



**EUROPEAID/129783/C/SER/multi**

**FWC COM 2011 Lot 1: Studies and Technical Assistance in all sectors**

**Request No 2011/276342**

**Strategic/Interim evaluation of support for  
improvement in governance and management  
(SIGMA) programme**

# **Evaluation Report**

April 2012



This project is funded by  
The European Union



A project implemented by  
B&S Europe and Proman  
Members of B&S Europe Consortium

## ACRONYMS

AR	Activity Report and Annual Report
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
EC	European Commission
EM	Evaluation Matrix
EUD	European Union Delegation
EU MS	European Union Member States
DCU	Donor Coordination Unit(s)
EQ	Evaluation Question(s)
EUD	European Union Delegation
IL	Intervention Logic
IR	Inception Report
FA	Financing Agreement
FR	Final Report
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
JC	Judgment Criteria
MIPD	Multi-Annual Indicative Planning Document
NR	Narrative Report
OA	Outline Agreement
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCM	Project Cycle Management
PAR	Public Administration Reform
PDS	Project Definition Sheet
PI	Performance Indicators
PP	Public Procurement
QR	Quarterly Report
RG	Reference Group
SIGMA	Support for Improvement in Governance and Management
SAI	State Audit Institution
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats
TGNA	Turkey Grand National Assembly
ToR	Terms of Reference
WBT	Western Balkans and Turkey

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	3
TABLES.....	4
<b>1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2 BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE EVALUATION MISSION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 OBJECTIVE OF THE SIGMA SUPPORT DURING THE LAST THREE YEARS.....	6
2.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION MISSION .....	6
<b>3 METHODOLOGY AND WORK PLAN OF THE EVALUATION MISSION.....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 METHODOLOGY USED BY THE EVALUATORS .....	7
3.2 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE.....	10
<b>4 KEY FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5 CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>46</b>
5.1 BENEFICIARIES' OPINIONS AND CONCLUSIONS: SWOT.....	46
5.2 EVALUATORS' OPINIONS AND CONCLUSIONS .....	49
<b>6 ANNEXES .....</b>	<b>53</b>
6.1 ANNEX 1 – QUESTIONNAIRE N°1 TO BENEFICIARIES .....	53
6.2 ANNEX 2 – QUESTIONNAIRE N°2 TO BENEFICIARIES .....	58
6.3 ANNEX 3 – QUESTIONNAIRE TO EUDS AND EC.....	62
6.4 ANNEX 4 – COST DIVERGENCES.....	69
6.5 ANNEX 5 – NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS TO CONFERENCE AND TO STUDY TOURS .....	72

### TABLES

**CHAPTER 2****TABLE 2.1 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS****CHAPTER 3****TABLE 3.1 COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES PER COUNTRY****TABLE 3.2 COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES BY SIGMA SECTOR****TABLE 3.3 EVALUATION SCHEDULE****CHAPTER 4****EQ1****TABLE 4.1 SHARE OF SIGMA INTERVENTIONS BY COUNTRY, 2009 - 2012****TABLE 4.2 SHARE OF SIGMA INTERVENTIONS BY WORK AREA****TABLE 4.3 NUMBER OF SIGMA PROJECTS AS PER PDSS, PER YEAR AND COUNTRY****TABLE 4.4 NUMBER OF SIGMA PROJECTS PER MAIN WORK AREA AND COUNTRY****EQ2****TABLE 4.5 QUESTIONNAIRE COOPERATION EUD AND SIGMA WORK AREA I: PAR****TABLE 4.6 QUESTIONNAIRE COOPERATION EUD AND SIGMA WORK AREA II: MANAGEMENT OF FUNDS****EQ3****TABLE 4.7 QUESTIONNAIRE SIGMA DEMAND-DRIVEN DIMENSION****TABLE 4.8 QUESTIONNAIRE SIGMA NEEDS RESPONSE****EQ4****TABLE 4.9 QUESTIONNAIRE APPLICABILITY SIGMA ADVICE****TABLE 4.10 QUESTIONNAIRE RELEVANCE SIGMA SUPPORT TO ACCESSION PROCESS****TABLE 4.11 QUESTIONNAIRE SIGMA SUPPORT TO INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE****TABLE 4.12 PARTICIPANTS TO SIGMA TRAINING PER WORK AREA 2009 - 2011****TABLE 4.13 RELEVANCE SIGMA INTERVENTIONS ACCORDING TO EUDS****EQ5****TABLE 4.14 COMPARISON TWINNING, TAIEX AND SIGMA****TABLE 4.15 COMPARATIVE BENEFICIARY SATISFACTION TAIEX, TWINNING, TA****TABLE 4.16 COMPARATIVE BENEFICIARY SATISFACTION OTHER DONORS****EQ6****TABLE 4.17 COMPARATIVE EFFICIENCY SIGMA - BENEFICIARIES****TABLE 4.18 COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS SIGMA – BENEFICIARIES****TABLE 4.19 COMPARATIVE IMPACT SIGMA – BENEFICIARIES****TABLE 4.20 COMPARATIVE SUSTAINABILITY – BENEFICIARIES****TABLE 4.21 COMPARATIVE EFFICIENCY SIGMA – EUDS****TABLE 4.22 COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS SIGMA – EUDS****TABLE 4.23 COMPARATIVE IMPACT SIGMA – EUDS****TABLE 4.24 COMPARATIVE SUSTAINABILITY - EUDS****EQ7****TABLE 4.25 LEGAL ACTS AS DIRECT RESULT OF SIGMA****TABLE 4.26 FOLLOW UP SIGMA****TABLE 4.27 IMPACT ASSESSMENT MODALITIES****EQ8****TABLE 4.28 DISSEMINATION AND QUALITY QRS/QRS – EUD****CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS****TABLE 5.1 SWOT – SIGMA BENEFICIARIES**

## 1 Executive summary

This evaluation of SIGMA has combined a traditional evaluation methodology with the use of beneficiary and stakeholder questionnaires. This approach has been considered useful as individual ideas and observations were added to the field and documentary findings. It has also allowed a richer dialogue and a sense of stakeholder ownership. Field interviews and documentary research have been guided by the questionnaires but have also focused on responding to performance indicators in the evaluation matrix, insofar as this proved feasible. A representative project sample for all countries of the Western Balkans and Turkey had been established during the inception phase to allow targeted field missions but each country visit aimed at gaining exposure to a maximum number of stakeholders.

The evaluation's broader enterprise has been to map SIGMA interventions between 2009 and 2011 and to gauge and assess the relevance, effectiveness and potential impact and sustainability of SIGMA collaboration, support and advice. The mapping allowed a better comprehension of SIGMA's scope and extent in the region. The allocation of SIGMA support is not exclusively linked to the *Acquis* and accession process; rather, as SIGMA is partially working on demand driven. Careful analysis of the merit and value of proposed requests is carried out by Sigma, in consultation with the EU Delegation, the relevant Country Desk in Brussels and D3, before a decision is made on whether to develop a PDS for a particular request. Issues such as the absorptive capacity of the potential beneficiary, the value that a particular project will add to public administration reform in the country and whether Sigma has the expertise and available resource to carry out the work are in depth analysed before to take a decision. Flexibility in SIGMA concepts and implementation are unorthodox in EU donor terms yet evaluation findings have confirmed that this effectively enhances SIGMA's responsive capacity to changing circumstances which typify the PAR process in the region.

In general, SIGMA responds to stakeholder needs but it is also acknowledged that the process is driven by mutual demand as institutional and legislative developments are decisive factors in agreeing on collaboration. Mapping has also revealed that multi-country support is by far the most substantial in financial terms, yet these activities, predominantly networking, information and meetings, have not been subject of this evaluation.

SIGMA programmes are indicative and activities on the ground are given a significant degree of flexibility. Intended results are most often described as outcomes and their potential realisation – as full-fledged results, rather– depends on the political commitment of national stakeholders. A large majority of SIGMA initiatives are demand-driven and meet perceived needs but often collaboration is decided in the context of peer dialogue and with SIGMA contacts.

Advice and support are highly appreciated by national stakeholders and collaboration with peers is considered relevant and useful to the development of national strategies and meeting accession requirements. SIGMA's design makes it complementary to other instruments such as twinning and TAIEX, notably in terms of it providing rapid deployment of peer knowledge, policy and strategic advice and also the fact that SIGMA does not exclusively focus on *Acquis*-related matters. It is in fact SIGMA's agility and potential to react in real time that is most appreciated by stakeholders and beneficiaries. Its egalitarian approach, allowing for peer exchange by means of face-to-face collaboration is seen as a significant attribute in a donor-intensive region.

SIGMA has achieved a number of significant outcomes and these are acknowledged by beneficiaries and stakeholders. In some cases, its support and advice to the definition of laws, bylaws and strategies has been instrumental in the adoption and implementation of those laws, according to

beneficiary questionnaires. This underlines the impact potential of SIGMA. Thus outcomes are being delivered, yet a structured and traceable hierarchy of the programme's general and specific objectives and integrated political risks is lacking. This could be the subject of a strategic mapping.

## 2 Background and justification of the evaluation mission

### 2.1 Objective of the SIGMA support during the last three years

SIGMA is a joint programme between the EU and the OECD. This association adds considerable value in the SIGMA's dealings with countries who appreciate that it brings a wide range of experience from different countries, together with the OECD professional expertise. It also contributes significantly to Sigma's relative independence, which is important, for example, in the annual assessment reports.

#### 1. Global objective

SIGMA's main objective is to assist partner countries to develop public governance systems which are appropriate to a democracy operating under the rule of law and supporting a market economy. The main focus is on horizontal administration systems.

#### 2. Specific objectives

Since 2007, assistance has been programmed under the Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) (contract 2009-2010, contract 2010 -2011, both for the value of € 10m). The beneficiaries of evaluation are the IPA beneficiaries in the Western Balkans and Turkey which received assistance from SIGMA in four main areas (see below).

#### 3. Main characteristics at moment of the mission

The formal status of the IPA beneficiaries impacts on the work carried out:

- **Croatia and Turkey** are Candidate countries with which negotiation has begun
- **The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM)** is a candidate country but the start of negotiations is subject to conditionality
- **Montenegro** was granted candidate country status in December 2010
- **Albania** has not been granted candidate status yet, following the Commission's opinion
- **Serbia** was granted candidate country status in March 2012 (after the beginning of the current evaluation).
- **Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH)** and **Kosovo** are only covered by the Stabilisation and Association process but have been assured of their "European perspective".

All the IPA beneficiaries are subject to the Commission's Annual Reporting Process and, therefore, to Sigma assessments.

### 2.2 Objectives of the evaluation mission

#### 1. Global objective of the mission

According to the ToR the primary objective of this evaluation is to provide relevant findings, conclusions and recommendations to the EC about the performance of SIGMA's activities, based on both the evaluator's assessment and as perceived by the beneficiaries, in the area of Public governance reform/ Public Administration Reform (PAR).

These findings will contribute to the Commission's future approach on planning and programming SIGMA with a view to responding better to the strategic goals of enlargement policy in the area of PAR/ Public governance reform.

## 2. Specific objectives and planned results

**Table 2.1 - Evaluation objectives and results**

Specific objectives	Planned results
Mapping SIGMA interventions	A mapping of the number and type of interventions per country per sub topic in the area of public administration reform (e.g. civil service reform, public procurement, administrative procedures, etc.).
Assessing the added value of SIGMA and to what extent it responds to IPA beneficiaries' needs	An assessment of the process of designing, programming and implementing SIGMA interventions, and the extent to which it is based on sound needs assessments, their complementarity with other instruments financed by IPA, and their comparative advantage compared to similar providers of expertise.
Assessing the extent to which SIGMA interventions are based on sound needs assessments	
Assessing the extent to which SIGMA interventions are complementary to other interventions financed under IPA	
Analysing SIGMA's comparative advantage as perceived by beneficiaries and other stakeholders in the Region	
Assessing the performance of SIGMA interventions in terms of their efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability	Assessment of the efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of SIGMA interventions.
Providing recommendations for improvement	Recommendations to improve the design, programming and implementation of SIGMA interventions with a view to improving their relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

## 3 Methodology and work plan of the evaluation mission

### 3.1 Methodology used by the evaluators

#### 1. Coverage

The evaluation will cover the following segment of assistance provided by SIGMA:

- **Period:** Assistance provided under IPA contract 2009-2010 and contract 2010 -2011 (“outline agreements”), both for the value of € 10m, with a main focus on completed projects, but including a view on-going projects.
- **Countries:** Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), Croatia, FYROM, Montenegro, Serbia, Turkey and Kosovo. Multi-country activities will not be included, with the exception of the SIGMA Assessments.
- **Areas:**
  - Legal Framework, Civil Service, Administrative Justice and Integrity
  - External and Internal Audit and Financial Control
  - Public Procurement
  - Policy and Regulatory Systems
- **Type of activities:**
  - SIGMA support and advice
  - Assessments

---

This segment consists of **88 projects** which are thus the population for the present evaluation.

2. Desk and documentation research

Several meetings at SIGMA headquarters in Paris provided the opportunity to collect relevant documentation, such as SIGMA project and programme background information, WBT country files, stakeholder and beneficiary contact details. This information was comprehensively provided on CD ROM.

The list of documentation provided by SIGMA includes: 2009 – 2011 SIGMA Annual Reports (AR), IPA Sigma Contracts, Outline Agreements (OA) and Project Definition Sheets (PDS), SIGMA 2011 Quarterly Reports (QR), SIGMA Country Desks, organigramme and other internal information, SIGMA End of Contract Report 1 January 2009 – 30 June 2011, Draft TOR SIGMA Internal Evaluation 2011, and Country-Specific Documentation comprising CVs, project deliverables and Narrative Reports (NR).

3. Statistical analysis (mapping)

During the inception phase it was decided to gather information from each beneficiary country; the official service in charge of IPA and donors coordination as well as each European Union Delegation (EUD). In reality much of the data collected in this way was very weak and inconsistent and could not be presented in an evaluation report. Therefore, the necessary data was provided by SIGMA financial staff, thereby allowing the team to gather the necessary statistical information required for answering to EQs 1 and 2.

4. Drafting and completion of questionnaire

During the inception phase, a set of questionnaires was prepared and submitted for approval to DG ENLARG.E4 and questionnaires were also separately discussed with SIGMA staff in Paris. They were translated into the local languages (Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian; Macedonian, Albanian and Turkish). Their purpose was to allow the gathering of optimal and quantifiable responses to specific sub-questions directly linked to the performance indicators in the evaluation matrix (EM). Questionnaires were aimed at the following target groups:

- **Q1:** SIGMA beneficiaries, specifically on SIGMA PDS activities and outcomes;
- **Q2:** SIGMA beneficiaries and stakeholders, on a general appreciation and usefulness of the SIGMA programme and thereby allowing them to 'evaluate' SIGMA according to global evaluation criteria, namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact;
- **Q3:** EC and EUD staff designated to providing input to and overseeing SIGMA implementation;
- **Q4:** Donor Coordination Units (DCUs) in the region. The response rate however was insufficient (and therefore is not be presented in the FR) and, instead, relevant information was collected from financial staff at SIGMA.

The questionnaires were sent to the region's stakeholders ahead of the planned bilateral field interviews with the evaluators, which took place in March 2012. Feedback was gathered at different intervals and often after completion of a given country field mission.

