

ANNEX 1: Performance indicators used for disbursements

Indicators related to specific conditions (variable tranches)

Indicator (1): Improved policy planning and coordination capacities and processes in the central public administration

Indicator 1.1:	Evidence of progress in terms of implementation
Programme:	PAR Roadmap 2015-2020, Objectives 1.2, 1.5, 1.6
Objective (of the SRC):	Enhance policy development and coordination in the central public administration
Expected result:	Improved policy planning, coordination capacities and processes in the central public administration
Action:	Activities related to objectives 2.2, 2.5, 2.6 of the PAR Roadmap Action Plan
Department responsible:	Administration of Government (AOG) – Policy Analysis Strategic planning and coordination Department
Description of the Indicator	
Indicator type:	Quantitative and qualitative
Measurement unit:	Number of policy structural units with policy planning and analysis capabilities and number of strategies aligned with the new policy planning framework
Periodicity of measurement:	Annual
Last known result (baseline):	None of the policy structural units in the pilot ministries (listed below) are fully aligned with the new policy planning framework; no monitoring and evaluation were implemented according to the new policy planning framework. All selected pilot ministries have a sectoral/inter-sectoral strategies and related action plans (Assessment by Administration of Government - Policy Planning System Reform Strategy 2015-2017 and PAR Roadmap action plan 2015-2016). The current PAR action plan covers 2015-16; two other plans are foreseen 2017-18 and 2019-20 . (2015)
Development and quality of the indicator	
Method of data collection:	Administrative collection (PAR Council reports, pilot ministries reports)
Departments responsible for collection:	Administration of Government – Policy Analysis, Strategic planning and Coordination Department
Method of calculation:	
2016:	
1.1.1.	Five pilot ministries ¹ have policy structural units, with policy planning and analysis capabilities, and whose mandate, procedures and resources are in line with the requirements of the new policy planning framework.

¹ 1- Agriculture (MoA), 2- Economy and Sustainable Development (MoESD), 3- Education and Science (MoES), 4- Health Labour and Social Affairs (MoHLSA), 5- Justice (MoJ)

2017:

1.1.2. At least one monitoring report of each selected sectoral strategy is prepared in line with the Handbook for policy planning and is published per each of the five pilot ministries. Each report shows evidence of the degree of progress and/or delays in the implementation of the action plans of sectoral strategies and proposes (where necessary) corrective actions

2018:

1.1.3. At least one monitoring report of a sectoral strategy prepared in line with the Handbook for policy planning and is published per each of the seven additional ministries. Each report shows evidence of the degree of progress and/or delays in the implementation of the action plans of sectoral strategies selected by the ministries and proposes (where necessary) corrective actions

1.1.4. At least one evaluation report of each selected sectoral strategy is prepared in line with the Handbook for policy planning and is published per each of the five pilot ministries. Each evaluation report shows evidence and reasons of achievements and/or not achievements in the actual implementation of the selected action plans in the five pilot ministries and makes recommendations for the future.

1.1.5. The Public Administration Reform (PAR) action plan for 2019-2020 including baselines, targets and indicators, is approved by the PAR Council and published

Means of interpretation

Known limits and bias: The policy structures, tasked with policy planning and analysis responsibilities, are not uniform throughout the ministries, depending on the scale of the ministry; these can be departments, divisions, units or teams. The assessment shall focus on the policy planning and analysis capabilities of these structure and their alignment with the new national policy framework.

Means of interpretation: The "new policy planning framework" refers to the Policy Planning System Reform Strategy 2015-17 adopted in 2015 and the Handbook for policy planning (elaborated by AoG, to be adopted by August 2016).

Documentation schedule

Delivery date (targets):

Data for 2016; assessment in Q2 2017, target: 1.1.1. One consolidated report validated by PAR Council and providing the evidence specified under condition 1.1.1 above

Data for 2017; assessment in Q2 2018, target: 1.1.2. Published PAR action plan 2019-2020 providing the evidence specified under condition 1.1.2 above

Data for 2018; assessment in Q2 2019, target:

1.1.3. Seven monitoring reports (one per each additional ministry) providing the evidence specified under condition 1.1.3 above.

