The International Civil Service Effectiveness (InCiSE) Index

InCiSE

Technical Paper
Assessment of the applicability of the InCiSE methodology to Brazil

April 2019

Contents

Assessment of the applicability of the InCiSE methodology to Brazil

André Carlos Busanelli de Aquino and
André Feliciano Lino,
Universidade de São Paulo

InCiSE

Executive Summary

The InCiSE Index was developed to benchmark the effectiveness of the civil service in OECD countries. The Index is comprised of 12 indicators[1] and 60 themes relating to processes used in the civil service. This report examines the viability of including the Brazilian federal civil service in the InCiSE Index using the same or similar indicators, themes, and data sources as those used in compiling the 2017 Index. A companion report similarly assesses the viability of including Nigeria in the InCiSE Index.

Of the 12 indicators covered in the 2017 report, we found data on 10 (digital service was a notable gap, and capabilities were covered only by one proposed alternative metric; social security administration indicators were not checked, as agreed in advance). For each of these indicators, we assessed whether the sources used in the 2017 report were available for Brazil, and the existence of comparable alternatives and/or regional and local supplementary sources. Our analysis concludes that it is possible to do the InCiSE analysis in Brazil.

- Good quality data are available for 37 of the 60 themes (62%) in the Index.

- Of the 76 metrics used in the 2017 report, we found 65 metrics (86%) for which the same data sources could be used, with some potential additional sources that could be considered to increase this further.

- We found good metrics for all indicators except digital services and capabilities, where no usable metrics were found, and regulation, where only one of three themes was adequately covered.

We propose the following considerations be taken into account in future work on the InCiSE Index:

- Additional themes and sources that would amplify the assessment of policy making, fiscal and financial management, and crisis and risk management.

- In the Brazilian case and perhaps other contexts too, questions of (i) the respective roles of the executive and legislative in fiscal and financial management, (ii) the independence of regulators, (iii) the effect of politicized appointment, payment and promotion on human resource management, (iv) the effect on inclusiveness not only of recruitment and promotion practices but also of equality of treatment and of discretionary payments.

---

1   The measurement framework includes 17 indicators, but the 2017 Index only used 12 of these in practice.

Objectives and methodology

This report is part of a joint study investigating the feasibility of applying the InCiSE methodology to Brazil and Nigeria, with the following objectives:

- Outline aspects of the structure and functions of the civil service of both countries that may affect application of the InCiSE framework;

- Identify international and national data sources relevant to the InCiSE framework and comment on the availability of data, the ease of accessing data, and the strengths and weaknesses of these sources for this purpose;

- Comment on the applicability of the InCiSE Index to cover these countries, and discuss (i) challenges that might be faced in using it and (ii) ways in which the Index might need to be adjusted to be more relevant, applicable, and feasible.

This project does not aim to evaluate the performance of the civil service in Brazil, but only to comment on the potential applicability and relevance of the InCiSE methodology to the country, and in particular to assess the availability of relevant data compatible with the current InCiSE methodology.

We have attempted as far as possible to match the same sources and metrics for the same themes as in the 2017 InCiSE Report. That report sought data for 12 indicators, although did not find sufficient data to include

the social security administration indicator. In consultation with the Blavatnik School of Government, we similarly did not include the indicator on social security administration, and focused on the remaining 11 indicators. For each indicator, the analysis went through the following steps:

a. Are the sources used in InCiSE 2017 available? Assess whether, for Brazil, the themes and indicators in the InCiSE framework were covered by the same metrics and sources as were used in the 2017 InCiSE Report, and comment on the quality of the data for each country.

b. What is the availability and quality of comparable alternative metrics? For the remaining themes, where the InCiSE team had found metrics for OECD countries but where the same data source does *not* cover Brazil, search for alternative regional or local data sources that address the same themes. Where comparable alternatives exist, we comment on the quality of these metrics.

c. Are there supplementary regional and local sources? Identify supplementary metrics, where we find that regional and local sources could be used alongside or instead of the metrics that the 2017 InCiSE Report had selected.

The structure of the civil service

The structure of the executive branch at the federal level in Brazil is similar to that of other federal countries, where the president appoints a Cabinet to run a corps of tenured civil servants for a four year term, extendable by one more term.

The development of the federal civil service in Brazil has passed through three phases: patrimonialist, Weberian (from 1937), and post-Weberian (from 1993). The reforms in Cardoso's presidency, inspired by the New Public Management movement, did not achieve the intended results (Abrucio, 2007). The effect of professionalizing the bureaucracy and evaluating its performance by implementing outcome indicators could have reduced the space for political influence in the allocation of job positions (Abrucio, 2007), but in fact this has increased over time.

In 2018, the federal level has about 620,000 civil servants (excluding state-owned companies), with more than 90,000 receiving some type of temporary gratification (salary increase) associated with specific roles. Most relevant to the InCiSE Index is the group of 240,000 civil servants of the central ministries and their departments. Although some of this group are subject to performance evaluation (based on targets and outputs) which is used to support promotions and confirmation of job tenure, payment-for-performance is rare.

Of these 240,000 civil servants, 22,500 are in high level advisory positions across 23 ministries and their executive agencies (excluding state-owned companies). Such advisory positions act mainly in policy design and implementation, and in leading central service delivery associated with the InCiSE indicators. At least 5,900 such positions are temporary political appointments to non-tenured positions. Of these high level positions, 36% are occupied by black or indigenous people, and 45% by women. The proportions of women occupying the very highest positions (levels DAS-6 and DAS-5) are 18% and 22% respectively (ENAP, 2018). More female than male civil servants have post-graduate degrees, while fewer female than male civil servants are less educated.