5. Field interviews

At the outset of each country mission, the evaluators met with the EUD contacts responsible for SIGMA in the region. These meetings allowed a general discussion about SIGMA and a review of specific SIGMA interventions on a case-by-case basis. Contact information of SIGMA stakeholders was often checked with EUD staff and this facilitated the arrangement and confirmation of field meetings. Publicly, EUDs do not identify SIGMA contact points and

this represented a logistical and planning challenge to the team. Knowledge about SIGMA varies greatly between Delegations in the region.

Thus support from the EUDs proved essential in finalising the meeting schedule of the evaluation team, who mostly travelled in pairs to fully exploit the limited time available per country. Collective efforts and time were required to confirm that a given meeting with SIGMA stakeholders would effectively take place. Bilateral meetings normally did not exceed one hour; in rare cases, an informal focus group format with participation of civil servants allowed a fruitful collective dialogue (for example: Ministry of Finance, EU and Foreign Affairs Department, Turkey).

It took longer than expected to establish a direct connection with the stakeholders of the SIGMA projects. The calendar of appointments was adapted on a day to day basis in the country of assignment.

**Table 3.1 – Number of completed questionnaires per country**

Country	Q1	Q2	Q3	Total
Albania	4	3	1	8
Bosnia and Herzegovina	4	2	1	7
Croatia	11	2	1	14
FYROM	3	4	1*	7
Kosovo	1	1	2	4
Montenegro	5	4	-	9
Serbia	2	1	1**	4
Turkey	9	11	1	21
Multi-Country				
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>74</b>

\* For EUD to FYROM, the questionnaire was completed by 3 persons

\*\* For EUD to Serbia, the questionnaire was completed by 3 persons

The IR indicated that the total population of SIGMA projects subject to this evaluation exercise stands at 88. With 66 respondents, it can be considered that the available data analysis and processing provides a good representation of stakeholder's opinions on the performance of SIGMA. Consideration should also be given to the fact that many stakeholders completing Q1 as well as Q2 often did so for more than one project under SIGMA intervention. Consequently, approximately at least 85% of all eligible projects are effectively evaluated.

**Table 3.2 – Number of completed questionnaires by SIGMA sector**

SIGMA Sector	Q1	Q2	Total
Financial Control and External Audit	13	3	16
Legal Framework, Civil Service and Justice	12	11	23
Policy-making	2	6	8
Public Procurement	12	8	19
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>66</b>

Above in table 3, the distribution of completed questionnaires per sector reflects the importance of stakeholders within each sector, i.e. two sectors targeting a broader spectrum of civil servants,

namely those engaged in Public Administration Reform (PAR) and public procurement (PP). The team has observed that financial control and external audit were considered by beneficiaries as a sector which should have significant resources allocated to it by SIGMA and which is highly important for the country, even if it concerns few civil servants.

It should be pointed out that Q2 also enabled the collection of information on multi-sector activities.

### 3.2 Implementation schedule

The project schedule was implemented as follows with minor delays in comparison with the initial time frame:

*Table 3.3 – Evaluation Schedule*

Activity	Date	Outputs
Preliminary meetings in Brussels (EC) and Paris (SIGMA)	7-9 December 2011	
<b>Desk Phase</b> Preparation and submission of the draft IR and preparation of stakeholder questionnaires	December 2011 to January 2012	<i>Draft IR, including evaluation tools (structured interviews and questionnaires)</i>
Kick-off meeting in Brussels	January 2012	<i>Presentation of methodology and draft IR</i>
Team Leader and junior expert resignation and replacement (Daniel Bollinger and Alexander Shumkovski)	February 2012	
Launch of questionnaires for stakeholder feedback and consultation	End February 2012	
<b>Field Phase – Brussels and Paris</b>	17 February 2012 23- 24 February	
<b>Field Phase – Locations in the WBT</b>	Turkey 4-9 March	
	Serbia 12 -15 March	
	Albania 13-16 March	
	Croatia 19-22 March	
	FYROM 1-2 March	
	BiH 6-9 March	
	Kosovo 19-20 March	
	Montenegro 26-27 March	
<b>Activity Report</b>	5 April 2012	<i>Draft activity report</i>
<b>Processing of questionnaire replies</b>	4- 9 April 2012	<i>Quantified responses presented in tables</i>
<b>Synthesis Phase</b> –Briefing in Brussels and presentation of preliminary field findings and conclusions –Elaboration and submission of the draft FR to the Reference Group (RG)	End April 2012	<i>Preliminary findings Preliminary draft FR</i>
Incorporating stakeholders' comments and submission of draft FR to ELARG E4	Mid May 2012	<i>Draft FR</i>

---

Incorporating ELARG E4 comments and submission of the FR to ELARG E4	Mid May 2012	
Debriefing of FR in Brussels and other locations, if necessary	End May 2012	<i>FR</i>

## 4 Key findings

### EQ 1: What are the type and number of SIGMA interventions per country and area (Mapping)?

Repartition of SIGMA resources is somewhat uneven between the different countries of the region. Croatia is the largest recipient of SIGMA support, followed by Montenegro, Albania and Serbia. This ranking is not necessarily or exclusively linked to the *Acquis* and a country's accession status. Field interviews have confirmed that SIGMA support and advice is provided (and budgeted) on a first-come-first-serve basis. The ranking and share of SIGMA collaboration per country therefore is linked to general preparedness for requesting, formulating and designing a given support or advice intervention. Multi-country assessments exceed 40% of 2009 to 2011 SIGMA interventions.

The share of SIGMA interventions by work area follows the above observations as specific activities are based on stakeholder demand and their readiness to tackle a given PAR priority. At the same time, an area which holds financial incentives, such as public procurement, claiming the highest share of SIGMA resources, has demonstrated significant reform momentum in nearly all countries and has been closely linked to *Acquis* provisions.

Mapping has also revealed that multi-country SIGMA support and advice is the most significant, in terms of projects and budget allocation and per main work area.

Table 4.1 – Share of SIGMA interventions by country 2009 - 2012

Share of SIGMA interventions by country*						
Country/Year	IPA 2009-2010**			IPA 2011-2012	Total	Share (ranking)
	2009	2010	2011	2011		
Albania	84 451	307 920	79 830	189 475	661 675	8.8% (3)
BiH	71 412	137 408	29 666	224 794	463 281	6.2% (6)
Croatia	273 587	283 687	113 555	260 202	931 031	12.4% (1)
FYROM	154 833	123 270	38 642	150 797	467 543	6.3% (5)
Kosovo	33 691	29 363	18 545	66 219	147 818	2% (8)
Montenegro	68 598	181 247	81 197	383 303	714 344	9.6% (2)
Serbia	44 909	152 783	89 645	324 994	612 330	8.2% (4)
Serbia : Assessment			89 845		89 845	1.2%
Turkey	94 857	151 681	44 890	26 066	317 494	4.2% (7)
Multi-Country (Exc. Assessments)	373 669	628 984	429 010	477 455	1 909 118	25.5%
1.2%Multi-Country : Assessments	284 850	361 296	15 495	510 693	1 172 333	15.6%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1 484 857</b>	<b>2 357 638</b>	<b>1 030 319</b>	<b>2 613 998</b>	<b>7 486 811</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*initially approved estimated budgets can be adjusted downwards by SIGMA according to actual operational costs

\*\* extended until 30 June 2011

Table 4.2 – Share of SIGMA interventions by work area

Share of SIGMA interventions by work area						
Country \ Area	Civil Service, Administrative Justice & Integrity	External Audit and Financial Control, Budgeting and Public Expenditure Management	Public Procurement	Policy and Regulatory Systems	Assessments	Total (ranking)
Albania	290 448	183 428	187 799	-		661 675 (5)
BiH	88 993	99 524	150 977	123 787		463 281 (7)
Croatia	98 413	377 467	366 073	89 079		931 031 (2)
FYROM	57 457	50 923	359 162	-		467 543 (6)
Kosovo	26 869	16 860	104 090	-		147 819 (9)
Montenegro	507 430	75 145	59 703	72 067		714 344 (3)
Serbia	522 873	61 813	27 644	-	89 845	702 175 (4)
Turkey	10 240	104 700	55 250	147 305		317 494 (8)
Multi-Country	306 467	703 327	767 801	131 523	1 172 333	3 081 451 (1)
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1 909 190</b>	<b>1 673 186</b>	<b>2 078 498</b>	<b>563 759</b>	<b>1 262 178</b>	<b>7 486 811</b>
<b>Share (ranking)</b>	<b>25.5% (2)</b>	<b>22.4% (3)</b>	<b>27.8% (1)</b>	<b>7.5% (5)</b>	<b>16.8% (4)</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 4.3 – Number of SIGMA projects as per PDSs, per year and country

Number of SIGMA projects as per PDSs, per year and country						
Country/Year	IPA 2009-2010*			IPA 2011-2012	Total	Share (ranking)
	2009	2010	2011	2011		
Albania	5	8	4	5	22	11% (3)
BiH	4	9	5	5	23	12% (2)
Croatia	6	6	5	4	21	11% (3)
FYROM	4	4	3	3	14	7% (6)
Kosovo	2	3	3	2	10	5% (7)
Montenegro	3	6	3	5	17	8.7% (5)
Serbia	3	5	4	5	17	8.7% (5)
Turkey	7	6	5	1	19	9.7% (4)
Multi-Country	9	20	11	13	53	27% (1)
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>100</b>

\* Extended to 30 June 2011. Of these projects, 76 are multi-annual.

Table 4.4 – Number of SIGMA projects per main work area and country<sup>1</sup>

Number of SIGMA projects per main work area and country 2009 – 2011						
Country \ Area	Civil Service, Administrative Justice & Integrity	External Audit and Financial Control, Budgeting and Public Expenditure Management	Public Procurement	Policy and Regulatory Systems	Assessments	Total
Albania	5	5	3	-		13
BiH	3	4	4	3		14
Croatia	2	5	2	2		11
FYROM	3	2	4	-		9
Kosovo	2	1	2	-		5
Montenegro	6	2	2	1		11
Serbia	4	4	2	-	1	11
Turkey	2	4	1	3		10
Multi-Country	6	13	10	1	6	36
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>120</b>

<sup>1</sup> This table is compiled on the basis of statistics directly from SIGMA in Paris

EQ 2: To what extent does the implementation of SIGMA programmes correspond with the outline agreements that SIGMA has with ELARG?

SIGMA's Outline Agreements (OA) provide an indicative and strategic orientation to the definition of specific advice and support to stakeholders. This allows a flexible and timely response in terms of implementation. Overall, it has been found that SIGMA's support and advice corresponds with the OAs. The achievement of results, on the other hand, heavily depends on a country's political commitment and bipartisanship to pursue reform and implementation.

Overall, collaboration with SIGMA in the region is viewed very favourably by EUD staff. The regularity of collaboration is seen as largely adequate and, specifically in the case of SIGMA's work area I<sup>2</sup> (PAR), often more frequent than required despite observations made during the field interviews that SIGMA preparation, briefings and debriefings would benefit from a degree of 'standardisation'<sup>3</sup>. The quality of cooperation with SIGMA is also judged positively.

On a general level, SIGMA interventions are by and large consistent with intended results yet their materialisation depends on the extent to which stakeholders seize political commitment and ownership and engage with implementation, a process which is difficult to grasp by either SIGMA or the EUDs. On the ground, however, SIGMA is able to generate intensive learning experiences which have a lasting impact on stakeholders, by means of face-to-face interaction.

The scope and depth of SIGMA programming is not exhaustive. Project collaboration often reveals unexpected dimensions or realities of legal and institutional reform and coherence of implementation is sometimes compromised by turf wars and political territorialisation. This necessitates an extensive dialogue with stakeholders, which can produce a positive spin off in terms of awareness and ownership. SIGMA collaboration targets the maximisation of effects and replication and it normally aims at choosing optimal strategic stakeholders as project partners. In the case of SIGMA's collaboration with the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) for instance, it proved essential to have a sufficiently high-level stakeholder engagement in overcoming the difficulties of working with a bureaucratized hierarchy.

SIGMA project cost divergences have occurred in some cases but these are always documented and subject to agreement with Commission services. Annex 4 provides an overview and examples.

Q3 (Q EUD 1) asked 7<sup>4</sup> EUDs to indicate the degree of cooperation of SIGMA with relevant EUD services, in terms of regularity and quality.

---

<sup>2</sup> Area I (PAR) includes Public administration reform strategy, Public service, Administrative legal framework and administrative justice, Public Integrity System, Policy making and coordination. Area II (management of funds) includes Public Expenditure Management (PEMS), Public Internal Financial Control (PIFC), External Audit, Anti Fraud, Public Procurement.

<sup>3</sup> A specific recommendation is proposed on this subject at the end of this report.

<sup>4</sup> With the exception of the EUD to Montenegro. Please note: data from the different type of evaluation questionnaires (Q1 to 3, see p.8) are found in each EQ section of this report. All questionnaires can be found in annexes 1 to 3. Reference to specific questionnaire sub question is given in brackets.

Table 4.5 – Questionnaire cooperation EUDs and SIGMA work area I: PAR<sup>5</sup>

SIGMA work area	Regularity of cooperation	Quality rating of cooperation
I.1 Public administration reform strategy	10% more often than required 90% as often as required	50% Excellent 25% Good 25% Satisfactory
I.2 Public service	20% more often than required 60% as often as required 20% insufficient	40% Excellent 10% Good 50% Satisfactory
I.3 Administrative legal framework and administrative justice	20% more often than required 80% as often as required	20% Excellent 60% Good 20% Satisfactory
I.4 Public Integrity System	75% as often as required 25% insufficient	25% Excellent 25% Good 25% Satisfactory 25% unsatisfactory
I.5 Policy Making and Co-ordination	100% as often as required	25% Excellent 25% Good 25% Satisfactory 25% unsatisfactory

Completed questionnaires were given individual comments from EUD staff, providing useful illustrations. With regard to SIGMA collaboration in work area I on PAR, the EUD to BiH noted that

*“...the cooperation was good-to-excellent and in line with EUD demands and needs. [SIGMA] has complemented the EU assistance especially in the area of PAR, which is highly appreciated by all parties and above all various beneficiaries”.*

It also added that the regularity of cooperation is “as often as required”. In contrast, the EUD to FYROM remarked that

*“...most of SIGMA's input was delayed coming at the last moment”.*

Table 4.6 – Questionnaire cooperation EUDs and SIGMA work area II: Management of Funds

SIGMA work area	Regularity of cooperation	Quality rating of cooperation
II.1 Public Expenditure Management (PEMS)	65% as often as required 35% less often than required	35% Excellent 50% Good 15% Satisfactory
II.2 Public Internal Financial Control (PIFC)	20% more often than required 80% as often as required	40% Excellent 40% Good 20% Satisfactory
II.3 External Audit	75% as often as required 25% less often than required	25% Excellent 50% Good 25% Satisfactory
II.4 Anti-Fraud	50% as often as required 50% less often than required	50% Good 50% Satisfactory
II.5 Public Procurement	65% more often than required 35% as often as required	85% Excellent 15% Good

<sup>5</sup> Tables 4.5 & 4.6 are based on the questionnaire. It provides more detailed information rather than information provided by SIGMA on table 4.4

The frequency of cooperation in such areas as PEMS, PIFC and external audit is judged less than in SIGMA work area I and it has been observed that specific areas such as PEMS could be subject to more regular collaboration with EUD services. In contrast, collaboration in public procurement is viewed very positively by the majority of EUDs, noting regular presence and follow up by SIGMA. The EUD to FYROM underlined that

*“...the adviser has a very hands on and practical approach and is ready to react to requests from the national authorities or EUD quickly”.*

EQ3: To what extent are SIGMA interventions based on an adequate needs assessment, and respond to beneficiaries' needs<sup>6</sup>?

