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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

National Performance Frameworks (NPFs) enable government to drive, monitor and assess progress towards achieving their overarching national objectives. NPFs also provide an accountability framework through which parliaments and civil society can measure the effectiveness of government action.

Half of OECD member countries have a NPF in place, although the types of framework differ substantially. In some countries the NPF is developed and monitored by the Ministry of Finance, while in other countries it is developed by the statistical agency. There are also some countries where the NPF is a joint project by government departments and the statistical agency. Who drives the framework can affect the extent to which there is political buy-in as well as its purpose. It can also determine whether or not there are specific targets attached to indicators.

Indicators within a performance framework are usually developed and organised under key themes in order to ensure and display broad and fair coverage. Of those OECD countries that have a NPF in place, most organise their indicators under a small number - three to five – themes. These are typically: economy, society, environment, health and education.

Of those OECD countries that have a NPF, some focus on identifying a small number of Key National Indicators (KNIs) whereas others track progress against a much larger number of measures (in some cases this may be 100 or more). Although there is variety in the KNIs used within different country’s NPFs, some trends are emerging.

There tends to be more variety in the KNIs used within the “economy” and “society” themes, than there are under the themes of “health” and “education” where healthy life expectancy at birth and adult educational attainment are very common KNIs. Under the “environment” theme there is consensus on greenhouse gas emissions as a KNI, but a variety of additional indicators also tend to be used as this indicator does not capture the broad range of issues under this theme.

The KNIs currently used by OECD member countries provide a useful starting point for thinking about what might be included when developing a coherent set of KNIs for a NPF. In general, it is desirable to have KNIs that are already in common use and that are internationally comparable, politically relevant and aligned with international commitments. In addition, KNIs should aim to be broadly representative of the key sectoral areas and, taken as a whole, should provide a comprehensive overview of the progress and wellbeing of a nation. On this basis, this paper draws together initial suggestions on KNIs for inclusion within a NPF under the five most popular broad themes.
INTRODUCTION

Performance frameworks can be used by governments as a tool to link policies and programmes to higher-level objectives and monitor progress towards them. They are also used by parliaments and civil society to measure the effectiveness of public service delivery.

Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has traditionally been the most important measure of a country’s progress and success. However, policy-makers are increasingly realising\(^1\) that the GDP of a country gives limited insight into the happiness and wellbeing of the people that live there. In recent years, there has been increasing development of National Performance Frameworks (NPFs) which incorporate outcome-based measures such as Key National Indicators (KNIs), also referred to as higher-level strategies, in relation to measures of health, social wellbeing and environment, alongside traditional economic measures.

The OECD Recommendation on Budgetary Governance (2015a) recommends that performance, evaluation and value for money should be integral to the budget process, in particular through using performance information which is:

“(i) limited to a small number of relevant indicators for each policy programme or area; (ii) clear and easily understood; (iii) allows for tracking of results against targets and for comparison with international and other benchmarks; (iv) makes clear the link with government-wide strategic objectives.”

Therefore, in the context of the development of results-based budgeting practices, there is a potential role for such NPFs to serve as an “anchor” for key dimensions of public policy, and for monitoring of progress both nationally and internationally.

This paper outlines the range of practices that have emerged in relation to national performance frameworks. It highlights some of the different types of performance frameworks that are in use across OECD member countries. It also considers the key trends emerging in relation to the themes under which indicators sit and the KNIs which are selected for use.

\(^1\) For example, see the Sen-Stiglitz-Fitoussi Commission (Sen, Stiglitz and Fitoussi 2009), the ‘Beyond GDP’ Initiative (European Commission 2015) and Higher Living Standards (New Zealand Treasury 2015).
WHAT IS A NATIONAL PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK?

A NPF shows how individual objectives across different areas of government contribute to its overarching strategy. The framework can also highlight the extent to which individual indicators are mutually supportive. For example, progress in the health and education of a nation can also improve its economic potential. Taken as a whole, a NPF serves as a coherent articulation of a government’s objectives. This articulation can help focus momentum and align activity, at a departmental, inter-departmental and central level, towards overarching developmental and strategic goals. A NPF is also a useful means of triggering systematic data collection and providing the impetus for a regular stocktake of national progress.

Performance frameworks exist in different formats, are driven by a variety of stakeholders and are subject to different levels of transparency and accountability. However, regardless of the type of framework, all of them are characterised by indicators, or performance measures, and progress is tracked by considering the outputs and outcomes in relation to each indicator.

The strengths and weaknesses of a NPF often lie in how it is developed. Factors which can strengthen the framework include the selection of high quality indicators that are SMART, of political interest and aligned with sectoral, national and international agreements. The engagement of civil society in the development of the framework and the selection of indicators can also help ensure that there is a shared vision for the nation based on citizens’ needs.

A good NPF will also be open and transparent so that citizens and stakeholders can track progress and hold the government to account for their performance against targets. It also provides an effective structure for performance budgeting, where resource-allocation decisions are linked to outcomes and outputs.

Overall, if a NPF is done well, there can be improved data collection, analysis and disclosure, a clear understanding of how policies and programmes feed into the overarching priorities of government and a shift toward outcomes-based reporting and budgeting.

The origins of National Performance Frameworks

In the post-war era, growing the economy was seen as the path to economic well-being and so GDP was adopted internationally as the primary measure of economic progress. However, over the decades, concerns have been growing as to the suitability of GDP as a sole indicator of progress and well-being. In its influential report, the Sen-Stiglitz-Fitoussi Commission (Sen, Stiglitz and Fitoussi 2009) gave strong momentum to the development of better metrics of well-being and progress and since then, many initiatives have been taken at national and international levels. Efforts in this area have been compounded in the aftermath of the financial crisis as a result of the increasing interest in equality and sustainability of growth. As indicated in Policy Shaping and Policy Making: The Governance of Inclusive Growth (OECD 2015b), performance budgeting, anchored in a NPF, is a natural vehicle for highlighting the objectives of budget policies, organisational objectives and their coherence with overall goals in relation to objectives, such as inclusive growth.

