Ministry of Public Finance
Authority for Coordination of Structural Instruments (ACIS)

Improving the system of indicators used in monitoring and evaluation

Activity 1.1 Analysis of the system of indicators used in monitoring and evaluation

OP Administrative Capacity Development

Contract number: 12/ 02.10.2009
March 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT 3
1.1. General design of the indicators system *3*
1.2. Institutional set-up *3*
2. ANALYSIS OF THE INDICATORS SYSTEM 5
2.1. Coverage of the indicators system *5*
2.1.1. Socio-economic environment 5
2.1.2. Objectives covered 9
2.1.3. Logic of intervention 23
2.1.4. ESF Reporting requirements (Reg. 1080/2006 - Annex XXIII) 30
2.2. Balance *32*
2.3. Manageability *35*
2.3.1. Overview 35
2.3.2. Defining indicators 36
2.3.3. Collecting indicators 37
2.3.4. Processing and measuring indicators 37
2.3.5. Progress monitoring 38
2.3.6. Communication 38
2.4. Preliminary Conclusions and recommendations on the system, affecting the analysis of individual indicators *40*
1. ANALYSIS OF THE INDIVIDUAL INDICATORS 48
3. 55
4. RECOMMENDATIONS 55
3.1. Needs assessment *55*
3.2. Analysis of the indicators system *55*
3.3. Analysis of individual indicators *56*
3.4. Recommended list of indicators for OP ACD *56*

1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The "Needs assessment questionnaire" was distributed to OP ACD Managing Authority and completed by just one expert. The opinions expressed by the respondent provide a useful though insufficient image as concerns the main features and weaknesses of the OP ACD system of indicators as well as the deficiencies in relation to their use by different stakeholders, in the monitoring and reporting process.

As presented in the Methodology chapter, stakeholder views are deliberately reported as received. This section does not comment on their accuracy, validity or feasibility. However, it does provide (in text boxes) a "consultants' perspective" in the form of preliminary conclusions deriving from the views of the stakeholders.

Findings are presented in two sub-sections: (1) general design of the indicators, which includes observations for individual indicators and (2) institutional set-up, including references to resources, SMIS usage and communication.

The opinion expressed through the questionnaires and the outcomes of the analysis exercise (as presented in the next chapters) were the starting points in formulating the conclusions and recommendations concerning the OP ACD system of indicators.

1.1. GENERAL DESIGN OF THE INDICATORS SYSTEM

The response to the survey shows that all OP ACD indicators are considered relevant both at PA level and for the overall Programme. Nonetheless, the respondent identified one operation within KAI 1.2 which does not have an output indicator allocated to it, which makes the physical monitoring of projects on this component, impossible.

As concerns the appropriateness of the individual indicators, the indicator "*Participant training days"* was provided as an example: this is a very important indicator for OP ACD and it is crucial for this indicator to be understood and used correctly; in order to ensure a coherent approach of training activities and the aggregation of values registered in projects at key area of intervention level, the respondent suggested that it should be revised as "Number of training days for all participants".

With respect to the balance among different categories of indicators, the respondent appreciated that OP ACD system of indicators is not balanced, since the current distribution of output indicators at KAI level does not allow the efficient evaluation of implementation of each KAI (see answer 2.5).

In relation to the ESF list of indicators, included in Annex XXIII of the Commission Regulation (EC) No 1828/2006, the opinion was that they were reasonably covered by the existing system of indicators (the respondent marked most of the indicators).

1.2. INSTITUTIONAL SET-UP

The respondent to the survey acknowledged that there are no specific procedures with respect to indicators. Within OP ACD, working procedures have been elaborated for three different types of activities – monitoring of project implementation, monitoring of the physical implementation of the OP and monitoring of financial progress, which cover the actual work concerning indicators. These procedures were rated mostly as 'fairly simple' (*see answers to Q 3.1, Q3.2*).

In the view of the MA OP DCA representative, the most important aspect which has a negative influence on day-to-day tasks relating to indicators is the quality and availability of data on the physical progress of projects. Also, the lack of observance of programme indicators in applications for financing and by beneficiaries in their progress reports represents a deficiency in the functioning of the current system (*see answer to Q 3.3*).

As regards the communication between the different components of the system, the present institutional arrangements are assessed by the respondent as acceptable (s*ee answer to Q3.4).*

Regarding SMIS functioning, the respondent underlined the need for improving and expanding some of its functionalities. For instance, SMIS should allow for the aggregation of data at project level, since it already offers the input of data at sub-project level (s*ee answer to Q3.8)*.

Preliminary conclusions

a) *Given the fact that only one response was received from the OP ACD representatives, the opinions expressed in the survey cannot be generalized for the other potential respondents.*

b) *In respect to the balance among the different categories of indicators, the issue needs further consideration, since our analysis did not confirm the views of the respondent (see next chapters). Other suggestions related to individual indicators were integrated into our recommendations. We also support the need for developing SMIS, particularly for enabling compliance with ESF reporting requirements.*

c) *Starting with the suggestions made by the respondent, there is a need to test each individual indicator through a multi-criteria analysis.*

2. ANALYSIS OF THE INDICATORS SYSTEM

2.1. COVERAGE OF THE INDICATORS SYSTEM

2.1.1. SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

OP ACD presents in the first three chapters an accurate overview of the priorities and needs related to the development of the administrative capacity in Romania, identified as a result of a thorough socio-economic and SWOT analysis done during the programming period. Also in this period, the Romanian Government decided to concentrate the program interventions upon three priority sectors, key for continuing the decentralization process: health, education and social assistance, thus enhancing the effectiveness and impact of the OP ACD. The main recommendations regarding the indicators, made by the ex-ante evaluators referred to the need to relate the indicators and the target data to the efficiency and productivity of the Romanian public administration.
According to EC Working Document no.2, Context indicators should reflect the structure of the socio-economic analysis of the program.
Although OP ACD does not have defined context indicators, they could be extracted using official statistics, macro-economic indicators, used at both national and EU level. They offer important information on the driving forces influencing the administrative reform – which has an indirect contribution to the achievement of the Lisbon Agenda objectives.
In the implementation phase the context indicators can provide useful information on the overall development in relevant areas outside of the programme interventions. At the moment there are no specific indicators which could monitor and measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the Governmental programmes[1] except one impact indicator at the level of the OP measuring the governance efficiency.
When reviewing the first chapters of OP ACD (socio-economic analysis and SWOT analysis) as well as the content of the National Reform Programme, several potential specific context indicators were identified. These indicators were listed in the table below as potential context indicators and were further analysed taking into consideration other context indicators used by Member States as well as in relation to the objectives and indicators of Europe 2020 Strategy.

During the analysis of the potential context indicators, the correlation between key government indicators and the country's economic development was taken into account. Thus, enhanced government effectiveness and improved control of corruption will significantly contribute to the increase of GDP per capita and subsequently on the employment, salaries and general social welfare.

Following the analysis of the administrative capacity development related OPs from other Member States[2] , it can be noticed that no context indicators were defined as such in any of the related operational programs, but Czech Republic (see Annex 1). The two main themes (fields) considered as key for the OP ACD in Romania are listed in the comparative table presented in the following pages, including the context indicators established for other countries.

[1] According to the National Reform Program, the governmental reform measures foresee elaborating and implementing of an indicators system with the purpose of monitoring the Governmental program. This measure it is envisaged to be funded from both national and ESF funding through the OP ACD.
[2] OPs in full text were consulted for the following MS: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Spain, Poland, Portugal and Ireland

TABLE 1 INTERNATIONAL BENCHMARK OF CONTEXT INDICATORS FOR OP ACD

Fields targeted by the OP ACD (with focus on the three priority sectors – health, social, education)	**Potential context indicators resulting from the OP ACD analysis**	**Context indicators targeted by the _Operational Programme for Human Resources Development 2007-2013 - Lithuania**	**Context indicators targeted by the Integrated Operation Programme (IOP)– Czech Republic**	**Context indicators targeted by the OP Employment and Social Inclusion 2007-2013 - and Education OP Slovakia**
- Building effective decision making and accountability processes that enhance organizational effectiveness - Improving the quality and efficiency standards in the delivery of public services, primarily on a decentralized basis	- Size of the priority sectors in the public expenditure - Share of public investment in GDP - Level of tax revenue collection - ICT level in public sector - Share of public debt in GDP (%)	- No context indicators established. However, a number of administrative capacity program indicators was established (impact indicators): - **Residents' confidence in state and municipality institutions and offices** (percent) - **Governance efficiency (according to World** Bank indicator[3]) - **Governing quality (according to World** Bank indicator)	**GDP at current prices** **Total employment rate 15+** - of that men (15-64) - of that women (15-64) **National budget balance** (NB) **ICT cost as percentage of GDP** **Total expenditure on health care** – share in GDP at current prices **Yearly average energy consumption**	- **Total Employment Rate (15 - 64)** - **Total Employment Rate (55 - 64)** - **Unemployment Rate** - **Long-term Unemployment Rate Total** - **Poverty Risk Rate** - **Gender Wage Difference in Unmodified Form** - **Graduates from the tertiary level of higher education** - **Youth with secondary education** - **Population percentage (aged 18 – 24) with lower secondary education, not receiving any further education** See Annex 1 for a detailed list of context indicators

[3] The World Bank governance indicators are: "voice" and accountability; political stability; government effectiveness; regulatory quality; rule of law; control of corruption" [based on *World Bank's Governance & Anti-Corruption (GAC) Strategy*]

Preliminary Conclusions:

- The monitoring system of the OP ACD in Romania does not formally include any context indicators, which hinders the proper contextualisation of the programme interventions;
- The absence of context indicators does not enable the monitoring of a constantly evolving general context of the programme and limits the possibility for a continuous check on the relevance of identified needs and on the implementation of interventions financed from the OP;
- Strategic reporting at the programme level (annual implementation reports) is missing an important source of useful information

Therefore, it would be advisable to consider the formal inclusion in the monitoring system of a number of context indicators.

