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## Introduction

The purpose of this Annex is to provide templates and examples related to the set-up and functioning of the monitoring, reporting and evaluation system for a PAR or sector strategy. All the provided templates are for flexible use and should be used in alignment with national requirements and with the specificities of the given strategy. Though some aspects detailed in this Annex are specific to PAR, due to its cross-sectoral nature, the concepts and tools presented to assist the set-up of a monitoring and evaluation system and the development of useful implementation and reform progress reports are applicable to any sector or policy area.

This Annex is comprised of:

* a short description of the institutional roles and responsibilities in a typical PAR management and co-ordination structure with regards to monitoring and reporting
* a descriptive structure template of an annual report
* a descriptive structure template of a semi-annual report
* a hypothetical example of a semi-annual and annual strategy progress report
* an example of a strategy implementation report instruction to be issued by the lead body responsible for the co-ordination of monitoring
* an example of the terms of reference (ToR) for a strategy evaluation.

The examples in this Annex are developed on the basis of real-life examples but have been generalised in order to be widely applicable and can serve as aids irrespective of the specificities of a given country.

### Institutional roles and responsibilities in monitoring and reporting

This section describes the roles and responsibilities of the key PAR or sector management and co-ordination structures vis-à-vis monitoring and reporting based on a review of current practices. The list of the roles is indicative and can be revised based on the country-specific situation – legal requirements, administrative structure, allocation of mandates, etc. This list does not include what roles external stakeholders and citizens should have in the process, but it is essential to ensure that they are involved as sources of information and as verifiers of key findings before decisions are taken based on the results of the monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes.

### Tasks of the government in monitoring and reporting for a PAR or sector strategy

The government is the ultimate decision-making body in the PAR or sector strategy development and implementation process. It can direct the efforts of or empower the lead institution and participating institutions. It can resolve the disputes between different institutions and adopt any necessary measures and solutions to improve the implementation of the country’s PAR or sector strategy.

The key roles of the government in the strategy implementation process are to:

* Hear, discuss and challenge or endorse the strategy progress reports;
* Adopt corrective measures to improve the implementation of the PAR-related or sector strategy if implementation of such measures requires government-level decisions;
* Resolve any issues between different institutions in implementing the strategy if the resolution has failed at the lower level (e.g. at a PAR council or any similar, sector-level co-ordination forum).

### Tasks of the PAR council (political-level) co-ordination forum

In the case of PAR, the PAR council (or similar, top political-level co-ordination forum) steers the implementation of the PAR strategy and provides advice to lead and implementing ministries. The key roles of the PAR council in the process of PAR strategy implementation are to:

* Hear, discuss and challenge or endorse all regular reports of PAR strategy;
* Steer the implementation of the PAR strategy by providing strategic guidance and policy advice;
* Take corrective measures and decisions to strengthen the implementation of the PAR strategy, taking into account risks associated with implementation
* Resolve any issues between different institutions in implementing the PAR strategy if the resolution has failed at the lower levels (e.g. at the interministerial body or between different institutions);
* Co-ordinate with development partners financial contributions and the allocation of resources.

### Tasks of the interministerial body (administrative-level co-ordination forum)

The interministerial body is an administrative-level co-ordination forum established to ensure regular monitoring of implementation of the PAR strategy or sector strategy against the objectives, targets, activities, and budget. The key roles of the interministerial body are to:

* Regularly meet and discuss progress in implementing objectives, targets, activities, and the allocation and use of financial resources;
* Identify bottlenecks and challenges to successful implementation and propose corrective measures to be taken by implementing institutions;
* Discuss the required regular reports to be submitted to the PAR council or government;
* Resolve disputes that arise between different institutions during the process of PAR or sector strategy implementation;
* Forward any unresolved issues to the next level, e.g. the PAR council or government.

### Tasks of a lead ministry or institution

The PAR or sector lead body co-ordinates the attainment of strategy objectives, indicators and activities on an ongoing basis. It is the institution that provides expert, technical-level co‑ordination of the implementation of the PAR or sector strategy. The key roles of the lead institution in terms of the management of the monitoring and reporting processes are to:

* Establish a monitoring and reporting mechanism for PAR or sector strategy implementation in line with monitoring and reporting requirements, and ensure its application (a sample monitoring and reporting instruction can be found later in this Annex);
* Collect information from participating ministries and institutions on the implementation of the PAR or sector strategy objectives, indicators, activities, and budget;
* Prepare required regular reports and submit them to the interministerial body (if applicable), PAR council, and government for discussion, including:
	+ - analysis of progress against any available broader national vision
		- analysis of progress against agreed objectives and targets
		- analysis of challenges, bottlenecks and critical risks to the implementation of the PAR or sector strategy
		- proposals for any required corrective measures to be discussed by the interministerial body, PAR council and the government.
* Publish PAR or sector strategy reports on the website of the ministry or institution responsible for PAR or the sector after their endorsement by the respective bodies (interministerial body, PAR council and the government);
* Initiate discussion of problematic issues at higher levels, if needed, as well as with line ministries, to identify solutions;
* Provide secretariat functions, organising the work of the interministerial body, PAR council and the government in relation to PAR or the sector (if applicable);
* Provide regular methodological support to ministries and government agencies in monitoring and reporting process.

### Tasks of ministries, government agencies and any participating institutions involved in implementing PAR or sector reform

The ministries (or other institutions) are in charge of ensuring the implementation of activities and objectives and providing the information needed to monitor PAR or sector strategy implementation to the PAR or sector lead institution. The key roles of such ministries or institutions in the process of strategy implementation are to:

* Collect and analyse data and provide information to the PAR or sector lead institution for the preparation of reports required by the PAR or sector lead institution or interministerial body;
* Participate in the meetings of the interministerial bodies.

## Strategy Annual Report Structure Template

The purpose of this template is to describe the structure of the annual progress report and to provide more detailed instructions on what information could be provided. The structure and instructions for the preparation of the strategy report are presented below. The **structure is indicative** and can be adjusted according to country-specific needs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1.** | **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**In this section brief information on the progress against each strategic objective of the strategy is provided, based on both the indicators and the implementation of key reforms in the sector. In this section achievements in the implementation of the most important activities only should be presented. The importance of activities is decided according to the scope of their impact, political attention, and media or civil society interest. Graphs, tables and pictures can be used to illustrate the achievements. This section also provides brief information about the progress towards achieving the vision (the “bigger picture”). It also summarises key challenges, risks and necessary corrective measures.This section should be used to brief decision makers, the general public and stakeholders. The executive summary will be short and concise, up to five pages long. |
| **2.**  | **PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING STRATEGY OBJECTIVES**This section describes the progress made towards implementing each objective of the strategy. It will have as many sub-sections as there are objectives in the strategy.Before describing the implementation of each objective, summary information on **overall progress** could be provided here. It could include information on:1. reforms successfully implemented in the year
2. areas needing improvement in implementation
3. overall budget execution.

