

Working Group on Key National Indicators

**INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPMENT
AND USE OF KEY NATIONAL INDICATORS**

BRIEF REVIEW

Prepared by:

State Audit Office of the Republic of Latvia

December 2009

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
SURVEY RESULTS	4
I. GENERAL ISSUES OF PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT	4
Scope of policy planning and performance measurement	4
Planning at national level	5
Cohesiveness of policies and indicators	7
Reporting towards international goals	8
II. NATIONAL INDICATORS	14
Development of national indicators	15
System of key national indicators	16
Indicators to report on progress toward international goals	18
Indicators that are compatible with macro-economic indicators	19
III. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	23
COUNTRY OVERVIEW	27
LIST OF RESPONDENTS	38

INTRODUCTION

How a country, its people, and its institutions are doing can be measured in many different ways. Performance measurement systems vary from country to country – some countries measure their performance at government agency level, some at government programme level and others at nationwide level, thus the interpretation of the term “key national indicators” varies as well.

Macro-economic indicators are most widely used to measure countries' developments, but they are not complete as they do not judge the key elements of social progress. Development of national performance indicators can contribute to upgrading quality of government's activities and eventually enhance people's living standards. The purpose of national performance indicator system is to systematically present measures and report on various aspects of well-being that are important to citizens, as well as measure economic, environmental, and social sustainability.

When referring to key national indicators, generally we would refer to a small set of indicators that reflect the nation's position and measure the economic, environmental, social and cultural progress towards achieving the country's goals. Ideally the key national indicators system is a cohesive part of national planning and performance management system. Key indicators are the most important part of national indicators that may arise from national level and sector by sector policy planning.

To prepare this review the State Audit Office of the Republic of Latvia prepared a questionnaire and distributed it within the INTOSAI community. In order to obtain a broader picture of the performance management and indicators systems worldwide, survey addressed the countries in which a key indicators system derives from the framework of strategic planning and performance measurement based on a short list of designed indicators and also the countries in which a system as such does not exist; however macro-level indicators at national level may be identified even if only in terms of statistics – either for United Nations (UN) Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Factbook, Sustainable Development Indicators initiative or any regional initiative (e.g. Structural Indicators in case of European Union).

Information in this review was obtained through the responses to the survey and was supplemented by information from publicly available sources (e.g., Internet). Overall, 47 SAIs responded to the questions raised in the survey and these respondents are identified at the end of this paper. The publicly available information was up-to-date as of March 2009.

SURVEY RESULTS

In further chapters of the brief review we have aggregated the information obtained from 47 country responses to the survey. The overall received data quality is good, although there are responses in which respondents have not provided either “Yes” nor “No” answer for some questions without explaining that, or there are just some blur comments that do not allow to conclude whether it would be more “Yes”-like or more “No”-like answer.

The brief review is structured according to the survey themes and at the beginning of each chapter corresponding to a part of the survey there are introductory remarks explaining what our expected output from the questions raised was and what the received responses are. The aggregated information is supplemented with country specific examples – comments and additional information provided by the respondents within the framework of the survey.

I. GENERAL ISSUES OF PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

The first part of the survey “General issues” was aimed at revealing the general picture of performance management in each country. Respondents were asked to provide the information on elements of performance management (setting objectives, measurable targets and milestones as part of planning and elaboration of indicators and analysing the data as part of performance measurement) in place at various levels – national, sub-national, government sectors, institutions, budget programmes etc. Further questions were made to find out whether the policy planning is cohesive at all levels and whether the performance measurement is consistent. Thus, when developing the question the following assumptions were made:

- indicators are an integral part of policy planning and should be defined for policies at all levels;
- policies at all levels must be cohesive;
- indicators at all levels from top to bottom and vice versa should be comparable and consistent;
- all indicators should be measurable;
- national goals and targets should be consistent with supranational ones (international or regional).

The first part of the survey was filled in by 46 respondents. Analysing the country responses we concluded that the question on linkage between the performance indicators and the single comprehensive nationwide policy document was interpreted in two ways – whether there are performance indicators for different levels incorporated in this document or whether performance indicators are formulated considering the objectives stated in the planning document (this is what we intended).

Scope of policy planning and performance measurement

The survey revealed that the planning and performance measurement systems depend greatly upon the political, legislative and administrative systems of the respective country. Almost all countries responded that they have national level planning even in cases when countries generally have decentralized government like in Canada, Switzerland, Austria and Germany. However Canada indicated that their response was mainly for the federal government’s responsibilities, which are reflected in the nationwide economic and environmental indicators, but not necessarily for all the social indicators.

Nationwide objectives, measurable targets and milestones at national level are not set only in four countries – Japan, New Zealand, USA and Iceland, while in Fiji and Greece only objectives at national level are set. Performance measurement at national level is not established in six responding countries which might mean that in case there is national level planning, sufficient monitoring and feedback on policy implementation might not be provided.

In the USA and New Zealand national level planning and performance measurement do not exist due to decentralized government and planning at local level as well as due to lack of political willingness to introduce nationwide planning system. However there are economic indicators and some social and environmental indicators in the USA, but they are used to monitor national condition rather than as basis for national planning. Lack of political interest and commitment is reason for non-existing national level planning and performance measurement in Iceland and here this reason is complemented by strong sector policies.

Planning at national level

In 32 countries with national level planning in place, a single government-wide planning document exists although the type and period of coverage varies considerably. Several types of nationwide planning documents were identified and they are reflected in the table below supported by some country specific examples.

Table 1 Types and examples of nation-wide planning documents

DOCUMENT TYPE	COUNTRY SPECIFIC EXAMPLES
Political programme or agenda	<p>In Germany <i>Coalition Agreement</i>¹ between parties forming the government is considered as government-wide planning document, although it does not include any comprehensive operational plan, but rather a set of political objectives thus it does not serve as a source for performance indicators.</p> <p>In Bulgaria it is Government's programme <i>Political priorities of the Government of European integration, economic growth and social responsibility</i>² elaborated by the Council of Ministers for the period 2005-2009; mainly national level and government sector performance indicators derive from the Government's programme.</p>
Medium-term development plan or economic programme	<p>In Tunisia there is a development plan covering five years, the current one is the <i>11th National Development Plan 2007-2011</i>. It is developed by the Ministry of Economic Development and contains performance indicators of the national level, government sectors and of some institutions.</p> <p><i>The Eleventh Five-year Plan for National Economic and Social Development 2006-2010</i>³ elaborated and approved by the National People's Congress is in place in China. Indicators of sub-national level</p>

¹ Coalition Agreement of Federal Government of Germany is available at <http://www.bundesregierung.de/Webs/Breg/EN/Federal-Government/CoalitionAgreement/coalition-agreement.html>

² Government's programme of Bulgaria is available at <http://www.government.bg/cgi-bin/e-cms/vis/vis.pl?s=001&p=0162&n=1&g=>

³ The Outline of the Eleventh Five-Year Plan of China is available at http://en.ndrc.gov.cn/hot/t20060529_71334.htm

	<p>(municipal, provincial and autonomous regions) are based on this plan.</p> <p><i>Multi-Annual Development Plan 2006-2011 of Suriname</i> developed by the Ministry of Planning and Development, the National Planning Office of Suriname, the General Bureau of Statistics and the Ministry of Finance forms the basis of planning in Suriname.</p> <p>“100 National Agenda” in Korea covering five years (2008-2012) is managed by the Office of the President and the Prime Minister and indicators of ministerial level are based on it.</p> <p>Cambodia’s Royal Government has developed <i>Rectangular Strategy for Growth, Employment, Equity and Efficiency</i> and the <i>National Strategic Development Plan</i> as the single, overarching development strategy for pursuing prioritized goals and actions for the period 2006-2010.</p>
Long-term development plan or economic programme	<p>In Russia such document is <i>Conception of long-term social-economic development of the Russian Federation till 2020</i>.</p> <p>In Kingdom of Bahrain such document is “<i>The economic vision 2030 for Bahrain</i>”⁴. It is approved and issued by the Bahrain Economic Development Board.</p> <p>In Lithuania there is the <i>State Long-term Development Strategy</i> covering the period till 2020 and performance indicators of national level, government sectors, institutions and policy areas are based on this document.</p>
Budget related document	<p>In Norway National budget published annually in October by the Ministry of Finance serves as nationwide planning document and it includes performance indicators at the national level.</p> <p>In Malta the Annual Budget Speech⁵ that covers a calendar year is published by the Ministry of Finance, Economy and Investment and approved by the Parliament and forms basis for national and sectoral performance indicators.</p> <p>In Saint Lucia this is Estimates of Expenditure for one fiscal year, the current one referring to 2008/09 and it includes performance indicators at ministerial level.</p>

In Slovenia, Moldova, Fiji and Latvia there is more than one nation wide policy planning document.

In Slovenia these are: *Economic Development Strategy*, *National Development Programme for 2007-2013*, *Economic and Social Reform Framework*, and *Two-Year State Budget Plan* etc; however the programme objectives set out future performance expectations and are based on aforementioned documents.

⁴ The economic vision 2030 for Bahrain is available at [http://www.bahrain.bh/wps/wcm/connect/85eca9004ca3c92fa6debf36e8840cc8/Vision%2B2030%2BEnglish%2B\(low%2Bresolution\).pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=85eca9004ca3c92fa6debf36e8840cc8](http://www.bahrain.bh/wps/wcm/connect/85eca9004ca3c92fa6debf36e8840cc8/Vision%2B2030%2BEnglish%2B(low%2Bresolution).pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=85eca9004ca3c92fa6debf36e8840cc8)

⁵ Budget Speech 2009 of Malta is available at http://www.budget2009.com.mt/media/docs/Budget_Speech-eng.pdf

In Moldova these are: *the National Development Strategy for 2008-2011*, *the Medium Term Expenditure Framework* and *the Activity Programme of the Government*. Policy documents provide for monitoring indicators at national, sectoral and institutional level, depending on the extent to which the strategic planning is carried out. Indicators are used to assess the progress, but not the economy, efficiency and effectiveness of the measures implemented.