When proposing context indicators for OP ACD, the following issues were considered:

1) Potential context indicators resulting from the analysis of the OP ACD were determined through:
   a) Screening the "Analysis of the current situation" chapter, which provided information on the most important sectoral context indicators, history and perspectives;
   b) Screening of the SWOT analysis; all four sub-section (strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and threats) offer a clear picture of the issues that have to be maximised or, on the contrary, alleviated, as well as of the ones that have to be taken into account or risk prevented;
   c) Analysing result indicators which may have been wrongfully assigned;
   d) Analysing of the National Reform Plan 2007-2010, Chapters related to Macro-economy (chapters 5 and 6), Annexes 4 (Structural indicators) and 5 (Evolution and Prognosis of some structural indicators in Romania);
2) Context indicators revealed by the international benchmarking analysis to be relevant for the Romanian OP ACD strategic objectives were taken into account.
3) The objectives and indicators (including headline indicators[4]) included in the Europe 2020 Strategy designed as the successor to the Lisbon Strategy.
4) Priorities established within the Community Strategic Guidelines on Cohesion 2007-2013
5) World Bank Governance indicators[5]

The following table encompasses the context indicators that were considered relevant, and their relation with the result indicators within the OP ACD, SWOT analysis but also their connection with the above-mentioned strategies.

[4] The headline indicators measure the progress made by the EU and the Member States towards achieving the headline targets of the strategy- on employment, innovation, education, social inclusion and climate/energy.
[5] See previous page.

TABLE 2 **PROPOSED LIST OF CONTEXT INDICATORS FOR OP ACD**

Context indicators suggested for the OP ACD Romania	Rationale	
	SWOT analysis	specific objective (SO) of the Programme
Share of draft normative acts resulting from public policy proposals, out of the total number of draft normative acts adopted (%)* *except for draft normative acts with individual application (such as nominations, dismissals etc.)	[S] ...Good building blocks in terms of legal framework and methodologies, as well as institutional arrangements to improve the public policy making, coordination and planning system of the central public administration; [W] Insufficient capacity to apply new methodologies and to respect newly established legal frameworks	[SO 1]: To achieve structural and process improvements of the public policy management cycle
Public servants / 1000 inhabitants (number)	[S] ....Recent improvements in the civil service legal and institutional framework (recruitment, performance appraisal and promotion based on merit) for a better management of the civil service;	[SO 1]: To achieve structural and process improvements of the public policy management cycle [SO 2]: To improve the quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralised basis.
Level of tax revenue collection (%)	[W] Incomplete transfer of the decision powers and financial resources, insufficient capacity to apply new methodologies and to respect newly established legal frameworks, etc.	[SO 2]: To improve the quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralised basis.
PCs connected to internet (number)	[W] ...strong frequency of reporting requirements for businesses and poor usage of electronic and web-based reporting for them; lack of relevant indicators for monitoring progress in reducing administrative burden	[SO 2]: To improve the quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralised basis.
Administrative cost reduction (%)	[W] ...Lack of a standardized model of measuring the administrative burden imposed by legislation; strong incidence of the overlaps of regulations required by different Governmental bodies and of the double-counting and registration of the same information obligations from existing legislation;... lack of relevant indicators for monitoring progress in reducing administrative burdens	[SO 2]: To improve the quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralised basis.

2.1.2. OBJECTIVES COVERED

In order to see the consistency of the indicators at system level, the correlation between indicators and objectives at different levels was analysed. The purpose was to identify:

1) Indicators that remain "outside" objectives;
2) Indicators that were inappropriately assigned to a certain PA/KAI/Operation;
3) Objectives that cannot be measured for lack of indicators;
4) Indicators that overlap

The analysis consisted in outlining the objectives of OP ACD as well as the breakdown from global, to specific and operational objectives (at PA/KAI level).

According to the objectives tree of OP ACD, the general objective of the OP ACD is "*to contribute to the creation of a more efficient and effective public administration for the socio-economic benefit of Romanian society.*"

This is further broken down into two specific objectives, as presented in the table below. For each KAI, the specific indicative operations were also examined (as detailed in OP ACD Framework Document of Implementation, version November 2010). Another purpose of the table was to map the link between the objectives and output and resulting indicators, so as to provide answer to the four topics of analysis set out in the beginning of this subsection.

Table 3 **Coverage of Operational Objectives OP ACD** (P=programme, S=supplementary)

	INTERVENTIONS/INDICATIVE OPERATIONS	**OUTPUT INDICATORS**	**OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES**
	KAI 1.1		
PA 1. Structural and process improvements of the public policy management cycle	-Elaborate a set of tools, methods and institutional framework (including strategic planning and program budgeting) specific to a policy oriented approach, leading to better regulation (also reducing administrative costs) within the public administration Training for specialists involved in public policy formulation process in line ministries and local public administration Implementing strategic plans and training on strategic planning (program budgeting included) for management level staff in central and local administration, including the inter-ministerial councils and a train-the-trainer group Develop mechanisms to promote and implement partnership initiatives at all levels, in order to ensure the involvement of stakeholders in the policy development process	- (P) Guidelines and other methodological documents (number) - (P) Participant training days (number) - (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men - (S) Number of training sessions - (S) Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	To develop capacity in policy formulation, better regulation, strategic planning and inter-institutional partnership working
	KAI 1.2		

	Developing methodologies and tools to improve systems and procedures for performance measurement and reporting Training to improve the quality and extent of performance reporting to the direct recipients of public services and to citizen groups by central and local administrative organizations. Training in performance measurement and reporting techniques, including performance indicators and monitoring and evaluation The development of a national database for collecting, reporting, analyzing and publishing the relevant statistics regarding the local administration performances. Elaborating methodologies and the institutional framework for extending the program/policy evaluation approach at central and local administration.	- (P) Guidelines and other methodological documents (number) - (P)Training modules elaborated (number - (P) Participant training days (number) Number of training participants of which: women/ men -(S) Number of training sessions - (S) Studies, analyses, reports, strategies - (S) Communication and promotion events	To make capacity improvements in the accountability framework
	KAI 1.3		
	Structural review and implementation of proposals resulting from there, implementation of modern instruments, setting up and operationalisation of new structures such as the public	- (P) Structural reviews (number) - (P) Participant training days (number) - (P) Training modules (number) - (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men - (S) Number of training sessions	To support structural and process improvements that contribute to organisational effectiveness

	management reform centre, intercommunity development associations, corps of professional public administrators in local administration, etc. (1.3)	- (S) Studies, analyses, reports, strategies		
	Introduction of quality management reforms. -Implementation of the human resource performance management system.			
	Development of the training management functions in public administration.			
	Provision of special graduate level management development programs for leading civil servants.			
	Module-based basic training programs on topics such as public procurement, ECDL, foreign languages, project development, project tendering and management, etc.			

	INTERVENTIONS/INDICATIVE OPERATIONS	**OUTPUT INDICATORS**		**OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES**
PA 2. Improved quality and efficiency of the delivery of public	Training and technical support for the structures involved in planning and coordination of the decentralization process	- (P) Structural reviews (number) - (P) Guidelines and other methodological documents (number) - (P) Participant training days (number) - (S) Number of training participants	⇒	To support structural and process change arising from sectoral decentralisation initiatives.
	Develop procedures for cooperation between central and local administration and local			

	authorities and schools/ hospitals/ decentralized social assistance services or other structures involved in decentralization process.	of which: women/ men - (S) Number of training sessions - (S) Studies, analyses, reports, strategies		
	Training for public administration staff at local level			
	Training for the management staff of hospitals and other medical institutions			
	Support for the evaluation of the pilot phase of the decentralization process in pre-university education and implementation of the recommendations of the evaluations.			
	Optimization of structures of the newly decentralized/ deconcentrated services in the priority sectors			
	Elaboration of studies/strategies to support the decentralization			
	KAI 2.2			
	Development, testing and roll-out of service cost and quality standards	- (P) Sectors in which cost and quality standards are designed (number) - (P) Guidelines for improving revenue collection (number) - (P) Participant training days	⇨	To realise improved public services
	Development of methods to measure administrative burdens			

	Elaboration of mechanisms/ tools/ procedures for the improvement of tax collection, including the interfacing of existing data bases	(number) - (P) Administrative simplification analyses (number) Number of training participants of which: women/ men - (S) Number of training sessions - (S) Studies, analyses, reports, strategies - (S) Exchange of experience and good practices participants		
	Implementation of initiatives to reduce the time taken to deliver services			
	Training on service performance assessment			
	Review of specific problems in service delivery, in order to simplify and reduce the administrative burden on citizens			
	Introducing and applying management systems, including EMAS24			
	The use of IT-driven mechanisms, *i.e.* web-based portals and databases			
	Implementing service delivery charters (introducing a set of general principles regarding the quality of the services which are delivered to the customers)			

	INTERVENTIONS/INDICATIVE OPERATIONS	**OUTPUT INDICATORS**		**OPERATIONAL OBJECTIVES**
	KAI 3.1			
Technical Assistanc	Support the overall management of the OP ACD	- (P) Participant training days (number)		To support the efficient management, monitoring,