Questionnaire results have demonstrated that SIGMA support and advice is predominantly demand-driven, which underlines SIGMA's support of potential stakeholder ownership. A significant majority of SIGMA collaboration is initiated by stakeholders and it is quite common that project ideas emerge from previous or ongoing dialogue with SIGMA peers. In general, SIGMA beneficiaries view the scope and results of SIGMA collaboration very favourably, with more than half of the respondents qualifying them as excellent. Yet while adequately addressing stakeholder demands, SIGMA advice can be occasionally challenged by political and cultural practices, which, in some cases as illustrated below, can provide opportunities for learning and dialogue on established practices and possibilities for change.

The length and frequency of SIGMA missions are reviewed more critically, but field findings have underlined that the ongoing nature of SIGMA collaboration is highly valued by a large number of stakeholders.

Field meetings with beneficiaries have revealed that SIGMA advice and support are by and large perceived as targeted and technically sound, yet the degree of adequacy may sometimes be questioned as it is felt that given solutions do not always take optimal account of existing country capacities and traditions. This does not negatively affect SIGMA's respect of stakeholders' needs but it touches on the process of learning and stakeholders' interpretation of advice that, in a first instance, would seem to contradict established culture and procedures. These field findings are confirmed by the comparative percentage of beneficiary positive replies in Q1 (QB3) on the applicability of SIGMA support to country-specific parameters.

As such, support provided to the TGNA was valuable yet the prescription of fostering a consensual approach ran counter to Turkey's political culture. Likewise, the proposal for having the chairmanship of the TGNA Standing Committees be granted to the opposition party was not always understood politically. The internal audit coordination board in the Turkish Ministry of Finance (MOF) was recommended to be headed by a private sector representative but this was judged inopportune. Recommendations on the thorny issue of delineating internal and external audit were perceived as being too Euro-centric.

Also, stakeholders sometimes expect a closer involvement in the technical implementation of given SIGMA support, especially if the latter is judged highly relevant, e.g. in the case of the Montenegrin Human Resources Management Authority (HRMA), so as to strengthen ownership. Similarly, it was considered that Montenegro's availability of good practice in the preparation of new civil service legislation should have been investigated more fully to potentially optimise relevance.

Relevant questionnaire reactions from respondents are presented in the tables below.

---

<sup>6</sup> The expression "beneficiaries' demands" seems more relevant than "beneficiaries' needs". However, the ToR used the word "needs".

Q1 (QB1) asked stakeholders to indicate whether their institution had requested SIGMA support and advice; the outcome is shown below.

**Table 4.7 – Questionnaire demand-driven dimension SIGMA**

Topics Answer	Legal Framework, Civil Service and Justice		Financial Control and External Audit		Public Procurement		Policy- making		TOTAL	
	Nb	%	Nb	%	Nb	%	Nb	%	Nb	%
Yes, by our institution	19	90%	11	78%	21	91%	3	100%	54	89%
No, it was not our initiative	2	10%	3	22%	2	9%	-		7	11%
	21	100	14	100	23	100	3	100	61	100%

Total: 61 Project Definition Sheets

Nearly 90% of all requests come from SIGMA beneficiaries themselves; this percentage is roughly similar for all SIGMA work areas.

Q1 (QB2) asked SIGMA beneficiaries whether projects responded to their needs.

**Table 4.8 – Questionnaire SIGMA needs response**

	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Total
With regard to the scope of the projects	61%	30%	9%	-	100%
With regard to the results achieved	59%	31	9%	1%	100%
With regard to the frequency of the SIGMA missions	53%	13	26	6%	100%
With regard to the length of the SIGMA missions	48%	26%	20	6%	100%
Total	55%	25%	16%	3% <sup>7</sup>	

Total: 61 Project Definition Sheets

A significant share of SIGMA beneficiaries, 80%, shown above, specify that the projects are excellent or good and correspond to their needs mainly “with regard to the results achieved” and less so “with regard to the length of the SIGMA mission”, often perceived as too short.

The demand-driven dimension of SIGMA is undeniable yet it should be borne in mind that SIGMA first reviews and evaluates the need for an activity in the context of overall reform. The outcome is then validated or not by the SIGMA beneficiary.

<sup>7</sup> These figures refer to two respondents from Turkey.

**EQ4: How applicable do beneficiaries find the advice and support provided by SIGMA?**

Field and questionnaire findings confirm the positive role played by SIGMA to help stakeholders meet specific EU requirements with regard to the accession process. Stakeholders' perceptions of SIGMA relevance to the *Acquis* are positive, as shown by questionnaire findings in this section. This was validated by field interviews which confirmed that the relevance of SIGMA support to PAR policy areas such as public finance and public procurement, which have been subject to chapter negotiations in selected countries, is perceived as high. Respondent data indicated that SIGMA applicability to national specificities could be improved, however, and this has been confirmed by field findings.

EUD perceptions of SIGMA are positive and similar to those of beneficiaries. In general, the SIGMA project scope and the achievement of outcomes are highly appreciated. At the same time, EUDs express concern with regards to the time management of expert and peer missions, whilst recognising that the frequency and duration of missions are logistically challenging, both in terms of planning and implementation.

The number of participants to SIGMA conferences and seminars from the Western Balkans and Turkey amounted to **5,667 persons** over 3 years. Study tour participation amounted to 145 persons per year. The exchange of information through brainstorming workshops, symposia and study tours is highly appreciated by stakeholders who are generated by multi-country interventions.

The applicability and relevance of SIGMA advice and support are planned in advance in detail by SIGMA country coordinator even if the process cannot ensure a fully-fledged scoping due to the relatively new or evolving legal and institutional contexts of stakeholders in the region. In the design of collaboration and support, SIGMA's entry point is at ministerial level; working relations are then at the level of Assistant Minister or State Secretary. The positive perception of SIGMA outputs was expressed by all EUD and by interviewed stakeholders (a mix of high level technicians with Directors of Departments representing the political level of the project).

SIGMA collaboration in the field of public procurement reform, pursued across the region, has produced replicable outcomes which can be shared with other peer stakeholders. Regional conferences are the most suitable platform for this and are appreciated by stakeholders, in areas such as public procurement benchmarks, PIFC and e-government.

In general, a country's accession status has a strong impact on the shape and contents of SIGMA support and advice. Turkey's relationship with SIGMA is very closely linked to its accession status, with strong collaboration following the opening of negotiations (2005) and a significant reduction of activities when Chapters were being closed to negotiation. SIGMA finance and audit support was unanimously considered highly relevant to EU requirements by Turkish stakeholders and SIGMA has been pivotal in supporting public procurement according to EU requirements. In Ankara, it is hoped in fact that a Chapter on public procurement can be opened during the upcoming European Council Presidency.

SIGMA support to PAR-related legislation in Albania has been considered relevant to the country's accession ambitions and SIGMA advice contributed to Croatia's response to meeting demanding

public procurement requirements. Sigma cooperation between the screening and effective opening of the public procurement Chapter (2005- 2008) was considered crucial by Croatian stakeholders.

Sigma is considered to provide high-level conceptual advice to (potential) candidate countries as well as to specialised services of the Commission. For example, Sigma helped design upcoming Technical Assistance programmes (e.g. Kosovo, 2012, PIFC). Outcomes of Sigma practical assistance have been valuable, for instance in the case of supporting Albania in managing a pilot project on PIFC implementation.

Sigma undertook a comprehensive Peer Review of the SAI in Montenegro. Although the outcome was appreciated, the financial independence of State Audit Institution (SAI), a key issue and closing benchmark of accession negotiations, appeared not sufficiently tackled. The report conclusions referred to a hypothetical situation of what "should be" but did not explicitly address specific recommendations to ensure legal certainty.

Sigma has organised two regional seminars on PIFC for Western Balkan countries. These seminars were well received by participants and considered to provide added value.

Q1 (QB3) probed beneficiaries about the applicability of advice and support provided by SIGMA. The received responses confirm the perceived positive correlation between SIGMA support and a country's enlargement agenda.

*Table 4.9 – Questionnaire applicability SIGMA advice*

<b>Applicability of advice provided by SIGMA</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Total</b>
How useful did you find the SIGMA projects with regard to the <b>priorities stated in your national strategies?</b>	72%	10%	18%	-	100%
How useful did you find the SIGMA projects with regard to your country's <b>EU accession process?</b>	74%	22%	4%	-	100%
How well targeted did you find the SIGMA projects to <b>your country, administrative structure and specifics of your institution?</b>	60%	18%	18%	4%	100%
How would you rate the clarity of communication with SIGMA, in particular with regard to the link of the activities with EU integration?	63%	26%	11%	-	100%
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Total: 61 Project Definition Sheets

Generally speaking, 67% of beneficiaries perceive SIGMA support as excellent and 19% as good (total: 86% with a very positive opinion). The highest opinion is with regard to the EU accession process and to the priorities stated in their national strategy. The "very relative" weakest point is related to the link to the country, administrative structure and specifics of their institutions (however, 60% found the SIGMA advice and support applicable to their country).

Questionnaire findings have confirmed that SIGMA collaboration is relevant to accession priorities and improved institutional performance. Firstly, an open question Q1 (Q7) asked the beneficiaries which of the priorities listed in the Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) have been addressed in their SIGMA projects. The answers, compiled below, provide a fairly representative overview of relevant priority issues.

Table 4.10 – Questionnaire relevance SIGMA support to accession process

<p><b>MONTENEGRO</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Copenhagen criteria pertaining to the civil service</li> <li>2. Recommendations for the EU Enlargement Strategy</li> </ol>
<p><b>ALBANIA</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure the compatibility of Albania's legal framework with the EU <i>acquis</i>.</li> <li>2. Further strengthen the administrative capacity of the Public Procurement Agency.</li> <li>3. Administrative capacity building in Public Procurement Commission.</li> </ol>
<p><b>BiH:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement the Strategy of Public Administration Reform from 2006, and ensure that ministries and state institutions are adequately financed, operational and properly equipped, especially in terms of facilities and staff.</li> <li>2. Fight against corruption.</li> <li>3. SAA – Stabilisation and Association Agreement.</li> <li>4. Harmonisation of EU legislation with national legislation pertaining to public procurement.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Croatia:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adoption and implementation of the <i>acquis</i>; reform of public administration, budgetary transparency and management of public debt, the fight against corruption.</li> <li>2. Ensure that an effective and transparent public procurement regime becomes fully operational and adopt the necessary implementing regulations.</li> <li>3. Improve the functioning of the public administration.</li> </ol>
<p><b>FYROM:</b></p> <p>Effective and transparent public procurement regime</p>
<p><b>SERBIA:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further strengthen European integration capacity within the public administration, embedding the necessary structures within line ministries and throughout government, and improve cooperation mechanisms with all departments dealing with European integration</li> <li>2. Continue full implementation of civil service and public administration laws, implement measures to develop human resources in the civil service, strengthen the policy-making and coordination capacity of the public administration at government and local levels, establish a centralised payroll system, implement the constitutional provisions relating to decentralisation and ensure the resources for local governments.</li> <li>3. Implement a consistent and effective public procurement regime, ensure the independence of the public procurement bodies, ensure transparent procedures, regardless of the value of the contract concerned, and non-discrimination between Serbian and EU suppliers and strengthen enforcement capacity in this sector.</li> </ol>
<p><b>TURKEY:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Financial internal control</li> <li>2. Institutional development</li> <li>3. Public Procurement reform</li> </ol>

The listing above confirms that SIGMA interventions are relevant to national strategic and EU accession priorities.

Secondly, Q1 (QB6) asked beneficiaries which institutional changes have been implemented as a direct result of SIGMA projects. The answers listed below are diverse but representative of SIGMA's wide scope and underline the importance SIGMA represents in achieved and desired institutional improvements.

**Table 4.11 – Questionnaire SIGMA support to institutional performance**

#### **MONTENEGRO**

1. The SAI of Montenegro will adopt the Strategic Development Plan of the Institution in April this current year. The Senate of State audit institution adopted the strategic goals of the Institution based on the recommendations of the Peer Review done by SIGMA. If Senate adopts the Draft Strategic Development Plan of the Institution, the Institution will do its best to implement recommendations within SIGMA Peer Review in the following five years.
2. Improvement of the HRM system of Montenegro: HR capacity strengthening in the civil service aiming towards a better implementation of the civil service system

#### **BiH:**

Improvements in efficiency and activities of the Republic of Srpska civil service employees due to amendments of legal acts

#### **SERBIA:**

In the HRMS Multi-Annual Plan adopted by the Government of Serbia one of the goals is introduction of Quality Management in the area of selection and recruitment.

#### **TURKEY**

1. Operational Risk Management Unit has been established in General Directorate of Public Finance which is responsible on the debt and receivables of government. By this unit, the operational risks have been followed regularly. With senior management informed of these studies, support the work of the internal control was initiated in the Treasury.
2. Business analysis studies in the debt, receivables and cash management process have been started and the flow diagrams of critical processes for business continuity were created.
3. Works were performed on administrative capacity building of Public Procurement Coordination Unit which was established in 2010 under the Ministry of Finance Directorate General for Budget and Fiscal Control. Currently 5 Experts and 3 Assistant Experts are working under the Head of the Unit.
4. As a result of the new Act on the Administrative Structure of the GNAT, many changes have been done.

Q1 (QB5) asked beneficiaries how many people were trained during the course of a SIGMA project and how many person days of training were delivered.

#### **a) Number of people trained<sup>8</sup>**

From a strictly terminological point of view, the exact wording in this section is 'participant' rather than training or trainee. SIGMA organises brainstorming workshops, conferences, symposium, forum and study tours where people ask questions and exchange information.

Excluding the study tours, the number of participants from all countries was 5,667 persons over 3 years, representing the equivalent of 54,136 person/days. All countries took advantage of this instrument (see tables next page), comprising Turkey (26%), FYROM (19%), Croatia (15%), Montenegro (14%) and Serbia (10%).

<sup>8</sup> Statistics on number of participants per country and per year as well as for the study tours are provided in annex 5

With regard to study tours, the number of participants from all studied countries was 145 persons on 3 years which represents equivalent to 465 person/days. In general terms, the most active work areas as regards SIGMA training comprise civil service, administrative justice and integrity (38%), followed by external audit (36%) and public procurement (18%).

Table 4.12 – Participants to SIGMA training per work area 2009 - 2011

Area Country	Civil Service, Administrative Justice & Integrity	External Audit and Financial Control, Budgeting and Public Expenditure Management	Public Procurement	Policy and Regulatory Systems	Total Per Country/ Area
Albania	185	0	277	0	462
BiH	163	0	55	0	218
Croatia	70	300	305	175	850
FYROM	510	37	505	0	1 052
Kosovo	71	46	99	0	216
Montenegro	494	0	147	42	683
Serbia	361	70	67	0	498
Turkey	0	1 127	83	141	1 351
Multi-Country	21	220	367	0	608
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1 875</b>	<b>1 800</b>	<b>905</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>4 938</b>

#### b) Number of manuals and guidelines drafted / adopted / in use

Q1 (QB5) also requested beneficiaries to indicate the number of manuals and guidelines drafted, adopted and used during the course of their project, between 2009 and 2011. According to the interviewed beneficiaries, 15 manuals and guidelines were drafted of which 12 were adopted and implemented (80%). These comprise:

1. Montenegro: Manual on Implementation of the Law on Civil Servants; guideline on centralised public procurements in the EU.
2. Croatia: Guidelines for the definition of concessions and for the calculation of the contract value; Manual for Legislative Drafting; Public Private Partnership Step by Step guide.
3. Turkey: Manual on Operational Risk Management; the Legislation Handbook for MPs.