1.1.4. Five evaluation reports (one per each pilot ministry) providing the evidence specified under condition 1.1.4 above

1.1.5. Published PAR action plan 2019-2020 providing the evidence specified under condition 1.1.5 above.

Comments:

The policy structural units are: 1) MoA - Policy and Analytical Department, 2) MoESD - Departments for Economic Growth policy analysis and planning (there are 2 policy departments in charge of SME strategy, but they should be restructured to be aligned with the new policy planning framework); 3) MoES-General Education Management and Development Department (Division for Analytical and Strategic Planning), 4) MoHLSA-Department of Health, 5) MoJ-Analytical Department.

The five strategies are: 1) Agriculture development strategy 2015-2020 and related action plan (Government decree #167), 2) Strategy for medium and small enterprises development 2016-2020 and related action plan (Government decree #100); 3) General education and science development strategy 2015-2020 and related action plan; 4) Hepatitis C Strategy 2016-2020 and related action plan; 5) Anti-corruption strategy of 2015 and related action plan. (Government decree #170).

The "new policy planning framework" refers to the Policy planning system reform strategy 2015-17 adopted on 19.08.2015 (Government decree #427). It stipulates the requirements in terms of M&E mechanisms. A handbook for policy planning is developed by the AOG, with international support (including SIGMA which provided support for part on M&E). It will be submitted for Government's adoption by July 2016.

The PAR roadmap and action plan 2015-16 have been adopted on 19.08.2015 (Government decree #427), on the basis of the EU PA principles, elaborated with support from SIGMA.

Indicator 1.2:	Increased linkage between policy planning and budgeting
Programme:	PAR Roadmap 2015-2020, Objective 1.4
Objective (of the SRC):	Enhance policy development and coordination in the central public administration
Expected result:	Improved policy planning, coordination capacities and processes in the central public administration
Action:	Activities related to objectives 2.4 of the PAR Roadmap Action Plan
Department responsible:	Administration of Government – Policy Analysis Strategic planning and coordination Department
Description of the Indicator	
Indicator type:	Quantitative
Measurement unit:	Percentage of costed sectoral strategies and related action plans
Periodicity of measurement:	Annual
Last known result (baseline):	30% of the policy planning documents reflected relevant financial calculation according to the methodology set by the Ministry of Finance (source: Policy planning system reform strategy 2015-17 and action plan). (2015)
Development and quality of the indicator	
Method of data collection:	Administrative collection (PAR Council report – AoG report on the policy planning system reform implementation strategy)
Department responsible for collection:	Administration of Government – Policy Analysis Strategic planning and coordination Department
Method of calculation:	The ratio is calculated as percentage (0 to 100%), by dividing the number of total sectoral strategies and related action plans adopted or revised in the year of assessment by the number of these documents, then multiplied by 100.
2017:	
1.2.1 At least 60% of the action plans of strategies involving more than one line ministry and revised or adopted by the Government in 2017 include evidence of costing consistent with the latest Government-approved medium-term budgetary framework (BDD). Eventual deviations in costing beyond the control of the Government are identified and justified.	
2018:	
1.2.2. All action plans of strategies involving more than one line ministry and revised or adopted by the Government in 2018 include evidence of costing consistent with the latest Government-approved medium-term budgetary framework (BDD). Eventual deviations in costing beyond the control of the Government are identified and justified.	
Means of interpretation	
Known limits and bias:	N/A.
Means of interpretation:	The indicator measures the proportion of strategies and related action plans more than one line ministry and revised or adopted by the Government and revised or adopted by the Government in the given year, that include evidence of costing consistent with the latest Government-approved medium-term budgetary framework (BDD).

Documentation schedule

Delivery date (targets):

2017:

1.2.1 One consolidated report validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence specified under condition 1.2.1.