	Support the OP evaluation activities, in order to ensure the effective implementation of the OP ACD	- (P) Relevant committees and working groups reunions (number) - (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men - (S) Number of training sessions		evaluation and control of the OP ACD, and to support the MA in accomplishing its task to prepare and coordinate the procedural rules for managing, monitoring, evaluation and control within the framework of the existing institutional, legal and financial systems
	Support the preparation of future structural funds interventions. This may include ensuring external expertise, elaborating needs assessments for next programming period, etc.	***No indicator to measure the number of studies, analyses, reports, strategies***		
	KAI 3.2			
	Support the communication and promotion activities of the OP ACD. This may include developing and implementing the OP ACD communication plan, establishing a system of public information related to the OP, etc.	-(P) Communication and promotion events (number) - (S) Information and publicity materials - (S) Participant training days – beneficiaries - (S) Participant training days – managing structures -(S) Participant training days – other structures	⇨	To develop an efficient system of promoting the OP ACD through the dissemination of the relevant information

Fig. 4 Coverage of Specific Objectives OP ACD (P=programme, S=supplementary)

	INTERVENTIONS/INDICATIVE OPERATIONS	**RESULT INDICATORS**		**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**
	KAI 1.1			
PA 1. *Structural*	-Elaborate a set of tools, methods and institutional framework	- Percentage of unsatisfactory policy documents and draft	⇨	To achieve structural and process improvements of the

	(including strategic planning and program budgeting) specific to a policy oriented approach, leading to better regulation (also reducing administrative costs) within the public administration	normative acts returned by GSG to initiators (%) - Percentage of administrative costs reduction (%) ***No indicator to measure the number of partnership initiatives implemented***		public policy management cycle
	Training for specialists involved in public policy formulation process in line ministries and local public administration			
	Implementing strategic plans and training on strategic planning (program budgeting included) for management level staff in central and local administration, including the inter-ministerial councils and a train-the-trainer group			
	Develop mechanisms to promote and implement partnership initiatives at all levels, in order to ensure the involvement of stakeholders in the policy development process			
	KAI 1.2			
	Developing methodologies and tools to improve systems and procedures for performance measurement and reporting	- Public institutions elaborating annual activity report according to Law No. 544/2001 (%) - Monitoring and evaluation reports elaborated/requested by central public institutions (number)	⇨	To achieve structural and process improvements of the public policy management cycle. To improve the quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralized basis
	Training to improve the quality and extent of performance reporting to the direct recipients of public services and to citizen groups by central and local administrative organizations.	***No indicator to measure the setup of national database***		

	Training in performance measurement and reporting techniques, including performance indicators and monitoring and evaluation		
	The development of a national database for collecting, reporting, analyzing and publishing the relevant statistics regarding the local administration performances.		
	Elaborating methodologies and the institutional framework for extending the program/policy evaluation approach at central and local administration.		
	KAI 1.3		
	Structural review and implementation of proposals resulting from there, implementation of modern instruments, setting up and operationalisation of new structures such as the public management reform centre, intercommunity development associations, corps of professional public administrators in local administration, etc.	- New and re-organized structures, operational (number) - Certified training participants (number)	To support structural and process improvements that contribute to organisational effectiveness To improve the quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralized basis
	Introduction of quality management reforms. -Implementation of the human resource performance management system.		

	Development of the training management functions in public administration. Provision of special graduate level management development programs for leading civil servants. Module-based basic training programs on topics such as public procurement, ECDL, foreign languages, project development, project tendering and management, etc.		

	INTERVENTIONS/INDICATIVE OPERATIONS	**RESULT INDICATORS**	**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**
PA 2. *Improved quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralized basis*	Training and technical support for the structures involved in planning and coordination of the decentralization process Develop procedures for cooperation between central and local administration and local authorities and schools/ hospitals/ decentralized social assistance services or other structures involved in decentralization process. Training for public administration staff at local level	New decentralized structures operational (number)	To improve the quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralized basis.

	Training for the management staff of hospitals and other medical institutions			
	Support for the evaluation of the pilot phase of the decentralization process in pre-university education and implementation of the recommendations of the evaluations.			
	Optimization of structures of the newly decentralized/ deconcentrated services in the priority sectors			
	Elaboration of studies/strategies to support the decentralization			
	KAI 2.2			
	Development, testing and roll-out of service cost and quality standards	- Sectors in which cost and quality standards are introduced (number) - Degree of own revenue collection of the local public administration (%)	⇒	To improve the quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralized basis.
	Development of methods to measure administrative burdens			
	Elaboration of mechanisms/ tools/ procedures for the improvement of tax collection, including the interfacing of existing data bases			
	Implementation of initiatives to reduce the time taken to deliver services			

	Training on service performance assessment		
	Review of specific problems in service delivery, in order to simplify and reduce the administrative burden on citizens		
	Introducing and applying management systems, including EMAS24		
	The use of IT-driven mechanisms, *i.e.* web-based portals and databases		
	Implementing service delivery charters (introducing a set of general principles regarding the quality of the services which are delivered to the customers)		

	INTERVENTIONS/INDICATIVE OPERATIONS	**RESULT INDICATORS**	**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**
	KAI 3.1		
PA 3. *Technical Assistance*	Support the overall management of the OP ACD	Observance of the commitment targets (%)	To support the efficient management, monitoring, evaluation and control of the OP ACD, and to support the MA in accomplishing its task to prepare and coordinate the procedural rules for managing, monitoring, evaluation and control within the framework of the existing institutional, legal and financial systems
	Support the OP evaluation activities, in order to ensure the effective implementation of the OP ACD		
	Support the preparation of future structural funds interventions. This may include ensuring external expertise, elaborating needs assessments		

	for next programming period, etc.			
	KAI 3.2			
	Support the communication and promotion activities of the OP ACD. This may include developing and implementing the OP ACD communication plan, establishing a system of public information related to the OP, etc.	Potential applicants participating in communication events	⇒	To develop an efficient system of promoting the OP ACD through the dissemination of the relevant information

The following preliminary conclusions can be observed from analysing the link between objectives and indicators at the level of OP ACD:

1. *Indicators that remain "outside" objectives*

Overall, as seen from the above table, all the indicators currently in use can be associated with one of the objectives of the KAI/PA/OP ACD and there are no indicators that remain outside objectives. However in few specific cases there is a matter of appropriateness in assignment the indicators to a certain PA/KAI/Indicative Operation, as reflected under the second tier of the analysis.

2. *Indicators that were inappropriately assigned to a certain PA/KAI/Operation*

The proposed output and result indicators as well as the supplementary indicators and impact ones add value to the measurement of KAI/PA/ OP ACD and reflect the type of operations to be undertaken thus supporting the measurement of the degree of accomplishment the objectives.

3. *Objectives that cannot be measured for lack of indicators;*

In respect to this third tier of the analysis, the main findings reflect the fact that overall, the existing indicators allows for a satisfactory coverage of the objectives, thus creating good prospects in terms of measurement of the objectives. Nevertheless there were identified particular cases when some of the operations/ objectives might be only partially measured in the absence of relevant indicators as for example:

- KAI 1.1, the operation concerning the *development of mechanisms to promote and implement partnership initiatives at all levels, in order to ensure the involvement of stakeholders in the policy development process*, do not have an indicator assigned in terms of results
- KAI 1.2, the operation concerning the *development of a national database for collecting, reporting, analyzing and publishing the relevant statistics regarding the local administration performances*, do not have an indicator assigned
- KAI 2.2, there is no indicator to measure the *number of institutions where the cost and quality standards are introduced*
- KAI 3.1, the elaboration of *studies, reports, analyses* do not have an indicator assigned

The general and specific objectives of the OP ACD are currently reflected in the system of indicators by output and result indicators, supplementary indicators and impact indicators. The impact indicators apply homogenously for all three PAs being defined as:

- Citizens' confidence in central public administration institutions (%)
- Citizens' confidence in local public administration institutions (%)
- Governance efficiency (%)

An improvement that can be brought at the level of the impact indicators is to measure also the quality of governance besides efficiency of the governance.

4. *Indicators that overlap*

In few cases, supplementary indicators overlap with the programme output and result indicators this causing an unnecessary load to system of indicators. Cases of overlapping were identified as following:

- KAIs 1.2, 1.3- for the indicator *Training modules elaborated (number)*, the operation measured is already covered by the supplementary indicator "*Number of training sessions*" (there is noticed also the low relevance of *modules elaborated* as compared with training sessions (implemented/ organized)

Other significant findings in relation to the coverage of OP ACD system of indicators refer to the fact that:

- There are no **context indicators** assigned for OP ACD (see previous section related to socio-economic context). Although this issue is not directly related to the objectives covered, their existence would enable a better understanding of the environment in which the OP is implemented, of its objectives and achievements.

The overall conclusion is that the current system of OP ACD indicators reflects a satisfactory level in securing coverage with the objectives although there is identified the need for partial revision.

2.1.3. LOGIC OF INTERVENTION

Starting from the strategic level (NSRF) and reaching the operational level (OP), the indicators system should reflect the programme objectives tree (see next figure). This analysis helps to assess whether indicators are appropriate to each level. While the "objectives covered" focuses on the horizontal correspondence between objectives and indicators, the logic of intervention examines the vertical relationship between input, output, result and impact indicators[6].

