Panteia

Ex-ante Evaluation

Operational Programme

Administrative Capacity Development

Romania
(Final)
EuropeAid/121373/D/SV/RO

Reka Matheidesz, Malcolm Ross
Bucharest, January 27, 2007

Contents

Executive Summary

At the start of the evaluation process, the evaluator based her preliminary views on an very early stage of the first draft of the OP. Three drafts of the Operational programme have been appraised by the evaluator in the course of the evaluation process. The first comments were made on the basis of the April 2006 version of the Administrative Capacity Development Programme 2007-2013. This document was amended and redrafted in October 2006. The first draft of the evaluation report was based on this version of the OP: A considerable redraft and reformulation of objectives took place in November and December 2006 which resulted in a reformulation of the OP's objectives, priority axis as well as the indicative operations.

This January 14th.2007 Version B of the evaluation report is based on this version.

The OP has been redrafted and updated and it takes into consideration the consultations between the evaluator and the MA, as well as the outputs of the various debriefing meetings.

The following key evaluation questions were addressed during the course of the evaluation process:

To what extent does the OP identify the appropriate means for addressing the issues confronting the problems and opportunities of the Romanian public administration?

To what extent does the OP define strategic axis, priorities and objectives and to what extent does it reflect an informed opinion as to whether these are relevant and can actually be achieved to best contribute to a well functioning, modern public administration?

Administrative capacity development projects are most successful if the objectives are very specific and focused. In line with the EU Strategic Guidelines, it was advised to concentrate funds on a few areas where socioeconomic impact was more evident. The OP now defines three areas of focus for interventions within the OP. These areas are: health, education and labour and social solidarity. The criteria that were used for the selection of these sectors have now been added to the OP and the justification for the selection of sectors has been strengthened. The focus of the analysis has been strengthened in the revised December 06 version of the OP by the insertion of the problem analysis and by further justification of priorities through a sector analysis. The criteria of selection are relevant and justified. **The sectoral focus is not, however reflected in the strategy, nor on priority axis, nor on some areas of intervention level, or on the level of indicators.**

The needs identified in the OP are in line with the EU strategic Guidelines as well as the priority areas set out in Public Administration Reform Programme (PAR), thus providing a continuity and synergy with the previous programmes on capacity building. **The concern about the needs is that they are not underpinned by the specific capacity needs of the priority sectors.**

The OP builds on the results of the previous programmes. A table of lessons learned, including lessons from previous evaluations have been inserted as well as the implications for the ACD OP as suggested previously. The problem analysis of this version is based on a problem tree where the hierarchy of problems can be seen. The problem tree ensures that more coherency is introduced in the OP on both the problem analysis and the priority axis.

An improved SWOT analysis is provided by the new December 06 version of the ACD OP.

The priority axes are no longer defined so as to distinguish between central and local interventions. The new distinction is between organisational effectiveness and service delivery. The SWOT reflects this new approach. The new version of the SWOT is designed to reflect the analysis sector, although no sectoral reference is included. The SWOT are real strengths, real weaknesses, and real threats. It now provides a valid assessment of the situation covered by the programme..

The objectives have been changed in line with the Lisbon agenda. The changes are in line with the discussions between the MA and the evaluator. A new key area in Priority Axis2 (PA2) was introduced for strengthening the absorption capacity for development funds, which is relevant due to the increased pressure on the Romanian public administration to absorb EU funds. The first two priority axes are now supported by three key areas of intervention. The key areas strategic responses to the problems identified in the analysis chapter and the SWOT analysis. The strategy is consistent, and the priority axes reflect justified needs. Some areas of interventions cover a wide range of areas that are although consistent with the objective of the priority axes, but are over ambitious.

The OP shows a logical link to the SWOT and the sectoral analysis. Strategy concentrates on issues that are relevant in the selected sectors as well as public administration as a whole. The selection of the priorities also been defined on this basis.

The entire revision uses the problem/ objective tree to improve the coherence of the document and therefore there is more linkage between the problems identified and the areas of interventions chosen. The new version adequately defines the areas of interventions. The content of the key areas in most cases has been retained with a better formulation of the objectives and also a better link to the overall and specific objectives. This formulation of key areas is more adequate from a customer point of view and to enhance service delivery of public administration bodies.

Cross-cutting objectives are in general relevant in the case of ACD OP, equal opportunities is addressed in more detail on Programme Complement level. The issue of the Information Society is missing from the document.

Better indicators and clearer target figures are provided in OP, nevertheless, the sectoral focus of the OP is not reflected in indicators. The reformulation of certain indicators was advised in the framework of a workshop to better serve monitoring needs. It was also advised to collect data on a sectoral basis in order to show the difference performances in the sectors. A working group was created within the MA ACD, consisting of staff from the Programming, Contracting, Monitoring and Evaluation Units for the definition of indicators.

The financial table does not contain any allocation of resources in the priority sectors, nor is the calculation of allocation of resources set between priority axes and interventions.

The legislative background for management structures are set down, but no management arrangement are elaborated at this stage, therefore it is difficult to comment on the implementation procedures , and whether the human resources and training planned are sufficient for this task. Coordination with relevant stakeholders is a key success factor for this OP, therefore strong coordination arrangements are advised on the implementation level.

1 Introduction

1.1 Objectives of the evaluation

The objective of an ex-ante evaluation was to help to ensure that the final programme is as relevant and coherent as possible.

An ex ante evaluation has five main components:
A. Appraisal of the socio-economic analysis and the relevance of the strategy to the needs identified;
B. Evaluation of the rationale of the strategy and its consistency
C. Appraisal of the coherence of the strategy with regional and national policies and the Community Strategic Guidelines
D. Evaluation of the expected Results and Impacts
E. Appraisal of the proposed implementation systems

The purpose of the ex-ante evaluation is to optimise the allocation of resources and to improve the quality of programming. It is therefore:

- An *interactive process* whereby judgement and recommendations are provided by experts on the content of programmes drawn up by those responsible for their composition.
- An *iterative process* whereby the recommendations of the experts are taken into account by the planners in subsequent drafts of different parts of programmes.

Three drafts of the Operational programme have been appraised by the evaluator in the course of the evaluation process. The first comments were made on the basis of the April 2006 version of the Administrative Capacity Development Programme 2007-2013. This document was amended and redrafted in October 2006and the first draft of the evaluation report (version A) was based on this version of the OP. A considerable redraft and reformulation of objectives took place in November 2006, and the analysis of the current December 06 version of the OP has also been analysed and incorporated in the current version, (B), of the evaluation report.

1.2 Methodology

The standard procedure for ex ante evaluation is laid down on the Commission's draft guidelines document.

The basic methodology involved:

Document and data analysis in order to obtain an overview of the evaluation experiences and results of preceding programmes.

Written sources of information included the following:
- Draft regulations on the Structural Funds (General and ERDF) for 2007 - 2013;

- Draft Commission Strategic Guidelines on Cohesion Policy 2007 - 2013 as well as the Lisbon Agenda.
- Commission Draft Working Papers on ex ante evaluation (October 2005) and on indicators (January 2006);
- Draft versions of the OP for Administrative Capacity Development (ACD)
- The reference documents as listed in the OP;
- The Programme and Programme Complement of the ACD OP.
- European Commission Regular Country Reports – Romania 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006
- Accession Partnership – 1999, 2001, 2003
- European Commission - The Community Lisbon Programme, July 2005
- ESF Note on Institutional Capacity Priority – Sept 2005
- European Commission – Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Jobs, April 2005
- European Commission – Working together for Growth and Jobs – A new start for the Lisbon Strategy, February 2005
- European Commission – Working Together for Growth and Jobs – Further steps in implementing the revised Lisbon Strategy, May 2006
- Moving up a gear for Growth and Jobs: Progress on implementing the new Lisbon Strategy – speech by José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission at the Seminar "Excellence and Partnerships for an Innovative Europe" - Lisbon, 6 October 2006
- Romanian Government Programme 2005-2008
- Strategy to accelerate the Public Administration Reform programme – 2001, 2004-2006
- Evaluation of ESF support to capacity building, SEOR Erasmus University Rotterdam, October 2006
- Interim evaluation of the PAR sector – ECOTEC, May 2006
- Ex-post evaluation of the Phare Programmes – MWH, June 2006
- SIGMA Sectoral Report on the public administration in Romania, 2005
- Phare Sectoral Programming Fiche – Public Administration Reform, 2005
- Activity Reports of the National Agency for Civil Servants – 2003, 2004, 2005

Interviews with key actors "Key actors" refer to all decision makers and responsible persons or participants who have taken part in the programme development at the different levels and will as well be involved in the implementation, management and monitoring. In case of ACD OP the key experts included the Managing Authority for Administrative Capacity, NIA, NACS and CUPAR

Persons interviewed and persons providing information were the following:

Central Level		
Mr Liviu Radu	Ministry of Administration and Interior	Secretary of state
Mrs Perla Simion	Ministry of Administration and Interior	Head of Unit Managing Authority for Administrative capacity development
Mr Victor Giosan	General Secretariat of the Government	Secretary of State
Ms Anca Ghinea	Public Policy Unit at the	Expert

Central Level		
	General Secretariat of the Government	
Mr Lorand Butyka	Central Unit for Public Administration Reform	Expert
Ms Claudia Lung	Central Unit for Public Administration Reform	Manager, department for Decentralisation
Mr Petre Diaconu	Former Department for Public Administration Reform	Former Secretary of State for Reform
Mr Dragoş Dincă	National Institute for Administration	Director general – Secretary of State
Mr Cristian Bitea	National Institute for Administration	Deputy Director general
Mr Doru Vasilescu	National Agency for Civil Servants	Director of the Programme Implementation Unit
Ms Smaranda Pălan	National Agency for Civil Servants	Head of Unit, Strategy department
Ms Xenia Teodorescu	National Agency for Civil Servants	Director, Directorate for Development and implementation
Ms Elena Ciocan	Ministry of Administration and Interior	Deputy Director, Directorate for European Integration
Mr Sorin Chelmu	Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Rural Development	Secretary General
Ms Florentina Enache	Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Rural Development	Counsellor

Drawing draft conclusions based on the assessments made on the different components of the evaluation. These assessments were based on the outcomes of the desk research and the interviews. Two follow up tables have been prepared with the findings of the evaluation phases. The follow up table included the main findings of the evaluation phase, as well as the proposed change in the document with the deadline and responsible body for the issue. The follow up tables were distributes amongst the stakeholders before a feed back meeting. (Annex 5, annex6)

Kick off meeting: A kick-off meeting was held in 14th September with the aim of giving an overview on the overall evaluation methodology, the evaluation process and also to give an initial feedback on the Operational Programmes. A dedicated presentation was held for the ACD OP.

Feed-back meetings with the involved stakeholders. In this framework several informal meetings were hold, with the Managing Authority as well as two interim debriefing meetings. The scope of the debriefing meetings was to overview and discuss the findings of the evaluator and other issues in more detail. Debriefing meetings were held following the issues identified out in the follow up table distributed to stakeholders prior to the meeting. (Annex 3, annex 4.)

Seminars on indicators: 2 seminars on the design and selection of indicators have been organised in order to support learning lessons. Main stakeholders were invited and were present at both seminars. The MA was provided with a paper on the list of proposed indicators on both input, output, and result level.

Reporting on the results of the evaluation and the final conclusions. In this report a short analysis of the evaluation results on a particular evaluation component was given. The report also explained why some of the evaluators' conclusions were accepted or not by the planners.

Dissemination of report: A draft evaluation report was drafted and distributed among key stakeholders. On the basis of this draft report, a presentation was held to draw attention to the main findings of the evaluator. In the framework of the presentation the main evaluation questions, the main findings and the main recommendations were summarized.

In order to analyse better certain major issues, the need for carrying out three **ad hoc analyses** was identified in the course of the evaluation process:
1.   Revision and lessons learnt from previous capacity building programmes
     (Annex 7)
2.   Assistance in the justification of the sectoral focus of the OP (Annex 8)
3.   Best practice of new and old Member States and methodologies used
The reports have been disseminated to all stakeholders and targeted in ways that supported learning lessons.

The main conclusions of the ad hoc analyses 1 and 2 have been incorporated in the evaluation report. The full text can be read in annexes 7 and 8.

A third Ad hoc analysis which aims to assist the drafting and finalisation of the Programme Complement, is currently being finalised.

The key evaluation questions asked in the course of the evaluation process:

To what extent does the OP identify the appropriate means for addressing the issues confronting the problems and opportunities of Romanian public administration?

To what extent does the OP define strategic axes, priorities and objectives and to what extent does it reflect an informed opinion as to whether these are relevant and can actually be achieved to best contribute to a well functioning, modern public administration?

Evaluation methodology was hindered by the fact that the text of the OP was constantly changing, and therefore a greater emphasis was given to informal meetings, summary tables with recommendations, as well as discussions on debriefing meetings in order to best contribute to the improvement of the OP. This of course resulted in the fact the evaluator based her draft evaluation on an earlier version, and only received the final version of the OP in a very late stage (late December). This gave very limited time for the finalisation of the report, which, in reality, was the equivalent of carrying out of a new ex ante evaluation of a new OP. **This current and revised evaluation report does not make reference to earlier versions of the OP, but concentrates merely on the current, latest version.**

1.3   Evaluation process

1)   The first step, following the standard approach is the appraisal of the socio-economic analysis and the relevance of the strategy to the needs identified.

In the case of this O.P. the socio-economic analysis was replaced by an examination of the description of the problems identified as existing in the administration of both Central and local Government. The OP has been revised and interviews have been organised to analyse the situation and problems that exist within Central Government and local institutions. A specialist short term expert was dedicated to analyse the results of previous programmes as well as lessons learnt. His findings have been incorporated in the OP, as well as in the analysis of the evaluation. (Ad hoc study of Eugen Perianu in annex 7)

Benchmarking has been done on the experiences of new Members States, best practice examples have been distributed to the Managing Authority.   Detailed benchmarking will be done on Programme Complement level. In this case examination and appraisal of the relevant problems, looking at the potential risks of capacity building projects in general and at the same time taking into account the best practice of Member States

Long term development strategies regarding the need to improve effectiveness of the public administration have also been considered.

Methods encompassed mainly desk research (analysis of documents outlined above). Findings of this assessment were discussed with ACD OP MA staff.

2)   The second step is an evaluation of the rationale of the strategy and its consistency and policy mix.

Mainly on the basis of desk research an assessment of the rationale of the strategy was made and an opinion of the evaluators on the internal consistency prepared. Previous project and programme results, gaps have been identified and evaluated.

The link between the strategy and the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats has been examined. Special attention was given to the analysis to decide if the sectors selected as priority sectors have a sound justification for selection. The analysis targeted their impact on socio-economic development.

An ad hoc study and a specialist were dedicated to assist in the finalisation and justification of the three selected priority sectors.

3)   The third step was an appraisal of the coherence of the strategy with EU and national policies and the National Strategic Reference Framework for Romania.

Based on desk research an assessment of the external coherence was made. Documents reflecting strategies for future administrative reform were also taken into account.

4)   The fourth step was an evaluation of the expected results and impacts.

The indicators proposed in the draft OP have been checked on the basis of the SMART principles and also their quantification. Their possible aggregation from project to

priority and programme level has been assisted by a specialist short term expert. 3 workshops have been organised for a better formulation of indicators.

5)   *The final step is the appraisal of the proposed implementation system for managing, monitoring and evaluating the Programme.*

Evaluation in this phase assessed if the ACD OP could be implemented in a smooth and lawful way against relevant regulations and demand. Work in this phase encompassed assessment of staff's and systems' availability for the effective and efficient management of the ACD OP.

1.4   Conceptual remarks

Capacity building will remain a key priority in the Romanian administration for the coming years after accession to the European Union. The existence of a separate operational programme for Administrative Capacity Building demonstrates that the importance of strengthening these capacities is considered as a major issue in Romania.

It has been noted in the new Member States that capacity building programmes were successful when[1]:

- There was a strong connection with the accession process
- There was a willingness to promote major policy changes
- There was a high commitment of the involved organization
- There was a strong support from central authorities.

In this same study it is also stated that those capacity building programmes that cover a wider range of policy fields and tend to concentrate on trainings are less successful if the objectives are not set clearly and specifically. It is also stated that capacity building projects are more likely be successful when they have a high relevance and specific objectives.

[1] Evaluation of ESF support to capacity building, SEOR Erasmus University Rotterdam, October 2006

2 Appraisal of the socio-economic sector analysis and the relevance of the strategy to the needs identified

2.1 Appraisal of the socio-economic analysis and the relevance of the strategy to the needs identified

The appraisal of the socio-economic analysis and the relevance of the evaluation strategy was based on three questions:

1. To what extent does this chapter build on best practices of other capacity building programmes and projects in other member states?
2. To what extent does the chapter analyse the previous lessons learnt in pre-accession projects and programmes and to what extent does it build on the achieved results?
3. The other focus of the evaluation was whether the analysis of the public administration was focused enough and to what extent are the selected sectors relevant to best contribute to socio-economic development of Romania?

1   To what extent does this chapter build on best practices of other capacity building programmes and projects in other member states?
According to best practice examples it is shown that institutions support the competitiveness of regions through the performance in implementation of the following functions[1]:
- assuring the respect of norms
- assuring welfare services, education
- assuring and promoting market competition
- assuring legal protection to support contracts respect
- assuring protection to environmental, territorial, cultural and social goods
- assuring quality and efficiency standards in producing and delivering public services
- assuring the realization of facilities and infrastructures to support mobility
- assuring the development of ICT networks
- assuring the quality of investment processes and projects selection
- assuring efficiency and effectiveness of public decision making processes

This list was analysed and compared with the previous version of the OP. The OP now addresses the following:
- assuring the respect of norms;
- assuring welfare services, education
- ensuring a better implementation and enforcement of legislation;
- ensuring quality and efficiency in public service delivery;
- improving the public decision making processes.

---

[1] Evaluation of ESF support to capacity building, SEOR Erasmus University Rotterdam, October 2006

To sustain development processes, public bodies must remove all relevant obstacles to territorial competitiveness, including: the backwardness of public structures and the weak performances of public services.

It can now be stated that the main objectives of the programme are relevant as compared to other capacity building programmes. The Programme also addresses efficiency and effectiveness which are also major issues in other member states. Best practice examples have been used from the Hungarian case.

2.   *To what extent does the chapter analyse the previous lessons learnt in pre-accession projects and programmes and to what extent does it build on the achieved results?*

Real lessons from the implementation of national strategies and Pre-accession Funds are crucial for using the opportunity to continue this reform process. Building on the results and lessons learnt from other capacity and institution building projects are of utmost importance, since considerable assistance has already been allocated to Romania (mostly from Pre-accession instruments, but also from other bilateral funds) for capacity building. Moreover, Phare assistance has contributed already to a considerable capacity building actions in several ministries and in several institutions related to the accession process.

This chapter has been has been substantially revised compared to the previous version of the OP. It is now more detailed, redrafted and updated and it takes into consideration the consultations between the evaluator and the MA, as well as the content of the debriefing meetings.

In 2004, the Romanian Government adopted an updated strategy for the acceleration of the public administration reform, a document that was favourably received by the European Commission. This was followed by a second strategy for the next two years which also focused on the continuation of government reform.

In the last number of years, there have been policies (Programmes) (sometimes funded by pre-accession funds) to make use of opportunities to develop capacity of institutions involved in pre-accession funds and Structural Funds management. It would be interesting to know the reasons why some approaches succeeded and (maybe) others failed.

Activities of the pre-accession period and the impact of projects have been analysed and experiences gathered and analysed in this chapter. This chapter now adequately addresses the experiences gathered in the pre-accession period as well as summarizing implications for the OP.

In this context, an integrated study approach targeting the results and lessons learnt, gaps identified from previous projects and programmes has been carried out and incorporated in the framework of an ad hoc analysis carried out by an evaluation consultant. A table of lessons learned, including lessons form the ex-ante evaluation has been inserted into the analysis as well as the implications for the ACD OP as suggested previously. This ensures that the analysis is sufficiently deep and relevant.

The analysis in the OP highlights the synergies of the national government reform and the OPACD, and elaborates on the possible overlaps, and interrelations between the two programmes and its interventions, and also analyses the lessons learnt from previous project and programmes in capacity building. As many of the pre-accession projects focusing on government reform had very little implementation content according to the OP, it is justified to put more emphasis on the setting up of implementation structures.

It is clear from the text that the areas addressed in the OP as Priority Axes are in line with the areas addressed by the PAR Strategy 2004. They are also consistent with the Government Strategy 2005-2008. The question is "do the activities proposed in the OP provide for a seamless continuation of the PAR Strategy to date? Are there possible overlaps between the programmes planned under Phare or national sources, and Structural Funds? The programmes 2004-2006 for administrative reform include several conclusions and lessons that are relevant in this context.

It is recommended that the OP provides more detail on answers to the following questions:
- What were the lessons learned?
- Which interventions proved to be a success?
- What were the main obstacles for successful implementation?
- Which are the institutions that have already benefited from capacity building projects?
- In what way have their functions, roles changed?

Previous external evaluations on capacity building projects have stated that there are certain actions that should be avoided and taken into consideration when planning new capacity building programmes. These were taken into consideration during the planning period:
- Implementation of training programmes should not precede the definition of functions
- Implementation of IT systems should not precede legislation and
- The definition of procedures should not precede structure.