Also in Fiji there is more than one document – *Twenty Year Development Plan* and *Strategic Development Plan 2007-2011*, both elaborated by Ministry of Finance and National Planning and approved by Parliament and performance indicators are based on these documents.

In Latvia there are several overlapping policy planning documents all approved by the Government. Some of them are the following: *A Growth Model for Latvia: People First* approved in 2005 for next 20-30 years, *Latvian Long-term Economic Strategy* approved in 2001 for next 20-30 years, *Latvian National Development Plan 2007-2013*, *Single Strategy for National Economy*, *Latvian Sustainable Development Guidelines*.

Countries were asked to provide information on how national planning is done in cases when there is not a single comprehensive nationwide policy planning document.

In Denmark the government has never formulated a comprehensive national plan for development which required a wide range of key national indicators. Plans for general macro-economic development and for specific sectors e.g. education, infrastructure progress exist, thus key indicators are used both in macro-economic planning and in specific sector planning. The government defines the political projects which are pertinent for the planning. Normally before political initiatives are presented to the Parliament, experts have analysed the issue in ad-hoc commissions.

In United Kingdom there is a planning document published called the *Comprehensive Spending Review* though this covers the Government's priorities and how they will be delivered rather than all sectors of government activities.

Also Estonia noted that *Medium-Term Budgeting Framework* includes short and medium term policy objectives/targets, but it can not be regarded as a document that overreaches all sectors of government activities.

Cohesiveness of policies and indicators

National planning and development of performance indicators are cohesive in most of responding countries. However top-down planning seems to be more widespread than bottom-up performance measurement as 39 countries responded that the policy planning is top-down and only 28 countries have bottom-up performance measurement.

However several countries commented that the coherence is somehow difficult to achieve in practice. Logical linkage of layers of information from outcomes and impacts to outputs and capability needs is a significant challenge in establishing performance frameworks in New Zealand. Politically based aspirations may also be the reason that targets and milestones set are not always clear and concise as it is in Suriname.

The system advises that the objectives, targets and indicators should be consistent and comparable, but it is not always the case in Slovenia, since it usually depends on the quality of the whole management and planning procedures. Similarly in Hungary top-down policy planning process and bottom-up performance measurement exists, but the consistency of performance indicators is rather formal in some cases. In Norway policy planning is more likely to be top-down, but it varies among sectors/areas.

In light of Canada's federal system of government, whereby each the federal, provincial and territorial, and municipal governments are independent, there is no roll-up or roll-down of planning, including goals and targets. In Germany policy planning is top-down at the federal level of government, but it is largely bottom-up where the relationship between the Federal Government, Germany's constituent states (*Länder*) and local authorities is concerned.

The United Kingdom government has made progress to strengthen the link between central government's objectives and targets and those set by local delivery agents. The new *Local Area Agreements* have formalised this relationship in respect to government departments and local authorities, but there are still many local delivery agents for which a standard approach does not apply.

Objectives at all levels should belong to the top level objective in Tunisia – the national development plan covering five year period. Moreover the development plan contains performance indicators of the national level, government sectors and some institutions; however top level could have only qualitative objectives that could be translated in quantitative objectives in lower levels.

In Denmark the performance measurement in practice is logical consistent at all administrative levels. The participation process which includes consultation and debate between different interest groups before political process starts between the political parties in parliament creates a general acceptance of a cohesive system of performance measurement.

Within the framework of launching "*The Economic Vision 2030 for Bahrain*" seeking to streamline national planning and enable a more structured and integrated cascaded planning at sub-levels the government has embarked on a program to train ministries and government agencies on institutional strategic and operational planning that is integrated with the above vision. Execution of this program covers various levels of management within each institution.

Reporting towards international goals

International goals are not always clearly linked to national planning and setting national targets. As to the MDGs and national level planning only some countries, for example Fiji and Suriname, indicated that government-wide planning document clearly reflects the countries international commitments and in the later the national indicator system has been launched based on recommendations from international institutions like IMF and World Bank.

Explicit answers on how countries report on progress towards international goals were not received as many countries just named the international commitments they are reporting on, not explaining how it is done.

International goals towards which countries report on are the following:

- UN Millennium Development Goals
- Lisbon Strategy and EU Structural Indicators
- EU Sustainable Development Strategy
- Maastricht Criteria
- Mauritius Strategy
- Pacific Plan
- Caribbean Project “Persistent Organic Pollution project”
- Kyoto Protocol
- WTO-Doha-Round
- Monitoring Sustainable Development
- Ramsar Convention on Wetlands

In New Zealand reporting towards international goals is undertaken on an ad hoc basis by responsible government departments and agencies, drawing on national statistics and information collected and managed by departments. Canada responded that it does not systematically report on progress towards international goals and some other countries indicated that information is provided by statistical offices. Korea and Saint Lucia responded that their governments do not report on any international goals.

The Danish Statistical Office has all relevant information for planning purpose and is capable of producing appropriate statistical material for the individual planning area, thus Denmark is fulfilling the international reporting’s obligations to international organizations such as UN, OECD, EU etc.

In Japan, each ministry or agency play a role for each policy. For instance, regarding the MDGs, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is taking a major role and publishes reports such as *White Paper on Japan’s Official Development Assistance* every year via the Internet and other appropriate means.

As UN Millennium Development Goals and EU Structural Indicators may be considered as supranational key indicators systems deeper insight on these systems and how reporting on these goals is done follows.

UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

In 2000 world leaders committed their nations to a new global partnership to reduce extreme poverty and setting out a series of time-bound targets – with a deadline of 2015 – that have become known as the Millennium Development Goals.⁶ Statistics Division of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs coordinates and publishes annual reports that present assessment of progress. Data collection is at regional and international level. However, the *UN Millennium Development Goals Report* still indicates the lack of data in many countries. Thus assessing progress worldwide is hindered by the lack of data for many countries.

Asian Development Bank prepares a statistical data book that features statistical data for regional members of the Asian Development Bank. The latest issue *Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2008* covers 48 countries and it includes social, financial, external trade, infrastructure, governance, and environment indicators. The book carries nontechnical commentaries on the Millennium Development Goals. For ease of understanding, regional tables are grouped under seven themes (people; economy and output; money, finance, and prices; international flows; infrastructure; government and governance; and energy and environment). Each theme is

⁶ Further reading on UN Millennium Development Goals is available at <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/bkgd.shtml>

introduced by a short, non-technical write-up highlighting some key developments since the 1990s.⁷

Kiribati informed that country's national goals are developed based on the national current issues and in parallel with or linked with the UN Millennium Declaration, Mauritius Survey and the Pacific Plan. Kiribati issued a report on progress toward the MDGs in 2007 highlighting in it which MDGs would be achieved within 2015 and which would potentially be met. Also in Fiji the international goals are included in the Government's Plan to ensure that national policies are consistent with the MDGs. The status of Fiji's implementation as regard the MDGs is reported by the Ministry of Finance & National Planning and the last report was published in November 2004. Based on UN Millennium Declaration Azerbaijan has elaborated *State Program for Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development for 2008-2015*.

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has submitted three national reports towards achieving MDGs – in 2002, 2006 and 2008. All three reports were prepared by the Ministry of Economy and Planning in close cooperation with the relevant government agencies and with support from UN Development Programme.

The USA statistical agencies provide publicly-available information on indicators related to the MDGs, but they are not reported as such by the USA government. Although other donor countries report on their contributions to the MDGs, the USA government has not. Interaction, an umbrella group of NGOs in the USA, has issued such a report, however.

The Government of Moldova monitors assesses and reports on the progress achieved in the implementation of the MDGs until 2015. The long term objectives are integrated and correlated with the medium-term ones, which are provided for in the medium-term planning documents, initially in the *Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (2004-2006, 2007)*, and currently in the *National Development Strategy for 2008-2011*. The Report on the MDGs *New Challenges – New Objectives* is available on the official web page of the Government of Moldova⁸.

Austria contributes to the MDGs and reports regularly on progress made and initiatives taken. The Ministry for European and International Affairs together with the Austrian Development Agency is responsible for this policy area⁹. The MDGs are reflected in national goals on the one hand by raising the budget and on the other through specific programme and project work. By 2010, spending on development cooperation will be gradually raised to 0.51 % of gross national income.

Since 2007 The Presidency of South Africa commenced with annual reporting on development indicators¹⁰ some of which are directly linked to MDGs targets. These indicators cover 10 broad themes namely: economic growth and transformation, employment, poverty and inequality, household and community assets, health, education, social cohesion, safety and security, international relations, good governance.

In *Policy Programme 2007-2011* which is the nationwide planning document in the Netherlands, prepared by the Department of General Affairs the MDGs are explicitly mentioned as the Dutch government wants to actively contribute to the achievement of the MDGs; however not all MDGs

⁷ Latest report (2008) on Key Indicators for Asia and Pacific is available at

http://www.adb.org/documents/books/key_indicators/2008/pdf/Key-Indicators-2008.pdf

⁸ Official website of the Government of Moldova <http://www.gov.md>

⁹ Report in German is available at http://www.entwicklung.at/uploads/media/%C3%96sterreichs_Beitrag_MDGS.pdf

¹⁰ South Africa's latest report *Development Indicators. Presidency 2008* is available at

<http://www.thepresidency.gov.za/main.asp?include=learning/me/indicators/mtr2008.html>

are goals of the Dutch government. In the budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs targets are set for some of the MDGs and in the annual report of this ministry information on the worldwide progress of the MDGs is given.

