope identified in the inception phase, the number of working days assigned to the Evaluation Team Leader was extended by 10 working days, and the number of working days assigned to the Evaluation Specialist by 20 working days. Because of difficulties in obtaining data in the implementation phase the assignment was later extended by 10 working days for the Evaluation Team Leader and 10 days for the Evaluation Specialist. In total, 70 working days were allocated to the Evaluation Team Leader and 80 working days to the Evaluation Specialist.

<sup>13</sup> The TOR for the PARS evaluation cited the AP PAR 2018-20, which states that the draft evaluation report is to be submitted to the Council for PAR for consideration.



European Union

## Lessons learned from the PARS evaluation



Republic of Serbia

The recommendations from the evaluation, which cannot be implemented under the current PARS will thus need to be integrated in the design and implementation of the new PARS.

TOR for future evaluations should be prepared and managed by MPALSG, in partnership with the Office for Cooperation with the Civil Society, academia, and the media, and plan for a **more extensive communication of evaluation results to a wider audience**. This approach could serve not only outreach and accountability functions but also the promotion of results and forging new PAR partnerships.

**ANNEX I****SELECTED PROVISIONS OF THE LAW ON THE PLANNING SYSTEM AND ITS  
BY-LAWS IN THE AREA OF EVALUATION**

An authorised proposer shall conduct an ex-post policy impact assessment (Art 40).

When the proposer of a public policy document is a public administration authority, that authority shall report to the Government, through the public administration authority competent for public policy coordination, on results of the implementation of the public policy document and/or on the ex-post impact assessment of the public policy set by the document, as follows: For a strategy/a programme, no later than 120 days upon the expiry of every third/first calendar year from its adoption (Art 43).

An action plan shall be revised as needed, in line with results of the implementation monitoring or ex-post policy impact assessment, and/or, if deemed necessary, amendments thereto shall be prepared. (Art. 18)

The Government shall determine the manner of public policy implementation monitoring, ex-post impact assessment and performance evaluation (Art. 41)

During the implementation of regulations, public administration authorities shall conduct an ex-post regulatory impact assessment (Art 41).

The proportionality principle, which implies that the scope and methods of public policy impact assessments, both ex-ante and ex-post, are proportionate to the significance and scale of the impacts being assessed (Art 3).

Based on findings obtained by the ex-post impact assessment, the authorised proposer [...] shall evaluate performance of the public policy and/or its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability with a view to revising and improving and/or reviewing and further planning the policy (Art. 40).

SABs shall present the results of the ex-post impact analysis of public policies already implemented as part of the public policy document itself (Art 33).

Public policy documents shall be developed in accordance with results of ex-ante impact assessment and ex-post impact assessment of current public policy documents and regulations in relevant field (Art. 31).

Annex 12 of the Regulation on the “Methodology of Public Policy Management, Impact Assessment of Public Policies and Regulations, and the Content of Individual Public Policy Documents” raises the following key questions for evaluating the impact of public policy documents:

**RELEVANCE**

- 1) Are the policy objectives directly correlated with the senior policy documents and priorities of the Government?
- 2) Why was government intervention (policy making and implementation) required?
- 3) Are the needs of the public policy target groups fully met?
- 4) Have the effects achieved been directly correlated with the policy objectives?





### EFFICIENCY

- 1) What indicators and targets have been defined for the results and have they been achieved?
- 2) What is the cost of the result - per result and total? How much do they deviate from the planned costs?
- 3) Were the resources engaged sufficient to deliver results?
- 4) Are the results achieved within the deadlines set? If not, what are the reasons?

### EFFECTIVENESS

- 1) Have the intended effects and outcomes been achieved and the development conditions changed?
- 2) If not, is it possible to quantify the difference and find the causes?
- 3) Are the activities / measures chosen relevant and most relevant to achieving results?
- 4) Are public policy users satisfied with the outcomes achieved?

### SUSTAINABILITY

- 1) Are financial and economic mechanisms in place for the long-term and sustainable benefits of concrete public policy?
- 2) Can existing benefits from concrete public policy be made available within the current regulatory framework?
- 3) Are there adequate institutional capacities to sustain sustainably the positive effects of concrete public policy?

**ANNEX II:****EVALUATION ROADMAP**

EVALUATION ROADMAP			
TITLE OF THE EVALUATION	Mid-term Evaluation of Serbian Public Administration Reform (PAR) Strategy and ex-post evaluation of the PAR Action Plan (AP) 2015-2017		
GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINT	Group for Management of Public Administration Reform at Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government (MPALSG)	DATE OF THIS ROADMAP	17.12.2019 (DRAFT)
TYPE OF EVALUATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>External mid-term (interim) evaluation of PAR Strategy</li><li>External ex-post evaluation of PAR Action Plan (2015-2017)</li><li>Review of PAR Action Plan (2018-2020)</li></ul>	PLANNED START DATE AND COMPLETION DATE	06/2018-12/2018
		PLANNING CALENDAR	n/a
This indicative roadmap is provided for information purposes only and is subject to change..			
A. PURPOSE			
(A.1) Purpose			
<p>The Government of Serbia on 25 January 2014 adopted the current Strategy for the Public Administration Reform (PAR) in the Republic of Serbia (Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia No. 9/14 and 42/15). The Strategy involved a change of focus from the state administration reform to the reform of the broader public administration – the scope has changed from 28,000 to half a million employees. The first Action Plan (AP) for implementation of the strategy, for the period 2015-2017, was adopted by the Serbian Government on 19 March 2015 (Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia No. 31/15). The AP operationalizes the strategy, and defines concrete measures, results, activities and cost of public administration reform until the end of 2017. The second AP (2018-2020) has been developed during 2017 and is awaiting approval by the Serbian Government.</p> <p>The planned joint evaluation of the PAR Strategy and the APs will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• assess performance, achievements and lessons learned; demonstrate whether past, on-going or planned interventions in the area of PAR have taken on board the latest lessons learnt and policy approaches to PAR;</li><li>• form the basis for deciding whether the current strategy and AP will be revised;</li><li>• provide information on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact of the PAR Strategy and APs;</li><li>• propose corrective activities taken if PAR Strategy implementation lags behind the planned schedule and expected results, or when planned activities are inconsistent with the set strategic goals.</li><li>• contribute to better design, programming and implementation over the forthcoming period.</li><li>• support the decision-making, both at a strategic (planning) level, and at the level of the design of the interventions;</li><li>• contribute to accountability, transparency, visibility of PAR in Serbia, enabling dissemination of</li></ul>			



<p>information to the general public, stakeholders and civil society; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promote the practice of evaluation of policy documents in the Serbian administration and contribute to the development of evaluation guidelines and templates.</li> </ul>
(A.2) Justification
<p>The PAR Strategy requires that "The internal evaluation of the report should be accompanied with the independent external evaluation through the involvement of renowned educational and other related expert institutions, civil society and reports by independent assurance companies and relevant international organizations." The AP (2015-2017) stipulates that "In order for the evaluation to be as objective as possible, external independent evaluators shall be engaged, and this objective a public tender shall be announced." Performance evaluation of public policies is a key principle in the Serbian Law on the Planning System (LPS), adopted in April 2018. Article 40 of the LPS stipulates that the "public policy implementation monitoring and performance evaluation shall be conducted taking into account data and information obtained from all authorities and organisations responsible for the implementation of the public policy measures and/or activities, and data and information obtained from other sources relevant to the performance of the public policy" and that the "Government shall determine the manner of public policy implementation monitoring, ex-post impact assessment and performance evaluation."</p>
<b>B. CONTENT AND SUBJECT OF THE EVALUATION</b>
(B.1) Subject Area
<p>A well-functioning public administration directly impacts governments' ability to provide public services and to foster competitiveness and growth. Public Administration Reform (PAR) aims at enhanced transparency, accountability and effectiveness and greater focus on the needs of citizens and business. Adequate management of human resources, better policy planning, coordination and development, effective management of the civil service, sound administrative procedures and improved public financial management (PFM) are of fundamental importance for the functioning of the state. The PAR Strategy has been conceived as an umbrella strategy for a number of important complementary strategies, among which are the Public Financial Management Reform Programme (2016-2020), Strategy for development of Public Internal Finance Control (2017–2020), the Regulatory Reform Strategy, the e-Government Strategy (2016-2020), the Strategy for Professional Development of Civil Servants, the Strategy for Professional Development of Employees in Local Self-government units, the Strategy of Development of the Public Procurement System (2014-2018) and the Plan of Priority Activities to Reduce the Administrative Burden in the Republic of Serbia (2016-2017).</p> <p>PAR is also an important part of criteria for EU accession and has been continuously addressed in the enlargement process. PAR is necessary for Serbia to be able to implement the reforms needed for EU integration. Substantial IPA assistance has been provided to enlargement countries in this area in the past decade both under national programmes and the multi-beneficiary programme. The EU Enlargement Strategy 2014-2015 emphasized that PAR is one of the three "fundamentals" of the strategy together with rule of law and economic governance., According to the EU Enlargement Strategy 2018, PAR remains paramount to strengthening governance at all levels. This includes improving the quality and accountability of administration, increasing professionalism, de-politicisation and transparency, also in recruitment and dismissals, more transparent management of public finances, and better services for citizens. An appropriate balance between central, regional and local government also needs to be found. Governments should ensure stakeholders can actively participate in the reform and policy making process, for example by establishing inclusive structured dialogues on reform priorities with the involvement of an empowered civil society. Even though not covered by a specific acquis chapter, PAR has progressively become an issue of fundamental</p>



importance for the EU, being cross-cutting and related to many acquis chapters.

