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Sofia, May 2020

The present summary outlines the results of the public procurement for Interim Evaluation of progress towards the implementation of Priority Axes 1, 2 and 3 of the Operational Programme “Good Governance” 2014-2020 (OPGG), budget line Reg. No. BG05SFOP001-5.001-0002, entitled “*OPGG Evaluations and Analyses”* financed under the Operational Programme “Good Governance” and co-financed by the European Social Fund.

The interim evaluation was carried out by an expert team of Global Advisers Corp., in the period of December 16th, 2019 – April 16th, 2020.

**Evaluation objectives**

**The overall objective** of the evaluation is to perform an independent analysis and assessment of progress towards the implementation of Priority Axis 1: Administrative Service Delivery and E-Government (PA 1), Priority Axis 2: Effective and Professional Governance in Partnership with the Civil Society and the Business (PA 2) and Priority Axis 3: Transparent and Efficient Judiciary (PA 3) under the Operational Programme “Good Governance” 2014-2020.

Four **specific objectives** have been defined:

* To assess the progress towards the Programme implementation achieved between the Programme approval by the European Commission on 19 February 2015 up to 30 September 2019 by analysing the set goals and priorities, the financed projects and the output and result indicators reached;
* To analyse new (2018-2019) priorities and trends in the field of e-government and e-justice, developments in the central administration and the judicial reform;
* To assess the extent to which the objectives, priorities and indicators under the OPGG remain current and achievable, and to assess the contribution of the OPGG to reforms in the different fields;
* To provide specific recommendations and proposals for amendment of the OPGG and the OPGG Indicator Guide, including changes to target values, reformulation, dropping out of certain indicators and proposals for new ones (if necessary).

**Evaluation Scope**

The evaluation covered the overall implementation of PA 1, PA 2 and PA 3 under the OPGG, from the Programme approval on 19 February 2015 up to 30 September 2019, including analysis of the extent to which indicator target values have been reached and formulation, if necessary, of recommendations for amendment and/or dropping out of certain indicators, and of proposals for new indicators or reformulation of existing ones.

Given the date of the contract conclusion and following the discussions with the Contracting Authority, the scope of the evaluation was expanded with the evaluation period covering the entire 2019 (up to 31.12.2019).

The interim evaluation was carried out on the basis of four main tasks, as follows:

* ***Task 1:*** Analysis and evaluation of progress towards the implementation of PA 1 of the OPGG and towards reaching indicator target values under the Priority Axis. Formulation of recommendations for enhanced implementation of PA 1 of the OPGG, including specific proposals for amendments to the OPGG, the OPGG Indicator Guide, metadata for the indicators and other documents.
* ***Task 2:*** Analysis and evaluation of progress towards the implementation of PA 2 of the OPGG and towards reaching indicator target values under the Priority Axis. Formulation of recommendations for enhanced implementation of PA 2 of the OPGG, including specific proposals for amendments to the OPGG, the OPGG Indicator Guide, metadata for the indicators and other documents.
* ***Task 3:*** Analysis and evaluation of progress towards the implementation of PA 3 of the OPGG and towards reaching indicator target values under the Priority Axis. Formulation of recommendations for enhanced implementation of PA 3 of the OPGG, including specific proposals for amendments to the OPGG, the OPGG Indicator Guide, metadata for the indicators and other documents.
* ***Task 4:*** Analysis and evaluation of financial resource allocation between PA 1, PA 2 and PA 3 under the OPGG, including formulation of specific recommendations for amendments under the OPGG.

**Evaluation Methodology**

The evaluation used **information and data** collected as part of the OPGG monitoring system and provided by the MA of the OPGG (internal programme performance analyses under PA 1, PA 2, PA 3; indicator data and financial performance), as well as publicly available information (Regulations and strategic documents, annual programme performance reports, guidelines and instructions, reports from previous evaluations) and data from Management and Monitoring Information System 2020.

In addition, in the course of the evaluation, information was obtained through meetings held with employees of the MA of the OPGG and **interviews** with key beneficiaries.

For the purposes of the analysis and evaluation under Priority Axis 2, a **survey** was carried out among beneficiaries of procedure BG05SFOP001-2.009 ***Enhancing Civil Participation in Processes of Policy and Legislation Formulation, Implementation and Monitoring***.