3.   *The other focus of the evaluation was whether the analysis of the public administration was focused enough and to what extent are the selected sectors relevant to best contribute to socio-economic development of Romania?*

The Community Strategic guideline states that investments should concentrate on those policy areas where are the greatest obstacles to socioeconomic development and on key elements of administrative reforms.

During the evaluation process it was advised to give priority to sectors where capacity building measures would provide more direct socio-economic impact when selecting sectors. This objective is also laid down in the Lisbon strategy.

Administrative capacity development programmes, as described above, have mostly indirect impacts on the socio-economic development, and sectors were more direct link was detected have been selected.

The OP defines three areas of focus for interventions within the OP. These areas are: **health, education, labour and social solidarity.**

The revised version of the ACD OP contains clear criteria for the selection of sectors and justification for this selection.

Furthermore, Annex III of the December version of the OP provides a detailed justification of the selection of the three sectors based on the following criteria:
• Amount of public expenditure in the sectors;
• Number of public employees;
• Number of public institutions;
• Number of citizens reached.

Criteria are justified, quantifiable therefore serve as a sound basis for the sectoral justification.

There is little doubt that the sectors of social solidarity, education and health meet these selection criteria and are in need of focussed assistance under the ACD OP. In recent years, significant efforts have been undertaken to reform the way in which these sectors operate, to decentralise decision-making and financial powers in line with the principle of subsidiarity. These are sectors which reach out to almost all the citizens of Romania, and where positive changes are expected to contribute significantly to the socio-economic development, the reduction of disparities between the EU and Romania, and the quality of life of the citizens.

In order to assist in this process of justification, an ad hoc analysis was undertaken with the aim of providing a selection process and background to the certain selected sectors. (Annex 8) An ad hoc analysis has been carried out in order to strengthen this part of the analysis. The aim of the ad hoc analysis was to assist in the sector specific needs analysis by defining criteria for selection and main points for justification of the sectors. **A detailed assessment of each of the selected sectors is strongly advised to be provided in the OP in order to enhance relevance and focus of the strategy.**

The strengths and weaknesses of Romanian public administration are described in general terms and there is a lack of information on the specific underlying causes of the selected sectors.

This focus is now present in most chapters of the OP, but should be **better highlighted** both in the strategy chapter and in the sections on areas of interventions

and indicators. However, there is still room for further debate on this issue. It is important to decide to what extent and in what way will the sectoral priorities be implemented. Furthermore, it is advised that special programmes/projects are developed together with the relevant line ministries and other agencies and bodies in order to address the specific needs of the priority sectors. **If the sectoral priority is left solely to open competition, the policy drive may be lost and the momentum to achieve significant changes in three very important areas in Romania may be lost as well.**

There needs to be more attention to the analysis of synergies between the selected SOP and TAOP as well as other sectoral programmes involving structural and institutional changes. More attention should be given to contribute to sectoral performance in the selected sectors. Bilateral meetings should be held on a regular basis with OP TA MA in order to clarify potential overlaps. A study was advised to be carried out with the potential synergies with the TA OP.

There was a lack of numerical data quoted in the analysis. More indicators and data should be presented in the analysis on all aspects of public administration capacity based on internationally comparable indicators.

Partnership
Although there has been some initial consultations at political level, the evaluator was not made aware of any working level consultations having been undertaken with representative of stakeholders of the relevant sectors in order to best detect their needs and to ensure synergies with their development plans and structural needs.

Nor is the evaluator aware of any consultations having taken place with representatives of NIA, NACS, CUPAR to specifically ask for and incorporate the lessons learnt so far in the PAR process as well as to ensure close cooperation between the pre-accession and post accession instruments.

The justification of the sector selection in the OP will be largely based on the findings of the ad hoc analysis. Nevertheless, consultations will **have to be** undertaken with the key stakeholders and beneficiaries in order to provide a real picture of the situation in the sectors concerned. Lack of consultation will also endanger the commitment from the relevant institutions.

Further consultation is advised with institutions who have been involved in the theoretical background of designing capacity building programmes, universities, organisations for design of management methods, etc

2.2   SWOT

The role of the SWOT analysis is to give a comprehensive picture of the problem analysis already addressed in the first part of the OP:

The programme's strategy also stems from the identified weaknesses and threats of the SWOT.

The SWOT analysis is now arranged conveniently, although there is no real balance between the strength, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and hardly any threats variables are shown.

The problems and statements are grouped and they are consistent with one another..

As recommended, an important opportunity should be exploited and that is to build on ongoing developments and lessons learnt from previous programmes and projects, especially Pre-accession operations.

The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and strengths, as described in the SWOT-analysis, have no cause and effect relation with other variables, and they do not contain contradictions.

The SWOT is not designed to reflect the analysis in the selected sectors. The variables of the SWOT are nevertheless real strengths, real weaknesses, and real threats even though they refer to public administration as a whole, and not to the selected sectors. All boxes of the SWOT should have some reference to priority sectors, with reference to the sectoral analysis in the annex.

Example:
Strengths: far reaching and accepted reform and decentralisation plans in the three priority sectors
Weaknesses: unclear competencies between various levels, insufficient preparedness and resources to provide quality services at local level in the priority sectors
Opportunities: Combined efforts with the other Operational Programmes (especially HRD OP) can bring about major positive changes in the priority sectors.
Threats: Resistance of the actors and/or the citizens to the proposed changes in the priority sectors

In the opportunities section, the development of the private education system is mentioned, although, this sector is beyond the scope of the administrative development operational programme, in the opinion of the evaluator.

There is only one threat mentioned, while threats such as implementation burdens, lack of motivation, etc are not analysed.

There is also no reference to the capacity of the administration within these prioritised sectors or ministries.

The weakness in the SWOT is that most of the variables identified are not quantifiable and measurable.

2.3   Relevance

The analysis chapter of the OP is drafted along the lines of a problem tree where the hierarchy of problems and links between them can be seen. The SWOT also reflects this line of thinking and reflects also the links with the strategy.

The major problems identified in the problem tree analysis are inefficiency, low productivity, lack of transparency, absence of service oriented operation, etc. The causes of these problems were also analysed in more detail in order to explain the causes of certain phenomena, as well explaining the cause and effect of certain interrelations, e.g., inefficiency deriving from structural problems, the quality of civil servants and procedural difficulties.

It is very evident that the potential in the capacity development of the Romanian public administration is one of the critical point for future development and also in the absorption of Structural Funds. This development can only be achieved by the enhancement of effectiveness and efficiency. The analysis highlights the importance of this objective, as well as underlining the importance of a large scale capacity development programme to address this issue.

In the view of the above, the evaluator considers the global objective to be relevant, and firmly based on the analysis undertaken. The main points identified for the development of the Romanian public administration are also viewed as beingrelevant and are therefore a relevant instrument under Structural Funds.

Nevertheless, it should further refer to the obstacles in the way of socio-economic development, emphasizing the problems and needs of the 3 priority sectors, in order to create a link to the Lisbon objectives. This should include a short analysis of the current institutional structures at all levels, (in the priority sectors) and the need to extend partnership arrangements

2.4   Conclusions

The strategy concentrates on issues that are relevant in the selected sectors as well as public administration as a whole, although special sectoral needs need to be more focused in order to better achieve results. This is underpinned by the analysis of the continuation of the PAR process as well as the specific needs in public administration. The SWOT also reflects the main findings of the analysis and consists of the main strengths, weaknesses and opportunities of the public administration.

3 Evaluation of the rationale of the strategy and its consistency

3.1 Evaluation of the rationale of the strategy

In order to assess the contribution to "Institutional and administrative capacity" development, one must refer to a set of characteristics of public organisations related to the performance and the success of public policies. The concept of "capacity" concerns the attention to the development of strategies and competences to maximise the opportunities for programme effectiveness.

Typical aspects of capacity are, for example:
- the quality of civil servants;
- some organisational characteristics;
- diffusion of ICTs among organisational units;
- intergovernmental relations, and
- the style of interaction between government and its social and economic environment.

The improvement in institutional and administrative capacity, "administrative modernization" is sometimes an explicit and very often an implicit goal of socio-economic development programmes.

Institutional and administrative capacity: in positive terms refers to the ability of the public structures to identify and solve problems in the formulation and implementation of government policy. The rationale of the strategy is the core element for an efficient programme implementation

In this last sense, capacity deals with set of functional conditions that allow Governments to elaborate and implement programmes with better performances.

There has been a change in the overall objectives as well as the specific objectives during the course of the evaluation process. The objectives of the OP are now in line with the discussions between the MA and the evaluator. The reformulated objectives include the following:

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

This general objective is an acknowledgement that effective and efficient public services are a pre-requisite for increased productivity in the economyand the improved design of policies for socio-economic development and good governance.

Improving service delivery and customer satisfaction is justified as being the key factors that lead to a more effective and more efficient public administration. This is also relevant for achieving the goals of the Lisbon agenda. On the basis of above, it

can be said, that the global objective of the ACD OP is considered as being satisfactory and that the programme is a suitable means to contribute to a more effective public administration and better public services.

Specific objective 1: to achieve structural and process improvements to the public policy management cycle;

Specific objective 2: to implement an improved quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralised basis.

A new key area in PA2 was introduced for strengthening the absorption capacity for development funds. The first two priority axes are now supported by three key areas of intervention. The key areas strategic responses to the problems identified in the analysis chapter and the SWOT analysis

The priority axes have now been redefined to group the common horizontal reforms that contribute to organisational effectiveness in one key area that will be available to effect both central and local institutions.

The separate requirements for sector decentralisation are also recognised. It is expected that Priority Axes 2 will be sufficiently flexible to cater for the needs of the different priority sectors. The sector analysis has been strengthened with data from the National Institute Statistics

According to lessons learnt in Member States, it can be stated that if the objectives of capacity building projects are vague, there is a high risk of poor outcome. The specific objectives are precise and are therefore expected to contribute to better results.

The logical links between objectives and problems are underpinned by a problem and objective analysis. The elements of this problem and objective tree also link with the SWOT analysis.

The objectives of the OP have now been narrowed, in line with recommendations that capacity building projects should be specific and realistic. Objectives are now more focused increasing the possibility of a positive outcome from implementation of the Programme.

3.2   Assessment of the spending decisions:

In this chapter the assessment of why particular priorities and spending decisions have been made and the justification for the weight for each priority and strategic axis is evaluated.

The OP, in its current version, provides only a short and vague justification for the decision on the allocation of funds amongst the priority axes. It is difficult to understand the basis on which the financial plan been drafted and spending decisions made, since no calculations have been provided to underpin these financial decisions. This of course also derives from the fact that there have

been some difficulties with the quantification of objectives. **Nevertheless, some calculations should be provided.**

It is not clear, for example, why 60% is allocated to decentralisation activities, whereas only 25% is provided for service delivery and 15% for the enhancement of absorption capacity for development funds. These decisions are also not clear as the extent of interventions is not always obvious.

In the rationale of the allocation it is stated that the interventions under priority axes 1 are large scale projects, therefore more costly. Nevertheless, this is not reflected in the financial allocations as only 36% is allocated to these areas.

Although the three priority sectors are mentioned and it is also stated that the allocation of funds will be concentrated on these areas, the degree of concentration cannot be detected, nor does the OP contain a financial table indicating these figures. Also, it is not evident if any consultations have taken place on this issue with the relevant stakeholders. It is also not clear whether or not institutions in the priority sectors will have additional own resources for the planned activities. This chapter should mention the foreseen indicative degree of concentration on the priority sectors.

A division between areas of interventions should also be provided with justification, as well as some underpinning calculations.

In the case of Priority axis 1, a wide range of activities are mentioned that are also very fund consuming. It is not clear how the concentration of funds will be ensured. In the view of the evaluator this will have to be based on strong coordination activities.

While the main objective of the OPTA is to contribute directly to the absorption of the Structural Funds, the OP ACD has as overall objective of contributing to the achievement of EU and national objectives; Also, to make progress in socio-economic development in line with cohesion and convergence goals, thus contributing indirectly to absorption capacity, by improving the efficiency and effectiveness of public administration operations. **The objectives reflect the goal.**

The thematic concentrations can now be explained by the introduction of the selected sectors and the background for their selection. The spatial and financial priorities are not touched upon, and should receive more attention.

3.3 The assessment of the consistency of the strategy

The strategy of the OP is generally consistent in terms of problem analysis, setting of objectives, results and intervention logic. The SWOT analysis is also linked with the strategy and findings correspond to the objectives in the strategy. The sectoral focus, nonetheless, is inadequately elaborated, and it does not reflect the priority of these sectors in all chapters of the document.

The problem analysis links the problem tree with the objectives. This tree improves the consistency of the strategy and links the objectives to the problem analysis. This is demoted from key area to indicator operation.

The relationship between interventions and objectives is now obvious in the OP. The direct outputs of the interventions relate to the objectives, although the degree to which the objectives are to be achieved is vague This is of course derives from the fact that the achievement of these objectives depends on a wider organisational, institutional and political context.

Specific objectives are well defined and valid, although in cases to wide and therefore difficult to quantify.

It was recommended that special attention be given to building on synergies that potentially exist with TAOP and especially regarding the increase of the absorption of funds in the framework of Priority Axes 2, communication and training activities.

The setting up of the legal background for an administrative reform programme has been laid down by previous Phare projects. The OP ACD did not mention any law enforcement component measures in this respect, although this is a core criterion for assuring sustainability of previous programmes. References to the timeliness of secondary legislation and the lack of capacity to implement laws have been introduced into PA1.

More emphasis was advised to be put on the partnership structures and development of partnership mechanisms, both in the planning and implementation phase. This is crucial in order to enhance synergies between different sectors. Partnership is introduced and given increased emphasis in the Priority Axes 1. **Nevertheless, the implementation of establishing partnership structures needs to be further enhanced**.

Priority Axis 1   Structural and process improvement to the public policy

The key areas of intervention have been changed during the course of the evaluation process in line with recommendations given by the evaluators. The key areas of interventions now include the following:
- Improved political-administrative decision making
- Strengthening the Accountability Framework
- Improved organisational effectiveness

The entire revision uses the problem/ objective tree which improved the coherence and consistency of the document and therefore better linkages between the problems identified and the areas of interventions chosen, can now be detected. The OP adequately defines the areas of interventions which are coherent with the objectives of the priority axis, as well as the overall objective. The content of the key areas in most cases has been retained with a better formulation of the objectives and also a

better link to the overall and specific objectives. The areas of interventions and the indicative operations now correspond to the aim of the priority.

The formulation of key areas reflects customer focus and aim at the final objective to improve effectiveness and efficiency of the public sector.

It is indicated that institutions in priority sector will primarily benefit from this priority axis, but it is still not obvious how the priority sectors will benefit more. A more focused sectoral approach of areas of interventions would help concentrate funds and thus enhance the results of these interventions.

The lists of indicative operations have also been rolled up and there is a good linkage between indicators and key areas.

Improve political-administrative decision making
This area of intervention is consistent with the objectives of the priority axis as well as the overall objective of the OP. The indicative operations support the implementation of the area. The indicative operations are in synergy and do not contradict each other. Sustainability is also ensured throughout the interventions.

Strengthen accountability Framework
This area of intervention covers a wide range of areas that are consistent with the objective of the priority axes, as well as the overall objective. At the same time it seems overambitious to the evaluator, to introduce performance reporting in major ministries and institutions as well as improving the evaluation capacity of public administration as a whole within one area, whereas the extent of this introduction is not seen. It is also not clear to what extent will the priority sectors benefit from this area of intervention. It is advised to focus the scope of this area of intervention in order to better achieve results. In order to avoid over-ambitious interventions, target actions, and focus areas have to be very specific and well planned.

Improve organisational effectiveness
The recommendations and comments have been taken into account, when reformulating the areas of interventions and the relevant indicative operations.
This area of intervention covers a wide range of areas that are consistent with the objective of the priority axis as well as the overall objective of the Programme. Improvement of organisational effectiveness, on its own, could absorb all the resources of the OP, if all ministries and central public administration institutions are involved. In order to avoid over-ambitious interventions, target actions, and focus areas have to be very specific and well planned.

One option is that the three selected sectors would manage pilot, large scale projects in this area.

Organisational effectiveness could lead to restructuring and a reduction in the size and importance of certain ministries, which could result in opposition from civil servants. Strong change management operations should also be planned as well as strong political support required in this area of intervention. This has to be ensured through high level partnership and regular consultations. Sustainability is of utmost

importance which could be ensured by constant trainings and communication programmes.

Priority axis 2   Improved quality and efficiency of the delivery of public services on a decentralised basis

The objective of this priority axis is to improve the quality of services provided by the public administration.

The key areas of intervention include:
- Support of sectoral service decentralisation
- Improve the quality and efficiency of service delivery
- Improve the absorption capacity for development funds

Priority Axis 2 as well as the key areas of interventions is relevant and consistent with the overall objective. The areas cover the main areas of concern and are in line with the main objective of the OP.

Priority Axis 2 has been reformulated in line with recommendations of the evaluator. The main focus of the axis reflects a customer focused approach, and the enhancement and quality development of services. A new key area was introduced to deal with the issue of absorption capacity as a major issue especially at local level.

Decentralisation is a key element of the government's public administration reform strategy. The continuation of the decentralisation process proves a smooth continuation of the previous decentralisation process under PAR.

Support sectoral service decentralisation
The identification of a separate area of intervention for the priority sectors is justified. Nevertheless, there is only a vague mention of any special programme or project in these fields. It is not clear which services will be decentralised in the priority sectors, or if there has been any needs analysis undertaken to justify decentralisation of these services. Some reference documentation should also be quoted to justify the need and decision on service decentralisation. The criteria for selection of these services or the basis for choosing certain services should be elaborated better, in the view of the evaluator. This is very important as decentralisation, in most cases, is subject to political decisions. This would be useful to know also for financial planning, as the decentralisation of different services will require different levels of funding.

Improve the quality and efficiency of service delivery
This area of intervention is consistent with the objective of the priority axis, as well as the overall objective. Nonetheless it is not evident as to how these sectors will benefit more than others under this priority. If possible, it would be advisable to develop "central programmes / projects" for each sector, with the involvement of the relevant ministries and bodies. These could address specific issues or include some or all the indicative activities mentioned under the priority. This way, they could also act as "pilot" programmes for other sectors.

The list of indicative actions is consistent, justified and contributes to the improvement of service delivery.

Improve the absorption capacity for development funds
This area of intervention is well justified and consistent with the objective of the priority axis as well as the overall objective. The text should indicate the means by which the OP wishes to increase absorption capacity.

Since the TA OP is also addressing the increase of the absorption capacity of Structural Funds, possible overlaps may occur in case of lack of coordination. A more specific plan as to where the dividing lines are should be drafted with the involvement of the TA MA. Project pipeline development could be the major focus of this area, in the view of the evaluator.

Priority Axis 3   Technical Assistance

The main areas of focus for the Technical assistance are the support of the effective implementation of the OP.
The general objective of the priority axis 3 is to contribute to the OP ACD implementation process, including the preparation for the next programming period, aiming at the effective and transparent use of the structural Funds and domestic co-financing by:

Support to the overall management of the ACD OP, including the preparation of the next programming exercise;

The support for the overall management should also include capacity development activities within the OP. The other three areas are too specific and are advised to be formulated on a higher level. EG: instead of buying computers, it should be stated: support of the monitoring committee

Support to the communication strategy of the ACD OP

The communication strategy aims at developing a system for promoting the ACD OP through an efficient dissemination of information. This focus is seen as relevant in order to help disseminate information.
It is advised that communication activities are two fold: they should both address citizens by awareness raising programmes but attention should also be given to public administration bodies at which the Programme is directed.

External communication is essential in the case of the improvement of services for example, whereas internal communication is crucial when implementing restructuring programmes. Structural changes, and the introduction of performance management and evaluation schemes is a very delicate intervention and could be hindered through the counter interest of stakeholders the internal communication programme would counterbalance this risk.

Carrying out opinion polls would also be important and eligible under this section and in the opinion of the evaluator is necessary given the missing of the quoted data collection.

Communication activities therefore are advised to include not only the dissemination of materials but also internal communication trainings, public awareness campaigns through website development, setting up call centres, etc The scope of this area is advised to be widened.

Close coordination with the TA OP is crucial in priority axis 3, not only during the programming, but also in the implementation phase. The greatest risk of overlap concerns training, communication and absorption capacity improving activities. The TA should also ensure that the operations planned under the OP are sustainable and special actions are advised to ensure sustainability.

3.4   Conclusions

The specific objectives are generally consistent with the overall objectives, and
are linked to the problem analysis. Nevertheless, the formulation and the content of the areas of interventions are sometimes vague which makes objectives difficult to quantify.

The entire revision uses the problem/ objective tree which improve the coherence of the document and therefore there is more linkage between the problems identified and the areas of interventions chosen. The new version adequately defines the areas of interventions. The content of the key areas in most cases has been retained with a better formulation of the objectives and also a better link to the overall and specific objectives. This formulation of key areas is adequate from a customer point of view and adequate means to enhance service delivery of public administration bodies.

4 Appraisal coherency of the strategy with EU, National and Regional policies and the Community Strategic Guidelines

4.1 Main questions asked

Are the priorities in line with the Strategic Guidelines?