#### (B.2) Original objectives of the intervention

The Serbian PAR Strategy aims to create a public administration based on the principles of the European Administrative Space - now described in the SIGMA Principles of Public Administration - providing high quality services to citizens and businesses, thereby positively affecting the standard of living of citizens. The PAR Strategy and APs are organized around five specific objectives (SOs):

SO 1: Improving organisational and functional public administration sub-systems

SO 2: Establishing a coherent public civil service system which is merit-based and improved human resources management

SO 3: Improvement of public finances and procurement management

SO 4: Increasing legal certainty and improving the business environment and the quality of service provision

SO 5: Increasing citizens participation and accountability in performing the tasks of public administration

#### (B.3) How the objectives were to be achieved

Each specific objective is meant to be achieved by a number of measures:

SO 1: Improving organisational and functional public administration sub-systems

- Organizational and Functional Restructuring of Authorities, Organizations and other Bodies Discharging Public Administration Operations
- Enhancement of Decentralization and De-Concentration of PA Activities
- Improvement of Strategic Planning System And Coordination of Public Policies
- Development of E-Government

SO 2: Establishing a coherent public civil service system which is merit-based and improved human resources management

- Introduction of Aligned System of Employment and Salaries of PA Civil Servants and Employees
- Development and Enhancement of HRM System in Public Administration

SO 3: Improvement of public finances and procurement management

- Improvement of Budget Planning and Preparation Process
- Enhancement of Management and Control Of Revenue and Internal Audit
- Enhancement of Public Procurement System

SO 4: Increasing legal certainty and improving the business environment and the quality of service provision

- Enhancement of Regulatory Processes
- Enhancement of Administrative Procedures
- Inspection Control Reform

SO 5: Increasing citizens participation and accountability in performing the tasks of public administration

- Improvement of Conditions for Participation of Interested Members of the Public in the work of the Public Administration
- Strengthening of Ethical Standards of Employees in Public Administration and Suppressing

**Corruption**

A number of measures have been added, replaced or re-phrased or otherwise adjusted to evolving circumstances, in the process of developing APs for strategy implementation. For each measure, APs list several activities intended to achieve the measure, Efforts have been made in APs to monetize resources needed to implement the strategy, differentiating between government and donors resources.

**C. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION****(C.1) Topics covered**

The evaluation will focus on the assessment of the achievement of the objectives of the Serbian PAR strategy both from a process/output and results/outcome point of view.

**(C.2) Issues to be Examined**

The evaluation shall examine the PAR strategy against five criteria, i.e. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Evaluation issues and questions will be refined at the inception stage, after a thorough review of the intervention logic. The following tentative evaluation questions have been identified:

1. Relevance (Looks at the relationship between the needs and problems in society and the objectives of the intervention. Things change over time - certain objectives may be met or superseded; needs and problems change, new ones arise)

- To what extent do the objectives, defined in the PAR strategy, correspond to existing priority needs and capacities in Serbia? To what extent has the strategy proved relevant to those needs? To what extent are the objectives of the PAR strategy still valid?
- How well have stakeholders been involved in the development of the strategy, and action plans, respectively?

2. Effectiveness (A measure of the extent to which the intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved (OECD))

- Which (positive and negative) changes have occurred? When the intervention works at its best, what does it produce? How do changes differ for each part of the strategy?
- To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved? How far is the strategy from completion?
- In areas where effectiveness has been high, which actions by stakeholders have contributed most to high effectiveness (driving forces/success factors)? In areas where effectiveness has been low, which actions by stakeholders explain the lack of progress (restraining forces)
- Were the cross-cutting issues (especially gender and climate change) sufficiently included in the strategy and its implementation?

3. Efficiency (Efficiency considers the relationship between the resources used by an intervention and the changes it generates (which may be positive or negative)).

- How well was the implementation of the PAR strategy managed? How adequate was the institutional and organizational structure for the coordination, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the implementation process of the strategy and action plan? Have the capacities to coordinate and monitor implementation of the PAR Strategy been adequate?
- Was the strategy implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? Were activities cost-efficient? To what extent are the costs proportionate to the benefits achieved? Were objectives achieved on time?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?



Which obstacles have been encountered in the course of implementing the strategy and AP, and how were they overcome?

4. Impact (Impact relates to the changes that are expected to happen due among other things to the implementation of an intervention. Such impacts may occur over different timescales and affect different actors. They can be positive and negative, direct and indirect, intended or unintended, on any dimension (social, economic, environmental, political, etc.)

- What has happened as a result of strategy implementation? What real difference has the strategy made to the beneficiaries? How many people have been affected in which ways (positives and negatives)?

5. Sustainability (Sustainability relates to the continuation of benefits from an intervention after major support has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time (adapted from the OECD-DAC). It has various dimensions: social, economic, political, environmental, financial, institutional, etc.)

- To what extent have stakeholder institutions designed and built into their plans and systems the necessary feedback and monitoring mechanisms that will ensure self-renewal (adaptation) in order to achieve objectives?

### (C.3) Other tasks

The Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government (MPALSG) will ensure that everybody involved understands the importance of this task and fully cooperates with experts carrying out evaluation. MPALSG will later provide the evaluators with feedback on the findings and recommendations from the evaluation, on behalf of the Serbian Government.

The IPA project "Support to Public Administration Reform under the Sector Reform Contract" will develop the terms of reference (TOR) for this evaluation, in consultation with MPALSG and the EU Delegation in Belgrade. The project will provide the evaluators with logistical and administrative support. The project will also appoint a quality controller for the evaluation.

## D. EVIDENCE BASE

### (D.1) Evidence from monitoring

The Serbian PAR Strategy includes provisions for a monitoring mechanism. All bodies bearing a responsibility for implementing the PAR strategy must provide MPALSG regularly with data on progress. After being processed by the MPALSG, the data is discussed by the Inter-ministerial Project Group and at the meeting of the Board of State Secretaries. Once in a year, as a minimum, findings are additionally discussed at the meeting of the PAR Council. MPALSG published the most recent progress report covering the period 2015-2017 in March 2018. In the AP 2018-2020, the coordination and monitoring structure is simplified by removal of the Board of State Secretaries.

OECD SIGMA has established a strategic framework for good public administration, entitled "Principles of Public Administration", first published in 2014.<sup>14</sup> SIGMA monitors country performance against those principles. The baseline for Serbia was established in 2015. A monitoring report for Serbia was issued in 2017. The PAR Special Group has been established under the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) as a main policy dialogue forum on PAR between the Commission and the Serbian government. The group monitors the general direction for PAR support is also organized

<sup>14</sup> Strategic Framework of Public Administration Reform, Policy Development and Co-ordination, Public Service and Human Resource Management, Accountability, Service Delivery, Public Financial Management  
Support to Public Administration Reform under the PAR Sector Reform Contract





around the six SIGMA principles. PFM policy dialogue with the Commission and IFIs is a prerequisite for budget support operations. Multi-Country Strategy Papers and Multi-Country Programmes, such as the Regional School for Public Administration (RESPA)<sup>[1]</sup> are complemented at the country level by Country Strategy Papers and National Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) Programmes.

IPA I/II projects have been subject to the results-oriented monitoring system (ROM). It is a performance based monitoring system, which systematically conducts monitoring missions in all regions and sectors of EU Aid, using the same consistent methodology to rapidly assess selected projects. The system is based on regular onsite assessments (once a year) by independent experts to ongoing projects and programmes.

The PAR sector reform contract (PAR SRC) concluded between the European Commission and Serbia, to facilitate sector budget support to PAR, involves six objectives<sup>15</sup> based on the “EC Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2014-2015”. The objectives in most part coincide with those identified in the Serbian PAR Strategy, and the SIGMA Principles. An IPA project for Evaluation and monitoring of the sector reform contract for public administration reform and public finance management in Serbia (EuropeAid/138059/DH/SER/RS) is currently under implementation. There are regular review missions for the disbursement of fixed and variable tranches once beneficiaries led by MPALSG have prepared a self-assessment report and materials/data defined as sources of verification in the policy matrix are available. The Serbian Government has established Operational Teams to share information, coordinate activities and monitor progress.