A focus group was carried out on 27 February 2020 with beneficiaries under PA 3. The topic was *Progress towards meeting the objectives of the OPGG Priority Axis 3 – Transparent and Efficient Judiciary*. The issues discussed covered the reporting of the Programme indicators, the results achieved, possible changes to the Programme objectives and indicators, changes to priorities, legislation and trends in the judicial system in the 2018-2019 period.

**Main Conclusions and Recommendations**

1. **General conclusions and recommendations for all three priority axes**

**1.1.** There is a risk of low disbursement of the planned financial resources for all three priority axes:

* Under PA 1, at the end of 2019, 67% of the budget of the Axis was contracted. With the new procedures planned under the Indicative Annual Working Programme 2020, assimilation of the Priority Axis budget is expected to remain below 77%.
* Under PA 2, at the end of 2019, 38% of the budget if the Axis was contracted, with funds actually disbursed remaining low (22%). It must be noted that a large portion of projects under the agreed procedures are still under implementation. The IAWP 2020 plans 2 new procedures with a total budget of BGN 12.2 million. If these procedures are implemented, the contracted funds under PA 2 will reach 46% of the Axis budget. In addition, the IAWP 2020 plans for a further two procedures to be implemented under both PA 1 and PA 2 of a total value of BGN 9.6 million, the budget allocation for which between the two axes cannot be currently determined.
* Under PA 3, at the end of 2019, 52.75 % of the funds planned for the announced procedures were contracted. Together with the currently assessed procedures and the new procedures planned in the IAWP 2020, the budget assimilation under the Priority axis is expected to reach 75.2%. That leaves unused financial resources in the amount of BGN 17,232,683.78, to which the funds saved under the implemented projects would be added, which, at the time of the evaluation, were in the amount of BGN 874,672.23 and which would increase following the completion of the projects under implementation.

**Recommendation:**

With view of avoiding loss of funds, it is recommended that the MA of the OPGG should assess the opportunities for negotiating procedures up to the remaining limit under the financial plan for the three axes. The remaining resources may be used to fund priority projects from the respective strategic documents and roadmaps of the axes, which could contribute to those indicators for which performance is weaker. As an alternative, given the risk that the planned financial resources will not be assimilated, measures for redirection of funds between the priority axes or to other Operational programmes are recommended.

**1.2.** The set milestone indicators under the three priority axes have been achieved and as of 2018 the implementation framework has been achieved.

**1.3.** The output and result indicators allow measuring the extent to which the objectives have been reached, although a direct connection between the output and result indicators is not evident in each case.

**1.4.** The metadata fail to provide information regarding the basis on which the baseline and the target values of the result indicators have been defined.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that, when programming of the Operational programme for the next programming period, the metadata of indicators include a description of the grounds and conditions for determining the baseline and the target values of the indicators. Such information would be useful when monitoring changes to the original conditions on which the target value is based and the extent to which these changes affect the target achievement.

**1.5.** There is a disparity between the approach adopted when setting out the target values of the indicators under the OPGG and the recommendations made in the EC Guidance for the 2014-2020 programming period[[1]](#footnote-1). The OPGG target values include baseline values while the EC guidelines recommend that the baseline value is not included in the target value.

**Recommendation:**

Recalculation of the result indicators target values is recommended, in compliance with the EC Guidance.

1. **Main conclusions and recommendations under Priority Axis 1**

**2.1.** The progress under PA 1 at the end of 2019, with regards to contacting, is relatively good – procedures with a total budget of around 88% of the financial plan for the Axis have been launched and 80% of the planned budget for the procedures has been contracted. Assimilation lags significantly - 31% of certified funds against those contracted.

**2.2.** The strategic and statutory framework in the field of e-governance in the period of 2018-2019 has undergone changes, most of which arise from the implementation of key projects supported under the OPGG. The following are of key significance for the infrastructure which would serve the e-governance: the electronic identification project launched by the Ministry of Interior, upgrading and elaborating the State Hybrid Private Cloud project of the State Agency for E-Governance, the Ministry of Health project for a National Health Information System and the remote voting project of the State Agency for E-Governance.

Among the external factors driving such changes, a great influence have the regulatory requirements of the EU on trans-border interoperability to facilitate the mobility of citizens and business.

**2.3.** The specific objectives of PA 1 remain current: the necessity for reducing the administrative and regulatory burden on citizens and the business also remains, as well as for increasing the electronic services available to citizens and businesses.