EU Structural indicators

EU Structural indicators derive from the *Lisbon Strategy for Growth and Jobs* which based on a close partnership between the EU and its member countries, with a clear division of responsibilities and a strong emphasis on maximising synergies between economic policy areas and action at different levels. EU Structural Indicators are covered in the National reform programmes (NRP) and the annual Implementation reports, which are submitted to the European Commission. Member States undertake reforms at national level based on the NRPs for 2008-2010. These in turn are based on the 2008-2010 renewed integrated guidelines. Each year, Member States produce reports on the implementation of their NRPs. Every year the list of key indicators is reassessed taking into account political priorities as well as progress with regard to development of indicators.

Reports on EU Structural Indicators in Austria are covered in the NRP and these reports in Austria are mainly based on the annual Economic report ("*Wirtschaftsbericht*") drafted by the Ministry of Economic Affairs in cooperation with the Ministry of Finance and any other relevant Lisbon Strategy Ministry¹¹. Various stakeholders are involved in the process of drafting the Economic report and the NRP respectively. Data is mainly provided by the Austrian Statistical Office based on different surveys, on environmental issues by the federal environmental agency.

In Malta in case of the EU, national indicators include those reported by the Ministry of Finance, Economy and Investment through the NRP that addresses the *Lisbon Strategy*, including the 2008-2010 document¹², the 2007 progress report¹³ and the 2005-2008 document and those reported by the Planning and Priorities Coordination Division of the Office of the Prime Minister in relation to the European Regional Development Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the European Social Fund¹⁴.

¹¹ Austria's latest report on EU Structural Indicators in German is available at <http://www.bmwfj.gv.at/BMWA/Schwerpunkte/Wirtschaftspolitik/Wirtschaftspolitik/006wirtschaftspolitik.htm>

¹² Malta National Reform Programme 2008-1010 is available at http://finance.gov.mt/image.aspx?site=MFIN&ref=NRP_Malta_2008-2010

¹³ Malta National Reform Programme Annual Progress Report 2007 is available at http://ec.europa.eu/growthandjobs/pdf/nrp2007/MT_nrp_en.pdf

¹⁴ Further reading is available at website of Malta's Office of the Prime Minister http://www.ppcd.gov.mt/links_and_downloads?l=1

No	Country	National				Sub-national				Sectors/Policies				Institutions				Budget			
		Objectives	Targets and milestones	Performance indicators	Data analysis	Objectives	Targets and milestones	Performance indicators	Data analysis	Objectives	Targets and milestones	Performance indicators	Data analysis	Objectives	Targets and milestones	Performance indicators	Data analysis	Objectives	Targets and milestones	Performance indicators	Data analysis
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
38	Slovenia	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
39	South Africa	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
40	Suriname	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
41	Sweden	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
42	Switzerland	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
43	Tunisia	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
44	Ukraine	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
45	United Kingdom	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
46	USA	-	-	-	-									+	+	+	+				

II. NATIONAL INDICATORS

The second part of the survey “National indicators” was aimed at detecting the types and characteristics of national indicators in the countries addressed; therefore the starting-point was to find out the following:

- whether there is a system of key national indicators in place;
- whether national indicators is a set of indicators that are compatible with macro-economic indicators;
- whether national indicators is a set of indicators for which statistics are gathered to report on progress towards international goals, or something else.

Respondents were asked to check all the applicable answers therefore the responses show that national indicators have diverse characteristics. The second part of the survey was filled in by 43 respondents and they are grouped in the table below according to the options they ticked.

Table 3 Types of national indicators

TYPES OF NATIONAL INDICATORS	COUNTRIES
A system of key national indicators ONLY	Indonesia, Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom
Indicators to report on progress towards international goals ONLY	Suriname
Indicators that are compatible with macro-economic indicators ONLY	Azerbaijan, Canada ¹⁵ , China, Denmark, Fiji, Hungary, Kingdom of Bahrain, Korea, Lithuania, Malta, Slovenia, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukraine, USA ¹⁶
All above mentioned types	Albania, Kiribati, Malaysia, Mexico, Slovak Republic, Switzerland
A system of key national indicators AND indicators to report on progress towards international goals	Greece
A system of key national indicators AND indicators that are compatible with macro-economic indicators	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Netherlands, Norway
Indicators to report on progress towards international goals AND indicators that are compatible with macro-economic indicators	Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Moldova, Pakistan, Panama, Russia ¹⁷ , Saint Lucia

¹⁵ Canada checked also „Other” specifying that this refers to health sector.

¹⁶ USA checked also „Other” specifying that a range of economic, as well as some social and environmental indicators are employed in the USA

¹⁷ Russia checked also „Other” specifying that such indicators are: 1. Indicators for preparation of the Consolidated report on the results and principal directions of activity of the Government of the Russian Federation. 2. Indicators for evaluation of the effectiveness of the executive branch at local level

Puerto Rico did not fill in this part of the survey; however from the websites it provided one can see that Puerto Rico has ~ 75 economic indicators for which data since 1991 is available¹⁸.

Besides the respondents were asked to identify how many and what kind of indicators they have, when the indicators were introduced etc. Free space was provided for additional explanations however in some cases the feedback received was quite limited, therefore in some cases it was even impossible to identify what the indicators are like. Answers to the questions concerning the targets of national indicators revealed some contradictions or unclear answer, thus the aggregated survey results may be misleading. Subsequently detailed analysis on this subject has not been done, but they are gathered as indicated by countries in Table 5 at the end of this chapter.

Development of national indicators

In most countries development of national indicators is mainly the responsibility of government sector however in some countries dialogue among the citizens and decisionmakers forms basis for the development of national indicators, thus also non-governmental sector is directly involved in the establishment of national indicators:

A non-government organization (NGO) called State of the USA was created in the USA in the last couple of years to develop a set of key national indicators. The intention is for the organization to be a public-private partnership, with some sort of government charter authorizing its role as the developer and provider of key national indicators.

Because of its militia structure, Switzerland features a strong involvement of external expert knowledge. After the draft bill has been approved by the Swiss Government, the draft is distributed for consultation among the cantons, the federal courts, political parties, business organisations and other stakeholders who are asked to submit their comments and propose changes.

It is part of Danish democratic model that interest groups and organizations play a role in defining the key indicators. As an example of interest groups influence on key indicators is the labour market and agriculture. In these areas the interest group is even paying for the key indicators because they use the information in business planning and decisions.

Social partners in the Netherlands are in a lot of cases involved in discussions about new policies. As indicators might be part of these policies, they have the opportunity to give their opinion on these indicators as well, but they do not decide upon them.

In Moldova the National Development Strategy (NDS) was developed within a wide participatory process. While developing the NDS, a National Participatory Council was established under the Inter-ministerial Commission for Planning composed of representatives of the non-governmental sector, academic environment, development partners, and was aimed to promote the strategic partnership between public authorities, civil society and private sector in the process of identification of strategic development priorities of the country and full involvement of the interested stakeholders in the decision making process.

In Estonia NGOs and all interested parties can participate in setting up different programs and strategic planning documents. In Panama different representatives of the society (unions,

¹⁸ Further reading on Puerto Rico's indicators is available on website of the Planning Board of Puerto Rico (in Spanish) <http://www.jp.gobierno.pr/>

universities and social research centres) participate in determination of the national report of development and development of indicators related to the MDGs.

In Suriname key national indicators are established through active participation and structural partnerships between the Government, NGOs, the private sector and the Unions. In Saudi Arabia joint stock companies, mixed public and private partnership, social entities and universities are involved in development of key national indicators. In Hungary business associations (e.g. chambers of commerce and industry), non-profit organizations and academics participate in establishment of indicators.

In Malaysia there are discussions in the working groups and meetings where the academics and non-profit organizations give their inputs. In Kiribati NGOs are also involved in establishing key national indicators. In Antigua and Barbuda National Local Social Council is involved and in Tunisia national union of agricultural and union of top managers.

In the United Kingdom the non governmental sector is not directly involved in the establishment of key national indicators, however the Government consults with key stakeholders and delivery partners in setting national targets.

System of key national indicators

14 countries responded that they have a system of key national indicators established – United Kingdom, Portugal, Kiribati, Slovak Republic, Malaysia, Albania, Indonesia, Mexico, Switzerland, South Africa, Netherlands, Norway, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Greece. Analysis of survey results reveal that concepts of “system of key national indicators” vary considerably among these countries. In some of responding countries key national indicators are a part of national planning process and cover explicitly government policies, in other countries a system of key national indicators refer to a set of macroeconomic indicators established by national statistical service. All these countries except United Kingdom have a single comprehensive nationwide policy planning document, but it does not necessarily mean that the system of key national indicators derives from it.

In most of these countries the system of key national indicators is relatively new and does not exist more than a decade, however in Indonesia the government started to develop national planning with indicators in 1969 by launching Five Year Development Planning and a State Twenty-five Year Development Guidance. Similarly Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has five years Development Plan along with its measures and indicators since 1970. In other countries the system is much more recent, for example, the Comprehensive Spending Review system in the United Kingdom was launched by the Labour Government in 1998. Spending Reviews happen every 2-3 years and Government’s national priority objectives, targets and indicators are re-evaluated and reset. The process has developed and matured over time and each Spending Review has shown greater prioritisation and a significant reduction in national targets. Also Key Economic indicators of Malaysia date back to 1998 when they were launched by Economic Planning Unit. The most recent system of key national indicators probably is in Kiribati that has introduced measureable national indicators only in the current Development Plan 2008-2011. At the same time Norway indicates key national indicators are established over time as part of development of different policy areas.