#### (D.2) Previous evaluations and other reports

There has not been a prior evaluation of the implementation of the PAR strategy. A number of other evaluation and assessment reports exist that address PAR, or certain aspects of it:

- External Evaluation of the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA II, 2017)
- Thematic Evaluation of Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance and European Neighbourhood Instrument support to Public Administration Reform
- IPA - interim evaluation and meta-evaluation of IPA assistance, Country Programme Interim Evaluation Serbia, August 2013
- Evaluation of effectiveness and efficiency of development assistance to the Republic of Serbia per Sector, Final Report, SIDA 2013
- Vági, P. and K. Kasemets (2017), “Functioning of the Centres of Government in the Western Balkans”, SIGMA Papers, No. 53, OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/2bad1e9c-en>
- SIGMA Monitoring Report for Serbia (2017)
- SIGMA (2016). Overview of the coordination structure for the Public Administration Reform Strategy. December 2016
- Progress reports on the Implementation of the PAR Strategy published by the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government (MPALSG)
- Reports on Functional Reviews of Serbian Ministries under the World Bank Modernization And Optimization of Public Administration Program
- Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) reports
- Indicative Strategy Paper for Serbia (2014-2020);
- 2015 Assessment of UNDP Contributions Towards Good Governance in Serbia (2011-2015)
- Relevant EU Monitoring (ROM) Reports

<sup>15</sup> (1) Improved organisation and functions of the central government administration; (2) Improved public policy development and coordination; (3) Increased participation of citizens and civil society organisations in the policy-making process; (4) Improved merit-based human resources management system within the public service; (5) Reduced administrative burden to citizens and businesses through support to the reform of the inspection services; and (6) Improved management of public finances.



- Annual EU Progress Reports for Serbia
- DG BUDG Fact Finding Mission Reports that include direct reference to PAR
- Gender Equality in Public Administration in Western Balkans. Beneficiary Report: Serbia (forthcoming)

(D.3) Evidence from assessing the implementation and application of legislation (complaints, infringement procedures)

N/A

(D.4) Consultation

During the inception and desk phases, the contracted evaluators will consult the main national stakeholders via email or in personal meetings. A stakeholder map will be established, explaining the mutual expectations stakeholders have toward one another. Comments will be sought from these stakeholders before the finalisation of the Inception Report and the Desk Phase Report. A stakeholder workshop will be held towards the end of the field phase, before the drafting of the Final Report. The Draft Final report will be sent for comments to the stakeholders consulted during the evaluation. A dissemination seminar will be held once the evaluation has been completed.

National stakeholders for this evaluation (non-exhaustive list):

- Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government (MPALSG)
- Office for IT and E-Government
- Public Policy Secretariat.
- General Secretariat of the Government
- Ministry of Finance
- Human Resource Management Service (SUK)
- National Academy for Public Administration (NAPA)
- Ministry of European Integration
- Senior officials within the line Ministries and Agencies
- Office for Cooperation with Civil Society
- State Audit Institution
- Local Governments
- Officials within the line Ministries and State Agencies responsible for implementing reforms
- Representatives of the Civil Society Organisations, business associations, academic institutions, and final beneficiaries

International stakeholders for this evaluation (non-exhaustive list):

- European Union Delegation
- OECD SIGMA
- World Bank
- Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA)
- GIZ
- SDC
- Sida
- UK
- Other donors playing a role in the area of PAR in Serbia

(D.5) Further evidence to be gathered

During the field phase, the evaluators will meet with national stakeholders, the EU Delegation in Serbia and other relevant international stakeholders. SIGMA and ReSPA may be visited during the field phase. Use of surveys, questionnaires and other tools will be considered and decided on during





the inception phase.
<b>E. OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION/ REMARKS</b>
n/a

**ANNEX III: TERMS OF REFERENCE****SUPPORT TO PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REFORM UNDER THE PAR SECTOR REFORM CONTRACT  
EuropeAid/137928/DH/SER/RS****Terms of Reference**

<b>Title of assignment:</b>		Evaluation of the Serbian Public Administration Reform Strategy
<b>Number and category of expert:</b>		2 Senior NKEs, 1 Junior NKE
<b>Expertise required:</b>		Evaluation of Strategies/Policies/Programmes
<b>Component</b>		III
<b>Activity line according to work plan</b>		3.1.1
<b>Working days foreseen</b>		SNKE 1 (50 working days)
		JNKE 1 (50 working days)
		SNKE 2 (5 working days)
1.	Introduction	3
1.1.	Background	3
1.1.1.	Context	3
1.1.2.	Evaluation	3
1.1.3.	Project Support	4
1.2.	Objectives	4
1.3.	Description of the Intervention Logic	4
1.4.	Evaluation and Monitoring Provisions	5
1.4.1.	Monitoring Provisions	5
1.4.2.	Previous Evaluations and other Reports	6
2.	Specifications of the assignment	7
2.1.	Stakeholders	7
2.2.	Requested Services, Evaluation Questions, Methodology and Quality Control	8
2.2.1.	Requested Services	8
2.2.2.	Evaluation Questions	8
2.2.3.	Methodology	9
2.2.4.	Phases	9
2.2.5.	Risks and Assumptions	10
2.2.6.	Roles of the Project and Quality Control	11
2.2.7.	Capacity Building	11
2.3.	Required outputs	12
2.3.1.	General Reporting Requirements	12
2.3.2.	Inception Report	12
2.3.3.	Interim Report	12



## Lessons learned from the PARS evaluation



European Union

Republic of Serbia

2.3.4.	Final Report	13
3.	Expert Profiles	13
3.1.	Profile and Expertise Required	13
3.2.	Indicative Allocation of Working Days	14
3.3.	Working language	15
3.4.	Conflict of interest	15
3.5.	Schedule and Place of Assignment	15
ANNEX I	Specific Objectives of the Serbian PAR Strategy and Measures to Achieve them	16
ANNEX II	Background Documents	17
ANNEX III	Donor Support in the area of PAR	19
ANNEX IV	Summary of Findings and Recommendations on PAR from the EU Progress Report on Serbia for 2018	20
ANNEX V	Overview of Recommendations from SIGMA 2017 Monitoring Report	22



## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

#### 1.1.1 Context

A well-functioning public administration directly impacts governments' ability to provide public services and to foster competitiveness and growth. Public Administration Reform (PAR) aims at enhanced transparency, accountability and effectiveness and greater focus on the needs of citizens and business. Adequate management of human resources, better policy planning, coordination and development, effective management of the civil service, sound administrative procedures and improved public financial management (PFM) are of fundamental importance for the functioning of the state.

PAR is an important part of political criteria for EU accession and has been continuously addressed in the enlargement process. It is also necessary in order to be able to implement the reforms needed for EU integration. The EU Enlargement Strategy 2014-2015 states that PAR is one of the three "fundamentals" of the strategy, together with rule of law and economic governance. The EU's 2018 Communication on EU Enlargement Policy reiterates that "[p]ublic administration reform is paramount to strengthening governance at all levels. This includes improving the quality and accountability of administration, increasing professionalism, de-politicisation and transparency, also in recruitment and dismissals, more transparent management of public finances, and better services for citizens. An appropriate balance between central, regional and local government also needs to be found. Governments should ensure stakeholders can actively participate in the reform and policy making process, for example by establishing inclusive structured dialogues on reform priorities with the involvement of an empowered civil society."

The Government of the Republic of Serbia, in January 2014, adopted the current Strategy for Public Administration Reform (PAR). The overall objective of the reform is the further improvement of the functioning of the public administration in accordance with the principles of the European Administrative Space, providing high quality services to citizens and businesses, and significantly contributing to economic stability and increasing the living standards of citizens. In March 2015, Government adopted the Action Plan (AP) for the implementation of the Strategy for the period 2015-2017. The second AP (2018-2020) has been developed during 2017 and is awaiting approval by the Serbian Government. The Serbian Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government (MPALSG) has the key role in the coordination, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the public administration reform process.

#### 1.1.2 Evaluation

The PAR Strategy includes an organizational structure for its coordination and monitoring. With regard to evaluation, the strategy states that "[f]ollowing the collection and processing of data from the regular reports on performed activities, and/or the continuing monitoring process, it is necessary to prepare occasional (but regular and systemic, well-grounded) assessments of the reform implementation, more specifically, the evaluation of this complex process."<sup>16</sup> For this purpose, internal evaluations "should be accompanied with the independent external evaluation". According to the AP (2018-2020), the first evaluation will start in mid-2018, as a combined ex-post evaluation of the implementation of the PAR AP (2015-2017), and a midterm evaluation of the PAR Strategy, based on which, if necessary, revisions of the PAR Strategy and AP can be prepared. "The draft evaluation report would thus be prepared by the end of 2018, and submitted to the Council for PAR Strategy for consideration. In order for the evaluation to be as objective as possible, external independent evaluators shall be engaged, through the complementary support of the Sector Budget Support for the PAR EU."<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Government of Serbia (2014). Public Administration Reform Strategy in the Republic of Serbia, p57.

<sup>17</sup> Government of Serbia (2018). Action Plan for implementation of the Public Administration Reform Strategy of the Republic of Serbia for the period 2018-2020. Draft, p76.



### 1.1.3 Project Support

The project “Support to Public Administration Reform under the PAR Sector Reform Contract” (hereinafter “Project”) is part of complementary support to the PAR Sector Budget Support Programme. The purpose of the Project is to strengthen capacity of the central government to manage the comprehensive public administration reform and coordination of implementation of the PAR Sector Reform Contract. As indicated in the PAR AP for the period 2018-2020, this evaluation will be carried out with support from this Project.