Types of National Performance Frameworks

Around half of OECD countries have a NPF in some form. These are described in more detail in Annex 1, along with links to relevant internet pages. A general overview of the different NPFs around the OECD is presented below.

---

2 SMART measures are most commonly known as Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound.
The Ministry of Finance is well placed to act as the principal co-ordinator of the NPF given their central position and the potential benefits that can be gained by setting out a strategic vision and national priorities and encouraging cross-departmental co-operation. This is indeed the case in countries such as Korea where the Ministry of Strategy and Finance determines what targets are appropriate to include in the NPF. This is also the case in other countries such as France (LOLF) and Chile where the NPF was developed and managed by the Ministry of Finance.

In other countries, the development of a NPF may be guided by another specific government department. For example, in Austria, the Federal Performance Office (part of the Federal Chancellery) supports and advises ministries in the process of performance measurement, provides quality assurance to objectives and indicators and prepares the performance reports to Parliament. In the UK, the Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs has driven the development of the *Sustainable Development Indicators*.

In other countries, the NPF is developed jointly by the central government and the statistical agency, or another organisation. For example, in France the Prime Minister’s Office (France Stratégie) and the Economic, Social and Environmental Council jointly constructed *A Dashboard of New Wealth Indicators* and in Finland, the *Findicator* NPF was set up as a joint project between the Prime Minister’s Office and Statistics Finland. A further example is the *MONET Indicator System*, a joint activity of the Swiss Federal Statistical Office and the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment. More detail on the *MONET Indicator System* in Switzerland is provided in Box 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 1: MONET Indicator System in Switzerland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do we live today?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being healthy, feeling safe and having enough income to live are all needs that, when met, contribute to the well-being of the population. Enabling all individuals to live in dignity and enjoy a good quality of life is a central goal of sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Health**
- **Income**
- **Physical safety**
- **Unemployment**

Source: Swiss Statistics

Finally, in some countries the development of a NPF is led by the statistical agency. For example, *Measuring Australia’s Progress* was launched by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The *Equitable and Sustainable Measurement Framework* was initiated by the National Institute of Statistics and the National Council of Economy and Labour in Italy. The *Sustainable Development Indicators* for Poland were
launched by the Central Statistical Office of Poland, *New Zealand Progress Indicators Tupuranga Aotearoa* were launched by Statistics New Zealand and *Measuring National Wellbeing* in the UK was launched by the UK Office for National Statistics. An example of this type of NPF is provided in Box 2 (overleaf) which outlines the *Measuring National Wellbeing* in the UK.

Across some of these NPFs, there is a lack of clarity with regards to who sets the indicators and the extent to which they represent targets with political buy-in. The distinction between a politically-driven NPF and informational NPF is not always clear-cut.

**Box 2: Measuring National Wellbeing in the UK**

The UK Office for National Statistics is committed to developing better measures of well-being as a long-term programme. The ONS describes measuring well-being as looking at “GDP and beyond”. As part of this, the ONS has identified headline indicators in areas such as health, relationships, education and skills, what we do, where we live, our finances, the economy, governance, the environment and measures of “personal well-being” (individuals' assessment of their own well-being).

The programme publishes updates to the national well-being measures every 6 months, including an interactive wheel of measures (shown below).

Source: UK Office for National Statistics (ONS)
In addition to NPFs, a number of international organisations have recognised the increasing interest in measuring the progress of society and launched their own initiatives. One particularly notable example is the performance framework set out by United Nations (UN). Following the Millennium Summit in 2000, the UN set out eight **Millennium Development Goals** (MDGs) – which ranged from halving extreme poverty rates to halting the spread of HIV/AIDS and providing universal primary education – to be achieved by the target date of 2015. These formed a unifying agenda, underpinned by goals and targets, agreed to by all the world’s countries and all the world’s leading development institutions. Building on the momentum of the MDGs, the UN has recently launched 17 **Sustainable Development Goals** (SDGs) (see Figure 1 overleaf) with the ambition of continuing to stimulate action “of critical importance for humanity and the planet” over the next fifteen years. These are a new, universal set of goals, targets and indicators that UN member states will be expected to use to frame their agendas and political policies over the next 15 years. The UN has conducted the largest consultation programme in its history to gauge opinion on what areas the SDGs should encompass. While the MDGs applied to all countries, in practice they were perceived as targets for developing countries to pursue with support from wealthier states. Conversely, the SDGs have been adopted by all 193 countries of the UN General Assembly and every country is expected to work towards achieving them. The indicators in relation to the SDGs are due to be finalised in March 2016. Once the indicators have been set, the UN will act as “scorekeeper” for these goals, helping countries track their progress.

Other international organisations have also developed overarching indicator sets in relation to their particular areas of focus. For example, The European Commission has set overarching priorities and **Europe 2020 Targets** for its member countries.

**Box 3: Europe 2020 Targets**

The European Commission Europe 2020 Targets give an overall view of where they believe that the EU should be on key parameters by 2020. The 5 targets are set out below:

1. **Employment**
   - 75% of the 20-64 year-olds to be employed

2. **R&D**
   - 3% of the EU’s GDP to be invested in R&D

3. **Climate change and energy sustainability**
   - greenhouse gas emissions 20% (or even 30%, if the conditions are right) lower than 1990
   - 20% of energy from renewables
   - 20% increase in energy efficiency

4. **Education**
   - Reducing the rates of early school leaving below 10%
   - at least 40% of 30-34-year-olds completing third level education

5. **Fighting poverty and social exclusion**
   - at least 20 million fewer people in or at risk of poverty and social exclusion

Source: European Commission
Figure 1 - UN Sustainable Development Goals launched in 2015

International organisations have also developed performance dashboards which enable citizens to compare the progress of their country on an international basis. A pre-eminent example of this is the **Better Life Initiative** launched by the OECD in 2011 (see Box 4). Other examples include the UN’s **Human Development Index**, while not-for-profit organisations have also developed comparable indices\(^3\).