Are the Priorities in line with the national strategies? (PAR, regional strategy, training strategy, sectoral strategies)

4.2 Appraisal compatibility strategy with regional, national and EU policy objectives

Compatibility with public administration reform Programme- PAR

The assessment of coherency with the PAR process is the most relevant issue when analysing compatibility with national strategies:

The PAR process is the most important building block of the ACD OP, and it is also described in the text of the OP. The ACD OP takes into account the synergies planned under national and pre-accession sources under Phare. The availability of financial resources is indicated in the financial table.

The main objectives of the Government's decentralisation strategy are the following:
- Limiting the governmental intervention at the local level, only for the cases in which certain social services, programmes or projects cannot be achieved using local resources by the local authorities;
- Legal commitment of the mechanisms for public participation to the process of drafting strategies on local level;
- Increasing the transparency of decisions at the local level and legal commitment of the mechanisms for public participation in the drafting local budgets;
- Total coverage from the state budget of the services paid in cash in the field of social assistance, by conditional grants, with the aim of ensuring the compliance with the principle of universal rights of citizens;
- Continuing the decentralisation process for the basic public services: education, health, social welfare and public order;
- Limiting the area of de-concentrated public services – maintaining the de-concentrated services only when they are functioning based on an integrated management system.

The strategy of the ACD OP is in line with the PAR process as also highlighted in the analysis chapter of the OP, and builds on the main strives of this strategy. The OP is proves to be a smooth continuation of the PAR up to date. Since some of the elements of the PAR strategy will be financed under pre-accession instruments a

strong coordination-especially in the area of implementation and impact analysis is essential be ensured between the two programmes. It is also crucial to adapt PAR to the selected priority sectors.

PAR strategies cover only 2 years while NSRF and the OPs cover 7 years of development strategy. It is therefore advised to change this hierarchy of relationship, and take the NSRF and OPs as a mid term strategy as starting point and align the PAR shorter term strategies to this longer term development process, or alternatively, extend the PAR national strategy over a longer timeframe.

Compatibility with evaluation strategy

The evaluation strategy drafted by the Ministry of Finance is a relevant document for the ACD OP, as it supports the implementation of the evaluation strategy within the accountability framework. The development of the culture for programme evaluation at central and local level is also included here. This is a very relevant and important issue as the main problem identified on both central and local level is the lack of learning from past experience and best practice. Nonetheless, the way evaluation capacity is to be enhanced is not evident from the text. The potential overlaps with the TA OP are also not touched upon in this case. The Ministry of Finance has also been involved in the drafting of the relevant parts of the OP, but further consultations are advised to ensure that the ACD OP is in line with the needs reflected in the evaluation strategy.

4.3   Synergies with other OPs

Enhancement of synergies with other SOPs, more specifically the HRD OP, is of utmost importance in order to support effectively sectoral capacity development. It is stated in the text that there is no overlap between the HRD OP and the ACD OP, but potential synergies and additionality are not addressed. It is advised that an analysis be carried out to rectify this in all the priority sectors.. This is not only crucial in the planning but also in the implementation phase.

Given the choice of areas, the coordination and intense consultation between the HRD OP and the ACD OP is very important. Coordination is advised to be regular and institutionalised, not only in the programming, but also in the implementation phase.

The territorial aspect on the local level should be considered in line with the ROP.
The coherence with ROP regional policy should be mentioned if taken into consideration. This could be tackled on the level of project selection criteria and dealt with on the Programme Complement level.

4.4   Appraisal compatibility with NSRF and EU Strategic Guidelines

The Community Strategic Guidelines highlights two main aspects of the public administration for development focus: productivity and quality. The ex ante evaluator considers the OP to be consistent with the Community Strategic

Guidelines as the global objective of the OP is to enhance effectiveness and efficiency of the Romanian public administration. Emphasis is placed on developing the productivity and efficiency of the public sector according to the Lisbon Agenda.

The analysis and the strategy has been drafted along these guidelines, taking also into account the different roles of public administration, such as:

- Public administration as service provider
- Public administration as largest "sector" in the economy (investor, employer, etc)
- Public sector as policy maker and legislator

The Community Strategic Guidelines also highlights in chapter 3.2, on Convergence

In chapter 4.3.4, "*Administrative Reforms, the Commission underlines the need for concentrating on the needs arising from the specific situation of Member States and on the areas where the greatest obstacles can be found.*

Therefore, under the Convergence Objective, Member States are called upon to build up public administrations and public services at national, regional and local level. Actions in this field should take into account the specific situation of each Member State. Thus, in line with the principle of concentration member states are invited to conduct a comprehensive analysis to identify the policy areas requiring the most support for administrative capacity. Investments should concentrate on those policy areas where are the greatest obstacles to socioeconomic development and on key elements of administrative reforms," (p.28.)

The NSRF for Romania identifies weaknesses of administrative capacities as one of the key issues from the point of view of achieving the objectives of the NSRF.

"*..Building an effective Administrative capacity- The strategy will improve governance in the public sector. Investment will help to improve policy formulation, planning, delivery and management of central and local government services. Actions will be targeted of the administration where the greatest impact can be achieved to aid economic and social development, support business growth and to fight against deficiencies of the Romanian economy…*"

"*Public services are weak and provide low customer satisfaction. Lack of sufficient administrative capacity is reflected by poor management structures, insufficient skills of civil servants, inadequate inter-ministerial cooperation, which ultimately lead to poor quality of the services delivered to the society, and thus jeopardise socio-economic development*"

The OP addresses these issues in the strategy giving focus to improving management structures, improve the skills of civil servants and enhance inter-ministerial cooperation. The strategy also addresses these issues in the light of concentrating funds where the most socio-economic growth is eminent.

Lisbon process

Following the interim evaluation of the Lisbon process, the importance of the efficiency of the public administration sector has become more important. The economy in itself cannot contribute to the economic development efficient government services and operations are also required. The importance of administrative capacity building and the performance of public administration have grown considerably.

The OP is in line with the Lisbon process as indicates the overall objective of the OP as to contribute to the socio-economic development of Romania.

4.5 Appraisal compatibility with EU horizontal objectives on Environment, Equal opportunities and Information society

Equal opportunities

Cross-cutting objectives in general are relevant to the ACD OP but these objectives have to be viewed in a wider aspect. Employment especially can be contradictory due to the fact that restructuring and improvement of efficiency can lead to the dismissal of civil servants, thus directly not contributing to improved employment. Nonetheless, by bringing about more efficient services and structures, the socio-economic environment is improved in each sector.

Equal opportunities objectives have more direct relevance for the ACD OP.
This cross cutting objective is relevant in all priority axes and priorities but have most direct impact in relation to the civil service development. Nine grounds for applying equal opportunities is mentioned in the OP, but the description on how this will be applied in relation to the public administration reform programme is vague. Measures addressing civil service reform should also take into account equal opportunities also on the level of planning. Further attention should be given to this issue in the Programme Complement taking into account the as horizontal issue of the projects implemented.

Information society

The issue of the Information Society is not addressed in the chapter for horizontal issues in the OP. The Information society is a very relevant issue for administrative capacity. Not only is it relevant as a horizontal issue for the administrative capacity development programmes, but also direct means to improve effectiveness and efficiency of the public sector. The OP does not tackle this issue nor in a horizontal, nor a vertical approach. The introduction of new management tools and the use of ICT are at the moment not part of the OP. The development of an e-government programme nevertheless is addressed by the Economic Competitiveness OP, and this area could be dealt with more attention. Some complementary interventions or a horizontal approach when planning actions could be planned in order to better create synergies and contribute to the joint enhanced results.

The aspect of ICT analysis should appear in the analysis section, even if it is not addressed in the strategy. ICT should also be treated as a horizontal issue.

Environment is not a major issue of the OPACD, nor is SEA relevant. Nevertheless the environmental aspect should be considered when implementing projects.

4.6   Conclusions

The strategy builds largely on the PAR strategy and is coherent with both the evaluation strategy as well as EU policies, the main EU Requirements and the Lisbon agenda. The horizontal nature of the OP requires intense coordination between the HRD OP representatives of the priority sectors to tackle the potential synergies and overlaps with the Op HRD as well as the PAR process.

5 Evaluation of expected results and impact

5.1 Main questions asked:

- Are indicators relevant to quantify objectives and disparities?
- Are indicators relevant for the three levels of objectives? (global, specific, operational?)
- Do indicators attain satisfactory level of quantification?
- What is the effectiveness of data collection envisaged?

5.2 Quantification of objectives at programme and priority level

The use of success indicators and corresponding targets makes it easier to judge the performance of programmes. It is also true that it gets more and more difficult to define indicators and targets when we get away from intervention and we get on to the objective and programme level.

It is always very difficult to judge and assess the impact of an administrative capacity programme, especially when only limited number of indicators are available, since the results are not only due to one factor. At this stage, the quantification of objectives is sometimes problematic, not only because there is no source of data, but also because the objectives are less measurable compared to the situation in other SOPs. However, it is imperative that objectives are quantified as much as possible, but only as far as impact assessment is feasible.

Identification of baseline data in the OP is especially difficult, not only because capacity building activities are difficult to quantify, but also because the effectiveness and efficiency of the public administration had not been measured earlier. The absence of baseline data creates the danger of not being able to set targets and not being able to evaluate them afterwards. Without targets, the gap between the desired status and the currents status cannot be identified either

When designing indicators attention was drawn to the importance of differentiation between the types of indicators (input, output, results, impacts) and of matching them to the level of general objectives, specific objectives and areas of interventions.

The assessment has been done on the SMART basis. In the view of the evaluator the indicators defined now are more specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely, compared to the earlier versions. Nonetheless, in some cases the method and system for gathering data is not clearly described.

Two workshops on the definition of indicators were held in order to assist in the design of indicators. Also,some best practice examples have been shown to give an example for indicators.3 A second indicator workshop was held for the

---

[3] List of indicators were provided by Short Term Expert Mr Dietmar Weltz in annex 9.

stakeholders to better assist in the identification of the result and outcome indicators. A top down approach was used in order to identify the appropriate indicators and targets, and the reformulation of certain indicators has been done on the workshop.

A working group was created within the MA ACD, consisting of staff from the Programming, Contracting, Monitoring and Evaluation Units for the definition of indicators. Indicators have been defined, but the baseline data is still problematic. In many cases 0 is quoted as a baseline data. This identification of the baseline data was advised to be revisited in order to avoid 0 where possible.

While defining indicators, it is advised to restrict the number of indicators. Indicators are now listed to measure the objectives, but in most cases these indicators have no baseline data, and it is predicted that ther will be problems with measuring progress. Data availability is also a problem in the ACD OP, and the means of collection certain data is not explained. In cases where no data is available, a short justification of its selection should be given.

There is a correct hierarchy and structure among objectives, and the indicators listed correspond to the achievement of the objectives.

The evaluator is of the view that the aggregation of the indicators will be problematic, and the definition of core data has to be revisited. Indicators as they stand now, need fine tuning in order to be useful tools for monitoring purposes.

It is advised to quantify better the impact indicators in relation to expected impact of the overall reform programme, and to rely on existing data when setting the baseline. (Survey results on the level of citizen trust were quoted in the April 2006 version of the OP which could serve as a baseline data.

Indicators and clearer target figures are provided in OP. Nevertheless, the sectoral focus of the OP is not reflected in indicators, one option is to collect indicators by sector in order to monitor how the priority sectors benefited more from the assistance than other sectors, and to show disparities in these sectors. Target data should therefore also be provided by sector.

The sources of indicators are more extensive and better defined. The OP ACD will work with existing international Agencies (WB, UNDP, Eurobarometer) to draw up a plan for monitoring the OP impact indicator. The OP ACD will collaborate with these Agencies and with relevant NGOs to have a regular survey/poll to collect objective data for use in tracking the impact of the interventions of the OP ACD. The basic reference will be to the relevant components of the Kaufmann indicators for governance (World Bank). The initial selection is based on government effectiveness. The list will be disaggregated to separate out, for individual study, the components that refer specifically to prioritised sectors and central or local administration.

5.3   Evaluation of expected results

As at this moment the OP does not contain any quantified expected results, therefore it is not possible to assess them. Quantifying results is also advised to be identified on a sectoral basis.

In cases where no data is available, a justification should be given as to how these results will be quantified at the end of the programme.

When quantifying results, the evaluator advises to take into account the following:
•   Only a restricted number of selected indicators should be given to each of the areas of interventions;
•   Aggregation of indicators has to be given special attention;
•   The absence of identifying expected results, in the view of the evaluator, hinders the effectiveness of future evaluation activities. In case of further difficulty, monitoring activities have to be strengthened.

5.4   Conclusions

Indicators are now better defined on both global, specific objective level, and intervention level which correspond to the impact, result and outcome indicators. Nevertheless, data collection and the setting of baseline data is still a problem.

6   Appraisal of the proposed implementation system

6.1   Introduction

The results of a programme cannot be achieved without a sound and well functioning implementation system. In the case of an administrative capacity programme it is even more important to build on a well functioning system, since it requires very strong monitoring and evaluation actions. This is required because changes in public administration are difficult to carry out due to its rigid structure and the lack of motivation of the participants taking part in the process. Results can fail if procedures are either too bureaucratic or on contrary not transparent.

Member States' experience shows that the following factors can hinder successful implementation of capacity building programmes:
- Lack of follow up activities
- Lack of Stakeholder involvement and commitment
- Weak legal environment
- Approaches and values prevailing in society
- Overly bureaucratic government procedures
- Weak management arrangements

6.2   Main questions asked

- Are management and monitoring structures sound and efficient?
- What is the basis of project selection?
- Is selection process accountable and in line with national and community regulations?

6.3   Management

The legal basis for the management of the structural funds are set down in the Government decision no 128/2006, amending Government decision no 497/2004 establishing the institutional framework for the coordination, implementation and management of the structural instruments and Government decision no 137/2006 amending Government Decision no 725/2003 regarding the organisation of the Ministry of Administration and Interior. The management structures are in line with the requirements, although there is no real evidence that the adequate number of staff is in place and operational by the start of the programme. A number of trainings are carried out but it is not clear whether all required staff has been trained to fulfil management and monitoring tasks, and how functions are separated.

Since the ACD OP is largely horizontal by nature, the implementation and management of the OP requires very strong co-ordination arrangements. It is important that task forces and inter ministerial working groups are established to strengthen joint effort partnership structures.

It is also important for the Managing Authority to build up a very close relationship with the ministries having responsibility for the priority sectors, and the other actors and partners in the process. Their representatives should be in the Monitoring Committee as well as inter ministerial working groups

It is advised therefore to set up an inter-ministerial working group to assist in the implementation and management activities of the programme, as well as a separate working group for each priority sector to ensure consistency, and coordination of activities.

In the evaluators view, strong coordination activity is one of the major success factors for a successfully implemented ACD OP: This is even more so in the case of the selected sectors. This is also crucial to ensure that the OP continues to respond to the priorities of the PAR, and that it responds well to the constant changes in the PAR environment, while continually stressing the need to maintain focus on the selected sectors with a view to serve the Lisbon agenda

The management structures of projects which are related to the other ministries due to their sectoral focus should be given more emphasis in this section of the chapter. Strong co-ordination and enhanced involvement on both sides is essential in order to gain best results. . The relevant ministries should also be involved in the developing these management structures, bearing in mind that the final responsibility of the management of this OP is by the MA ACD.
It is advised to set up of an inter-ministerial working group to assist in the implementation and management activities of the programme. It is important that task forces and inter ministerial working groups are established to strengthen joint effort partnership structures.

The role of such a working group should be well defined and its roles and responsibilities explained. Support to partnership and inter-ministerial working is envisaged under PA1.

Partnership is addressed in the OP, but it is advised that it is further emphasized in the OP. It is crucial that National and regional government institutions learn to work together and maximize their inputs and resources that support economic development.

To ensure good co-ordination with the programmes funded under the Phare 2004-2006 Phare budget is also crucial for efficient management activities.

There is no Intermediate body nominated for the management of the OP ACD. Therefore it is especially important to ensure that the resources available will suffice for the management of the programme in the given timeframe. A thorough analysis is needed in order to ensure that enough resources are in place and trained for the implementation. Since the implementation schemes are unknown, it is difficult to judge the workload, as well as to appraise if capacity and number and quality of human resources are well planned to undertake all implementation tasks.

It is now not clear what scale of projects will there be implemented under the OP. The selection criteria are advised to be detailed in the Programme Complement.

The IT system for the monitoring and evaluation of the programme is now in place although no training has been undertaken.

6.4   Methods of implementation

The description of implementation methods is missing; it is not clear on what basis projects will be selected, whether actions planned are to be included in calls for projects or larger scale projects. Experience from Hungary shows, that in order to optimise the results (and the use of funds) a variety of methods should be used that fit well with the content of the programme. These could include 2 stage calls for projects, central project, plan-based programme, etc. Procedures for implementation are not clearly defined.

Special emphasis should be given at later stages to the definition of selection criteria (regarding the priority sectors) in the case of calls for projects.

It is advised to concentrate on larger scale projects not only to gain better impact, but also to increase the efficiency of the management of the funds.

6.5   Monitoring

The experiences from other MS shows that it always important to check whether the monitoring system (SMIS in this case) also provides the necessary information about the administrative capacity and other funds effecting capacity building. There have already been some initiatives of the Managing Authority in this field (concerning e.g. background indicators about target groups) The MA should consider how to monitor specific impacts.

The tasks of the monitoring committee are well elaborated. The composition of the monitoring committee is still vague; the basic criteria for the composition of the Monitoring Committee should be laid down. The committee should also comprise for members of the sectors where priority is given, as well as it should give a wide representation of partnerships in line with the planned impact of the programme.

6.6   Evaluation

Evaluation is a crucial for the continuous development and feedback of programme achievements Evaluation Central Unit is also a recipient of this OP under PA1. Since there is a potential overlap in this respect with the TA OP, further discussions are advised to take place between the two MAs. Strategy is a key element of the OP. It is in line with the evaluation strategy that has been drafted by the Evaluation Unit. The OP is creating the necessary condition for evaluations. The timing of the evaluations is not clearly defined.

6.7   Financial management and control

The standard framework for the implementation of the NSRF is designed for the financial management of this OP. The Managing Authority and the intermediate bodies have responsibilities in the field of financial control, selection and sometimes also facilitation of projects. Separation of responsibilities should be very clear, which is not evident from the text at the moment

When drafting the details of the selection process transparency has to be taken into consideration as well as the selection process has to be in line with the EU regulations.

6.8   Conclusions

The legislative background for management structures are set down, but no management arrangement are elaborated in this stage, therefore it is difficult to know what the methods of implementation will be, and whether the human resources planned and trained suffice for this task. Coordination with relevant stakeholders is a key success factor for this OP, therefore strong coordination arrangements are advised on the implementation level.

7 Summary of recommendations

Recommendations have been made in the course of the evaluation process in the framework of informal meetings, summary tables with recommendations, as well as discussions on debriefing meetings in order to best contribute to the improvement of the OP.

The recommendations in this current evaluation report only contain recommendations that are based on the latest, December version of the OP.

These recommendations are the following:

Socio-economic analysis and relevance of the strategy to needs identified

Most important recommendation during the evaluation process was to focus administrative capacity development measures more direct socio-economic impact can be detected. This was accepted and three sectors were selected. This sectoral focus is now present in most chapters of the OP, but should be **better highlighted** both in the strategy chapter and in the sections on areas of interventions and indicators. It is important to decide to what extent and in what way will the sectoral priorities be implemented. Furthermore, it is advised that special programmes/projects are developed together with the relevant line ministries and other agencies and bodies in order to address the specific needs of the priority sectors. **A detailed assessment of each of the selected sectors is strongly advised to be provided in the OP in order to enhance relevance and focus of the strategy.** More indicators and data should be presented in the analysis on all aspects of public administration capacity based on internationally comparable indicators.

When analysing lessons learnt, it is recommended that the OP provides more detail on answers to the following questions in specific sectors:

What were the lessons learned?
Which interventions proved to be a success?
What were the main obstacles for successful implementation?
Which are the institutions that have already benefited from capacity building projects?
In what way have their functions, roles changed?

There needs to be more attention to the analysis of synergies between the selected SOP and TAOP as well as other sectoral programmes involving structural and institutional changes. More attention should be given to contribute to sectoral performance in the selected sectors.

The SWOT is not designed to reflect the analysis in the selected sectors. The variables of the SWOT are nevertheless real strengths, real weaknesses, and real threats even though they refer to public administration as a whole, and not to the selected sectors. All boxes of the SWOT should have some reference to priority sectors, with reference to the sectoral analysis. There is only one threat

mentioned, while threats such as implementation burdens, lack of motivation, etc are not analysed.

In the opportunities section, the development of the private education system is mentioned, although, this sector is beyond the scope of the administrative capacity development operational programme, in the opinion of the evaluator.

Nevertheless, it should further refer to the obstacles in the way of socio-economic development, emphasizing the problems and needs of the 3 priority sectors, in order to create a link to the Lisbon objectives. This should include a short analysis of the current institutional structures at all levels, (in the priority sectors) and the need to extend partnership arrangements

Rationale of the strategy and its consistency

Although the three priority sectors are mentioned and it is also stated that the allocation of funds will be concentrated on these areas, the degree of concentration cannot be detected, nor does the OP contain a financial table indicating these figures. This chapter should mention the foreseen indicative degree of concentration on the priority sectors. The spatial and financial priorities are not touched upon, and should receive more attention

It is indicated that institutions in priority sector will primarily benefit from this priority axis, but it is still not obvious how the priority sectors will benefit more. A more focused sectoral approach of areas of interventions would help concentrate funds and thus enhance the results of these interventions.