The first step of the analysis was to establish the causal link between the output and result indicators and to see whether there are indicators that fall outside the logical pattern. At the programming level for the development of an intervention logic and set of objectives (with indicators) the EC External Services Evaluation Unit put forward its assistance and guiding for the elaboration of country strategic papers through five working papers developed for the sectors: roads; water and sanitation; health; education; and agriculture and rural development.

The process of identification the thematic areas of the OP ACD intervention was guided by the analysis on the scope of operations proposed at the level of the PAs:

- Addressing the horizontal management problems at all public administration levels (central and local) with a focus on key attributes that strengthen the reliability of the administration, in particular decision making, better regulation, accountability and organizational effectiveness
- Specifically target improvements to the decentralization of service delivery in certain prioritized sectors (Health, Education, Social Assistance) and improve the quality and efficiency of service delivery

The interventions targeted by OP ACD are designed to produce broad effects at the level of all sectors aiming to obtain a high level of trust in public administration thus the thematic areas that might be enunciated are:

1. **Socio-Economic Development**
2. **Institutional Capacity**

The two thematic areas are often interlinked, as further described. The overall investment of OP ACD in structural and process improvements of the public policy management cycle and improvement of the quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralized basis will consequently affect positively and globally social and economic sectors at the same time.

The figures below show the causal link between the output and result indicators by trying to identify the most visible areas thematic areas of the interventions financed through OP ACD:

[6] This section will be reformulated in the final version of the Analysis Report and most of the methodological references will be moved to a separate, cover section, so as to avoid repetition across OPs.

Fig. 6 Intervention LOGIC OP ACD (P=programme, S=supplementary)

	INTERVENTIONS/INDICATIVE OPERATIONS	**OUTPUT INDICATORS**	**RESULT INDICATORS**
	KAI 1.1		
PA 1. *Structural and process improvements of the public policy management cycle*	-Elaborate a set of tools, methods and institutional framework (including strategic planning and program budgeting) specific to a policy oriented approach, leading to better regulation (also reducing administrative costs) within the public administration Training for specialists involved in public policy formulation process in line ministries and local public administration Implementing strategic plans and training on strategic planning (program budgeting included) for management level staff in central and local administration, including the inter-ministerial councils and a train-the-trainer group Develop mechanisms to promote and implement partnership initiatives at all levels, in order to ensure the involvement of stakeholders in the policy development process	- (P) Guidelines and other methodological documents (number) - (P) Participant training days (number) - (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men - (S) Number of training sessions - (S) Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	- Percentage of unsatisfactory policy documents and draft normative acts returned by GSG to initiators (%) - Percentage of administrative costs reduction (%) ***No indicator to measure the number of partnership initiatives implemented***

KAI 1.2		
Developing methodologies and tools to improve systems and procedures for performance measurement and reporting	- (P)Training modules elaborated (number	*No indicator defined*
Training to improve the quality and extent of performance reporting to the direct recipients of public services and to citizen groups by central and local administrative organizations.	- (P) Guidelines and other methodological documents (number) - (P) Participant training days (number) Number of training participants of which: women/ men -(S) Number of training sessions - (S) Studies, analyses, reports, strategies - (S) Communication and promotion events	- Public institutions elaborating annual activity report according to Law No. 544/2001 (%) - Monitoring and evaluation reports elaborated/requested by central public institutions (number) ***No indicator to measure the setup of national database***
Training in performance measurement and reporting techniques, including performance indicators and monitoring and evaluation		
The development of a national database for collecting, reporting, analyzing and publishing the relevant statistics regarding the local administration performances.		
Elaborating methodologies and the institutional framework for extending the program/policy evaluation approach at central and local administration.		
KAI 1.3		
Structural review and implementation of proposals resulting from there, implementation of modern instruments, setting up	- (P) Training modules (number) - (P) Structural reviews (number) - (P) Participant training days	*No indicator defined* - New and re-organized structures, operational

	and operationalisation of new structures such as the public management reform centre, intercommunity development associations, corps of professional public administrators in local administration, etc. (1.3)	(number) - (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men - (S) Number of training sessions - (S) Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	(number) - Certified training participants (number)
	Introduction of quality management reforms. -Implementation of the human resource performance management system.		
	Development of the training management functions in public administration.		
	Provision of special graduate level management development programs for leading civil servants.		
	Module-based basic training programs on topics such as public procurement, ECDL, foreign languages, project development, project tendering and management, etc.		

INTERVENTIONS/INDICATIVE OPERATIONS	**OUTPUT INDICATORS**	**RESULT INDICATORS**
KAI 2.1		

PA 2. *Improved quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralized basis*	Training and technical support for the structures involved in planning and coordination of the decentralization process Develop procedures for cooperation between central and local administration and local authorities and schools/ hospitals/ decentralized social assistance services or other structures involved in decentralization process. Training for public administration staff at local level Training for the management staff of hospitals and other medical institutions Support for the evaluation of the pilot phase of the decentralization process in pre-university education and implementation of the recommendations of the evaluations. Optimization of structures of the newly decentralized/ deconcentrated services in the priority sectors Elaboration of studies/strategies to support the decentralization	- (P) Structural reviews (number) - (P) Guidelines and other methodological documents (number) - (P) Participant training days (number) - (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men - (S) Number of training sessions - (S) Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	⇨	New decentralized structures operational (number)
	KAI 2.2			

	Development, testing and roll-out of service cost and quality standards	- (P) Sectors in which cost and quality standards are designed (number) - (P) Guidelines for improving revenue collection (number) - (P) Participant training days (number) - (P) Administrative simplification analyses (number) Number of training participants of which: women/ men - (S) Number of training sessions - (S) Studies, analyses, reports, strategies - (S) Exchange of experience and good practices participants	- Sectors in which cost and quality standards are introduced (number) - Degree of own revenue collection of the local public administration (%)
	Development of methods to measure administrative burdens		
	Elaboration of mechanisms/ tools/ procedures for the improvement of tax collection, including the interfacing of existing data bases		
	Implementation of initiatives to reduce the time taken to deliver services		
	Training on service performance assessment		
	Review of specific problems in service delivery, in order to simplify and reduce the administrative burden on citizens		
	Introducing and applying management systems, including EMAS24		
	The use of IT-driven mechanisms, *i.e.* web-based portals and databases		
	Implementing service delivery charters (introducing a set of general principles regarding the quality of the services which are delivered to the customers)		

	INTERVENTIONS/INDICATIVE OPERATIONS	OUTPUT INDICATORS		RESULT INDICATORS
	KAI 3.1			
PA 3. *Technical Assistance*	Support the overall management of the OP ACD Support the OP evaluation activities, in order to ensure the effective implementation of the OP ACD Support the preparation of future structural funds interventions. This may include ensuring external expertise, elaborating needs assessments for next programming period, etc.	- (P) Participant training days (number) - (P) Relevant committees and working groups reunions (number) - (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men - (S) Number of training sessions ***No indicator to measure the number of studies, analyses, reports, strategies***	⇨	Observance of the commitment targets (%)
	KAI 3.2			
	Support the communication and promotion activities of the OP ACD. This may include developing and implementing the OP ACD communication plan, establishing a system of public information related to the OP, etc.	-(P) Communication and promotion events (number) - (S) Information and publicity materials - (S) Participant training days – beneficiaries - (S) Participant training days – managing structures -(S) Participant training days – other structures	⇨	Potential applicants participating in communication events

- The OP ACD provides three impact indicators labelled as *Citizens' confidence in central public administration institutions (%), Citizens' confidence in local public administration institutions (%), -Governance efficiency (%)*; as impact indicators assigned at the level of OP ACD, the comments on the causal link with the outputs, results and impact indicators are provided under this section: by the way the impact indicators are defined, it is noticeable the broad coverage of all interventions financed under OP ACD in terms of expected impact; also by analyzing the causal link between the existing outputs and results indicators assigned per each KAI and the impact indicators assigned at the level of OP ACD it is easy to observe their causality and further effects in terms of the two broad thematic areas identified: socio-economic development and institutional capacity.
- As regards the existing system of indicators under present analysis it is also noticeable the existence of direct causal links between the output and result indicators this being also allotted to the carefulness in definition of the result indicators; nevertheless some comments in respect of improvement the coverage and manageability were made by the Consultant under the section *2.1.2 Objectives covered.*
- The thematic area Institutional Capacity can be directly assigned to all the Priority Axis by given the specific characteristics of the proposed interventions under OP ACD.
- There are cases when there is no clear causal link between outputs and results indicators which makes difficult the task of identifying the effects. This is for example the case of the indicator *training modules elaborated (number)* assigned at the level of KAIs 1.2 and 1.3, which in the absence of direct causal link with results do not make possible to identify the clear benefits in term of generating effects on different sectors

The effects generated by interventions on each Priority Axis/ KAI have a high level of coverage, especially when the effects on social and economic sectors are considered, being given by the specificity of operations funded per each PA/KAI. Also the effects on strengthening the institutional capacity are not to be neglected.

As a general conclusion, the system of OP ACD indicators is perfectible; while there are components that follow the logical pattern there are also components (particularly concerning definition and availability of output and result indicators) that need review.