### Box 4: The OECD Better Life Index

The Better Life Index aims to involve citizens in the debate on measuring the well-being of societies, and to empower them to become more informed and engaged in the policy-making process that shapes all our lives. It allows citizens to compare lives across 34 countries, based on 11 dimensions -- housing, income, jobs, community, education, environment, governance, health, life satisfaction, safety, work-life balance -- giving their own weight to each of the dimensions. Within each topic, the indicators are averaged with equal weights. However, by assigning their own weights to each of the 11 dimensions, users can see how the emphasis they place on any particular factor affects the relative position of each country. The indicators have been chosen on the basis of a number of statistical criteria such as relevance (face-validity, depth, policy relevance) and data quality (predictive validity, coverage, timeliness, cross-country comparability etc.) and in consultation with OECD member countries. These indicators are seen as good measures of the concepts of well-being, in particular in the context of a country comparative exercise.

However, the choice of measures used by international organisations and individual governments can vary considerably. This is partly as a result of differing priorities and partly as a result of a lack of high-quality, internationally comparable data that would allow countries to fully understand how they fare in these critical areas.

### Themes used in National Performance Frameworks

Indicators within a NPF are usually developed and organised under key themes in order to ensure and display broad and fair coverage. Of those OECD countries that have a NPF in place, most organise their indicators under a small number - three to five – themes, as shown in Figure 2.

---

\(^3\) For example, the New Economics Foundation’s **Happy Planet Index** and the Legatum **Prosperity Index**.
Where countries use three themes, these tend to be “economy”, “society” and “environment”. In those countries which have four or five themes, it is often because “health” and/or “education” have been added as additional themes (these tend to be covered under the “Society” theme in countries where there are just three themes). Where a larger number of themes are used (eight or more) these are likely to include subjects such as “governance”, “security” and “international”. There is also growing interest in themes such as “equality” and “climate change”, reflecting increasing demands from citizens and stakeholders for indicators to measure progress in these areas. Figure 3 (overleaf) visualises the prevalence of different theme headings amongst OECD countries that have a NPF.

Performance indicators

The number of top level performance indicators under each NPF varies substantially. As shown in Figure 4, OECD countries tend towards using either a small number of key top level indicators (France’s Dashboard of New Wealth Indicators, the UK’s Sustainable Development Indicators, the US at federal level, Canada, New Zealand and Switzerland all have twenty or fewer) within their performance frameworks or a larger number of indicators (Ireland, Korea, Finland, Austria, Italy, Chile, France Forum de la Performance and the UK Measuring National Well-being all have fifty or more).

Where countries use a small number of indicators, these are generally termed Key National Indicators.
Figure 3 – The prevalence of different theme headings amongst OECD member countries

Source: OECD
Key National Indicators (KNIs)

Key National Indicators (KNIs), sometimes called higher level strategies, are indicators which have been selected to measure progress across a broader policy area. For example, average life expectancy is often taken to indicate the health of a population as a whole. The purpose of selecting a key indicator for describing a broader subject is to reduce information overload for stakeholders. An alternative is to aggregate scores against a number of indicators into one composite indice. For example, the World Bank gathers information in relation to procedures for starting a business, the time and cost for a business to obtain a permanent electricity connection and the strength of legal rights, etc, to give an overall ranking for economies on their ease of doing business (World Bank 2015a). Governments track progress against KNIs as part of the policy development cycle. Stakeholders and citizens track progress against KNIs in order to hold the government to account. Particularly well selected indicators will facilitate international comparison, be closely influenced by government policy and have limited scope for manipulation.

Trends in KNIs

A number of factors bring about differences in the KNIs selected by OECD countries. Some countries may link their goals to domestic or international legislative commitments, EU targets or topics of national political interest. For this reason, there is considerable variety in the KNIs that are being adopted across those countries which have them. Despite this, it is possible to highlight areas of broad consensus that are emerging under each of the most popular broad themes: economy, society, health, education and environment. Note that this analysis considers only those countries which adopt 20 or fewer indicators in their NPF as where there are more measures than this, there are generally too many indicators for them to be considered KNIs.

Figure 4 – The number of top level indicators under each NPF

This includes Australia, Ireland (Measuring Ireland’s Progress), France (Dashboard of New Wealth Indicators), New Zealand, Switzerland, the UK (Sustainable Development Indicators) and the US.
Economy

There is no overarching measure which dominates KNIs in relation to the economy. The most frequent KNI used by OECD countries is one relating to employment/unemployment. For example, France’s *Dashboard of New Wealth Indicators* include employment rate as a KNI, the *Sustainable Development Indicators* in the UK include an indicator on the long-term unemployment rate as a headline measure and the *MONET Indicator System* in Switzerland includes an indicator on the unemployment rate. In addition, it is one of the EU 2020 Targets for 75% of 20-64 year olds to be employed by 2020. Some OECD countries also include the level of capital or investment in capital as a KNI. For example, France’s *Dashboard of New Wealth Indicators* include investment in research and development as a KNI, New Zealand’s *Progress Indicators Tupuranga Aotearoa* include real net capital stock per person as an indicator and the *MONET Indicator System* in Switzerland includes an indicator on the investment to GDP ratio. It is also fairly commonplace to see GDP or income per head appear as a KNI. For example, the *Sustainable Development Indicators* in the UK include GDP per head as a headline measure and the *MONET Indicator System* in Switzerland includes an indicator on equalised disposable income. There is also increasing interest in including a KNI in relation to public and private debt.

Society

Similarly, there is no overarching measure used as a KNI in relation to society. It is commonplace for an indicator to appear in relation to public safety, for example New Zealand’s *Progress Indicators Tupuranga Aotearoa* include a measure of physical safety and *Measures of Australia’s Progress* includes an indicator on the physical assault victimisation rate. It is also commonplace to see an indicator in relation to both income equality and poverty, for example, France’s *Dashboard of New Wealth Indicators* have an indicator on income gaps, New Zealand’s *Progress Indicators Tupuranga Aotearoa* include a measure in relation to income inequality and the *MONET Indicator System* in Switzerland includes an indicator on both the wage gap between men and women and the poverty rate. In recent years, some NPFs have also started including measures of wellbeing. For example, France’s *Dashboard of New Wealth Indicators* measure life satisfaction.