Some areas of interventions (Strengthening accountability framework, support sectoral service decentralisation) covers a wide range of areas that are although consistent with the objective of the priority axes, but are over ambitious It is advised to focus the scope of these areas of interventions in order to better achieve results.
In order to avoid over-ambitious interventions, target actions, and focus areas have to be very specific and well planned. One option is that the three selected sectors would manage pilot, large scale projects in this area.

In case of PA1 (Strengthen accountability framework)it is advised to better describe the improvement of evaluation capacity also to avoid potential overlap with the TA OP:

In case of PA2 (Support sectoral service decentralisation) it is advised to further clarify which services will be decentralised in the priority sectors. Some reference documentation should also be quoted to justify the need and decision on service decentralisation. The criteria for selection of these services or the basis for choosing certain services should be elaborated better, in the view of the evaluator.

In case of PA3 it is advised that communication activities are two fold: they should both address citizens by awareness raising programmes but attention

should also be given to public administration bodies at which the Programme is directed.

Coherency of strategy with EU, National and Regional policies and Community Strategic Guidelines

Cross-cutting objectives are in general relevant in the case of ACD OP, equal opportunities should also be more stressed within the document, more detailed description on how this will be applied is advised.

The issue of the Information Society is not addressed in the chapter for horizontal issues in the OP. The Information society is a very relevant issue for administrative capacity, and therefore should be added and described in detail. If the development of an e-government programme is addressed by the Economic Competitiveness OP. some complementary interventions could be planned in order to better create synergies and contribute to the joint enhanced results. The aspect of ICT analysis should also appear in the analysis section, even if it is not addressed in the strategy.

Expected results and impacts

Indicators and clearer target figures are provided in OP. Nevertheless, the sectoral focus of the OP is not reflected in indicators, one option is to collect indicators by sector in order to monitor how the priority sectors benefited more from the assistance than other sectors, and to show disparities in these sectors. Target data should therefore also be provided by sector.

It is advised to quantify better the impact indicators in relation to expected impact of the overall reform programme, and to rely on existing data when setting the baseline. (Survey results on the level of citizen trust were quoted in the April 2006 version of the OP which could serve as a baseline data.

Indicators are now listed to measure the objectives, but in most cases these indicators have no baseline data, and it is predicted that there will be problems with measuring progress. In many cases 0 is quoted as a baseline data. This identification of the baseline data was advised to be revisited in order to avoid 0 where possible.
Data availability is also a problem in the ACD OP, and the means of collection certain data is not explained. In cases where no data is available, a short justification of its selection should be given.

Quantifying results is also advised to be identified on a sectoral basis.
While defining indicators, it is advised to restrict the number of indicators.

The evaluator is of the view that the aggregation of the indicators will be problematic, and the definition of core data has to be revisited. Indicators as they stand now, need fine tuning in order to be useful tools for monitoring purposes.

However, it is imperative that objectives are quantified as much as possible, but only as far as impact assessment is feasible.

Implementation system

Since the ACD OP is largely horizontal by nature, the implementation and management of the OP requires very strong co-ordination arrangements. It is important that task forces and inter ministerial working groups are established to strengthen joint effort partnership structures.

It is also important for the Managing Authority to build up a very close relationship with the ministries having responsibility for the priority sectors, and the other actors and partners in the process. Their representatives should be in the Monitoring Committee as well as inter ministerial working groups.

It is advised therefore to set up an inter-ministerial working group to assist in the implementation and management activities of the programme, as well as a separate working group for each priority sector to ensure consistency, and coordination of activities. The role of such a working group should be well defined and its roles and responsibilities explained,

The composition of the monitoring committee should be further elaborated, the basic criteria for the composition of the Monitoring Committee should be laid down. The committee should also comprise for members of the sectors where priority is given, as well as it should give a wide representation of partnerships in line with the planned impact of the programme.

Further description of the implementation methods is required; it is not clear on what basis projects will be selected, whether actions planned are to be included in calls for projects or larger scale projects, whether they are implemented in the framework of 2 stage calls for projects, central project, plan-based programme, etc. Procedures for implementation should be more clearly defined. It is advised to concentrate on larger scale projects not only to gain better impact, but also to increase the efficiency of the management of the funds.

Annex 1 First meeting of ex-ante evaluator with Managing Authority

Yesterday (23 August 06) Malcolm Ross held a meeting with Ms. Alina Ungureanu and Niall McCann (TA MACSF). He expressed the view that, in light of the comments from the Commission there appeared to be two options for the Managing Authority. Either it stays essentially with the present strategy outlined in the OP, or it takes the Commission's main criticism into account – lack of focus - and sets up an inter-ministerial working group to take broad decisions as to where the focus should be and the main strategy for dealing with the weaknesses in the Central and local administration. If the former approach is adopted, then a long drawn out process is predicted, with approval of the OP being seriously delayed, thus further jeopardizing Romania's ability to absorb Structural Funds. The latter approach would hopefully result in early approval of the OP and enhancement of Romania's ability to absorb structural funds.

It was suggested that these options be explained to the State Secretary and that his preferred approach to the situation be provided to the peer group review which is scheduled to take place on 7 September between DG Employment and the Managing Authority.

If the latter option is the preferred one, the contractor offered the services of a short term international expert to provide technical assistance to the Inter-ministerial working group.

One of the criticisms of the Commission was lack of information as to what had been achieved to date by the reform programme. The contractor offered the services of a short term expert to help strengthen this section of the OP.

Annex 2 Minutes of 2nd Meeting with external evaluators

On 26 September 2006, at the Ministry of Administration and Interior (MAI) headquarters, a second meeting with the ex-ante evaluators of the Operational Programme "Administrative Capacity Development" (OP ACD) was held.

The following persons attended the meeting: Mr. Liviu Radu, Secretary of State for Public Administration Reform; Mr. Malcolm Ross, ex-ante evaluator of OP ACD; Mrs. Perla Simion, Head of the Programming and Evaluation Unit; Miss Reka Matheidesz, key expert on the ex-ante evaluation of OP ACD; Miss Alina Ungureanu, public manager; Mr. Eugen Perianu, local expert and Mr Razvan Ionescu, assistant expert in the MA for OP ACD.

The main topics of discussion were focused on:

1. how the comments of the EC on the OP ACD should be addressed:
    o   Mr. Liviu Radu will send a response to the comments of the EC in the following days. This response will be structured on three main parts:
        •   an update to the information in the OP, e.g. unfinished legislation;
        •   recommendations that will not be followed, e.g. interventions in the agriculture sector that are within the competence of the Ministry of Agriculture;
        •   recommendations that will be followed, e.g. clear identification of problems and measurable outcomes.
    o   Mr. Liviu Radu stated that from the meeting with the EC last week in Brussels, a very important conclusion emerged: the OP needs to focus primarily on managerial areas, which will have a clear effect on the other layers of public administration.

2. the redrafting process of the OP in order to enable the ex-ante evaluation on a new version:
    o   Currently, the OP is being re-drafted. There are three working groups envisaged in the process of consultation (with the Central Unit for Public Administration Reform from MAI, with the UPP from the General Secretariat of the Government and with central and local public administration representatives);
    o   A National Public Administration Reform Strategy 2007-2009 is being drafted at the moment. Based on the evaluation of the previous strategy, this new document will focus on very concrete actions to be taken in the next period of time. The OP will match the new Public Administration Reform Strategy and it will take it further (which will be very good in terms of absorbing the money);
    o   At Mr. Ross's suggestion to target the organizations dealing with absorption, Mr. Liviu Radu emphasised the fact that the absorption capacity is not the objective of the OP ACD, but of the Operational

Programme for Technical Assistance that offers support to the management and implementation of structural instruments;

- o Mr. Malcolm Ross and Miss Reka Matheidesz suggested it would be good to have the OPs on Administrative Capacity Development from Hungary and Bulgaria, that they could provide the MA ACD with.

3. Timetable for the ex-ante evaluation process of OP ACD:
   - o Mr. Eugen Perianu will write a report on PAR to date in terms of results and impact;
   - o Also, Mr. Eugen Perianu's inputs on a training needs analysis for the above-mentioned working groups will be used by the MA ACD;
   - o The final version of the OP ACD on which the ex-ante evaluation will be based will have to be finished by the end of October; the first draft of the ex-ante report will be elaborated by 15 November;
   - o The final ex-ante evaluation report will be finished by the end of November - beginning of December.

27 September 2006

Annex 3 1st debriefing meeting

On 12 October 2006, the Ministry of Public Finance held a meeting of the ex-ante evaluators of the Operational Programme "Administrative Capacity Development" (OP ACD) with the representatives of the Managing Authority for OP ACD.

The following persons attended the meeting: Mr. Stefan Ciobanu, Director of the Programming Unit of the Managing Authority for Community Support Framework (MA CSF); Ms. Claudia Bedea, Head of the Evaluation Central Unit of MA CSF, Mrs. Perla Simion, Head of the Programming Unit of MA ACD, Mr. Malcolm Ross, Team Leader, Ms. Reka Matheidesz, key expert on OP ACD, Mr. Niall McCann, key expert on evaluation in the MA CSF, Ms. Alina Ungureanu, Head of the Evaluation Unit of OP ACD, Ms. Monica Cristea, expert in the Programming Unit of MA CSF, Ms. Aura Munteanu, public manager in the MA ACD, Mrs. Olga Strejan, counselor in the MA ACD, Mr. Eugen Perianu, local expert and Ms. Katalin Damianovich, key expert on training.

The main topics of discussion were focused on the table of recommendations of the ex-ante evaluators and the following issues were debated by the participants:

I.   Re-drafting of the OP according to the Comments of the European Commission:

o   Mr Malcolm Ross offered additional help to support the MA ACD; therefore, Mr Eugen Perianu, local expert, can have more days in order to work with the MA ACD; his contribution will deal with clearly stating the dividing lines between Public Administration Reform and the OP.
o   It was agreed that the ex-ante evaluators will do some of the redrafting by 20 October when there will be an agreed version of the document; this version should represent a response to EC comments and it will include the contribution of the local expert (all new versions will have track changes).
o   When redrafting the OP, some statements through which the MA ACD mentions it intends to focus and to prioritise some of the areas of intervention will also have to be included. Mr. Stefan Ciobanu stated that in order to respond to the Commission's comments, the MA will have to take a step further and identify some sectors that contribute to the socio-economic development in order to have a clear impact; otherwise, the MA CSF will not endorse a mainly horizontal approach. The ex-ante evaluation team re-enforced the idea that the EC comments regarding some sectors' identification is needed, also being in line with the Lisbon Strategy and the Note from the Commission issued in September 2005. Therefore, they offered their support to finance an ad-hoc study, made by an international and a local expert to identify the main areas to be tackled by the OP alongside with the horizontal issues already envisaged, by 25 October. An indicative list of the areas that clearly represent bottlenecks of socio-economic development will have to be provided.

o   The deadline with the European Commission is 25 October. Mr. Stefan Ciobanu stated that the MA ACD should not send informal versions to the Commission, but should send an official draft for inter-commission services. The MA ACD should send the OP to the MA CSF (that should give the favor of opinion) and then officially to the Commission. The submission on 25 October should be the last submission before January 2007.

II.   Presenting the National Evaluation Strategy (NES): Mr Niall McCann made a short presentation of the Strategy and its objectives. The main driver of the NES is the Evaluation Central Unit in the MA CSF. The following activities will be financed through OP ACD:

o   Training of civil servants on management of evaluations;
o   Evaluation facility – promote evaluation exercises in the public bodies that have not engaged in evaluations to date; commissioning evaluations as an exercise for capacity building – to be further discussed;
o   Resource Centre and Networking activities – from 2008 onwards financed through OP ACD.

In the light of the above-mentioned, it was agreed that Mr. Niall McCann will use the inputs of this meeting in order to update the OP ACD's key areas of intervention related to monitoring and evaluation (causes, problems, objectives, interventions, indicators), according to the NES provisions.

Evaluation Unit, 16 October 2006

Annex 4 First follow up table

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

No	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accepted/ Not accepted	Institution responsible with the implementation of the recommendation	Measures for implementation	Deadline	Comments
General							
1	Following the interim evaluation of the Lisbon process, the importance of the efficiency of the public administration sector has become more important. Economy in itself cannot contribute to the economic development of the member states, efficient government services and operations are also required. Although there are several remarks in this field in the OP and also some interventions meeting this problem, it is clear how the mentioned interventions contribute to these objectives and what are the main criteria for reaching this development.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October	Assistance shall be provided from the evaluator to assist the redrafting of the OP to meet the deadlines required. The relevant comments have been added to documents of the OP to better help the MA in the redrafting.
2.	In 2004, the Romanian Government adopted an updated strategy for the acceleration of the public administration reform, a document favourably received also by the European Commission. The analysis in the OP does not highlight the synergies of the national government reform and the OPACD, nor does it elaborate on the possible overlaps, and interrelations between the two programmes and its interventions.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP Assistance from ex ante evaluator	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP.	20th October	

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

No	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accepted/ Not accepted	Institution responsible with the implementation of the recommendation	Measures for implementation	Deadline	Comments
3.	The analysis mentions the main findings of the ECOTEC report of July 2005, in which the following are highlighted: 1. more attention is needed for absorptive capacity in the design process 2. there is insufficient lesson learning (despite the abundance of lessons drawn on through project monitoring and evaluation) 3. lack of decision making and high level political support The answer to these main findings should also appear in the strategy of the OP. Currently no reference is made on lessons learnt and the enhancement of absorption capacity.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October	
4.	Due to the risk of overlap, special attention should be given to the harmonisation of the OP ACD with other Ops, especially the OPTA and the OP HRD, but the other SOPs TA component is also be taken into consideration when fine-tuning the OP.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Add some clarification in OP:	20th October	
5.	While the main objective of the OPTA is to contribute directly to the absorption of the Structural Funds, the OP ACD has as overall objective to contribute to the achievement of EU and national objectives to make progress in socio-economic development in line with cohesion and convergence goals, thus contribute indirectly to absorption capacity, by improving the operation of public administration. The objectives should reflect this goal. This was also emphasised in the Commission's comments.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October	

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

No	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accepted/ Not accepted	Institution responsible with the implementation of the recommendation	Measures for implementation	Deadline	Comments
6.	As also has been commented by the European Commission that the analysis does not point out some aspects when describing the state of affairs of the sector. In the opinion of the ex ante evaluator, this concerns more the complex role of the public administration. The OP concentrates more on the public administration as a whole and does take into account the specific characteristics of any sector or institution. The OP should be more focused on sectors, or specific institutions as well as a general overview on the overall public administration.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP Ex ante evaluator	Ad hoc analysis on the possible focus areas carried out by the evaluator in order to support decision. Decision of the Managing Authority OPACD on the sectoral focus is needed, ans a redraft accoring to this new approach.	5th November	TOR for an additional expert needed
7.	The Community Strategic Guidelines highlights two main aspects of the public administration for development focus: - productivity and quality. The analysis and the strategy should also be drafted along these guidelines, taking also into account the different roles of public adminsitration, such as: • Public administration as service provider • Public administration as largest "sector" in the economy (investor, employer, etc) • Public sector as policy maker and legislator	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP to add more customer oriented view.	20th October	
8	Considerable assistance has already been allocated to Romania (mostly from Pre-accession instruments, but also from other bilateral funds) for capacity building. However no detailed analysis is incorporated in the OP focusing on the projects and programmes undertaken, the results achieved, lessons learnt, gaps identified. A more in-depth analysis should elaborated in this field. An integrated study approach targeting the results and lessons learnt, gaps identified from previous projects and programmes shall be carried out in the framework of an ad hoc analysis carried out by an evaluation consultant.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP Ex ante evaluator	Ad hoc analysis on the previous programmes, results, gaps to be carried out by the evaluator.	25th October	

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

No	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accepted/ Not accepted	Institution responsible with the implementation of the recommendation	Measures for implementation	Deadline	Comments
9.	An analysis of the key factors for achieving an efficient and cost efficient customer based public administration should be further elaborated. The reason for selection of certain priorities and certain interactions should be better underlined. The hierarchy of objectives is not clear, and not well focused in the current version of the OP.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October	
10.	An important comment by the Commission is the lack of focus within the OP in terms of intervention and strategy. A more focused approach should therefore be followed when drafting the OP. When defining the focus attention should be given to the potential overlap between the objectives of other OPs as well as the objectives of the PAR.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP Ex ante evaluator	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP. Ad hoc analysis on the possible sectoral focus areas carried out by the evaluator in order to support decision. Decision of the Managing Authority OPACD on the sectoral focus is needed, ans a redraft accoring to this new approach.	20th October	
11.	An important point already made by the Commission as well, is of course the development of indicators and quantified targets. The MA has already informed the Commission it will tackle this point and provide indicators and quantified targets. The ex ante evaluators will assist the MA in this task by providing a horizontal indicator expert for these tasks.	ACD OP		MA ACD Ex ante evaluator	Ad hoc analysis on the possible sectoral focus areas carried out by the evaluator in order to support decision. Decision of the Managing Authority OPACD on the sectoral focus is needed, ans a redraft accoring to this new approach.Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October	

Socio-economic analysis

12	The ex ante evaluator agrees, however, with the Commission that the SWOT analysis does not cover all aspects of the public administration capacity development issues, but instead concentrates on the strengths and weaknesses of the system from an internal point of view- and mainly on Human Resource Development. No analysis is undertaken from the customers' point of view. Operational models, policy making, ICT, and cost effectiveness issues are not studied in depth.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP with customer point of view.	20th October
13	The examination of the description of problems identified both on central and local level should be further elaborated. The analysis and strategy refers to the analysis of the structural changes in central and local administration, public policy formulation but does not refer to a number of aspects, which should be taken into account such as: • the quality of civil servants, • some organisational characteristics, • the diffusion of ICTs among organisational units, • the intergovernmental relations and • the style of interaction between government and its social and economic environment.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
14.	Although the analysis recognises the need for a clearer definition of roles at various levels (central, regional, county, sub-county), the issue is not sufficiently addressed in the description of the areas of intervention and of indicative operations.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
15.	The analysis should also be more analytical. It should explain the causes of certain phenomena as well as it should refer to the cause and effect of certain interrelations . It should also build on the lessons learnt from previous project and programmes in capacity building.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October

	ACD OP	MA ACD OP		20th October
16.	There is a lack of numerical data quoted in the analysis. More indicators and data should be presented in the analysis on all aspects of public administration capacity based on internationally comparably indicators Most indicators are referring to the quality of human resources, and does not reflect the other aspects of the quality of (e.g: government effectiveness, regulatory quality, control and corruption eg: Number of staff, cost of services, duration of services, number an quality of policy making procedures, quality of human resources, number of procedures using ICT, all indicating the quality of the services, also in order to compare with other countries.	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP, using more data where possible.	20th October
17.	More emphasis should be put on the partnership structures and development of partnership mechanisms as this is one of the key elements for enhancing absorption capacity indirectly.	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
18..	The Commission highlights the importance of development of a transparent and reliable system of staff recruitment, promotion, career and motivation and proposes a more focused strategy on this issue. The evaluator also agrees with the necessity of this issue, and emphasises the importance of the harmonisation of the OPHRD.	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
19.	Real lessons from the Pre-accession Funds are lacking. There is only a description of activities. This should be more analytical (what are the lessons that were learned: interventions that proved to be a success and what were the main obstacles?). The NAP contains a more analysis-based description of some of the PHARE-programmes.. An example is the introduction of EDIS within Phare involved institutions. Introduction and accreditation of EDIS could also be considered as a pilot to introduce other reforms in institutions.	MA ACD OP Ex-ante evaluator	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
20.	Most statistical data refer to the quality of HRD, but the analysis of this data is missing.	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October

SWOT

21	The SWOT mentions a lot of weaknesses and a lesser amount of strengths, opportunities and threats which together are the main elements for analyzing the Romanian socio-economic situation regarding public administration.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft SWOT with more reference to situation analysis
22	The ex ante evaluator agrees, however, with the Commission that the SWOT analysis does not cover all aspects of the public administration capacity development issues, but instead mainly concentrates on the strengths and weaknesses of the system from an internal point of view- and mainly on Human Resource Development. No analysis is undertaken from the customers' point of view. Operational models, policy making, ICT infrastructure and cost effectiveness issues are not studied.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft SWOT with more reference to situation analysis	20th October
23.	An important opportunity would be to build on ongoing developments and lessons learnt from previous programmes and projects, especially Pre-accession operations. Targeting capacity building measures, and preparatory measures.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft SWOT with more reference to situation analysis, use the ad hoc study on previous programmes and lessons learnt.	20th October
24.	The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and strengths as mentioned in the SWOT-analysis have no cause and effect relation to most of elements in the startegy and there is a lack of connection with the interventions chosen.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft SWOT with more reference to situation analysis	20th October