Q3 (Q3) asked all EUDs about their perception on the relevance of the SIGMA interventions, which produced the data below.

Table 4.13 – Relevance SIGMA interventions according to EUDs

Topics	Score			
	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
With regard to project scope	37%	63%	-	-
With regard to achieved results	12%	63%	25%	-
With regard to the frequency of SIGMA missions	-	50%	50%	-
With regard to the length of SIGMA missions	-	63%	37%	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>-</b>

---

EUD perceptions of SIGMA relevance are positive and similar to those of beneficiaries, but not without criticism. Staff members of the EUD to Serbia noted that

*“...in general, SIGMA provides high quality advice and expertise. The experts are available for thorough consultations on projects or on policy developments. The Serbian institutions are generally very satisfied with SIGMA assistance, in particular training activities. However, it would be useful to foresee some follow-up to SIGMA activities (e.g. assessment of training; subsequent assistance on policy- law implementation)”.*

The EUD to BiH remarked that

*“SIGMA interventions are frequent and their advantage is the ability to adjust to the needs of beneficiaries and respond to a detailed design for the new process, and then implement it. Time management is their strong side taking into account the effectiveness of their interventions especially in PAR projects. SIGMA has the ability to respond quickly to process and problem variations as detected within the beneficiaries. E.g. SIGMA has been very effective in analysing the public procurement system and addressing its key elements such as the legislative framework, institutional set-up and operational practice. The SIGMA peer review team has followed-up with specific recommendations on improving the institutional and legal aspects of public procurement which is seen as a very weak link in the system to date”.*

EQ5: To what extent are SIGMA activities complementary with other IPA (namely TAIEX, Twinning and regional and national programmes) and donors interventions in support of PAR

SIGMA has been specifically designed to complement the EU's main instruments of support to administrative reform, notably TAIEX and Twinning. Its general complementarity to other instruments is functional and regards purpose and method, with SIGMA allowing rapid and highly targeted support, in contrast to longer term interventions. Unlike TAIEX and Twinning, SIGMA does not exclusively focus on Acquis and accession. SIGMA's relevant 'philosophical' complementarity to other support modalities comes from a horizontal approach to reform and the concern that stakeholders are not overburdened by change. Its approach that sets it apart from traditional TA – potentially longer-term and adaptable according to emerging needs and requirements – makes SIGMA complementary to other EU interventions.

SIGMA, TAIEX and twinning are complementary in terms of input duration and thematic coverage. The overview below was produced by the Estonian Centre for Eastern Partnership (ECEP) in December 2011.

*Table 4.14 Comparison between Twinning, TAIEX and SIGMA*

	<b>Twinning</b>	<b>TAIEX</b>	<b>SIGMA</b>
<b>Duration</b>	1-2 years	1-5 days	1 day to 6 months
<b>Delay before starting</b>	1-2 years	5-6 weeks	1-6 weeks
<b>Areas of activity</b>	Preparation of legislative and institutional reforms, implementation of <i>Acquis</i>		1. PAR (strategy, public services, adm. legal framework, public integrity, policy making) 2. Management of funds (PEMS, PIFC, external audit, anti fraud, public procurement) 3. Improving business environment (better regulation, responsive public service delivery) + Assessment of government system for EC
<b>Best practices in EU members</b>	Implementation of <i>acquis communautaire</i> , best practices in EU member states (EU MS)	PAR, public internal financial control, public procurement (general governance management systems)	
<b>Format</b>	Resident advisor representing 1 to 3 EU MS, plus experts from EU MS	Individual experts from EU member states	Individual experts from OECD, EU member states or other relevant countries
<b>Flexibility</b>	Low	Medium	High

Source : [http://www.eceap.eu/ul/Review\\_No6.pdf](http://www.eceap.eu/ul/Review_No6.pdf)

From a conceptual point of view, we can observe strong synergies between the 3 instruments: all have proven their efficiency during enlargement whilst allowing for a differentiated approach. They may overlap on the ground yet they follow different purposes.

The EU's most advanced instrument for assessment of government systems and PFM system is SIGMA particularly designed to evaluate public administration of accession candidates. SIGMA has different delivery mechanisms - quick mobilisation of expertise, agile implementation and ability to

respond to evolving needs and circumstances on the ground - which give it an edge over other EU instruments. It also has the ability to combine a political dimension with capacity-building and development in the area of public administration, as SIGMA pursues an ongoing dialogue with policy operators. No formal IPA coordination mechanism exists for SIGMA, TAIEX and twinning.

SIGMA is usually able to act in a coordinated and complementary way. Support to concessions and Public Private Partnership (PPP) reform in Serbia was complementary to a twinning intervention led by an association of Danish local authorities supporting public procurement reform, by means of providing input to, rather than leading, a sector strategy development to foster ownership. A key beneficiary from FYROM noted that the

*“... EU needs to continue implementing SIGMA interventions in MK and other Balkan states as complementary to TA and Twinning projects”.*

Questionnaires provided useful additional data on comparison rather than complementarity, below.

Q1 (QB8) asked beneficiaries about their satisfaction with SIGMA in comparison with TAIEX, Twinning and Technical Assistance (TA).

*Table 4.15 Comparative beneficiary satisfaction TAIEX, twinning, TA*

Opinion \ Score	SIGMA is much better	SIGMA is a little better	SIGMA is a little worse	SIGMA is much worse
Adequacy of project scope	42%	42%	16%	-
Achievement of the intended results	38%	54%	8%	-
Improvement of institutional performance	35%	50%	15%	-
Sustainability (=Creating long-lasting effects)	31%	54%	15%	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>36,5%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>13,5</b>	-

Total: 39 respondents

Beneficiaries compare SIGMA very favourably to other instruments and this underlines its added value and effective approach, particularly with regards to perceived achievement of intended results.

Apart from SIGMA and the EU, the most frequent donors active in the field of PAR comprise the Department for International Development (DFID), the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), bilateral aid from the Netherlands, France and Germany, USAID, UNDP, the World Bank and OSCE.

When asked to give a comparative opinion, (Q1 QB9), beneficiaries clearly ranked SIGMA higher in all categories, as shown below.

*Table 4.16 Comparative beneficiary satisfactions other donors*

Opinion \ Score	SIGMA is much better	SIGMA is a little better	SIGMA is a little worse	SIGMA is much worse
Compared to GRANTS of other donors	40%	55%	5%	-
Adequacy of project scope	45%	40%	15%	-
Achievement of the intended results	30%	65%	5%	-
Improvement of institutional performance	40%	40%	20%	-
Sustainability (=Creating long-lasting effects)	40%	50%	10%	-
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>-</b>

Total: 34 respondents

Whilst fewer respondents filled out this part of the questionnaire, responses were by and large positive, scoring an average of 89% for all items (SIGMA is much or little better). In some cases country comments gave useful illustrations. A key stakeholder in BiH noted that

*“...Sigma’s approach is highly appreciated by local stakeholders because they understand complicated administrative structure in BiH better than some other international providers of support”.*

A Croatian beneficiary added that

*“...SIGMA is much more effective compared to other donors in respect to its responsiveness, promptness in providing assistance”.*

EQ6: What is SIGMA's comparative advantage on PAR, as compared to other providers of similar expertise?

Various stakeholders in the region, regardless of PAR and public governance sector, underline SIGMA's agility and rapidity to act and react in real time as the most significant advantage to comparable support from other donors. This sets SIGMA apart from support modalities where preparation and mobilisation time is significantly longer, to the extent that it may negatively affect relevance.

In addition, SIGMA is able to provide face-to-face dialogue and support from peer to peer, which is considered an unequalled advantage in the donor-intensive region that is the Western Balkans and Turkey. Questionnaire data confirms these trends and shows perceptions of a stronger performance of SIGMA yet this is judged quite differently per PAR work area.

A large majority of questionnaire beneficiary and EUD respondents, exceeding 75%, perceive SIGMA interventions as significantly or moderately more efficient, more effective, and as having a potential impact and sustainability compared to other donors supporting similar activities. Beneficiaries rank SIGMA's comparative efficiency and sustainability the highest.

SIGMA's method for collaboration is significantly different from other donor modalities. The pursuit of long-term relationships with institutional stakeholders provides it with a strategic advantage, as the mobilisation time of staff and expertise time is reduced to a minimum. The provision of intellectual input to the reform process - focusing on instrumental rather than managerial improvements - allows SIGMA to build good working relations with stakeholders, on an equal footing, by exposing the latter to fellow peers and practitioners. Often, SIGMA collaboration is conceived as follow up to previous support and this also makes it distinguishable from traditional technical assistance, which often suffers from discontinuity and incomplete outcomes and results.

Continuity of support sets SIGMA apart from most other donor modalities, yet this does not always lead to a sufficient degree of political ownership and commitment to see through a given reform measure. A case in point was SIGMA's support to the delineation of inspection and internal audit, which suffered from (unexpected) politicisation and this affected the collaboration momentum.

SIGMA expertise, through dialogue and face-to-face contacts and exchange, can sometimes overcome contradicting technical interpretations or understandings engendered by legal and institutional reform.

As such, the SAI of BiH was introduced to the purpose and objectives of an audit report, an independent tool which should stand above political pressurisation. In Turkey, as well as elsewhere in the region, SIGMA contributed to a better understanding of audit and inspection, in the context of drafting legal provisions and Chapter 32. The Turkish Parliament stakeholders used the SIGMA Peer Review in defence of controversial changes such as standardised entry exams for administrative employees, detailed job descriptions, staff capacity strengthening of standing Committees and training of MP Assistants in legislative and oversight processes (a five-week training programme has been launched recently).

SIGMA expertise is sometimes able to provide a useful middle ground, to overcome technical or cultural stumbling blocks. This was illustrated by the discussion on internal control and SAI between

---

the Serbian Parliament and the MOF, a contentious issue across the region. In the case of launching an operational risk management in the Turkish Treasury, which incidentally relies more on (EU) best practice than adhering to specific accession requirements, limiting cultural interpretations were overcome with the input from SIGMA. The reference to a so-called 'error report', considered potentially harmful to the work of colleagues, was rephrased to 'incident report'. On the other hand, national stakeholders can sometimes disagree about strategic follow up and this is, ultimately, a valuable dynamic. As such, a discussion is currently ongoing between Albanian finance and administration authorities on the organisation of the policy, regulatory and operational departments in the overall architecture of PAR.

As an institutionalised programme, SIGMA enjoys positive recognition and this facilitates contacts and collaboration on the ground. Advice and support can be continuous and with a rapid deployment of expertise, this allows SIGMA to act coherently, in real time. Stakeholders often perceive SIGMA advice as being holistic, taking account of the sector and country's wider and specific requirements and circumstances, in contrast to traditional technical assistance, which tends to focus on vertical needs first and foremost. Yet SIGMA's technical repercussions of advice are not automatically accepted at face value and an exchange of ideas with stakeholders can result in a compromise, ultimately ensuring ownership.

In Turkey, SIGMA's added value has been occasionally compromised by a stalling reform process and a declining interest in EU accession matters from Turkish stakeholders. This is significant as EU accession remains a potentially important motivating factor for pursuing reform here and elsewhere in the region.

Q2 was completed by 27 beneficiaries from all countries in the Western Balkan region and Turkey. Completed questionnaires cover 44 projects which focus on PAR strategy, administrative legal framework and administrative justice and public procurement. A number of beneficiaries choose not to fill out or complete Q2, as they claimed feeling uncomfortable with comparing SIGMA and other donors. One respondent, the Turkish Ministry of EU Affairs, explained:

*"I do not want to compare SIGMA with other donors because support of different donors may fill in the different types of needs in the same subject. All donors have different procedures for application and implementation. We decide on the donor depending on the type of need. If we need urgent action we avoid long application and implementation procedures and we select SIGMA. If we need long term or big project with more than one component than we may tolerate some bureaucracy".*

Q2 (Q2.1 BEN) asked beneficiaries to classify efficiency and effectiveness of SIGMA support to PAR as compared to other donors supporting similar activities.

Table 4.17 Comparative SIGMA efficiency - beneficiaries

Sub work area	SIGMA significantly more efficient	SIGMA moderately more efficient	SIGMA moderately less efficient	SIGMA significantly less efficient*
Public administration reform strategy	37%	53	10%	-
Public service	20%	70%	10%	-
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice	50%	36%	7%	7%
Public Integrity System	10%	80%	-	10%
Policy making and coordination	33%	58%	9%	-
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3%</b>

\* 2 respondents from Turkey

90% of respondents perceive SIGMA as significantly or moderately more efficient as compared to other donors supporting similar activities in public administration reform. Two respondents from Turkey perceived SIGMA as significantly less efficient.

Table 4.18 Comparative SIGMA effectiveness - beneficiaries

Sub work area	SIGMA significantly more effective	SIGMA moderately more effective	SIGMA moderately less effective	SIGMA significantly less effective*
Public administration reform strategy	59%	30%	11%	
Public service	22%	67%	11%	
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice	58%	25%	8,5%	8,5%
Public Integrity System	10%	70%	10%	10%
Policy making and coordination	36%	55%	9%	
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3%</b>

\* 2 respondents from Turkey

87% of respondents perceive SIGMA as significantly or moderately more effective as compared to other donors supporting similar activities in public administration reform. Two respondents from Turkey perceived SIGMA as significantly less efficient.

Table 4.19 Comparative SIGMA impact - beneficiaries

Sub work area	SIGMA significantly more (potential) impact	SIGMA moderately more (potential) impact	SIGMA moderately less (potential) impact	SIGMA significantly less (potential) impact*
Public administration reform strategy	59%	30%	11%	-
Public service	38%	50%	12%	-
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice	62%	23%	7,5%	7,5%
Public Integrity System	20%	50%	20%	10%
Policy making and coordination	50%	25	25%	-
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>3%</b>

\* 2 respondents from Turkey

82% of respondents perceive SIGMA as having significantly or moderately more (potential) impact as

compared to other donors supporting similar activities in public administration reform.  
2 respondents from Turkey perceived SIGMA as significantly less efficient.

*Table 4.20 Comparative SIGMA sustainability - beneficiaries*

(POTENTIAL) SUSTAINABILITY SCORE Sub work area	SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability	SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability	SIGMA moderately less (potential) sustainability	SIGMA significantly less (potential) sustainability
Public administration reform strategy	35%	65%		-
Public service	29%	57%	14%	-
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice	46%	36	18%	-
Public Integrity System	13%	50%	37%	-
Policy making and coordination	46%	36%	18%	-
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>-</b>

83% of respondents perceive SIGMA as having significantly or moderately more (potential) sustainability as compared to other donors supporting similar activities in PAR.

Q3 (Q6.1 EUD) asked EUDs in the region about their perceptions of the quality of SIGMA interventions in PAR as compared to other donors supporting similar activities.