A survey undertaken in 2017 by the Brazilian National School of Public Administration found 1740 services delivered by 85 agencies and departments of the federal government. The clients for those services include citizens (for 50% of the listed services), private companies (57%), state-owned companies (45%), other government agencies (20%), states and municipalities (24%) (services may have more than one type of client). Currently, 46% of the services are web-based, and 71% are free-of-charge (ENAP, 2017[1]).

As indicated in Table 1, some InCiSE functions are delivered essentially by one

1   ENAP, 2017, Pesquisa sobre Serviços Públicos de Atendimento do Governo Federal, Escola Nacional de Administração Pública (Brasil), http://repositorio.enap.gov.br/handle/1/3217

Ministry, facilitating data collection, while others are decentralized, requiring multiple surveys to access a broader range of federal organisations.

A significant feature of the Brazilian civil service is the large number of politically appointed civil servants. These political appointments are made through political bargains between the president and leaders of political parties that occupy a significant proportion of seats in the congressional lower chamber (the *Câmara dos Deputados*). Despite reforms in 2016/2017, when under the Presidency of Dilma Rousseff the number of such positions was significantly reduced, those jobs are still present all over the federal structure (including federal agencies, state-owned companies and ministries).

Table 1: The InCiSE central functions and attributes in Brazil

	Located at	Functions and levels of government	Dispersion of function and difficulty of data collection
Central executive			
Policy-making	Each ministry	Related to federal level	Moderate
Fiscal and financial management	Ministry of Finance	Related to federal level	Low
Regulation	Federal executive agencies (ANA, CVM, ANEEL, etc)	Related to federal level	High
Crisis/risk management	Ministry of Planning and Budgeting, and Decentralized	Related to federal level	Moderate
Mission support			
Procurement*	Ministry of Planning and Budgeting	Related to federal level	Low
HR management	Ministry of Planning and Budgeting	Related to federal level	Low
IT*	Decentralized and State-owned enterprise (CERPRO)	Related to federal level	High
Finance*	Ministry of Finance	Related to federal level	Low
Direct service delivery			
Tax	Ministry of Finance	Shared, local and state taxes	Low
Social security	Ministry of Social Security	National system	Low
Digital services	Decentralized	Related to federal level	High
Attributes			
Integrity	All ministries	All levels of government. Includes politically appointed positions.	High
Openness			
Capabilities			
Inclusiveness			
Staff engagement*			
Innovation*			

* Not yet measured or included in the InCiSE (2017) Index due to data availability

Availability of metrics

The InCiSE Index analyses 12 indicators, composed of 60 themes. For the countries covered in the 2017 Index, data were found to be available for 40 of the themes, measured by 76 metrics coming from 19 different sources of data. Table 2 shows that 14 of these sources of data are available for the Brazilian case. These comprise 65 metrics, meaning that 86% of the data are available. The InCiSE framework sets a threshold for a country's inclusion in the Index of 75% of the metrics being available, so we conclude that it is possible to do the InCiSE analysis in Brazil. Hereafter we describe the availability of metrics per indicator and themes.

Additional themes or metrics. We suggest two additional themes for this indicator. Following the recommendations of OECD (2015), governments must (a) ensure that budget documents and data are open, transparent and accessible, and (b) promote the integrity and quality of budgetary forecasts, fiscal plans and budgetary implementation through rigorous quality assurance including independent audit. Thus, we suggest the inclusion of new themes and underlying metrics that capture more phases of the budgetary cycle than its preparation, namely the monitoring phase and external audit.

The themes and the following metrics are:

- Theme: Openness of budgetary practices; metric: IBP Open Budget Index "Transparency" indicator.

- Theme: Integrity of budgetary practices; metric: IBP Open Budget Index "Budget Oversight" indicator.

Overall, there are good metrics for this indicator in the Brazilian case. Moreover, these new themes and metrics may be useful for all countries in next year's InCiSE Index.

Regulation
Existence of metrics. All three of the themes comprising the "Regulation" indicator are covered by the OECD's "Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance" (iREG). In 2016 the iREG indicators were applied to seven Latin America countries that are OECD member and partner countries: Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico and Peru.

Table 2: Availability of data sources included in InCiSE 2017 for Brazil

Sources used in InCiSE 2017 available for Brazil	Sources used in InCiSE 2017 NOT available for Brazil
• Bertelsmann Sustainable Governance Indicators	• European Commission E-Government Benchmarks
• Doing Business index	• Government at a Glance 2013
• Hyogo Framework for Action	• OECD medium-term budgeting
• OECD conflict of interest, private interest, and whistle-blower data	• OECD performance budgeting
• OECD Tax Administration 2015	• OECD PIAAC
• OECD's 'Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance'*	
• OECD's OURdata Index	
• Open Knowledge Foundation's Open Data Index	
• Quality of Government Expert Survey Data	
• Transparency International's Global Corruption Barometer	
• UN's E-participation Index	
• World Economic Forum (WEF) Global Competitiveness Index (GCI)	
• World Justice Project's Open Government Index	
• World Wide Web Foundation's Open Data Barometer	

Note: * OECD's iREG is not available in full detail. See more information below.

Thus, Brazil is covered, and we have available metrics. However, we need to take a closer look at each of the themes that form the "Regulation" indicator.