It is worth noting that in European countries like Portugal and Slovak Republic the indicators have been developed within the framework of commitments arising from EU membership. In

Slovak Republic national indicators are part of the National Reform Programme of the Slovak Republic for 2008–2010. The above mentioned set of indicators enables the monitoring of progress in the implementation of priorities and goals of the national Lisbon Strategy. The set of indicators constitutes the intersection of the European Council recommendations and the consideration and the consideration of national specifics in the fulfilment of the tasks of the Lisbon process. But there are other set of indicators in agendas of the membership in the European Union and Economic and Monetary Union (euro area) as National Strategic Reference Framework for the programming period 2007–2013, Mid-term Strategy of the National Programme of the Official Development Assistance for 2009–2013 and Stability Programme of the Slovak Republic for 2008–2012 etc. In Portugal more than hundred indicators have been developed on the basis of various policy documents and strategic goals of the EU, e.g. the Lisbon Strategy, 6th Environmental Action Programme, the Millennium Declaration and the EU Sustainable Development Strategy, however as “key” are indicated those compatible with EU Structural Indicators.

Table 4 Main characteristics of the systems of key national indicators of 14 countries

As these questions required checking the applicable options, symbol “+” is used if the respective option was checked, while symbol “..” means that the respondent did not provide a precise answer

Country	Number of KNIs	Areas covered				Indices		Structure	
		Institutional	Social	Economic	Environment	Targets	Statistical data	Separate	Composite
Albania	..	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Greece	> 100	+	+	+	+		+	+	+
Indonesia	34	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia	163	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Kiribati	75	+	+	+	+	+		+	+
Malaysia	..	+		+		+	+	+	+
Mexico	13 ¹⁹	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
The Netherlands	344	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Norway	..	+	+	+	+		+	+	
Portugal	14 ²⁰	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Slovak Republic	79 ²¹	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
South Africa	76	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Switzerland	21 ²²	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
United Kingdom	130	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Further details on systems of key national indicators on country by country basis are available in Table 5 at the end of this chapter and in the chapter “Country overview” of this review.

¹⁹ Main national indicators referring to macroeconomic variables, but in order to assess the impact of execution of public policies on population, each sector establishes their indicators according to their competence scope, for education there are 15 indicators and health 13 indicators.

²⁰ As key indicators may be considered 14 EU structural indicators, however Statistics Portugal gathers statistical information on 140 indicators and a set of indicators for sustainable development has been elaborated

²¹ Within the National reform Programme of the Slovak Republic for 2008–2010 there are 51 main indicators

²² Within the Swiss MONET system of 120 indicators, there are 21 main indicators

Indicators to report on progress toward international goals

21 countries reported that they have a set of selected indicators for which statistics are gathered to report on progress toward international goals, however not all the countries indicated what those international goals are. Suriname and Moldova are the only two countries indicating that their national indicators are only a set of indicators for which statistics are gathered to report on progress toward international goals.

In Moldova the system of national indicators was established in 2004, along with the development of the first medium-term strategic planning document – *the Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy*. This process advanced while developing *the National Development Strategy for 2008-2011*, which is the second major strategic planning document and it was developed within a wide participatory process. National Participatory Council was established under the Inter-ministerial Commission for Planning composed of representatives of the non-governmental sector, academic environment, development partners, and was aimed to promote the strategic partnership between public authorities, civil society and private sector in the process of identification of strategic development priorities of the country and full involvement of the interested stakeholders in the decision making process. Monitoring of the implementation of the objectives and priorities set in *the National Development Strategy for 2008-2011* is carried out based on over 130 indicators covering institutional, economic, social, environmental and regional planning issues. Comparable data on progress is available since 2000 and in order to monitor the implementation of *the National Development Strategy for 2008-2011*, half year progress reports and annual evaluation and implementation reports are developed and published.

In Suriname the national indicators' initiative was launched at the end of the 1990s by recommendations from the IMF and World Bank missions whom were advising the Government of Suriname on some critical issues regarding the distribution of data. The selected indicators are more or less statistical based provided by different governmental institutions, which are also involved with conducting the Multi-Annual Development Plan. *The Multi-Annual Development Plan 2006-2011* of Suriname is based on the 'Rights-based approach' and consists of 4 main pillars which are covering 9 policy areas and 33 sub-policies. These main pillars are:

- Governance
- Economic development
- Social and Human Resource development
- Constitutional State/democracy

Furthermore some cross-cutting issues such as:

- Environment
- Gender (equality) and Youth development

Also in Suriname national indicators are developed through active participation and structural partnerships between the Government, NGOs, the private sector and the Unions. The Ministry of Planning and Development in collaboration with the National Planning Office of Suriname are mainly responsible for setting the targets for national key indicators. Data is being collected systematically and is available for the last ten years on annual basis. The national key indicators are reported every five years when the Multi-Annual Development Plan is being conducted and it is a public document.

Russian Federation, Pakistan, Finland, Saint Lucia, Bulgaria, Germany, Austria, Antigua and Barbuda and Cambodia have national indicators in order to report on international goals, too.

Finland has used performance management systems including use of performance measurement and indicators for over a decade but no national indicator system has yet been built. However, Statistics Finland provides a comprehensive set of various statistics, largely based on high quality register data. Similarly Austria has a comprehensive list of high quality indicators in various policy areas that are provided by the Austrian Statistical Office; however no systematic set of national indicators is available.

Indicators that are compatible with macro-economic indicators

Most of the countries (35 altogether) responded that they have indicators that are compatible with macroeconomic indicators. Some of the countries reporting that they do not have a system of key national indicators actually have a set of indicators that reflect the nation's position and measure the economic, environmental, social and cultural progress towards achieving the country's goals.

Austria has a comprehensive list of high quality indicators in various policy areas that are provided by the Austrian Statistical Office covering institutional, social, economic and environmental areas; however no systematic set of national indicators is available even though the Federal government, the states and the local communities apply various tools for strategic and budgetary planning. Concerning medium term budgeting on the national level three instruments are available at the moment: the federal government budget program, the stability programme and the national stability pact. However, even if all these instruments include objectives in terms of economic, environmental, social and cultural developments and indicators are at place to measure and monitor the developments, there exists no conclusive system of key national performance indicators so far. There is a number of statistical data available and used to prepare sound political decisions and to analyse the results, but no or only a general definition (eg. high level of employment) of operational goals in terms of Key Performance Indicators. In some policy areas, like environment, there exist very comprehensive data and indicators for planning purposes. However, most of the data are input data, just in recent years more emphasis has been put on output and outcome oriented indicators.

Tunisia has 29 key national indicators that are developed through the national planning process. Currently the 11th Plan of development covering 5 year period is in operation and it contains performances indicators of the national level and of government sectors and of some institutions. Report named Key Economic and Social Indicators is published annually²³ and indicators in it are grouped along the following 10 areas: better living standards, population policy, health indicators, social security benefits, educations, women, employment, economic growth and macro-economic balances, boosting production and diversifying the economy, establishing an open economy. For some of the indicators historical comparisons date back to 1966.

Besides, countries publish different reports reflecting various aspects of their development. Even if such reports often reflect mostly the economic developments, different social and environmental aspects are also taken into the account. For example, Saint Lucia publishes annual *Economic and Social Review* that includes analysis of economic developments, monetary and

²³ Latest report on Tunisia's Key Economic and Social Indicators is available at <http://www.tunisieinfo.com/indicateurs/indicateurs-eng.pdf>

financial sector, real sector, government fiscal operations, balance of payments, socio-demographic indicators and economic outlook for the following year as well as statistical appendix²⁴.

Canada's macro-economic indicator reports are found in at least three sources – the Federal Budget²⁵, which is prepared by the Department of Finance; quarterly reports on Canada's economic climate, the Monetary Policy Report²⁶ published by the Bank of Canada; statistics for a variety of economic and other indicators²⁷ and national economic accounts²⁸ released by the Statistics Canada, the national statistical agency. Perhaps the closest report by the Government of Canada to a document containing “a small set of indicators that reflect the nation's position and measure the economic, environmental, social and cultural progress towards achieving the country's goals” is *Canada's Performance* which is published annually by the President of the Treasury Board of Canada since 2000, with key national indicators in 13 economic (including environmental), social and other areas, together with selected international comparisons²⁹. This report has at least 4 of the 14 identical indicators found in the EU Structural Indicators, as well as several similar indicators. Besides there are several non-government organizations which play an indirect role by producing and commenting on key national indicators, such as the *Conference Board of Canada*, which publishes reports with indicators and statistics on the economy, including trends and forecasts³⁰ and the *Canadian Council on Social Development*, which publishes reports with statistics in social indicator areas such as the economic well-being of children, poverty, literacy, child health and safety.

The Strategic Development Plan 2007-20011 for Fiji is the culmination of consultations with a wide range of stakeholders in the private sector, non-government organisations and Government. Policies in *The Strategic Development Plan 2007-20011* are consistent with the MDGs. Targets and Indicators for the achievement of the MDGs, which have been developed by the various UN departments, the World Bank, the IMF, and the OECD, and the relevant MDGs indicators are incorporated as Key Performance Indicators in Part 3 of it³¹.