Tables and graphs can be used here.  |
| **2.1.** | **PROGRESS AGAINST OBJECTIVE: [title of objective]**In these sub-sections the information on the progress against each strategy objective should be provided. The progress against each objective is described according to indicators and the overall progress in implementing activities under the objective. Information on whether indicator targets were achieved should be presented. A description of the key reforms implemented should be provided as well as reasons for any failure to achieve the targets. This information will give a sense of whether the strategy is moving closer to achieving the targets. Those activities that contributed to the achievement of the objective can also be presented here, but always with the aim of answering such questions as: ‘Why did we plan this activity?’ and ‘How has this activity helped to improve the public services we are responsible for?’ It is especially important to mention the successes, gaps and challenges, along with recommendations for overcoming the gaps and challenges. Priority actions to improve the performance should also be outlined.Each sub-section could include the following information:1. assessment of the main achievements, using indicators and graphs
2. success stories
3. assessment of challenges, gaps and bottlenecks
4. conclusions and recommendations for the next steps.

Graphs, tables or pictures should be used to illustrate the assessment. Linked indicators should be used to tell the story. |
| **3.** | **RISKS AND STEPS TO ADDRESS THEM**In this section any risks to the overall strategy implementation are assessed and steps to address these risks are provided. Such risks can relate to institutional capacity, financial capacity, the regulatory environment, partnership and engagement by other institutions, and other factors external to the strategy. Steps to address these risks in the future are identified and listed in this section.This section is prepared by the lead ministry based on the inputs provided by implementing institutions. The lead institution or ministry must instruct participating institutions to provide such information through the reporting process. |
| **4.** | **ANNEXES**Annex 1: Action plan monitoring report for the year 20XXOther annexes may be provided to support and illustrate the information presented above. |

**Action plan monitoring report template**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Action | Responsible institution | Timeframe | Progress | Problems and next steps | Risk analysis | Budget |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|  | ***OBJECTIVE 1: as in the strategy*** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. | *(as in the Action Plan)* | *(as in the Action Plan)* | *(as in the Action Plan)* | Description of progress in implementing the action and its activities.Should clearly indicate the following:1. Status of activity implementation, possibly using traffic light system:
* Full
* Partial
* No

 implementation.1. Brief description of progress made or lack of progress.
 | 1. Actions behind schedule or not implemented according to the plan.
2. Solutions and key targets for the next period.
 | Key risks to implementation of the action and its corresponding activities. | Budget utilised as compared to the plan. |
|  |  |  |  |  | *Total for Objective 1:* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | *Total for strategy:* |  |  |  |
|  | *Completion instructions:* |  |  |  |
|  | *Column 1* | *Actions and their corresponding activities are replicated here from the Action Plan.* |  |
|  | *Column 2* | *The institutions responsible for the implementation of each action and its corresponding activities are indicated here as per the Action Plan.* |  |
|  | *Column 3* | *This shows the Action Plan deadline for completion of the action (and its activities).* |  |
|  | *Column 4* | *This column is to be completed by the respective institution.**The realisation status of actions (and activities) is provided here. The status can be “fully implemented”, “partially implemented” or “not implemented”. A fully implemented activity is one which has been implemented in full according to the scope defined in the Action Plan. A partially implemented activity is one which is between 50 and 99 percent implemented. A not implemented activity is one which is between 0 and 49 percent implemented. The realisation status is defined by experts within the institution itself. However, the status can change following review by the institution responsible for central planning and monitoring co-ordination and discussion with the institution in charge of the activity.**The status is shown both in words and by colour code. The first column is highlighted in* ***green*** *for a fully implemented activity; in* ***yellow*** *for a partially implemented activity and in* ***red*** *for a not implemented activity.**In addition, the major achievements or challengesin implementing the activity are described in this column. The aim is to provide only strategic information to justify the realisation status assigned to the activity. The achievements should be supported by evidence, if possible, such as statistical data and comparisons. Routine and administrative information (the number of meetings organised, working groups established, etc.) should not be included. For example, if the law implementing the activity has been prepared, the achievements should explain what will change as a result, briefly summarising the main benefits of the new law, rather than just stating the fact that the law has been prepared and when.* |  |
|  | *Column 5* | *This column is to be completed by the respective institution, but only for those actions and activities whose status is “partially implemented” or “not implemented”. The reasons for deviation should be briefly explained. The next steps to implement the action and activity should also be provided here.* |  |
|  | *Column 6* | *Information in this column is to be completed according to the analysis of risks associated with implementation of the action and its activities.*  |  |
|  | *Column 7* | *Information in this column is to be completed according to the money spent to implement the action and its corresponding activities, as compared with the planned budget. Any substantial over- or underspending should be highlighted, with proposals for dealing with the financial implications.* |  |
|  | ***EXAMPLE*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. | The development of a feasibility study for the registry and its adoption by the PAR Council | *Ministry X* | *2016 Q2* | **Status:** Partially implemented**Progress made:** The study has been developed. Within the framework of the feasibility study an analysis of the existing human resource management (HRM) systems has been carried out on the basis of which quality technical files are to be developed for the project. It is necessary that the study be adopted by the E-Govern-ment Implementation Task Force, formed as part of the Public Admin-istration Reform Council. | **Problems:** The reason for the partial implementation of this activity is the fact that the Public Administration Reform Council did not adopt this report, given that the E-Government Implementation Task Force has not been formed.**Next steps:** Following the forming of the E-Government Implementation Task Force, this report should be reviewed and adopted. | Further delays to establish the task force. | The allocated budget of EUR 35 000 has been fully consumed. No additional funding is needed. |

## Strategy semi-annual report structure template

The purpose of this template is to describe the structure of the semi-annual (6-monthly) monitoring report and to provide more detailed instructions on what information should be provided. The 6-monthly report structure and instructions on how to prepare it are presented below. The **structure is indicative** and can be adjusted based on country-specific needs.

|  |
| --- |
| **I. SUMMARY INFORMATION** (1 page max)  |
| **OVERALL PROGRESS**In this section the following information is provided:* The overall number of valid actions and corresponding activities for the 6 months covered
* information on the overall implementation rate, e.g. the percentage and number of fully, partially and not implemented activities
* those areas showing the best and the worst performance (based on objectives).

**PROBLEMS AND RISKS**In this section a summary of the main reasons for delays in implementing activities is presented. Any risks to the future implementation of activities and achievement of objectives are highlighted.**NEXT STEPS**Here, possible solutions to the problems identified are presented and next steps towards implementation of the strategy are suggested.**II. DETAILED INFORMATION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES** |

In this section information on the implementation status of the actions and their corresponding activities is provided, along with a brief description of the progress against each activity, (output) indicators, any problems identified and the proposed next steps.