### 1.2 Objectives

The planned joint evaluation of the Public Administration Reform (PAR) Strategy and the APs will:

- Assess performance, achievements and lessons learned; demonstrate whether past, on-going or planned interventions in the area of PAR have taken on board the latest lessons learnt and policy approaches to PAR;
- Form the basis for deciding whether the current strategy and AP will be revised;
- Provide information on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact of the PAR Strategy and APs;
- Propose corrective activities taken if PAR Strategy implementation lags behind the planned schedule and expected results, or when planned activities are inconsistent with the set strategic goals.
- Contribute to better design, programming and implementation over the forthcoming period.
- Support the decision-making, both at a strategic (planning) level, and at the level of the design of the interventions;
- Contribute to accountability, transparency, visibility of PAR in Serbia, enabling dissemination of information to the general public, stakeholders and civil society; and
- Promote the practice of evaluation of policy documents in the Serbian administration and contribute to the development of evaluation guidelines and templates.

### 1.3 Description of the Intervention Logic

The overall objective of the Serbian PAR Strategy is to create a public administration based on the principles of the European Administrative Space - now described in the SIGMA<sup>18</sup> Principles of Public Administration - providing high quality services to citizens and businesses, thereby positively affecting the standard of living of citizens. The PAR Strategy and APs are organized around five specific objectives (SOs):

SO 1: Improving organisational and functional public administration sub-systems

SO 2: Establishing a coherent public civil service system which is merit-based and improved human resources management

SO 3: Improvement of public finances and procurement management

SO 4: Increasing legal certainty and improving the business environment and the quality of service provision

SO 5: Increasing citizens participation and accountability in performing the tasks of public administration

Each specific objective is meant to be achieved by a number of measures (see 0). Some of these measures have been added, replaced or re-phrased or otherwise adjusted to evolving circumstances, in the process of developing APs for strategy implementation. For each measure, APs list several activities, intended to achieve the measure. Efforts have been made in APs to monetize resources needed to implement the strategy, differentiating between government and donors resources.

<sup>18</sup> Support for Improvement in Governance and Management (SIGMA) is a joint initiative of the Commission and OECD, principally financed by the EU.



## 1.4 Evaluation and Monitoring Provisions

### 1.4.1 Monitoring Provisions

The Serbian PAR Strategy includes provisions for a monitoring mechanism. All bodies bearing a responsibility for implementing the PAR strategy must provide MPALSG regularly with data on progress. After being processed by the MPALSG, the data is discussed by the Inter-Ministerial Project Group (IMPG) and at the meeting of the Board of State Secretaries.<sup>19</sup> Once in a year, as a minimum, findings are additionally discussed at the meeting of the PAR Council. MPALSG published the most recent progress report covering the period 2015-2017 in March 2018. In the proposed AP 2018-2020, the Board of State Secretaries is no longer part of the coordination and monitoring structure. An online monitoring portal for the PAR strategy will be developed with support from the Project in the course of 2018.

OECD SIGMA has established a strategic framework for good public administration, entitled “Principles of Public Administration”, first published in 2014.<sup>20</sup> SIGMA monitors country performance against those principles. The baseline for Serbia was established in 2015. SIGMA issued a monitoring report for Serbia in November 2017 (0 summarizes key recommendation from the report). The PAR Special Group has been established under the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) as a main policy dialogue forum on PAR between the Commission and the Serbian government. The group monitors the general direction for PAR support around the six SIGMA principles.

IPA projects have been subject to the EU’s results-oriented monitoring system (ROM). ROM is a performance based monitoring system, which systematically conducts monitoring missions in all regions and sectors of EU Aid, using the same consistent methodology to rapidly assess selected projects. The system is based on regular onsite assessments by independent experts to ongoing projects and programmes.

In 2015, Serbia and the European Commission concluded a PAR sector reform contract (PAR SRC) to facilitate EU sector budget support to PAR. The SRC involves six objectives<sup>21</sup> based on the “EC Enlargement Strategy and Main Challenges 2014-2015”. The objectives in most part coincide with those identified in the Serbian PAR Strategy, and the SIGMA Principles. A specific coordination structure has been established for the guidance, management, coordination and monitoring of the actions included in the SRC. A complementary IPA project for Evaluation and Monitoring of the Sector reform contract for public administration reform and public finance management in Serbia (EuropeAid/138059/DH/SER/RS) is currently under implementation. There are regular review missions for the disbursement of fixed and variable tranches, once beneficiaries led by MPALSG have prepared a self-assessment report and materials defined as sources of verification in the policy matrix are available. The Serbian Government has established Operational Teams to share information, coordinate activities and monitor progress of SRC implementation.

The European Commission’s progress report for Serbia for 2018 recommends strengthening the capacity for monitoring and evaluation. According to the report, Government monitoring reports and ministries’ strategy monitoring reports should start to increasingly measure achievements against stated objectives rather than report on implemented activities. The progress report emphasizes that monitoring and reporting on the public financial management reform programme needs to be harmonised with monitoring and reporting on

<sup>19</sup> The IMPG for the forthcoming period will be established after adoption of the AP 2018-2020 by the Serbian Government.

<sup>20</sup> Strategic Framework of Public Administration Reform, Policy Development and Co-ordination, Public Service and Human Resource Management, Accountability, Service Delivery, Public Financial Management

<sup>21</sup> (1) Improved organisation and functions of the central government administration; (2) Improved public policy development and coordination; (3) Increased participation of citizens and civil society organisations in the policy-making process; (4) Improved merit-based human resources management system within the public service; (5) Reduced administrative burden to citizens and businesses through support to the reform of the inspection services; and (6) Improved management of public finances.



the PAR strategy. The main findings and recommendations of the report with regard to PAR are summarized in 0.

The Serbian Parliament adopted the Law on the Planning System (LPS) in April 2018. The Law introduces a system of accountability for results and creates a framework for measuring the efficiency of work in public administration. It is expected that a coherent monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system at the national level, including appropriate templates, will be established as a result of the adoption of the LPS.

#### 1.4.2 Previous Evaluations and other Reports

There has not been a prior evaluation of the implementation of the PAR strategy. A number of other evaluation and assessment reports exist that address PAR, or certain aspects of it:

- External Evaluation of the Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA II, 2017); [https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation-instrument-pre-accession-assistance-ipa-ii-draft-report\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation-instrument-pre-accession-assistance-ipa-ii-draft-report_en);
- Thematic Evaluation of Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance and European Neighbourhood Instrument support to Public Administration Reform (2018). Background Paper for Public Consultation; [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/tenders/public-consultations\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/tenders/public-consultations_en);
- IPA - interim evaluation and meta-evaluation of IPA assistance, Country Programme Interim Evaluation Serbia, August 2013; [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial\\_assistance/phare/evaluation/2013/ipa\\_interim\\_meta\\_evaluation\\_report.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/2013/ipa_interim_meta_evaluation_report.pdf);
- Evaluation of effectiveness and efficiency of development assistance to the Republic of Serbia per Sector, Final Report, SIDA 2013; <http://www.evropa.gov.rs/Documents/Home/DACU/12/193/Final%20Evaluation%20Report.pdf>;
- Vági, P. and K. Kasemets (2017), "Functioning of the Centres of Government in the Western Balkans", SIGMA Papers, No. 53, OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/2bad1e9c-en>
- SIGMA Monitoring Report for Serbia (2017); <http://sigmaweb.org/publications/Monitoring-Report-2017-Serbia.pdf>
- SIGMA (2016). Overview of the coordination structure for the Public Administration Reform Strategy. December 2016;
- Progress reports on the Implementation of the PAR Strategy published by the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government (MPALSG); <http://www.mduls.gov.rs/english/reforma-javne-uprave.php>;
- Reports on Functional Reviews of Serbian Ministries under the World Bank Modernization And Optimization of Public Administration Program; <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/603651467999088461/Serbia-Modernization-and-optimization-of-public-administration-program-technical-assessment>;
- Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) reports; <https://pefa.org/assessments/serbia-2015>;
- Indicative Strategy Paper for Serbia (2014-2020); [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/key\\_documents/2014/20140919-csp-serbia.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/key_documents/2014/20140919-csp-serbia.pdf);
- 2015 Assessment of UNDP Contributions Towards Good Governance in Serbia (2011-2015); <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/documents/download/8591>;
- Relevant EU Monitoring (ROM) Reports;
- Annual EU Progress Reports for Serbia; <http://www.mei.gov.rs/eng/documents/eu-documents/annual-progress-reports-of-the-european-commission-for-serbia>;
- Gender Equality in Public Administration in Western Balkans. Beneficiary Report: Serbia (forthcoming).

A non-exhaustive list of PAR related programmes and projects is included in an 0.