		ACD OP	MA ACD OP	
25.	The SWOT-analysis as such should be followed by some texts, explaining the relations between elements of the SWOT and also highlighting the most important factors. Which are the strengths and weaknesses of Romanian public administration seems to be clear. There is a lack of information, however, on the underlying causes. Something similar counts for the opportunities and threats. In the past years, there have been policies (sometimes funded by pre-accession funds) to make use of opportunities to develop capacity of institutions involved in pre-accession funds and structural funds management. It is interesting to know the reasons why some approaches succeeded and (maybe) others failed.	Redraft SWOT with more reference to situation analysis		20th October
Assessment of the rationale of the strategy				
26.	As highlighted in the Commission comment's Priority axes 1 and 2 should contribute indirectly to the absorption capacity of Romania as there is a risk of not benefiting from Structural Funds. Special attention should be given to avoid any possible overlaps to the TAOP. The focus should be the enhancement of the efficiency and effectiveness of the public administration thus contributing to the strengthening of the structure which increases absorption capacity.	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP		20th October
27	The rational should contain a more solid base for the prioritisation of actions as commented also by the European Commission.			
The consistency of the strategy				
28.	The ex ante evaluator agrees with the Commission that the strategy is consistent with the Community Strategic Guidelines and also (in particular the sub-priority "administrative capacity" except maybe for some more attention to developing the productivity and efficiency according to the Lisbon Agenda.	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP		20th October

56

No.	Description				
29.	The ex ante evaluator agrees that the priority setting in the area of administrative capacity development in the NSRF is very vague and does not identify the sectors to be reformed. It is not clear how the ESF will solve the countries public sector bottlenecks that hinder economic development.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
30.	More attention should be given to adjust and enhance sectoral reforms.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
31.	There needs to be more attention to the relation between the HRD strategy in the SOP and TAOP as well as other sectoral programme involving structural and institutional changes.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
The priority axes					
32	Indicators and quantified targets are still absent.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP Ex ante evaluator	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
33.	*Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration"* Areas of intervention are defined too wide and no focus is seen within the activities. The list of indicative operations are too vague and they are not proven to contribute to the indicative operations and objectives. It might be advisable to focuse activities on activities targeting structural change rather than studies, study visits, etc.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
34.	*Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration"* The mentioned indicators have no real linkage with the proposed operations and activities. Linkages between objectives, areas of interventions, activities and indicative operations should be ensured. Operations that do not contribute to certain objectives should be eliminated while others have to be incorporated to support certain objectives and activities.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October

#					
35.	*Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration"* It is still not clear what is the rationale of the priorities identified and what are the planned activities to implement the civil service reform, and to what extent is the PAR supporting this programme. It is only partially described who takes the political commitment of implementing an overall reform.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
36	*Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration"* A more focused sectorial approach of the priorities would help concentrate funds and thus enhance the results of the interventions	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
37	*Priority axes 2. "Capacity development to improve the service performance of local administration"* Indicators of the Axis 2 are not directly linked to the operations and intervention actions and do not contribute to the overall objectives. Indicators should be better elaborated.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
38.	*Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration"* Structural changes, and especially government reform is a very delicate intervention and could be hindered with the counter interest of stakeholders (accountability, transparency) as well as the introduction of a performance management system. Therefore a large scale communication programme should also be planned for the smooth implementation of such reforms.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
39.	The ex ante evaluator agrees with the Commission there are long lists of "indicative operations" in the OP, which sometimes cover almost all possible activities in certain fields without any focus	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October

#	Recommendation				
40.	*Priority axes 2. "Capacity development to improve the service performance of local administration"* Indicators of the Axis 2 are not directly linked to the operations and intervention actions and do not contribute to the overall objectives. Indicators should be better elaborated	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
41.	*The Priority Axes 2 "Capacity development to improve the service performance of local administration"* should be approached more from the customers' point of view and not from an internal point of view. Therefore more emphasis should be given to the service development measures such as, the integrated process automatisation, the establishment of customer based services. Human resource development and trainings, as well as the enhancement of the management should only be supportive actions.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
42.	A more focused sectorial approach of the priorities would help concentrate funds and thus enhance the results of the interventions	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
43.	*The Priority Axes 2 " Capacity development to improve the service performance of local administration"* Indicators of the Axis 2 are not directly linked to the operations and intervention actions and do not contribute to the overall objectives. Indicators should be better elaborated.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
44.	*Priority Axis 3: Technical Assistance* It is not clear how the training within the TA complements the ones in the OPACD as well as the TA sof other OPs.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October

Quantification of objectives at programme and priority level

45.	The indicators are still weak. Not only is there only a summing up of indicators, but moreover, there is lacking a description of the several types of indicators (input, output, results, impacts). Moreover, in most cases it is better to restrict the amount of indicators as one or two of each type for each of the priority axes and the total OP.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP evaluator	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October
46.	Also there is hardly any quantification of the targets for the programme and the priority axes. At some places, however, the OP already contains some of these targets, e.g.,:	ACD OP	MA ACD OP Ex ante evaluator	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	20th October

Minutes 2nd debriefing meeting 8 November 2006

On **8 November 2006**, the Managing Authority for Community Support Framework (MA CSF) organized the second debriefing meeting on the ex-ante evaluators' recommendations on the Operational Programme for Administrative Capacity Development (OP ACD).

The following persons attended the meeting: **Mr. Razvan Cotovelea**, General Director of the MA CSF, **Mr. Malcolm Ross**, Team Leader of the ex-ante evaluation team, **Mrs. Perla Simion**, Head of the Programming Unit of the Managing Authority for Administrative Capacity Development (MA ACD), **Ms. Reka Matheidesz**, key expert in the ex-ante evaluation team, **Ms. Anca Ionas**, integration counselor in the MA CSF Evaluation Central Unit, **Ms. Monica Cristea,** expert in the MA CSF, **Mr. Colm Dunne**, Team Leader of the MA ACD technical assistance team, **Mr. Robert Schodle**, expert in the MA ACD technical assistance team, **Mr. Eugen Perianu**, local expert; **Ms. Alina Ungureanu,** Head of the MA ACD Evaluation Unit, **Ms. Aura Munteanu**, public manager, **Mrs. Olga Strejan**, counselor in the MA ACD, **Mrs. Ramona Cranciova,** counselor in the MA ACD and **Mr. Razvan Ionescu**, expert in the MA ACD.

The **main issues** discussed during the meeting were the following:

- **Substantial progress** has been made in the re-drafting process of the OP ACD; however, more work is needed in some areas, e.g. : better description of the existing situation, justify the selection of the sectors (health, education and labor);
- There is a need **to define the problems** in the three identified sectors and to mention **the proposed manner to address them**,;
- In the key area of intervention related to monitoring and evaluation, **the monitoring part should be elaborated**, and it was suggested that the **coordination of the actions related to monitoring** should be attributed to the **Evaluation Central Unit in the MA CSF**;
- **The ex-ante experts' recommendation** is to elaborate a short operational programme (about 50 pages, maybe with some annexes, if needed) and a strong Programme Complement to use in the negotiation process with the European Commission;

- By the end of the meeting it was agreed that:
  - the ex-ante evaluators will send the page numbers for some of the comments and will also give some **suggestions and examples of indicative actions**;
  - an **ad-hoc study** dealing with the justification of the sectors will be elaborated by an international expert;
  - **first draft** of the ex-ante evaluation report will be finalized **in the third week of November**;
  - **final version** of the evaluation report will be finalized **in the third week of December** (that's why **the revised OP version**, that will also take into account new comments from the Commission**, needs to be finished by the middle of December**);
  - **22 December** is the deadline for the **1ˢᵗ draft report on the Programme Complement.**

Drafted by Alina UNGUREANU   Evaluation Unit, DG DCA, MAI

Annex 6 2nd follow up table

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme						
Recommendations /Findings	**OP**	**Accept ed/Not accept ed**	**Institution responsible with the implementatio n of the recommendatio n**	**Measures for implementati on**	**Deadlin e**	**Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report**
General						
1 Following the interim evaluation of the Lisbon process, the importance of the efficiency of the public administration sector has become more important. Economy in itself cannot contribute to the economic development of the member states, efficient government services and operations are also required. Although there are several remarks in this field in the OP and also some interventions meeting this problem, it is clear how the mentioned interventions contribute to these objectives and what are the main criteria for reaching this development.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Clarification to be added as given on the debriefing meeting	5th Decemb er	In the revised OP, several remarks and references are made to the Lisbon process, but it is still not clear how the actions proposed in the OP contribute to the achievement of these goals. The sectors selected have to contribute to the Lisbon strategy.

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

	Recommendations/Findings	OP	Accept ed/Not accept ed	Institution responsible with the implementatio n of the recommendatio n	Measures for implementati on	Deadlin e	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
2.	In 2004, the Romanian Government adopted an updated strategy for the acceleration of the public administration reform, a document favourably received also by the European Commission. The analysis in the OP does not highlight the synergies of the national government reform and the OPACD, nor does it elaborate on the possible overlaps, and interrelations between the two programmes and its interventions.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Clarification to be added as given on the debriefing meeting	5th Decemb er	The present draft of the OP now highlights the relationship between the ACDOP and PAR. It is clear from the text, that the areas addressed in the OP as Priority Axies are in line with the areas addressed by the PAR Strategy 2004. They are also consistent with the Govt Strategy 2005-2008. The question is "do the activities proposed in the OP provide for a seamless continuation of the PAR Strategy to date? And are there possible overlaps between the programmes planned under Phare or national sources, and Structural Funds? In some instances this part of the OP has duplications in the text. The programmes 2004-2006 for administrative reform includes several conclusions and lessons that are relevant in this context. Pg 6-8

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accepted/Not accepted	Institution responsible with the implementation of the recommendation	Measures for implementation	Deadline	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
3.	The analysis mentions the main findings of the ECOTEC report of July 2005, in which the following are highlighted: 4. more attention is needed for absorptive capacity in the design process 5. there is insufficient lesson learning (despite the abundance of lessons drawn on through project monitoring and evaluation) 6. lack of decision making and high level political support The answer to these main findings should also appear in the strategy of the OP. Currently no reference is made on lessons learnt and the enhancement of absorption capacity.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Clarification to be added as given on the debriefing meeting	5th Decemb er	The current version of the OP now refers to certain findings of the ECOTEC report, especially the lessons learnt chapter, but it is still not clear what will ensure success this time, while previous actions failed. The reader is left with the impression that this OP is trying to achieve what other initiatives before have failed to do and it is hard to believe that there is any reason why they should be more successful than the previous attempts. The OP has to describe in detail what has has worked in the past, what has been achieved to date, and what changes are proposed based on lessons learnt from past failures Clarification to be added as given on the debriefing meeting to Pg 7-8

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

	Recommendations/Findings	OP	Accepted/Not accepted	Institution responsible with the implementation of the recommendation	Measures for implementation	Deadline	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
4.	Due to the risk of overlap, special attention should be given to the harmonisation of the OP ACD with other OPs, especially the OPTA and the OP HRD, but the other SOPs TA component is also be taken into consideration when fine-tuning the OP.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Add some clarifications to the OP.	5th December	The synergies with other SOPs in terms of supporting sectoral reforms should be better highlighted when justifying the selection of the three sectors Pg 14
5.	While the main objective of the OPTA is to contribute directly to the absorption of the Structural Funds, the OP ACD has as overall objective to contribute to the achievement of EU and national objectives to make progress in socio-economic development in line with cohesion and convergence goals, thus contribute indirectly to absorption capacity, by improving the operation of public administration. The objectives should reflect this goal. This was also emphasised in the Commission's comments.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Justification of the selected sectors is to be better formulated	5th December	The current version of the OP now defines three areas of focus for interventions within the OP. These areas are: health, education, labour and social solidarity. However it is very unclear as to what basis of selection of these areas was made. No analysis, and no detailed justification is given for the selection of these three sectors. It is difficult to understand for example, why the health sector has a greater priority than say the Ministry of the Economy or the Customs and taxation system in terms of contributing to the above objectives Pg 14
6.	As also has been commented by the European Commission that the analysis does not point out some aspects when describing the state of affairs of the sector. In the opinion of the ex ante evaluator, this concerns more the complex role of the public administration. The OP concentrates more on the public administration as a whole and does take into account the specific characteristics of any sector or institution. The OP should be more focused on sectors, or specific institutions as well as a general overview on the overall public administration.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Justification of the selected sectors is to be better formulated	5th December.	In the current version of the OP, there are references to the selected sectors, but it is still not clear what the specific need in each selected sector is, how the selected interventions will serve to support these sectors. A needs analysis or justification for the proposed interventions is needed. Pg 14

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accept ed/Not accept ed	Institution responsible with the implementatio n of the recommendatio n	Measures for implementati on	Deadlin e	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
7.	The Community Strategic Guidelines highlights two main aspects of the public administration for development focus: - productivity and quality. The analysis and the strategy should also be drafted along these guidelines, taking also into account the different roles of public administration, such as: • Public administration as service provider • Public administration as largest "sector" in the economy (investor, employer, etc) • Public sector as policy maker and legislator	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP to add more customer oriented view.	5th Decemb er	In the current version of the OP, it is more clear that public administration is analysed as a public service provider and that this role should be improved (especially on local level), but it is still not well emphasied how this cultural change is addressed. The need for a cultural change in public administration directed at customer satisfaction should be highlighted. The final impact of the priority axe should be customer satisfaction especially on local level. Pg 40.
8	Considerable assistance has already been allocated to Romania (mostly from Pre-accession instruments, but also from other bilateral funds) for capacity building. However no detailed analysis is incorporated in the OP focusing on the projects and programmes undertaken, the results achieved, lessons learnt, gaps identified. A more in-depth analysis should elaborated in this field. An integrated study approach targeting the results and lessons learnt, gaps identified from previous projects and programmes shall be carried out in the framework of an ad hoc analysis carried out by an evaluation consultant.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP Evaluator	Ad hoc analysis on the previous programmes, results, gaps to be clarified as on debriefing meeting.	5th Decemb er	The current version of the OP already contains the projects and initiatives taken so far in the framework of the pre-accession programmes. It also highlights the results and the lessons learnt. Some structural changes are proposed in the text, a table format with the project title, objective and main results would make the text easier to overview. Pg 6-8

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accept ed/Not accept ed	Institution responsible with the implementatio n of the recommendatio n	Measures for implementati on	Deadlin e	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
9.	An analysis of the key factors for achieving an efficient and cost efficient customer based public administration should be further elaborated. The reason for selection of certain priorities and certain interactions should be better underlined. The hierarchy of objectives is not clear, and not well focused in the current version of the OP.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP in line with the sector selection.	5th Decemb er	The hierarchy of objectives should be further elaborated, objectives mentioned are of different levels, and not always coherent with the priority axes. A better formulation of objectives is also advised. In the light of the selected sectors the objectives are more adequate.
10.	An important comment by the Commission is the lack of focus within the OP in terms of intervention and strategy. A more focused approach should therefore be followed when drafting the OP. When defining the focus attention should be given to the potential overlap between the objectives of other OPs as well as the objectives of the PAR.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Justification of the selected sectors is to be better formulated.	5th Decemb er	The current version of the OP now defines three areas of focus for interventions within the OP. These areas are: health, education, labour and social solidarity. However it is very unclear as to what was the basis of selection of these areas. No analysis, and no detailed justification is given for The selection of these three sectors. It is difficult to understand for example, why the health sector has a greater priority than say the Ministry of the Economy or the Customs and taxation system in terms of contributing to the above objectives. Pg 14
11.	An important point already made by the Commission as well, is of course the development of indicators and quantified targets. The MA has already informed the Commission it will tackle this point and provide indicators and quantified targets. The ex ante evaluators will assist the MA in this task by providing a horizontal indicator expert for these tasks.	ACD OP		MA ACD Ex ante evaluator	Reformulate indicators on the basis of the workshop given	5th Decemb er	A workshop for the definition of indicators is to be held on 13th November. This will allow for the better design of indicators and the distinction between input, output and result indicators

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accept ed/Not accept ed	Institution responsible with the implementatio n of the recommendatio n	Measures for implementati on	Deadlin e	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
12	Objective to improve the national evaluation and monitoring system is now well elaborated, but emphasis is only put on Evaluation. However, this cannot be undertaken without having an effective monitoring system in place . The monitoring system is not mentioned when addressing the question of evaluation				Redraft and incorporate monitoring reference.	5th Decemb er	Pg 19
Socio-economic analysis							
13	The ex ante evaluator agrees, however, with the Commission that the SWOT analysis does not cover all aspects of the public administration capacity development issues, but instead concentrates on the strengths and weaknesses of the system from an internal point of view- and mainly on Human Resource Development. No analysis is undertaken from the customers' point of view. Operational models, policy making, ICT, and cost effectiveness issues are not studied in depth.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	It was clarified on the debriefing meeting	5th Decemb er	The SWOT analysis has improved significantly in the revised version of the OP, but has some contradicting statements: eg: stable civil service corps mentioned as a strength and the lack of professionalism of civil service corps mentioend as weakness. It is not clear where the dividing line is. Well educated civil service corps is mentioned as a strength and not having skills suitable for their job is mentioned as weakness. Pg 22-23 It was clarified on the debriefing meeting.

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accept ed/Not accept ed	Institution responsible with the implementatio n of the recommendatio n	Measures for implementati on	Deadlin e	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
14	The examination of the description of problems identified both on central and local level should be further elaborated. The analysis and strategy refers to the analysis of the structural changes in central and local administration, public policy formulation but does not refer to a number of aspects, which should be taken into account such as: • the quality of civil servants, • some organisational characteristics, • the diffusion of ICTs among organisational units, • the intergovernmental relations and • the style of interaction between government and its social and economic environment.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft and add to Support for the overall PAR process the relevant sections of the OP	5th Decemb er	The current version of the OP addresses the above aspects, but still has no real focus on partnership issues, intergovernmental relations and relationship with social and economic environment. To be incorporated in Support for the overall PAR process Pg 32
15.	Although the analysis recognises the need for a clearer definition of roles at various levels (central, regional, county, sub-county), the issue is not sufficiently addressed in the description of the areas of intervention and of indicative operations.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Justify as on debriefing meeting.	5th Decemb er	It is still not clear on what level the interactions will be addressing problems, and which institutions on which levels will be involved. (regional, county, sub county, etc) Pg 40

	Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme						
	Recommendations/Findings	OP	Accept ed/Not accept ed	Institution responsible with the implementatio n of the recommendatio n	Measures for implementati on	Deadlin e	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
16.	The analysis should also be more analytical. It should explain the causes of certain phenomena as well as it should refer to the cause and effect of certain interrelations. It should also build on the lessons learnt from previous project and programmes in capacity building.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Reformulate the relevant sections of the OP	5th Decemb er	The line of reasoning is clearer but is needs some more elaboration. Pg 8. Pg 14. Example: Problem: the quality of services are low at local level in the health sector Cause: No real quality standards established at the local county level. No development strategy for the health sector Need: development of strategic capacity at local level, introduction of quality standards for health sector
17.	There is a lack of numerical data quoted in the analysis. More indicators and data should be presented in the analysis on all aspects of public administration capacity based on internationally comparably indicators Most indicators are referring to the quality of human resources, and does not reflect the other aspects of the quality of (e.g: government effectiveness, regulatory quality, control and corruption eg: Number of staff, cost of services, duration of services, number an quality of policy making procedures, quality of human resources, number of procedures using ICT, all indicating the quality of the services, also in order to compare with other countries.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Add more reference to findings	5th Decemb er	Numerical data and underpinning of certain findings is still lacking and, no statistical evidence is presented to support certain findings. If no evidence exists explain the basis on which the findings were made Pg 12-15

	Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme					
	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accept ed/Not accept ed	Institution responsible with the implementatio n of the recommendatio n	Measures for implementati on	Deadlin e	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
18.	More emphasis should be put on the partnership structures and development of partnership mechanisms as this is one of the key elements for enhancing absorption capacity indirectly.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP, To be incorporated in the Support to the PAR process section in more detail	5th Decemb er	This element still needs some further elaboration. To be incorporated in the Support to the PAR process section in more detail. Pg 32
19.	The Commission highlights the importance of development of a transparent and reliable system of staff recruitment, promotion, career and motivation and proposes a more focused strategy on this issue. The evaluator also agrees with the necessity of this issue, and emphasises the importance of the harmonisation of the OPHRD.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	5th Decemb er	Several steps have been done in this areas so far, further activities should be focusing on the gaps. Civil service reform in the OP now focuses on performance management system implementation rationalisation of structures, and does not include HR system development (recruitment, promotion, motivation) Formulation of the proposed interventions should rather include the development of these areas, and include performance management as one area. Pg 35.