The following table may be used:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Activity | Responsible institution | Deadline | Progress | Problems and next steps |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  | ***OBJECTIVE 1: as in the strategy*** |  |
| 1. | *(as in the Action Plan)* | *(as in the Action Plan)* | *(as in the Action Plan)* | *Description of the progress in implementing the activity.**Should clearly indicate the following:*1. *Status of activity implementation, possibly using traffic light system:*
* *Full*
* *Partial*
* *No*

*implementation, with explanations in cases of no implementation.*1. *Brief description of progress made or lack of progress, including information on the achievement of activity-linked indicators.*
 | 1. *Acitivities behind schedule or not implemented according to the plan.*
2. *Solutions and key targets for the next period.*
 |
|  | *Completion instructions:* |
|  | *Column 1* | *Activities are replicated here from the Action Plan.* |
|  | *Column 2* | *The institutions responsible for the implementation of each activity are indicated.* |
|  | *Column 3* | *This shows the Action Plan deadline for the completion of the activity.* |
|  | *Column 4* | *This column is to be completed by the respective institution.**The realisation status of activities is provided here. The status can be “fully implemented”, “partially implemented” or “not implemented”. A fully implemented activity is one which has been implemented according to its full scope as defined in the Action Plan. A partially implemented activity is one which is between 50 and 99 percent implemented. A not implemented activity is one which is between 0 and 49 percent implemented. The realisation status is defined by experts within the institution itself. However, the status can change following review by the institution responsible for central planning and monitoring co-ordination and discussion with the institution in charge of the activity.**The status is shown both in words and by colour code. The first column is highlighted in* ***green*** *for a fully implemented activity; in* ***yellow*** *for a partially implemented activity and in* ***red*** *for a not implemented activity.**In addition, the major achievements in implementing the activity are described in this column. The aim is to provide only strategic information to justify the realisation status assigned to the activity. The achievements should be supported by evidence, if possible, such as statistical data and comparisons. Routine and administrative information (the number of meetings organised, working groups established, etc.) should not be included. For example, if the law implementing the activity has been prepared, the achievements should explain what will change as a result, briefly summarising the main benefits of the new law rather than just stating the fact that the law has been prepared and when.*  |
|  | *Column 5* | *This column is to be completed by the respective institution, but only for those activities whose status is “partially implemented” or “not implemented”. The reasons for deviation should be briefly explained. The next steps to implement the activity should also be provided here.* |
|  | ***EXAMPLE*** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. | The development of a feasibility study for the registry and its adoption by the PAR Council | *Ministry X* | *2016 Q2* | **Status:** partially implemented**Progress made:** The study has been developed. Within the framework of the feasibility study an analysis of the existing HRM systems has been carried out on the basis of which quality technical files are to be developed for the project. It is necessary that the study be adopted by the E-Government Implementation Task Force, formed as part of the Public Administration Reform Council. | **Problems:** The reason for the partial implementation of this activity is the fact that the Public Administration Reform Council did not adopt this report, given that the E-Government Implementation Task Force has not been formed.**Next steps:** Following the forming of the E-Government Implementation Task Force, this report should be reviewed and adopted. |

## Examples of PAR Strategy and action plan reports

Below are examples of an annual and a semi-annual PAR report. The information used in the examples is only for illustration purposes and is not factually correct. The structure of the reports is indicative and can be adjusted based on country-specific needs.

## Semi-annual report on the implementation of the PAR strategy and its action plan for the period January to June 2017

*[A picture showing an aspect of public service could be included here to make the report friendlier]*

***[Date]***

### I. OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES

For the period from January to June 2017 the ministries and state administration bodies had to complete the implementation of 52 activities. The biggest number of reforms was envisaged in the area of human resources management, 15 in total. In the area of business environment and service improvement 12 activities were envisaged, while 10 were planned in the area of organisation and functioning of public administration systems, 9 in public finance and public procurement and 6 in participation and transparency. The number of activities for the reporting period constitutes 25% of the total number of activities planned in the PAR Strategy Action Plan.

In the first half of 2017 only about half the activities were fully or partially implemented. This means that in the second half of 2017 the ministries will need to complete the backlog of planned activities not implemented in this period in addition to activities planned for the second half of 2017. This will significantly increase institutions’ workloads. The implementation of activities is presented in Figure 1 below.

**Figure 1: Implementation of activities in the first half of 2017**

The best performance was achieved implementing **Specific Objective 1 – Improvement of organisational and functional public administration subsystems**. About 80% of all activities under this specific objective were either fully implemented or partially implemented. However, **Specific Objective 2 – Establishment of a public service system based on merit** has the lowest performance. Out of 15 activities only 6 are fully or partially implemented. The implementation of other objectives is average with about 60% of all planned activities being fully or partially implemented. The information on the implementation of activities under each objective is illustrated in Figure 2 below.

**Figure 2: Implementation of activities by specific objective**

The main reasons for underperformance in implementing Specific Objective 2 were the lengthy consultation process of the laws related to civil service and wages. This was due to poor policy design and lack of policy options at the start of interministerial consultations, affecting policy option development and consultation during the later stages of policy deliberations.

Even though all line ministries take part in the development and implementation of public administration reform, there are five key bodies leading policy design and implementation – the Ministry of Public Administration (MPA), the Ministry of Finance (MoF), the Public Procurement Office (PPO), the Public Policy Bureau (PPB), and the Ministry of Justice (MoJ). The number of activities for which these five key institutions were is charge is presented in Figure 3 below.

**Figure 3: Number of reform activities by lead institution**

The MPA has the biggest number of activities. At the same time, it has the biggest proportion of activities not implemented due to issues with Objective 2. The best performing institutions were the MoJ and the PPO, but they also had the lowest number of activities to implement. The performance of institutions in implementing activities is illustrated in Figure 4 below.

**Figure 4: Number of implemented activities by institution**

### II. KEY ACHIEVEMENTS

Objective 1 - Improvement of organisational and functional public administration subsystems. To achieve this objective, a total of ten activities were implemented during the period covered in this report. This represents an average implementation rate. The main focus of the activities under this objective was the creation of the methodological foundations for the rightsizing of the public sector and the implementation of the functional reviews.