²⁴ Latest Saint Lucia's Economic and Social Review (2007) is available at <http://www.stlucia.gov.lc/docs/EconomicReview2007.pdf>

²⁵ Further reading on budget related issues of Canada is available at <http://www.fin.gc.ca/access/budinfo-eng.asp>

²⁶ Monetary policy reports of the Bank of Canada are available at http://www.bank-banque-canada.ca/en/mpr/mpr_previous.html

²⁷ Economic indicators of Canada are available at http://www.statcan.gc.ca/dai-quo/economic_indicators-indicateurs_economiques-eng.htm

²⁸ Further reading on system of national accounts of Canada is available at <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/nea-cen/index-eng.htm>

²⁹ *Canada's Performance* Reports are available at <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/reports-rapports/cp-rc/index-eng.asp>

³⁰ Further reading on activities of the Conference Board of Canada and its reports is available at <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/>

³¹ Strategic Development Plan 2007-20011 for Fiji is available at http://www.mfn.gov.fj/Documents/Draft_Strategic_%20Development_%20Plan_2007-2011.pdf

Table 5 Characteristics of national indicators in responding countries

Most of these questions required checking the applicable options; therefore symbol “+” is used if the respective option was checked.

As the questions of the survey on issues in column 6 and column 17 required Yes or No answers, the following symbols are used:

+ Yes

- No

Blank space is left where no answer was given

No	Country	National indicators				Role of non-government	Areas covered				Indicators				Targets			Data collection	
		System of KNI	International goals	Macro-economic			Institutional	Social	Economic	Environmental	Targets	Statistical data	Separate	Composite	Policy-driven	Statistic-driven	Consistency with policies	Systematically	Ad-hoc
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
1	Albania	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
2	Antigua/Barbuda		+	+	+	+	+	+			+		+	+	+	+		+	
3	Austria		+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
4	Azerbaijan			+															
5	Bulgaria		+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+	+	
6	Cambodia		+	+	+	+	+				+	+	+	+		+		+	
7	Canada			+	-			+			+		+	+		+	+		
8	China			+	-		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		
9	Denmark			+	32	33				34		35						+	
10	Estonia		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		
11	Fiji			+	-		+	+	+	+	+			+	+	+	36		
12	Finland		+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		
13	Germany		+	+			+	+	+	+	+	+	+				+	+	
14	Greece	+	+		-	+	+	+	+		+	+	+		+		+		
15	Hungary			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	
16	Iceland																		
17	Indonesia	+			-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+		
18	Japan				-	+	+	+	+		+	+	+		+		+		
19	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
20	Kingdom of Bahrain			+	37		+	+			+	+	+				+	+	
21	Kiribati	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	38		
22	Korea			+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
23	Latvia		+	+	-		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	

³² It is part of the Danish democratic model that interest groups and organizations play a role in defining key indicators

³³ Statistical infrastructure gives possibility for key indicators in most areas

³⁴ Answer is depending on the sector and the political issue

³⁵ There is a great variety of indicators, depend of the objectives in the pertinent political area and issue

³⁶ Information is gathered by Bureau of Statistics, for analysis of economic indicators is obtained systematically, while other on ad-hoc basis

³⁷ Not relevant

³⁸ Every 4 years

No	Country	National indicators				Role of non-government	Areas covered				Indicators				Targets			Data collection	
		System of KNI	International goals	Macro-economic			Institutional	Social	Economic	Environmental	Targets	Statistical data	Separate	Composite	Policy-driven	Statistic-driven	Consistency with policies	Systematically	Ad-hoc
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
24	Lithuania			+	³⁹		+	+	+		+	+		+	+	+	+		
25	Malaysia	+	+	+	+	+		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
26	Malta			+			+	+			+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
27	Mexico	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	⁴⁰		+	+		
28	Moldova		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
29	Netherlands	+		+	⁴¹	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	
30	New Zealand																		
31	Norway	+		+	-	+	+	+	+		+	+		+	+	+	+		
32	Pakistan		+	+	-		+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+		
33	Panama		+	+	+		+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
34	Portugal	+			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+		
35	Russia		+	+	-		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
36	Saint Lucia		+	+	-		+	+		+		+	+	+	+	+	+		
37	Slovak Republic	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
38	Slovenia			+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
39	South Africa	+			-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
40	Suriname		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+		
41	Sweden			+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
42	Switzerland	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
43	Tunisia			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+		
44	Ukraine	+		+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
45	United Kingdom	+			-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	
46	USA			+	+		+	+	+	⁴²	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		

³⁹ Not relevant

⁴⁰ legally compulsory

⁴¹ social partners are involved in discussions about new policies (they include indicators), but they do not decide upon them

⁴² for some indicators targets have been set by law

III. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Third part of the survey was primarily aimed at countries not having performance measurement at national level, however all other countries were invited to fill it in as well. The purpose of the questions was to obtain the picture of performance management systems in various countries, how governments measure their performance.

The third part of the survey was completed by 39 countries, two of which indicated that they do not have a coherent or formal performance management system in place and three other countries responded that it is still under development and pilot projects are implemented. Overview of countries' responses is reflected in Table 6 at the end of this chapter.

In most countries the performance management system was introduced through 1990s and 2000s, but in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia it dates back to 1970 when the first development plan was launched and in Norway the performance management system was introduced in 1985. *Planning Law* was introduced in Mexico in 1983, however the Assessment and Compensation System in order to measure federal entities' progress in relation to the accomplishment of their goals and objectives was introduced in 2003 through amendments to the law.

The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 created a performance management framework for the federal government in the USA. However, the picture in the USA is quite varied, with federal, state and local governments each having their own system. Within the federal government, the performance management system required by the Government Performance and Results Act applies to individual agencies rather than to the whole of government. The Government Performance and Results Act requires agencies to complete strategic plans, establish goals, and identify the strategies that will be needed to achieve those goals. It also requires agencies to measure performance toward the achievement of the goals and report annually on their progress. These reports are intended to provide important information to agency managers, policymakers, and the public on what each agency accomplished with the resources it was given. The Office of Management and Budget, within the Executive Office of the President formulates the performance measurement policy in the USA.

Survey results reveal that performance measurement systems are more comprehensive in countries that have also a system of key national indicators. In these countries the performance measurement system in 7 out of 13 cases covers all levels – national, sub-national, government sectors, institutions and budget programmes. Performance measurement system covers also budget sub-programmes in Slovenia and projects in Pakistan.

Country responses show, that performance management at institutional level is most widespread as it is done in 29 countries. Further follows performance measurement at national level and government sectors' level – 25 and 23 countries respectively. Less widespread is performance management at sub-national level and budget programs – 14 and 16 countries respectively.

In Estonia the applicability of performance indicators is dependent on the policy field in which they are set (are there concisely measurable results or not), thus, in some policy areas performance indicators are not systematically used (e.g. foreign policy). Consequently, the system of performance indicators is fragmented and in some policy areas the practicality of performance indicators is openly questioned. In other policy fields (varying across ministries), performance indicators are used to a great and quite useful extent, however, this is, thus far, not a

characteristic of the overall system. Therefore, all performance indicators are not logically consistent with policies.

In Slovenia, where the performance management system covers all levels, the initiative for performance management system was launched in 1999 with the adoption of the Law of public finance in the National Assembly. It came into power for the budget year 2001 and the institution responsible for formulating the performance measurement policy is Ministry of Finance.

In majority of countries (namely 26) performance management system has been introduced by legislative means. The institution formulating performance measurement policy in most countries is Ministry of Finance or Treasury (in 20 countries) either alone or in cooperation with some other institutions, however this does not mean that the performance budgeting is necessarily a part of the performance management system in the respective countries.

Table 6 Characteristics of performance management in responding countries

Questions in columns 3-8 required checking the applicable options; therefore symbol “+” is used if the respective option was checked.

As the questions of the survey on issues in column 10, 12 and 13 required Yes or No answers, the following symbols are used:

+ Yes

- No

+/- both Yes and No answers were checked

Blank space is left where no answer was given

No	Country	Scope of performance management system						Introduction		Institution formulating performance measurement policy	Performance budgeting	Consistency with policies
		National level	Sub-national level	Government sectors	Institutions	Budget programmes	Other	when	legislative measures			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	Albania	+	+	+	+	+		2005	+	Ministry of Integration	+	+
2	Antigua/Barbuda	+		+	+	+			+		-	+
3	Austria	+	+	+	+			2009	-		-	
4	Azerbaijan	+		+		+			+	Ministry of Economic Development, Ministry of Finance	+	+
5	Bulgaria ⁴³								-			+
6	Cambodia			+	+				+		+	+
7	Canada	+ ⁴⁴			+ ⁴⁵			1995	-	The Treasury Board	-	+
8	China ⁴⁶	+							-	Ministry of Finance	-	+
9	Denmark	+	+	+	+			> 10 years	+	Ministry of Finance	-	+
10	Estonia	+		+	+	+		2005	+	Ministry of Finance, Strategy Office of the State Chancellery	-	-
11	Fiji	+						1995	+	The Public Service Commission	+	-
12	Finland				+			1990s	+	Ministry of Finance	+	-
13	Germany ⁴⁷								+	each ministry within its respective remit	-	+
14	Greece	+						2008 ⁴⁸	+	Ministry of Finance	+	+
15	Hungary			+	+			2003-2004	-	The Prime Minister's Office	-	+
16	Iceland				+			1998	+	Ministry of Finance	+	+
17	Japan		+		+			2001-2002	+	Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications	-	+
18	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia	+						1970	+	Ministry of Economy and Planning	+	+
19	Kiribati	+	+	+	+	+					+	+
20	Korea				+				+	Ministry of Strategy and Finance	+	+
21	Latvia			+	+	+		1997	+	Ministry of Finance, State Chancellery	+	-

⁴³ Does not have a coherent performance management system

⁴⁴ Federal government but not national-wide

⁴⁵ Federal entities

⁴⁶ At the stage of initiating performance management system, it is not formally launched yet

⁴⁷ Up to the present there is no single overarching performance management system in place, it exists for rather narrowly defined fields only