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accept ed/Not accept ed	Institution responsible with the implementatio n of the recommendatio n	Measures for implementati on	Deadlin e	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
20.	Real lessons from the Pre-accession Funds are lacking. There is only a description of activities. This should be more analytical (what are the lessons that were learned: interventions that proved to be a success and what were the main obstacles?). The NAP contains a more analysis-based description of some of the PHARE-programmes. An example is the introduction of EDIS within Phare involved institutions. Introduction and accreditation of EDIS could also be considered as a pilot to introduce other reforms in institutions.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP evaluator	To be clarified as on debriefing meeting.	5th Decemb er	The current version of the OP already contains the main results and lessons learnt from previous programmes, although the continuity of certain actions are still not evident. Pg: 6-7To be clarified as on debriefing meeting.
21.	Most statistical data refer to the quality of HRD, but the analysis of this data is missing.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Add more reference to findings.	5th Decemb er	Data still only refers to the quality of civil servants and less attention is given to the other aspects of public administration, such as HR system. In case of missing of data, there should be qualitative affirmation on the findings, or an explanation what the findings are based on. Pg 15-16
SWOT							
22	The SWOT mentions a lot of weaknesses and a lesser amount of strengths, opportunities and threats which together are the main elements for analyzing the Romanian socio-economic situation regarding public administration.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft SWOT with regrouping findings so they are on similar level	5th Decemb er	The SWOT analysis has improved in the current version of the OP, reflecting more the problem analysis in the first chapter. Pg 22-24

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accept ed/Not accept ed	Institution responsible with the implementatio n of the recommendatio n	Measures for implementati on	Deadlin e	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
23	The ex ante evaluator agrees, however, with the Commission that the SWOT analysis does not cover all aspects of the public administration capacity development issues, but instead mainly concentrates on the strengths and weaknesses of the system from an internal point of view- and mainly on Human Resource Development. No analysis is undertaken from the customers' point of view. Operational models, policy making, ICT infrastructure and cost effectiveness issues are not studied.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft SWOT with regrouping findings so they are on similar level.	5th Decemb er	The SWOT analysis has improved in the current version of the OP, reflecting more the overall problems of the public administration, but is some cases the problems mentioned in the problems analysis should also be incorporated. There is for example no reference on the structures of the current HR system. Pg 22-24
24.	An important opportunity would be to build on ongoing developments and lessons learnt from previous programmes and projects, especially Pre-accession operations. Targeting capacity building measures, and preparatory measures.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft SWOT with more reference to situation analysis, and link to strategy.	5th Decemb er	The redrafted version of the OP now contains an analysis of the previous programmes, and results learnt, but still the link with the strategy still has to be strengthened. Pg:
25.	The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and strengths as mentioned in the SWOT-analysis have no cause and effect relation to most of elements in the startegy and there is a lack of connection with the interventions chosen.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft SWOT with more reference to situation analysis and also link to the strategy	5th Decemb er	The SWOT analysis has improved in the current version of the OP, the links between certain levels of the problems, opportunities, and threats are still not well elaborated. Pg 22-24

Ex -Ante Evaluation of Administrative Capacity Development Operational Programme

	Recommendations /Findings	OP	Accept ed/Not accept ed	Institution responsible with the implementatio n of the recommendatio n	Measures for implementati on	Deadlin e	Comments on redraft by 2nd interim report
26.	The SWOT-analysis as such should be followed by some texts, explaining the relations between elements of the SWOT and also highlighting the most important factors. Which are the strengths and weaknesses of Romanian public administration seems to be clear. There is a lack of information, however, on the underlying causes. Something similar counts for the opportunities and threats. In the past years, there have been policies (sometimes funded by pre-accession funds) to make use of opportunities to develop capacity of institutions involved in pre-accession funds and structural funds management. It is interesting to know the reasons why some approaches succeeded and (maybe) others failed.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft SWOT with more reference to situation analysis	5th Decemb er	This part is partly incorporated in the lessons learnt section, but as no analysis is made on the underlying causes of certain problems. Pg 8-12
	It is mentioned in the" strength" that civil servants receive continuous training, but this is not highlighted in the analysis section what type of trainings these are, who is delivering them, whether there is a training strategy on the basis of which this is delivered, and how these training complement the planned training activities	ACD OP		MA ACD OP	Redraft SWOT with grouping of findings.	5th Decemb er	Pg22-24
27.	Not enough absorption capacity for structural funds is being rather a threat than an opportunity.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP		5th Decemb er	Pg 22-24
28.	In the SWOT analysis " opportunities " is made up of elements such as possible future results. Instead it should be more focusing on the achievements, results so far.	ACD OP		MA ACD OP		5th Decemb er	The opportunities should include the continuation of the basis achieved so far.

Assessment of the rationale of the strategy

29.	As highlighted in the Commission comment's Priority axes 1 and 2 should contribute indirectly to the absorption capacity of Romania as there is a risk of not benefiting from Structural Funds. Special attention should be given to avoid any possible overlaps to the TAOP. The focus should be the enhancement of the efficiency and effectiveness of the public administration thus contributing to the strengthening of the structure which increases absorption capacity.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft and justify relevant sections of the OP	5th Decemb er	The distinction is clear, but some reference or a sentence underlining this statement should be incorporated in the text. Pg 49.
30.	The rationale should contain a more solid base for the prioritisation of actions as commented also by the European Commission.			Redraft and justify the relevant sections of the OP	5th Decemb er	Rationalisation of the civil service structures is the first measure foreseen within the Civil Service Reform objective. Why this was chosen needs to be better explained, particularly as no clear reference to the problem that generated this measure is made in the analysis section; moreover, such a rationalisation is not included in the Govt programme 2005-2008. Clarification as on debriefing meeting should be added. Pg 35-37.

The consistency of the strategy

31.	The ex ante evaluator agrees with the Commission that the strategy is consistent with the Community Strategic Guidelines and also (in particular the sub-priority "administrative capacity" except maybe for some more attention to developing the productivity and efficiency according to the Lisbon Agenda.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	5th Decemb er	The redrafted OP has already takes into account these aspects, but some clarification when describing impacts of certain actions should be given, as they contribute to the productivity and efficiency mentioned in the Lisbon Agenda.
32.	The ex ante evaluator agrees that the priority setting in the area of administrative capacity development in the NSRF is very vague and does not identify the sectors to be reformed.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Harmonise with NSRF	5th Decemb er	It has to be ensured that the sectoral focus is in line with the development goals of the NSRF. Pg 42, Pg 49

33.	More attention should be given to adjust and enhance sectoral reforms.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	5th December	Secoral focus is now integrated in the OP, but it is still not clear what reform process it will contribute to, and what are the main focuses of the reform. If the problems derive from structural problems, how are they going to be tackled? Pg: 14
34.	There needs to be more attention to the relation, and synergies between the HRD strategy of civil servants in the SOP and TAOP as well as other sectoral programmes involving structural and institutional changes.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Clarification as on debriefing meeting	5th December	More harmonisation with the other OPs in relation to sectoral change, and sectoral capacity development plans is needed. Pg 49
The priority axes						
35.	Indicators and quantified targets are still absent. This work is in progress and a special indicator expert is assisting the work shall assist the definition of indicators in the framework of a training	ACD OP	MA ACD OP Ex ante evaluator	Reformulate indicators on the basis of the workshop given	5th December	
36.	*Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration"* Areas of intervention are defined too wide and no focus is seen within the activities The list of indicative operations are too vague and they are not proven to contribute to the objectives. It might be advisable to focuse activities on activities targeting structural change rather than studies, study visits, etc.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Grouping of indicative operations	5th December	Interventions are now more focused but they still address diverse elements of a structural reform and do not target the structure itself. Pg 38. Grouping of indicative operations: Exampel: Development and implementation of traing startegy Introduce partnership structures
37.	*Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration"* It is not clear what "Support for the overall PAR process is focusing on. This intervention is too vague and well defined. If it is for the support of partnership, it should be more specific, otherwise this is duplicating of the TA			Clarify this section as on debriefing meeting including the establishment of partnership structures.	5th December	Pg 32

38.	*Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration"* The mentioned indicators have no real linkage with the proposed operations and activities. Linkages between objectives, areas of interventions, activities and indicative operations should be ensured. Operations that do not contribute to certain objectives should be eliminated while others have to be incorporated to support certain objectives and activities. The activities do not seem to be in hierarchy and in synergy.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Reformulate indicators on the basis of the workshop given.	5th Decemb er
39.	*Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration"* It is still not clear what is the rationale of the priorities identified and what are the planned activities to implement the civil service reform, and to what extent is the PAR supporting this programme. It is only partially described who takes the political commitment of implementing an overall reform.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	To be clarified in the support of the overall PAR process	5th Decemb er
40.	*Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration"* A more focused sectorial approach of the priorities would help concentrate funds and thus enhance the results of the interventions.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	The focus of interventions through impact analysis.	5th Decemb er
41.	*Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration"* The hierarchy of objectives is not well elaborated, and the relationship between the objectives and the priority axes are vague. Support for the overall PAR process is not clear, and is also not the same level of objective as implementation of civil service reform. Implementation of civil service reform now includes structural changes, implementation of performance management systems.	ACD OP		Restructuring of objectives as clarified.	5th Decemb er

Recommendation text (right-hand column):

38. Improvement of the indicators is still needed, and also the improvement of operations, which are not always linked to the objectives.

39. The reform process is now only focusing on 3 ministries on the central level. Are the others not at all involved, or is there only a priority for the thee sectors? How is this addressed related to partnership development, etc? Pg 32.To be clarified in the support of the overall PAR process

40. Activities should be formulated on a higher level. E.g: Instead of Establishing common terminology with the Ministry of Finance.... Instead: Establish partnership structures and frameworks, or establish a multi annual budgeting system for linked to programme planning, design and performance management Pg: 33-34

41. Pg 32. Structure of objectives should be restructured as clarified on the debriefing meeting.

42.	One of the measures foresees training for high civil servants. While reasons for choosing to focus on this particular target group are provided in the text, why the needs of the executive levels of the civil service were not addressed needs to be explained, especially as it is this group who are responsible for the day-to-day functioning of the Service and who are in direct contact with the 'customers'. It is also this group that will have the greatest role in determining Romania's adsorption capacity of structural Funds.	ACD OP		Rethink of the target group, or justification of the target group.	5th Decemb er	Pg 37
43.	Priority axes 2. "Capacity development to improve the service performance of local administration" Indicators of the Axis 2 are not directly linked to the operations and intervention actions and do not contribute to the overall objectives. Indicators should be better elaborated.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Reformulate indicators on the basis of the workshop given.	5th Decemb er	There is a need for a more elaborate explanation of the actions that are foreseen under the Performance Management measure. How this links with the analysis of the civil service situation and how the problems therein described will be alleviated with the introduction of performance management practices needs to be clearer. Pg 37
44.	Priority Axes 1. "Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration" Structural changes, and especially government reform is a very delicate intervention and could be hindered with the counter interest of stakeholders (accountability, transparency) as well as the introduction of a performance management system. Therefore a large scale communication programme should also be planned for the smooth implementation of such reforms.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Include risk analysis, potential burdens and means to overcome them.	5th Decemb er	The communication element and the introduction element of the OP is still weak, no interventions are planned to overcome this gap. Training in its own cannot fulfil this task. Pg 44. to include supportive actions to Support of the overall PAR process on local level
45.	The ex ante evaluator agrees with the Commission there are long lists of "indicative operations" in the OP, which sometimes cover almost all possible activities in certain fields without any focus.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Grouping of indicative operations.	5th Decemb er	A more focused and more integrated way of introducing reform programmes would be more adequate. It is mentioned that the objective that the introduction of the organizational assessment scheme is planned? How will it be ensured that local institutions implement is? Pg 44. to include supportive actions to Support of the overall PAR process on local level.

46.	Priority axes 2. "Capacity development to improve the service performance of local administration" Indicators of the Axis 2 are not directly linked to the operations and intervention actions and do not contribute to the overall objectives. Indicators should be better elaborated.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Reformulate indicators on the basis of the workshop given.	5th Decemb er	
47.	Priority axes 2. "Capacity development to improve the service performance of local administration" The revised version of the OP mentions three priority areas related to sectors, but does not mention what these institutions are on the local and regional level who would be the potencial beneficiaries.	ACD OP		Identify the institutions concerned.	5th Decemb er	Pg 43. to be clarified as on debriefing meeting
48.	The Priority Axes 2 "Capacity development to improve the service performance of local administration" should be approached more from the customers' point of view and not from an internal point of view. Therefore more emphasis should be given to the service development measures such as, the integrated process automatisation, the establishment of customer based services. Human resource development and trainings, as well as the enhancement of the management should only be supportive actions.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Include impacts to highlight customer satisfaction.	5th Decemb er	What does service development mean in the local institutions of selected sectors? What needs to be done to achieve better service delivery? Interventions should be focusing on those issues. Pg43-44 The impact of the interventions should be customer satisfaction and better services at local level.
49.	A more focused sectorial approach of the priorities would help concentrate funds and thus enhance the results of the interventions	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	5th Decemb er	
50.	The Priority Axes 2 " Capacity development to improve the service performance of local administration" Indicators of the Axis 2 are not directly linked to the operations and intervention actions and do not contribute to the overall objectives. Indicators should be better elaborated. The different objectives of Priority axes 2 are not on the same level. Strengthening human resource management is higher level than the strengthening of the planning and strategic management.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Reformulate indicators on the basis of the workshop given.	10th Decemb er	This still has to be addressed in the revision, although a considerable improvement in adding indicators can be stated.

#	Description					
51.	*Priority Axis 3: Technical Assistance* It is not clear how the training within the TA complements the ones in the OPACD as well as the TA sof other OPs. A study to analyse the overall training startegy to harmonise the trainings is being undertaken within the ex ante evaluation.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP	Ad hoc analysis to be incorporated in the OP. Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	10th Decemb er	This still has to be addressed in the revision based on the ad hoc study on training needs.
Quantification of objectives at programme and priority level						
52.	The indicators are still weak. Not only is there only a summing up of indicators, but moreover, there is lacking a description of the several types of indicators (input, output, results, impacts). Moreover, in most cases it is better to restrict the amount of indicators as one or two of each type for each of the priority axes and the total OP.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP evaluator	Reformulate indicators on the basis of the workshop given.	20th October	This still has to be addressed in the revision. An indicator workshop will be held to assist in better defining indicators.
53..	Also there is hardly any quantification of the targets for the programme and the priority axes. At some places, however, the OP already contains some of these targets, but it should also be quantified.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP Ex ante evaluator	Reformulate indicators on the basis of the workshop given.	20th October	At some places, however, the OP already contains some of these targets, but it should also be quantified, some more elaboration is needed in this field.
Quantification of objectives at programme and priority level						
54.	There is hardly any quantification of objectives at priority level.	ACD OP		Reformulate indicators on the basis of the workshop given.	20th October	The revised version of the OP has not considerably changed in this respect. In case no data is available maybe some capacity building can be allocated on the statistical office to develop in this area.
	Consistency with other OPs as regards stategy and interventions	ACD OP				
55.	The OP at the moment does not analysis consistency with other SOP, although the sectoral focus entails a very harmonised set of interventions from other OP s, in order to contribute to the overall sectoral reform process.	ACD OP	MA ACD OP Ex ante evaluator		5th Decemb er	Pg 49
	Evaluation of expected results					
56.	As at his moment the OP hardly contains any expected results, most indicators are mostly outcome indicators and do not reflect results.	ACD OP		Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	5th Decemb er	Results such as listed below.

57.	The relationship between the activities and the expected results can hardly be seen. The logical link between the activities, outcomes and results should be better highlighted.	ACD OP		Clarify the links with objectives, activities, outcomes, results, impacts.	5th Decemb er	See below for result eg: Indicative actions should be grouped for better flexibility eg: design and delivery of training programmes for local civil servants Example: Implement HR system, introduce quality standars for services, etc
58.	Results of the interventions for example would be such as: Increased HR management systems Enhanced institutional capacity and enhanced partnership structures for the stakeholders involved. Civil service accountability and transparency enhanced Improved public service delivery Local administration effectively manage	ACD OP		Reformulate text in sections of the OP and add results and impacts to the axes.	5th Decemb er	
59.	The project pipeline is not clear. How will the projects be generated? Will there be any assistance allocated for this?	ACD OP		Clarify relevant sections of the OP	5th Decemb er	Pg 46 TA section
	It is now not clear what scale of projects will there be implemented under the OP. It is advised to concentrate on larger scale projects in order to gain better impact.	ACD OP		Redraft the relevant sections of the OP	5th Decemb er	To incorporate in Indicative actions section .
Appraisal of the proposed implementation system - Management						
60.	The implementation structure of the OP is not clear. Will there be any intermediate bodies nominated? If yes who will be the intermediate body? What will the segragation of tasks be between the MA and the IB?	ACD OP		Clarify and justify management structures	5th Decemb er	Pg 57. Clarification to be incorporated in text as given on the debriefing meeting.

No.	Comment		Action	Date	Reference
61.	Why is INA not involved in the implementation structure or as beneficiary It would be advised to involve other institutions that had already taken part in the implementation of civil service reform. I believe that in particular they need to define better the rationale of introducing performance management practices and the actions that will fall under this measure. Not least, the NACS will have a strong say regarding the measure of rationalising civil service structures – their further explanation of why this is needed and how it should be done is crucial to justify the measure.	ACD OP	Clarify and justify management structures	5th December	Pg 55. Clarification as given on the debriefing meeting
62.	Capacity of the MA and implementing structures are also not clear. Which department within the Ministry will be responsible for the Will there be enough resources for the efficient implementation?	ACD OP	Clarify management structures	20th October	
63.	The Managing Authority and the intermediate bodies have responsibilities in the field of financial control, selection and sometimes also facilitation of projects. Separation of responsibilities should be very clear with each activity	ACD OP	Clarify the segregation of tasks and duties.	5th December	Pg 55-56
64.	The financial table should include a justification of the numbers	ACD OP	Add justification to the table.	5th December	Pg53-54
	Appraisal of the proposed implementation system – Monitoring		Redraft relevant sections of the OP	5th December	
65.	Monitoring and evaluation structures are well elaborated within the document. Other functions are less clear, such as control	ACD OP	Redraft relevant sections of the OP	5th December	Pg57
66.	Administrative capacity building OP is implemented horizontally across the line ministries. Therefore it would be advisable to set up an interministerial working group for the implementation, involving all relevant ministries, especially those where secoral focus is given.	ACD OP	Add and consult with the representatives of the inter-ministerial working group.	5th December	Pg 57

67.	The monitoring committee should also comprise for members of the sectors where priority is given	ACD OP	Add and consult with the representatives of the selected sectors.	5th December	Pg 57
	Appraisal of the proposed implementation system - Evaluation	ACD OP			
68.	Improving evaluation strategy is a key element of the OP. It is in line with the evaluation strategy that has been drafted. The OP is creating the necessary condition for evaluations. The timing of the evaluations are not clear.	ACD OP		5th December	Pg 57
	Appraisal of the proposed implementation system - Financial management and control	ACD OP			
69.	The proposed financial management and control mechanism are set down in detail, but although internal control is not elaborated and cannot be seen in the OP	ACD OP	Add more detail on the management system as regards internal control.	5th December	Pg 61

Annex 7 Ad hoc analysis-Assessment on the lessons learnt

Preface

This assignment has come about in the context of the project for the ex-ante evaluation of the Sectoral Operational Programmes of Romania. Its scope was confined to the Sectoral Operational Programme for Administrative Capacity Development (OP ACD). The purpose of the assignment was to carry out a review of the achievements to date of the reform in the public administration sector, assess the up-coming priorities of the reform, as a basis to judge whether the content of the OP ACD was a sound reflection of the real needs as well as relevant and well-thought in the context of the past events, the present and expected circumstances.

The assignment has been completed between 20th of Sept and 20th of Nov 2006.

The author of the report is Eugen Perianu. The views expressed therein belong solely to the author and were based on data collected through means of interviews, document consultation and questionnaires, from the central as well as the local level of the administration. A full list of sources of data is attached as Annex 1.

This report is structured as follows:
- the *Background* chapter sets out the evolution of the public administration reform (PAR) process since the early 1990's. This chapter is very important for a good understanding of the local culture and the local circumstances under which the PAR process has been implemented over time, as a pre-requisite for understanding the context in which the present OP ACD has been designed.
- The 2nd chapter looks at the OP ACD itself, draws conclusions about its relevance and design and makes specific judgements on each of its Priority Axis. A number of remarks and judgements that would have been made on the first version of the OP ACD were no longer included. Instead, the text draws on the 2nd, updated version of the OP ACD, dated 3^d of Nov 2006, which was more elaborate than the 1st version and as a result, the text of this report no longer points out the problems that had been solved in the latest version of the OP ACD.
- The *Recommendations* chapter puts forward a number of suggestions on what needs to be done to improve the OP ACD.

Background_ The PAR process

The purpose of this chapter is to describe in general terms the dynamic of the PAR horizontal process between 1990 – 2005, as a basis for a better understanding of how the current OP ACD fits into the overall reform process. It does not go into details for each of the three pillars of the reform – Public Policies, Civil Service, Decentralisation – as these are now sufficiently covered in the OP ACD.

The text makes the distinction between the reform in the administration on a sectoral basis, as a result of the process of adopting the *acquis*, and the public administration reform as a horizontal process, across all sectors and covering both the central and the local levels of the administration.

Between 1990-2000, the PAR horizontal process emerged and grew very slowly – it was a period of emerging thinking, testing and promoting the first attempts at reform, mainly funded by the EU Phare programme. Such attempts and steps were visible in the process of decentralisation, which has been the subject of constant, albeit limited attention, in the process of developing the concept of the civil service and in the process of institutional restructuring and strengthening.

Phare support for the horizontal public administration reform was relatively small until 2000, amounting to little more than 10 mill EUR. Until 2000, Phare-funded programmes were focused on support for a few measures of institutional development, particularly on separating the political level from the civil service, on setting the basis for creating and developing the body of civil servants, and provided limited support for the local level of the administration. Apart from the Phare-funded programmes, there were only dispersed and *ad-hoc* attempts to re-organise the administration (e.g. at the Ministry of Transport, one of the incumbents of the position of secretary of state for strategy and reform initiated and completed a process of redefining the organisational structure of the ministry, starting from a review of the ministry's mission, role and functions).

The period 1996-2000 saw the first coalition government in office. It was a very difficult political period, because learning how a coalition government can work was a painful exercise and that in itself was not helpful for the PAR process. Given such circumstances, it was very unlikely that the PAR would be able to make much progress.