The **key achievements** under this objective were the following:

1. Based on the functional review methodology, a **Roadmap** for public sector analysis was prepared and approved in January. The Roadmap envisages three phases in the public sector review, during which a total of 97 institutions will be reviewed and 154 functions will be optimised. The first phase will take place January–June 2017, the second phase June–December 2017 and the third phase January–August 2018. It is expected that by the end of August 2018 all functions of the 97 institutions will have been reviewed and recommendations provided.
2. In the period of this report the MPA carried out 17 **functional reviews**. This constitutes 100% of the planned reviews. The functional reviews included 14 ministries and 3 government agencies. World Bank support in the amount of EUR 1.3 million was allocated to this activity. As a result of functional reviews, an action plan with recommendations was prepared and approved by the Government in June. If the plan is implemented, it is expected that the functional reviews will lead to savings in public expenditure of approximately EUR 12 million per year. The savings will result from the merging of four institutions into two (Ministry X with Z, and Agency F with G). The merging of ministries and agencies will save EUR 7 million. Furthermore, ten functions should be abolished allowing an additional EUR 5 million to be saved. It is expected that the recommendations will be implemented by the end of 2017. The financial benefits will be monitored and calculated in 2018 to determine the full scope of the savings.
3. There is, however, a delay in theconsolidation of **performance management processes**. During the reported period it had been planned to prepare the methodology and the action plan to review the performance management framework (legal framework, processes, methodologies, etc.) and to start a new technical assistance project. However, due to delays in the procurement process the preparation of the methodology was also delayed. The project winner has been announced and the work started. It is expected that the methodology will be finalised after a delay of one month in August.

|  |
| --- |
| Objective 1 main achievements |
| * Functional methodology prepared and approved
* Road map for public sector prepared and approved
* 17 functional reviews of ministries and agencies completed
* Expected savings as a result of reviews: EUR 12 million
 |

The following next steps for timely implementation are recommended:

1. The MPA should finalise the methodology and action plan for the consolidation of the performance management framework and submit it to the Interministerial Group and the PAR Council for discussion and approval. Consultations on the action plan should take place with relevant institutions to ensure they are properly informed.
2. The MPA should make any necessary arrangements for the second phase of functional reviews to ensure they start on time.

[The other objectives are covered here in a similar way.]

### III. CHALLENGES AND OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

The biggest challenges encountered during the period of this report concerned the implementation of activities under Objective 2: Human resource management. The main **challenges** were as follows:

1. A lengthy public procurement procedure, given the timeframe for implementation of some activities. Enough time must be allowed for the completion of public procurement procedures when setting deadlines.
2. A lack of the skills required to develop public policy options. The civil servants in charge of policy development need training in policy analysis and scenario planning.
3. Lengthy interministerial consultations. Sufficent time must be allowed for interministerial consultation, especially for those activities which are likely to have a wide impact across institutions.
4. *[Etc.]*

The following **recommendations** are provided for overcoming these challenges:

1. When setting the deadlines for activities requiring a public procurement procedure, six months should be allocated for the completion of the procedure.
2. The MPA should plan training initiatives for civil servants working in the area of policy analysis.
3. The MPA should prepare guidance for wide-ranging interministerial consultations. The guidance should set out the method of consultation and the expected timeframe for completion. Such guidance will aid the completion of interministerial consultations in a correct and timely manner.
4. [Etc.]

**ANNEX: DETAILED INFORMATION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES**

[Completed Table should be inserted here.]

## Annual report on the implementation of the PAR strategy and action plan for the period January to December 2017

 *[A picture showing an aspect of public service could be included here to make the report friendlier]*

***[Date]***

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2017 ministries carried out 95 activities contributing to the implementation of five PAR-specific objectives and the achievement of 92 performance indicators. The progress achieved against these specific objectives is briefly described below.

**OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVEMENT OF ORGANISATIONAL AND FUNCTIONAL PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SUBSYSTEMS**

The main focus when implementing Objective 1 was the improvement of the functioning and efficiency of the public sector’s organisation and performance of functions.

* + In 2017 a total of 37 **functional reviews**, covering 15 ministries and 22 government agencies, were accomplished.
	+ The work is based on a unified methodology approved by the Government. This represents a completion rate of 93%, as compared to the total number of 40 planned reviews. During the reporting period a total of 57 recommendations were provided and 48 were approved by the Government. The recommendations will lead to the merging of six institutions with other ones, and the abolition of two institutions. In addition, the status of seven institutions will be revised. It is expected these functional reviews will result in budget savings of EUR 23 million. This will represent 5% of the total budget of the reorganised institutions.
	+ The MPA has started a review of the **performance management system** with the aim of linking the different performance processes and making them simpler and more understandable.

Currently the ministries and agencies are working with five separate performance management systems – strategic planning, public policy development, public consultations, impact assessment and performance measurement – which are not properly interlinked. In 2017 the five systems were reviewed, but the action plan was not finalised, due to the lengthy public procurement process which caused delays to the start of the review.

*[The other objectives should be described in a similar way]*

### II. PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE PAR STRATEGY

**2.1. Overall information on progress**

**Progress against performance indicators.** A total of 91 performance indicators are established to measure progress towards the five objectives. Of these, 69 were applicable in 2017 and the remaining 22 will come into effect during 2017 and 2018 as the planned activities are implementated. for now, therefore, this latter group of indicators are marked as not applicable, or “N/A”. Of the 69 applicable indicators, progress has been made against 61 and is unchanged against the remaining 8. The progress against performance indicators is illustrated in Figure 1 below.

**Figure 1: Progress against performance indicators (shown in number of indicators)**

Analysing this progress by objectives reveals that the best performance has been achieved under Objective 1. As in the case of activities implementation, the worst results are observed under Objective 2. The analysis is illustrated in Figure 2 below.

**Figure 2: Indicator performance analysed by objective (shown in number of indicators)**

In summary, Objectives 1, 4 and 5 achieved significant performance; Objective 2 needs significant improvement and Objective 3 requires moderate improvement.

Progress against activities. In order to work towards achieving the five objectives of the PAR Strategy, 95 activities were carried out in 2017. Of these, about 55% were fully implemented, 30% were partially implemented and 15% lacked significant progress. This means that 45% of activities will have to be completed in 2018. This will significantly increase the workload of the institutions, since the implementation of 65 new activities is envisaged in 2018. The implementation of activities in 2017 is presented in Figure 3 below.

**Figure 3: Implementation of activities in 2017 (shown in number of activities)**

The best performance was achieved implementing Specific Objective 1 – Improvement of organisational and functional PA subsystems. About 94% of planned activities under this specific objective were fully implemented and the remaining 6% were partially implemented. There were no activities lacking significant progress in 2017. However, Specific Objective 2 – Establishment of the public service system based on merits has the lowest performance. Of the total number of activities planned for 2017, only 32% were fully implemented, 23% were partially implemented and as many as 45% were not implemented. The implementation of other objectives is satisfactory, with about 90% of all planned activities being fully or partially implemented. The information on the implementation of activities analysed by objective is illustrated in Figure 4 below.