Health

**Healthy life expectancy at birth** is very often chosen by OECD countries as the main KNI in relation to health.

Education

Under the theme of education, the most commonly used KNI is that relating to adult educational attainment. Some NPFs also include measures in relation to children’s education. For example, New Zealand’s *Progress Indicators Tupuranga Aotearoa* include a measure on access to childhood education and the *MONET Indicator System* in Switzerland includes an indicator on the reading skills of 15 year olds.
Environment

Greenhouse gas emissions is the most common KNI adopted under the theme of the environment. However, it does not tend to exist as a standalone measure, reflecting the broad coverage of the theme. Other measures that sit alongside it include abundance of wildlife. For example, the Sustainable Development Index in the UK includes bird population indices and New Zealand’s Progress Indicators Tupuranga Aotearoa include a measure on the distribution of selected native species. Some countries also include a KNI in relation to energy consumption and natural resource use or energy from renewables.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

The KNIs highlighted above provide a useful starting point for thinking about what might be included when developing a coherent set of KNIs for an internationally comparable NPF. In general, it is desirable to have indicators that are already in common use and for which data are readily available. However, some of the data currently being used in relation to these KNIs may not be internationally comparable. In this instance it may be more appropriate to use metrics produced by international organisations. In particular, well known metrics such as the ease of doing business index or the government effectiveness indicator produced by the World Bank and the PISA score (this stands for the Programme for International Student Assessment and provides a score in relation to the competencies of 15-year-olds in reading, mathematics and science in 65 countries and economies) produced by the OECD.

It is also important for KNIs to be politically relevant so that citizens, stakeholders and parliament have a genuine interest in tracking progress. At the same time, they should insofar as possible align with international commitments that have been made, such as those relating to climate change, European Union membership or international frameworks such as the SDGs.

In addition, KNIs should aim to be broadly representative of the key sectoral areas and, taken as a whole, should provide a comprehensive overview of the progress and wellbeing of a nation.

On this basis, Figure 5 summarises initial suggestions on a rationalised, internationally comparable set of KNIs which might be considered for inclusion within a NPF under the five most popular broad themes.
Figure 5 – Suggested KNIs for inclusion in a NPF

Source: OECD
ANNEX 1 – AN OVERVIEW OF NPFs ACROSS OECD COUNTRIES

The following pieces of information have been extracted from websites and publications, including OECD ones.

**Australia**

**Measures of Australia’s Progress (MAP)** is designed to help Australians address the question, 'Is life in Australia getting better?' Measures of Australia's Progress (MAP) provides a digestible selection of measures in answer to this question. Australians can use this evidence to form their own view of how their country is progressing. It was first released in 2002 by the Australia Bureau of Statistics (ABS) and has evolved since. In 2011-12, the ABS undertook a national consultation to review MAP and ensure it remained relevant with indicators that aligned with the aspirations and hopes of Australians for their and the nation's future. The ABS is releasing a refreshed set of indicators that measure those areas that Australians told were most important to them for national progress.

The MAP indicators are designed to show changes towards key aspirations of Australians, so that an assessment of progress can be made. The indicators are grouped under four broad headings: society, economy, environment and governance, based on the areas of life that Australians have told are important for progress.

Within these broad headings (domains) many areas of life (themes) are addressed, such as 'health' within the social domain, 'prosperity' within the economic domain, 'healthy natural environment' within the environmental domain and 'trust' within the governance domain. Where available, each theme has a headline progress indicator that represents the theme as a whole and shows whether progress has been made for this area.

Each theme is broken down further so that a more detailed story about the extent of progress can be told. Where possible, these important aspects (elements) of each theme have a single progress indicator. For example, the health theme contains progress indicators for areas such as physical and mental health.

MAP highlights where there are data gaps for aspects of progress that may be significant to Australians. In this way, MAP points to where development may be needed in order to find suitable measures for these areas of progress. Gaps in the availability of measures occur for a number of reasons; for example, some areas of progress are inherently subjective and hence difficult to measure reliably. In other cases, the concept to measure is not yet sufficiently developed, or the concept is important for progress but may not lend itself to meaningful measurement. The quality of data or availability of data from only one point in time may also mean that there is no appropriate current measure of progress. And then there are areas of interest which have yet to be measured.

To assist readers in gaining a quick 'at a glance' view of recent progress in Australia, MAP presents a 'traffic light' dashboard of headline progress indicators on the MAP home page. Progress for each theme is shown by a green tick (for progress), a red cross (for regress), or an orange line (for little or no change).

Austria

Since 2013 the Austrian federal government has been managed according to the principle of outcome-orientation. This reform element is integrated in a holistic financial management framework, comprising a legally binding medium expenditure framework with a relaxed budget system giving high carry-forward and shifting possibilities (as of 2009), accrual budgeting and accounting, a modified form of programme budgeting, the creation of the Federal Performance Office in the Federal Chancellery and a Budget Office in Parliament (Seiwald & Geppl, 2013). The relaxed budget rules, since 2009 in effect, have created an accountability gap, which are closed by the performance framework.

The performance framework consists of a performance budgeting model with the obligatory definition of objectives and performance indicators for each line ministry, a performance management system with obligatory performance mandates for state bodies and organisations with budgetary responsibility as well as a performance reporting system, for both Parliament and within the government and ministries. The performance measurement systems have been established and reorganised in order to fulfil the demands of the new performance management regime. The Performance Management Office, established in 2010, supports and advises ministries in this process, provides quality assurance to objectives and indicators and prepares the performance reports to Parliament.

http://www.wfa.gv.at

Canada

Since 2005, the Policy on Management, Resources and Results Structures (MRRS) has supported the development of a common, government-wide approach to the collection, management, and reporting of financial and non-financial information on program objectives, performance, and results. All federal organizations receiving appropriations must plan and manage their operations and report their performance against strategic outcomes that represent enduring benefits to Canadians.