⁴⁸ Launched on experimental basis; date for full application 2012

No	Country	Scope of performance management system						Introduction		Institution formulating performance measurement policy	Performance budgeting	Consistency with policies
		National level	Sub-national level	Government sectors	Institutions	Budget programmes	Other	when	legislative measures			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
22	Malta ⁴⁹				+			1992	-	Office of Prime Minister	-	+
23	Mexico	+	+	+	+	+		2003 ⁵⁰	+	Ministry of Finance	+	+
24	Moldova	+		+	+	+		2003	+	Ministry of Finance	+	+
25	Netherlands	+	+ ⁵¹	+	+	+		1999	+	Ministry of Finance	+	+/-
26	New Zealand			+	+			1990s	+	The Treasury, the State Services Commission	+	+
27	Norway	+		+	+	+		1985	+	Ministry of Finance	+	+
28	Pakistan	+	+	+	+	+	+ ⁵²		-	Ministry of Finance	-	-
29	Portugal	+	+	+	+	+		2004	+	Ministry of Finance and Public Administration	+	+
30	Russia ⁵³					+			-	Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Economic Development	+	+
31	Saint Lucia ⁵⁴								+	Ministry of Finance	-	+
32	Slovak Republic	+	+	+	+	+		2005	+	Ministry of Finance	+	+
33	Slovenia	+	+	+	+	+	+ ⁵⁵	1999	+	Ministry of Finance	+	+
34	South Africa	+	+	+	+			2000	+	National Treasury, Department of public service and administration	+	+
35	Suriname	+		+	+	+			+	Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Planning and Development	+	+
36	Switzerland	+		+	+			..	+	Federal ministries under the coordination of Federal Chancellery	+	+
37	Ukraine	+	+	+	+	+		2002	+	Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Finance	+	+
38	United Kingdom	+	+	+	+			1998	-	HM Treasury	+	
39	USA				+			1993	+	Office of Management and Budget within the Executive Office of the President	-	+

⁴⁹ Response refers to the performance management system applied to senior civil servants who are appointed on the basis of three-year performance agreements

⁵⁰ Implementation of the Performance Assessment System to be completed in 2008

⁵¹ Partly

⁵² Projects

⁵³ Performance management system is under development

⁵⁴ No formal performance management system in place. First stage of budget by programme, but not for results.

⁵⁵ Budget sub-programmes

COUNTRY OVERVIEW

In this chapter summarized information on all the countries with established systems of key national indicators is gathered.

Mexico counts on a *Planning Law*, which established that planning must be carried out as a means to achieve an effective performance of the State's responsibility on the country's entire and sustainable development, and it shall be focused on the accomplishment of political, social, cultural and economic goals and objectives contained in the *United Mexican States Constitution*.

According to this Law, the Federal Executive Branch prepares a National Development Plan, which must specify the national goals, strategies and priorities on the country's sustainable development. *The National Development Plan* shall determine the sector, institutional, regional and special programmes that must be prepared. These programmes shall be aligned with the *National Development Plan*, and their validity shall not exceed the 6-year constitutional period, although their dispositions and scope refer to a longer period.

The Ministry of Finance is the responsible for the *National Development Plan*, taking into account the proposals of federal and local government entities, as well as those proposals presented by social groups and rural communities concerned. This Plan is endorsed by the Mexican President. *The Planning Law* establishes that the *National Development Plan* is mandatory to Federal Administration entities (Federal Executive Branch). Although not mandatory, the Plan is used as means for coordination for federal States and of guidance for social and private sectors.

The National Development Plan 2007-2012 details the objectives and national indicators, strategy and priorities of the country's sustainable development. This Plan shall contain provisions on the resources to be allocated to attain those objectives, shall determine the means and those responsible for its implementation; shall establish the global, sector and regional policy guidelines. The Plan's provisions shall refer to the economic and social activities, taking into account the related environmental variables, and must regulate the programmes content, which arise from the democratic national planning system.

The National Development Plan establishes the sector, institutional, regional and special programmes that must be generated. These programmes are subject to the provisions contained within the Plan, and specify the objectives, priorities and policies regulating the performance of the corresponding activities. These programs shall contain estimations on the resources and also definitions on the means and those responsible for their implementation.

For the Plan's implementation and the sector, institutional, regional, and special programmes, the entities must prepare annual programmes, which shall include the corresponding management, political, economical, social and environmental aspects. These annual programmes, which must be consistent with each other, shall rule, during the corresponding year, the activities of federal administration and they shall be basis for the integration of annual budgetary draft projects, which shall be prepared by the government entities in accordance with the applicable regulations.

The main national indicators refer to macroeconomic variables. In order to assess the impact of the execution of public policies on population, each sector establishes their indicators according to their competence scope. The indicators designed by the federal Government reflect the desirable progress in order to diminish or surpass the corresponding national problem.

Performance Indicators at national level are:

- By entity of the Federal Executive Branch
- Macroeconomic
- Millennium Development Goals

Federal Government entities, within the framework of policies and the national development plan, shall focus their programmes and public expenditure on the achievement of objectives and goals, and the results must be objectively measured through indicators related to efficiency, economy, effectiveness and quality, as well as the social impact derived from public expenditure.

According to the *Federal Law on Budget and Financial Responsibility* and its corresponding Rules of Procedure, information on national indicators is compiled monthly, quarterly and annually. Data on national progress indicators can be subject to comparison within a six-year period.

The *Planning Law* establishes the obligation of Ministers to deliver an annual report to the Congress on their current financial situation, and to report on the degree of fulfilment of the objectives and priorities established in the national planning that, according to their competence, belong to them, as well as to inform about the results from actions previously foreseen.

The Federal Executive Branch reports on the status and degree of compliance about its goals and priorities established in the national planning through the following 5 instruments:

- Government Report⁵⁶
- Performance Report on the National Development Plan⁵⁷
- Quarterly Reports on the Economic Status, Public Finances and Public Debt⁵⁸
- Financial Management Progress Report⁵⁹
- Federal Public Account⁶⁰

The nationwide policy planning document in **Portugal** is titled *National Planning Objectives (Grandes Opções do Plano)*, it covers four years (2005-2009), it is elaborated by the Portuguese Ministry of Finance and Public Administration and it is presented, as a law proposal, before the Portuguese legislative power (*Assembleia da República*). Meanwhile the indicators have been developed on the basis of various policy documents and strategic goals of the EU, e.g. the *Lisbon Strategy*, *6th Environmental Action Programme*, the *Millennium Declaration* and the *EU Sustainable Development Strategy*.

In 2007 Portugal launched Strategy for Sustained Development (*Estratégia de Desenvolvimento Sustentável*)⁶¹, which also encompasses the *Portuguese National Reform Plan: PNACE 2005-*

⁵⁶ <http://www.informe.gob.mx>

⁵⁷ <http://pnd.presidencia.gob.mx/indexa821.html?page=primer-informe-de-ejecucion>

⁵⁸ http://www.shcp.gob.mx/FINANZASPUBLICAS/finanzas_publicas_info_trimestral/2008/informe_trime408%20gral.pdf

⁵⁹ http://www.apartados.hacienda.gob.mx/contabilidad/documentos/informe_avances/2008/index.html

⁶⁰ http://www.apartados.hacienda.gob.mx/contabilidad/documentos/informe_cuenta/2007/index.html

2008⁶², extending however the planning period to 2015. To monitor this program, the Portuguese Government designed a set of key indicators⁶³ that includes the aforementioned structural indicators; a system of Sustainable Growth Indicators as adopted by the Portuguese Environmental Agency, the system of Sustainable Growth Indicators as adopted by EU, territorially based indicators and other non-specified indicators.

Indicators have been developed according in 7 areas:

1. Knowledge based society (20 indicators)
2. Sustainable growth, global competitiveness, energy efficiency (33 indicators)
3. Better environment and natural heritage (22 indicators)
4. Equality, opportunities and social cohesion (14 indicators)
5. Better connection to world and balanced regions (10 indicators)
6. Active role in Europe and the world (10 indicators)
7. More efficient and modern public administration (16 indicators)

At the EU level, 127 structural indicators were defined within the *Lisbon Strategy*, which were grouped in six domains. Among those 127 structural indicators, it might be labelled as “key indicators” those integrating the shorter list of 14 structural indicators. It might also be labelled as “key indicators” those reported under the Special Data Dissemination Standard⁶⁴. Moreover, Statistics Portugal gathers statistical information on 140 indicators⁶⁵. For structural indicators targets and statistical data are available. The Ministry of Finance and Public Administration is responsible for setting targets. Indicators are policy and statistics-driven.

In **Slovak Republic** development of key national indicators is closely linked to EU requirements which are reflected in several government-wide planning documents:

- *National Reform Programme of the Slovak Republic for 2008-2010*, elaborated by Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic approved on the national level by Government of the Slovak Republic and by National Council of the Slovak Republic.
- *National Strategic Reference Framework for the programming period 2007-2013*, elaborated by Ministry of Building and Regional Development of the Slovak Republic and approved by Government of the Slovak Republic.
- *Mid-term Strategy of the National Programme of the Official Development Assistance for the years 2009-2013* (MDGs)

⁶¹ Further reading on Portuguese Strategy for Sustained Development (in Portuguese) is available at <http://www.desenvolvimentosustentavel.pt/default.aspx?site=desenvolvimentosustentavel> -

⁶² Portuguese National Reform Plan 2005-2008 is available at <http://www.estrategiadelisboa.pt/InnerPage.aspx?idCat=340&idMasterCat=334&idLang=2&site=estrategiadelisboa>

⁶³ Further reading on indicators according to Portuguese Strategy for Sustained Development (in Portuguese) is available at <http://www.desenvolvimentosustentavel.pt/pt/desenvolvimentosustentavel/indicadores-e-metas/lista.aspx>

⁶⁴ Economic and Financial Data for Portugal are available at http://www.bportugal.pt/stats/sdds/inf_esta.htm

⁶⁵ Main statistical indicators on Portugal are available at http://www.ine.pt/xportal/xmain?xpid=INE&xpgid=ine_princindic&menuBOUI=13707095&Contexto=pi&selTab=tab0

As the main document is considered the National Reform Programme of the Slovak Republic for 2008–2010 (Slovakia's Lisbon Strategy). The measures of it are outlined with the goals of creating the preconditions for fast and in the long-term sustainable economic growth, increased social mobility, strengthen social cohesion, moderate the effects of demographic development and improved adaptability of the economy to the changes in the external and external economic environment in conditions of the absence of its own currency. It presents the status of implementation of structural policies consisting of measures for 2006–2008, macroeconomic framework, fiscal policy, program financing and new measures for 2008–2010 in five priority areas:

- Research – Development – Innovation
- Education
- Employment
- Entrepreneurial environment
- Climate change and energy industry.