The main lesson learnt until 2000 was that the PAR was a long-term process, a system as large as the public administration system is very difficult to change and therefore constant pressure and stimulation are needed before visible improvements can be seen .

The year 2000 marked a new beginning and an acceleration of the PAR process, spurred by at least 3 elements: the psychological moment of the new millennium, the recent re-orientation of the Phare programme to support the pre-accession process and the fact that the newly elected government was uni-colour, no longer a coalition as in the previous tenure. Moreover, the new government explicitly stated that one of its key goals was Romania's accession to the EU.

Between 1999-2001, the then Secretary of State for public administration reform attempted a fundamental structural change of the public administration, but this process went lost in the complicated and somewhat long process of establishing and revising the institutional structures in charge with reform.

A good part of the Phare support after 2000 was focused on supporting the institutions in charge with the management of the PAR process – the MAI, CUPAR, NACS, NIA and on creating a body of professional public managers who would become the main drivers of reform in the administration. For the local level, support was focused on the process of fiscal decentralisation. This means that although strengthening the institutions that are in charge to manage the reform does lead to progress of the reform overall, providing a limited level of direct support to the public administration bodies can only lead to limitations of the capacity to actually implement the reform. In this respect, it is highly relevant that the current OP ACD provides direct support to the public administration bodies themselves.

Between 2000-2004 there have been some further attempts towards structural reforms – e.g. reduce the nb of ministries, mainly because the EU suggested that this was needed. It is not clear whether such an exercise was based on strategic thinking or whether it was carried out to merely satisfy the "reduce the nb" objective.

Two milestones have marked the period: the 2001 strategy to accelerate the PAR process, which was overly complex and attempting a comprehensive approach. Systems are notoriously difficult to change and the best strategy to go about it is step-by-step. The 2001 strategy was far too complex, making it impossible to manage. A further attempt was much better managed, and the result was the 2004-2006 strategy to accelerate the PAR process. This document was much better than its predecessor and has indeed become a working tool for the management of the reform.

Overall, the PAR has been constantly lagging behind other sectors and areas. Some reasons why this has happened:

- Although the Accession Partnership specifically set the objective of developing the administrative capacity, the horizontal PAR process has always been given a 2nd tier importance, as it was not one of the chapters of the *acquis*. The sectoral PAR, led by the EU accession process, has benefited from much more attention, and here the results in terms of institutional changes and strengthening, as well as introducing new practices, were impressive. The European Commission itself was more keen on seeing that progress was made on the *acquis* chapters than on progress of the horizontal PAR and this has translated into less pressure placed by the Commission on this latter process.
- Romania, like Bulgaria, was far more backward than the other countries of the former communist block. That meant that Romania had a lot to catch up, and adopting the *acquis* was arguably more difficult than for the other countries. This meant that, with so much to do on the other sectors, there was simply less capacity and less attention for the horizontal PAR.

- The horizontal PAR it is a very difficult process. It requires political will far and above any of the other sectors, it entails changing *profoundly* a very *big system*, and that is a very difficult undertaking.

Given all of the above, it was clear that the horizontal PAR process would have only limited chances to move at a significant speed. As such, the achievements of the PAR process so far, in spite of it receiving less attention and resources than the other *acquis*-led processes, are commendable.

The OP in the context of the PAR process and the Lisbon Agenda

General assessment

The OP ACD was prepared in a given setting: an on-going PAR process and an important opportunity to access the EU Social Fund, with all the reasons not to be missed. As such, the OP had to be prepared in such a way that would satisfy both agendas – the priorities of the PAR process in Romania and the priorities that the Social Fund was prepared to finance, i.e. those particular types of public admin reform measures that are in support of the Lisbon agenda. This was not an easy exercise.

As it stands now, basically the OP continues the PAR process and has designed actions that fall under the same 3 pillars for reform that are featured in the 2004-2006 PAR Strategy. This is a positive element: it is a display of the OP's wise approach in not neglecting the PAR agenda and in actually choosing to carry on the reform process instead of attempting a different, independent approach that might have been confusing or conflicting with the existing set of priorities. To satisfy the Lisbon agenda, the OP now features a nb of 3 socio-economic sectors, where its support will be directed primarily.

The team that has prepared the OP has held consultation with the 1st tier of stakeholders, namely the PAR management bodies. The table shows the assessors view on the adequacy of consultations with the different PAR managing parties:

The GSG	Consultations were adequate
The NACS	Consultations held, further consultations are needed
The NIA	Consultations held, further consultations are needed
The CUPAR	Consultations were adequate

The 2nd tier of stakeholders is made up of the beneficiaries (public administration bodies themselves): line ministries, local public admin bodies. Consultations were held also here. It is the assessor's view that consultation at this level were less important than for the 1st tier. Normally consultation at the level of beneficiaries are held in the beginning of an intervention, when the intervention is designed. The design stage of the PAR was back in 2004 and at the time there have been extensive consultation between the designers of the PAR 2004-2006 strategy and the beneficiaries (bodies of the public admin). In 2005-2006 when the OP was designed, the PAR process was mid-way. It could have been interpreted as inappropriate if the MAI, in designing the OP, would have attempted consultations beyond the 1st tier, for instance going to the public administration bodies and gathering views on the PAR process. First of all, the timing would have been wrong – why go and consult again, mid-way, when this had already been done at the design stage. Secondly, it could have been easily interpreted as unprofessional, as it would have come across as an attempt to shortcut the 1st tier of actors who were managing the PAR process. The MAI therefore decided to maintain consultations primarily at the level of the 1st tier, as the actors at this level, who were managing the reform, were the most knowledgeable about the status of the PAR process, its achievement to date and the areas that needed further support.

If the co-operation between the MA and the PAR managing bodies will also be adequate throughout the implementation of the OP, in order to ensure that the OP continues to respond to the priorities of the PAR, while continuously stressing the need to maintain focus on the selected sectors with a view to serve the Lisbon agenda, then this OP stands very good chances to achieve significant and sustainable success.

Link between the OP and the PAR documents 2004-2006, 2007-2009
The PAR strategies are the overarching planning documents that set out what needs to be done in the PAR process. PAR 2007-2009 is the planning document that sets out what will be done in the next stage of the PAR process. This document has not yet been prepared, but it is expected that it would propose further steps under the same three pillars of the PAR strategy 2004-2006, with increased support for improving institutional effectiveness and efficiency both at the central as well as the local level. This is an appropriate timing to step up support in this area – doing it sooner would have been very difficult and perhaps downright wrong, given that at central level, most of the line ministries were far too preoccupied with adopting the *acquis* and the institutional and legal changes that this process entailed; at local level, the public admin bodies are now facing tasks of such a magnitude - the decentralisation process, increased nb of EU-funded projects – that they need all the support available to help them in the process of taking up new responsibilities, meaning particularly improvement of their institutional capacity.

In relation to the PAR strategic documents, the view of the assessor is that the OP has a dual nature:
- it is a funding mechanism for the actions of the PAR process;
- it includes a programming dimension for the PAR process.

Both elements are complemented by a view to support the Lisbon agenda. PAR Strategy 2007-2009 will carry on the PAR process, the OP will support the PAR process and will do so with a focus on the selected three sectors.

Specific assessment
This section aims to assess the relevance of the Priority Axis and the respective key areas. It does so at general level, without going into detailed description of what has been achieved to date under each of the key areas and what needs to be done further, as this is now sufficiently covered in the present draft of the OP. Instead, it aims to judge whether each of the key areas is relevant, taking into account the past, the present circumstances and needs and the foreseen events and needs.

Priority Axis 1   Strengthen public policy interventions in the central administration

1) Support for the overall PAR process

As it stands now, this key area aims to support the overall management of the PAR process as a whole, not just the actions of this OP. So far, significant support has been provided to the bodies who are managing the PAR process, but much less direct support was granted to the public administration bodies

themselves. This key area aims to provide funding to public administration bodies, allowing them to strengthen their capacity to undertake reviews of the PAR process at their level. So far, many of these bodies have actually been so preoccupied with implementing various reform projects or initiatives that have been pushed towards them that they have had hardly any time to break, take stock, think things through and decide how to best manage the process further on. This key area is therefore well justified in providing support to that end.

2) Improve efficiency and effectiveness of public decision making processes through public policy cycle interventions

Adequate consultation took place with the main managing body of this area – the General Secretariat of the Government – and that was the pre-requisite for a good design of this key area.
The actions foreseen are relevant as they reflect well the current state of affairs and the plans drawn up by the GSG for the next stage. Co-ordination with the Phare-funded programmes has also been duly considered during consultations.

This key area features, among others, a very important element of the PAR, where efforts to date have not yet yielded conclusive results, namely a management review of the mission and responsibilities of the line ministries and their associated bodies. Providing support to that end is therefore relevant and reflects an urgent need.

A management review of the mission and responsibilities of various bodies may, as a consequence, lead to possible organisational changes to match the possible revisions of the role of these institutions. It is therefore appropriate that support for *Rationalisation of structures* has also been included as part of the Key Area 3, *Implement Civil Service Reform*. While the rationalisation of structures does not serve only this purpose, its main justification being that of supporting projects that aim to improve efficiency and effectiveness in general, the fact that it can provide support also for effecting changes as a result of revised missions and definition of roles, is beneficial.

3) Implement Civil Service Reform

Performance management
This area reflects indeed an existing need, but it is not clear whether the choice made to support this area was based on sufficient thinking and consultation. Before anything else, more consultation is needed with the NACS, as managing body in the area of civil service development, as well as with the CUPAR, as the designers of the 2007-2009 Strategy.

Rationalisation of structures
Although this area is not included in the PAR Strategy 2004-2006, there are good reasons to include it in this OP. In the past, efforts to support rationalisation of structures have been scarce, *ad-hoc* and not always based on sound reasoning. Admittedly, as indicated in a previous section, doing this sooner would have been very difficult and perhaps wrong, given that at the central level most of the line ministries were far too preoccupied with adopting the *acquis* and the institutional and legal changes that this process entailed. Adding efforts to rationalise

structures in the same time with reviewing and revising the structures as a result of the requirements of the *acquis*, would have been unproductive. Now, however, the time is right to undertake this kind of rationalisation.

Not only is the timing right, there is also a real need to make funds available for rationalisations, because if ultimate improvement of public administration service performance is to be seen, then it is clear that this cannot be done with better public policies or reform of the civil service alone. Structural changes of the organisational set up are also needed.

When applications under this area will be received, attention should be paid that each of the projects proposed are based on sound justification. While clear and measurable project objectives are needed for each of the projects, well-formulated objectives are not enough if they are not relevant too. Each of the projects should include a clear justification, that is a description of the need that has led to the identification of such a project. Otherwise, change for its own sake is difficult to implement and is unsustainable.

Training for high civil servants and for developing basic competencies
This area is justified given the plans to improve strategic management capabilities and practice at the level of central and local public administration bodies. Such a process needs to be backed-up by adequate competence building and training serves well this purpose. In addition, the corps of high civil servants is newly emerged and, as any new establishment, needs support.

Although justification for this area is sound, the need for further consultation with the NIA and the NACS remains, to ensure that training in these two areas reflect the most pressing needs and that possible other areas of urgent need are not left out.

Support for developing the training management function
Adequate justification for funding projects in this area is already included in the OP.

4) Implement the national evaluation and monitoring system

Recent events – namely the development and launching of the National Evaluation Strategy – justify support in this area. The fact that this OP provides such support is justified by the fact that the National Evaluation Strategy is such a wide area, touches horizontally every sector, touches both central and local levels and it is therefore relevant, from the point of view of the PAR process overall, to support capacity building in evaluation. As far as the Lisbon agenda is concerned, in the assessor's view, when the Lisbon strategy talks about "better governance" this means better governance of the process itself to achieve the strategic goal set in 2000. With this in mind, it is very appropriate to support the improvement of the evaluation capacity of the administration, because this is a crucial ingredient of improved strategic management capacity, and is therefore directly supporting the afore-mentioned Lisbon priority.

Priority Axis 2   Capacity   development   to   improve   the   service performance of local administration

Assessment of the relevance of this priority axis is done as whole, not for each of its key areas. The reason is that apart from the Key Area 1 *Support for the PAR process at local level* whose relevance has already been discussed in a previous section, all of the other three key areas can better be judged as a whole, as components of an integrated approach aiming to build capacity at the local level.

Again, this section will not repeat what has been achieved to date in the public administration reform process at the local level, as this is now adequately described in the OP.

Data collected for this study from the local level indicate that all of the key areas of this priority axis - *Strengthen capacity for planning and strategic management; Rationalization of structures; Strengthening of human resource management* – have also been identified by the local public administration bodies to be the priorities for the next stage of the PAR process at the local level.

As indicated in Chapter 1, the level of direct Phare support for the local public administration has been rather limited until now and was, for the better part, directed to upgrading the legal framework for decentralisation and to supporting the process of fiscal decentralisation. Direct support for capacity building at local level has been very limited. Considering the challenges faced now by the local level – decentralisation, EU integration – it is now the proper time to step up the level of support at this level of the administration.

Supporting decentralisation has been and will remain one of the main preoccupations of the PAR. In this context, building capacity at the local level is needed if decentralisation, with all of the difficulties entailed, is to be successful.

The forth-coming EU funding will reach levels never seen before, and that requires development of the local capacity not just to prepare project applications for funding, but more importantly, of the capacity to think in strategic management terms – identify local development priorities, design local development   policies,   programmes   and   projects,   implement   modern management practices. It is only in such a context of good local management that the absorption of EU funds can be improved, and can be of a better quality, not just enough in quantity.

Ultimately, improving the quality of the local services requires capacity building. The OP has selected three sectors where it will focus its funding, aiming to thus support the Lisbon agenda. If the projects funded by this OP will in the end lead to a visible improvement of services in the three sectors, then this will be a good measure of its success.

Recommendations
Further consultation should be held with: NIA, NACS, CUPAR, the three line ministries who manage the three selected sectors, to ensure that the OP reflects existing and urgent needs and to specifically ask for and incorporate the lessons learnt so far in the PAR process, by these institutions.

Because the local level is so preoccupied now with the decentralisation process, when promoting the OP funding possibility, make it easy for the local level to understand how this OP can help them. Explain that the actions fundable under the OP can be directly linked to the decentralisation process, particularly to the 3 selected sectors

Improving communication and co-operation between the central and the local levels, as well as between the different tiers of the local level itself, could be better featured in this OP, possibly as part of both Key Areas 1 *Support for the overall PAR* process under both of the priority axis. This has been identified as an important need by the local level of the administration, during the information-gathering stage of this study.

Maintain close co-operation between the MA and the PAR managing bodies, throughout the implementation of this OP:
- to ensure good co-ordination with the programmes funded by the 2004-2006 Phare budget
- to ensure that the OP continues to respond to the priorities of the PAR, that it responds well to the constant changes in the PAR environment, while continuously stressing the need to maintain focus on the selected sectors with a view to serve the Lisbon agenda.

Sources of data

Central Level		
Mr Victor Giosan	General Secretariat of the Government	Secretary of State
Ms Anca Ghinea	Public Policy Unit at the General Secretariat of the Government	Expert
Mr Lorand Butyka	Central Unit for Public Administration Reform	Expert
Ms Claudia Lung	Central Unit for Public Administration Reform	Manager, department for Decentralisation
Mr Petre Diaconu	Former Department for Public Administration Reform	Former Secretary of State for Reform
Mr Dragoş Dincă	National Institute for Administration	Director general – Secretary of State
Mr Cristian Bitea	National Institute for Administration	Deputy Director general
Mr Doru Vasilescu	National Agency for Civil Servants	Director of the Programme Implementation Unit
Ms Smaranda Pălan	National Agency for Civil Servants	Head of Unit, Strategy department
Ms Xenia Teodorescu	National Agency for Civil Servants	Director, Directorate for Development and implementation
Ms Elena Ciocan	Ministry of Administration and Interior	Deputy Director, Directorate for European Integration
Mr Sorin Chelmu	Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Rural Development	Secretary General
Ms Florentina Enache	Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Rural Development	Counsellor
Local Level		
Ms Narcis Muraru	Association of Municipalities of Romania	Executive Director
Mr Sergiu Ţâra	Assciation of Communes of Romania	Executive Director
City Hall of Petroşani		
City Hall of Vulcan		
City Hall of Mediaş		
City Hall of Topliţa		
City Hall of Hunedoara		
City Hall of Suceava		
City Hall of Dorohoi		
City Hall of Rădăuţi		
City Hall of Reghin		

Documents consulted

- European Commission Regular Country Reports – Romania 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006
- Accession Partnership – 1999, 2001, 2003
- European Commission - The Community Lisbon Programme, July 2005
- ESF Note on Institutional Capacity Priority – Sept 2005
- European Commission – Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Jobs, April 2005
- European Commission – Working together for Growth and Jobs – A new start for the Lisbon Strategy, Febr 2005
- European Commission – Working Together for Growth and Jobs – Further steps in implementing the revised Lisbon Strategy, May 2006
- Moving up a gear for Growth and Jobs: Progress on implementing the new Lisbon Strategy – speech by José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission at the Seminar "Excellence and Partnerships for an Innovative Europe" - Lisbon, 6 October 2006
- Romanian Government Programme 2005-2008
- Strategy to accelerate the Public Administration Reform programme – 2001, 2004-2006
- Interim evaluation of the PAR sector – ECOTEC, May 2006
- Ex-post evaluation of the Phare Programmes – MWH, June 2006
- SIGMA Sectoral Report on the public administration in Romania, 2005
- Phare Sectoral Programming Fiche – Public Administration Reform, 2005
- Activity Reports of the National Agency for Civil Servants – 2003, 2004, 2005

Glossary of Acronyms (alphabetical order)

CUPAR	Central Unit for Public Administration Reform
MA	Managing Authority
MAI	Ministry of Administration and Interior
NACS	National Agency for Civil Servants
NIA	National Institute for Administration
OP ACD	(Sectoral) Operational Programme for Administrative Capacity Development
PAR	Public Administration Reform

Annex 8 Ad hoc analysis 2: Justification on sectoral focus

Ad-hoc Study on the Justification of the Selected Sectors for the ACD OP (2007-2013) of Romania

Introduction

The expert assigned with the preparation of this study was contacted in early December 2006 for carrying out the study. She has contacted the Ministry and other experts in the consortium to obtain written material and relevant studies already carried out. In addition she had visited the Ministry of Administration and Interior (MAI) in Bucharest on 13th December 2006, to meet with and interview the personnel of the Department responsible for the preparation of the OP.

The author had the choice between two methods. One of them was to look at all possible sectors of intervention and carry out an in-depth analysis of each, taking into account the existing needs and available sectoral and PAR strategies. The second option was to concentrate on the already selected priority sectors and justify their selection. It was agreed by all parties, that the first option would not be viable, taking into account the available time and resources, therefore the second method was chosen.

The list of material, on the basis of which this study was prepared is annexed. Current situation of the OP and the selected sectors within it.

Situation of the OP

As the basis of the study, the fourth version (13th December 2006) was received, together with earlier versions. The earlier versions of the OP were criticized both by the European Commission and the ex-ante evaluators for being too general, lacking any specific strategic and/or sectoral focus.

The writers of the OP have decided to accept these arguments and introduced a sectoral focus, and a concentration on employment and social solidarity, education and health. The OP however does not clarify what parts of these very broad sectors it intends to concentrate on, neither does it mention what is the foreseen degree of concentration.

In the course of the meetings with the expert, the sectors were further defined as to include health, pre-university education, labour and social solidarity. This is reflected in the current version of the OP, however, further definition is necessary. (It would be useful to have at least a basic notion of the sub-sectors, such as pre-school, primary, secondary education, vocational education, etc. Also the text is not clear whether labour/employment is actually part of the selected sectors, as most of the times it only talks about social solidarity.) If employment is included care should be taken to avoid any overlaps with the HRD OP, if not, any reference for labour/employment as part of the focus sector shall be removed from the text.

The approximate degree of concentration, according to the staff interviewed shall be around 35-40%. Taking into account the size of the selected sectors compared to the rest of the state budget and administration, (see also tables 3 and 8 in the OP) in our view this does not mean any concentration at all, and this indicative figure should be in the range of at least 50-55% to have any meaning.

Regarding the implementation of the concentration on the sectors, the OP remains silent. In the course of the interview, the MAI experts said that a priority will be given to the applicants from the focus sectors in the selection process. In our opinion, this is insufficient, and further work is needed on this. For some suggestions on how to implement the sectoral focus, see also Chapter 4.

Situation in the priority sectors (needs to be addressed)

Taking into account the long history of PAR in Romania, the efforts of the Romanian Government and its Ministries, and the significant Phare support to date, some progress has already been achieved in terms of administrative reform and decentralisation in all priority sectors.4 Ambitious decentralisation strategies have been adopted in all the concerned line ministries, defining the strategies and steps for future action.

For taking the reform further, some problems have been identified for the priority sectors, which are outlined in the following5.