- Theme – "Ex ante appraisal: application, quality, sustainability, transparency, oversight". For this theme it is possible to see whether (i) there is a requirement to conduct a Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA); (ii) the RIA is conducted in practice; (iii) the quality of RIA is checked by a government body outside the ministry undertaking the regulation; and (iv) there is written guidance on the preparation of an RIA. However, there is no composite index available.

- Theme – "Stakeholder engagement: application, quality, transparency, oversight". For this theme, there is a composite indicator available for Brazil, following the methodology of OECD's 2015 Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance[1].

- Theme – "Ex post evaluation: application, quality, sustainability, transparency, oversight". Again, there is no composite index available – but there is data on the report that might be useful.

The term "Secondary regulation" is also referred to as "Subordinate regulation" in recent OECD surveys (see the Glossary on the methodology on OECD's 2015 Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance).

Alternative metrics were not found for these themes.

Additional themes or metrics are not proposed for this indicator.

Overall, there is good data for one of the three metrics that make up this indicator.

Crisis and Risk Management
Existence of metrics. Five of the six themes comprising the "Crisis and Risk Management" indicator are covered by Hyogo Framework for Action reports ('preparedness for disaster response' is missing). There are five reports for Brazil (including (i) Brazil: National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action [2011-2013]; and (ii) Brazil: Sendai Framework data readiness review report [2017]) covering all metrics needed for this indicator.

Alternative metrics were not found for these themes.

Additional themes or metrics. We propose for consideration a potential new theme related to "Risk Exposure". The perceived vulnerability of a country is an important factor to guide implementation of anticipatory capacities, influencing coping capacities in periods of strain. Thus, based on the European Commission's "INFORM – Index for Risk Management"[2], we propose the "Hazard and Exposure" index as a proxy for Risk Exposure. However, while the Inform index includes elements related to coping capacity which may be related to civil service effectiveness, it encompasses many other factors as well, so is not a particularly strong metric for the civil service.

Overall, we conclude that there are good metrics for the Brazilian case.

1   http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5jrnwqm3zp43-en
2   http://www.inform-index.org/

Human Resource Management

Existence of metrics. Six themes comprise the "Human Resource Management" indicator but in the InCiSE Index 2017 data are only available for two of them, namely (i) "Meritocracy of recruitment" and (ii) "Attracting and retaining talent". These themes are also covered for the Brazilian case, based on the "Quality of Government Expert Survey Data".

Alternative metrics. We suggest that for the first theme, an alternative could be "Civil service merit" available in table 6.4, pp 105 of Government at a Glance: Latin America and the Caribbean 2017.

Additional themes or metrics are not proposed for this indicator.

Overall, there are good metrics for the Brazilian case.

Tax Administration

Existence of metrics. Five themes comprise the "Tax Administration" indicator in the InCiSE Index 2017, but only three of them are already covered. The 2017 report did not identify any data for the themes 'prevention of tax evasion' and 'level of tax gap measurement', and we were likewise unable to find alternative metrics for these themes for Brazil. All of the remaining themes covered in InCiSE 2017 are available for Brazil, based on data from OECD Tax Administration surveys.

Alternative metrics. The "Institutional Profile Database" (IPD), organized by the CEPII, have some metrics on (i) efficiency of tax administration in the collection of corporation tax, income tax, across the national territory, and also on (ii) one country ability to limit tax evasion.

Additional themes or metrics are not proposed for this indicator.

Overall, there are good metrics for the Brazilian case.

Digital Services

Existence of metrics. Four themes comprise the "Digital Services" indicator in the InCiSE Index 2017. These data come from the European Commission, and none of the metrics used in InCiSE 2017 are available for Brazil.

Alternative metrics. We did not find alternative sources of data. However, there is a forthcoming publication by OECD - the "Digital Government Review of Brazil" that might be useful (https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264307636-en).

Additional themes or metrics are not proposed for this indicator.

Overall, we do not find any usable metrics for the Brazilian case.

Integrity

Existence of metrics. Six themes comprise the "Integrity" indicator in the InCiSE Index 2017. The sources of data are Transparency International's Global Corruption Barometer, Quality of Government (QoG) Expert Surveys, World Economic Forum's (WEF) Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) and OECD. Data for all of these themes are available for Brazil.

Alternative metrics. The LatinoBarometro 2018 could be an alternative source for the levels/perception of corruption theme for Latin countries.

Additional themes or metrics are not proposed for this indicator.

Overall, there are good metrics for the Brazilian case.

Openness
Existence of metrics. Six themes comprise the "Openness" indicator in the InCiSE Index 2017. The sources of data are The World Justice Project's Open Government Index, The UN's E-participation Index, Bertelsmann's Sustainable Governance Indicators (SGIs), The World Wide Web Foundation's Open Data Barometer, The Open Knowledge Foundation's Open Data Index and OECD's OURdata index. Data for all themes are available for Brazil. However, the Bertelsmann SGI could be weak on the "degree and quality of societal consultation" theme, because it is based on a special report for BRICS, issued in 2014 which may be a one-off exercise.

Alternative metrics. For the "The degree and quality of societal consultation" theme, we suggest for consideration a potential alternative metric, item 3.6.6 of the "Varieties of Democracy index", namely, "Engaged society (v2dlengage)", with the question "When important policy changes are being considered, how wide and how independent are public deliberations?" This metric relates to the openness of policy-making, but is only an indirect indication of civil service effectiveness.

Additional themes or metrics are not proposed for this indicator.

Overall, there are good metrics for the Brazilian case.