**Figure 4: Implementation of activities analysed by specific objective (show in number of activities)**

**Figure 5: The number of implemented activities analysed by institution**

In summary, the most progress in the implementation of activities was seen against Objectives 1 and 4. In addition, Objective 1 had the greatest number of planned activities. Good performance was influenced by proper planning and adequate political and financial support.

**2.2. Progress against each specific objective**

**Objective 1 - Improvement of organisational and functional public administration subsystems.**

The Government implemented the greatest number of activities under this Objective. In total 32 activities were planned and 30 were fully implemented. The main focus of this Objective was the review of functions performed by the public sector institutions with the aim of increasing their efficiency and effectiveness and consolidating the performance management framework for public sector institutions.

Impressive progress was achieved in the area of functional reviews. The Methodology for the Analysis and Rightsizing of the Public Sector was prepared and approved by the Government in January 2017. The Methodology is based on the best international practice. It describes the methods to be used to review the functions of the public sector institutions and the types of recommendations that could be formulated as a result.

Based on the functional review methodology, a roadmap for public sector analysis was prepared and approved in January. The roadmap envisages three phases in the public sector review during which a total of 97 institutions are to be reviewed and 154 functions optimised. The first phase will take place January–June 2017, the second phase June–December 2017 and the third January–August 2018. It is expected that by the end of August 2018 all functions of the 97 institutions will have been reviewed and recommendations provided.

In 2017, a total of 40 functional reviews of 15 ministries and 25 government agencies were completed. This represents a 93% completion rate as compared to the total number of 42 planned reviews. During the reporting period a total of 57 recommendations were provided and 48 were approved by the Government. The recommendations will lead to the merging of six institutions with others (Ministry X with Z, Agency F with G, Agency H with Y, Agency P with R, Agency A with B, and Agency E with W), and the abolition of two (Ministry H and Agency P). In addition, the status of seven institutions will be revised.

**Figure 6: Number of institutions to be merged, abolished or reorganised**

It is expected that as a result of these functional reviews the budget will experience EUR 23 million in savings. This will represent 5% of the total budget of the reorganised institutions. It is anticipated that approved recommendations will be implemented by the end of 2017. The financial benefits will be monitored and calculated in 2018 to determine the full scope of the savings.

The review of three institutions was delayed due to a political decision to postpone the review. This was because of new laws pending in the Parliament and new functions ensvisaged for the relevant institutions. The review will be resumed once the laws have been approved, which is expected to happen during the spring session in April 2018.

It is expected that in 2018 the number of institutions reporting to the Government will increase and those reporting to the Parliament will decrease. Following functional reviews completed in 2017 and the change of the status the number of institutions reporting to the Government has increased by three. It is also expected that as a result of the consolidation process the total number of independent public sector institutions will decrease by about 22%. This will allow better management and policy implementation, as well as more efficient use of public expenditure. See Figure 7 below.

**Figure 7: Number of institutions reporting to the Government and Parliament**

The consolidation of the performance management processes has been progressing as planned. During the reported period it had been planned to prepare the methodology and action plan for the review of the performance management framework (legal framework, processes, methodologies, etc.). To achieve this, a technical assistance project with was initiated the help of Sweden. The methodology was subsequently developed and an action plan prepared. The review of the performance management systems is planned to take place in 2018. It is expected that this review will simplify performance management processes and will make the system more user-friendly for ministries and government agencies. A single guidance document will be prepared which will help to consolidate all the processes.

|  |
| --- |
| Objective 1 main achievements |
| * Functional methodology prepared and approved
* Road map for public sector prepared and approved
* 40 functional reviews of ministries and agencies completed
* EUR 23 million financial savings expected as a result of reviews
* Projected savings constitute 5% of the total budget for reviewed institutions
* Methodology and action plan for performance management framework review prepared and approved
 |

Overall, it is expected that the majority of the performance indicator targets related to this Objective will be achieved in 2018. The main factors leading to successful implementation have been:

* + proper analysis and planning of the actions
	+ political attention given to the implementation of planned activities
	+ adequate financial and human resources.

The following next steps for timely implementation are recommended:

1. The MPA should continue the implementation of the functional review process and make any arrangements necessary to ensure the third phase of functional reviews starts on time.
2. The MPA should prepare a proposal for the social package (including calculation of the additional financial needs) to be used as part of the institutional consolidation process.

[The other objectives are covered here in a similar way.]

### III. SUMMARY OF KEY RISKS AND PRIORITY ACTIONS FOR NEXT YEAR

Key risks (as identified under the detailed analysis of the attainment of the strategy objectives) demonstrate that the biggest challenge can be observed for reaching the targets for Objective 2 – Establishment of the public service system based on merit. This is due particularly to delayed procurement procedures for the design and establishment of the unified system. While this delay poses a risk for full implementation as planned, with adjustment of the timeline and focused and expedited implementation, it still can be mitigated.

Priority actions for Objective 1:

1. Implementation of the third functional review package
2. Implementation of the review of performance management frameworks
3. Implementation of the training programme on policy analysis.

[The other objectives are covered here in a similar way.]

**ANNEXES:**

1. Annex on the progress against indicators and activities
2. Other annexes

[Any other annexes to be inserted]

## PAR-related example of draft instruction for strategy monitoring and reporting

This document provides an example of an instruction that could be used by the PAR or sector lead institution or the government to co-ordinate the process for preparation of the PAR Strategy or sector strategy monitoring reports. The Instruction is indicative and it is not mandatory for the country. If used, it can be adjusted according to the country-specific needs and circumstances. The example below is **not fully aligned** to the semi-annual and annual report templates presented in this annex,in order to demonstrate that the structure and variety of information required by the strategy lead institution from the bodies implementing various reform actions can be differently set, though the logic of reporting remains the same.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PAR STRATEGY AND THE ACTION PLAN MONITORING AND REPORTING**1. **Introduction**