2.1.4. ESF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS (REG. 1080/2006 - ANNEX XXIII)

TABLE 4 REG. 1080/2006 ANNEX XXIII REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Annex XXIII- Data on participants in ESF operations by priority	OP ACD
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS PER YEAR (people entering, those leaving, carry-over from one year to the next)	-
BREAKDOWN OF PARTICIPANTS BY GENDER	- (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men (KAI 1.1) - (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men (KAI 1.2) - (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men (KAI 1.3)

	- (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men (KAI 2.1) - (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men (KAI 3.2) - (S) Number of training participants of which: women/ men (KAI 3.1)
BREAKDOWN OF PARTICIPANTS ACCORDING TO STATUS IN THE LABOUR MARKET - **Employed (total number of employed, including self-employed)** - **Self-employed** - **Unemployed (total number of unemployed including long-term unemployed)** - **Long-term unemployed** - **Inactive persons (total number of inactive persons, including those in education, training or retirement, those having given up business, the permanently disabled, those fulfilling domestic tasks or other)** - **Inactive persons in education or training**	-
BREAKDOWN OF PARTICIPANTS BY AGE **— Young people (15-24 years)** **— Older workers (55-64 years)**	-collected at project level (Excel forms)
BREAKDOWN OF PARTICIPANTS BY VULNERABLE GROUPS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH NATIONAL RULES **— Minorities** **— Migrants** **— Disabled** **— Other disadvantaged people**	-collected at project level (Excel forms)
BREAKDOWN OF PARTICIPANTS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT - **Primary or lower secondary education (ISCED 1 and 2)** - **Upper secondary education (ISCED 3)** - **Post-secondary non-tertiary education (ISCED 4)** - **Tertiary education (ISCED 5 and 6)**	-collected at project level (Excel forms)

- According to the provisions of Annex XXIII, the Managing Authorities have to collect information in respect of participants involved in the projects funded from ESF
- The OP ACD stipulates under the section *Monitoring and Evaluation*, sub-section *Monitoring and reporting system* that *whenever appropriate, the indicators will be broken down by different criteria (territorial, gender, target groups, size of the recipient, etc.). For ESF interventions, the Annex XXIII: Data on participants in ESF operations of the Implementing Regulation No 1828/2006 will be observed*.

- Based on the thorough analysis of the existing system of indicators of OP ACD (according to FDI), in relation to the ESF list of indicators, included in Annex XXIII of the Commission Regulation (EC) No. 1828/2006, the opinion is that part of the indicators use the breakdown on categories as detailed in Annex XXIII. In this respect the breakdown of participants by gender is the most used one.
- Nevertheless it is worth mentioning that, in order to observe the requirements of Annex XXIII, the MA of OP ACD included in the Manual of Implementation for the projects funded under OP ACD two types of forms to be filled within the reporting requirements: *individual form of participants to the activities funded under OP ACD* and *statistical form concerning the participants to the activities funded under OP ACD*. By availability of this information, the observance of the Annex XXIII is secured.
- Although there are conditions created to collect data on participants at project level (using the breakdown on categories), it is not clear how this data is correlated with SMIS and how is further on reported by MA to EC.

2.2. BALANCE

In order to assess the balance of the indicators system of OP ACD, two main issues were analysed:

1) **Proportionality**
2) **Distribution by types of indicators** (input, output, result, impact).

The analysis of proportionality started from the guidelines provided by the EC Working Document No. 2[7]:

> *"The scale of the Operational Programme should be considered in the context of the indicator system proposed. In particular for the measurement of impacts, methodologies used should reflect the size of the interventions.*
> *The indicator systems of complex programmes (e.g., within the Convergence Objective) with a high number of priorities and measures will necessarily be more difficult to manage than the system of a smaller programme. The challenge is to design indicator systems as complex as necessary and as small as possible under the specific circumstances of a specific programme. The aim is not to achieve an equal coverage of all programme and priority objectives. The impact and result indicators should cover priorities or measures which represent the bulk of expenditure or are of strategic importance from the point of view of programme objectives or the information needs of the potential users."*

The following aspects were extracted as being the most relevant for the analysis:

- Result and impact indicators need most care and are not necessary to be assigned to every intervention financed under the programme. Result indicators were given careful consideration and were chosen as the first criterion;

[7] DG Regional Development, Indicative Guidelines on Evaluation Methods: Monitoring and Evaluating Indicators, Working Document No.2, Aug.2006, p.21 [Note: Methodological details will be removed in the final version and transferred in the overall cover section of the Analysis Report, to avoid duplication]

- Complexity of the intervention should be taken into account; in the sense of this analysis, a complex intervention within OP ACD is one with several possible results and/or with long term or complicated implementation[8];
- The system of indicators should take into account the scale of the intervention; therefore, financial allocation was one of the criteria for analysis.

Funds[9] (EUR)		**Categories**				**Total**
	Input (allocation)	Output	Result	Supplementary	Impact	
Axis 1: 137,037,022	56%	8	6	10	3	24
Axis 2: 97,883,587	46%	7	3	7		17
Axis 3: 11,093,472	4%	3	2	6		11
Total funds: **246,014,081**	100% (% of NSRF)	18	11	23	3	52 + 3 impact = 55

Following the analysis of the proportionality of the indicators system based both on the quantitative data provided by the previous table (number of indicators) and on qualitative information, such as number and types of interventions (activities) supported by each PA, it was outlined that:

- Priority Axis 1 has the largest allocation (marked by +) and relatively high number of result indicators (also marked by +). PA 1 is complex (also marked by +), as it supports interventions aiming strengthening structural and processes of the public policy management cycle, which could take several years (and sometimes more than one financial perspective) to be implemented and lead to a significant number of results. The number of indicators is balanced – however, a careful analysis is needed in order to assess the quality of the indicators. Any recommendation in this respect must take into account the other criteria for analysis (see the other chapters of the report).
- Priority Axis 2 although smaller than PA 1, it has a relatively large financial allocation (market by +) and complexity (marked by +) giving the type of interventions, and a smaller number of indicators (-). The number of indicators is acceptable. However, additional indicators may be added for securing a better coverage of the KAI/PA objectives. Any recommendation in this

[8] Own interpretation, starting from the EC understanding of a complex programme

[9]Based on: Financial plan of the OP ACD for the whole programming period 2007-2013, giving the amount of the total financial allocation of the Community funding and the national counterpart for each priority axis, Chapter 4 - Financial Plan, OP ACD, EN version, 2007, p. 61

respect has to be carefully analysed in order not to influence negatively the balance of the indicators.

- Priority Axis 3 has the smallest financial allocation (marked by -) and complexity (-) among the three axes. The number of indicators is balanced – however, a careful analysis is needed in order to assess the quality of the indicators. Additional indicators may be added for securing a better coverage of the KAI/PA objectives. Any recommendation in this respect will have to be carefully analysed in order not to influence negatively the balance of the indicators.

FIG. 7 BALANCE OF OP ACD SYSTEM OF INDICATORS

	PA 1	PA 2	PA 3
Complexity	+	+	-
Financial allocation	+	+	-
Ideal number of indicators	**High (46%)**	**Medium-High (33%)**	**Medium-Small (21%)**
Existing number of indicators	**46,15%**	**32,69%**	**21,15%**
Conclusions	**Proportion seems appropriate**	**Proportion seems appropriate**	**Proportion seems appropriate**

In respect to analyzing the **distribution between the output/result indicators**, the following observations can be made:

- Priority Axis 1 has the highest number of indicators of all PAs (total number of 24 indicators including 10 supplementary indicators), of which there is approximately the same number of output and result indicators (two more output indicators). This stems from the complexity of the intervention (3 key topics) and, while it should not be regarded in itself as a deficiency, attention should be paid when analysing output and result indicators, so as to avoid situation where no indicator(s) is assigned to support measurement of interventions (see also section 1.1 General design of the Indicators system) as well as any unnecessary load (see also section 2.1.2 Objectives Covered).
- Priority Axis 2 has a reasonable number of indicators (total of 17 indicators, of which 7 supplementary indicators). The number of result indicators (3 indicators) is much less that the output ones (7 indicators). Supplementary indicators (7 indicators) are assigned for each KAI and as presented in previous chapters, there are interventions which are partially measured (see also section 2.1.2 Objectives Covered).

- Priority Axis 3 is well balanced having one more output indicator (3 indicators) than the number of result indicators and a total number of 6 supplementary indicators, less than the number of supplementary indicators of the other two axis. This stems from the reduced complexity of the intervention and of the budget allocation.
- One characteristic of the OP ACD system of indicators is that it has a number of 3 impact indicators allocated for the whole programme.

The overall conclusion is that OP ACD system of indicators, it is reasonably balanced, with some deficiencies which were observed and presented in previous chapters (see section 2.1.2 Objectives covered). However, any recommendation in relation to the issues identified, should be made taking into consideration the finding s and conclusions of all the other chapters of the analysis.

All three PAs, have few more output indicators than result. Two of the priority axes, have large financial allocations and high complexity. In one case the number of indicators is high and in the other one, is lower. However, the system is reasonably balanced in both cases. As it can be observed, one priority axis (PA3) has a small financial allocation and a small number of indicators, meaning that the cost of collection is lower than in the case of PA 1.

For all axes, attention should be paid when analysing output and result indicators, so as to avoid situation where no indicator(s) is assigned to support measurement of interventions.

Also as concerns the supplementary and impact programme indicators it is advisable to analyse them in order to ensure their ability to measure the Program/PA/KAI objectives.

For the balanced PAs, caution is necessary in adding new indicators. Any recommendation in this respect should be made in relation to the findings and conclusions of all the other chapters of the analysis.

2.3. MANAGEABILITY

2.3.1. OVERVIEW

This section assesses the main processes involved in working with OP ACD indicators, namely collecting, measuring, processing, monitoring and communicating/reporting. The analysis covers also briefly the institutional context, the procedures and the resources available for running the above mentioned processes, from the specific OP ACD viewpoint.