Capabilities
Existence of metrics. Six themes comprise the "Capabilities" indicator in the InCiSE Index 2017. These data come from the OECD PIAAC, and none of the metrics used in InCiSE 2017 are available for Brazil.

Alternative metrics. We suggest that one alternative metric for the "Core capability" theme could be the "HR personnel technical skills" – available at Government at a Glance: Latin America and the Caribbean 2017 - pp. 103 , table 6.2.

Additional themes or metrics are not proposed for this indicator.

Overall, we do not find suitable metrics for the Brazilian case.

Inclusiveness
Existence of metrics. Five themes comprise this indicator, but data are only available for two of them in the 2017 InCiSE report. These data come from Quality of Government expert surveys and OECD's Government at a Glance. The Brazilian case is partly covered but the two metrics from GaaG are not available.

Alternative metrics. The Brazilian Government National School of Public Administration (ENAP) produces reports based on surveys of quantitative data of gender, LGBT and other minorities that could be useful for the Brazilian case. However, these data are country specific and not comparable with other countries.

Additional *themes or metrics* are not proposed for this indicator.

Overall, there are good metrics for the Brazilian case.

Potential new data sources and metrics

The proposed new data sources for Brazil are summarised in table 3 below.

Our aim was to identify data for 12 indicators comprising 60 themes. Table 3, shows which indicators and themes we feel can be well represented (✔), approximately represented (~), or not represented (✘) for Brazil, and whether the data sources would be the same as the sources that were used in the 2017 InCiSE report or whether new metrics are suggested, either instead of or in addition to the original sources.

Table 3: Proposed new data sources for Brazil

Organisation	Instrument	Period	Frequency
CEPII	Institutional Profile Databases	2001, 2006, 2009, 2012 and 2016	Unsure
Freedom House	Freedom in the World index	1998-2018	Annual
International Budget Partnership	Open budget Survey	2006-2018	Bi-annual
Latinobarómetro	Informe Latinobarómetro	1995-2018	Annual
OECD	Government at a Glance: Latin America and the Caribbean	2014 and 2017	Unsure
Varieties of Democracy Institute	V-DEM Annual Democracy Report	1900-2018	Annual

Indicator	Theme	Data availability	Same sources as InCiSE 2017?	New metrics proposed?
Policy making	The quality of policy advice	✗	No	
	Degree of strategic policy direction	✗	No	
	Coordination of policy proposals	✗	No	
	Timeliness and accuracy of policy delivery	✗	No	
	Degree of policy monitoring	✗	No	
Fiscal and financial management	Economic appraisal (use, quality, guidance)	✔	Yes	
	Economic evaluation (use, quality, guidance)	✔	Yes	
	Medium-term budgeting	✔	No	Yes
	Performance budgeting	✔	No	Yes
Regulation	Ex ante appraisal: application, quality, sustainability, transparency, oversight.	✗	No	
	Stakeholder engagement: application, quality, transparency, oversight	✗	No	
	Ex post evaluation: application, quality, sustainability, transparency, oversight	✗	No	
Crisis/risk management	Integrated risk planning	✔	Yes	
	Risk monitoring	✔	Yes	
	Public information dissemination and public awareness strategies	✔	Yes	
	International cooperation and risk coordination	✔	Yes	
	Preparedness for disaster response	✗	No	
	Post disaster assessment methodology	✔	Yes	
Human resource management	Meritocracy of recruitment	✔	Yes	
	Attracting and retaining talent	✔	Yes	
	Talent deployment (i.e. minimising skills gaps)	✗	No	
	Performance management	✗	No	
	Quality of learning and development	✗	No	
	Level of customer (i.e. civil servant) satisfaction	✗	No	
Tax administration	Overall efficiency of collection	✗	No	
	User centricity of services	~	Yes	
	Extent and quality of digital provision	✗	No	
	Prevention of tax evasion	✗	No	
	Level of tax gap measurement	✗	No	
Social security administration	Overall efficiency of distribution	✗	No	
	User centricity of services	✗	No	
	Extent and quality of digital provision	✗	No	
	Prevention of fraud	✗	No	
Digital service	User centricity of services	~	No	Yes
	Transparency of service	~	No	Yes
	Cross-border mobility of services	✗	No	
	The availability of 'key enablers'	✗	No	

Indicator	Theme	Data availability	Same sources as InCiSE 2017?	New metrics proposed?
Integrity	Levels/perceptions of corruption	✔	Yes	
	Fairness and impartiality	✔	Yes	
	Adherence to rules and procedures	✔	Yes	
	Striving to serve citizens and ministers	✔	Yes	
	Work ethic	✔	Yes	
	Processes in place to preserve integrity and prevent conflicts of interest	✔	Yes	
Openness	The degree and quality of societal consultation	✔	Yes	
	The existence and quality of complaint mechanisms	✔	Yes	
	Government data availability and accessibility	~	No	Yes
	Government data impact and support for re-use	✘	No	
	Right to information (e.g. FOIs)	✘	No	
	Publicised laws	✔	Yes	
Capabilities	Leadership capability	✘	No	
	Commercial capability	✘	No	
	Analytical capability	✘	No	
	Digital capability	✘	No	
	Core capability (e.g. problem-solving, numeracy, literacy skills)	✘	No	
	Educational attainment of the workforce	✘	No	
Inclusiveness	Proportionate gender representation	✔	No	Yes
	Proportionate ethnic minority representation	✔	Yes	
	Proportionate disability representation	✘	No	
	Proportionate socio-economic representation	✘	No	
	Proportionate Lesbian Gay Bi-sexual Transgender Other sexuality representation	✘	No	