These Instructions define the actors and the procedures for monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the PAR Strategy and its Action Plan. The purpose of the Instructions is to unify the monitoring and reporting process by defining the procedures, responsibilities, deadlines and templates. The primary users of these Instructions are all ministries and state administration bodies (SABs) that take part in the implementation of the PAR Strategy Action Plan. The secondary users are the wider public, NGOs and other stakeholders.1. **PAR monitoring and reporting actors, processes, and deadlines**
2. The overall monitoring of the implementation of objectives, indicators and activities of the PAR Strategy and its Action Plan is carried out by the Ministry of Public Administration (MPA) through its daily communication with ministries and SABs.
3. The monitoring of the implementation of separate activities, linked performance indicators and objectives is carried out by the ministries and SABs responsible for these elements as indicated in the Action Plan 2015–2017.
4. The reporting is semi-annual and annual. The preparation of the semi-annual and annual reports is co-ordinated by the MPA based on the information received from the ministries and SABs responsible for the respective objectives.
5. The semi-annual report will be prepared as follows:
	1. By 5 July of the year in question, the MPA shall send a circular letter to ministries and other SABs responsible for activities to be implemented in the respective reporting period, to request them to submit semi-annual reports in the format provided for in Section III of this Instruction.
	2. By 20 July of the year in question, the ministries and SABs responsible for the activities indicated in the Action Plan shall submit a report to the MPA in the form provided by the MPA. If respective ministries or SABs do not provide information on time, the MPA can inform the Interministerial Group or take any other actions.
	3. The MPA shall analyse the information received from ministries and SABs, consolidate the information and compile a draft semi-annual progress report. The MPA may request additional information from the ministries and SABs if the information submitted is unsatisfactory or insufficient.
	4. By 15 August of the year in question, the MPA shall finalise the semi-annual progress report and submit it to the PAR co-ordination council for consideration.
6. The annual report will be prepared in the following way:
	1. By 10 January of the year in question, the MPA shall send a circular letter to all ministries and SABs reminding them that the ministries are to submit annual reports on the implementation of the PAR Strategy and Action Plan.
	2. By 1 February of the year in question, the institutions responsible for the implementation results shall summarise the information received from their implementation partners and submit the summarised information to the MPA in the format provided by the MPA. The institutions responsible may ask their implementation partners to clarify or supplement any required information.
	3. The MPA shall analyse and the consolidate the information received in this manner, and prepare a draft annual progress report. The MPA may request additional information from these institutions if the information submitted is unsatisfactory or insufficient.
	4. By 1 March of the year in question, the MPA shall submit the draft annual progress report to the PAR co-ordination councilfor consideration.
7. If needed, the MPA can organise workshops to guide ministries and other SABs and help them strengthen the skills needed to prepare PAR-related reports.
8. **PAR semi-annual reporting templates and instructions**
9. Two tables will be used to provide semi-annual and annual information on the implementation of the PAR Strategy and its Action Plan:
	1. Semi-Annual Report Template
	2. Annual Report Template
10. The format and instructions on how to complete the Semi-Annual Report Template are provided below. It is to be used by all ministries and SABs to provide semi-annual information on the implementation of activities. This table is in Excel format.

**Semi-Annual Report Template**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome**  | **Outcome indicators** | **Activity** | **Deadline**  | **Realisation status of activity****AAA** | **Achievements** | **Next steps (milestones)** | **Expected date of realisation** |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| *Completed by MPA* | *Completed by ministry* |
| ***Completion instructions:*** |
| *Column 1* | *In this column the Outcome from the Action Plan is indicated. This column is filled in by the MPA.* |
| *Column 2* | *In this column the indicators for the realisation of outcomes are listed. All indicators should be provided. They are taken from the Action Plan of the PAR Strategy. This column is filled in by the MPA.* |
| *Column 3* | *In this column the activities from the Action Plan are provided. Only activities that are relevant for the reporting period are provided. This column is filled in by the MPA.* |
| *Column 4* | *In this column the deadline for implementation of each respective activity is provided. This column is filled in by the MPA.* |
| *Column 5* | *In this column the realisation status of the activity is given. The status can be: fully implemented, partially implemented or not implemented. A “fully implemented” activity is one which has been fully implemented according to the scope defined in the Action Plan. A “partially implemented” activity is one which falls within the range 50%–99% implemented. A “not implemented” activity is one falling within the range 0%–49% implementation. The realisation status is established by experts within the institution itself. However, the status may change following review by the MPA and discussion with the institution responsible for the activity.**The status is expressed in writing and through the use of colour codes. The cell is highlighted in* ***green*** *for a fully implemented activity, in* ***yellow*** *for a partially implemented activity and* ***red*** *for a not implemented activity. This column is completed by the institution concerned.* |
| *Column 6* | *In this column the major achievements in implementing the activity are described. The aim here is to justify the realisation status of the activity. The ministry or SAB should provide only strategic information on those aspects which helped to bring about the outcome. The achievements should be supported by evidence, if possible (e.g. statistical data and comparisons). Routine and administrative information (the number of meetings organised, working groups established, etc.) should be avoided. For example, if a new law was prepared to implement the activity, the achievements should explain what will change as a result, briefly summarising the main benefits of the law, rather than simply stating that the law was prepared and when.**If the activity’s realisation status is “partially implemented” or “not implemented”, then the reasons for deviation should be briefly explained. This column is completed by the institution concerned.* |
| *Column 7* | *In this column the next steps to implement the activity should be provided. This column is filled in only for those activities whose status is “partially implemented” or “not implemented”. This column is completed by the institution concerned.* |
| *Column 8* | *In this column the institution should indicate the new anticipated date of realisation of the activity based on the next steps. This column is completed only for those activities whose status is “partially implemented” or “not implemented”. This column is completed by the institution concerned.* |
| **Examples:** |
| 1.1.1. Improved organisational stuctures and inter-organisational relations, and rationalisation of the number of organisations and employees within the public administration. | Number of bodies reporting to the Government, to the Prime Minister or to the Parliament Base Value (BV): to be determined in 2015Target Value (TV): to be determined in 2015 | 1. Systematic analysis of the public administration with recommendations for systems improvement. | Q2 2015 | Fully implemented | The functional analysis of 17 institutions has been completed. Based on the analysis, it is planned to significantly reorganise seven institutions, and merge two institutions. Of a total of 35 functions, 7 will be abolished. Savings after implementation of the functional analysis results are expected to be EUR 17 million. | N/A | N/A |
| Number of organisations which have been discontinued, merged or whose organisational structure has been changedBV: 0TV: to be determined in the plans and recommendations referred to in Activities 2, 3 and 4 | 4. Preparation of the plan for improvement of the general organisation of public administration systems, including the definition of a typology of bodies and public administration organisations, basic terms (including the term public administration), and criteria for the establishment and selection of organisational forms. | Q2 2015 | Partially implemented | The plan is currently being finalised. It envisages four types of institutions and defines the type of functions performed by these institutions and their establishment criteria. Based on the plan, the status of 350 institutions will have to be redefined and all institutions will have to be grouped into four categories. The institutions concerned are now being consulted regarding the plan’s implementation schedule. The preparation of the plan was delayed due to consultations with targeted institutions taking longer than expected. | To finish interministerial consultations and adjust the plan according to consultation outcomes.  | Q3 2015 |

1. **PAR annual reporting templates and instructions**
2. The format and instructions on how to complete the annual report template are provided below. The format asks for information on implementation of activities as well as progress achieved in implementing specific objectives and performance indicators.
3. The annual report template is more analytical than the semi-annual. As well as information on activity implementation, this template asks for information on progress towards achievement of objectives and performance indicators, and is therefore more elaborate.