*Table 4.21 Comparative SIGMA efficiency -EUDs*

EFFICIENCY SCORE PAR domain	SIGMA significantly more efficient	SIGMA moderately more efficient	SIGMA moderately less efficient	SIGMA significantly less efficient
Public administration reform strategy	28%	44%	28%	-
Public service	25%	75%	-	-
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice	28%	44%	28%	-
Public Integrity System	50%	25%	25%	-
Policy making and coordination	40%	60%	-	-
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>-</b>

82% of persons in charge of SIGMA in EUD found that SIGMA is significantly or moderately more efficient compared to other donors supporting similar activities which is similar to beneficiaries' perception.

Table 4.22 Comparative SIGMA effectiveness -EUDs

<b>EFFECTIVENESS SCORE</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less effective</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less effective</b>
<b>PAR domain</b>				
Public administration reform strategy	28%	58%	14%	-
Public service	75%	25%	-	-
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice	20%	60%	20%	-
Public Integrity System	66%	-	33%	-
Policy making and coordination	60%	20%	20%	-
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>-</b>

The perception of effectiveness with 84% of positive perception is similar to efficiency and to beneficiaries' perception in this field.

Table 4.23 Comparative SIGMA impact -EUDs

<b>(POTENTIAL) IMPACT SCORE</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less (potential) impact</b>
<b>PAR domain</b>				
Public administration reform strategy	14%	43%	28%	-
Public service	33%	67%	-	-
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice	40%	20%	40%	-
Public Integrity System	67%	-	33%	-
Policy making and coordination	50%	25%	25%	-
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>-</b>

Impact of SIGMA interventions has a little lower pitch with 72% of respondents perceiving it positively.

Table 4.24 Comparative SIGMA sustainability -EUDs

<b>(POTENTIAL) SUSTAINABILITY SCORE</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less (potential) sustainability</b>
<b>PAR domain</b>				
Public administration reform strategy	40%	40%	20%	-
Public service	33%	66%	-	-
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice	25%	50%	25%	-
Public Integrity System	100%	-	-	-
Policy making and coordination	66%	33%	-	-
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>-</b>

88% of persons in charge of SIGMA in EUDs found that SIGMA is significantly or moderately more sustainable compared to other donors supporting similar activities which is similar to beneficiaries' perception. The EUD to FYROM indicated that sustainability is difficult to judge as this would mainly depend on national authorities and their efforts to take on board, pursue and implement proposals and recommendations for reform across all sectors.

**EQ7: To what extent have the institutional reforms supported by SIGMA been implemented? Are there mechanisms in place to assess the impact of these reforms in terms of improved institutional performance?**

At the level of PDS, SIGMA results are predominantly defined as outcomes and this stops short of describing the expectation of a wider and potentially sustainable impact of given input and advice. The achievement of SIGMA results is difficult to track and measure, as the description of objectives and intended results does not always follow a linear approach. Often, individual project objectives and results are defined in relation to a wider process hierarchy which involves multiple SIGMA interventions. This is a sound approach, justified by the process that is PAR, but a conceptual, documented and updated overview of targeted SIGMA support in its larger overall strategic context is lacking. At the level of EUDs, there is no formal mechanism or regular modality in place to assess SIGMA interventions.

Field findings have confirmed the realisation of concrete and important outputs, at the policy and institutional levels. A number of laws, bylaws and strategies which benefitted from direct or indirect SIGMA support have been fully or partly implemented, according to beneficiaries. This is an important field finding which confirms SIGMA's potential that a degree of impact can be achieved where and when a causal link can be established.

Detailed findings relevant to EQ7 are presented below. A first section provides a narrative of country examples of SIGMA support to reform and outcomes. A second section gives details and interpretation of questionnaire data on SIGMA input to legal acts and strategies (table 4.25), SIGMA follow up (4.26) and impact assessment modalities used by Commission staff (4.27).

### **Narrative of country examples of SIGMA support to reform and outcomes**

#### **Turkey**

The leverage and capacity of SIGMA to comprehensively achieve intended results in Turkey have been challenged in recent years as the commitment to PAR lost momentum and reform became increasingly politicised. Despite this, achievements have been made. SIGMA's ambitions for its collaboration with Turkish stakeholders took account of the fact that the country's civil service is advanced yet in need of democratisation and modernisation, rather than an overhaul.

SIGMA desk inputs were provided to define a Turkish anti-corruption strategy, to boost the articulation of priorities and targets. Today, an improved draft strategy is in place which reflects SIGMA-inspired recommendations on political and administrative integrity and priorities and targets are better and more concretely defined. At the same time, the strategy's implementation is held up by pending constitutional reform and Sigma's input is pivotal yet risks being somewhat insulated, when considered in the wider political context.

Also, SIGMA advice on the separation of regulatory and review functions in public procurement impacted the organisation of the Public Procurement Agency (PPA). The Agency now holds a regulatory department and the entire reorganisation involved approximately 80 staff members. Momentum has slowed however, as uncertainty prevails over the possible opening of a public procurement Chapter and a new draft PP law is blocked.

Similarly, support provided to the Ministry of Finance (MOF) to enhance ownership and

development of inspection and audit functions - in line with EU alignment requirements according to the Chapter 32 – has produced important outcomes, such as the preparation and agreement of a revamped Internal Audit Co-ordination Board (IACB) and a strengthened Central Harmonisation Unit (CHU). An unexpected politicisation of financial management, however, has immobilised authorities preventing them from taking essential steps forward. Yet outcomes have been judged useful by direct stakeholders as a participatory review of possible inspection and audit models facilitated an essential understanding and ownership of the key issues at hand.

Strengthening operations and functions of the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA), by means of supporting a peer review process, has allowed useful progress on staff management and rules of procedures. A comprehensive exchange of ideas with key stakeholder participants defined the collaboration method. SIGMA provided inputs to the Assembly's Act on Structural Organisation (December 2011) and the Peer Review has been concretely used to pursue change, such as the standardization of examinations for administrative staff, the capacity strengthening of standing Committees with the recruitment of 50 assistant legislative experts, enhanced job descriptions and the undertaking of first steps to launch a protocol between the Assembly and Ankara University to establish a legislative academy.

Overall, the TGNA has opened itself to new ideas, witnessed by its readiness for self assessment and procedural change and efficiency. There is greater awareness that rendering MPs more accessible to constituencies requires an increased staff capacity and that Parliamentary Assistants should be trained and educated in legal drafting techniques and oversight processes; there is now a recently launched five-week training and education programme.

The choice of providing advice to the Turkish Parliament was strategic, as it plays an instrumental role in public governance. The above achievements have leveraged impact and are potentially sustainable. Despite a lacking overarching reform stimulus, SIGMA has been able to provide support to a process which directly and indirectly facilitates wider change, if pursued and combined with other key reform elements. In the case of support to the Assembly, strengthening structures and procedures has introduced Turkish stakeholders to discussing change, which is a significant and unique consensual achievement that lends itself well to duplication into a wider public spectrum.

### **Albania**

Implementation support has been provided by SIGMA to the Albanian Strategy for Public Administration (September 2009), which has allowed a lengthy and useful participatory and multilateral dialogue with stakeholders that includes civil society, yet a political consensus is lacking to take the new civil service law (and a comprehensive PAR-related package of laws) forward, in a decisive manner. The prospect for effective reform has highlighted the importance of fostering a consensual approach but this does not reach the implementation level, to the detriment of SIGMA's potential capacity to achieve results. At the same time, draft laws, as a SIGMA outcome, provide a potential basis for future change, despite the country's political stalemate.

SIGMA supported the launch of a new law on general administrative procedures, a process which is technically complete and is providing a legal framework for administrative procedures according to EU requirements. Additional inputs from SIGMA were requested to prepare implementation modalities for the new law. At the same time, however, the draft law encountered parliamentary gridlock and as a result, it was shelved. Similarly, support to the preparation of a unitary legal package comprising various civil service and public administration laws will also be subject to a parliamentary vote later on this year. In collaboration with the Department of Public Administration (DOPA), Sigma facilitated a 'bipartisan' dialogue on the new draft civil service law and this is preparing the ground for impact.

---

The political polarisation jeopardises the laws' final adoption yet SIGMA has been able to achieve results, such as the effective improvement of civil service legislation, by means of useful inputs to the civil service policy paper and inclusive multi-stakeholder dialogue and consultation. Attaining consolidated outcomes and results are put at risk by the lack of bipartisan political commitment.

Support from SIGMA to Financial Management and Control (FMC) focused on launching a training strategy and a five-year implementation plan. The latter allowed the MOF stakeholders to be part of an intensive, face-to-face learning exercise with regard to e.g. self assessment and accountability, areas which have high impact potential in terms of working methods and modalities. Provisions of the FMC law and structures were reviewed in a participatory way and this has led stakeholders to adopt a strategic approach to change.

SIGMA provided best practice models for the establishment of the Public Procurement Commission (PPC) and ongoing support has been provided to public procurement review mechanisms and assessment. Outcomes of this support are (still) contributing to realising intended results, as part of a longer term process.

### **Croatia**

SIGMA provided support to the MOF in strengthening its financial control framework. Agreed objectives and results with regard to financial auditor training and the preparation of capital budgeting and financial inspection methodology were not fully attained due to a shift in prioritisation and lacking staff capacities of the stakeholder. Yet ongoing collaboration with SIGMA has allowed increased stakeholder awareness and understanding of PIFC (by means of updating the policy paper) and audit modalities and structures with regard to EU fund management.

As the country's main counterpart in PIFC, SIGMA provided an essential connection with the EU context and was positively perceived as giving direction and support to the preparation of a legal framework and development of strategic orientations and understanding of financial management concepts. Problems and bottlenecks were identified and discussed by means of a peer review and this allowed the MOF stakeholders to acknowledge that PIFC should be an integral part of an overall strategic framework 2009 – 2011. Today, the importance of fiscal responsibility is recognised by a wider spectrum of stakeholders and it is fair to say that PIFC is part of the country's reform process. It is acknowledged that SIGMA's work has made a tangible contribution to this, thereby achieving impact and laying the foundation for sustainable change.

The launch of Croatia's National Anti-Fraud Strategy (January 2010), prepared with significant SIGMA input, was highly relevant to EU accession requirements. This benchmark, closely linked to the country's obligation to establish an Anti-Fraud Coordination Structure (AFCOS), provided SIGMA with a favourable context to its potential of achieving intended results.

SIGMA's support to public procurement (PP) in Croatia, part of an ongoing effort focusing on legislative and capacity strengthening in accordance with EU accession Chapter 5, capitalised on the growing functionality and institutional system in place, which was reorganised from scratch. This is a strongly favourable setting for achieving results and is further reinforced by the presence of a relevant, structured *Acquis*. With the Ministry of Economy (MOE) as lead stakeholder in PP, the Public Private Partnership (PPP) Agency became operational and a PP Review Law was adopted by Parliament. SIGMA advice was considered valuable during the screening and opening of the PP Chapter, with input to the PP strategy and institutional provisions, modeled on EU MS practices and the definition of a legal framework in accordance with EU Directives.

Thus SIGMA collaboration proved essential in helping Croatia meet some of the stringent provisions of Chapter 5, including the development of a PP system strategy and the establishment of an elaborate institutional set up. Much valued support was provided by means of 'holding hands' and engaging in face-to-face interaction and direct dialogue. This has produced essential law-drafting capacities and best practice and practitioners sharing in highly specific or complex issues, such as defense procurement. PP practice in Croatia has been disseminated in the region thereby exploiting its replication potential to the fullest.

A reinforcing factor of SIGMA's potential to achieve results is the perception of stakeholders that SIGMA is providing an opportunity for collaboration rather than bilateral support, and this enhances the sense of ownership and consequently, impact potential. In the case of PP, stakeholders gained confidence in acknowledging and asking for external support. This became part of a learning process which generated its own replication, as Croatian PP authorities shared lessons learned with peer stakeholders from countries in the region.

The adoption and starting implementation of Croatia's Law on General Administrative Procedures (LGAP) was a specifically foreseen outcome which SIGMA helped to materialise in full. The preparation of a new law on civil service pay proved politically inopportune as it relates to collective bargaining, however, and its pursuit was abandoned. SIGMA's general input was given to various aspects of the country's public administration and civil service reform from 2008 onwards. A revision mechanism was foreseen and a new strategy 2012 – 2020 is to be prepared that coincides with the timing expected to have an EU structural funds financial framework in place.

The adopted reform strategy is a significant improvement to the initial draft, as SIGMA persuaded Croatian stakeholders that it should reflect citizens' needs and interests, thereby adopting a bottom up rather than top down approach. For the Croatian stakeholders, this represented a novel approach and the resulting strategy bears proof to an achieved result.

### **Montenegro**

The strengthening of training capacities at the country's Human Resource Management Agency (HRMA), one of four executive authorities in the reformed Montenegrin institutional landscape, aimed at boosting internal training skills and delivery for the country's civil service. Planned outcomes were nearly achieved, with only 20% fewer trainers trained (target: 100), yet, reportedly, all are operative today.

SIGMA's contribution to the HRMA was well placed in its larger framework of collaboration, including the definition of a country PAR strategy, which comprised merit-based recruitment, now HRMA's area of competence. Furthermore, a functional review of the authority is foreseen. These initiatives provide a good ground for SIGMA results, as they are comprehensive and complementary.

Boosting the interface between EU integration and PAR was a specific dimension that was tackled by SIGMA's collaboration to establish a PAR strategy (March 2011). This comprised targeted activities such as the review of the Civil Service Law and the drafting of a policy paper on civil service reforms (also with HRMA, approved March 2011), and a review of the draft Law on Civil Servants and State Employees (adopted July 2011). These are concrete outcomes but their effective impact of implementation is unknown.

At the same time, SIGMA's multi-collaborative effort in PAR is not free from potential contradictions, which can hamper or diminish the achievement of outcomes and results. In the case of projected support to the Law on Administrative Procedures (LGAP), as part of an overall effort to strengthen the country's general legal administrative framework according to EU expectations, collaboration

proved to be inopportune, as national stakeholders perceived the preparation of this law to be incompatible with the ongoing preparation of a general PAR Strategy 2011 – 2016.

Support to Montenegro's Government Council for PAR was meant to launch an inclusive process whereby a wide spectrum of national stakeholders would lead efforts in defining a reform action plan. A strategy was developed and adopted by Government (June 2010), which addresses the main areas of public governance, linked to the EU accession process.

SIGMA's political intelligence observed a lacking commitment to the enforcement of the strategy however, as no inter-ministerial coordination was provided as follow up. For SIGMA, operating in the EU accession context can carry the risk of the national stakeholder wanting to progress on a pro forma basis, in view of expedient (but not substantial) adherence to EU accession requirements.

In contrast, SIGMA's collaboration with the State Audit Institution (SAI) on the launch of a Peer Review, allowed for a participatory, bottom up approach, as the SAI undertook an internal evaluation in parallel, thus ensuring that own findings and priorities became part of the overall exercise.

**Details and interpretation of questionnaire data on SIGMA input to legal acts and strategies**

Beneficiaries were asked which legal acts and strategies had been drafted as a direct result of these SIGMA projects, in Q1 (Q4 BEN). On the basis of information provided by individual SIGMA beneficiary respondents, more than half of the listed new laws, bylaws and strategies have been fully implemented. This confirms that SIGMA can achieve impact.