Applicability of the InCiSE methodology to Brazil

For the Brazilian case there are indexes that focus on the effectiveness of procedures within the civil service, as well as output measures. Here we indicate the relevance of metrics in the Brazilian context. Our comments may also be relevant considerations for extending the coverage of the InCiSE Index to countries similar to Brazil.

a. **Fiscal and Financial Management**:
   The "quality of the budgeting process" ultimately depends on the legislative branch of government, but legal mandates vary at different points in the budgetary process. For a federal presidential country like Brazil, budgetary bills, policy execution and policy monitoring are the concern of the executive branch, but the legislative branch has autonomy to amend and monitor the budget in regard to its fiscal aspects. Consequently, the "quality of the budgeting process" spills over from the executive to the legislative branch, in ways that may affect comparability with other governmental systems. It is important that the InCiSE metrics focus on processes that are within the legal mandate of the executive branch for all countries covered by the Index.

b. **Regulation:** The "extent and quality" of assessments and stakeholder engagement do not entirely capture the effectiveness of the executive agency. The question of the independence of the regulator from regulated bodies is not covered by the Index. This is a particularly relevant issue in clientelistic countries, where political appointments to regulatory agencies can undermine the regulatory process.

c. **Human Resource Management**:
   Although the "meritocracy of recruitment" is an important dimension of HRM, other important features of meritocracy are how performance is evaluated and connected to promotion, how high level strategic positions are assigned, and how far down the hierarchic chain politically assigned supplementary payments and gratifications can be awarded. These factors can distract officials' motivation from performance to the development of paternalistic ties.

d. **Inclusiveness:** Problems of the representation of groups in public administration (women; racial, ethnic and religious minorities; the disabled; indigenous populations) can be observed not only in their opportunities for recruitment, promotion and rewards, but also in equality of treatment and openness to their voice and ideas. Another metric currently not included in the Inclusiveness indicator relates to the discretionary assignment of extra payments for politically appointed temporary roles. In Brazil, such payments are concentrated on men occupying high level positions, but are also used to favour specific groups in medium level positions.

Bibliography

Abrucio, F. L. (2007). Trajetória recente da gestão pública brasileira: um balanço crítico e a renovação da agenda de reformas. *Revista de Administração Pública-RAP*, *41*.

ENAP (2018). *Servidores(as) por raça/cor: sumário estatístico*, Escola Nacional de Administração Pública (Brasil), http://repositorio.enap.gov.br/handle/1/3259

OECD (2013). *Government at a Glance 2013.* OECD Publishing, Paris. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/government-at-a-glance-2013_gov_glance-2013-en

OECD (2015). *Recommendation of the Council on Budgetary Governance*. OECD Publishing, Paris. http://www.oecd.org/gov/budgeting/Recommendation-of-the-Council-on-Budgetary-Governance.pdf

Annex: Detailed assessment of the applicability of the InCiSE methodology

The tables in this annex outline in detail the applicability of the methodology set out in the Technical Report for the 2017 edition of the InCiSE Index, assessing whether data is available for Brazil and proposing potential alternatives where possible.

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Policy making				
The quality of policy advice	Bertelsmann 'Scholarly Advice' sub-indicator is used as a proxy for the evidence base to policy decisions by assessing the degree of civil servant to academic coordination: 'How influential are non-governmental academic experts for government decision-making?'	NO		
	Bertelsmann 'Government Office Expertise' sub-indicator assesses: 'Does the government office/prime minister's office (GO/PMO) have the expertise to evaluate ministerial draft bills substantively?'	(1) The same metric is available in a specific country report from 2014. It is unsure if it is a "one-off" experience or if Bertelsmann intend to elaborate these reports frequently.		
	Bertelsmann's SGI Report for Brazil is reliable, since it is co-authored by two Brazilian researchers who have formal and tacit knowledge about the institutional and economic environment of the country.	N/A		
Degree of strategic policy direction	Bertelsmann 'Strategic Planning' sub-indicator assesses: 'How much influence do strategic planning units and bodies have on government decision-making?'	See comment (1)	NO	N/A
Coordination of policy proposals	Bertelsmann 'Ministerial Bureaucracy' sub-indicator assesses: 'How effectively do ministry officials/civil servants coordinate policy proposals?'	YES	CEPII Institutional Profiles Database is now available in 144 countries of the world.	The data are reliable since they are gathered via surveys of collaborators at the Ministry of Economy and Finance of the selected country + the French Development Agency (if it exists in the country)
	Bertelsmann 'Line Ministries' sub-indicator assesses 'To what extent do line ministries involve the government office/prime minister's office in the preparation of policy proposals?' See comment (1)			
Timeliness and accuracy of policy delivery	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Degree of policy monitoring	Bertelsmann 'Monitoring Ministries' sub-indicator assesses: 'How effectively does the GO/PMO monitor line ministry activities with regard to implementation?'			
	Bertelsmann sub-indicator 'Monitoring Agencies', assesses: 'How effectively do federal and subnational ministries monitor the activities of bureaucracies/executive agencies with regard to implementation?'			
	Bertelsmann 'National Standards' sub-indicator assesses: 'To what extent does central government ensure that subnational self-governments realise national standards of public services?'	See comment (1)	NO	N/A
Fiscal and financial management				
Economic appraisal (use, quality, guidance)	'Public Spending': WEF GCI business executive opinion: 'How would you rate the composition of public spending in your country?' (1) extremely wasteful; (7) highly efficient in providing necessary goods and services.	(2) The same metric is available and disclosed frequently.		
	WEF GCI uses a mix of secondary data and country surveys conducted by partner organisations based on the country analysed – increasing the reliability of the index due to formal and tacit knowledge about the institutional and economic environment of the country.	NO		
	N/A			
Economic evaluation (use, quality, guidance)			NO	N/A
Medium-term budgeting	OECD 'Medium-Term Budgeting' index	Same metric is NOT available	YES	
	International Budget Partnership Open Budget Survey	Question 48 of the OBS capture exactly the dynamics of Medium-term budgeting – i.e. "is the Executive's Budget Proposal or any supporting budgetary documentation present		

