Output indicators

1) GUIDELINES AND OTHER METHODOLOGICAL DOCUMENTS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments

- Programme indicator KAI 1.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting elaboration of guidelines and other methodological documents 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, guidelines and other methodological documents - 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 *Guidelines and other methodological instruments elaborated* (number) increases the manageability and coverage and also increases relevance.

2) PARTICIPANT TRAINING DAYS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:
- Programme indicator – KAI 1.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing training activities for specialists involved in public policy formulation process 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, 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.
- No recommendation made at system level in respect of the need to re-label the indicator.

3) GUIDELINES AND OTHER METHODOLOGICAL DOCUMENTS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

Programme indicator – KAI 1.2
The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting elaboration of guidelines and other methodological documents 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, guidelines and other methodological documents - 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 *Guidelines and other methodological instruments elaborated* (number) increases the manageability and coverage and also increases relevance

4) PARTICIPANT TRAINING DAYS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- *Programme 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, 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.
- No recommendation made at system level in respect of the need to re-label the indicator.

5) STRUCTURAL REVIEWS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:

- Programme indicator – KAI 1.3
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing reviews of structures for the improvement of the public policy management cycle 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, structural reviews - 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.
- No recommendation made at system level in respect of the need to re-label the indicator.

6) PARTICIPANT TRAINING DAYS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:
- Programme 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, 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.
- No recommendation made at system level in respect of the need to re-label the indicator.

7) STRUCTURAL REVIEWS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:
- Programme indicator – KAI 2.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing reviews of structures involved in planning and coordination of the decentralization process 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, structural reviews - 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.
- No recommendation made at system level in respect of the need to re-label the indicator.

8) GUIDELINES AND OTHER METHODOLOGICAL DOCUMENTS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:
- Programme indicator – KAI 2.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting elaboration of guidelines and other methodological documents 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, guidelines and other methodological documents - 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 *Guidelines and other methodological instruments elaborated* (number) increases the manageability and coverage and also increases relevance

9) PARTICIPANT TRAINING DAYS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:
- Programme 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, 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.
- No recommendation made at system level in respect of the need to re-label the indicator.

10) SECTORS IN WHICH COST AND QUALITY STANDARDS ARE DESIGNED (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:
- Programme indicator – KAI 2.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting the development, testing and roll-out of service cost and quality standards 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, sectors in which cost and quality standards are designed - 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 *Cost and quality standards designed* (number) simplifies the definition

11) GUIDELINES FOR IMPROVING REVENUE COLLECTION (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availabil*ity*	*Cost*
3	*3*	*3*	*3*

Comments:
- *Progra*mme indicator – KAI 2.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting elaboration of guidelines for improving the revenue collection 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, guidelines - 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 replace the indicator as *Guidelines and other methodological instruments elaborated* (number) increases the manageability and coverage and also increases relevance

12) PARTICIPANT TRAINING DAYS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:
- Programme 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, 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.
- No recommendation made at system level in respect of the need to re-label the indicator.

13) ADMINISTRATIVE SIMPLIFICATION ANALYSES (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:
- Programme indicator – KAI 2.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects aiming to improve the quality and efficiency of public services 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 - 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 replace the indicator with *"Studies, analyses, reports, strategies (number)"* increases the manageability and coverage and also increases relevance

14) PARTICIPANT TRAINING DAYS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:
- Programme 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, 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.
- No recommendation made at system level in respect of the need to re-label the indicator.

15) RELEVANT COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS REUNIONS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
3	3	3	3

Comments:
- Programme indicator – KAI 3.1
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects supporting the OP ACD overall implementation 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, reunions of committees and working groups - 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 at system level to re-label the indicator as "*Meetings of relevant committees and working groups"* improves manageability and ensures consistency across OPs.

16) COMMUNICATION AND PROMOTION EVENTS (NUMBER)

Multi-criteria analysis scoring

Relevance	Sensitivity	Availability	Cost
2	3	3	3

Comments:
- Programme indicator – KAI 3.2
- The indicator is relevant for measuring the output of the projects financing activities supporting the OP ACD overall implementation particularly organisation communication and promotion events 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, 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.

- The recommendation made at system level to replace with "Participants at events organized (number)" increases the manageability, ensures consistency across OPs and increases the relevance.