**Annual Report Template**1. **Information on progress against objectives** (This information is provided in Word format)

**Progress on implementation of specific objective 1:** E.g. Improvement of organisational and functional public administration subsystems*In this section the institution responsible for the specific objective provides a brief overview of its implementation. This section is prepared on the basis of overall progress in implementing activities and the achievements against performance indicators (both of the specific objective and the outcomes). The achievements in this section should be illustrated using graphs, tables or diagrams. The key factors influencing the achievement of or failure to achieve the outcomes are provided. An assessment should be made of how likely the performance indicator target values are to be achieved. Priority actions to improve the performance should also be provided.*1. **Information on progress against performance indicators and activities** (This information is provided in Excel format)

*The template below allows for the provision of full details of achievement against performance indicators as well as the implementation of activities. The actual achievements for two past years (the reporting year and the year preceding it) are provided as well as the target values for the current year. Details on the achievement of performance indicators is provided by the institution responsible as indicated in the Indicator Passport. The institutions concerned must also report on the implementation of activities.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OBJECTIVE/ Outcome**  | **Outcome indicators** | **2014 Actual** | **2015 Actual** | **Target 2017**  | **Activity** | **Deadline**  | **Realisation Status of Activity****AAA** | **Achievements** | **Next steps (milestones)** | **Expected date of realisation** |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| *Column 1* | *In this column the Outcome from the Action Plan is indicated. This column is filled in by the MPA.* |
| *Column 2* | *In this column the indicators for the realisation of outcomes are listed. All indicators should be provided. They are taken from the Action Plan of the PAR Strategy. This column is filled in by the MPA.* |
| *Column 3* | *In this column the actual result of the indicator achievement in the year preceding the reporting year is indicated. If there is no data available, the value is indicated as “N/A”. This column is filled in by the respective ministry/institution.* |
| *Column 4* | *In this column the actual result of the indicator achievement in the reporting year is indicated. If there is no data available, the value is indicated as “N/A”. This column is filled in by the respective ministry/institution.* |
| *Column 5* | *In this column the target value for respective year is provided. The target value has to be in line with that indicated in the Indicator Passport. If there is no target value available, the value is indicated as “N/A”. This column is filled in by the respective ministry/institution.* |
| *Column 6* | *In this column the activities from the Action Plan are provided. Only activities that are relevant for the reporting period are provided. This column is filled in by the MPA.* |
| *Column 7* | *In this column the deadline for implementation of the respective activity is provided. This column is filled in by the MPA.* |
| *Column 8* | *In this column the realisation status of the activity is given. The status can be: fully implemented, partially implemented or not implemented. A “fully implemented” activity is one which has been fully implemented according to the scope defined in the Action Plan. A “partially implemented” activity is one which falls within the range 50%–99% implemented. A “not implemented” activity is one falling within the range 0%–49% implementation. The realisation status is established by experts within the institution itself. However, the status may change following review by the MPA and discussion with the institution responsible for the activity.**The status is expressed in writing and through the use of colour codes. The cell is highlighted in* ***green*** *for a fully implemented activity, in* ***yellow*** *for a partially implemented activity and* ***red*** *for a not implemented activity. This column is completed by the institution concerned.* |
| *Column 9* | *In this column the major achievements in implementing the activity are described. The aim here is to justify the realisation status of the activity. The ministry or SAB should provide only strategic information on those aspects which helped to bring about the outcome. The achievements should be supported by evidence, if possible (e.g. statistical data and comparisons). Routine and administrative information (the number of meetings organised, working groups established, etc.) should be avoided. For example, if a new law was prepared to implement the activity, the achievements should explain what will change as a result, briefly summarising the main benefits of the law, rather than simply stating that the law was prepared and when.**If the activity’s realisation status is “partially implemented” or “not implemented”, then the reasons for deviation should be briefly explained. This column is completed by the institution concerned.* |
| *Column 10* | *In this column the next steps to implement the activity should be provided. This column is filled in only for those activities whose status is “partially implemented” or “not implemented”. This column is completed by the institution concerned.* |
| *Column 11* | *In this column the institution should indicate the new anticipated date of realisation of the activity based on the next steps. This column is completed only for those activities whose status is “partially implemented” or “not implemented”. This column is completed by the institution concerned.* |
| ***Examples:*** |
| 1.. Improved organisational stuctures and inter-organisational relations, and rationalisation of the number of organisations and employees within the public administration. | Number of bodies reporting to the Government, the Prime Minister or the Parliament. | 130 | 129 | 132 | 1. Implementation of systematic analysis of public administration with recommendations for system improvement. | Q2 2015  |  | So far, the number of organisations remained mostly unchanged, due to substantial delay in the analysis as well as lack of institutional support for changes. | After finalisation of the review, enhance the institutional buy-in through awareness rasisng activities. | Q2 2016 |
| Number of organisations which have been discontinued, merged or whose organisational structure has been changed. | 0 | 4 | 16 | 2. Implementation of analyses of strategic expediency of selected organisations in the public administration system and the preparation of recommendations for improvement. | Q2 2015 |  | Due to the delay in finalising the analysis only limited change has been achieved in the organisational rationalisation. | Focused co-ordination of implementation and follow-up. | Q2 2016 |
| Percentage of recommendations from implemented Functional Review adopted by the Council for PAR. | 0 | 25% | 95% | 3. Provision of International Monetary Fund (IMF) support for SABs in preparing and implementing of rationalisation plans, with the goal of minimizing negative impacts on PA capacity. | Q2 2015 |  | Only a small number of recommendations and interim observations have been implemented so far. | Enhance the implementation through focused co-ordination and follow-up. | Q2 2016 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4. Preparation of the plan for improvement of general organisation of public administration systems, including the definition of the typology of bodies and public administration organisations, basic terms (including the term public administration) and criteria for the establishment and selection of organisational structures. | Q3 2015 |  | The plan has been developed and adopted. |  |  |

 |

## Example of terms of reference for the evaluation of a PAR-related strategy

This is an example of terms of reference (ToR) for the mid-term evaluation of a PAR strategy. The ToR can be adjusted to take the particular timing and purpose of the evaluation into account. The objectives, the scope of the evaluation and the questions may be adjusted accordingly.

**Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Evaluation of the PAR Strategy**

**1. Background information and rationale**

The Public Administration Reform Strategy approved in September 2015 by the Government of [country] constitutes one of the main pillars for public administration reform in [country]. The Strategy contains general objectives, specific objectives, indicators and targets to be achieved by 2020 for each of the main areas. The Strategy covers three main areas: the civil service, administrative services and procedures, and the organisation and accountability of the public administration. Implementation of these reforms is planned and monitored through the Action Plan 2015–2017.