## 2. SPECIFICATIONS OF THE ASSIGNMENT



## 2.1 Stakeholders

During the inception and implementation phases, the contracted evaluators will consult the main national stakeholders via email or in personal meetings:

National stakeholders for this evaluation (non-exhaustive list):

- Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government (MPALSG)
- Office for IT and E-Government
- Public Policy Secretariat
- General Secretariat of the Government
- Ministry of Finance
- Human Resource Management Service (SUK)
- National Academy for Public Administration (NAPA)
- Ministry of European Integration
- Senior officials within the line Ministries and Agencies
- Office for Cooperation with Civil Society
- State Audit Institution
- Local Governments
- Officials within the line Ministries and State Agencies responsible for implementing reforms
- Representatives of the Civil Society Organisations, business associations, academic institutions, and final beneficiaries

International stakeholders for this evaluation (non-exhaustive list):

- European Union Delegation
- OECD SIGMA
- World Bank
- Regional School of Public Administration (ReSPA)
- GIZ
- SDC
- Sida
- UK
- Other donors playing a role in the area of PAR in Serbia

## 2.2 Requested Services, Evaluation Questions, Methodology and Quality Control

### 2.2.1 Requested Services

- Assess Performance (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability);
- Provide conclusions and recommendations on how to further improve PAR in Serbia.

### 2.2.2 Evaluation Questions

The evaluation shall examine the PAR strategy against five criteria, i.e. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Evaluation issues and questions will be refined at the inception stage, after a thorough review of the intervention logic. The following tentative evaluation questions have been identified:

#### 1. Relevance:

- To what extent do the objectives, defined in the PAR strategy, correspond to existing priority needs and capacities in Serbia? To what extent has the strategy proved relevant to those needs? To what extent are the objectives of the PAR strategy still valid?





- How well have stakeholders been involved in the development of the strategy, and action plans, respectively?

## 2. Effectiveness:

- Which (positive and negative) changes have occurred? When the intervention works at its best, what does it produce? How do changes differ for each part of the strategy?
- To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved? How far is the strategy from completion?
- In areas where effectiveness has been high, which actions by stakeholders have contributed most to high effectiveness (driving forces/success factors)? In areas where effectiveness has been low, which actions by stakeholders explain the lack of progress (restraining forces)
- Were the cross-cutting issues (especially gender and climate change) sufficiently included in the strategy and its implementation?

## 3. Efficiency:

- How well was the implementation of the PAR strategy managed? How adequate was the institutional and organizational structure for the coordination, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the implementation process of the strategy and action plan? Have the capacities to coordinate and monitor implementation of the PAR Strategy been adequate?
- Was the strategy implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? Were activities cost-efficient? To what extent are the costs proportionate to the benefits achieved? Were objectives achieved on time?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? Which obstacles have been encountered in the course of implementing the strategy and AP, and how were they overcome?

## 4. Impact:

What has happened as a result of strategy implementation? What real difference has the strategy made to the beneficiaries? How many people have been affected in which ways (positives and negatives)?

## 5. Sustainability:

To what extent have stakeholder institutions designed and built into their plans and systems the necessary feedback and monitoring mechanisms that will ensure self-renewal (adaptation) in order to achieve objectives?

### 2.2.3 Methodology

The methodology should be based on DG NEAR's Evaluation guide.<sup>22</sup> The evaluators will select the methods used to gather and analyse information and for making the assessment, but must take account of the following:

- The evaluation must be based on recognised evaluation techniques and triangulation methods;
- In addressing the evaluation questions, quantitative indicators should be sought and used as far as possible.
- The evaluators must support findings and recommendations by explaining the degree to which these are based on opinion, analysis and objectively verifiable evidence. Where opinion is the main source, the degree of consensus and the steps taken to test the opinion should be provided.

<sup>22</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial\\_assistance/phare/evaluation/2016/20160831-dg-near-guidelines-on-linking-planning-progrming-vol-1-v-0.4.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/2016/20160831-dg-near-guidelines-on-linking-planning-progrming-vol-1-v-0.4.pdf)



- The final evaluation questions and methodology (including judgement criteria and indicators) for this assignment will be completed and agreed upon during the inception phase. Advantages, limitations and risks involved in using the proposed tools and techniques should be explained.
- There should be a clear link between the evaluation questions addressed and the corresponding methodology proposed. The evaluation questions can be further elaborated, e.g. by providing operational sub-questions under each question, or merged where justified, but the overall number of questions must remain manageable (see DG NEAR's Evaluation guide for guidance on the number of evaluation questions and their refinement).

#### 2.2.4 Phases

This evaluation will be divided into four phases:

##### 1) Inception Phase

A stakeholder map will be established, explaining the mutual expectations stakeholders have toward one another. Comments will be sought from these stakeholders before the finalisation of the Inception Report. The following tasks will be carried out in the inception phase.

- Collection and analysis of relevant documentation; desk review of the documents which will be subject to evaluation;
- Conduct an in-depth stakeholder analysis, clearly describing expectations stakeholders have toward each other;
- Completion of the assessment approach and methodology: scope, evaluation questions, judgement criteria and indicators;
- Drafting and submitting of the inception report.

##### 2) Implementation Phase (Desk Work and Field Work)

During the implementation phase, the evaluators shall:

- Complete the collection of relevant documentation;
- Update the level of information by means of interviews, questionnaires or any other relevant tools with relevant actors;
- Analyse the documentation against the evaluation questions;
- Elaborate preliminary findings, conclusions, according to the scope and the requirements of the ToR and present them in a discussion paper. This is a working document and does not require formal approval. It serves as a basis for discussions with the different stakeholders and to double check some facts and understanding at this early stage.

During the implementation phase, the evaluators will meet with the national and international stakeholders. SIGMA and ReSPA may be visited during the implementation phase. Phone interviews, online questionnaires and other tools may complement personal interviews and analysis of information, e.g. confidential surveys and structured interviews with relevant local and international stakeholders to collect data on PAR strategy implementation.

The implementation phase will also include an in-depth analysis of relevant information. A concise Interim Report should be drafted towards the end of the implementation phase providing an overview of the status of the evaluation, highlighting any problems encountered and solutions found, also providing a proposal for the structure of the final report and the executive summary.

A meeting between the IMPG and the evaluators may take place once the desk and field work have been completed. A stakeholder workshop will be held towards the end of the implementation phase, before the drafting of the Final Report.

##### 3) Synthesis and Reporting Phase



This phase is mainly devoted to the preparation of the evaluation report based on the work carried out during the previous phases.

Recommendations should address weaknesses identified and be clear, well structured, operational and realistic in the sense of providing clear, feasible and relevant input for decision making and should clearly indicate the measures to be undertaken. Presentation of good practices and success stories and the use of different modalities and tools to enhance PAR objectives should be highlighted.

Recommendations for action will be addressed to MPALSG. However, where appropriate, the evaluators should specify the role of any actor other than MPALSG in implementing the recommendations. The draft final report will be sent to MPALSG and to other main stakeholders consulted during the evaluation.

#### 4) Dissemination Phase

The evaluators will organize a dissemination seminar once the evaluation has been completed for presenting main findings, conclusions and recommendations.

#### 2.2.5 Risks and Assumptions

Risks and assumptions cannot be listed exhaustively. It is assumed that stakeholders accept the evaluation as an integral part of the PAR strategy implementation and are committed to provide the necessary information, and will subsequently act on recommendations and findings.

The following assumptions are made:

- Monitoring data is available on time and provide sufficient and adequate information;
- National authorities and donors grant access to requested documentation and information relevant to the evaluation;
- Stakeholders are regularly informed on objectives and methods of this evaluation, in order to ensure their full cooperation.

In the event that one or several of the above assumptions prove to be untrue, the evaluators should immediately inform the Project Team Leader.

#### 2.2.6 Roles of the Project and Quality Control

The Project will act as evaluation manager of the evaluation. In this role, the Project will be responsible for the following tasks:

- Support identification and access to data (organise briefings and de-briefings, support evaluators in identifying datasets and accessing, and familiarising with data, support them with completing data collection, and provide contacts with relevant stakeholders);
- Monitor the work of the evaluators (provide first assessments of the quality of the reports submitted by the evaluators, ensuring that the Contractor's independence is not compromised; ensure that evaluators explain all points in a clear and simple way and that, whenever possible, they accept suggestions from stakeholders, and ask evaluators for clarifications on specific points);
- Discuss revisions of evaluation methodology, evaluation questions, judgment criteria, and other elements of the evaluation; discuss reports and organise presentations, identify specific audiences that should receive feedback and organise formal or informal meetings to discuss particular issues;
- Distribute reports, support stakeholders in formulating responses, consult with stakeholders on follow-up action, and integrate findings into the further Project coordination and planning;
- Ensure quality control during the inception, implementation and reporting phases of the evaluation. The quality control shall ensure that the draft reports comply with the above requirements and meet adequate quality standards before sending them to stakeholders for comments. The quality control shall ensure consistency and coherence between findings, conclusions and recommendations. It shall also ensure that findings reported are duly substantiated and that conclusions are supported by the relevant judgement criteria.



MPALSG will perform a quality assessment of the final evaluation report. The quality assessment judges the evaluation report and the overall evaluation process. It is the final confirmation of the evaluators' work and includes a judgement on whether key aspects of the work conducted meet the required standards and provides any related comments.

### 2.2.7 Capacity Building

Capacity deficits in the Serbian administration have been pointed out in EU Progress Reports and SIGMA assessment reports over the years. Since 2015, existing capacity has come under stress from an extensive reduction of positions in many parts of the administration (rightsizing). Capacity building of the Serbian administration is thus widely recognized as a critically important agenda. This agenda includes, in particular, monitoring and evaluation functions. The European Commission's progress report for Serbia for 2018 therefore emphasized strengthening the capacity for monitoring and evaluation. The Project will actively promote such capacity building by strengthening resources, processes and structures for good management of the policy cycle, including monitoring and evaluation.

