



On approval of the Methodology for operational assessment for the block of goals achievement

Unofficial translation

Joint regulatory resolution of the Accounts Committee for Control over the Execution of the Republican Budget № 1- HK dated February 26, 2020, and Order of the First Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Kazakhstan - Minister of Finance of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated February 26, 2020, № 201. Registered with the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Kazakhstan on February 27 2020 № 20072.

Unofficial translation

In accordance with paragraph 27 of the System of annual performance assessment of central state and local executive bodies of regions, cities of republican significance, the capital, approved by Decree of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated March 19, 2010, № 954, the Accounts Committee for Control over the Execution of the Republican Budget (hereinafter referred to as the Accounts Committee) **RESOLVES** and the First Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Kazakhstan - Minister of Finance of the Republic of Kazakhstan **ORDERS**:

1. To approve the attached Methodology for operational assessment for the block of goals achievement.

2. The Legal Department of the Accounts Committee, in accordance with the procedure established by the legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan, shall ensure:

1) state registration of this Joint regulatory resolution and Order with the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Kazakhstan;

2) posting of this Joint regulatory resolution and Order on the Internet resource of the Accounts Committee.

3. Control over the implementation of this Joint regulatory resolution and Order shall be entrusted to the Chief of Staff of the Accounts Committee and the supervising Vice Minister of Finance of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

4. This Joint regulatory resolution and Order shall come into effect upon the expiration of ten calendar days after the day of its first official publication.

*First Deputy of the
Prime Minister of the
Republic of Kazakhstan -
Minister of Finance of the
Republic of Kazakhstan* ___ A. Smailov

*Chairman of the Accounts
Committee for Control
over the Execution of the
Republican
Budget* ___ N. Godunova

Approved by the
Joint regulatory
resolution of the Accounts Committee for

Methodology for Operational Evaluation of the Goals Achievement Cluster Chapter 1. General provisions

Footnote. The methodology is in the wording of the joint regulatory resolution of the Supreme Audit Chamber of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated 11.04.2023 № 11-NK and the order of the Deputy Prime Minister - Minister of Finance of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated 11.04.2023 № 367 (effective ten calendar days after the date of its first official publication).

1. This Methodology for Operational Evaluation of the Goals Achievement Cluster (hereinafter - the Methodology) has been elaborated to implement the System of Annual Performance Evaluation of Central State and Local Executive Bodies of Regions, Cities of National Importance and the Capital City approved by Decree of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan № 954 of March 19, 2010 (hereinafter - the Evaluation System).

2. The following terms and definitions are used herein:

1) efficiency of budget programme implementation is an attainment of the goals with least costs, determined by the proportion (ratio) of results to costs;

2) an indicator overachievement is an indicator's actual value exceeding the planned one by 25% or more;

3) adjustment of the target values of the indicator is a decrease in the target values of the target indicators of the development plan of the public authority;

4) target indicators interrelated with financial expenditures are target indicators interrelated with budget programmes of local executive bodies and/or dependent on the activities of local executive bodies;

5) macro-indicators are target indicators that reflect a composite description of the development of the industry/sphere in the region and do not require linkage with budget programmes/sub-programmes;

6) dynamics of actual performance of target indicator is the absence of deterioration of actual performance of target indicators of the development plan of the public authority compared to the fact of the previous period, unless there are cases of non-fulfillment of activities and obligations due to factors beyond the control of the public authority;

7) a final result is an indicator of the budget programme that quantitatively measures the achievement of the goal of the development plan of the public authority, development plan of

the region, city of national importance, capital city and (or) the budget programme due to the achievement of direct results of the public authority's activity;

8) an immediate outcome is a quantitative description of the volume of public functions, powers and public services performed within the limits of budget funds, the achievement thereof being fully dependent on the activities of the entity that performs these functions, powers or renders services.

3 The methodology is designated to determine the efficiency of measures undertaken by public authorities to develop the supervised industry/sphere/region, as well as the use of budgetary funds.