National Reform Programme of the Slovak Republic for 2008–2010 has three annexes. Annex No. 1 contains the set of indicators for monitoring and fulfilment of the Slovakia's Lisbon Strategy in eight areas:

1. Macroeconomic framework (10 indicators)
2. Education (8 indicators)
3. Employment and social inclusion (23 indicators)
4. Business environment (10 indicators)
5. Energy industry (4 indicators)
6. Science, research and innovations (14 indicators)
7. Information society (5 indicators)
8. Environment (5 indicators)

Annex No. 2 contains an information on institutional framework of the Lisbon Strategy in the Slovak Republic, which lies in the adequate delegation of responsibilities and tasks to the competent authorities of particular policy areas and in incorporating all relevant institutions in the design and implementation of structural policies. The implementation and monitoring of the fulfilment of basic strategic goals is coordinated by the Office of the Government and the Ministry of Finance. The Depute Prime Minister for the Knowledge-oriented Society, European Affairs, Human Rights and Minorities and the Minister of Finance fulfil the role of the national coordinators of the Lisbon Strategy in the Slovak Republic. The Office of the Government in its position as the central state administration authority oversees the coordination and communication with the ministries which are competent in the agenda of the Lisbon strategies. The Ministry of Finance in cooperation with the relevant ministries coordinates the content-related issues of the Lisbon Strategy. It is responsible for the strategic direction within conditions of the Slovak Republic, ensures the compliance of the structural policies with the general government budget, and draws up the National Reform Programme of the Slovak Republic. The coordinators communicate the agenda to the European Commission.

Annex No. 3 contains an overview of action plans. Detailed information presented in the Action Plan focuses on the description, objectives, analytical reasoning measures and on their ties to the Council of the European Union recommendations on the Broad Guidelines for the Economic Policies of the Member States and the Community, the Commission of the European Communities Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Employment for 2008–2010 as a part of the mid-term review of the Lisbon Strategy and other prescribed particulars. Particular attention was paid to ensure that the proposed financial arrangements were worked out and a detailed schedule of tasks thereby creating better conditions for monitoring.

But there are other agendas of key national indicators. One of the commitments arising for the European Union Member States from membership in the Economic and Monetary Union is the preparation of annual stability programmes by Member States of the euro area, and of convergence programmes by the remaining Member States. Starting in 2004, the Slovak Republic prepared a total of five convergence programmes. Formal approval for the Slovak Republic joining the euro area therefore means an obligation for the country to present its stability programmes replacing the previous convergence programmes.

The Stability Programme of the Slovak Republic for 2008–2012 is subject to approval by the Government and submitted to the National Council of the Slovak Republic for consideration. The content and the format of the document fully respect Commission of the European communities guidelines. They are based on the „Specifications on the implementation of the Stability and Growth Pact“ and „Guidelines on the format and content of stability and convergence programmes“, approved in 2005 in order to improve the implementation of the Stability and Growth Pact which constitutes an essential part of the macroeconomic framework of the Economic and Monetary Union. The Stability programme also reflects discussions, documents and recommendations of the Economic and Financial Committee.

The linkage between the Stability Programme of the Slovak Republic for 2008–2012 and the National Reform Programme of the Slovak Republic for 2008–2010 is ensured in a manner that the measures implemented under the National Reform Programme are financed from the public funds allocated in the general government budget, which is in line with the medium-term fiscal consolidation plan. Some of the measures require more detailed parameters, therefore the budgetary impact estimate is only indicative in such cases. The European Union Structural and Cohesion funds are an additional source of funding for structural policies of the Slovak Republic and cover almost 40 % of the overall financial cost of measures under the National Reform Programme of the Slovak Republic for 2008–2010. A reference tool to prepare the programming of the European Union Structural and Cohesion funds is the National Strategic Reference Framework for the programming period 2007–2013. It is ensuring the use of the assistance extended from the funds in line with the European Union Community Strategic Guidelines on Cohesion and outline the links between the Community priorities on one hand and the National Reform Programme of the Slovak Republic on the other.

In 2000 the Swiss Federal Statistical Office, the Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape and the Swiss Federal Office for Spatial Development launched the MONET project

with the aim of setting up a system of indicators which could be used to measure sustainable development in **Switzerland**⁶⁶.

Intended for both the general public and policymakers, MONET provides over 120 regularly updated indicators. The system is based on a series of postulates which transform the qualitative objectives of sustainable development into specific requirements. “MONET globo” has been expanded to include globally relevant sustainability indicators. MONET indicators show whether the interplays between Switzerland and other countries are sustainable with respect to the use and distribution of environmental, economic and social resources.

From the MONET system of indicators, the 21 key national indicators are taken, such as health, income, physical safety, unemployment, poverty, official development assistance, equality, teenage reading skills, public debt, investment, innovations and technology, biodiversity developed land, freight transport, passenger transport, fossil fuel consumption and consumption of raw materials. Each key indicator represents a group of indicators and statistics. Key indicators make it easier to highlight major trends and the salient features of a given phenomenon.

In **South Africa** the system of key national indicators was introduced in 2004 and the *State of the Nation Address*, delivered annually by the President of South Africa, forms the basis of these key national indicators. The Presidency commenced with annual reporting on Development indicators in 2007⁶⁷ although data for some indicators is available since 1994.

76 national indicators in 2008 are grouped in 11 broad areas:

1. Economic growth and transformation (15 indicators)
2. Employment (3 indicators)
3. Poverty and inequality (8 indicators)
4. Household and community assets (6 indicators)
5. Health (8 indicators)
6. Education (6 indicators)
7. Social cohesion (8 indicators)
8. Safety and security (10 indicators)
9. International relations (6 indicators)
10. Good governance (2 indicators)

The national indicators in South Africa serves as basis to the detailed indicators contained in national, provincial and logical government plans.

⁶⁶ Monitoring Sustainable Development. MONET. Final report - methods and result.
<http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/en/index/themen/21/22/publ.Document.50367.pdf>

⁶⁷ Further reading is available on the website of the Presidency of the Republic of South Africa
www.thepresidency.gov.za

In **Kingdom of Saudi Arabia** national indicators consist of 163 key indicators and they are a part of national planning and progress measurement system, the principal tool of which is five year development plan. Five year development plan outlines objectives, policies and targets for selected directions. The responsible organization in preparing, coordinating and implementing the development plan is the Ministry of Economy and Planning. Comparable data on Kingdom's of Saudi Arabia progress is gathered on annual basis since 1970 and a report is prepared every five years at the end of each development plan.

The development plans have realized immense developmental achievements since 1970. These achievements shifted the levels of development in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to a higher status in all economic and social fields according to the results of applying standards and indicators related to the volume of GDP and its sectoral components, improvement in the quality and quantity of education, health and social care services, development of water resources, industrial and agricultural production, increase in the quantity and enhancement of the quality of non-oil exports, and steady improvement in the standard of living and quality of life. Government efforts continued to expand and develop the scope of these achievements, through dealing in an efficient and flexible manner with the national, regional and international developments, developing the planning methodology and establishing specialized, comprehensive data bases.

The Eighth Development Plan (2005-2009) constitutes the cornerstone of the endeavour to achieve the MDGs – it seeks to build a true partnership between national and global efforts aimed at creating a world of peace, security and development, within the framework of the MDGs. Available data on implementation of the MDGs in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia demonstrate that the set targets for a number of goals have already been reached or even surpassed, while others are expected to be reached well ahead of schedule.

Indicators are grouped along the following categories:

1. Public Finance, Gross Domestic Product and Investment (40 indicators)
2. Trade and Monetary Affairs (24 indicators)
3. Prices and Cost of Living indexes (9 indicators)
4. Water and Energy (11 indicators)
5. Agricultural and Animal Production (9 indicators)
6. Industrial and Electricity Affairs (12 indicators)
7. Human Resources Development (35 indicators)
8. Health and Social Affairs (12 indicators)
9. Transport and Telecommunications (12 indicators)

In addition to indicating the expected outcomes for the next five years in the Eighth Development Plan, the *Long-Term Strategy 2025* provides a vision for the next twenty years. The long-term strategy involves clear articulation of Vision 2025, defining the direction and destination for the Saudi economy for the next twenty years, the policies required to achieve Vision 2025 and follow-up and implementation mechanisms to ensure that aspirations articulated in Vision 2025 are converted into reality on the ground.

The Saudi Quality of Life Index (SQLI) is a composite index based on the indices of the following eleven areas:

9. Income and Distribution
10. Working Life
11. Transport & Communications
12. Health
13. Education
14. Housing
15. Environment
16. Family Life
17. Public Safety
18. Leisure
19. Public Services

A total of 40 indicators were selected to represent the eleven areas.