The evaluation of the PAR strategy is the first major evaluation commissioned by MPALSG. The TOR at hand respond to the currently fragile capacity by ensuring that MPALSG and other stakeholders in the PAR are not overstretched in a way that would hinder organizational learning rather than expedite it. For this purpose, the Project takes on the responsibilities that are typically those of an evaluation manager. In this context, the Project, in close consultation with the European Union Delegation in Serbia and the MPALSG will, on a needs basis, organize purpose driven meetings of stakeholders that could fulfill the roles typically taken on by reference groups in independent external evaluations.<sup>23</sup>

It remains important for the evaluators, however, to actively seek and use opportunities for developing capacities for monitoring and evaluation throughout their assignments. These opportunities include increasing the awareness of stakeholders of the importance of evaluation and monitoring for a functioning policy management, and stimulating learning on specific aspects of evaluation and monitoring among all participants whenever possible. The evaluators will also maximise the use of the dissemination of findings, conclusions and recommendations from the evaluation to reinforce the development of a joint understanding of monitoring and evaluation among and between the branches of government, civil society and the private sector.

## 2.3 Required Outputs

### 2.3.1 General Reporting Requirements

The outputs of this evaluation are represented by an Inception Report, Interim Report, and a Final Report. The reports shall be presented in the English language. The Project will have the final evaluation report translated into Serbian.

All draft reports will be submitted to the Project Team Leader. All electronic versions have to be submitted in a format compatible with MS Office software. The Project reserves the right to request the necessary additional revisions of the reports in order to reach an appropriate outcome and quality control requirements.

### 2.3.2 Inception Report

The Inception report will detail the final methodology, evaluation questions and judgement criteria, sources of information, timetable of the assignment and documents required and a tentative list of contacts to be met. The report must as a minimum provide:

- A summary of the objectives, scope and outputs of the evaluation;

---

<sup>23</sup> The purpose and tasks of Inter-Service Steering Group/Reference groups are detailed on page 114 of the DG NEAR Evaluation Guidelines (July 2016)



- The final evaluation questions, methodological approach, including the judgement criteria to be used and sources of information, samples of the questionnaires, etc.;
- A work plan for the implementation, synthesis and dissemination phases.

The inception report shall not exceed 20 pages, annexes excluded.

### 2.3.3 Interim Report

The Interim report is to be produced towards the end of the implementation phase, and should as a minimum provide:

- An overview of the status of the evaluation;
- An assessment of the data, whether it meets expectations and will provide a sound basis for responding to the evaluation questions;
- A description of problems encountered, and solutions found;
- A conclusion whether any changes are required to the work plan, or any other solutions should be sought in order to ensure that the required results of the evaluation are achieved;
- A proposal for the final structure of the Final Report, for the document to be used for the public consultation as well as a structure of the Executive Summary.

The interim report shall not exceed 20 pages, annexes excluded.

### 2.2.4 Final Report

The Final Report should cover the points below:

- Assessment of the performance of the PAR Strategy and Action Plan;
- Assessment of the intervention logic of the PAR Strategy and Action Plan;
- Lessons learned;
- Recommendations.

The Final Report shall include: an overview, an executive summary, main section, conclusions and recommendations and annexes. The final report should specifically answer each of the evaluation questions and address the defined scope.

The main part of the report, containing the analysis, the conclusions and the recommendations should not be more than 50 pages. The annexes must collate the technical details of the evaluation, and must include questionnaire templates, interview guides, any additional tables or graphics, and references and sources.

In addition, the evaluators should provide an abstract of no more than 200 words and, as a separate document, an executive summary of maximum 6 pages. The purpose of the abstract is to act as a reference tool helping the reader to quickly ascertain the evaluation's subject. An executive summary is an overview, which shall provide information on the (i) purpose of the assignment, (ii) methodology / procedure / approach, (iii) results / findings and (iv) conclusion and recommendations.



### 3. Expert Profiles

#### 3.1 Profile and Expertise Required

A senior non-key expert (SNKE) will act as Evaluation Team Leader. He/she will meet the following minimum requirements:

Category	Senior NKE : Evaluation Team Leader
Qualifications and skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least a Master degree Academic level (preferably in political sciences, public administration, economics or similar) or equivalent professional experience of 10 years;</li> <li>Excellent drafting skills in English and ability to express him/herself clearly and concisely;</li> <li>Working knowledge of Serbian would be a distinct advantage;</li> </ul>
General professional experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least five years of professional experience, preferably seven in evaluation and monitoring of programmes or policies; proven experience as team leader or senior evaluator for at least three evaluations of strategies/programmes/instruments/policies;</li> </ul>
Specific professional experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least one years' of work experience in the field of public administration reform;</li> </ul>

One junior non-key expert (JNKE) will support the Evaluation Team Leader in conducting the evaluation. He/she will meet the following minimum requirements:

Category	Junior NKE : Evaluator
Qualifications and skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least a Master degree Academic level (preferably in political sciences, public administration, economics) or equivalent professional experience of 6 years;</li> <li>Excellent drafting skills in English and ability to express him/herself clearly and concisely;</li> <li>Working knowledge of Serbian would be a distinct advantage;</li> </ul>
General professional experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least two years of professional experience in implementation, evaluation or monitoring of programmes/instruments or projects;</li> </ul>
Specific professional experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least two years of experience in research/data analysis.</li> </ul>

One SNKE will act as quality controller for the project and perform the tasks described in section 2.2.6. He/she will meet the following minimum requirements:

Category	Senior NKE : Quality Controller
Qualifications and skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least a Master degree Academic level (preferably in political sciences, public administration, economics or similar) or equivalent professional experience of 10 years;</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent drafting skills in English and ability to express him/herself clearly and concisely;</li> </ul>
General professional experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least five years, preferably seven years of relevant professional experience in evaluation and monitoring of programmes or policies;</li> </ul>
Specific professional experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience as quality controller in at least two evaluations or studies;</li> <li>Team Leader of at least one evaluation of a programme/project or policy.</li> </ul>

### 3.2 Indicative Allocation of Working Days

The table below reflects an indicative allocation of working days per evaluation phase.

Activities	Outputs	SNKE Team Leader	JNKE Evaluation Specialist	SNKE Quality Controller
Inception phase: produce evaluation design (reconstruction of the intervention logic and definition of evaluation questions and related judgement criteria and indicators, with identification of data collection tools and sources). Map relevant spending and non-spending interventions; draft methodological proposal for the following phases.	Inception Report	5	5	2
Implementation phase: collect and analyse data and come up with preliminary answers to the evaluation questions and hypotheses that can guide the subsequent field work. Carry out field activities help in validating/rejecting preliminary answers to the evaluation questions and bring additional information and direct evidence.	Interim Report, Presentation at Workshop	30	30	1
Synthesis and Reporting Phase: analyse the data collected during the desk and field phase, to finalise the answers to the evaluation questions, and prepare the synthesis report that includes the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.	Draft Final Report	10	10	2
Dissemination Phase: disseminate final report and organize workshop for presentation main findings, conclusions and recommendations.	Evaluation Report Disseminated, Presentation at Workshop	5	5	0
Total <sup>24</sup>		50	50	5

### 3.3 Working language

<sup>24</sup> As detailed in footnote 12 of this report, the number of working days was increased on total by 20 days for the Evaluation Team Leader and 30 days for the Evaluation Specialist.





The main working language of the assignment is English. At least one of the experts must have a working knowledge of Serbian.

### 3.4 Conflict of interest

The team members must be independent from the work to be evaluated. Should a conflict of interest be identified in the course of the evaluation, it should be immediately reported to the Evaluation manager for further analysis and appropriate measures.

### 3.5 Schedule and Place of Assignment

The indicative periods for carrying out the assignment are provided in the timetable below. The place of assignment will be Belgrade, Serbia.

Phase	Month
Kick-off Meeting	July 2018
<b>Inception Phase</b> Draft Inception report Final Inception Report	July 2018 August 2018
<b>Implementation Phase</b> Discussion Paper & stakeholder workshop Draft Interim Report Final Interim Report	September 2018 September 2018 October 2018
<b>Synthesis and Reporting Phase</b> Draft Final Report with all annexes Final report including required translations	November 2018 November 2018
<b>Dissemination Phase</b> Dissemination Seminar Quality Assessment on the Final Report	December 2018 December 2018





## **ANNEX I: SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE SERBIAN PAR STRATEGY AND MEASURES TO ACHIEVE THEM**

### **SO 1: Improving organisational and functional public administration sub-systems**

- Organizational and Functional Restructuring of Authorities, Organizations and other Bodies Discharging Public Administration Operations
- Enhancement of Decentralization and De-Concentration of PA Activities
- Improvement of Strategic Planning System And Coordination of Public Policies
- Development of E-Government

### **SO 2: Establishing a coherent public civil service system which is merit-based and improved human resources management**

- Introduction of Aligned System of Employment and Salaries of PA Civil Servants and Employees
- Development and Enhancement of HRM System in Public Administration

### **SO 3:Improvement of public finances and procurement management**

- Improvement of Budget Planning and Preparation Process
- Enhancement of Management and Control Of Revenue and Internal Audit
- Enhancement of Public Procurement System

### **SO 4: Increasing legal certainty and improving the business environment and the quality of service provision**

- Enhancement of Regulatory Processes
- Enhancement of Administrative Procedures
- Inspection Control Reform

### **SO 5: Increasing citizens participation and accountability in performing the tasks of public administration**

- Improvement of Conditions for Participation of Interested Members of the Public in the work of the Public Administration
- Strengthening of Ethical Standards of Employees in Public Administration and Surpressing Corruption

**ANNEX II: BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

There follows a non-exhaustive list of key background documents for carrying out the assignments under these TOR:

Banciu, Onorica (2015). A Guide for Monitoring and Evaluation of Public Policies (Draft).