Social Solidarity
- administrative structures' resistance to de-centralisation, at all levels including the local one, motivated by the lack of experience of the latest regarding the management and the organization of social services;
- insufficient communication between responsible institutions in the field;
- lack of relevant monitoring and evaluation systems on the services provided
- the personnel from town hall is insufficient in number and is not trained for the amount of the activities in the field
- insufficient motivation of the staff working in the field

Education
- legislative dysfunctions regarding the distribution of tasks and responsibilities and in approving the curriculum.;
- attributions of the public local authorities in making the decisions on the establishment, reorganization, restructuring and shutting-down of instructional units are not clearly presented. At the moment, MER has to

---

[4] (Unfortunately, after going through the available documentation it proved impossible to have a clear view on the main results achieved so far in the sectors. The sectoral decentralisation strategies do not give an overview of the achieved results, nor of lessons learnt, the ACD OP text relating to the sectoral background is not helpful in this respect either. The Human Resources Development SOP situation analysis gives a good overview of the sectors in general, however it does not talk about administrative structures.)

[5] Based on the paper of November 2006, Current State of Affairs in the priority sectors, handed over to the expert by the MAI staff, the text of which was later incorporated into the 4th version of the OP.

assume the responsibility for the authorization and certification of their functioning based on standards and indicators established by law, as well as on the quality assessment of the education process;

- training and professional development of human resources in the instructional system is centralised and is not always correlated with the needs and the interests of individual and institutional beneficiaries (didactic personnel, managers).

- dysfunctions of the financial system in the area of allocating funds from the state budget to the local budgets cannot take into account neither the standard costs, nor the correction indicators as long as those funds are exclusively meant for scholarships and expenditures related to the personnel.

Health

- Excessive institutional centralization;
- Overlappings between the various structures from the deconcentrated public services of other ministries and the Ministry for Public Health;
- The existence of decisional levels that render difficult the activity of deconcentrated public services (ex. The incumbency of MPH to approve the income and expense budgets, the list of public positions within the ministry, the unlocking of positions, contests etc.)
- The existence of community interest structures which are under the authority of MPH (the community assistants, the health mediators, the school medicine, etc.)
- Past experience shows an unequal involvement of the local public administration in managing the health units, with large variations between counties or localities, which is due to the lack of local management capacity to undertake all the specific functions of the health sector and also to the lack of training of the personnel who will take over the activities regarding the public health.

Justification for the three sectors
The existing arguments for the selection in the current text are threefold. Firstly, the argument of the PAR process is mentioned, implying, that in the selected sectors the PAR process was more advanced, significant deconcentration/decentralisation took place, and therefore the most immediate was the need to assist the administration. Secondly, the size and budget of the selected sectors are mentioned. Thirdly, the identified needs are mentioned. As the current OP underlines:

"To that end, the current Government strategy emphasised the need to improve service delivery by completing the decentralisation process and strengthening human resource management with the target of improved allocative and operational efficiency that delivers social and economic effectiveness and impact. This is the intended role of the OP ACD with priority to sectors that combine high public spending and staff allocations, an acknowledged need for improved output performance and a broad impact on society." (p.1.)

Common arguments
In order to support this argumentation, a summary of relevant Commission and national documents has been prepared to show the eligibility and the well-foundedness (needs) of the sectoral choices.

Commission documents

Community Strategic Guidelines (CSG)
In its chapter 3.2., on Convergence, the CSG emphasises that
„substantial efforts are required to expand investment in human capital; increase access to employment; strengthen social inclusion; and introduce and implement reform in education and training systems" (p.9.)
In chapter 4.3.4, Administrative Reforms, the Commission underlines the need for concentrating on the needs arising from the specific situation of Member States and on the areas where the greatest obstacles can be found.
„Therefore, under the Convergence Objective, Member States are called upon to build up public administrations and public services at national, regional and local level. Actions in this field should take into account the specific situation of each Member State. Thus, in line with the principle of concentration, Member States are invited to conduct a comprehensive analysis to identify the policy areas requiring the most support for administrative capacity. Investment should concentrate on those policy areas where there are the greatest obstacles to socioeconomic development and on the key elements of administrative reforms." (p.28.)
In terms of the selected sectors, the document points at the need of an increased efficiency of the health care system (pp.28-29.) and in chapter 3.5. it refers particularly –among others- to the social and educational fields.
„For countries and regions, in particular those eligible under the Convergence objective, the quality and productivity of the public sector are essential in order to embrace reforms and good governance, especially in the economic, employment, social, educational, environmental and judicial fields. This will help not only to improve the implementation of EU cohesion policy, but also to raise economic performance overall." (p.10)
.
Note from the European Commission, DG EMPL6
The note explains the environment, rationale and possible content of the new ESF priority: institutional capacity development. The objectives of the new priority are to support PAR and the modernisation of public services, to attain sustainable socio-economic growth and narrow disparities and to ensure good governance. The note suggests a "strategic approach towards the strengthening of the institutional and administrative capacity… with a focus on those areas where interventions are most needed and have the highest added value." (p.4.)

The ESF regulation, article 3.2.b. explicitly refers (among a few others) to the employment, education and social fields, in which institutional and administrative capacity shall be strengthened.

The note specifically refers to the sectors of employment, education and training, and social inclusion services as priority sectors, where institutions and administrative capacity shall be strengthened (p.6.)

---

[6] Strengthening institutional capacity and efficiency of public administrations and public services in the next programming period (2007-2013), Brussels, September, 2005

Thus, in conclusion it can be said, that the intentions of the Commission point in the direction of selecting certain sectors as priority, and it also names specifically the sectors of education and social inclusion services.

The Regular Report (2006) underlines the need of strengthening the public administration in the field of labour and social inclusion and public health.
"In general increased efforts continue to be needed to strengthen the administrative capacity to ensure due implementation of the social policy acquis" (p.29)

Posititon Paper of the Commission services on the SOP ACD for Romania 2007-2013[7] (PP)
The PP analyses the OP submitted, and formulates an overall assessment as well. In this assessment we can find a few important issues, which should be taken into account with regards the priority sectors as well.
Among the missing elements (p.13.) it mentions the need for a clearer definition of the roles at various levels.
The PP mentions the need for an increased effort on selecting concrete, large projects inside government that need to be carried out (p. 13.)
"Priority is expected to be given to sectors directly contributing to economic growth" (p. 14.) The PP suggests agriculture/rural development and the health sector. In the course of the negotiations with the EC, it can be clarified, why the agriculture/rural development sectors were not selected as priorities.

From all the Commission documents mentioned above, it can be stated, that the selection of the priority sectors appears to coincide with or even originate from official Commission sources, therefore their eligibility is unquestionable.

The Romanian PAR process objectives in each sector

The PAR process is the most important building block of the ACD OP, and it is also described in the text of the OP. Below is a summary of the sectoral PAR issues.

The main objectives of the Government's decentralisation strategy are the following:
- Limiting the governmental intervention at the local level, only for the cases in which certain social services, programmes or projects cannot be achieved by local resources, by the local authorities
- Legal commitment of the mechanisms for public participation to the process of drafting strategies on local level
- Increasing the transparency of decisions at the local level and legal commitment of the mechanisms for public participation in the drafting local budgets
- Total coverage from the state budget of the services paid in cash in the field of social assistance, by conditional grants, with the aim of ensuring the compliance with the principle of universal rights of citizens

---

[7] Brussels, EMPL/LS D(2006) 14 815

- Continuing the decentralisation process for the basic public services: education, health, social welfare and public order
- Limiting the area of de-concentrated public services – maintaining the de-concentrated services only when they are functioning based on an integrated management system.

Labour and Social Solidarity
A strategy of decentralisation was prepared by the ministry, covering separately each of the sub-sectors: labour force, social assistance, protection of children's rights, protection of the rights of the disabled people, fight against family violence, social insurances.

Social Assistance
- Improving the legal and administrative framework in the field of social assistance
- Restructuring, developing and rendering more professional the services for social assistance
- Producing informatics systems within the central and local public institutions and establishing the social indicators, with a view to monitoring the implementation of the measures in the field of social assistance
- Training the personnel of the central and local public institutions operating in the field of social assistance
- Developing the public services for social assistance at the level of the county and local councils
- Fighting against social exclusion by means of measures and actions in the field of social assistance

Education
The objectives of the decentralisation of pre-university education[8] include
- Increasing the effectiveness and the performance of the educational institutions
- The democratisation of the educational system
- Ensuring transparency in the decision making process and in managing the public funds for education
- Ensuring the equity and the access to education
- Increasing the relevance of educational services for all the categories of children and pupils
- Stimulation of innovation, professional responsibility and public accountability (by increasing decision-making powers of schools)

An administrative and pilot phase of the process has been taking place since 2005, and with the assistance of the ACD OP the process can enter the next stages (extension to the national level, completion of decentralisation).

Health
The objectives of decentralisation of the Ministry of Public Health include[9]
- Demarcation of competencies for central and local public administration in order to reach a more efficient management in the health system, debureaucratisation and transfer of competencies, attributions and

[8] Decentralisation of Pre-Universtiy Education (2005), found on the web-site of the MER
[9] Based on a summary prepared by the MAI

responsibilities from the MPH to the regional authorities and local public administration.

- Increase in the role of the county and local public administration in developing and implementing programs for public health that respond to the specific needs of the community.
- Redefining the role of MPH's structures in elaborating and implementing public health policies, increasing the quality of hospital services and the role of regional structures in managing public health issues.
- Strengthening the control capacity of MPH over its objectives, activities and structures within the public health area.
- Decentralization of medical assistance in hospitals and strengthening of the responsibility of local public administration toward the citizen.
- Ensuring decisional transparency and transparency in allocating funds for the medical sector.

As can be seen from the above, in all sectors there are well-developed decentralisation strategies, which often go beyond decentralisation and touch upon many other relevant issues of public administration reform. Therefore they constitute a good basis for support in the ACD OP, which as a document could go even further to address directly the already identified needs of the focus sectors.

Arguments by sector

Institutions belonging to the selected sectors

Employment
- Ministry of Labour, Social Solidarity and Family (MSSF)
- National Agency for Employment (with tripartite management)
- 42 county agencies for employment
- 89 local agencies for employment
- 175 working offices
- 6 regional centres for adults' vocational training
- 20 county centres for vocational training
- 1 centre for vocational training of the NAE staff

Social Solidarity
- Ministry of Labour, Social Solidarity and Family
- National Authority for the Children's Right Protection (under the authority of the MLSSF)
- National Authority for Disabled Persons (under the authority of the MLSSF)
- National Agency for Family Protection (under the authority of the MLSSF)
- Deconcentrated service of the Ministry (Directorates for labour, social solidarity and family)
- County Councils
- General Directorates for social assistance and protection of children (sub-ordinated to the County Councils and Council of Bucharest)
- Local councils of municipalities, towns and communes
- Public services for social assistance (organised by the local councils)
- Civil society (associations and foundations operating in the social field)
- Social Inspectorate (from 2007)

- National Agency for Social Benefits (from 2007)
- Social Observatory (from 2007)

Education
- Ministry of Education and Research
- County School Inspectorates
- County Councils
- Local Councils
- Schools (management: administrative boards and directors)

Health
- Ministry of Public Health (MPH)
- Deconcentrated public services of the MPH (public health authorities at the county level and in Bucharest Municipality)
- National Agency of Programs and Medical Assistance (supervised by the MPH)
- County Councils
- Local Councils
- Public Medical Units

Selection criteria and justification for the selection

It has been concluded so far, that the priority sectors in the OP ACD are both eligible and in need of focussed assistance by the OP. To take the argumentation further, a set of selection criteria was prepared which could be applied to the sectors.

- Size of the sector compared to the national budget
- Proportion of people employed in the sector compared to the whole public administration
- Significance of the sector from the point of view of economic and social cohesion
- Significance of the sectors from the point of view of competitiveness
- Stage of implementation of PAR
- Needs on the central level
- Needs on the local level

To apply the above-mentioned criteria, a simple system of points from 0-2 is proposed, where 0 is not significant, 1 is average significance, 2 is above average significance.

	(Employment and) Social Solidarity	Education	Health
Size of the sector compared to the national budget	2*	2*	2*
Proportion of people employed in the sector compared to the whole public administration	2***	2**	2***
Significance of the sector from the point of view of economic and social cohesion	2	2	2
Significance of the sectors from the point of view of competitiveness	1	2	2
Stage of implementation of PAR	(2)	(2)	(2)
Needs on the central level	2	2	2
Needs on the local level	2	2	2
Altogether	13	14	14

*aggregated data of the 3 sectors (Table 3 of the OP ACD)

** and *** source: table 8 of the OP ACD

***Health and social assistance

(2) means that the reform is quite far reaching, but is at different stages of implementation in the priority sectors.

Suggestions for the introduction of the sectoral focus in the OP text

The sectoral focus is an important element of the OP. It has been clarified, that the concentration of the resources on the selected sectors shall be valid for both main priorities (central and local levels). Therefore it is necessary to introduce the sectoral issues in the situation analysis, the SWOT, the strategy, the description of the priorities and even in the implementation chapter. In the 4th version of the OP, this approach is already present, however further efforts are needed in this respect. In the following some suggestions are given on specific sections missing or to be supplemented/corrected.

Situation analysis

The chapter should refer to the obstacles in the way of socio-economic development, emphasizing the problems and needs of the 3 priority sectors, in order to create a link to the Lisbon objectives and to ESF. This should include a short analysis of the current institutional structures at all levels, and the need to extend partnership arrangements.

The sectoral analysis chapter is not homogeneous, with regards to the three sectors. The data produced in the section "Number of Agencies" shall be presented in the form as the Social Assistance is presented (ie. the structures and actors of the sector and their functions, and not the 'end-units'). Also, the structure presenting the sectors does not mention clearly the results of the process so far, it is more a mixture of objectives and past intentions.

SWOT

In all boxes of the SWOT reference should be made to the priority sectors. For example:

Strengths: far reaching and accepted reform and decentralisation plans in the three priority sectors

Weaknesses: unclear competencies between various levels, insufficient preparedness and resources to provide quality services at local level in the priority sectors

Opportunities: Combined efforts with the other Operational Programmes (especially HRD OP) can bring about major positive changes in the priority sectors.

Threats: Resistance of the actors and/or the citizens to the proposed changes in the priority sectors

Strategy

The section "Sectoral focus" is a mixture of different topics, sectoral focus relates only to the first two paragraphs. The second two paragraphs talk about "improvement in service delivery", which should be a separate section.

Priority 1

In the tables giving details about indicative actions, there is no mentioning of the priority sectors or any special programme or project in these fields. It is not clear how these sectors will benefit more than others under this priority. If possible, it would be advisable to develop "central programmes/projects" for each sector, with the involvement of the relevant ministries and bodies. These could address specific issues or include some or all the indicative activities mentioned under the priority. This way, they could also act as "pilot" programmes for other sectors.

Priority 2

Again, there is little mentioning of the priority sectors. An area which would easily lend itself to the sectoral priorities would be for example sector performance measurement.

Financial Plan

This chapter should mention the foreseen indicative degree of concentration on the priority sectors.

Implementation

The description of implementation methods is missing, so it is not clear if all actions planned are to be included in calls for projects or there are other mechanisms planned as well. Experience from Hungary shows, that in order to optimise the results (and the use of funds) a variety of methods should be used that fit well with the content of the programme. These could include 2 stage call for projects, central project, plan-based programme, etc.

Special emphasis should be given at later stages to the definition of selection criteria (regarding the priority sectors) in the case of calls for projects.

It is also important for the Managing Authority to build up a very close relationship with the ministries having the overall responsibility for the priority sectors, and the other actors and partners in the process. Their representatives should be in the Monitoring Committee. Separate working groups for each priority sector should be set up.

Conclusion

There is little doubt that the sectors of social solidarity, education and health are eligible and in need of focussed assistance under the ACD OP. In recent years significant efforts have been undertaken to reform the way in which these sectors operate, to decentralise decision-making and financial powers in line with the principle of subsidiarity. These are sectors which reach out to almost all the citizens of Romania, and where positive changes are expected to contribute significantly to the socio-economic development, the reduction of disparities between the EU and Romania, and the quality of life of the citizens.

The current version of the ACD OP has advanced significantly compared to previous versions in its aim to introduce sectoral focus. This focus is now present in most chapters of the OP, however there is still room for further thinking on this issue. It would be important to decide to what extent and in what way will the sectoral priority be implemented. Furthermore, it is advised that special programmes/projects are developed together with the relevant line ministries and other agencies, bodies to address the specific needs of the priority sectors. If the sectoral priority is left solely to open competition, the policy drive may be lost and the momentum to achieve significant changes in three very important areas in Romania may be lost as well.

Annex 9

Fields of Action	Examples of Specific Objectives (to be appraised by the result indicators)	Examples of activities (to be appraised by the output indicators)	Output Indicators	Result Indicators
A) GOVERNANCE	A-1) Better legislation	• Actions towards the development of impact assessment systems • Actions to support the specific legal bodies established to check for the quality of legislation	Number of impact assessments delivered Percentage of laws where impact assessment was conducted Percentage of bills/legal acts which have been checked for the legislative quality by these bodies Number of studies/analysis conducted	- Satisfaction surveys;
	A-2) Improvement of Monitoring and Evaluation of Public Expenditure	• Actions to establish sound monitoring systems • Actions to build evaluation capacity	Number of public employees involved in conducting monitoring Number of public employees conducting evaluation ; Number of evaluation studies	-Percentage of public expenditure which is subject to monitoring under the systems established -Percentage of public expenditure which is subject to evaluation under the systems established
	A-3) Reduction of corruption levels	• Support for new bodies fighting corruption • Awareness raising campaigns for civil servants on the issue of corruption • Actions to increase the transparency of actions and accessibility of information	Number of studies/projects supported Percentage of public employees reached by the campaigns Percentage of citizens consulting electronic information tenders on which the information is electronically accessible	-Level of corruption (criminal statistics + victimisation survey to measure corruption not included in statistics)

Fields of Action	Examples of Specific Objectives (to be appraised by the result indicators)	Examples of activities (to be appraised by the output indicators)	Output Indicators	Result Indicators
B)PUBLIC SERVICES	B-1) Modernisation of the service delivery systems	• Revision and re-engineering of the competences and functions performed by different units • Introduction of customer management systems • Introduction of standards of customer care • Pilot projects for customer support	Number of units/departments under review Number of public bodies to which the customer management systems were introduced Number of public service providers to which the costumer care standards were introduced Number of pilot projects realised	-Reduction in time and burden for obtaining the service (e.g. reduction in time needed to obtain licence etc) -Number of clients having access to/using these new opportunities/syst ems
	B-2) Introduction of concentrated services	• Development of "one-stop-shop" services e.g. for business start-ups	Number of "one-stop shop" services developed and presented to the public	-Percentage of new start-ups having used this service -Time needed to get the service (e.g. for the registration of new businesses)
	B-3) Development of e-government, e-procurement and other e-services	• Introduction of administrative e-services • Actions to increase the accessibility of the information on tenders to the public	Number of services delivered by public administration which can be accessed via internet (web pages, e-mails) by the public Percentage of tenders on which the information is electronically accessible Number of applicants to public tenders	-Percentage of the public/customers using the e-services

Fields of Action	Examples of Specific Objectives (to be appraised by the result indicators)	Examples of activities (to be appraised by the output indicators)	Output Indicators	Result Indicators
C) PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION'S HUMAN RESOURCES	C-1) Improvement of the skills needed by Public Administration's staff to implement the reforms	• Training in new administrative procedures • Training of newly established bodies	Number of civil servants/public employees trained in new administrative procedures Number of new bodies/agencies/units which staff has been trained in the skills important for delivering their new tasks	-For the training connected to the reforms/establishment of new bodies etc. the result indicators have to describe how the training enhanced the reform e.g. - reduction in the time needed to provide the services by the new body
	C-2) Improvement of the managerial skills of Public Administration's managers	• Training on human management issues	Number of managers trained in human resources development	The result indicators for this part will be "normal" indicators used for the training as e.g. these under the adaptability policy field (coverage ratio etc.) as for example: - percentage of public employees trained in IT skills - percentage of public employees trained in language skills
	C-3) Improvement of IT and language skills of Public Administration's staff	• IT training • Language training	Number of public employees trained in IT skills Number of public employees trained in language skills	
	C-4) Improvement of skills of Public Administration's for newly recruited staff	• Training in ethics, conduct etc • Training in job related skills • Training in overall administrative skills/functioning of public bodies	Number of newly recruited public employees trained Number of newly recruited public employees trained Number of newly recruited public employees trained	

List of most important literature used

1. OP ACD 4th version, December 2006
2. OP ACD 3rd version, October 2006
3. Ex-ante evaluation of the OP ACAD Romania, Panteia, November 2006
4. Current state of affairs in the relevant sectors – short justification (prepared by MAI)
5. Decentralisation of Pre-University Education, February, 2006 MER
6. Education Action Plan, November, 2006, MER
7. Romanian Statistical Yearbook 8, Education
8. Sectoral Strategy for de-centralisation in the field of labour and social protection, November, 2006
9. Strategy for Decentralisation – Health, summary prepared by MAI
10. Strengthening institutional capacity and efficiency of public administrations and public services in the next programming period (2007-2013), DG Empl, 2005
11. National Reform Programme of Romania, 2006
12. National Reform Programme Action Plan, 2006
13. National Strategic Reference Framework of Romania, draft April, 2006
14. Position paper of the Commission Services on the Sectorial Operational Programme "Administrative Capacity Development" Romania 2007-2013
15. Regular Report (Romania) May 2006
16. Sectorial Operational Programme for Human Resources Development, draft, April 206
17. Sectorial Operational Programme for "Increase of Economic Competitiveness", draft April 2006