2018:

1.2.2. One consolidated report validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence specified under condition 1.2.2.

Comments:

The Ministry of Finance has developed the regulations and methodology for annual and multi-annual programme based budgeting with performance indicators. The approach has been rolled-out to the line ministries. The "new policy planning framework" refers to the policy planning system reform strategy 2015-17 adopted on 19.08.2015 (Government decree # 427) and the handbook for policy planning developed by the Administration of Government, with international support. The handbook will be submitted for Government's adoption by August 2016.

Indicator (2): Policy-driven, results-oriented management approach progressively introduced in the central public administration

Programme:	PAR Roadmap 2015-2020, Objective 2.2
Objective (of the SRC):	Enhance policy development and coordination in the central public administration
Expected result:	Policy-driven, results-oriented management approach progressively introduced in the central public administration
Action:	Activities related to objective 3.2 of the PAR Roadmap action plan
Department responsible:	Administration of Government – Policy Analysis Strategic planning and coordination Department
Description of the Indicator	
Indicator type:	Quantitative
Measurement unit:	Decision of CSB on institutional review- number of institutional reviews and functional reviews conducted – adopted strategic plan and number of pilot action plans for the implementation of functional reviews
Periodicity of measurement:	Annual
Last known result (baseline):	The Government comprised 16 line ministries and 3 State ministers' offices. The first draft of the methodology for institutional review is elaborated but not finalised. No institutional review has been conducted. By the end of 2016, five reviews should be conducted. (2015)
Development and quality of the indicator	
Method of data collection:	Administrative collection
Department responsible for collection:	Administration of Government – Policy analysis Strategic Planning and Coordination Department
Method of calculation:	
2017:	
2.1.1	Institutional reviews on all ministries are concluded.
2018:	
2.1.2.	Functional reviews on all ministries are concluded.
2.1.3.	At least 20% of the short-term actions of the reviews concluded in 2017 in the five pilot ministries (same as for condition 1) are implemented. .
Means of interpretation	
Known limits and bias:	.
Means of interpretation:	
2.1.1:	The condition measures the proportion of <u>institutional</u> reviews carried out in all line ministries and in line with the methodology adopted by the Civil Service Bureau.
2.1.2.	The condition measures the proportion of <u>functional</u> reviews carried out in all line ministries and in line with the methodology adopted by Government.

2.1.3. The condition measures the implemented proportion of short-term actions (up to two year) identified in the reviews concluded in 2017 in the five pilot ministries (listed in indicator 1²).

Documentation schedule

Delivery date (targets):

2017::

2.1.1. One consolidated report including the institutional reviews and validated by the PAR Council. Civil Service Bureau (CSB) report confirming that all ministries are included in the above-mentioned report and presenting the main conclusions of the institutional reviews in all ministries.

2018,:

2.1.2. Administration of Government (AoG) report confirming that all ministries are included in the above-mentioned reviews and presenting the main conclusions of the functional reviews in all ministries. One consolidated report including the functional reviews and validated by the PAR Council.

2.1.3. Publication of a PAR Council-validated report providing the evidence specified under condition 2.1.3 above.

Comments:

The wording "line ministries" covers ministries and state minister offices. The Government decree #627 of 2014 and the Civil Service Law adopted in October 2015 require that institutional review and functional reviews are conducted for the improvement of the institutional set-up of central ministries and related agencies. The Civil Service Bureau has developed guidelines for the institutional review and will adopt them in 2016. The "institutional review" is the institutional mapping of the structure and human resources (by status) of an institution. It prepares the entry into force of the new classification system, required by the new Civil Service Law of 2015. The reviews are conducted by the Civil Service Bureau in cooperation with the human resources units. The "functional reviews" of a ministry (and subordinate institutions - LEPLs) is the exercise aiming to streamline the business processes on policy formulation, coordination, monitoring and evaluation as well as the functions between ministries and subordinate institutions (LEPLs). Functional reviews shall be conducted by the Administration of Government, with the human resources units, internal auditors and operational managers of each institution. They should lead to a strategic plan for streamlining the business processes of line ministries with a piloting phase for the 5 ministries identified above.