4. Operational assessment of the goals achievement cluster shall be implemented in line with the Schedule of the Operational Assessment of the Public Authorities' Performance Efficiency (hereinafter - Assessment Schedule) approved by the Executive Office of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan pursuant to paragraph 11 of the Assessment System.

5. Operational assessment on the goals achievement cluster shall be made by the following public authorities (hereinafter - authorized public authorities for assessment):

by the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Kazakhstan (hereinafter referred to as the competent authority for budget execution) - evaluation of the efficiency of budget programmes execution and their interrelation with the objectives of the development plan of public authorities, efficiency of local executive bodies in achieving the indicators of budget programmes, evaluation of the use of new budgeting practices (participatory budgeting) of local executive bodies, as well as double-checking of the reporting data of the central state and local executive bodies on the implementation of budget programmes;

by the Supreme Audit Chamber of the Republic of Kazakhstan (hereinafter referred to as the Supreme Audit Chamber) - evaluation of the efficiency of public authorities in achieving the goals of the development plans of public authorities and development plans of regions, cities of national importance, and the capital city.

A working group (hereinafter referred to as the Budget Execution Working Group), being a subgroup of the Annual Evaluation Commission, shall be established within the competent authority for budget execution to assess the efficiency of local executive bodies in achieving the indicators of budget programmes, to evaluate the use of new budgeting practices (participatory budgeting), to double-check the reporting data of central public authorities on the implementation of budget programmes. The composition of the Working Group on Budget Execution shall be approved by the order of the competent authority for budget execution or by the order of the department of the competent authority for budget execution.

Chapter 2: Sources of information for the operational assessment of the goal achievement cluster

6. The evaluated public authorities shall annually, within the terms established by the Evaluation Schedule, submit to the public authorities responsible for evaluation the reporting

information on electronic media on the findings of the reporting (calendar) year to the public authorities authorised for evaluation:

1) data on the relationship between the goals, target indicators and budget programmes of the central public authority in the form as per Annex 1 hereto;

2) data on the achievement of direct results of the evaluated budget development programmes (local executive bodies) in the form as per Annex 2 hereto;

3) an explanatory note (local executive bodies).

An explanatory note on the achievement of immediate outcomes of the evaluated budget development programmes by local executive bodies shall contain information in the context of evaluation criteria.

The indicators of actual performance of target indicators of the development plan of public authorities and the development plan of a region, a city of national importance, the capital city shall be formed by the evaluated public authorities considering mathematical rounding to two decimal places.

The evaluated public authorities shall present data on the implementation of recommendations given on the outcomes of the previous year's operational evaluation to the public authorities authorised for evaluation.

7. State audit and financial control authorities shall present to the authorised budget execution authority data on the results of the state audit, execution of instructions and resolutions of the state audit and financial control authorities, in the form specified in Annex 3 to the Methodology.

Operational evaluation of the goals achievement cluster shall be performed based on the reported information, as well as the information posted on their official Internet resources as per the Evaluation Schedule:

1) development plans of public authorities;

2) development plans of oblasts, cities of national importance, and the capital city;

3) reports on the implementation of development plans of public authorities;

4) reports on implementation of development plans of oblasts, cities of national importance, and the capital city;

5) statistical report of the competent authority on budget execution of the evaluated central state and local executive bodies;

6) statistical and departmental data;

7) international ratings;

8) other sources (if available).

Chapter 3: Double-checking the data reported by the assessed public authorities

8. The public authorities responsible for the evaluation shall double-check the data presented in the reporting information of the evaluated public authorities for their reliability.

9. The reliability of data shall be ensured by the evaluated public authorities and confirmed by statistical and departmental data, international competitiveness indicators, as well as by the reporting data of the sectoral central public authorities.