Institutions in charge with OP ACD indicators	Types of indicators	Role
Managing Authority for OP ACD	- Financial - Performance	- Defining - Processing - Measuring (Analysing) - Monitoring Communication

Institutions

The management and implementation of SOP ACD are set up by EC Regulation N°. 1083/2006 and the EC Regulation N°. 1828/2006. The SOP ACD MA is organised and functions as a General Directorate for the Development of Administrative Capacity (GDDAC) within the Ministry of Administration and Interior (MAI). The MA is made up of six compartments or units, each having specific responsibilities.

There are no Intermediary Bodies established for managing the Programme, both because the allocated funds are limited and because the MA itself is able to efficiently implement the OP[10]. Based on the documents reviewed for the purpose of this analysis, a clear-cut distinction cannot be made on which unit or service within the MA deals with each of the PAs. The Service for strategy and programme coordination is responsible for the coordination for PA 3 Technical Assistance by administering the funds allocated to it. At the same time, the Unit for coordination and synthesis, which is part of the Service for strategy and programme coordination, has specific responsibilities related to PA3 Technical Assistance[11].

Although there are no explicit instructions dedicated specifically to working with indicators at the level of OP ACD, several references are made throughout other documents, especially in respect to monitoring, reporting or evaluation activities.

In common with other Ops, there are no ACD resources dedicated exclusively or explicitly to working with indicators. The allocation of resources for each of the institutions involved in the activities of working with indicators have been associated with that of other related activities, such as monitoring, evaluation, reporting and are detailed in their respective internal procedures.

Given that there are no explicit procedures for working with indicators, the various functions that involve them have been extracted from other procedures, like the Description of the Management and Control Systems for OP ACD. Additional information has also been extracted from the Ex-ante evaluation of the FDI, the Ex-ante evaluation of the OP, as well as from the Annual Implementation Reports, particularly with respect to the current issues in the system functioning.

2.3.2. DEFINING INDICATORS

Defining indicators is the responsibility of the Managing Authority. An initial list of programme indicators was defined during the programming exercise, validated through the ex-ante evaluation and approved by the EC as part of the OP. Starting with 2009, an additional number of supplementary indicators were added, based on the consultations between OP ACD and ACIS, so as to correct some deficiencies identified during the implementation and to improve correlation across OPs. These consultations were aimed at simplify the monitoring system, by avoiding the duplication of indicators in the case they apply to more categories of interventions. At the same time, the exercise was meant to bring more clarity and value-added in the way each of the interventions is monitored.

However, the introduction of new indicators did not mean removing the old ones, even if this meant total or partial overlaps and supplementary load for the system. These overlaps should be further analysed and taken into consideration for simplification purposes.

[10] According to PO DCA, September 2007, p. 62

[11] Description of the management and control system

Clarifying definitions, labels and measurement units

As regards the definitions, labels and measurement units, further refinement is necessary. Some indicators have the measurement unit included in the definition, such as "*Percentage of administrative costs reduction (%)*". Others have the measurement unit expressed in brackets at the end of the definition, such as "*Guidelines and other methodological documents (number)*", which seems far more appropriate. Therefore, it is advisable to increase standardization, and preferably place all measurement units at the end of the definitions. This would also provide consistency across OPs.

2.3.3. COLLECTING INDICATORS

Once the indicators were defined and included in the Framework Document for Implementation (both initial programme indicators and supplementary ones), their collection became mandatory, based on the OP ACD procedures.

One of the specificities of OP ACD indicators is data collection, which rests completely with the Managing Authority. More than in the case of other OPs, project level information is not enough to collect all required indicators. For result/context indicators, often a more complex analysis is required, which will imply specific studies and analysis, since there are no official statistics in the field of administrative capacity development, relevant for OP ACD.

For the indicators which cannot be calculated based on input from beneficiaries, there is a need to define in a more clear way the collection procedure. Moreover, the OP ACD does not have currently any official context indicators, which is a weakness in terms of its overall monitoring.

On the other hand, OP ACD identifies a series of sources[12]. for collecting indicators:

- Beneficiaries – for project level information;
- SMIS – for output, result and financial indicators from project to program level;
- Official statistics – such as Eurostat, the National Statistics Office, the UNDP or the World Bank for context and impact indicators;
- Other sources (such as MA records, MAI records, surveys, field work, studies) commissioned to external experts or done internally – usually for aggregated data at operation, KAI, PA or OP level.

In the case of indicators that cannot be directly drawn from the project documents or other administrative documents[13], statistical instruments like surveys or studies done by specialised institutions and organisations are used[14].

2.3.4. PROCESSING AND MEASURING INDICATORS

Vertical aggregation

Connecting project level to programme level indicators is crucial to facilitate proper processing and measuring of indicators. Currently, the existing guidelines ensure the match between the indicators required in the application process, the ones required in the progress/financial reporting and the programme indicators. The Applicants' Guide provides a list of indicators relevant for the call

[12] http://www.fonduriadministratie.ro/pictures/PODCA in engleza.PDF
[13] Records of local or central public administration
[14] RAI 2007, p. 18

and states that "*it is compulsory that the project should contain at least one of these indicators [...]. It is also allowed to use other indicators, if these are necessary for project monitoring. During the implementation [...] the following supplementary indicators will be required through monitoring reports: [...].*"[15]. Also, the Application form states that indicators "*must be measurable and must contribute to the achievement of the indicators stated in the Operational Programme, Framework Document of Implementation and the Applicant's Guide, respectively*"[16]

In respect to aggregating programme indicators, the limitations of the electronic system have a significant impact on this function, in the sense that the current way of managing ESF indicators requires very complex aggregation mechanisms built within predefined reports. This problem has been encountered also by other Member States such Greece and the solution proposed was eventually very simple. (See Analysis Report for SOP HRD)

Horizontal aggregation

Processing and measuring some of OP ACD interventions cannot be done completely independent from other OPs. In order to achieve this, a coherent, common approach would highly improve the quality and the added value of the information obtained through aggregating indicators.

This is the case of ESF specific indicators (EC Reg. 1080/2006 – Annex XXIII) (see also SOP HRD Analysis) and of the TA indicators (see also OPTA analysis).

2.3.5. PROGRESS MONITORING

Given the nature of the projects ("soft" interventions such as training, counselling, awareness, support etc.), progress (in terms of outputs) can be observed during the implementation of the project and immediately after. However, in terms of results, progress is more difficult to monitor and assess, or even to relate to the intervention (this lead to difficulties in setting result indicators for some interventions: for example the indicator "*Degree of own revenue collection of the local public administration (%)*" may be influenced heavily by other factors; likewise the indicator "*Governance efficiency (%)*" requires specific studies to collect.

2.3.6. COMMUNICATION

In terms of communication and reporting, the specific of the programme is reflected in the narrowly targeted audience – namely the public administration institutions. This results in less pressure from the general public and faster communication channels.

On the other hand, the shorter duration of projects enables for more updates and more accurate data on real progress.

Preliminary conclusions

Given all the above, a number of preliminary conclusions regarding manageability can be reached:

- The overlapping indicators affect the manageability of the system, in terms of resources needed for collecting, measuring and reporting.

[15] See Applicant's Guide for Call 1/2010, page 8: http://www.fonduriadministratie.ro/arhiva/242_Ghid%20solicitant.PDF
[16] See Application Form, for Call 1/2010, page 12,: http://www.fonduriadministratie.ro/Arhiva?cat=Cererea de proiecte 1/2010

- The process of collecting result/context indicators can be quite demanding, in the sense of requiring adequate and accurate data, in the absence of official statistics
- ESF reporting requirements should be observed and for this, a more developed information system is needed.

2.4. PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE SYSTEM, AFFECTING THE ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL INDICATORS

Based on the findings from the analysis of the system of indicators, a number of preliminary conclusion and recommendations can be drawn in respect to the existing individual indicators:

- Some indicators which are very similar in terms of purpose for collection. This is the case for example of the indicators (P) *Training modules elaborated (number*) and (S) *Number of training sessions.* For example, for this particular case a revision is required consisting in keeping the supplementary indicator as considered more relevant for the purpose of reporting
- There are no indicators that remain outside objectives; all the indicators currently in use can be associated with one of the objectives of the KAI/PA/OP ACD. As specified in previous sections, there is a matter of appropriateness in assignment the indicators to a certain PA/KAI/Indicative Operation.
- The proposed OP ACD system of indicators add value to the measurement of KAI/PA/ OP ACD and reflect the type of operations to be undertaken thus supporting the measurement of the degree of accomplishment the objectives. Nevertheless, slight revisions of part of the indicators are required in terms of increasing their appropriateness and coverage in terms of objectives measurement.
- Overall, the existing system of indicators allows for a satisfactory coverage of the objectives, thus creating good prospects in terms of measurement of the objectives; nevertheless there were identified particular cases when some of the operations/ objectives might be only partially measured in the absence of relevant indicators
- An improvement that can be brought at the level of the impact indicators is to measure also the quality of governance besides efficiency of the governance
- There are no **context indicators** assigned for OP ACD (see previous section related to socio-economic context). Although this issue is not directly related to the objectives covered, their existence would enable a better understanding of the environment in which the OP is implemented, of its objectives and achievements.
- The overall conclusion is that the current system of OP ACD indicators reflects a satisfactory level in securing coverage with the objectives although there is identified the need for partial revision aiming an increased level of definition and manageability.
- Although a part of the indicators have percentage as measurement unit, an analysis case by case was undertaken concerning the appropriateness of the measurement unit.

Based on the findings from the analysis of the system of indicator – coverage, balance, manageability – a number of recommendations can be presented in respect to the individual indicators, as presented in the following table.