*Table 4.25 Legal acts and strategies as direct result of SIGMA*

Result Topics	Drafted	Adopted	Fully implemented	Partly implemented	Examples of legal acts
<b>New laws</b>	16	13	10	3	<p><b>Montenegro:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Law on Civil Servants 2011</li> <li>2. Law on Public Procurement was drafted (No.42/11). As a result of direct communication with SIGMA, their comments have been accordingly incorporated in the final text of this Law.</li> </ol> <p><b>Albania:</b> The Bill “on Administrative Courts” (2008) The new Code on Administrative Procedures</p> <p><b>BiH:</b> Amendments to the Law on Civil Servants</p> <p><b>Croatia:</b> 1. Concessions Law (OG 125/08) and harmonisation of sectoral legislation on concessions 2. Pre-draft of the Law on Regulatory Impact Assessment 3. New Public Procurement Act (OG 90/2011 4. Public Private Partnership Act</p> <p><b>Kosovo:</b> Law on Administrative Procedure</p> <p><b>Turkey:</b> Law no.6253 on the Administrative Organisation of the Turkish Grand National Assembly. Adopted on December 1, 2011</p>

<b>Amendment of existing laws</b>	8	6	2	4	<p><b>Montenegro</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amendments of the Law on State Audit Institution</li> <li>2. Law on Civil Servants 2004</li> </ol> <p><b>Croatia:</b> Amendments to the Public Procurement Act (OG 125/08)</p> <p><b>Serbia:</b> Amendments on the Law on Public Procurement</p> <p><b>Turkey</b> .Draft Amendments on the Law No:5018 Regarding the Restructuring of the Internal Audit Coordination Board IACB Act on the Human Rights Inquiry Committee Act on the Right to Petition</p>
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	--

<b>New bylaws</b>	11	8	6	2	<p><b>Montenegro :</b> By-law on the criteria and mode for assessment of civil service candidates 2012</p> <p><b>BiH:</b> The rulebook on unique rules and criteria for public competition process for employment of civil servants (in relation to the Law on Civil Servants)</p> <p><b>Croatia:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regulation on the internal organization of the State Office for the Central Public Procurement (Official Gazette 031/2012)</li> <li>2. Subordinate legislation based on previous Public Procurement Act (OG 110/07, 125/08)</li> <li>3. Regulation on the Criteria for Assessment and Approval of the PPP Projects</li> <li>4. Regulation on the Content of PPP Contract</li> <li>5. Regulation on the Supervision of Implementation of PPP projects</li> </ol>
<b>Amendment of existing bylaws</b>	1	1	1		<p><b>Croatia:</b> Regulation on amendments to the regulation on the Office for Central Public Procurement of the Government of the Republic of Croatia (Official Gazette 78/10)</p>
<b>Strategies</b>	19	15	11	4	<p><b>MONTENEGRO</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strategic Development Plan of the State Audit for 2012-2017</li> <li>2. Montenegro PAR Strategy (AURUM) 2010-2014</li> <li>3. Strategy for Development of a Public Procurement System in Montenegro for the period 2011-2015</li> </ol> <p><b>BiH:</b> Strategic Development Plan of SAI (Supreme Audit Institution) for BiH, Republika Srpska and the Federation</p> <p><b>CROATIA:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "National anti-fraud strategy for the protection of the EU financial interests in the Republic of Croatia for the period of 2010 – 2012" and its Action plan</li> <li>2. Pre-draft of the Regulatory Impact Assessment Strategy with an Action Plan</li> <li>3. Strategy for the Development of the Public Procurement System in the Republic of Croatia</li> <li>4. Audit strategy per component</li> <li>5. Strategic Framework for the Development of the PPP in Croatia</li> </ol> <p><b>KOSOVO:</b> PAR Strategy was revised as a result of SIGMA intervention</p> <p><b>SERBIA:</b> Strategy on Development of Public Procurement System in Serbia</p> <p><b>TURKEY:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ National Public Procurement Strategy Paper – 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft</li> <li>➤ The existing Strategic Plan of the GNAT will be revised.</li> <li>➤ Anti Corruption Strategy</li> </ul>

In Q1, beneficiaries were asked if “a follow-up project on the same (or on a closely related) topic” was undertaken. (This question was on follow up and not on assessment because beneficiaries could not be informed about an assessment procedure)

**Table 4.26 Follow up SIGMA**

Topics Answer	Legal Framework, Civil Service and Justice		Financial Control and External Audit		Public Procurement		Policy- making		TOTAL	
	Nb	%	Nb	%	Nb	%	Nb	%	Nb	%
Yes (implemented or under implementation)	13	62%	-	-	9	39%	-	-	22	36%
Yes (waiting for approval)	-	-	2	14%	3	13%	-	-	5	8%
No follow-up	8	38%	12	86%	11	48%	3	100%	34	56%
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100%</b>

Total: 61 Project Definition Sheets

No follow up was reported for more than half of those projects subject to questionnaire responses; the sub-sector on legal framework, civil service and administrative justice saw the highest percentage, i.e. 62%.

EUD staff was asked to identify impact assessment modalities of SIGMA interventions in Q3 (Q EUD 7).

**Table 4.27 Impact assessment modalities**

	Existence of SIGMA impact assessment modalities		Frequency
Formal	40%	Expost written assessments	Regular
	40%	Case-by-case evaluations	Regular
	50%	Official oral and/or written debriefing	2/3 regular 1/3 irregular
	25%	Templated and independent monitoring and evaluation (M&E) reports	Regular
	25%	Field visit missions SIGMA interventions	Regular
Informal	85%	Beneficiary debriefings	Regular
	100%	Ongoing contacts	1/2 regular 1/2 irregular
	100%	Third party feedback	3/4 regular 1/4 irregular
	100%	Ad hoc feedback	3/4 regular 1/4 irregular

Answers from 7 EUD by multiple choice

The answers to this question demonstrate that there is no formal mechanism in place at the EUD level to assess the SIGMA interventions. It is done informally and not on a regular basis. The EUD to Serbia noted that “... assessment is mainly performed informally, through bilateral contacts between task managers and SIGMA and through informal feedback by the beneficiaries. This doesn't allow a proper follow-up and subsequent planning, and makes it difficult to integrate SIGMA assistance into on-going IPA projects. Besides, follow-up on the actual impact of SIGMA assistance is not structured”.

EQ8: How can the design, programming, implementation, monitoring and reporting of SIGMA interventions be enhanced to improve its efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability?

Design and identification of SIGMA support and advice follow a relatively lengthy and thorough process whereby stakeholders' needs and context are subjected to review, analysis and bilateral dialogue. Priorities are set at a country level and project-specific complementarities to the *Acquis* are reviewed and endorsed by Commission services. A full-fledged and detailed consistency between SIGMA and EC programming is not ensured however and technical gaps can occur.

The planning process of SIGMA collaboration aims at ensuring an optimal strategic dimension with regard to PAR and public governance reform. Yet as the wider political context cannot always be effectively gauged, an intentional flexibility is maintained until the final preparatory stages of collaboration. At the level of PDSs, traditional Logical Frameworks (LFs) are not used.

SIGMA's impact and sustainability are not subject to systematic and comprehensive reporting. Achieved outcomes are documented by means of narrative reports but effects and results are often unconfirmed. Strengthened personal relationships between stakeholders and practitioners are providing platforms for potentially sustainable effects but these are not necessarily investigated, documented or validated.

The monitoring and evaluation of SIGMA support and advice are by and large informal. Information on real time outcomes and lessons learned are most often disseminated orally, by means of ongoing contacts, third part and beneficiary feedback and debriefings (see table 4.27, above). A comprehensive overview is missing however and this represents an information gap that could be possibly addressed by an agreement on strategic forward planning that is regularly updated (see recommendations and intervention logic chart, below).

SIGMA enjoys a certain budgetary autonomy and cost divergences can occur without disrupting collaboration with stakeholders. Information disseminated by means of SIGMA Quarterly and Annual Reports is judged useful and of good quality by nearly all EUDs.

Beneficiary needs are fine tuned during the early stages of the implementation phase, and normally comprise commentaries; module and case design, an organisational assessment of institutional and legal preparedness, adaptation to emerging requirements, awareness, dissemination, stakeholder inclusion and expert backstopping coordination. There is flexibility therefore to respond to needs and circumstances to maximise the usefulness of SIGMA support and collaboration. This is underpinned by the non-binding nature of the PDS, which is in fact not a contractual document and which provides a financial and programming liberty (yet with any change by SIGMA subject to consent of the Commission services). Thus modalities aim at having an implementation method which is optimally responsive to the realities on the ground. These elements have been positively acknowledged by SIGMA beneficiaries during field interviews.

SIGMA's planning and implementation method stands in contrast with traditional technical assistance as the former's impact is particularly process-dependent. Dialogue with stakeholders is pursued after detailed findings and recommendations are tabled. This is normally the strategic

approach adopted for SIGMA's collaboration on sector-specific peer reviews of the various institutional stakeholders, for instance.

Yet outputs can greatly differ according to political and institutional context. Consensus is undermined when stakeholders do not share or accept SIGMA findings, as was the case with the perceived depth of work and procedures of the BiH public procurement review body. The process stalled, further thrown back by the absence of a favourable reform implementation context, and SIGMA recommendations were rejected. SIGMA collaboration generating a political and institutional leverage proved to be too large an obstacle to achieving optimal outcomes and impact, i.e. a longer-term strategic partnership which can foster sustainable change.

In the general context of EU accession, SIGMA's position is often perceived as neutral and this has helped foster trustful relationships with stakeholders on sensitive reform issues. Occasionally national stakeholders perceive EU accession requirements as overly ambitious, yet collaboration with SIGMA, in contrast to twinning for instance, allows peer exchange on an equal footing, facilitating collaboration through confidence-building.

Q3 (Q EUD 8) asked EUD stakeholders to provide feedback on the dissemination and quality of SIGMA Quarterly (QR) and Annual Reports (AR).

*Table 4.28 Dissemination and quality QRs/ARs - EUD*

Score	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<b>Topics</b>				
<b>Dissemination and distribution</b>				
SIGMA QR	14%	72%	14%	-
SIGMA AR	14%	72%	14%	-
<b>Overall quality and contents</b>				
SIGMA QR	33%	33%	33%	-
SIGMA AR	33%	33%	33%	-

Overall, distribution and contents of QRs and ARs are appreciated; this was illustrated by written comments. The EUD to Serbia noted that

*"...the reports are of good quality and very useful for the Delegation. It should be ensured that annual SIGMA reports are received by the Delegation before the drafting of the EC annual Progress Report (or at least at the same time)"<sup>9</sup>.*

The EUD to Kosovo underlined however that

*"...only the mission reports are of a good quality"*

and the EUD to BiH remarked that

*"...the quality of the reports is good both in content and structure. The reports help in developing judgments on specific questions. The reports provide an approximate sense of the information gathering requirements implied by proposed performance indicators. However, the reports need to be more narrative in structure".*

<sup>9</sup> This opinion shows an ignorance of the internal EC business by our interlocutor.



## 5 Conclusions

Questionnaires have allowed SIGMA stakeholders to submit a number of written comments and observations. These are structured and presented below as a first set of ‘own’ conclusions. The team’s general conclusions are presented in section 5.2.

There are in fact no specific contradictions between stakeholder and evaluator opinions. SIGMA beneficiaries operate in national and regional contexts and their specific observations are judged useful and complementary to the wider approach adopted by the evaluators, applied in accordance with the evaluation methodology.

### 5.1 Beneficiaries’ opinions and conclusions: SWOT

In Q1 (questions 10 and 11), beneficiaries were asked to identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) of the SIGMA programme and direct feedback is compiled in table 5.1. This may give useful insights for future SIGMA conceptualisation and programming.

#### Reminder of the SWOT concept as an evaluation method

##### What are strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats?

**Strengths:** Those things that are working well in this programme. The aspects people are proud to talk about.

**Weaknesses:** Those things that have not worked so well.

**Opportunities:** Ideas on how to overcome weaknesses and build on strengths.

**Threats:** The things that constrain or threaten the range of opportunities for change.

*Table 5.1 SWOT – SIGMA beneficiaries*

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although all [...] activities were done after [the] beneficiary’s demand, [these] were not demand-driven, because Sigma first evaluated the actual need for such activities in the context of overall reform patterns and activities.</li> <li>SIGMA has been introducing a regional approach in the Balkan states and Turkey which is a huge advantage due to the possibility of sharing best practices and this gives [SIGMA] an advantage over other donors.</li> <li>SIGMA enables very quick assistance provided in “real time” (no long delays related to programming procedure),</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of information about SIGMA related activities.</li> <li>SIGMA support is liaised to the EU <i>Acquis</i> and what is out of the scope of the <i>Acquis</i> is hardly [...] subject of [SIGMA’s] intervention.</li> <li>Limited scope with regard to working areas (e.g. taxation [not covered])</li> <li>SIGMA could also try to “cover” issues related to IT aspects (e.g. e-tools) in institutions in question.</li> <li>Inability to monitor project implementation in terms of specific activities.</li> <li>Obviously, SIGMA has advantages</li> </ul>

<p>based on an actual needs of beneficiary at [a given] moment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SIGMA experts are not imposing a ready-made solution to the beneficiary but rather work jointly, respecting the specificities of a particular system, on achieving the same goal.</li> <li>• Excellent planning prior to mission start.</li> <li>• Regular annual visits [...]</li> <li>• Engagement of quality experts with extensive experience from specific areas, [who have] great comparative knowledge.</li> <li>• Sigma technical staff is very cooperative and has excellent organizational skills. Experts are very effective and [...] to the point.</li> <li>• The possibility of permanent communication with [an] expert, even [when the] project (PDS) [is completed].</li> <li>• SIGMA experts understand complicated administrative structures better than [certain] other international providers of support.</li> <li>• Comprehensive analysis of the context, proposal of new concepts and their suitability to the national environment.</li> <li>• Translation and interpretation facilities.</li> </ul>	<p>considering the [...] experience of different countries. Moreover, its close relationship with the European Union Commission increases the efficiency of [...] proposals. However, the project activities do not sometimes fulfill the expectations regarding the necessities of the <i>acquis communautaire</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country [visits are too short].</li> <li>• [Limited] budget.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SIGMA has a UNIQUE APPROACH in that [it does] not insist on drafting secondary legislation e.g. by-laws. Rather they allow the beneficiary to draft by-law(s) while SIGMA provides the necessary comments and ultimately improves the quality of the document.</li> <li>• Peer review process reinforces the ownership of reports.</li> <li>• Peer Reviews focus more on the “outcomes/proposals” and provide more concrete, viable and tailor-made solutions for the countries concerned, rather than [commenting on] the “current state of play”, [which] is already</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political constraints: a drafted law elaborated and agreed with peer support, may not be in line with the current agenda of the government...</li> <li>• Language constraints: only few leaders and key staff can work in English. Interpretation, translation and use of national/regional expertise are compulsory.</li> <li>• External experts accompanying [...] SIGMA advisors should not come only from new EU MS, but also and mainly from those which have developed public procurement markets, internal and external audit and similar public administrative structures.</li> </ul>