² Ministries of Agriculture (MoA), Economy and Sustainable Development (MoESD), Education and Science (MoES), Health Labour and Social Affairs (MoLHSA), Justice (MoJ)..

Indicator (3): The Civil Service is progressively professionalised and merit-based human resources management policies implemented

Indicator 3.1:	The legal framework required by the Civil Service Law is adopted, new remuneration and appraisal systems are applied in central administration
Programme:	PAR Roadmap 2015-2020, Objectives 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6
Objective (of the SRC):	Enhance professionalisation of the civil service
Expected result:	The Civil Service progressively professionalised and merit-based human resources management policies implemented
Action:	Activities related to objectives 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6 of the PAR Roadmap action plan
Department responsible:	Civil Service Bureau of Georgia (CSB)
Description of the Indicator	
Indicator type:	Quantitative and qualitative
Measurement unit:	Number of compliant laws and regulations adopted – new classification, appraisal and salary scheme applied
Periodicity of measurement:	Annual
Last known result (baseline):	The number of civil servants in line ministries and related LEPLs was approximately 63.000 (43.000 without police forces). The Civil Service Law was adopted on 27 October 2015. It will enter into force on 1 st of January 2017. The Law defines the framework against which the secondary legislation and regulations are to be drafted. It embodies the principles set out in the Civil Service Reform Concept adopted in 2014 and the PAR Roadmap 2015-2020 adopted in August 2015. The enactment of the Law will require the drafting of 12 decrees and 2 laws. They are being drafted, with international support. In 2015, no law and no decree required by the Civil service law are elaborated and adopted. The current classification, salary and appraisal schemes are not consistent with the new system and shall be modified by the new decrees before 1 st January 2017. (2015)
Development and quality of the indicator	
Method of data collection:	Administrative collection
Department responsible for collection:	Civil Service Bureau of Georgia (Annual report of CSB)
Method of calculation:	
2016	
3.1.1	At least 10 of the 12 required decrees implementing the Civil Service Law are adopted by the Government
2017	
3.1.2	The new classification system is implemented in all ministries falling under the scope of the Civil Service Law.
3.1.3	The Government publishes a report that explains to citizens and media the main objectives and the expected impact of the new civil service legal framework (laws and decrees), and its alignment with the European Principles of Public Administration and with the EU Equal Opportunities Directives in terms of the gender dimension. The report addresses comments and observations from civil society organisations.

2018

3.1.4 All civil servants eligible in 2018 to the annual appraisal in ministries have been appraised in 2018 in line with the new legal framework.

Means of interpretation

Known limits and bias: The condition 3.1.3 relies on the calendar of the parliamentary sessions (affects the date of adoption of the required laws). The result of the general elections of October 2016 can affect the calendar of adoption of the laws.

Means of interpretation: The indicator illustrates the alignment of new legal framework for Civil Service with the European Principles of Public Administration EU Equal Opportunities Directives, in particular in relation to the gender dimension, and the extend of public communication and consultation on the new framework. The laws and regulations required by the Civil Service Law shall be elaborated and adopted in line with the policy planning strategy 2015-2017, including ensuring proper public consultations.

+The application of the classification and appraisal systems as of 2017 and 2018 shall be in line with the new legal framework.

Documentation schedule

Delivery date (targets):

2016:

3.1.1. One consolidated report validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence as specified under conditions 3.1.1

2017:

3.1.2 and 3.1.3. One consolidated report validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence as specified under conditions 3.1.2 and 3.1.3.

2018:

3.1.4. One consolidated report validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence as specified under conditions 3.1.4.

Comments:

Laws to be adopted are: Law on Remuneration in Public Institutions and Law on Legal Entities of Public Law (LEPLs).

