

Analysis of individual indicators

Result indicators

1) PERCENTAGE OF UNSATISFACTORY POLICY DOCUMENTS AND DRAFT NORMATIVE ACTS RETURNED BY GSG TO INITIATORS (%)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
2	1	2	3

Comments:

- Programme indicator – KAI 1.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the effects of the interventions supporting improving political-administrative decision making process, under KAI 1.1.
- The indicator is has low sensitivity to the intervention since it there might not be an immediate change in the variable to be measured (in terms of effects) – in this case, the proportion of policy documents and draft normative acts returned by GSG to initiators (%), since it depends not only on the quality of the normative act but also by the affluence of draft documents submitted and by the rigour of the GSG. It is therefore recommended to replace this indicator with two others, which are less sensitive and more relevant to the objectives of the KAI.

Draft public policy proposals elaborated according to the legal framework”

Draft normative acts with severe problems regarding the quality of the grounding of their presentation and motivation instruments (number)

- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them providing that the percentage of unsatisfactory documents returned is closely monitored and periodically reported.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.

2) PERCENTAGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS REDUCTION (%)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	2	2	2

Comments:

- Programme indicator – KAI 1.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the effects of the interventions supporting improving political-administrative decision making process, and particularly measure the reduction of the administrative costs as result of the interventions financed under KAI 1.1
- The indicator is partial sensitive to the intervention since it there might not be an immediate change in the variable to be measured (in terms of effects) – in this case, the reduction of the administrative costs; the indicator might capture the results of the interventions with some delay, after the completion of the projects.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports after the completion of the projects and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.

- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator might vary from low to high depending on the collecting methods used.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator *Administrative costs reduction (RON/year)* increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance).

3) PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS ELABORATING ANNUAL ACTIVITY REPORT ACCORDING TO LAW NO 544/2001 (%)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
2	2	2	3

Comments:

- Programme indicator – KAI 1.2
- The indicator is partially relevant for measuring the effects of the interventions supporting strengthening the accountability framework, under KAI 1.2., since it does not reflect the increase in accountability of the public administration, but rather the compliance with an administrative task of drafting the report. An alternative replacement would be “Institutions elaborating and publishing annual information brochures according to Law 544/2001 (number)”, which is better for reflecting the objectives.
- The indicator is partial sensitive to the intervention since it there might not be an immediate change in the variable to be measured (in terms of effects); the indicator might capture the results of the interventions with some delay, after the completion of the projects. However is less sensitive than an output indicator which is directly linked to the project.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports after the completion of the projects and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator *Public institutions elaborating annual activity report according to Law No. 544/2001 (number)* increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance).

4) MONITORING AND EVALUATION REPORTS ELABORATED/REQUESTED BY CENTRAL PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	2	2	3

Comments:

- Programme indicator – KAI 1.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the effects of the interventions supporting strengthening the accountability framework, under KAI 1.2.
- The indicator is partial sensitive to the intervention since it there might not be an immediate change in the variable to be measured (in terms of effects); the indicator might capture the results of the interventions with some delay, after the completion of the projects. However is less sensitive than an output indicator which is directly linked to the project.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports mainly after the completion of the projects and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.

- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- No recommendation made at system level in respect of the need to re-label the indicator.

5) NEW AND RE-ORGANIZED STRUCTURES, OPERATIONAL (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	2	2	3

Comments:

- Programme indicator – KAI 1.3
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the effects of the interventions supporting improving of organisational effectiveness, and particularly the setting up and operationalisation of new structures, under KAI 1.3.
- The indicator is partial sensitive to the intervention since it there might not be an immediate change in the variable to be measured (in terms of effects); the indicator might capture the results of the interventions with some delay, after the completion of the projects.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports mainly after the completion of the projects and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- No recommendation made at system level in respect of the need to re-label the indicator.

6) CERTIFIED TRAINING PARTICIPANTS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	2	3	3

Comments:

- Programme indicator – KAI 1.3
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the effects of the interventions under KAI 1.3. It quantifies the number of persons certified, as result of participation to training programs.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and can capture over time the progress of the intervention (in terms of effects). However is less sensitive than an output indicator which is directly linked to the project and might be influenced by factors as dropout rate of participants to training sessions.
- The indicator can be available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring at the level of MA/ ACIS.
 - The recommendation made at system level is that, when used to be broken down according to EC Annex XXIII.

7) NEW DECENTRALIZED STRUCTURES OPERATIONAL (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	2	2	3

Comments:

- Programme indicator – KAI 2.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the effects of the interventions supporting the sectoral service decentralization process, under KAI 2.1.
- The indicator is partial sensitive to the intervention since it there might not be an immediate change in the variable to be measured (in terms of effects); the indicator might capture the results of the interventions with some delay, after the completion of the projects. Also it might be influenced by external factors as general socio-economic context, political environment etc.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports mainly after the completion of the projects and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- No recommendation made at system level in respect of the need to re-label the indicator.