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
information on how the proposed budget (both new proposals and existing policies) is linked to government's policy goals for a multi-year period (for at least two years beyond the budget year)?"				
		The data are reliable. IBP Methodology asks for a government response and an academic peer review before the publication of the responses for the questionnaire.		
		More metrics coming from the same data source can be useful for InCiSe team on this theme (and overall indicator).		
Performance budgeting	OECD 'Performance Budgeting' index	Same metric is NOT available	YES	
	International Budget Partnership Open Budget Survey	The question 51 of the OBS capture exactly the dynamics of PBB – i.e., 'Are performance targets assigned to nonfinancial data on results in the Executive's Budget Proposal or any supporting budget documentation?"		
		The data are reliable. IBP Methodology asks for a government response and an academic peer review before the publication of the responses for the questionnaire.		
		More metrics coming from the same data source may be useful for InCiSE team on this theme (and overall indicator).		
Regulation				
Ex ante appraisal: application, quality, sustainability, transparency, oversight.	OECD i-reg indicators – Regulatory 'Impact Assessment – Primary Laws'			
OECD i-reg indicators – Regulatory 'Impact Assessment – Secondary Laws'				
Stakeholder engagement and ex post evaluation assessments are made on four areas of performance: methodology, systematic adoption, transparency and oversight/quality control.	The same data is available, but there is no composite indicator in the Brazilian country Report.			
NO	N/A			

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Stakeholder engagement: application, quality, transparency, oversight	OECD i-reg indicators – 'Stakeholder Engagement – Primary Laws'			
OECD i-reg indicators – 'Stakeholder Engagement – Secondary Laws'	The same data are available and, for this theme, there is a composite indicator available for Brazil. The indicator follows the methodology of OECD's 2015 Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance.	NO	N/A	
Ex post evaluation: application, quality, sustainability, transparency, oversight	OECD i-reg indicators – Ex-post 'Evaluation – Primary Laws'			
OECD i-reg indicators – Ex-post 'Evaluation – Secondary Laws'	The same data are available, but there is no composite indicator in the Brazilian country report.	NO	N/A	
Crisis/risk management				
Integrated risk planning	'Risk Planning Extent': The extent to which disaster risk is integrated into national policy planning is measured by counting the types of policy planning into which risk is integrated (out of 7, e.g. national development plans).			
'Disaster Spending Appraisal': A score for economic appraisal (3) looks at whether the costs and benefits of spending related to disaster spending are considered.	(3) The same metric is available in a specific country report. As in other countries, it is unsure if it is a "one-off" experience.			
The report for Brazil is reliable, since it relies on a focal point working at the central government - that has formal and tacit knowledge about the institutional and economic environment of the country.	NO	N/A		
Risk monitoring	'Risk Assessment Quality': The quality of multi-hazard risk assessment is measured by assessing the processes behind risk assessments (out of 5, e.g. whether risk assessments have agreed national standards);			
The 'Degree of Risk Monitoring' is measured by assessing the extent and use of reports and databases of this type.	See comment (3)	NO	N/A	
Public information dissemination and public awareness strategies	'Early Warning Systems': The quality of early warning systems is assessed by looking at the processes in place (out of 3, e.g. whether protocols are used and applied).			

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
'Public Information' dissemination is scored by looking at the types of communications in place (out of 4, e.g. is a national disaster information system publicly available?).				
'Public Awareness Strategy' looks at the relevant workstreams in place (out of 5, e.g. whether public education campaigns for risk awareness exist).	See comment (3)	NO	N/A	
International cooperation and risk coordination	'International Cooperation' is measured by assessing the number of processes/activities in place for international cooperation and international risk management (out of 6, e.g. whether transboundary protocols are in place).	See comment (3)	NO	N/A
Preparedness for disaster response	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Post disaster assessment methodology	'Post Disaster Assessment': A score is given for post disaster damage and loss assessment by considering, for example, whether a specified methodology for this exists (out of 3).	See comment (3)	NO	N/A
Human resource management				
Meritocracy of recruitment	'Applicant Skills': QoG expert assessment of extent to which the skills and merits of the applicants decide who gets the job when recruiting public sector employees;			
	'Connections Bias in Recruitment: Political': QoG expert assessment of extent to which political connections of the applicants decide who gets the job;			
	'Connections Bias in Recruitment: Personal': QoG expert assessment of extent to which personal connections of the applicants decide who gets the job;			
	'Recruitment via Formal Exam System': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees are hired using a formal examination system.	(4) The same metric is available and disclosed frequently.		
	QoG surveys are conducted with Brazilian experts – increasing the reliability of the index due to formal and tacit knowledge about the institutional and economic environment of the country.		YES	