The Ministry of Public Administration (MPA) has the primary responsibility for implementation of the Strategy. The Office of the Prime Minister and other institutions are also involved. The MPA is responsible for reporting on the implementation of the PAR Strategy to the Council for Public Administration Reform (CPAR) and the Government. In addition, the Strategy is discussed through the Public Administration Reform Special Group that serves as a mechanism for dialogue on PAR between the Government and the European Commission.

The PAR Strategy aims to achieve three general objectives by 2020:

1. An advanced and adequate system for the management, monitoring and implementation of legislation on the civil service and the potential for a professional, effective and efficient civil service based on principles of good administration and oriented towards the implementation of legal requirements;
2. Accessible public administrative services of high quality, based on rationalised administrative procedures and applying e-government methods which are oriented towards citizen and business needs;
3. A transparent and accountable public administration, with a clear system of accountability, characterised by a professional civil service with internal administrative structures that function according to the legislation on public administration and in line with principles of good governance.

The implementation of the PAR Strategy has been reported via a governmental internal reporting system on a quarterly, semi-annual and annual basis. Information has also been included in the European Commission progress reports, the SIGMA assessment reports as well as reports of civil society organisations.

The PAR Monitoring and Evaluation Methodology stipulates that the PAR Strategy shall undergo a mid-term evaluation, and a new action plan be drafted for the second part of the strategy period based on any changes in objectives or indicators prompted by the mid-term evaluation.

**2. Objectives of evaluation**

The mid-term evaluation is expected to provide both a retrospective assessment of the performance of the Strategy to date, and a prospective analysis providing forward-looking recommendations that can be fed into the revision of the Strategy and formulation of the next action plan.

For the retrospective assessment, the Contractor should consider all relevant performance metrics such as the rate of implementation of the Strategy, the achievability of targets and indicators, and the effectiveness and efficiency of the monitoring and reporting process.

For the prospective part, the Contractor is expected to consider also the context of the Strategy, reflecting on the MPA’s role in the overall planning and monitoring of the PAR Strategies and the need for adjustments regarding government commitments to comply with the forthcoming Sector Budget Support Contract between the Government and the EU.

The objectives of the evaluation of the PAR Strategy 2015–2020 are as follows:

* To assess progress towards implementation of the 2015–2017 PAR Strategy Action Plan through the achievement of general and specific objectives, by analysing the extent to which the planned activities were carried out, whether indicator targets were met and whether this contributed to achieving the overall strategy objectives.
* To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of PAR monitoring and reporting mechanisms, particularly in terms of the institutional set-up.
* To examine any constraints and factors that have negatively impacted the implementation of the PAR Strategy and the functioning of reporting and monitoring mechanisms and to make recommendations on how they can be addressed.
* To assess the continued relevance of the general and specific objectives, as well as the indicators and targets, in order to assess whether the PAR Strategy needs to be revised mid-term. Any general and specific objectives, indicators and targets requiring revision should be identified, and proposals outlined which will inform the MPA and CPAR when formulating the reviewed PAR Strategy and implementation plan.

**3. Scope of evaluation**

This mid-term evaluation covers the period of time from 2015, when the PAR Strategy and Action Plan were drafted and approved, up until June 2017. The evaluation will analyse data and actual outcomes as compared with the baseline values included in the PAR Strategy, as well as the situation presented in the 2015 SIGMA assessment report for the areas covered by the Strategy. In terms of evaluation criteria, the evaluation will focus on three of the OECD’s evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. It is considered premature to fully assess the criteria of impact and sustainability but the Contractor should provide its assessment of the current trajectory based on the available information. The Contractor is expected to operate in strict accordance with the OECD definitions of these evaluation criteria[[1]](#footnote-1).

In terms of data collection, the evaluation will be limited to a desk review of existing available documents and between 10 and 20 key informant interviews.

**4. Evaluation Questions**

Questions to be answered by this evaluation are as follows:

Relevance:

* Are the objectives of the Strategy still valid?
* How have the Strategy’s activities and outputs responded to the defined problems and objectives?

Effectiveness:

* To what extent were objectives achieved or are likely to be achieved?
* What are the major reasons for objectives not being achieved?
* What are the main factors leading to any successes?

Efficiency:

* How cost-efficient has the implementation of activities been?
* Were objectives achieved on time?
* How efficient is the process and institutional set-up?

Recommendations:

* What lessons can be learned from the approach and implementation of the current PAR Strategy and what could be done better in the future?

**5. Technical and financial proposal**

A short technical proposal (not exceeding 1500 words) should be submitted, outlining the methodology of the evaluation and including as a minimum:

* a short rationale demonstrating a clear and detailed understanding of the assignment and describing the methodology and framework that will be used;
* a preliminary list of key documents to be reviewed;
* a plan for how to conduct interviews and, potentially, stakeholder focus group discussions;
* proposals for other data to be collected;
* a sample of one or more previous evaluations, as well as CV(s) of the expert(s) that will conduct the evaluation;
* a description of the individual qualities, skills and attributes of the expert(s) that will conduct the evaluation.

The financial proposal should provide as a minimum the total contract value and a breakdown of costs into the number of working days and the fee rate for each expert. If other costs are included in the proposal these should be clearly explained.

**6. Roles and responsibilities**

The main beneficiary of evaluation is the MPA. The main responsibilities of the Beneficiary are to:

* select and engage a contractor and manage their work, as per the assignment ToRs;
* cover the cost of the assignment as per the agreed contract;
* provide access to information and documents needed for the assignment;
* contribute to the draft review report and provide feedback.

The responsibilities of the Contractor are to:

* prepare and present to the Beneficiary the initial work plan and technical and financial proposal;
* report to the Beneficiary regularly on the work progress as required;
* produce deliverables as required by the ToRs within the timeframe;
* provide draft deliverables for comments to the Beneficiary;
* discuss comments of the Beneficiary and take them into consideration for the final draft evaluation report;
* if necessary, prepare a short “main findings and recommendations” note no later than mid-October to feed into the process of revising the Strategy and developing the new action plan.

**7. Criteria and required qualifications**

The required qualifications of the expert(s) conducting the evaluation are:

* a university degree in economics, management or other social sciences;
* a minimum of 10 years professional experience in public administration and/or related projects (preference will be given to candidates who are able to demonstrate experience in evaluation of projects for public administration);
* proven experience in conducting evaluations for at least one strategy/programme/project evaluation exercise (reference to specific evaluations should be provided in the CV);
* high quality analytical and document drafting skills.

**8. Deliverables**

The deliverable of the assignment will be the final evaluation report of around 30 pages (not including annexes) in both *[country language]* and English. The report’s structure should be as follows:

* executive summary
* tables of contents, acronyms etc.
* introduction
* analysis of evaluation questions
* conclusions and recommendations
* annexes.

**9. Schedule of evaluation**

The deliverable should be submitted no later than 30 days from the contract signature date.

1. Guidance material and definitions are accessible here: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)