**2.4.** The achieving of the target values of two **output indicators –** О1-2 and О1-8 by 2023 is at risk.

For О1-2 indicator, a change is possible in the indicator’s metadata in order to allow reporting of partial preliminary assessments of the impact of statutory acts arising from projects supported under the OPGG. Such partial assessment of statutory acts related to projects supported by the OPGG contribute to the specific goal and, at the same time, assist project implementation and the achievement of results.

Under indicator О1-8 the supported internal administrative services should also be taken into account, in their entirety, including access to data via RegIX. Even under improved reporting of internal administrative services, the current data report a large discrepancy between the target value and the contracted services (target value of 850 services against 387 contracted). Services entered into the Integrated Public Administration Information System, which could be upgraded to level 3 and 4, are only 684.

**Recommendations:**

* It is recommended that the metadata for indicator О1-2 be amended to allow not only an overall preliminary evaluation of the impact of statutory acts, but also a partial one.
* It is recommended that the metadata for indicator О1-8 be amended with view of reporting the new internal administrative services provided through data access via RegIX.
* It is recommended that the target value for indicator О1-8 be reduced from 850 to 650—700 services. Currently 387 services have been contracted and there is a risk that some of these will not be implemented and reported. At the same time it is expected that the projects planned under the Indicative Annual Working Programme 2020 will contribute, as per the MA forecasts, with a further 178 supported services.

**2.5.** Under indicators О1-5 and О1-9 the potential for funding of additional projects which could contribute to the indicators is limited by the measures set out in the updated E-Governance Roadmap, or, in the case of indicator О1-5 – by the number of control, revenue and regulatory authorities planned to be supported.

For the purpose of achieving the target value for indicator О1-3, the contribution of institutional access to data via RegIX towards introduction of comprehensive administrative services should also be taken into account, given that it reduces the administrative burden on citizens and businesses.

**Recommendation:**

Based on the contracts expected to be concluded in 2020, it is recommended that a forecast be made for the achievement of the target values for indicators О1-5 and О1-9. Where a sufficient number of projects contributing to the indicators cannot be financed, an adjustment of target values is recommended.

It is recommended that the amendments to internal rules and ordinances of administrations as a result of data access via RegIX be reported as contribution to indicator О1-3. Such data access facilitates the overall administrative service delivery.

**2.6.** With regards to **result indicators,** there is a risk that the target values of two indicators – R1-1 and R1-3 may not be achieved.

With regards to indicator R1-1 under the project of the Council of Ministers Administration, 10 services of the type “life episodes” and “business events” were selected and grouped. A service provision model is expected to be elaborated with the support of a SRSS project in two stages (initially five services and thereafter – further five). Although service introduction will not be carried out entirely with the OPGG support, the Programme itself has a significant contribution through the studies carried out and the regulatory changes to be introduced. Currently, however, it is unclear whether the services will be introduced by the end of 2023, as the model must be put into practice, which may require additional efforts or support. Implementation is more likely for the first five services of the first stage.

Whether the target value for the result indicator R1-3 will be achieved is still unclear. The contribution of only one project has been reported under the indicator, with this contribution being uncertain. Indicator О1-8 also has a direct contribution to this indicator. It is possible that a portion of the services reported under the output indicator be reported under the result indicator, as long as these are priority services (i.e. used more than 5,000 times per year) and are based on the State Hybrid Private Cloud. For this reason, the recommendations made regarding indicator О1-8 and concerning changes to metadata for the purpose of more comprehensive reporting of internal administrative services apply to indicator R1-3 as well. Despite this, the target value of 225 supported priority services appears unrealistic. The number of registers supported under the OPGG which, as per RegIX data analyses, are used more than 5,000 times per year, is only 7 (with a total of 30 registers accessed via RegIX more than 5,000 times per year[[2]](#footnote-2)).

**Recommendations:**

For indicator R1-1 it is recommended that elaboration of the service introduction model for the five services (“Life episodes” and “Business events”) is monitored at the first phase of implementation of the SRSS-supported project. Depending on outcomes and expectations, the recommendation is for (1) reducing the target value of the indicator to 5 services and amending the metadata in order to clarify the contribution of the OPGG; or (2) dropping out of the indicator when introduction of “Life episodes” and “Business events” services by the end of 2023 is not possible.

For indicator R1-3 the recommendation is:

(1) Amendment to metadata with view of reporting data access via RegIX as an internal administrative service.

(2) Reducing the target value of the indicator. A change can also be made to the threshold for annual service use which will reflect on the target value.