---

<p>known by the beneficiaries/institutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Advice [is] followed because of the context of accession process to EU (their recommendations are usually being seriously taken into consideration by national governments).</li><li>• Networking meetings [...] are highly appreciated.</li><li>• Of the 4 work areas listed in this report, SIGMA [represents] an institutional memory [which is] useful for [the] EC and EUD.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A risk of divergence could occur when SIGMA is unilaterally developing policy on certain areas/countries, without ensuring policy coherence with DG Budget.</li><li>• If a SIGMA budgetary cut is proposed, the duration of experts' stay in-country [and] the length of workshops and conferences will not be [insufficient to ensure an adequate] sharing of knowledge and experience.</li></ul>
--	--

## 5.2 Evaluators' opinions and conclusions

- A significant majority of stakeholders considers SIGMA input to the reform process to be indispensable and effective. SIGMA peer exchange and face-to-face interaction on legislative and institutional priorities are considered unique attributes in the donor-intensive context of public administration governance strengthening in the Western Balkans and Turkey.
- Stakeholders are exposed to useful learning processes as they collaborate with peers and this approach has had an impact on mindsets and decision-making modalities. This concerns not in the least the cultural and psychological implication of SIGMA beneficiaries opening up to a support process which requires them to question their own context and mentalities. In some cases, stakeholders have expressed a readiness to being increasingly involved in SIGMA collaboration and are keen to ensure that national or local specificities are optimally taken on board.
- Particularly in the framework of ongoing efforts on accession and adherence to the *Acquis*, SIGMA is perceived as providing the possibility for stakeholders to establish a flexible, adaptable modality of collaboration which is not (only) defined in terms of meeting stringent criteria. Thus collaboration with SIGMA is often less formal. This fosters ownership and expedites the achievement of outcomes.
- SIGMA collaboration feeds into a larger (reform) process which is chaotic and unpredictable as it involves multi-layered aspects of society and culture. Advice and support to stakeholders aim at taking into account a horizontal dimension and this is often valued and appreciated, as it increases the chance of impact and sustainability. Vertical ripostes maybe technically adequate but do not always address the entirety of the problem. This holistic approach is considered valuable.
- In general terms, SIGMA delivers a maximal degree of planned outcomes, and impact can often be detected, albeit in abstract terms rather than according to predetermined results. The nature of SIGMA support – largely intellectual which then reflects in improved procedures, modalities and law - does not match the traditional context of project cycle management (PCM), deliverables and quantified results.
- Flexibility is crucial to ensure effective support and this is seen as SIGMA's added value by stakeholders yet it does not sufficiently facilitate responding concretely to whether and which achievements have had results. Given the state of ongoing system and process change in the PAR sector, with the possible exception of Croatia which has reached a level of consolidation, focusing on realising sustainable deliverables would be problematic, if not unrealistic.
- At the same time, whilst SIGMA outcomes are being achieved in line with the OAs, lasting results are often outstanding – or simply not yet visible - due to the inaptitude of the political class to commit to change. This has clearly emerged from field findings as the most significant stumbling block to achieving discernible progress.

---

## 6. Recommendations

- The SIGMA reporting and documentation on support and advice to the Western Balkans and Turkish stakeholders provide an overview of project-specific background, aims and methodology. However, a structured and traceable hierarchy of general and specific objectives and integrated (political) risks, which is currently lacking, would illustrate SIGMA's final expectations and allow it to update and justify developments in terms of achievements and bottlenecks.
- This could be undertaken by means of establishing a SIGMA intervention logic (IL) which represents the programme as a whole, as it is foreseen specifically for the region of the Western Balkans and Turkey. In particular, this would allow links to be developed between aims at OA and PDS level, outcomes and contextual risks. Individual country cases could demonstrate interdependence and national specificities.
- Indicators, both qualitative and quantitative, could be developed but it is recommended that their design is subject to a participatory approach with SIGMA staff. As a pre-condition, it should be determined whether a results-based approach (comprising the definition of/agreement on outputs, outcomes and impact) is desired and feasible. If yes, and where possible, intended SIGMA results should be formulated in the early design phase and project documentation and subject to review, updating and reporting. Attributing results or impact to SIGMA alone may not be possible, however, given the variety of donors active in all complex aspects of the reform process.
- An agreement should be sought between the Commission services in Brussels and the field and SIGMA management whether such an IL would be useful to provide a real time overview of SIGMA's implementation context and realities. An IL could also serve as a framework for discussion (and clarification) of (potential) strategic commonalities between SIGMA and EC PAR and public governance as regards accession. The graph 5.1 below sets out a simplified IL as illustration. This could be the framework for a more detailed strategic mapping for reference to both contracting parties.
- The prioritisation of peer/stakeholder dialogue, at a national or regional level, is considered a crucial modality for achieving impact and awareness. Integrated dialogue modalities in SIGMA support and advice are often praised by stakeholders as a significant capacitating influence which facilitates engagement, ownership and awareness. SIGMA support and collaboration could continue to emphasise and expand dialogue provisions with stakeholders.
- Both SIGMA and the Commission services would benefit from greater political leverage to maximise the potential effect of SIGMA outcomes, but this greatly depends on field aptitude and know how. In the meantime, it is recommended that SIGMA involves relevant EUD staff in programming and (general) implementation missions where and when feasible. Briefings and debriefings of SIGMA country missions to relevant EUD should be undertaken, preferably, if relevant, with the participation of the EUD's political attaché.

# Acquis

Facilitate European integration

Strengthen public governance in IPA countries

Sustainable administrative reforms

Optimal Community Funds utilization

## Contribution Agreement

### Annual Outline Agreements



#### PAR

PAR Strategy	Public Service
ALF/Justice	Public Integrity

Policy/Coord.



Rule of Law & Policy Capacities

#### Fund Management

PEMS	PIFC
External Audit	PP



Rationalisation of Administrative Organisation

#### Business Environment

Regulation
Public Service

↓ = indicative/strategic



## 6 ANNEXES

### 6.1 Annex 1 – Questionnaire n°1 to beneficiaries

#### STRATEGIC/INTERIM EVALUATION OF SIGMA PROGRAMME

February 2012

#### Questionnaire N°1 country beneficiaries

**QB1. Your institution has been beneficiary of the following SIGMA projects in the period 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2011:**

<b>PI 3.1</b>		
<b>Project</b>	<b>Has this project been requested by your institution?</b>	<b>Did you request a follow-up project on the same (or on a closely related) topic?</b>
<b>Project 1</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes, by our institution <input type="checkbox"/> no, it was not our initiative	<input type="checkbox"/> yes (implemented or under implementation) <input type="checkbox"/> yes (waiting for approval) <input type="checkbox"/> no follow-up
<b>Project 2</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes, by our institution <input type="checkbox"/> no, it was not our initiative	<input type="checkbox"/> yes (implemented or under implementation) <input type="checkbox"/> yes (waiting for approval) <input type="checkbox"/> no follow-up

**QB2. Did these SIGMA projects respond to your needs?**

Please tick the appropriate box.

<b>PI 3.2.1</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
With regard to the scope of the projects				
With regard to the results achieved				
With regard to the frequency of the SIGMA missions				
With regard to the length of the SIGMA missions				

**QB3. This question tests how applicable you found the advice and support provided by SIGMA during these projects?**

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
How useful did you find the SIGMA projects with regard to the <b>priorities stated in your national strategies?</b> (PI 4.1)				
How useful did you find the SIGMA projects with regard to your country's <b>EU accession process?</b> (PI 4.2)				
How well targeted did you find the SIGMA projects to <b>your country, administrative</b>				

<b>structure and specifics of your institution?</b> <b>(PI 4.5)</b>				
How would you rate the clarity of communication with SIGMA, in particular with regard to the link of the activities with EU integration?				

**QB4. Which legal acts and strategies have been drafted as a direct result of these SIGMA projects?**

<b>PI 4.3.1 and PI 4.3.2</b>	<b>Please list the main legal acts / strategies drafted</b>	<b>Was it adopted?</b> (please tick)	<b>To what extent has it been implemented?</b> (please tick)
New laws	1.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
	2.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
	3.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
Amendment of existing laws	1.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
	2.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
	3.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
New bylaws	1.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
	2.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
	3.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
Amendment of existing bylaws	1.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
	2.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
	3.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
Strategies	1.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
	2.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all
	3.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> fully <input type="checkbox"/> partly <input type="checkbox"/> not at all

**QB5. This question refers to training implemented by SIGMA during these projects (if any).**  
 "Training" includes all activities that have contributed to the development of skills, including for instance advice to senior management.

<b>PI 4.4.1</b>	
How many people in your institution were trained in the course of these SIGMA projects?	
How many person-days of training were delivered by SIGMA? (Please sum up for all trainings: Number of participants x number of training days)	

<b>Please list the main manuals and guidelines drafted as a direct result of these SIGMA projects (PI 4.4.2)</b>	<b>Was it adopted? (please tick)</b>	<b>Is it being used? (please tick)</b>
1.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
2.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
3.	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no

**QB6. Which main institutional changes have been implemented as a direct result of these SIGMA projects (PI 7.1.3)**  
 (Please tick)


- Internal procedures
- Administrative structure
- Number of employees
- Job descriptions of employees (systematization acts)
- Other. Please describe \_\_\_\_\_

**QB7. Which of the priorities listed in the Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) have been addressed in these SIGMA projects? (PI 7.1.4)**

1.
2.
3.

QB8. If you compare these SIGMA projects with other types of EU funded projects (TAIEX, Twinning, Technical Assistance programmes) in the area of public administration: How satisfied are you with SIGMA in regard to the following aspects ?

Please tick the appropriate box in each line.

	SIGMA is much better	SIGMA is a little better	SIGMA is a little worse	SIGMA is much worse
Adequacy of project scope (PI 6.2.1)				
Achievement of the intended results (PI 6.2.2)				
Improvement of institutional performance (PI 6.2.3)				
Sustainability (=Creating long-lasting effects) (PI 6.2.4)				

QB9. If you compare the SIGMA projects with those of other donors (World Bank, UNDP and bilateral donors such as USAID, GIZ, DFID, SIDA) in the area of public administration: How satisfied are you with SIGMA in regard to the following aspects:

Please tick the appropriate box in each line.

	SIGMA is much better	SIGMA is a little better	SIGMA is a little worse	SIGMA is much worse
Compared to GRANTS of other donors				
Adequacy of project scope (PI 6.2.1)				
Achievement of the intended results (PI 6.2.2)				
Improvement of institutional performance (PI 6.2.3)				
Sustainability (=Creating long-lasting effects) (PI 6.2.4)				
Compared to LOANS of other donors				
Adequacy of project scope (PI 6.2.1)				
Achievement of the intended results (PI 6.2.2)				
Improvement of institutional performance (PI 6.2.3)				
Sustainability (=Creating long-lasting effects) (PI 6.2.4)				

QB10. Please comment on strengths and weaknesses of SIGMA compared to other providers of support in public administration:

--

**QB11. Please provide any other comment that you deem important with regard to SIGMA's performance**

**Name:** ..... (optional)

## 6.2 Annex 2 – Questionnaire n°2 to beneficiaries

STRATEGIC/INTERIM EVALUATION OF SIGMA PROGRAMME  
February 2012

### Questionnaire N°2 country beneficiaries

**Q1 BEN:** Can you quantify the number of requests for having a SIGMA programme activity be developed and implemented in the country/PAR sector of your responsibility?

Please quantify in the appropriate box.

<b>PI 3.1</b>	<b>0 &lt; 5</b>	<b>5 - 10</b>	<b>10 - 20</b>	<b>&gt; 20</b>
Number of requests				
Number of unsuccessful requests				
<b>Reference number SIGMA work area (cf. above)</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>III</b>	
Please tick specific work area(s) concerned	1/2/3/4/5	1/2/3/4/5	1/2/3	

**Q2.1 BEN:** How do you perceive to be the quality of SIGMA interventions in the area of public administration reform, as compared to other donors supporting similar activities? Please tick and provide written comments, if possible.

**EUDs/beneficiaries**

<b>PI 6.2.1(I)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less efficient</b>
Public administration reform strategy				
Public service				
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice				
Public Integrity System				
Policy making and coordination				
<b>PI 6.2.1(I)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less effective</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less effective</b>
Public administration reform strategy				
Public service				
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice				
Public Integrity System				
Policy making and coordination				

<b>PI 6.2.1(I)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less (potential) impact</b>
Public administration reform strategy				
Public service				
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice				
Public Integrity System				
Policy making and coordination				
<b>PI 6.2.1(I)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less (potential) sustainability</b>
Public administration reform strategy				
Public service				
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice				
Public Integrity System				
Policy making and coordination				

**Q2.2 BEN:** How do you perceive to be the quality of SIGMA interventions in the area of management of funds, as compared to other donors supporting similar activities? Please tick and provide written comments, if possible.

<b>PI 6.2.2 (II)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less efficient</b>
Public Expenditure Management (PEMS)				
Public Internal Financial Control (PIFC)				
External Audit				
Anti Fraud				
Public Procurement				
<b>PI 6.2.2 (II)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less effective</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less effective</b>
Public Expenditure Management (PEMS)				
Public Internal Financial Control (PIFC)				
External Audit				

Anti Fraud				
Public Procurement				
SIGMA (potential) sustainability				
<b>PI 6.2.2 (II)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less (potential) impact</b>
Public Expenditure Management (PEMS)				
Public Internal Financial Control (PIFC)				
External Audit				
Anti Fraud				
Public Procurement				
<b>PI 6.2.2 (II)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability</b>
Public Expenditure Management (PEMS)				
Public Internal Financial Control (PIFC)				
External Audit				
Anti Fraud				
Public Procurement				

**Q2.3 BEN:** How do you perceive to be the quality of SIGMA interventions in improving the business environment, as compared to other donors supporting similar activities? Please tick and provide written comments, if possible.

<b>PI 6.2.2 (III)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less efficient</b>
Better regulation				
Responsive public service delivery				
Managing property rights				
<b>PI 6.2.2 (III)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less effective</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less effective</b>
Better regulation				
Responsive public service delivery				
Managing property rights				

<b>PI 6.2.2 (III)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less (potential) impact</b>
Better regulation				
Responsive public service delivery				
Managing property rights				
<b>PI 6.2.2 (III)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability</b>
Better regulation				
Responsive public service delivery				
Managing property rights				

Name: .....

Position: .....

Ministry/Directorate/Department/Unit .....

Signature

## 6.3 Annex 3 – Questionnaire to EUDs and EC

## STRATEGIC/INTERIM EVALUATION OF SIGMA PROGRAMME

February 2012

## Questionnaire EC/EUDs

**Q1 EC/EUD:** What has been the regularity and quality of cooperation between your services and the SIGMA programme regarding its planned activities? Please describe your choice and provide examples in the box below.

PI 2.6.1/PI 2.6.2		
SIGMA work area	Regularity of cooperation	Quality rating of cooperation (A = excellent; B = good; C = satisfactory; D = unsatisfactory)
I.1 Public administration reform strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
I.2 Public service	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
I.3 Administrative legal framework and administrative justice	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
I.4 Public Integrity System	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
I.5 Policy Making and Co-ordination	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
II.1 Public Expenditure Management (PEMS)	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
II.2 Public Internal Financial Control (PIFC)	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
II.3 External Audit	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
II.4 Anti-Fraud	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required	<input type="checkbox"/> A

	<input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
II.5 Public Procurement	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
III.1 Better Regulation	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
III.2 Responsive public service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
III.3 Managing property rights *	<input type="checkbox"/> more often than required <input type="checkbox"/> as often as required <input type="checkbox"/> less often than required <input type="checkbox"/> insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D
<b>Written comments and examples</b>		

\*2009 and 2010 OAs

**Q2 EC/EUD:** Can you quantify the number of requests for having a SIGMA programme activity be developed and implemented in the country/PAR sector of your responsibility?