European Commission (2016). DG NEAR Guidelines on linking planning/programming, monitoring and evaluation. [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhoodenlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial\\_assistance/phare/evaluation/2016/20160831-dg-near-guidelines-on-linking-planning-progrming-vol-1-v-0.4.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhoodenlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/phare/evaluation/2016/20160831-dg-near-guidelines-on-linking-planning-progrming-vol-1-v-0.4.pdf).

European Commission (2017). Better Regulation Guidelines (2017). [https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/law-making-process/planning-and-proposing-law/better-regulation-why-and-how/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/law-making-process/planning-and-proposing-law/better-regulation-why-and-how/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox_en).

European Commission (2018). Progress Report for Serbia. <https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/20180417-serbia-report.pdf>.

European Union (2014). Map of Policy Cycle at Central Government Level in Serbia. Reforming Policy Coordination and the Centre of Government. Third Phase (EuropeAid 11SER01/03/21).

European Union (2016). Enlargement Strategy.

European Union (2018). Support to Public Administration Reform under the Sector Reform Contract (2018). Inception Report.

Government of Serbia (2014). Public Administration Reform Strategy in the Republic of Serbia. <http://www.mduls.gov.rs/doc/PAR%20Strategy.doc>

Government of Serbia (2014). Regulation on Internal Organisation and Job Classification in the MPALSG. July 2014.

Government of Serbia (2016). Regulatory Reform Strategy (2016-2020) and Action Plan (2016-2017)

Government of Serbia. E-Government Strategy.

Government of Serbia (2015). Action Plan for the Implementation of Public Administration Reform Strategy in the Republic of Serbia 2015–2017. [http://www.mduls.gov.rs/doc/AP\\_PAReng.doc](http://www.mduls.gov.rs/doc/AP_PAReng.doc)

Government of Serbia (2018). Action Plan for implementation of the Public Administration Reform Strategy of the Republic of Serbia for the period 2018-2020.<sup>25</sup>

MPALSG (2018). Evaluation Roadmap for Mid-term Evaluation of Serbian Public Administration Reform (PAR) Strategy and ex-post evaluation of the PAR Action Plan (AP) 2015-2017.

MPALSG (2018). Public Administration Reform 2015-2017. Progress Report. [http://www.mduls.gov.rs/doc/PAR%20Report\\_eng\\_mar2018.pdf](http://www.mduls.gov.rs/doc/PAR%20Report_eng_mar2018.pdf)

MPALSG (2018). Public Administration Reform 2015-2017. Progress Report. Annexes. [http://www.mduls.gov.rs/doc/eng%20Tabelarni%20deo%20prilog%202015\\_2017.pdf](http://www.mduls.gov.rs/doc/eng%20Tabelarni%20deo%20prilog%202015_2017.pdf)

MPALSG (2016). Action Plan on Implementation of the OGP Initiative in the Republic of Serbia in 2016 and 2017.

<http://www.mduls.gov.rs/doc/Action%20Plan%20on%20Implementation%20of%20the%20OGP%20Initiative%20in%20the%20Republic%20of%20Serbia%20in%202016%20and%202017.docx>

Public Policy Secretariat (2017: Training Needs Assessment for Public Policy Secretariat (May 2017).

Regulatory Reform Strategy and Action Plan.

---

<sup>25</sup> Awaiting approval by Government at the time of drafting these TOR.



European Union

## Lessons learned from the PARS evaluation



Republic of Serbia

Republic of Serbia (2016). Law on General Administrative Procedure.

Republic of Serbia (2017). Law on Civil Servants.

Republic of Serbia (2018). Law on e-Government.

Republic of Serbia (2018). Law on the Planning System.

Republic of Serbia. Law on State Administration (draft).

ReSPA (2015). E-Government Analysis: From E- to Open Government.

<https://respaweb.eu/download/doc/eGov+-+From+E-Government+to+Open+Government.pdf/d3ab1cd43fa4cd3071be9cea7e4b0cd3.pdf>

SIGMA (2015): The Principles of Public Administration Reform. Baseline Measurement Report for Serbia. April 2015. <http://sigmaweb.org/publications/Baseline-Measurement-2015-Serbia.pdf>

SIGMA (2017): The Principles of Public Administration Reform. Monitoring Report for Serbia. 2017 edition. [http://www.sigmaweb.org/publications/Principles-of-Public-Administration\\_Edition-2017\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.sigmaweb.org/publications/Principles-of-Public-Administration_Edition-2017_ENG.pdf).

SIGMA (2018). Toolkit for preparation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation of PAR and sector strategies. ANNEX 5 Monitoring, reporting and evaluation tools. Monitoring responsibilities; annual and semi-annual report structures and examples. May 2018.



### **ANNEX III: DONOR SUPPORT IN THE AREA OF PAR**

IPA 2010 Project support to Public Administration Reform - 1.7 M EUR

The ongoing IPA 2014 Project Serbia rightsizing and restructuring of public administration - 2.5 M EUR

IPA 2014 project Support to the further development of electronic administration - 2 M EUR

IPA 2011 Project Reforming Policy Coordination and the Centre of Government --1.86 M EUR

IPA 2012 Project Human Resource Management in Local Self-Government - 1.8 MEUR

IPA 2014 Support to the Implementation of the Law on General Administrative Procedure - 0.3 M EUR

IPA 2015 Evaluation and monitoring of the Sector reform contract for Public administration reform and public finance management - 1.0 M EUR

IPA 2015 Support to the Ministry of Finance under the PAR Sector Reform Contract - 3 M EUR

IPA 2015 Support to Public Administration Reform under the PAR Sector Reform Contract - 3.5 M

IPA 2015 Support to Public Administration Reform visibility and communication under the PAR Sector Reform Contract -2.5 M EUR

World Bank - Modernization and Optimization of Public administration - 69 M EUR

Sweden - Project Support to Public Administration Reform in the Republic of Serbia - 2.1 M EUR

Norway - Management of changes - 0.1 M EUR.

GIZ - Support to PAR - 2.5 M EUR

UNDP/SIPU - Action Plan for Implementation of the Government Programme (APIGP) for 2015

UK Good Governance Fund (GGF) - Towards the Central National Training Institution - Phase 1; "Improving the E-Government in Serbia; "Citizen-Oriented Administration"



#### **ANNEX IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON PAR FROM THE EU PROGRESS REPORT ON SERBIA FOR 2018**

The European Commission published its progress report for Serbia for 2018 on 17.4.2018. There follow highlights from the report relevant to public administration reforms:

- Serbia is moderately prepared in the area of public administration reform. Some progress was achieved in the area of service delivery and with the adoption of several new laws. Serbia needs to implement its reform targets, professionalise and depoliticise the administration, especially regarding senior management positions, and ensure systematic coordination and monitoring of the public financial management reform programme 2016-20. Serbia's ability to attract and retain qualified staff in the administration dealing with EU issues will be crucial.
- Major structural reforms of the public administration, the tax authority, and state-owned enterprises remain incomplete.
- However, the Commission recommendations from 2016 have not been fully addressed. In particular, political influence on senior managerial appointments remains an issue of concern, with an estimated 60 % of senior managers in acting positions, many for an extended period of time. Also, the implementation of the public administration reform action plan has experienced delays.
- In the coming year, Serbia should in particular: → align the National plan for the adoption of the acquis (NPAA) with the government annual work programme, medium-term budget plan, provide costing for actions, and update it with a view to setting a legislative programme that promotes better regulation based on impact assessments and timely inter-institutional and public consultations; → amend the civil service law through an inclusive and evidence-based process to guarantee the neutrality and continuity of the public administration and ensure merit-based human resources management; → monitor and report on the implementation of the public financial management reform programme in line with the reporting established for the PAR strategy.
- While the institutions are in place to ensure a central government policy-making system, policy coordination faces challenges in practice due to a focus on formal and procedural issues rather than on substance. Quality of strategic planning continues to be weak. There are no established rules for the development of sector strategies, which are often not costed and which are not sufficiently linked to the medium-term fiscal planning.
- The public administration needs to further strengthen its capacity for inclusive and evidence-based policy and legislative development, including on the acquis. Public consultations on proposals are often conducted formalistically and too late in the process, not enabling all interested parties to provide timely and qualitative input. Line ministries have yet to develop internal rules on policy development and legal drafting, and improve acquis transposition costing. With regard to inter-ministerial consultations, high-level civil servants remain uninvolved in the process, and possible conflicts between services have to be resolved at the ministerial level. Regulatory impact assessments vary in quality and the Public Policy Secretariat does not have a mandate to return them for revision. Regulatory impact assessments are not submitted to the parliament together with legislative proposals. There are discrepancies between the financial impact assessments, which the Ministry of Finance coordinates, and financial information in the regulatory impact assessments, so better coordination is needed between the Ministry of Finance and the Public Policy Secretariat.
- Public scrutiny of government work is affected by the fact that government agendas are not systematically available to the public, and that many reports, such as the implementation reports of the annual government work plans or reports on the implementation of the NPAA, have not been regularly published. The government monitoring reports and ministries' strategy monitoring reports should start to increasingly measure achievements against stated objectives rather than report on implemented activities.
- A monitoring framework has been set up, but its efficiency and link with the PAR strategy monitoring need to be improved.