**2.7.** The metadata for indicator R1-5 (Functioning NHIS) does not take into account the phasing of NHIS construction set out in the National Health Strategy 2020.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the metadata of the indicator be amended by specifying which of the key components of NHIS will be constructed by 2023, so that an operable NHIS will be in place and which functionalities will be provided at later stages.

**2.8.** Under PA 1, due to the specifics of the support, some activities and results are not covered by the system of indicators. For this purpose, specific indicators are set out for some projects. The specific outcomes from these activities and projects are related to changes in the statutory, strategic and institutional framework and the construction of information systems and infrastructure to facilitate access to data and e-governance.

1. **Main conclusions and recommendations under Priority Axis 2**

**3.1.** As of the end of 2019, 38 % of the budget of the priority axis were contracted, but the disbursed funds are still very low (22%). It must be noted that a large portion of projects under the contracted procedures are still under implementation. Two new procedures are planned in the IAWP for 2020 with an overall budget of BGN 12.2 million. If these procedures are implemented, the contracted funds under PA 2 will reach 46% of the axis budget. In addition, IAWP 2020 plans for two further procedures which will be implemented under both PA 1 and PA 2, in the value of BGN 9.6 million in total.

**3.2.** Priority axis 2 of the OPGG contributes to implementation of the four strategic objectives set out in the Public Administration Development Strategy 2014 – 2020, related to the **elaboration and monitoring of policies, organisational development and human resources management:** Strategic objective 1: Effective governance and Rule of Law; Strategic objective 2: Partnership governance with citizens and business; Strategic objective 3: Open and accountable governance; and Strategic objective 4: Professional and expert governance. The roadmap to the Public Administration Development Strategy sets out, under strategic objectives 1-3, a total of 39 activities in implementation of the measures, 22 of which are planned to be implemented under the OPGG and which, in their essence, are precisely the activities through which reforms in the field of elaborating and monitoring policies and organisational development will be effected. The contribution of the OPGG under Strategic Objective 4 is in the field of human resource management and is implemented through training sessions, traineeships, enhanced capacity of the Public Administration Institute, i.e. more than 32 completed projects, under which more than 47,000 participants from the administration’s work force were trained; 99 training modules for the administration were modernised or created and a Portal was launched to facilitate the operation of the state administration.

During the reviewed period, the measures and activities set out in the Roadmap to the Public Administration Development Strategy 2014 – 2020 underwent updating, which is due mainly to the implementation and reporting of the contracted funds under ongoing OPGG projects; this updating involves mainly: specification of deadlines, budgets and indicators for several of the measures including through reporting of contracted funds under launched OPGG projects; updating of output indicators; consolidation or separation of activities; elimination of non-up-to-date measures and activities; addition of new measures and activities, such as support for the institutions of the Ministry of Finance, the State Agency for Energy Regulation and the Ombudsman and training of public administration officials in connection with the reform implementation as per PADS Roadmap objectives.

No changes have been made to the Roadmap which may result in changes to the Operational Programme, its objectives and activities.

**3.3.** Significant changes to statutory acts were introduced during the reviewed period of 2018 – 2019 (the Civil Servants Act and its by-laws) which have had a negative effect on the implementation of the measures set out in the PADS 2014-2020 Roadmap and the OPGG Specific objective 2: Improvement of the specialized knowledge and skills of the administration staff and development of career development mechanisms, more specifically:

* The State Budget Act for 2020 introduces changes to the Civil Servants Act (effective as of 20.12.2019) which repeals all provisions for the performance of centralized competitions, the centralized stage of competitions for specific positions and testing for leading positions in the administration through mobility and competitive selection;
* The amendments to the Civil Servants Act (State Gazette No. 57/ 22.07.2016; State Gazette No. 100/2019, effective 20.12.2019) further develop the mechanisms providing career development opportunities for civil servants.

**3.4.** Several of the priority activities under Specific Objective 1 of PA 2, and more specifically those related to decentralisation of governance and the outsourcing of public administration functions to the business and the NGO sector are outdated.

Specific Objective 2 of PA 2 is also outdated with view of the adopted changes in the statutory framework and the changes in policies in the field of career development for public administration staff which requires its reformulation and the amendment of some of its priority activities, more specifically those related to planning and managing officials’ careers.