TABLE 5 SYNTHESIS OF THE ANALYSIS OF THE SYSTEM OF INDICATORS

OUTPUT INDICATORS								
KAI	No.	Indicators	Type	Recommendation		RATIONALE		
						COVERAGE	BALANCE	MANAGEABILITY
KAI 1.1	1.	Guidelines and other methodological documents (number)	P	Keep and examine further at individual level	Re-label as *Guidelines and other methodological instruments elaborated (number)*	Improved coverage		Improved manageability by the new definition. Allows the use of AC 600
	2.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep and examine further at individual level	Label as *Participant training days (number)*			
KAI 1.2	3.	Guidelines and other methodological documents (number)	P	Keep and examine further at individual level	Re-label as *Guidelines and other methodological instruments elaborated (number)*	Improved coverage		Improved manageability by the new definition. Allows the use of AC 600
	4.	Training modules elaborated (number)	P	Remove		Partially overlaps with "*Participant training days (number)*"		Simplifies the list of indicators
	5.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep and examine further at individual level				
KAI 1.3	6.	Structural reviews (number)	P	Keep and examine				Allows the use of AC 600/602/603/604

OUTPUT INDICATORS								
KAI	No.	Indicators	Type	Recommendation		RATIONALE		
						COVERAGE	BALANCE	MANAGEABILITY
				further at individual level				
	7.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep and examine further at individual level				Allows the use of AC 600/602/603/604
	8.	Training modules (number)	P	Remove		Partially overlaps with "*Participant training days (number)*"		Simplifies the list of indicators
KAI 2.1	9.	Structural reviews (number)	P	Keep and examine further at individual level	Label as *Structural reviews (number)*			Allows the use of AC 600/602/603/604/SMIS 605
	10.	Guidelines and other methodological documents (number)	P	Keep and examine further at individual level	Re-label as *Guidelines and other methodological instruments elaborated (number)*	Improved coverage		Improved manageability by the new definition. Allows the use of AC 601/602/603/604
	11.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep and examine further at individual level	Label as *Participant training days (number)*			Allows the use of 601/602/603/604
KAI	12.	Sectors in which	P	Keep and	Label as *Cost and*			Improved manageability

OUTPUT INDICATORS								
KAI	No.	Indicators	Type	Recommendation		RATIONALE		
						COVERAGE	BALANCE	MANAGEABILITY
2.2		cost and quality standards are designed (number)		examine further at individual level	*quality standards designed (number)*			by the new definition. Allows the use of AC 601/602/603/604
	13.	Guidelines for improving revenue collection (number)	P	Remove	Replace with *Guidelines and other methodological instruments elaborated (number)*			Simplifies the list of indicators Improved manageability Allows the use of AC 601
	14.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep and examine further at individual level	Label as *Participant training days (number)*			Allows the use of 601/602/603/ 604
	15.	Administrative simplification analyses (number)	P	Remove	Replace with *Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)*			Allows the use of AC 601/602/603/604
KAI 3.1	16.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep and examine further at individual level	Label as *Participant training days (number) Break down into:* - Participant training days – managing structures (number)			Allows the use of AC 701 – Management and coordination; AC 702 – Beneficiary support
	17.	Relevant committees and	P	Keep and examine	Re-label *Meetings of relevant committees*			Improved manageability AC 701 – Management

OUTPUT INDICATORS								
KAI	No.	Indicators	Type	Recommendation		RATIONALE		
						COVERAGE	BALANCE	MANAGEABILITY
		working groups reunions (number)		further at individual level	*and working groups (number)*			and coordination;
KAI 3.2	18.	Communication and promotion events (number)	P	Keep and examine further at individual level	Re-label as *Communication and promotion events organized (number)*			Improved manageability by the new definition. AC 705 – Information and publicity

TABLE 6 PRELIMINARY LIST OF INDICATORS RESULTING FROM THE SYSTEM LEVEL ANALYSIS

	NO.	PROGRAMME OUTPUT INDICATORS TO BE FURTHER ANALYSED AT INDIVIDUAL LEVEL	
KAI		*Indicators*	*Type*[17]
KAI 1.1	1.	Guidelines and other methodological documents (number)	P
	2.	Participant training days (number)	P
KAI 1.2	3.	Guidelines and other methodological documents (number)	P
	4.	Participant training days (number)	P
KAI 1.3	5.	Structural reviews (number)	p
	6.	Participant training days (number)	p
KAI 2.1	7.	Structural reviews (number)	P
	8.	Guidelines and other methodological documents (number)	P
	9.	Participant training days (number)	P
KAI 2.2	10.	Sectors in which cost and quality standards are designed (number)	P
	11.	Participant training days (number)	P
KAI 3.1	12.	Participant training days (number)	P
	13.	Relevant committees and working groups reunions (number)	P
KAI 3.2	14.	Communication and promotion events (number)	P

	No.	PROGRAMME RESULT INDICATORS TO BE FURTHER ANALYSED AT INDIVIDUAL LEVEL	
KAI		*Indicator*	*Type*
KAI 1.1	1.	Percentage of unsatisfactory policy documents and draft normative acts returned by GSG to initiators (%)	P
	2.	Percentage of administrative costs reduction (%)	P
KAI 1.2	3.	Public institutions elaborating annual activity report according to Law No. 544/2001 (%)	P
	4.	Monitoring and evaluation reports elaborated/requested by central public institutions (number)	P
KAI 1.3	5.	New and re-organized structures, operational (number)	P
	6.	Certified training participants (number)	P

[17] P= programme, S=supplementary

	No.	PROGRAMME RESULT INDICATORS TO BE FURTHER ANALYSED AT INDIVIDUAL LEVEL	
KAI		*Indicator*	*Type*
KAI 2.1	7.	New decentralized structures operational (number)	P
KAI 2.2	8.	Sectors in which cost and quality standards are introduced (number)	P
	9.	Degree of own revenue collection of the local public administration (%)	P
KAI 3.1	10.	Observance of the commitment targets (%)	P
KAI 3.2	11.	**Participants at events organized (number)**	P
		SUPPLEMENTARY INDICATORS TO BE FURTHER ANALYSED AT INDIVIDUAL LEVEL	
KAI 1.1	12.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S
	13.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	S
KAI 1.2	14.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S
	15.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	S
	16.	Communication and promotion events	S
KAI 1.3	17.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S
	18.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	S
KAI 2.1	19.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S
	20.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	S
KAI 2.2	21.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S
	22.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	S
	23.	Exchange of experience and good practices participants	S
KAI 3.1	24.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S
KAI 3.2	25.	Information and publicity materials	S
	26.	Participant training days – beneficiaries	S
	27.	Participant training days – managing structures	S
	28.	Participant training days – other structures	S

No.	PROGRAMME IMPACT INDICATORS TO BE FURTHER ANALYSED AT INDIVIDUAL LEVEL	
	Indicator	*Type*
1.	Citizens' confidence in central public administration institutions (%)	
2.	Citizens' confidence in local public administration institutions (%)	

No.	PROGRAMME IMPACT INDICATORS TO BE FURTHER ANALYSED AT INDIVIDUAL LEVEL	
	Indicator	*Type*
3.	Governance efficiency (%)	

No.		NEW ADDED INDICATORS TO BE FURTHER ANALYSED AT INDIVIDUAL LEVEL	
		Indicator	*Type*
KAI 1.1	4.	Partnerships concluded (number)	R
KAI 2.2	5.	Guidelines and other methodological instruments (number)	R
	6.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)	O
KAI 3.1	7.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)	O
KAI 3.2	8.	Participants at events organized (number)	O

1. ANALYSIS OF THE INDIVIDUAL INDICATORS

The analysis of the individual indicators consisted of the examination of the existing output, result and impact indicators **which passed the analysis at system level**. Indicators that were rejected after the analysis of the system were considered inherently flawed so as to make their individual analysis unnecessary. The reasons for their rejection, as well as suggestions for their replacements (where appropriate) were presented in the previous section.

The list of indicators subject to the current individual analysis includes the original programme indicators and supplementary indicators, introduced as an update through the common effort of MA OP ACD and ACIS-ECU during the implementation so far. As no context indicators are included in the current system, such categories are not covered by the analysis.

This list of output, result and impact indicators was assessed against the four criteria for quality indicators as set out in the ToR, based on the DG Regional Policy Guidelines namely: "relevance", "sensitivity", "availability" and "cost". Each indicator was scored from 1 to 3, for each of the criteria (1 being the lowest, 3 the highest).

Relevance: 1 – little relevance; 2 – partial relevance; 3 – relevant

Sensitivity: 1 – low sensitivity (the indicator has no or very limited response when changes occur in the variable to be measured and can be influenced by a lot of external factors); 2 – partially sensitivity (the indicator responds partially to when changes occur in the variable to be measured and is not significantly influenced by external factors); 3 – sensitive (the indicator fully reflects the changes in the variable to be measured and is not influenced by external factors).

Availability: 1 – no or limited availability (cannot be collected and/or updated); 2 – partial availability (it is difficult to collect/update regularly, due to calculation method, source etc.) 3 – available (does not pose any difficulties for collection/update)

Cost: 1 – high costs (specific studies, surveys at MA/ACIS etc.), 2 – medium costs (specific studies or other costs for beneficiaries), 3 – low cost (no additional costs for collection, other than regular reporting requirements and input into the electronic system)

Scoring interpretation: If an indicator scores 1 to any of the criteria, it is recommended to be removed;

Comments have been made in relation to each of the above issues. The analysis of the individual indicators of OP ACD can be found in **ANNEX II.**

Overall, the individual indicators of OP ACD have scored relatively high for the criteria of relevance and availability.