The decrees to be adopted are: 1- Determination of the procedures, standards and topics for the certification of professional civil servants, 2- Procedure for determining the needs for professional development of professional civil servants and of the standards and procedures for their professional development, 3- position of professional civil servants (classification), 4- Conduct of competitions in civil service, 5- Procedure and conditions for the evaluation of professional civil servants, 6- Procedures and conditions for the use of leave by professional civil servants for the purpose of professional development, 7- Determination of the procedure for sending professional

civil servants on business trips, and of the amount of Compensation and Conditions of Reimbursing Their Business Trip Expenses, 8- Procedure for part-time and night work, work during rest days, public holidays and under working conditions dangerous to health, 9- Approving the standard forms of agreements under Public Law, 10- Procedure for the mobility of professional civil servants, 11- Procedure and conditions for assigning officer classes to professional civil servants, 12- Establishment of special requirements for each hierarchical rank of professional civil servants.

The current classification system is largely dependent on the appreciation of each institution, with no homogeneity or transparency. The new classification system will be a unique framework for all civil servants falling under the scope of the new Civil Service Law. It shall be verified with samples of contracts of employment, extracts from the electronic HRM system (e-HRMS) and interviews.

There is no unified salary scheme for civil servants throughout the public institutions. The new system shall introduce a single grid and criteria for objective definition of the remuneration, in relation with the classification and position. Application of the new salary scheme shall be verified through interviews with civil servants, ensuring the representativeness of civil servants (gender, position etc....), civil society organisation reports and statistics.

As for the annual appraisal system foreseen under the Civil Service Law: not all civil servants shall be appraised each year: a separate appraisal system is applied to law enforcement forces; civil servants under probation or in a position for less than one year (following mobility, promotion...) will not be part of the annual exercise for the given year. The number of civil servants will be readjusted with the introduction of the new classification.

Indicator 3.2: A comprehensive Civil Service training system is established, coordination and quality assurance mechanisms are introduced
Programme: PAR Roadmap 2015-2020, Objectives 2.6
Objective (of the SRC): Enhance professionalisation of the civil service
Expected result: The Civil Service progressively professionalised and merit-based human resources management policies implemented
Action: Activities related to objectives 3.6 of the PAR Roadmap action plan
Department responsible: International Education Centre of Georgia (IEC)

Description of the Indicator

Indicator type: Quantitative and qualitative
Measurement unit: PAR Council public reports on training scheme established and piloted, quality assurance mechanism introduced
Periodicity of measurement: Annual
Last known result (baseline): Eight State training centres/schools of the line ministries, private training entities and ad-hoc contracted individuals deliver trainings to civil servants on national and local levels. The State budget covers the operational and administrative costs of the training entities; however trainings of civil servants largely rely upon the availability of donor support. The current training system lacks a strategic approach to institutional, systemic professional development of civil service, and quality assurance requirement. The institutional setting for the coordination and quality assurance of the training system is deemed to be attributed to the International Education Centre: a memorandum of understanding between the CSB and the IEC in May 2016, delegates to the latter the tasks of steering the establishment of the training system. A Government Decree, among the regulations required by the civil service law of 2015, shall be adopted by end 2016, mandating the IEC with the responsibility of coordination and quality assurance of the training system in Civil Service. Such a change shall be reflected in the Civil Service Law (2015)

Development and quality of the indicator

Method of data collection: Administrative collection
Department responsible for collection: International Education Centre of Georgia (IEC) – (PAR Council annual report – Annual report of IEC)
Method of calculation:
2017:

3.2.1 Publication of a report informing the public and the media on the revised training system (applicable to the institution mandated by Law for coordinating the civil service training system, and applicable to training schools) and providing evidence of its alignment with (i) the national gender strategy, (ii) the national strategy for civil equality and integration, (iii) the European Principles of Public Administration, and (iv) the EU Equal Opportunities Directives in terms of the gender and minority inclusion. Such report also presents the main programmes as well as the monitoring and evaluation system established for the quality assurance of delivered trainings.

