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NETWORK OF THINK TANKS AND EU POLICY RESEARCH CENTRES IN SOUTH EAST EUROPE
What is Think for Europe Network?

TEN is a network of non-profit, independent think-tank or policy research organisations focusing on the EU integration process and committed to the evidence-based policy making and advocacy.
Why TEN?

• Established against the background of weak regional cooperation in EU related policy research (despite the common challenges pre-accession countries face on their road to EU membership);
• Brought together by the values of good governance and rule of law as primary drivers of the development of our societies;

TEN objectives

• To promote evidence-based policy making and promotion of EU integration;

• Seek to establish themselves as “honest brokers” of the governments of their countries, balancing the role of partners in development and reforms and that of watchful scrutinizers of their actions;

• To promote excellence in policy research, through collaboration and exchange of practices with the aim of expanding the scope and further improving the quality of methodologies applied in both joint and individual research projects.
Present and Past Work

- Europeanisation Beyond Process
- Western Balkans Enabling Project for Civil Society Monitoring of Public Administration Reforms (WeBER)
- Raising Capacities and Advocacy Potential of CSOs of Visegrad Group and Western Balkans
- Benchmarking for EU Reforms – How Effective? BENCHER
- Performance Audit and Policy Evaluation: On the Same Track?
MIND (Y)OUR REFORM!

WeBER - Western Balkans Enabling Project
For Civil Society Monitoring of Public Administration Reform
WeBER Overall Goal

Western Balkans Enabling Project for Civil Society Monitoring of Public Administration Reform – WeBER – three-year project funded by the European Union and co-financed by the Kingdom of the Netherlands

Increase the relevance, participation and capacity of civil society organisations and media in the Western Balkans to advocate for and influence the design and implementation of public administration reform
Who implements WeBER?

WeBER is implemented by the Think for Europe Network (TEN) composed of EU policy oriented think tanks in the Western Balkans.

European Policy Centre (CEP) from Belgrade is the coordinator of the Project.
WeBER Methodology

Combination of activities aimed at improving the capacity of civil society organisations in the WB to participate in PAR including, but not limited to:

- WeBER PAR Platform
  - Venue for dialogue of CSOs and governments on PAR

- PAR Monitor
  - Generating evidence for meaningful dialogue on PAR

- Regional PAR Scoreboard
  - Regional peer pressure & country benchmarking

- Local CSOs participation in PAR
  - Training and coaching of local CSO; grant scheme
PAR Monitor Methodology

21 principle

23 complex indicators

www.europeanpolicy.org
/EuropeanPolicyCentre
@CEPBelgrade
Centar za evropske politike
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# PAR Monitor Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR ELEMENTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Element #</strong></td>
<td><strong>Element formulation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| E.1 | The government regularly publishes written information about its activities | 2 | • Government websites  
• Government reports |

**Element methodology**

Regular publishing of information will be interpreted to mean:
- online publishing of press releases on a weekly basis;
- online publishing of reports mentioned above on at least annual basis.

These two criteria are assessed cumulatively (absence of each of them results in 0 points).

The measurement of the indicator will cover the period of two years/annual reporting cycles, except for the press releases, which are assessed for a period of one year. If the measurement is done in the first half of the year, it will focus on the previous two calendar years. If it is done in the second half of the year, it will include the year within which the measurement is performed and the previous year.

**Point allocation**

- 0 if no written information
- 1 if written information was published but not regularly
- 2 if written information was published regularly

*Maximum points: 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element #</th>
<th>Element formulation</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Element data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E.2 | The information issued by the government on its activities is written in an understandable way | 2 | • Government websites  
• Government reports |
## PAR Monitor Methodology

### Indicator Scoring Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>SRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Indicator | The right to access public information is enshrined in legislation and consistently applied in practice |
| Indicator | Extent to which proactive informing of the public is fulfilled in practice by public authorities |

### General methodology

This indicator focuses on the provisions of public authorities in informing the public, particularly through comprehensiveness, timeliness and clarity of information disseminated through official websites. In the case of one element, indicator reference on proactiveness of publishing open data in public administration as a way to proactively informing of the public.

- For the first 17 elements, each indicator, evaluated information is assessed against the following groups of criteria:
  1. First group: assessing whether each piece of information:
     - Complete: all elements and aspects of the information are included;
     - Relevant: all aspects of information are relevant;
     - Accurate: all elements of information are accurate;
     - Up-to-date: information reflects the current factual situation;
     - Clear: all elements of information are clear;
     - Accessible: information is not more than three clicks away from the homepage;
     - Human friendly: written in an understandable language, devoid of bureaucratic terminology.
   - The exception is information contained in the element E.3 on accountability, which is assessed only against the first group of criteria.

- Search for information is conducted through the official websites of public authorities, through a sample of 4 ministries and 9 agencies/offices, more previously 13 key ministries (large, medium,次要的 in terms of thematic scope), and with a general planning and coordination function. The government office agency with CoC function, coordinated body of an agency responsible to a minister (branch), or government office agency for delivering services.

- When assessing each of the first 17 elements, it is calculated how many sample institutions publish information according to two criteria from the respective group. Obtained numeric value is added to the maximum score for each of these elements – 1 (element 1 sample institutions) and multiplied by 100. Final score represented in percentage is subject to point allocation as described for each element. Elements assessed against first group of criteria have higher threshold for awarding points, as indicated in point allocation for these elements.

### Final indicator score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator score</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional PAR Scoreboard
Small Grant Facility
Monitoring of PAR at Local Level

142 applications received
33 grants

Total: 255,000 EUR
Duration 6 – 12 months
Start: 1 June 2017
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Other resources
Videos on all SIGMA Principles
Other resources

PAR Resource Centre

CSO PAR Knowledge Centre

Here you can access the regional database of reports and analyses of civil society organisations from Western Balkan countries for different areas of public administration reform.
How is the situation in the Western Balkans?

PAR MONITOR RESULTS
- SELECTION
Transparency of the Government’s decision-making

• In general, **governments’ decision-making process is transparent** - agrees 13% of CSOs at the regional level

• **Agendas and minutes** of the Governments’ sessions unavailable to the public in half of countries

• **Adopted documents and decisions** published timely, except for BIH and MKD
Public perception of state administration’s citizen orientation

- 46% agreement that the time needed to obtain services has decreased in the past two years
- 59% agree that governments have been moving towards digitalisation the past two years
- Only 4 in 10 citizens are aware e-services are offered by their public administration
- Only 3 in 10 agree that administration asked for citizens’ feedback on how to improve administrative services the past two years

**EUROPEAN POLICY CENTRE**
Transparency and accessibility of budgetary documents

- Enacted annual budgets **regularly uploaded and easily accessible** at the MoF webpages
- **In-year budget execution reports** easily accessible; **mid-year** only in KS and MKD
- **Year-end reports** almost exclusively **lack non-financial performance information**
- Citizen-friendly budgets are **regularly published**, except for BIH and MNE
Thank you!

European Policy Centre – europeanpolicy.org
Think for Europe – ten.europeanpolicy.org
WeBER – par-monitor.org
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