In terms of sensitivity and cost, for part of the indicators (notably result indicators), influences from external factors have been identified that led to partial sensitivity and variant level of cost from low to medium / high as assessed.

Recommendations regarding each individual indicator are presented in the following table.

TABLE 7RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING INDICATORS, FOLLOWING THE ANALYSIS AT INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

	Operational Programme Administrative Capacity Development				
No.[18]	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Recommendation**		**Rationale**
	OUTPUT INDICATORS				
	Priority Axis 1				
	KAI 1.1				
1.	Guidelines and other methodological documents (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
2.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
3.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
4.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
	KAI 1.2				
5.	Guidelines and other methodological documents (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
6.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
7.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
8.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability,	Passing the individual analysis.

[18] Number corresponding to the order in which the indicator was treated in the individual analysis (see Annex II)

	Operational Programme Administrative Capacity Development				
No.[18]	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Recommendation**		**Rationale**
				cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	
9.	Communication and promotion events	S	Remove	Replace with "Participants at events organized"	Increased relevance
	KAI 1.3				
	Structural reviews (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
10.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
11.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
12.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
	Priority Axis 2				
	KAI 2.1				
13.	Structural reviews (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
14.	Guidelines and other methodological documents (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
15.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
16.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.

	Operational Programme Administrative Capacity Development				
No.[18]	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Recommendation**		**Rationale**
17.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
	KAI 2.2				
18.	Sectors in which cost and quality standards are designed (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
19.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
20.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
21.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
22.	Exchange of experience and good practices participants	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
	Priority Axis 3				
	KAI 3.1				
23.	Participant training days (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
24.	Relevant committees and working groups reunions (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
25.	Number of training participants of which: women/ men	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.

	Operational Programme Administrative Capacity Development				
No.[18]	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Recommendation**		**Rationale**
	KAI 3.2				
26.	Communication and promotion events (number)	P	Remove	Replace with "Participants at events organized (number)	Passing the individual analysis.
27.	Information and publicity materials	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
28.	Participant training days – beneficiaries	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
29.	Participant training days – managing structures	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
30.	Participant training days – other structures	S	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
	RESULT INDICATORS				
	Priority Axis 1				
	KAI 1.1				
31.	Percentage of unsatisfactory policy documents and draft normative acts returned by GSG to initiators (%)	P	Remove	Replace with "Draft public policy proposals elaborated according to the legal framework"	.Low sensitivity
32.	Percentage of administrative costs reduction (%)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
	KAI 1.2				
33.	Public institutions elaborating annual activity report	P	Remove	Replace with "Institutions elaborating and publishing annual information	Low relevance

	Operational Programme Administrative Capacity Development				
No.[18]	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Recommendation**		**Rationale**
	according to Law No. 544/2001 (%)			brochures according to Law 544/2001 (number)"	
34.	Monitoring and evaluation reports elaborated/requested by central public institutions (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
	KAI 1.3				
35.	New and re-organized structures, operational (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
36.	Certified training participants (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
	Priority Axis 2				
	KAI 2.1				
37.	New decentralized structures operational (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
	KAI 2.2				
38.	Sectors in which cost and quality standards are introduced (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
39.	Degree of own revenue collection of the local public administration (%)	P	Remove		Low sensitivity
	Priority Axis 3				
	KAI 3.1				
40.	Observance of commitment targets	P	Remove	Low sensitivity	
	KAI 3.2				
41.	Potential applicants participating in communication events	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost. Apply recommendations made at system level	Passing the individual analysis.
	IMPACT INDICATORS				

	Operational Programme Administrative Capacity Development				
No.[18]	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Recommendation**		**Rationale**
42.	Citizens' confidence in central public administration institutions (%)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
43.	Citizens' confidence in local public administration institutions (%)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
44.	Governance efficiency (%)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
	NEW INDICATORS ADDED AT SYSTEM LEVEL				
45.	Partnerships concluded (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
46.	Guidelines and other methodological instruments (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
47.	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)	P	Keep	No changes necessary for increasing relevance, sensitivity, availability, cost.	Passing the individual analysis.
48.	Participants at events organized (number)	P	Keep		Increased relevance
	NEW INDICATORS ADDED AT INDIVIDUAL LEVEL				
	Draft public policy proposals elaborated according to the legal framework"				
	Draft normative acts with severe problems regarding the quality of the grounding of their presentation and motivation instruments (number)				
	"Institutions elaborating and publishing annual information brochures according to Law 544/2001 (number)"				

3.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Considering that only one respondent representing the Managing Authority provided information as requested within the questionnaire, no relevant conclusions could be drawn under the needs assessment section.

The opinions expressed by the respondent provide a useful though insufficient image as concerns the main features and weaknesses of the OP ACD system of indicators as well as the deficiencies in relation to their use by different stakeholders, in the monitoring and reporting process.

3.2. ANALYSIS OF THE INDICATORS SYSTEM

1. Given that the European Commission underlines the importance of context indicators and that the need for this type of indicators has resulted from the previous analysis this recommended to introduce and define context indicators for OP ACD. A list of context indicators is presented in the following table.
2. As the system analysis identified few cases when the existing indicators at the level of KAIs do not provide a full coverage in measurement the objectives, some particular recommendations were made in respect of adding new indicators. A detailed list of new added indicators is presented in the following tables.
3. As regards the correspondence of ESF indicators with the Annex XXIII of EC Regulation 1828/ 2006, it is advisable to use the breakdown of indicators according to categories as detailed in the EC mentioned document.
4. Further development of SMIS, particularly for project level monitoring purposes is an advisable action, providing that the review of the system will not overburden the MA's personnel tasks.
5. Following the analysis of the system of indicators, overall this proved to be reasonably balanced; slight improvements were necessary in order to reduce the number of indicators, in particular cases of overlapping as purpose for collection.
6. A part of the indicators should be re-label by mentioning the measurement unit from for improved manageability.

3.3. ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL INDICATORS

The recommendations resulting from the analysis at individual level represent the second step in the indicators assessment, after that done at system level. Together, the combined recommendations have lead to the final recommended list of indicators, which can be found in the next sub-section.

3.4. RECOMMENDED LIST OF INDICATORS FOR OP ACD

The recommended list of indicators for OP ACD is built based on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of all the previous chapters and aims at bringing improvements both at the level of the system and at the level of individual indicators.

TABLE 8FINAL RECOMMENDED LIST OF INDICATORS OP ACD

NO.	KAI	INDICATORS
OUTPUT		
1.	KAI 1.1	Guidelines and other methodological instruments (number)
2.		Participant training days (number)
3.		Training participants (number)
4.		Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)
5.	KAI 1.2	Guidelines and other methodological instruments (number)
6.		Participant training days (number)
7.		Training participants (number)
8.		Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)
9.		Participants at events organized (number)
10.	KAI 1.3	Structural reviews (number)
11.		Participant training days (number)
12.		Training participants (number)
13.		Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)
14.	KAI 2.1	Structural reviews (number)
15.		Guidelines and other methodological instruments (number)
16.		Participant training days (number)
17.		Training participants (number)
18.		Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)

NO.	KAI	INDICATORS
19.	KAI 2.2	Cost and quality standards designed (number)
20.		Guidelines and other methodological instruments (number)
21.		Participant training days (number)
22.		Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)
23.		Participants involved in activities regarding exchange of experience and good practices (number)
24.		Training participants (number)
25.		Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)
26.	KAI 3.1	Participant training days (number)
27.		Meetings of relevant committees and working groups (number)
28.		Training participants (number)
29.	KAI 3.2	Participants at events organized (number)
30.		Information and publicity materials (number)
31.		Participant training days-beneficiaries (number)
32.		Participant training days-managing structures (number)
33.		Participant training days-other structures (number)
RESULT		
34.	KAI 1.1	Draft public policy proposals elaborated according to the legal framework"
35.		Draft normative acts with severe problems regarding the quality of the grounding of their presentation and motivation instruments (number)
36.		Administrative costs reduction (RON/year)
37.	KAI 1.2	Institutions elaborating and publishing annual information brochures according to Law 544/2001 (number)
38.		Monitoring and evaluation reports elaborated/requested by central public institutions (number)
39.	KAI 1.3	New and re-organized structures, operational (number)
40.		Certified training participants (number)
41.	KAI 2.1	New decentralized structures, operational (number)
42.	KAI 2.2	Cost and quality standards introduced (number)
IMPACT		
43.		Increase of citizens' confidence in central public administration institutions (%)
44.		Increase of citizens' confidence in local public administration institutions (%)
45.		Increase of governance efficiency (%)

NO.	KAI	INDICATORS
NEW ADDED INDICATORS		
OUTPUT		
46.	KAI 3.1	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)
47.	KAI 1.2	Participants at events organized (number)
48.	KAI 2.2	Guidelines and other methodological instruments (number)
49.		Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)
50.	KAI 3.1	Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)
51.		Participants at events organized (number)
RESULT		
52.	KAI 1.1	Partnerships concluded (number)
CONTEXT INDICATORS		
53.	-	Share of draft normative acts resulting from public policy proposals, out of the total number of draft normative acts adopted (%)* **except for draft normative acts with individual application (such as nominations, dismissals etc.)*
54.	-	Public servants / 1000 inhabitants (number)
55.	-	Level of tax revenue collection (%)
56.	-	PCs connected to internet (number)
57.	-	Administrative cost reduction (%)