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
	OECD's Government at a Glance: Latin America and the Caribbean	The data are available, and it is reliable. However, the frequency is unsure: the data is disclosed discretionarily by OECD.		
Attracting and retaining talent	'Comparable Salaries': QoG expert assessment of extent to which senior officials have salaries that are comparable with the salaries of private sector managers with roughly similar training and responsibilities.	See comment (4)	NO	N/A
Talent deployment (i.e. minimising skills gaps)	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Performance management	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Quality of learning and development	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Level of customer (i.e. civil servant) satisfaction	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Tax administration				
Overall efficiency of collection	'Collection Cost': Data from OECD Tax Administration on: cost of collection ratios (administrative costs/net revenue collected); 'Tax Debt' ratios (total year-end tax debt (excluding disputed)/ net revenue collected).	(6) The same metric is available and reliable. It is disclosed discretionarily by OECD.	YES	CEPII Institutional Profiles Database. CEPII IPD is now available in 144 countries of the world. The data is reliable since it is gattered via surveys applied to collaborators at the Ministry of Economy and Finance of the selected country + the French Development Agency (if it exists in the country)
User centricity of services	'Time to Pay Taxes – Business': Data from the World Bank's 'Doing Business' Index on the time it takes businesses to pay taxes.			(5) The same metric is available and disclosed frequently.

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
	Doing Business' team uses a mix secondary data and a group of contributors (both individuals and organisations) based on the country analysed – increasing the reliability of the index due to formal and tacit knowledge about the institutional and economic environment of the country.	NO	N/A	N/A
Extent and quality of digital provision	'E-Filed Tax Returns – Personal': Data from OECD Tax Administration on: the percentage of tax returns e-filed during the last fiscal year for personal taxes;			
	'E-Filed Tax Returns – Corporate': Data from OECD Tax Administration on: the percentage of tax returns e-filed during the last fiscal year for corporate taxes;			
	'E-Filed Tax Returns – VAT': Data from OECD Tax Administration on: the percentage of tax returns e-filed during the last fiscal year for VAT taxes.	See comment (6)	NO	N/A
Prevention of tax evasion	No data identified	N/A	YES	
	CEPII Institutional Profiles Database	CEPII IPD is now available in 144 countries of the world.		
		The data is reliable since it is gathered via surveys applied to collaborators at the Ministry of Economy and Finance of the selected country + the French Development Agency (if it exists in the country)		
Level of tax gap measurement	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Social security administration				
Overall efficiency of distribution	Administration costs as a percentage of total expenditure on social security.	NO	NO	N/A
User centricity of services	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Extent and quality of digital provision	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Prevention of fraud	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/ availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Digital service				
User centricity of services	European Commission E-Government benchmark: 'User Centricity', indicates to what extent (information about) a service is provided online.	Same metric is NOT available	NO	N/A
Transparency of service	European Commission E-Government benchmark: 'Transparency', indicates to what extent governments are transparent as regards a) their own responsibilities and performance, b) the process of service delivery and c) personal data involved.	Same metric is NOT available	NO	N/A
Cross-border mobility of services	European Commission E-Government benchmark: 'Cross Border Mobility', indicates to what extent European users can use online services in another country;	Same metric is NOT available	NO	N/A
The availability of 'key enablers'	European Commission E-Government benchmark: 'Key Enablers', indicates the extent to which five technical pre-conditions for eGovernment are used.	Same metric is NOT available	NO	N/A
Integrity				
Levels/perceptions of corruption	'Corruption Perceptions': Global Corruption Barometer – % of people viewing public officials/civil servants as corrupt;			
'Public Officials Stealing': QoG – expert opinion of how often public sector officials steal or embezzle public funds;				
'Public Officials Favours for Bribes': QoG – expert opinion of how often public sector officials grant favours for bribes;				
'Government Favouritism of Business': WEF GCI – business executive opinion of extent government officials show favouritism to well-connected firms.	Global Corruption Barometer is frequent and reliable set of data. Surveys are conducted via phone or internet with adults living in the country of analysis.			
See comment (2) & (4)	YES			
Latinobarómetro	Latinobarómetro is a frequent and reliable set of data. A leading local polling company is contracted. All geographic regions of Brazil are covered in the sample.			

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/ availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Fairness and impartiality	'Fair Treatment by Public Officials': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees treat some groups in society unfairly;			
'Public Officials Act Impartially': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees act impartially when deciding how to implement policy.	See comment (4)	NO	N/A	
Adherence to rules and procedures	'Public Officials Follow Rules': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees strive to follow rules.	See comment 4	NO	N/A
Striving to serve citizens and ministers	'Public Officials Strive to Help Citizens': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees strive to help citizens;			
'Public Officials Strive to Implement Policies' QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees strive to implement policies decided by political leaders;				
'Public Officials Strive to Fulfill Ideology': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees strive to fulfil ideology of party in government.	See comment (4)	NO	N/A	
Work ethic	'Employee Absences': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees are absent without permission;			
'Employee Efficiency': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees strive to be efficient.	See comment (4)	NO	N/A	
Processes in place to preserve integrity and prevent conflicts of interest	'Post Employment Cooling Off': OECD data on whether a post-employment cooling off period exists and whether it's paid;			
'Lobbyist Protection': OECD data on degree of protection against lobbyists and other private interests influencing advisory groups;				
'Whistleblower Protection: Coverage': OECD data on number of groups who receive whistleblower protection;				
'Whistleblower Protection: Degree': QoG expert assessment of degree of whistleblower protection.	See comment (6)	NO	N/A	