As a complement to this regime of departmental performance management and reporting, the Government of Canada has adopted a whole-of-government framework for reporting to Parliament on progress made as a nation. The whole-of-government framework maps the financial and non-financial contributions of departments, agencies, and Crown corporations receiving appropriations to a set of 16 high-level Government of Canada outcome areas within four Government of Canada spending areas - Economic, Social, International, and Government Affairs.

This tool allows to 1) compare actual versus planned spending for each fiscal year; 2) identify which organizations contribute to each spending and outcome area; and 3) drill down to learn more about the specific programs.

Departments and agencies are required to indicate in their Report on Plans and Priorities (RPP) and Departmental Performance Report (DPR) the alignment of program activities to Government of Canada outcome areas. Because the alignment of strategic outcomes and their corresponding program activities to the whole-of-government framework makes it possible to calculate spending by Government of Canada outcome area and also correctly total all government spending, a program activity can only be aligned to one Government of Canada outcome area. A strategic outcome, however, can contribute to more than one outcome area.

Chile*

The **Chilean performance management system** has been developed and managed by the Budget Directorate (DIPRES) of the Ministry of Finance.

Performance indicators are developed for each of the “strategic products” in the institution’s strategy statement, as a result of which approximately 1 200 performance indicators have been defined as part of the strategic framework. Performance targets are set for each of these indicators, and the performance incentive system delivers rewards which are to a large degree based on institutional performance against these performance targets.

However, concretely, entities are required to specify the objectives (intended outcomes) of every budgetary programme, and to develop performance indicators for each programme. This disconnect between the strategic and budgetary objectives has the serious consequence of separating the entity’s strategic planning from its budgeting.

The other disconnect between the budget and the performance management system is that the “programmes” which are the subject of the evaluations carried out by DIPRES are not the same as the programmes in the budget and not part of the budget classification.

As a consequence, Chile has decided to reform its programme budget classification so as to make it more consistent with the principles of programme budgeting. This reform will involve the careful definition of budgetary programmes on the basis of outputs and outcomes, plus the creation of sub-programmes. The reform will also involve the full integration of the programme classification and strategic framework, with objectives, key outputs and performance indicators being linked to programmes.


European Union

The current performance framework at EU level is a complex system integrating the following elements:

1. the Europe 2020 strategy set in 2010 by the decision makers fixing some headline targets to be achieved by the EU by the end of 2020 (cf. Box 3 of the main text);
2. number of other political goals, not directly covered by the Europe 2020 strategy but defined in various sectorial policy documents in accordance with the EU competences stemming from the treaty;
3. the political priorities set by the President of the European Commission for the duration of his mandate, e.g. currently for the period 2014-19 (Juncker 10 priorities);
4. the objectives and targets defined in the Multiannual Financial Framework (e.g. currently 2014-2020) and in the legal basis of related spending programmes (e.g. Horizon 2020, Erasmus, Galileo, ERDF, CAP, ENI…).

The European Commission plans and reports on its work following an annual cycle known as the "Strategic Planning and Programming" (SPP) cycle. As from this year the directorates-general of the Commission are requested to prepare two planning documents: a Strategic Plan covering the Commission term and an annual Management Plan. The Strategic Plan is organised around the long-term objectives...
defined at Commission level (general objectives) and operational objectives defined at directorates-general level (specific objectives). The Management Plan lists the main outputs for the year to come. In the Strategic Plan, the general objectives are derived from the political priorities of the Commission and Treaty obligations. Central services steer the process of defining and streamlining common Commission-level general objectives and ensure the coherence of objectives and indicators for directorates-general contributing to the same general objectives. The resulting new approach aims at the planning documents to become more streamlined and centred on the priorities of the Commission and the competencies of the DGs, helping them to establish operational priorities and tell a coherent performance story with a clear distinction between attribution (for impacts and results that are fully under the control of the Commission) and contribution (where the Commission's action plays a part in bringing about a given impact or result) for policy and programmes' achievements.

The annual cycle of planning documents preparation starts with the State of the Union address - whereby the Commission President defines strategic priorities of the year, followed by the drafting of the Commission (annual) Work Programme - in consultation with other EU and national institutions. Based on that the Commission directorates-general produce management plans showing how they will contribute to the Commission's annual priorities and setting the annual outputs.

For all major legislative and policy defining initiatives, Commission departments prepare an impact assessment to analyse the likely economic, environmental and social effects of the proposals. A list of planned Commission initiatives and a list of adopted Commission initiatives is updated regularly and sent to other EU institutions to help them organise their own activities. At the end of the budget year, all directorates-general produce an Annual Activity Report (AAR) on their performance in achieving their specific objectives. These reports are collated in a synthesis report by the College of Commissioners and submitted to the European Parliament and the Council.

As regards programmes financed by the EU budget, the performance framework for each programme consisting of objectives, targets and performance indicators, is established in the governing legislation (regulations) of the programme. The performance information on each programme is presented and updated annually in the programme statements of operational expenditure annexed to the draft annual budget and presented to the European Parliament and the Council during the annual budget negotiations. In addition, as part of the budget discharge procedure the Commission presents an evaluation report based on results achieved for the programmes financed by the EU budget, as required by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (i.e. article 318).

EU institutions are working on further rationalising and strengthening of the performance framework. In particular, the EU Budget Focused on Results initiative is progressing towards a more structured integration of PBB concepts, better use of performance indicators supporting the political messages on objectives achieved, improved consistency in the objective setting, results measurement and reporting framework, main criteria for designing a sound structure of indicators that serve both: budgetary decisions and communication on EU budget added value; how to develop scoreboards; how to measure progress and integrate necessary adjustments into the performance frameworks when the initial conditions evolve.


Finland

“Findicator” was set up in 2009 as a joint project between Statistics Finland and the Prime Minister’s Office. It brings together statistics and indicators on social progress in different formats available to everyone looking for such information in their work or other activities: decision makers, public servants, specialists, teachers, journalists, citizens. The indicators have been selected in consultation with user
groups and data providers. They can be consulted on internet either under “All indicators” or through filters “Sustainable development indicators” and “Well-being indicators”.

http://www.findikaattori.fi/en

France

In 2001, the Organic Law on Finance Laws (LOLF) reformed the construction and the monitoring of the French national budget, which is now presented by public policies. One of the main objectives of the LOLF was to improve the results of public management through the formulation of objectives, presented to Parliament, and the introduction of performance indicators.