Kiribati national indicators system was launched by holding wide consultation with key stakeholders and it is reflected in *Kiribati Development Plan 2008-2011*⁶⁸ elaborated and approved by the Ministry of Finance. Although this plan is the 8th in the series of development plans which started in 1979 when Kiribati first became an independent nation and it builds on the previous plans extending it for a further four years in the past, monitoring has been inadequate largely due to lack of participation from line ministries in the monitoring process as well as a lack of measurable Key Indicators.

In *Kiribati Development Plan 2008-2011* national indicators are built upon six broad priority issues or key policy areas, reflecting the broad strategies required to address them, the Ministries responsible for implementing the strategies and indicators that can be used, not only by government but also by international agencies, to measure and monitor the development progress in the country:

1. Human resource development (8 indicators)
2. Economic growth and poverty reduction (10 indicators)
3. Health (30 indicators)
4. Environment (4 indicators)
5. Governance (11 indicators)
6. Infrastructure (12 indicators)

Most of these issues in fact are reflected in the *MDGs Declaration*, the *Mauritius Strategy*, and the *Pacific Plan* therefore *Kiribati Development Plan 2008-2011* is also consistent with the international and regional agenda.

⁶⁸ Kiribati Development Plan 2008-2011 is available at <http://www.sprep.org/att/IRC/eCOPIES/Countries/Kiribati/87.pdf>

In **Malaysia**, since 1998 the Economic Planning Unit of the Prime Minister's Department publishes selected economic indicators to monitor short-term development in the economy. These indicators are published on monthly basis and they are divided according to consumption, investment and production indicators as well as external sector⁶⁹. Since 2005 the Economic Planning Unit publishes *Malaysian Economy in Figures* that reflects broader scope of indicators divided in 15 categories⁷⁰. Key Performance Indicators in ministries, departments and agencies were introduced in 2005.

However there is also a nationwide policy planning document titled *Ninth Malaysia Plan 2006-2010* elaborated by Economic Planning Unit and performance indicators for states and provincial level are based on this planning document. The *Ninth Malaysia Plan 2006-2010* is the first of three five-year blueprints for the National Mission, encapsulating policy directions and programmes, which are aimed at delivering the Mission's philosophy and thrusts. The National Mission will drive the design and prioritization of programmes, plans and budgets from the year 2006 onwards. With consistent and determined effort in the implementation and delivery of the National Mission, the nation will be well placed to achieve its aspirations and join the ranks of developed nations by the year 2020.

According to this document by 2020 key performance indicators would have been established and tracked across government departments to enable objective measurement of the efficiency and effectiveness of public services, particularly those of frontline agencies.⁷¹ *The Mid-term review of Ninth Malaysia Plan 2006-2010* reflects the key results for 2006-2007 and expected outcomes by 2010 according to the five thrusts of the plan:

- To move the economy up to the value chain,
- To raise the capacity for knowledge and innovation and nurture "First class mentality",
- To address persistent socio-economic inequalities constructively and productively,
- To improve the standard and sustainability of quality of life,
- To strengthen the institutional and implementation capacity.

In the **Netherlands**, the most important set of indicators was developed as part of the national government outcome-based budgeting system that was launched in 1999. One of the main goals of this operation From Policy Budget to Policy Accountability (VBTB) was to focus on (intended) achievements of government policy. For each policy area a number of policy goals were operationalized and indicators were developed. In 2008 this resulted in 344 indicators. Every budget program of central government is built around these indicators. Budget programs of agencies are also built on the basis of VBTB.

VBTB stands for the Dutch programme, implemented under the responsibility of the Ministry of Finance, which was designed to achieve the above-mentioned goal (Dutch abbreviation of From

⁶⁹ Key economic indicators of Malaysia are available at

http://www.epu.jpm.my/New%20Folder/kei/key_economic_indicators.html

⁷⁰ The Malaysian Economy in Figures – 2008 is available at <http://www.epu.jpm.my/New%20Folder/MEIF2008.htm>

⁷¹ 9th Malaysia Plan 2006-2010 is available at <http://www.epu.gov.my/rm9/english/Mission.pdf>

Policy Budget to Accounting for Policy). The VBTB system is based on the formulation of goals for public policy, preferably in terms of social effects. These general objectives are operationalised in terms of products and services, and sometimes also in terms of activities. The intention is to make departmental budgets and accounting more transparent and more closely related to policy goals, by linking objectives, performance and resources to one another.⁷²

The basic document is the *Policy Program 2007-2011* consisting of 74 goals, elaborated by the Department of General Affairs and approved by the Parliament. Although there is not always a direct link between the goals in the *Policy Program 2007-2011* and the goals in the budget programs or ministries, performance indicators are based on this nationwide policy planning document and there are 344 goals in the annual budgets of the ministries. Moreover in the *Policy Programme 2007-2011* the MDGs are explicitly mentioned as the Dutch government wants to actively contribute to their achievement. Dutch national indicators are both targets (policy-driven only) and statistical data, although not for all targets statistical data are collected. For indicators for which annual information can be collected the information will be provided in the annual reports of the Dutch ministries, of which the policy programmes are part of. For other indicators information will be *ad-hoc*.

In **Albania** the nationwide policy planning document is titled *National Strategy for Development & Integration 2007-2013*⁷³ and it is elaborated by Department of Strategy & Donor Coordination, Council of Ministers. The *National Strategy for Development & Integration* crystallises the medium- to long-term vision of the development of the country based on an open and transparent process, which guarantees the broad inclusion of the civil society, local government, the business community, the academic and scientific world, the Albanian political spectrum and other groups of interest. For the first time the perspectives for sustainable economic and social development, integration into the European Union and NATO structures, as well as achievement of Millennium Challenges Goals are harmonised in a single strategic document. Policy planning in Albania is top-down: from *National Strategy for Development & Integration* to Sectorial Cross-Cutting Strategies and then to Integrated Planning Management for each institution. Ministry of Integration (European Integration) is responsible for setting targets for key national indicators. Albania reports on European Integration, Stabilization-Association Agreement implementation.

In **Indonesia** there is a single comprehensive nationwide policy planning document *Long-term National Development Planning for Year 2005-2025* that is later derived in *Medium-term National Development Planning for Year 2004-2009*⁷⁴ as guidance for all levels of government in making its development planning. Both documents are elaborated by National Development and Planning Agency and approved by Indonesian Parliament. The policy planning document forms

⁷² Further reading on Dutch programme From Policy Budget to Accounting for Policy (VBTB) is available at http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/evalsed/sourcebooks/capacity_building/netherlands/background_en.htm

⁷³ Albania's National Strategy for Development and Integration 2007-2013 is available at <http://mie.gov.al/skedaret/1226905647-NSDI.pdf>

⁷⁴ The National Medium-term Development Plan 2004-2009 of Indonesia is available at <http://www.bappenas.go.id/index.php?module=ContentExpress&func=display&ceid=2821>

basis for performance indicators at all levels – national, sub-national, government sectors and agencies. On the basis of the national development vision, three national development missions (agendas) for 2004-2009 have been determined, namely:

1. Realizing a Safe and Peaceful Indonesia (7 indicators)
2. Realizing a Just and Democratic Indonesia (7 indicators)
3. Enhancing the Prosperity of the Indonesian People (20 indicators)

The three basic development agendas for 2004–2009, are subsequently translated into development programs that are to be attained within the next five years and targets, priorities, and basic policy directions have been set. Data on these indicators are collected systematically on annual basis since 2004 and Indonesia publishes an annual report which contains the progress of key national indicators – Annual Evaluation on National Medium-Term Development Planning Implementation.

United Kingdom Comprehensive Spending Review system was launched by the Labour Government in 1998. Spending Reviews happen every 2-3 years and Government's national priority objectives, targets and indicators are re-evaluated and reset. There have been five spending reviews in 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004 and 2007. The process has developed and matured over time and each Spending Review has shown greater prioritisation and a significant reduction in national targets. Following the Comprehensive Spending Review, the UK government published 30 priority objectives, supported by c.130 indicators⁷⁵. The targets are set following negotiation between HM Treasury and departments though they must be agreed by the ministers responsible. However the quality of the data and frequency of collection varies from indicator to indicator

In **Greece** the system of key national indicators reflects the initiative implemented by the National Statistical Service of Greece for more than 15 years. There are more than 100 indicators for all major aspects of the national economy. These indicators are purely statistical data that are gathered systematically and published on annual basis in the *Concise Statistical Yearbook of Greece*. The indicators cover institutional, social, economic, environmental and other areas.

In **Norway** key national indicators are established over time as a part of the development of different policy areas and nearly all policy areas have a certain number of key indicators. These indicators are purely statistical data that are gathered systematically and published annually by Statistics Norway which is a professional autonomous institution placed under the Ministry of Finance. The indicators cover institutional, social, economic, environmental and other areas.

⁷⁵ Further reading on United Kingdom's Comprehensive Spending Review is available at http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/pbr_csr07_psaindex.htm

LIST OF RESPONDENTS

1. Albania
2. Antigua and Barbuda
3. Austria
4. Azerbaijan
5. Bulgaria
6. Cambodia
7. Canada
8. China
9. Denmark
10. Estonia
11. Fiji Islands
12. Finland
13. Germany
14. Greece
15. Hungary
16. Iceland
17. Indonesia
18. Japan
19. Kingdom of Bahrain
20. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
21. Kiribati
22. Korea
23. Latvia
24. Lithuania
25. Malaysia
26. Malta
27. Mexico
28. Moldova
29. Netherlands
30. New Zealand
31. Norway
32. Pakistan
33. Panama
34. Portugal
35. Puerto Rico
36. Russian Federation

37. Saint Lucia
38. Slovak Republic
39. Slovenia
40. South Africa
41. Suriname
42. Sweden
43. Switzerland
44. Tunisia
45. Ukraine
46. United Kingdom
47. USA