- Implementation reports, which are regularly prepared and published, need to become a useful management tool. Implementation has suffered from limited human and financial resources, aggravated by fiscal consolidation measures. The planned revision of the reform programme in 2018 needs to be based on more realistic planning and costing, better sequencing, clearer emphasis on key reforms, and improved indicators.
- Merit-based recruitment is still undermined by excessive discretion allowed to the political level in the choice of final candidates. Also, there are no clear criteria for organisation of the selection tests and composition of selection committees. Exemptions from the normal recruitment procedures are allowed for temporary staff, that continues to make up around 10 % of the civil service. The legal separation of political and public service positions is still not clearly enforced.
- 60 % of senior civil servants are not appointed in line with the legal provisions, but they serve in 'acting' positions, many for a number of years. High turnover among senior civil servants and the consequent loss of institutional memory continue to be of particular concern.
- The weaknesses in the legal framework create the risk of abusive use of dismissals at both expert and management level, as dismissal is allowed after one negative appraisal followed by a confirmation of such appraisal through an additional evaluation after 30 days.
- The performance appraisal system, with inflated appraisal grades, remains ineffective. The Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government is responsible for central coordination of human resources management, but it lacks capacity to coordinate and harmonise the work of human resources units. The human resources management information system still does not interact with other national databases such as the treasury payroll registry, and it is not regularly updated.
- Implementation of the strategy for professional development of local government employees continued with accreditation of training programmes and the introduction of accreditation for the training providers.
- "Rightsizing" of the state administration remains a key government priority. Since 2015 the number of public employees has been reduced by more than 29 175.
- The political commitment to improve managerial accountability and more systematic delegation of responsibilities within institutions has still not delivered results. Institutions continue to have a bureaucratic and process-oriented approach to planning, budgeting and reporting of their activities. There has been no progress towards results-based management. (see chapter 32 — Financial control)
- Administrative silence, whereby public authorities fail to properly act on the citizens' information requests, continues to be a major issue.
- The legal framework for simplification of administrative procedures is in place with the law on general administrative procedures. However, the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government lacks the resources for efficient oversight of its implementation.
- Serbia is implementing its umbrella public administration reform strategy, which is further supported by additional strategic planning documents in public finance, anti-corruption, open government, e-government, professional development of civil servants and regulatory reform and public policy management. A new action plan for 2018-2020 is being finalised, with increased focus on the key reform actions. While the lead ministry has improved the monitoring and reporting system for the strategy, there have been serious delays in implementation, due to a lack of resources and weak planning and managerial capacity. Monitoring and reporting on the public financial management reform programme needs to be harmonised with monitoring and reporting on the PAR strategy.
- Financing relies heavily on external donor funding. The government needs to allocate sufficient resources in the annual budget and the medium-term expenditure framework.

**ANNEX V: OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SIGMA 2017 MONITORING REPORT**

<b>Pillar</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Strategic Framework of Public Administration Reform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the implementation rate of activities &amp; fulfilment of objectives from PAR Strategies</li> <li>• Enhance reform-orientation, realistic costing and development of outcome-level measurement when plans are revised</li> <li>• Better utilisation (and streamlining) of the management and co-ordination structures</li> </ul>
Policy Development and Co-ordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance the quality of central planning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Closer co-operation within the Centre of Government (CoG) when central plans are developed</li> <li>◦ Embed outcome-based objective-setting</li> <li>◦ Establish a unified system for strategy development and monitoring</li> <li>◦ Costing of the National Programme for Accession to the Acquis (NPAA)</li> <li>◦ Development and publication of result-based monitoring reports</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ensure better quality control over policy proposals through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Strong gatekeeping mandate (for formalities as well as for the content and quality of the analysis)</li> <li>◦ More transparency over the government decision-making (e.g. publication of all decisions)</li> <li>◦ Widen the use of systematic approach to public consultation</li> <li>◦ Drastic reduction of the use of extraordinary procedures for adoption of laws</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Public Service and Human Resource Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roles of MPALSG and Human Resources Management Service (HRMS) clearly defined</li> <li>• HRMIS to be updated</li> <li>• MOI —civil service positions subject of CSL</li> <li>• Recruitment process less complicated</li> <li>• Temporary positions based on open competition</li> <li>• Merit based recruitment to be ensured</li> <li>• Acting heads—to review implementation</li> <li>• Pay system reform needed</li> <li>• ACA board members - merit based criteria</li> </ul>
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in the government organisation need ex ante analysis</li> <li>• Access to info — Commissioner to conduct inspections and request sanctions</li> <li>• Ombudsman — to manage staff independently</li> <li>• MoJ — an action plan to reduce backlogs on administrative courts</li> <li>• Law on legal aid needed plus funding</li> <li>• Liability of the state cases—to be monitored</li> </ul>
Service Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harmonize Legislation to with LGAP</li> <li>• Common road map for interoperability based on Stop to Bureaucracy Action Plan</li> <li>• MPALSG and PM Delivery Unit should cooperate to better monitor performance in service delivery</li> <li>• Electronic signature to be made more convenient for citizens with more digital services</li> </ul>
Public Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Base Fiscal Strategy on budget beneficiaries' actual initiatives and use as a bridge between their strategic and operational plans and the</li> </ul>





Management	<p>Government's priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Parliament to increase analytical capacity of the Parliamentary Committee on Finance, Budget and Control</li> <li>• The MoF to publish monthly profile of planned expenditure and revenue in January and compare actual outcomes versus the profile, explaining significant differences at budget beneficiary level</li> <li>• Parliament to discharge the Annual Financial Statement containing analysis of significant variations in expenditure at the budget beneficiary level</li> <li>• MoF to strengthen the CHU legislative framework to strengthen its powers to guide FMC and IA development</li> <li>• Government to make resources available to responsible entities to carry out the action plan of a new PIFC Strategy 2017-2020 in a timely manner</li> <li>• CHU to implement programmes for quality assurance in compliance with the IIA Standards and implement continuous professional development</li> <li>• SAI to work with Parliament to ensure that issues raised in SAI reports can be examined more effectively by the Parliament.</li> </ul>
Public Procurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalise the new laws on public procurement and on concessions; close the legislative gaps and ensure proper public consultation</li> <li>• Strengthen the PPO's institutional capacity in order that it can focus on its monitoring and advisory functions</li> <li>• Shift focus from procedural details to principles and outcomes</li> <li>• Help contracting authorities take on their responsibilities; raise the skills of their staff</li> <li>• Introduce a full e-procurement system</li> </ul>

**ANNEX IV: COMPOSITION OF EVALUATION REFERENCE GROUP (ERG)**

Natalija Pavlović Šiniković	MPALSG
Ljiljana Uzelac	MPALSG
Danka Bogetić	EUD
Bojana Tošić	PPS
Sanja Mesanović	PPS
Ivana Vukasinović	PPS
Tamara Stojcević	GS
Verica Ignjatović	MOF
Mladen Lazić	MOF
Marija Oros Janković	MEI
Nevena Karanović	MEI
Marija Kujačić	ITE
Slađana Andrejić	ITE
Nikola Tarbuk	SCTM
Milena Radomirović	SCTM
Dragana Janković	HRMS
Danilo Rončević	HRMS
Dražan Maravić	NAPA
Snezana Antonijević	NAPA
Dejan Raketić	NAPA
Sanja Stanojević	NAPA
Zarko Stepanović	OCCS
Danilo Rodić	OCCS
Sanja Stanković	CFPE
Danijela Stojimenov	CFPE
Vukosava Crnjanski	CRTA
Tamara Branković	CRTA
Marija Petrović	MPALSG
Tara Tepavac	CRTA
Milena Lazarević	CEP
Annika Uudelepp	SIGMA
Brian Finn	SIGMA
Karjuk Marina	SDC
Alexandra Hilbig	GIZ
Nikola Djurić	GIZ
Dragana Curcija Gligorijević	GIZ
Vladan Petrovic	EUD
Duska Subotić	EUD
Thomas Kerscher	EU PAR TA
Tijana Kolundzija	PMO