Please quantify in the appropriate box.

<b>PI 3.1</b>	<b>0 &lt; 5</b>	<b>5 - 10</b>	<b>10 - 20</b>	<b>&gt; 20</b>
Number of requests				
Number of unsuccessful requests				
<b>Reference number SIGMA work area (cf. above)</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>III</b>	
Please tick specific work area(s) concerned	1/2/3/4/5	1/2/3/4/5	1/2/3	

**Q3 EC/EUD:** How relevant do you perceive SIGMA interventions to be? Please provide written comments and examples in the box below.

<b>PI 3.3</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
With regard to project scope				
With regard to achieved results				
With regard to the frequency of SIGMA missions				
With regard to the length of SIGMA missions				
<b>Written comments and examples</b>				

**Q4 EC/EUD:** How would you describe coordination between your services and SIGMA? Please provide written comments and examples in the box below.

<b>PI 5.1.1</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Formal consultation on planned SIGMA activities				
Informal consultation on planned SIGMA activities				
Professional contacts with SIGMA peers				
<b>IPA programme type</b>				
	<b>TAIEX</b>	<b>Twinning</b>	<b>Regional</b>	<b>National</b>
Please tick IPA programme concerned				
<b>Reference number SIGMA work area</b>				
	<b>I</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>III</b>	
Please tick specific work area(s) concerned	1/2/3/4/5	1/2/3/4/5	1/2/3	
<b>Written comments and examples</b>				

**Q5 EC/EUD:** How would you describe the effectiveness of coordination between your services and SIGMA? Please provide written comments and examples in the box below.

<b>PI 5.1.2</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Degree to which SIGMA reflects relevant EU and Commission priorities on PAR in the region				
Degree to which complementarity is perceived between EU and SIGMA priorities and activities on PAR				
<b>IPA programme type</b>				
	<b>TAIEX</b>	<b>Twinning</b>	<b>Regional</b>	<b>National</b>
Please tick IPA programme concerned				
<b>Reference number SIGMA work area</b>				
	<b>I</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>III</b>	
Please tick specific work area(s) concerned	1/2/3/4/5	1/2/3/4/5	1/2/3	
<b>Written comments and examples</b>				

**Q6.1 EC/EUD:** How do you perceive to be the quality of SIGMA interventions in your area of public administration reform, as compared to other donors supporting similar activities? Please tick and provide written comments, if possible.

<b>PI 6.2.1(I)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less efficient</b>
Public administration reform strategy				
Public service				
Administrative legal framework and				

administrative justice				
Public Integrity System				
Policy making and coordination				
<b>PI 6.2.1(I)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less effective</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less effective</b>
Public administration reform strategy				
Public service				
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice				
Public Integrity System				
Policy making and coordination				
<b>PI 6.2.1(I)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less (potential) impact</b>
Public administration reform strategy				
Public service				
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice				
Public Integrity System				
Policy making and coordination				
<b>PI 6.2.1(I)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less (potential) sustainability</b>
Public administration reform strategy				
Public service				
Administrative legal framework and administrative justice				
Public Integrity System				
Policy making and coordination				

**Q6.2 EC/EUD:** How do you perceive to be the quality of SIGMA interventions in your area of management of funds, as compared to other donors supporting similar activities? Please tick and provide written comments, if possible.

<b>PI 6.2.2 (II)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less efficient</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less efficient</b>
Public Expenditure Management (PEMS)				
Public Internal Financial Control				

(PIFC)				
External Audit				
Anti Fraud				
Public Procurement				
<b>PI 6.2.2 (II)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less effective</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less effective</b>
Public Expenditure Management (PEMS)				
Public Internal Financial Control (PIFC)				
External Audit				
Anti Fraud				
Public Procurement				
SIGMA (potential) sustainability				
<b>PI 6.2.2 (II)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less (potential) impact</b>
Public Expenditure Management (PEMS)				
Public Internal Financial Control (PIFC)				
External Audit				
Anti Fraud				
Public Procurement				
<b>PI 6.2.2 (II)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability</b>
Public Expenditure Management (PEMS)				
Public Internal Financial Control (PIFC)				
External Audit				
Anti Fraud				
Public Procurement				

**Q6.3 EC/EUD:** How do you perceive to be the quality of SIGMA interventions in improving the business environment, as compared to other donors supporting similar activities? Please tick and provide written comments, if possible.

<b>PI 6.2.2 (III)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly</b>
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------

	more efficient	more efficient	less efficient	less efficient
Better regulation				
Responsive public service delivery				
Managing property rights				
<b>PI 6.2.2 (III)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more effective</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less effective</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less effective</b>
Better regulation				
Responsive public service delivery				
Managing property rights				
<b>PI 6.2.2 (III)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately less (potential) impact</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly less (potential) impact</b>
Better regulation				
Responsive public service delivery				
Managing property rights				
<b>PI 6.2.2 (III)</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA moderately more (potential) sustainability</b>	<b>SIGMA significantly more (potential) sustainability</b>
Better regulation				
Responsive public service delivery				
Managing property rights				

**Q7 EC/EUD:** Is impact of SIGMA interventions assessed by your services, and if so, how? Please provide written comments, if possible.

<b>PI 7.2/PI 7.3</b>		
	<b>Existence of SIGMA impact assessment modalities</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <i>If yes, please proceed to questions below</i>
Formal	<i>Expost</i> written assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <i>If yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> regular <input type="checkbox"/> irregular
	Case-by-case evaluations	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <i>If yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> regular <input type="checkbox"/> irregular
	Official oral and/or written debriefings	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <i>If yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> regular <input type="checkbox"/> irregular
	Templated and independent monitoring and	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <i>If yes</i>

	evaluation (M&E) reports	<input type="checkbox"/> regular <input type="checkbox"/> irregular
	Field visit missions SIGMA interventions	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <i>If yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> regular <input type="checkbox"/> irregular
Informal	Beneficiary debriefings	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <i>If yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> regular <input type="checkbox"/> irregular
	Ongoing contacts	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <i>If yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> regular <input type="checkbox"/> irregular
	Third party feedback	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <i>If yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> regular <input type="checkbox"/> irregular
	Ad hoc feedback	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <i>If yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> regular <input type="checkbox"/> irregular
Planned	Any of the above modalities	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <i>If yes, please specify and provide details of timing</i>
<b>Written comments</b>		

**Q8 EC EUD:** How would you classify the dissemination and quality of SIGMA quarterly (QR) and annual reports (AR)? Please provide any additional written comments and examples in the box below.

PI 8.4	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<b>Dissemination and distribution</b>				
SIGMA QR				
SIGMA AR				
<b>Overall quality and contents</b>				
SIGMA QR				
SIGMA AR				
<b>Written comments</b>				

Name: .....

Position: .....

DG/Directorate/Unit:.....

Signature

## 6.4 Annex 4 – Cost divergences

#	PIMS/PDS title	Budget	Spent	Percentage	Rationale
1	ALBANIA: IT Treasury	93,856	53,329	55.75%	The difference between the estimated budget and the real cost was due to that the two IT experts spent less time than foreseen and consequently less money was spent on experts than foreseen. Further after the first mission it appeared that a foreseen deep involvement of the Public Expenditure Management expert in the project seemed not to be needed. Finally, the IT audit was carried out with two IT auditors instead of the budgeted three IT auditors.
2	ALBANIA: Law on Administrative Procedures	61,998	N/A	N/A	The European Commission approved increased budget request in May 2009. The adjustment was necessary, since the draft of a completely new text turned out to require more external Sigma expertise than it could have been anticipated.
2a	Albania: Law on Administrative Procedures - simplification tools according to EU law	124,100	N/A	N/A	It was possible to achieve an economisation in comparison to both the estimated as well as adjusted estimated budget through using enhanced Sigma in house capacity for the production of policy papers, comments on draft legal texts and presentations at conferences.
3	ALBANIA: Civil Service Reform & Public Administration Development 2009-10	75,600	N/A	N/A	In IA4101, divergence after adjustments is not significant. The reduction of the budget --and the consequent savings was due to the fact that, because of the political situation, 1) we did no action on quality management and 2) the improvement of administrative procedures was transferred to another PDS, the IA4202.
3a	ALBANIA: Civil Service Reform & Public Administration Development 2011-2012	44,750	N/A	N/A	
4	BiH_ II. Peer review Supreme Audit Institutions	83,703	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	BiH - Peer Review of the Public Procurement System (part 1)	35,100	N/A	N/A	Costs of fact-finding missions to BiH were slightly higher than expected - due to complicated travel arrangements to organize meetings both in Sarajevo, Mostar and Banja Luka (and more Sigma staff involved than initially planned).
6	BiH - Public procurement - Peer Review & assistance to legislation drafting (2011)	67,214	N/A	N/A	
7	CROATIA: Support to Ministry of Finance in 2009	204,029	182,618	89.51%	The under spending in the first project is mainly caused by not carrying out the foreseen workshops for Capital Budgeting and the Budget Supervision Department. In the follow-up project the estimated costs were € 59,520.00. Real cost were € 34,142.93 (=57.36%). Due to the slow progress in developing methodologies for Capital Budgeting and the Budget Supervision Department and the cancelling of the Internal Audit trainings the budget was under spent again.
7a	CROATIA: Support to Ministry of Finance in 2010	37,020	N/A	N/A	

8	CROATIA: Development of administrative justice	10,300	N/A	N/A	There is a gap regarding estimated costs and real costs because part of the foreseen actions (a mission for discussing sigma comments) was finally considered as not necessary. In addition, the offered support in the preparation for the implementation of the law was not requested by the MoJ.
9	CROATIA: Assistance to the public procurement system	203,500	N/A	N/A	The slight overrun of the projects costs were due to its both budget and time extension leading to the need to cover additional topics through the arrangement of seminars end 2010 and in 2011.
10	FYRoM: Support for public procurement and concessions systems	164,925	152,159	92.26%	The difference (real costs representing 92, 26% of estimated) can be explained by abandonment of the seminar initially foreseen on e-procurement.
11	KOSOVO: Developing the civil service system and the legal administrative framework	20,000	N/A	N/A	There is a gap regarding estimated costs and real costs which is due to four reasons: 1) the delay in the adoption of the relevant pieces of legislation (having direct impact in activities related to its implementation); 2) lack of capacity of sigma interlocutors in making better use of sigma's offer for further direct support; 3) in spite of the intensive activity in following the preparation and discussion of these pieces of legislation, the work was performed mainly using sigma's internal resources; 4) an important part of the financial costs related to the support to these reforms was provided by DFID, with the background support of sigma.
12	MONTENEGRO: support to modernising the system of administrative procedures	30,750	N/A	N/A	The differences between the estimated budget and the real costs is accounted for by the political decision of Montenegrin authorities to postpone the process of preparing the reform of administrative procedures until the PAR Strategy 2011 - 2016 is adopted and continue after the adoption of the Strategy (see below section "Final comments"). Therefore more than half of the activities planned could not be carried out under this PDS, but were included in the follow up PDS KT4201.
13	MONTENEGRO: support to the Government Council for Public Administration Reform	67,500	N/A	N/A	While the initial budget for this PDS was 47.500 €, its actual budget was 72.000€. <b>The cost divergence</b> can be explained by two cumulative factors: 1) the work of the GCPAR was slower than initially envisaged and relied much more than anticipated on foreign inputs. Actually, Sigma did provide far more guidance, advise, support and inputs than foreseen at the time of project definition. This generated, for instance, additional advisory missions, the delivery of workshops for the members of the GCPAR, for instance on project cycle management, policy-coordination, etc. Those were not foreseen in the initial project definition; 2) once the strategy was formulated and articulated, it became urgent for both the EUD and the beneficiaries to design project fiches in the area of Civil Service and policy-coordination. At the request of the EUD, the scope of the PDs was extended to provide the Government of Montenegro with support in designing those IPA

					project fiches.
14	SERBIA: support to SAI Serbia	45,310	N/A	N/A	N/A
15	SERBIA (IPA): Improving the State Legal Administrative Framework	231,700	N/A	N/A	Divergence after adjustments is not significant. The divergence between initially foreseen costs and final costs is due to the fact that there was a need to organise two seminars/conferences, which were not foreseen initially: one on the law on administrative procedures and the other on transparency policy, where we presented the Paper in Belgrade (Nov. 2010) inviting several MS representatives to present their national experiences.
16	Serbia: Assistance to concessions and PPP reform in 2010	33,524	N/A	N/A	The real costs were smaller than initially planned due to lesser scope of the work.
17	Turkey: support to MoF in delineation of inspection and internal audit; reviewed roles and objectives of the IACB and the CHU	74,286	53,310	71.76%	The final cost of the project was € 51,310 against € 74,286 budgeted. The under spending was due to fewer missions than planned, linked to the lack of responsiveness of the Turkish Authorities on the drafts provided.
18	TURKEY (IPA): ANTI-CORRUPTION STRATEGY	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
19	TURKEY: strengthening the administrative capacity of the TGNA	122,242	N/A	N/A	Insignificant
20	MULTICOUNTRY: Assessments 2011 (Excl. Serbia)	194,607	N/A	N/A	The estimated costs of the project were € 262.223.00. In reality only € 188.009,56 (71.7%) was spent. The difference between the estimated budget and the real cost was due to: less external experts were involved than budgeted; (for efficiency reasons) less assessment missions were carried out. The needed information was gathered during other project missions; the cancelling of the debriefing meeting in Brussels.

## 6.5 Annex 5 – Number of participants to conference and to study tours

Number of participants								
Country/Year	IPA 2009-2010*				IPA 2011-2012			
	2009	2009	2010	2010	2011	2011	2011	2011
	No. of Part'pts	No. of Person Days	No. of Part'pts	No. of Person Days	No. of Part'pts	No. of Person Days	No. of Part'pts	No. of Person Days
Albania	70	420	270	2 970	89	178	21	42
BiH	75	225	11	11	0	0	122	488
Croatia	230	2 070	267	2 937	50	150	203	2 030
FYROM	566	7 358	216	2 592	80	160	117	702
Kosovo	50	200	41	82	20	20	75	75
Montenegro	137	548	316	13 588	19	133	211	1 477
Serbia	86	688	93	651	54	216	254	5 842
Turkey	141	423	65	325	1 137	2 274	0	0
Multi-Country	138	1 380	248	1 736	0		195	2 145
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1 493</b>	<b>13 312</b>	<b>1 527</b>	<b>24 892</b>	<b>1 449</b>	<b>3 131</b>	<b>1 198</b>	<b>12 801</b>

\* Extended to 30 June 2011

Study Tours								
Country/Year	IPA 2009-2010*				IPA 2011-2012			
	2009	2009	2010	2010	2011	2011	2011	2011
	No. of Part'pts	No. of Person Days	No. of Part'pts	No. of Person Days	No. of Part'pts	No. of Person Days	No. of Part'pts	No. of Person Days
Albania	0	0	0	0	12	60	0	0
BiH	0	0	0	0		0	10	10
Croatia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FYROM	11	33	27	81	4	12	31	93
Kosovo	6	12	0	0	0	0	4	8
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Serbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Turkey	0	0	0	0	8	40		0
Multi-Country	0	0	21	105		0	0	0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>122</b>

EA PP