2018
 3.2.2 Publication of a report presenting the results of the basic training programmes delivered for (i) managers (heads of department and Heads of divisions) and (ii) civil service entry level (basic mandatory training programme) and providing evidence of their alignment with the revised training system. The report shall also present the evaluation of these trainings according to the quality assurance system established in 2017.

Means of interpretation

Known limits and bias: N/A.

Means of interpretation: The indicator measures the setting and implementation of the new training scheme with quality assurance mechanism introduced and its alignment with (i) the national gender strategy, (ii) the national strategy for civil equality and integration, (iii) the European Principles of Public Administration, and (iv) the EU Equal Opportunities Directives in terms of the gender and minority inclusion. It also measures the compliance with the public communication on the new training system..

Documentation schedule

Delivery date (targets):

2017:

3.2.1. One consolidated document validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence as specified under condition 3.2.1.

2018:

3.2.2. One consolidated document validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence as specified under condition 3.2.2

Comments:

The scope of challenges in current training pattern contain, but are not limited to : 1- lack of coordination within the network of training providers in selecting subject matter, certain categories in topics or trainee groups are overlooked, while others report overabundance of reoccurring trainings; 2- failure of systemic approach in identifying specific/scope /rank based needs in civil services, hindering career and professional growth opportunities for CSs; 3- Inconsistency in training approaches or lack of standards in transferred knowledge , hence incompatible skills /experience. 4-Unsystematised training plans/no professional development planning per employer institution, hence the ad-hoc trainings with institutionally non-applicable experience and outputs.

In line with the European Principles of Public Administration and EU Equal Opportunities Directives, the national gender strategy and the State strategy for civil equality and integration and action plan 2015-2020, the Civil Service training system shall ensure that gender and minority inclusion perspective shall be taken into consideration while elaborating the programmes, performing the trainings, setting and applying the quality assurance requirements.

Indicator (4): Improved accountability of public sector through reduction of corruption and increased openness towards citizens

Indicator 4.1: Improved transparency and accountability of civil servants
Programme: PAR Roadmap 2015-2020, Objectives 2.7
Objective (of the SRC): Enhance accountability, integrity and openness in the public sector
Expected result: Improved accountability of public sector through reduction of corruption
Action: Activities related to objectives 3.7 and 4.2.24 of the PAR Roadmap Action Plan
Department responsible: Civil Service Bureau

Description of the Indicator

Indicator type: Quantitative and qualitative
Measurement unit: Report showing that the assets declaration monitoring mechanism effectively implemented
Periodicity of measurement: Annual
Last known result (baseline): 5.200 officials are subject to submission of declarations. With the adoption of the Civil Service Law of Georgia in October 2015 and amendments to the Law on Conflict of Interest and Corruption in Public Sector (also adopted in October 2015), a code of ethics shall be elaborated and enacted, integrating the requirement of these laws. With these laws, the existing asset declaration mechanism has been significantly reinforced. Regulations and legal decisions setting the procedures are needed for the effective functioning of such a system. It will be led by the Civil Service Bureau and involves law enforcement agencies. (2015)

Development and quality of the indicator

Method of data collection: Administrative collection (PAR Council report – CSB annual report)

Departments responsible for collection: Civil Service Bureau

Method of calculation:

2016

4.1.1 The Government publishes a multi-annual action plan with baselines, targets and indicators for implementation of the assets declaration monitoring system

2017

4.1.2 The Civil Service Bureau publishes a report demonstrating compliance with the Law on Conflict of Interest and Corruption in terms of number of declarations actually monitored in 2017

2018

4.1.3 The Government publishes a report on the implementation of the action plan of the assets declaration monitoring system. The report provides evidence that all cases of incomplete or inaccurate assets declarations submitted in 2017 have been subjected to administrative or legal proceedings and, based on the degree of progress and/or delays in the implementation of the 2016-published action plan, identifies main areas for further actions

Means of interpretation

Known limits and bias: N/A

Means of interpretation: The indicator relates to the assessment of assets declaration implementation and effectiveness.