An alignment has been achieved across line ministries thanks to the creation of a rather precise framework for all ministries: program managers must present an "annual performance plan” presenting their actions, associated costs, the objectives, the expected results for the years to come, measured through indicators. All documents are created through an application, monitored by the Budget directorate. A public performance guide was produced to lay down the rules on indicators and objectives.

However, after several years of implementation, it appears that this framework still needs to evolve to improve significantly the effectiveness and efficiency of public policies.

The Budget Directorate thus worked with ministries to simplify the performance framework and make it more meaningful. In particular:

- Between 2007 and 2015, the number of objectives has decreased from above 600 to 400 and the number of indicators has decreased from 1300 to 755.
- Other measures aim to improve cooperation between ministries, such as “Transversal policy documents” set up to report about interdepartmental budgets and results (for example: integration policy, social inclusion, gender equality, …), strengthened authority of the regional prefects in 2013, which are now responsible for budgets allocated on their territory and placed under their responsibility; as well as the creation of transverse indicators for support functions (human resources, data processing, real property…) in order to benchmark the costs between ministries.
- Specific evaluation mechanisms and tools have been developed to support implementation of this framework, in particular performance conferences are held annually between Program managers and representatives of the Budget directorate to discuss the performance framework and agree on the targets. An evolution of these conferences is being studied to put their focus on results analysis and to better take them into account in budgeting.

However, the link between performance and budgeting is not yet realized: poor performance in a program has generally no direct impact on budgetary discussion. This is a problem common to a lot of OECD countries. Several measures are being studied to address this issue:

- A better communication on performance data for the members of Congress: a synthetic document with key budget and performance data for each mission has been established (published on the Budget Directorate website and sent to the members of the Finance commissions);
- A reorientation of performance conferences to rather analyse results and to better take them into account in budgeting;
- A reorientation of the discharge law (voted in July), to make it a space for dialogue and evaluation with analyse of past performance and budgetary implementation, in order to improve public finances accordingly;
- The law for public finance (2012) provides the « expenses review » as a mandatory step for cost-saving purposes and a necessary input for the budgetary annual process.

Since a new law was passed on April 13th 2015, the government must now report annually to the Parliament with wealth indicators other than GDP on the occasion of the Finance Law debate and evaluate the impact of the past and projected reforms on these indicators. “France Stratégie” (the General commission for the strategy and foresight, under the Prime Minister’s Office) and the Economic, Social and Environmental Council have been involved in the construction of a **dashboard of new wealth indicators**, developed after a wide consultation of civil society in order to better measure the situation and progress of the country in its economic, social and environmental dimensions. The Budget Directorate is willing to support the production of such a dashboard in consistency with the LOLF’s performance framework.

http://www.performance-publique.budget.gouv.fr/
http://www.gouvernement.fr/partage/5711-les-nouveaux-indicateurs
http://www.acteurspublics.com/2015/10/27/dix-nouveaux-indicateurs-de-richesse

**Germany**

Germany’s budget documentation includes much detail about financial allocations and purposes, but does not include specific information correlating budget programmes with strategic objectives or performance indicators. Previous reform initiatives aimed at providing a performance framework for the budget, and strengthening its cost-accounting basis, did not find favour with the Bundestag. Ongoing reforms are geared towards supplementing the traditional budget with narrative information about the broader strategic context of expenditure programmes.

With the Federal Statistical Office, German policy-makers have specified targets for the sustainable development of intergenerational equity, quality of life and social cohesion, and for maintaining international responsibility. Environmental-economic accounting supports the National Sustainable Development Strategy of the Federal Government by analysing in greater detail the development of various environment-related indicators of the sustainability strategy, showing differences and indicating cross references to economic and social aspects. This refers in particular to the following indicators: energy and raw material productivity, greenhouse gas emissions, increase in the housing and transport area, intensity of passenger and goods transport, and air pollutants.


**Ireland**

1) Since 2003-5, the Central Statistics Office has been supporting a move towards a more evidence-based policy making by developing a set of national progress indicators, in cooperation with the National Statistics Board. Since then, the “**Measuring Ireland’s Progress**” report has been published annually. This national indicators framework started with 109 indicators covering 10 domains and 49 sub-domains. Since 2012, with the launch of its web-based edition, it has been re-organised with 57 indicators presented in 5 themes.

2) The Department of Public Expenditure and Reform has developed “Ireland Stat”, a government performance measurement. The objective of Ireland Stat is to provide all interested parties with a whole-of-Government performance measurement system. It aims to show what Ireland’s Government has achieved, what it did in order to deliver on those achievements, what it cost and how Ireland compares with other countries. In a nutshell it answers the question “How is Ireland doing?” This initiative is part of the Programme for Government 2011 commitment to make “the whole of Government… more transparent, accountable and efficient” and builds on the changes introduced in the detailed Estimates of Expenditure. The Estimates have been restructured around Strategic Programmes – matching the presentation in the Statements of Strategy – so that resources and results are now presented together. Departments’ Statements of Strategy are the anchor documents to the Government’s approach of presenting performance information. Each ‘High Level Goal’ in a Statement of Strategy is associated with a ‘Strategic Programme’.

http://www.irelandstat.gov.ie/

Israel

Israel’s Progress Index (“Erech”) is being developed by the Israeli Society for Sustainable Economics, a non-profit organisation. The goal of the project is to establish an index for progress and quality of life (QOL), and promote it as a central tool for decision making in Israel. The project cooperates with the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics, The Ministry for Environmental Protection, JDC Israel and other environmental and social NGO’s.

The Index has three layers: Calculating the Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW, also known as GPI - Genuine Progress Indicator) for Israel; producing a preliminary report card which shows a variety of indicators (some objective and some subjective indicators for QOL); developing the index further, bottom up, with the assistance of the public, by developing community indicators projects in communities throughout Israel.