**Recommendations:**

* It is recommended that the priority activities under Specific Objective 1, related to governance decentralisation and the outsourcing of functions of the public administration to the business and the NGO sector be dropped out due to their outdatedness and inability to be implemented within the current programming period;
* It is recommended that Specific Objective 2 be reformulated, with the current formulation of *Enhancing the specialised knowledge and skills of administration officials and elaboration of career development mechanisms* be replaced with the following wording: *Enhancing the specialised knowledge and skills of administration officials*. It is recommended that the priority activities under Specific objective 2, related to planning and managing the career of officials, be eliminated with view of the amendments to the statutory framework and the adopted policies in the field;
* It is recommended that the texts in the Operational Programme relating to non-priority activities under Specific Objectives 1 and 2 of PA 2 be removed in the event of future amendments to OPGG.

**3.5.** No progress has been reported under two of the output indicators (O2-3 and O2-4) and one of the result indicators (R2-3) and no new procedures are planned to contribute towards reaching target values.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the MA takes action to remove these indicators from the operational programme.

**3.6.** Risk of non-achieving target values is evident for further three output indicators (O2-1, O2-6 and СO20), and for one result indicator (R2-1).

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that measures be taken towards reducing the target values of these indicators, as follows:

* Reducing the target value of indicator O2-1 to 90 administrations supported for the introduction of quality management systems.
* Reducing the target value of indicator O2-6 to 100,000 trained administration officials.
* Reducing the target value of indicator СO20 to 280 projects.
* Reducing the target value of indicator R2-1 to 165 supported administrations applying mechanisms for organisational development and results-oriented management.

Alternative options for indicators СO20 and R2-1 are:

* Taking measures to increase the awareness and motivation of potential beneficiaries for participation in IAWP 2020 procedure ***Enhancing Civil Participation in Processes of Policy and Legislation Formulation, Implementation And Monitoring*** (indicator С020) and
* Announcing a procedure for competitive selection of projects aiming to enhance results-oriented management, in which indicator R2-1 can also be included. The design of such a procedure could be aimed at ensuring support for the introduction and implementation of a programme- and results-oriented budget in administrations.

**3.7.** The target values for two of the indicators under PA 2 (О2-5 and R2-4) are expected to be outperformed, where outperformance under indicator R2-4 is expected to be significant – almost 4 times.

**Recommendation:**

The option of increasing the target values for indicators О2-5 and R2-4 should be considered, as follows:

* An increase in the target value of indicator О2-5 to 180 supported new/modernised training modules.
* An increase in the target value of indicator R2-4 to around 1,400 recommendations.

1. **Main conclusions and recommendations under Priority Axis 3**

**4.1.** Seven procedures were announced by the end of 2019 under PA 3, with a total budget of slightly more than BGN 60 million. The contracted funds amount to 52.75% of the funds under the announced procedures and 45.7% against the total budget for the axis. Disbursed funds amount to 52.84% of those contracted. At the time of the evaluation, certified funds under PA 3 are in the amount of BGN 16,147,787.22 or 27.34% of the final target value of indicator F-3 „Certified funds“.

**4.2.** Over the last two years certain results have been achieved in some of the priority areas of the judicial reform which are related to project support under OPGG, e.g. in the field of legal education, in the field of ensuring greater transparency in the appointment and attestation of magistrates, increasing the quality of operation of the National Institute of Justice.

The slowest to be achieved are results in the field of e-justice, with the main achievements under the programme for the last two years being the elaboration and commissioning of the Unified Information System (UIS-3) of the Prosecutor’s Office of the Republic of Bulgaria.

**4.3.** No changes are observed in the specific objectives and priorities set out in the strategic documents in the field of justice and the judicial reform. No changes are observed in the needs of the leading institutions in the judicial reform. The objectives and priority activities set out under PA 3 of OPGG are current and relevant and no need has been identified for their amendment or reformulation.

**4.4.** No risks have been identified it terms of reaching the target values of 7 of the output indicators under PA 3.

Indicators O3–1 (analyses, surveys, research), O3–4 (projects for alternative legal dispute resolution methods), О3–5 (Number of institutions having undergone IT and communication infrastructure audits), O3–6 (electronic judiciary services) have achieved their target values as of 31.12.2109.

Indicators СО20 (projects fully or partially implemented by social partners or NGO’s), O3–2 (Joint action projects) and indicator O3–8 (Trained magistrates) have not yet reached their target values but, given the number of contracted projects and the projects expected to be contracted in the beginning of 2020, these values will be achieved.

For several of these indicators changes in metadata are necessary so that the results achieved under the programme can be clearly and fully reflected.