Documentation schedule

Delivery date (targets):

2016:

4.1.1: Government-published action plan as specified under condition 4.1.1.

2017:

4.1.2.: One consolidated report by the Civil Service Bureau (CSB) providing the evidence as specified under condition 4.1.2.

2018:

4.1.3. One consolidated report validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence as specified under condition 4.1.3.

Comments:

Art. 2 of the Law on Conflict of Interest and Corruption in the public sector revised in 2015 provides the list of officials required to submit assets declarations (including political appointees, top officials in central and local public institutions, judges, parliamentarians, prosecutors, heads of state owned-enterprises...). The declarations are submitted via the e-HRM system managed by the CSB. The monitoring of declarations will be performed following the criteria established by law. It is expected that min. 10% of the declarations will be checked annually.

Indicator 4.2: Increased openness of the public administration towards citizens
Programme: PAR Roadmap 2015-2020, Objectives 3.1, 3.2
Objective (of the SRC): Enhance accountability, integrity and openness in the public sector
Expected result: Improved accountability of public sector through increased openness towards citizens
Action: Activities related to objectives 3.7 and 4.2.28 of the PAR Roadmap Action Plan
Department responsible: Ministry of Justice – Analytical Department

Description of the Indicator

Indicator type: Quantitative and qualitative
Measurement unit: Rating of Georgia on RTI – new Law on Freedom of Information adopted – percentage of answered requests of information.
Periodicity of measurement: Annual
Last known result (baseline): The latest international Right To Information rating (www.rti-rating.org) is 97/150 (2014). The Government is committed to improve its legal framework for access to information, in the Open Government Partnership action plan 2014-2016 and the Anti-Corruption strategy and action plan 2015-2016. The Government of Georgia is drafting a new law on Freedom of information (FoI), to be submitted to the Parliament in 2016 after public consultations. Each public entity reports annually to the Parliament of Georgia, the President and the Prime Minister on the implementation of its legal obligations in that field. At the same time, each public entity is committed to publish the report on the official web page of the legislative herald of Georgia “MATSNE”. There are no consolidated statistics published by the Government, President or Parliament. The only available aggregated statistics are published by the Institute for the Democracy and Freedom of Information (IDFI), the latest showing that 86% of requests for information were answered (fully or partially) by the public institutions (central and local levels, LEPLs) (2015)

Development and quality of the indicator

Method of data collection: Administrative collection (PAR Council report – Anti-corruption Council report)
Departments responsible for collection: Ministry of Justice – Analytical Department , Institute for Development of Freedom of Information (IDFI)
Method of calculation:
 2017

4.2.1 Following the entry into force of the new Law on Freedom of information, Georgia’s score in the “Global Right to Information” report to be published in 2017 is higher than the 2014 score.

2018

4.2.2 The percentage of requests for information by the public which was answered by public entities during 2018 is higher than 86%

Means of interpretation

Known limits and bias: For 2017: 1- the 1st component of the indicator on the adoption of legislation relies on the calendar of the national Parliament. The result of the general elections of October 2016 can affect the calendar of adoption of the laws. 2- For the 2nd component, the rating is updated upon

request of Government after the enactment of the FoI Law. For 2018: the ratio will be determined in the PAR Council report, it shall explain the methodology used for measuring the proportion of answered requests amongst public entities, and possible discrepancies with external organisation (IDFI) assessment.

Means of interpretation:

2017: the indicator indirectly relates to adoption the new Law on Freedom of Information in partnership with civil society organisations; and its alignment with international standards and best practices. It relates on its impact on the scoring of Georgia on Global Right to Information rating (www.rti-rating.org). It relates on the effective improvement.

2018: the ratio of answered requests shall be calculated using the methodology used by the PAR Council, with explanation of possible discrepancies with external organisation (IDFI) methodology and assessment of 2015.

Documentation schedule

Delivery date (targets):

2017:

4.2.1. Published "Global Right to Information" report transmitted and, where appropriate, commented by the PAR Council.

2018.