8) SECTORS IN WHICH COST AND QUALITY STANDARDS ARE INTRODUCED (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	2	2	3

Comments:

- Programme indicator – KAI 2.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the effects of the interventions supporting improvement of the quality and efficiency of service delivery also by introduction of cost and quality standards, under KAI 2.2.
- The indicator is partial sensitive to the intervention since it there might not be an immediate change in the variable to be measured (in terms of effects); the indicator might capture the results of the interventions with some delay, after the completion of the projects.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports issued both during the implementation period of the project and after the completion of the projects and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
 - The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Cost and quality standards implemented* (number) simplifies the definition

9) OBSERVANCE OF THE COMMITMENT TARGETS (%)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
2	1	2	2

Comments:

- Programme indicator – KAI 3.1

- The indicator is partially relevant for measuring the effects of the interventions supporting the overall management of the OP ACD, under KAI 3.1, since it does not reflect efficiency or effectiveness.
- The indicator is partially sensitive to the intervention since it there might not be an immediate change in the variable to be measured (in terms of effects); the indicator will capture the results of the interventions with some delay, after the completion of the projects. Also it can be severely influenced by diverse external factors as the general socio-economic context,
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports both during the implementation and after the completion of the projects providing that the commitment targets are constantly monitored and the status reported with accuracy.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator might vary from low to high depending on the collecting methods used.

10) POTENTIAL APPLICANTS PARTICIPATING IN COMMUNICATION EVENTS

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	2	3	3

Comments:

- Programme indicator – KAI 3.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the effects of the interventions in support of OP ACD promotion and communication, under KAI 2.2.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and can capture over time the progress of the intervention (in terms of effects). However the indicator is less sensitive than an output indicator which is directly linked to the project.
- The indicator can be available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring at the level of MA/ ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator *Participants at events organized (number)* increases the manageability and also improves coverage and relevance

Supplementary indicators

11) NUMBER OF TRAINING PARTICIPANTS OF WHICH: WOMEN/ MEN

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 1.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing training activities under KAI 1.1.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, training participants - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.

- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Training participants* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance). When used, it is recommended to be broken down according to EC Annex XXIII.

12) STUDIES, ANALYSES, REPORTS, STRATEGIES

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 1.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting elaboration of studies, analyses, reports, strategies under KAI 1.1.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, analyses, reports, strategies - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Studies, analyses, reports, strategies* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance).

13) NUMBER OF TRAINING PARTICIPANTS OF WHICH: WOMEN/ MEN

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 1.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing training activities under KAI 1.2.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, training participants - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Training participants* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the



information collected (relevance). When used, it is recommended to be broken down according to EC Annex XXIII.

14) STUDIES, ANALYSES, REPORTS, STRATEGIES

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 1.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting elaboration of studies, analyses, reports, strategies under KAI 1.2.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, analyses, reports, strategies - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Studies, analyses, reports, strategies* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance).

15) COMMUNICATION AND PROMOTION EVENTS

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
2	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 1.2
- The indicator is partially relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing communication and promotion events aiming at strengthening the accountability framework under KAI 1.2. It does not reflect the size or the impact of the event. A more relevant replacement would be “Participants at events organized (number)”, which would provide information on the size/popularity of the event. It would also ensure consistency with the other OPs.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, communication and promotion events - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.

16) NUMBER OF TRAINING PARTICIPANTS OF WHICH: WOMEN/ MEN

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 1.3
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing training activities under KAI 1.3.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, training participants - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Training participants* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance). When used, it is recommended to be broken down according to EC Annex XXIII.

17) STUDIES, ANALYSES, REPORTS, STRATEGIES

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 1.3
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting elaboration of studies, analyses, reports, strategies under KAI 1.3.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, analyses, reports, strategies - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Studies, analyses, reports, strategies* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance).

18) NUMBER OF TRAINING PARTICIPANTS OF WHICH: WOMEN/ MEN

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 2.1

- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing training activities under KAI 2.1.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, training participants - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Training participants* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance). When used, it is recommended to be broken down according to EC Annex XXIII.

19) STUDIES, ANALYSES, REPORTS, STRATEGIES

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 2.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting elaboration of studies, analyses, reports, strategies under KAI 2.1.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, analyses, reports, strategies - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Studies, analyses, reports, strategies* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance).

20) NUMBER OF TRAINING PARTICIPANTS OF WHICH: WOMEN/ MEN

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 2.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing training activities under KAI 2.2.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, training participants - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).

- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Training participants* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance). When used, it is recommended to be broken down according to EC Annex XXIII.

21) STUDIES, ANALYSES, REPORTS, STRATEGIES

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 2.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting elaboration of studies, analyses, reports, strategies under KAI 2.2.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, analyses, reports, strategies - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Studies, analyses, reports, strategies* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance).

22) EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCE AND GOOD PRACTICES PARTICIPANTS

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 2.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting exchanges of experience and good practices under KAI 2.2.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case participants in exchanges of experience and good practices activities - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.

- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Participants involved in activities regarding exchange of experience and good practices (number)* simplifies the definition but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance).

23) NUMBER OF TRAINING PARTICIPANTS OF WHICH: WOMEN/ MEN

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 3.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing training activities under KAI 3.1.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, training participants - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Training participants (number)* increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance). When used, it is recommended to be broken down according to EC Annex XXIII.

24) INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY MATERIALS

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 3.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing the elaboration of information and publicity materials under KAI 3.2.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, the elaboration of publicity materials - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Information and publicity materials (number)* increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance).

25) PARTICIPANT TRAINING DAYS – BENEFICIARIES

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 3.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing training activities under KAI 3.2.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, participant training days - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Participant training days-beneficiaries* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance). When used, it is recommended to be broken down according to EC Annex XXIII.

26) PARTICIPANT TRAINING DAYS – MANAGING STRUCTURES

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 3.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing training activities under KAI 3.2.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, participant training days - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Participant training days-managing structures* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance). When used, it is recommended to be broken down according to EC Annex XXIII.

27) PARTICIPANT TRAINING DAYS – OTHER STRUCTURES

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
-----------	-------------	--------------	------

3

3

3

3

Comments:

- Supplementary indicator – KAI 3.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing training activities under KAI 3.2.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case, participant training days - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator (number).
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.
- The recommendation made at system level to re-label the indicator as *Participant training days-other structures* (number) increases the manageability but does not affect the quality of the indicator or the information collected (relevance). When used, it is recommended to be broken down according to EC Annex XXIII.

 IMPACT INDICATORS

 28) CITIZENS' CONFIDENCE IN CENTRAL PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION INSTITUTIONS (%)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	2	2	2

Comments

- Impact indicator
- The indicator is relevant for the purpose for which is collected, that of measuring the impact of the projects financed under OP ACD. For increasing clarity (and relevance) it is suggested to relabel as "Increase in"
- The indicator is partial sensitive to the intervention as not directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the activity it monitors – in this case, the citizen's confidence in central public administration institutions- is not immediately reflected in the value of the indicator; also the value of the indicator can be influenced by external factors as context/ time when the measurement is done, the quality of information collected from respondents, number of respondents etc
- The indicator is not directly available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and usually impact studies/surveys are required to be undertaken in order to assess the variable measured.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator may vary from low to high, since usually additional resources are needed (studies, surveys); the cost depend directly on the type of measurement tools used.

 29) CITIZENS' CONFIDENCE IN LOCAL PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION INSTITUTIONS (%)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	2	2	2

Comments

- Impact indicator
- The indicator is relevant for the purpose for which is collected, that of measuring the impact of the projects financed under OP ACD. For increasing clarity (and relevance) it is suggested to relabel as "Increase in"
- The indicator is partial sensitive to the intervention as not directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the activity it monitors – in this case, the citizen's confidence in local public administration institutions- is not immediately reflected in the value of the indicator; also the value of the indicator can be influenced by external factors as context/ time when the measurement is done, the quality of information collected from respondents, number of respondents etc
- The indicator is not directly available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and usually impact studies/surveys are required to be undertaken in order to assess the variable measured.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator may vary from low to high, since usually additional resources are needed (studies, surveys); the cost depend directly on the type of measurement tools used.

30) GOVERNANCE EFFICIENCY (%)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	2	2	2

Comments

- Impact indicator
- The indicator is relevant for the purpose for which is collected, that of measuring the impact of the projects financed under OP ACD. For increasing clarity (and relevance) it is suggested to relabel as "Increase in"
- The indicator is partial sensitive to the intervention as not directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the activity it monitors – in this case, the governance efficiency- is not immediately reflected in the value of the indicator; also the value of the indicator can be influenced by external factors as context/ time when the measurement is done, the quality and type of the information collected and reported, etc
- The indicator is not directly available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and usually impact studies/surveys are required to be undertaken in order to assess the variable measured.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator may vary from low to high, since usually additional resources are needed (studies, surveys); the cost depend directly on the type of measurement tools used.

NEW ADDED INDICATORS RESULTING FROM SYSTEM ANALYSIS

31) PARTNERSHIPS CONCLUDED (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	2	2	3

Comments

- Result indicator, KAI 1.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the effects of the interventions in support of improvement the political administrative decision making and particularly the interventions aiming to develop mechanisms to promote and implement partnership initiatives at all levels, under KAI 1.1.



- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and can capture over time the progress of the intervention (in terms of effects). However the results of the interventions might be captured also after the completion of the projects.
- The indicator can be available from beneficiaries, through progress reports during the project implementation (when results in the respect of development of partnerships are available) but also after the completion of the projects (as effects of the interventions)
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring at the level of MA/ ACIS.

32) STUDIES, ANALYSES, REPORTS, STRATEGIES (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments

- Output indicator, KAI 3.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the interventions supporting the overall management of OP ACD and particularly the elaboration of studies, analyses, reports and strategies under KAI 3.1.
- The indicator is sensitive to the intervention and it directly captures its progress over time, in the sense that any change in the variable it monitors – in this case the production of studies, analyses, reports and strategies - is immediately reflected in the value of the indicator.
- The indicator is available from beneficiaries, through progress reports and can be updated every time new reports are received from them.
- The cost associated to collecting, monitoring and reporting this indicator is low, since no additional resources are needed for its usage, except for the operational costs resulting from reporting requirements at project level and for OP monitoring, at the level of the MA/ACIS.