**Recommendations:**

* For indicator O3–6 (electronic judiciary services) the following is recommended: amendment to two items in metadata. In item 2.3 *Classifications Used* of the metadata under indicator О3-6 the text should be added: *and other electronic systems/registers in the Judiciary sector.* In accordance with the amendment to item 2.3, an amendment should also be introduced to item 7.1. *Methodological documents and methodological sources* (according to the indicator, as applicable), and, after Unified Court Information System the same text should be added, i.e. *and other electronic systems/registers in the Judiciary sector*.
* For indicator O3–8 (Trained Magistrates) change in metadata is recommended. In Item 2.1 *Definition/Indicator Description* two target groups should be added: 1. Members of the Supreme Judicial Council, the chief inspector and inspectors at the Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council; other individuals, for whom training is required per law or an act of the Council of Ministers pursuant to Article 249, para 2 of the Judiciary Act by the National Institute of Justice; and 2. Employees of the Ministry of Interior in sub-item 'employees and officials in the Justice sectors assisting the judicial system'. These changes must thereafter be reflected in item 2.2. *Calculation Method*.

**4.5.** For two of the output indicators there is a risk of non-implementation: О3-3 “judiciary bodies supported for programme budgeting introduction” and О3-7 „Operating Unified Court Information System“. For the first indicator there is a huge delay in preparation of the project proposal and hence a short implementation period, while for the second, project implementation is significantly delayed. According to evaluation results, achieving the target values for indicators О3-3 and О3-7 is still possible.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the MA continues to strictly monitor and obtain daily feedback from the beneficiaries of the contracts related to these two indicators.

**4.6.** For two of the result indicators – indicator R3-1 (new and improved judiciary instruments) and indicator R3-3 (trained magistrates holding certificates) no risk of non-performance has been identified.

Changes to metadata should be introduced for indicator R3-3 with view of expanding the scope of target groups.

For these two indicators the target value includes the baseline value, while EC Guidance recommends that the baseline value is not included in the target value. Only such progress should be reported as improves on the baseline value and comprises the difference between target and baseline values.

**Recommendation:**

Changes in metadata is recommended for indicator R3-3. In Item 2.1 *Definition/Indicator Description* and in item 2.2, the following text should be added: 1. Members of the Supreme Judicial Council, the chief inspector and inspectors at the Inspectorate with the Supreme Judicial Council; other individuals, for whom training is required per law or an act of the Council of Ministers pursuant to Article 249, para 2 of the Judiciary Act by the National Institute of Justice; 2. Employees of the Ministry of Interior in sub-item 'employees and officials in the Justice sectors assisting the judicial system'.

For these two result indicators it is recommended that the baseline value be subtracted from the target value and that the target value is set as the difference between the two. In other words, for indicator R3-1 with a baseline value of 13, the target value should be 30, and for indicator R3-3, with a baseline value of 9,101, the target value should be 20,000.

**4.7.** Indicator R3-2 (electronic cases) is the riskiest indicator under PA 3 in terms of performance. This indicator is related to output indicator О3-7 (an operable Electronic Court Information System) which is also identified as risky. The definition of the indicator does not reflect well on the result to be achieved.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that indicator R3-2 (electronic cases) be reformulated from „Number of cases reviewed electronically” to “Number of institutions within the judiciary system connected to the Electronic Court Information System“, and the target value for the indicator be reduced from 250,000 cases to 180 judiciary bodies.

**4.8.** For three of the output indicators – O3–1 (analyses, surveys, research), O3–4 (projects for alternative legal dispute resolution methods), O3–6 (electronic judiciary services) significant outperformance of target values is expected.

Such significant outperformance of indicators of two, three and even four times above target values is a sign of faults in programming due to lack of data and analyses on behalf of beneficiaries and leading institutions regarding the needs of the system and the capacity of beneficiaries and hence setting down of low indicator values.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that an increase in target values is considered for O3–1 (analyses, surveys, research), O3–4 (projects for alternative legal dispute resolution methods), O3–6 (electronic judiciary services), so that programme outcomes can be realistically reflected, as follows:

* An increase in the target value of O3–1 (analyses, surveys, research) to 150 supported analyses, surveys, research, methods and evaluations related to the activities of the judiciary.
* An increase in the target value of O3–4 (projects for alternative legal dispute resolution methods), to 15 projects.
* An increase in the target value of O3–6 (electronic judiciary services) to 10 electronic judiciary services.
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