4.2.2. A report validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence as specified under condition 4.2.2 .

Comments:

The Ministry of Justice co-chairs the Open Government Partnership (OGP) Forum in Georgia with the Institute for Development of Freedom of Information (civil society organisation). It coordinates the elaboration and monitoring of the OGP Action Plan and activities. The FoI is one of the commitments undertaken in the OGP and in the Anti-corruption national Strategy.

Indicator (5): Improved transparency and accessibility in service provision

Programme: PAR Roadmap 2015-2020, Objective 4
Objective (of the SRC): Improve transparency, accessibility and the quality of services to citizens
Expected result: Enhanced country-wide efficiency and cost effectiveness of the delivery of public services
Action: Activities related to objective 5 of the PAR Roadmap Action Plan
Department responsible: Ministry of Justice – Public Service Development Agency (PSDA)

Description of the Indicator

Indicator type: Quantitative and qualitative
Measurement unit: Number of community centres - number of municipalities using the Municipal Management System (e-MMS)
Periodicity of measurement: Annual
Last known result (baseline): 27 community centres are functioning in 25 Municipalities, and 8 municipalities were prepared to the E-Municipal Management System (Report of PSDA). (2015)

Development and quality of the indicator

Method of data collection: Administrative collection (PAR Council report – PSDA report)

Departments responsible

for collection: Ministry of Justice – Public Service Development Agency)

Method of calculation:

2017:4

5.1.1 A consolidated report, validated by the PAR Council, providing evidence that at least 44 municipalities have community centres and 55 municipalities use the Municipal Management System and that electronic services are integrated in the national citizen's portal (www.my.gov.ge)

5.1.2 The surveys of community centres users show an average rate of high satisfaction of at least 86%.

2018:

5.1.3 A consolidated report, validated by the PAR Council, providing evidence that at least 52 municipalities have community centres and 70 municipalities use the Municipal Management System and that electronic services are integrated in the national citizen's portal (www.my.gov.ge)

5.1.4 The surveys of community centres users show an average rate of satisfaction of at least 86%

Means of interpretation

Known limits and bias: Data collected by PSDA.

Means of interpretation: The conditions 5.1.1. and 5.1.3 are the absolute numbers of centres and municipalities having access to the e-MMS. Conditions 5.1.2 and 5.1.4 show the result of the surveys to be carried out in 4th quarter 2017 and 4th quarter 2018, validated by the PAR Council.

Documentation schedule

Delivery date (targets):

2017

5.1.1: One consolidated report validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence specified under condition 5.1.1.

5.1.2: One consolidated report validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence specified under condition 5.1.2.

2018

5.1.3: One consolidated report validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence specified under condition 5.1.3.

5.1.4: One consolidated report validated by the PAR Council and providing the evidence specified under condition 5.1.4.

Comments:

The community centres' core purpose is to improve the accessibility of public services to population of rural and remote areas, through the development of local infrastructure and introduction of e-Governance in local governments. They also free English and Georgian language courses to the population, the latter contributing to the integration of minority communities. The centres are also considered as a platform for stimulating civic engagement and capacity building activities on the ground by offering relevant facilities. In 2015, the centres offered 200 types of administrative services, according to the 'one-stop-shop' principle, increasing with the extension of the agreements between the PSDA and other state administrative service providers. They also provide a space for private services (banking, telecommunication). The PSDA has been tasked with the responsibility of the development of these centres, in cooperation with the hosting municipality and service providers. The design and functioning of the centres take into consideration specific constraints of women with children. As for the existing ones, the new centres should be easily accessible for all citizens, physically accessible to persons with children, persons with disabilities.

The PSDA is also in charge of the development of the electronic MMS, to be used by municipalities as part of the modernisation of their management. The PSDA provides the training and equipment to municipalities and community centres as well. The development of this initiative has been launched in 2010, with international donors' support, including the European Union. The EU-funded grant to PSDA has come to an end in May 2016.