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/ availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Openness				
The degree and quality of societal consultation	The 'Civic Participation' component of the Open Government Index, which "measures the effectiveness of civic participation mechanisms, including the protection of the freedoms of opinion and expression, and assembly and association, and the right to petition the government. It also measures whether people can voice concerns to various government officers and members of the legislature, and whether government officials provide sufficient information and notice about decisions affecting the community, including opportunities for citizen feedback";			
	'E-Government Engagement': The UN's E-Participation Index, which reviews the quality and usefulness of e-government programs for the purpose of engaging people in public policy-making and implementation;			
	'Negotiating Public Support' Bertelsmann sub-indicator, which "assesses how successfully the government consults with societal actors such as trade unions, employers' associations, leading business associations, religious communities, and social and environmental interest groups in preparing its policy."	(7) The OGI is reliable and frequent. A leading local polling company is contracted out + expert surveys taken.		
		UN data is reliable and frequent. The data is gattered via survey with focal points on central governments, case studies and secondary data available on government websites.		
	For Bertelsmann, see comment (1)		YES	
	Varieties of Democracy			VDem is reliable and frequent. Data is gattered via surveys with experts in the countries analysed.

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/ availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
The existence and quality of complaint mechanisms	The 'Complaint Mechanisms' component of the Open Government Index, which "measures whether people are able to bring specific complaints to the government about the provision of public services or the performance of government officers in carrying out their legal duties in practice, and how government officials respond to such complaints. It also measures whether people can challenge government decisions before another government agency or a judge."	See comment (7)	NO	N/A
Government data availability and accessibility	'Open Data Practice and Impact': The Open Data Barometer (ODB) measures the implementation of open data practice and is the only index to also measure the impact of open data (e.g. how many use it).			
	'Government Datasets Openness': The Open Data Index (ODI) measures whether publicly held data across 13 areas is defined as open, with results crowdsourced from volunteers reviewing websites.			
	'Data Availability and Government Support': The OURdata index also aims to capture the availability and accessibility of data but uniquely it also attempts to measure the level of pro-active support governments provide to foster innovative re-use of the data.	NO	N/A	
Government data impact and support for re-use			NO	N/A
Right to information (e.g. FOIs)	The 'Rights to Information' component of the Open Government Index which "measures whether requests for information held by a government agency are granted. It also measures whether these requests are granted within a reasonable time period, if the information provided is pertinent and complete, and if requests for information are granted at a reasonable cost and without having to pay a bribe. This dimension also measures whether people are aware of their right to information, and whether relevant records – such as budget figures of government officials, ombudsman reports, and information relative to community projects – are accessible to the public upon request."	See comment (7)	NO	N/A

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Publicised laws	The 'Publicised Laws' component of the Open Government Index, which "measures whether basic laws and information on legal rights are publicly available, presented in plain language, and are made accessible in all languages used by significant segments of the population. This dimension also measures the quality and accessibility of information published by the government in print or online (i.e. active transparency), and whether administrative regulations, drafts of legislation, administrative decisions, and high court decisions are made accessible to the public in a timely manner."	See comment (7)	NO	N/A
Capabilities				
Leadership capability	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Commercial capability	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Analytical capability	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Digital capability	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Core capability (e.g. problem-solving, numeracy, literacy skills)	'Literacy Skills': Taken from the OECD's PIAAC (Survey of Adult Skills) data (analysis of the microdata): the proportion of the public sector getting level 4 or 5 for literacy skills;			
'Numeracy Skills': The proportion of the public sector getting level 4 or 5 for numeracy skills;				
'Problem Solving Skills': The proportion of the public sector getting level 3 for problem skills.	Same metric is NOT available	YES		
OECD's Government at a Glance: Latin America and the Caribbean	This is available and it is reliable. It is disclosed discretionarily by OECD.			
Educational attainment of the workforce	'Educational Attainment': The proportion of the public sector with tertiary education, taken from the OECD's PIAAC (Survey of Adult Skills) data (analysis of the microdata).	Same metric is NOT available	NO	N/A

Theme	Metrics used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality/availability of the InCiSE metrics for Brazil	Alternative metrics suggested	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Inclusiveness				
Proportionate gender representation	'Gender: Central Government Share': OECD data – the absolute difference between the share of total central government employment filled by women and the share of women in the labour force;			
	'Gender: Public Sector Share': QoG data – the absolute difference between proportion of women in public sector and in the labour force;			
	'Gender: Management Share': OECD data – the absolute difference between the share of employment in top management positions within central government filled by women and the share of women in the labour force;			
	'Gender: Senior Management Share': QoG data – the absolute difference between proportion of women in central government senior positions and in the labour force	See comment (4)	YES	
Brazilian National Public Administration School (country specific)	This is available and it is reliable. It is disclosed discretionarily by ENAP.			
Proportionate ethnic minority representation	'Ethnic and Religious Group Representation': QoG data – expert opinion as to whether 'Key ethnic and religious groups in society are proportionally represented among public sector employees (1=hardly ever, 7=almost always)'	See comment (4)	NO	N/A
Proportionate disability representation	No data identified	N/A	YES	
Brazilian National Public Administration School (country specific)	This is available and it is reliable. It is disclosed discretionarily by ENAP.			
Proportionate socio-economic representation	No data identified	N/A	NO	N/A
Proportionate Lesbian Gay Bi-sexual Transgender Other sexuality representation	No data identified	N/A	YES	
Brazilian National Public Administration School (country specific)	This is available and it is reliable. It is disclosed discretionarily by ENAP.			

InCiSE