The project aims are to explore what progress and QOL means to Israelis, while at the same time bring to the general public the idea that economic growth does not always bring about wealth and welfare to the people. This, hopefully, will challenge the current view that GDP growth should be the most desirable policy target to pursue, and in turn might shake the ground beneath the current Israeli consumer-culture, allowing for different ideas to sprout. The project is committed to the process of defining, measuring and fostering the progress and QOL of the Israeli Society, working closely to achieve these objectives with the Israeli public, government, municipalities and NGO’s. The project is focused both on top-down and bottom-up processes, aiming to offer a better understanding of QOL and progress in Israel, and a valuable tool for policy.

http://wikiprogress.org/data/dataset/israel-s-progress-index-erech

Italy

In 2010, The National Council of Economy and Labour (CNEL) and the National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) initiated the Equitable and Sustainable Well-being (BES) measurement framework to provide a shared measurement of wellbeing at the national level as a reference point for public debate and to guide democratic choices. They published their first report in 2013. The project is part of the international debate on “GDP and beyond”. The central idea is that economic parameters alone are inadequate to evaluate the progress of societies and should be complemented by social and environmental information and by measures of inequality and sustainability. The twelve dimensions of well-being are: 1. Health, 2. Education and training, 3. Work and life balance, 4. Economic well-being, 5. Social relationships, 6. Politics and
Korea*

The Korean public sector exhibits aspects of substantial results orientation in each component of the country’s performance framework, which together are significantly interdependent. The continuous pursuit for results-based public sector management (PSM) began with strong and highly centralized planning during the era of high economic growth. Over the years, central planning has weakened relative to the period of development. Planning and budgeting are significantly aligned and primarily administered by a single ministry. The strongest results-based components are implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Despite current real-time monitoring and robust evaluation systems, challenges remain including resistance to evaluation in the senior civil service, an emphasis on general learning rather than specialization, and a fragmented and overlapping evaluation system that leads to redundancy and evaluation fatigue.

Under the performance-based budgeting framework, introduced in two phases in 2000 and 2003, agencies measure performance systematically through a strategic plan and performance report, the results of which are incorporated into budgeting and management. The performance plan (i) incorporates each agency’s mission statement, (ii) establishes midterm-goals (3-5 years), (iii) establishes performance objectives in line with goals, (iv) identifies performance indicators and methods to measure them, (v) suggests strategy and policy measures, and finally (vi) provides a budget statement relevant to the objectives. The performance report, for its part, would include outcomes achieved and unachieved, (with reasons for the latter) and a schedule for the completion of unachieved objectives (Kim 2002). The Korean performance system is outcome-orientated, but outputs are used in cases where it is difficult to define appropriate outcome measures, such as for the Ministry of Construction and Transportation. Outcome (or output) targets are defined by the various ministries. The former Ministry of Planning and Budget (MPB), which was merged with the Ministry of Finance and Economy to form the Ministry of Strategy and Finance in 2008, makes the ultimate decision as to whether the defined targets are appropriate.

* (cf. Kim (2015))

Netherlands*

The Netherlands have tested several approaches of performance-related budgeting and they adopted in 2013 the “accountable budgeting reform”. Dutch analysts have produced critical analysis of performance information. For example, M. de Jong wrote in 2012 that: “The problems encountered with the use of performance information by public sector organisations are summed up well by Donald Moynihan in his “interactive dialogue model of performance information use” (Moynihan, 2008). This model, or rather set of assumptions, challenges some often unarticulated notions behind PBB theory. The model’s central assumptions are: ● Performance information is not comprehensive. ● Performance information is ambiguous. ● Performance information is subjective. ● Production of performance information does not guarantee use. ● Institutional affiliation and individual beliefs will affect selection, perception, and presentation of performance information. ● The context of dialogue will affect the ability to use performance information to develop solutions.

The first three assumptions reflect the idea that performance information usually consists of one or more indicators of actual performance and, as such, never represents a whole universal truth about performance. These assumptions partly mirror the “misassumptions” of PBB as noted by Beryl Radin (Radin, 2006). The importance of these notions lies in the fact that once you accept that performance information is incomprehensive, ambiguous and subjective, a number of underlying key assumptions of PBB theory
ought to be reconsidered as well – most notably the reliance on a comprehensive, yet SMART policy goal and a limited set of key indicators as the basis for a performance-informed dialogue between actors in the budget process. The fourth assumption deals with problems regarding the use of performance data. Moynihan also notes that when performance information is used, it is not always used in the way PBB reforms envisioned it to be used (Moynihan, 2008). So, not only does the production of performance information not guarantee use, the use itself may or may not contribute to efficiency depending on the purpose of use.(…)

* (cf. De Jong, van Beek and Posthumus (2013))

New Zealand

New Zealand has had several projects on measuring social progress and wellbeing. The following ones are among the bigger and more recent ones:

1) In 2014, “Statistics New Zealand” launched the New Zealand Progress Indicators **Tupuranga Aotearoa**, which gives a picture of New Zealand across the economic, environmental and social dimensions of progress, in particular: how well the New Zealand population is living, how resources are being distributed and used, and what the population is leaving for future generations. This interactive platform builds on existing multidimensional data gathered by Statistics New Zealand since 2002 in order to inform the public, researchers and policy-makers on progress indicators.  


2) Statistics New Zealand’s Framework for **Measuring Sustainable Development** has defined the concept of sustainable development and provides a basis for selecting indicators to measure progress towards sustainable development.  


Poland

The Central Statistical Office of Poland has published in October 2015 a portal on **Sustainable Development Indicators** for Poland 2015, which contains the following information:

Sustainable development of the country, considered as a Constitutional Principle of the Republic of Poland, defined in the Environmental Protection Act as the “socio-economic development integrating political, economic and social actions, balanced with environmental protection and permanence of basic natural processes in order to ensure the possibility of satisfying the basic needs of individual communities or citizens in both the present generation and future generations”.

Due to the absence of a Polish National Strategy for Sustainable Development coordinating policies related to sustainable development, the process of monitoring can be implemented using a set of indicators selected on the basis of principles and objectives written down in the national documents of strategic nature. The publication Sustainable Development Indicators for Poland 2015 presents a proposal of Polish official statistics in terms of a set of indicators to monitor sustainable development of the country. The indicators are grouped in four domains: social, economic, environmental, and institutional-political. Areas were differentiated within the domains, reflecting the objectives and priorities of sustainable development contained in the national strategic documents.

The main part of the publication contains an analytic description of sustainable development indicators of the country including tables and charts containing data for the years 2004-2014. Data for Poland are
compared with data for the European Union and individual Member States. Descriptions of indicators are preceded by a short indicator profile containing definitions as well as basic methodological explanations and information about the importance of the indicator for sustainable development. The set of elaborated indicators will be developed in subsequent years subject to further work on updating the scope of measures to adapt to the existing strategic documents and the selection of indicators most fully reflecting the idea of sustainable development in national conditions.


Switzerland

In German MONET stands for Monitoring of Sustainable Development. It is a project which aims to use indicators to determine the sustainability of Switzerland’s development. MONET is a joint activity of the Federal Statistical Office (FSO), the Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN), the Federal Office for Spatial Development (ARE) and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC).

17 key indicators measure progress towards sustainable development. Each key indicator represents a group of indicators and statistics. They respond to four questions: 1) “Meeting needs – How well do we live?”, 2) “Fairness – How well are resources distributed?”, 3) “Preservation of resources – What are we leaving behind for our children?” and 4) “Decoupling – How efficiently are we using our natural resources?”. Selected MONET indicators show Switzerland's progress towards global sustainable development; more on the global dimension. The indicators are updated once a year in autumn.

45 principles of sustainable development (previously called "postulates") indicate the direction to be taken in order to create and maintain sustainable development.

http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/en/index/ themen/21/02/01.html

United Kingdom

1) UK Sustainable Development Indicators (SDI) have been published since 2013 by the ONS (Office for National Statistics) and DEFRA (the Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs). These indicators provide an overview of national progress towards a more sustainable economy, society and environment. They replace the previous set of SDIs which had been maintained by Defra since 2001. This set is formed of fewer indicators: 12 headline and 23 supplementary indicators, comprising 25 and 41 measures respectively. The reduced size of the set follows the example of other international institutions in identifying a core set of headline indicators to highlight sustainable development priorities for users and government. It was also in part prompted by the need for alignment with the Office for National Statistics’ (ONS) development of national wellbeing measures.


2) In parallel the ONS is developing since 2011 new “Measures of National Well-being”. The aim is to provide a fuller picture of how society is doing by supplementing existing economic, social and environmental measures to ensure that the measures are relevant and founded on what matters to people. The framework includes headline indicators in areas such as health, relationships, education and skills, what we do, where we live, our finances, the economy, governance, the environment and measures of “personal well-being” (individuals' assessment of their own well-being). The programme started with a national debate that gathered views on what matters to people. A report on the findings was published in July 2011. The debate helped establish an ongoing dialogue with citizens, specialists and others.


- Scotland
In 2007 a unifying strategic framework was produced by the Scottish Government, including targets, objectives, outcomes and indicators, which have been used to measure progress. Following the National Performance Framework (NPF), “Scotland Performs” measures and reports on Scottish Government progress in creating a more successful country with opportunities for all to flourish through increasing sustainable economic growth.

Scotland Performs provides accountability based on national priorities set out in the NPF. It draws on the success of the outcomes-based performance model used in Virginia, USA. Similar to Virginia, people can judge for themselves how Scotland is progressing through “direction of travel” arrows on the “performance at a glance” page, which indicates whether performance is improving, worsening or maintaining.

The NPF was updated in December 2011. Progress towards the Purpose is now tracked by 7 Purpose Targets and it is supported by 16 National Outcomes and 50 National Indicators, covering key areas of health, justice, environment, economy, and education measure progress.

http://www.gov.scot/About/Performance/scotPerforms

United States

The US Government has developed in 2010 the “Performance.Gov” framework in order to improve the performance of government at every level. Following successful evidence-based practices used in both the private and public sectors, the Administration engaged senior Federal leaders in establishing two-year Agency Priority Goals in areas where agencies were focused on accelerated performance improvement. The Administration also established government-wide Cross-Agency Priority Goals in areas benefiting from collaboration across multiple agencies.

These goals serve as a way to motivate people and communicate priorities in improving the Federal Government’s performance and accountability. Agencies establish a variety of performance goals and objectives to drive progress toward key outcomes, while outlining long-term goals and objectives in their strategic plans.

In continuation of the successes seen from setting clearly established goals to improve the way the government works, the Administration has introduced new Agency Priority Goals and Cross-Agency Priority Goals in the 2015 Budget, along with the release of new agency strategic plans.

http://www.performance.gov/

- Virginia, USA

**Virginia Performs** was initiated by the Council on Virginia's Future (an advisory board to the Governor and the General Assembly) and established in 2004. It is a performance leadership and accountability system within state government. It begins with a vision for Virginia’s future: Responsible economic growth, an enviable quality of life, good government, and a well-educated citizenry prepared to lead successful lives and to be engaged in shaping the future of the Commonwealth. Seven long-term goals further define this vision by outlining specific outcomes to achieve.

Virginia Performs aligns specific state government outcomes with larger statewide goals: Firstly, quality-of-life measures (societal indicators) answer the question, "How is Virginia doing?" on broad issues such as obesity, land preservation, and educational attainment. Secondly, enterprise priorities, issue-specific report cards, and key outcome measures help see whether Virginia is getting results on its highest priorities -- for example, reducing childhood obesity, increasing agricultural exports, and strengthening workforce skills. Finally, a range of other metrics help gauge whether state programs and services are producing the desired results and whether agency operations are well managed.
Virginia’s wellbeing approach is widely recognised as a pioneer for outcomes-based wellbeing measurement and its “Performance at a glance” dashboard of indicators functioned as a model for Scotland and others.

http://vaperforms.virginia.gov/
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