10. Under paragraph 42 of the Evaluation System, the public authorities responsible for the evaluation shall recheck the data contained in the reporting information of the evaluated public authorities (hereinafter - rechecking). In this case, the reporting information of the assessed public authorities subject to rechecking shall be specified as per paragraph 43 of the Evaluation System.

11. Cross-checking shall be performed to assess the reliability of the data provided on the implementation of development plans of public authorities/development plans of oblasts, cities of national importance, the capital and budget programs.

12. Reconciliation procedure shall include collection and analysis of supporting documents (departmental reports, acts of work performed and services rendered, protocols, letters), as well as access to the public authorities being evaluated. Based on the results of cross-checking the data contained in the reporting information, a reconciliation act shall be drawn up in the form as per Annex 4 to the Methodology (hereinafter referred to as the Reconciliation Act).

13. As part of the re-examination, the public authorities responsible for the assessment shall receive electronic copies of supporting documents, excluding documents that are classified and marked "For Official Use".

Should cumulative data for several years be used in the calculation of the target indicator, the authorities whose reporting information is subject to re-examination shall present information for several years confirming the reliability of the cumulative calculations.

Public authorities, whose reporting information is subject to rechecking, submit supporting documents only during the period of this procedure. Also, supporting documents (in particular, official letters, requests, etc.) for central public authorities shall be submitted by 15 February following the reporting year, for local executive bodies - by 1 March of the year following the reporting year.

14. The competent authority for budget execution shall annually submit a Reconciliation Act to the Supreme Chamber of Auditors by 10 April, based on the results of cross-checking the indicators of achievement of the results of the budget programmes of the central public authorities.

Chapter 4. Procedure for assessing timeliness, completeness and reliability of reporting information

15. The assessed public authority shall ensure timely delivery of complete and accurate reporting data as per the Assessment Schedule.

16. Should the assessed public authority present untimely, unreliable reporting information to the public authorities entitled for assessment, penalty points shall be deducted from the final assessment of the assessed public authority for this cluster.

17. Reporting information presented/posted after the deadline stipulated in the Evaluation Schedule shall be deemed untimely.

1.5 penalty points shall be deducted for submission/placement of untimely reporting information by the assessed public authority.

18. 2 penalty points shall be deducted for the submission/placement of incomplete reporting information by the assessed public authority.

An incomplete report shall be deemed to be reporting data that lacks elements (annexes, sections, tables) specified by the established requirements for the structure of reporting data.

19. Reporting data shall be regarded as unreliable if cross-checking of the information reveals facts that do not correspond to reality.

For submission/placement of false reporting information by the assessed public authority 0.2 penalty points shall be calculated for each recorded fact.

For the provision of inaccurate statements, a deduction of no more than 2.5 points shall be made for the achievement of the goals of the development plan of a public authority or the development plan of a region, a city of national importance, the capital, and no more than 2.5 points for the achievement of the indicators of budget programmes.

For submission/posting of repeated, considering the Reconciliation Act of the previous reporting year, unreliable reporting data of the assessed public authority, 0.5 penalty points shall be deducted for each recorded fact.

The total amount of deducted penalty points shall not exceed 6.5 points.

The facts of presenting unreliable data shall be recorded in the Reconciliation Act based on the results of data reconciliation.

20. If there is no calculation methodology for the target indicator, 0.5 penalty points shall be subtracted for each recorded fact.

21. Should the indicators of direct and final results of budget programmes show overfulfilment of actual values from the planned ones by more than 5%, 0.2 penalty points shall be subtracted for each recorded fact of overfulfilment of planned values, excluding budget programmes aimed at formation or increase of charter capitals of legal entities and (or) provision of budget credits for implementation of budget investment projects or state investment policy by financial agencies.

22. The information on deductions shall be reflected in the Opinion in the section “Deduction of Points” of the central public authority/local executive body.

Chapter 5: Operational evaluation of central public authorities in the goal achievement cluster

23. Operational evaluation of the goals achievement cluster shall be performed by determining the level of achievement of the goals of the development plan of the public authority and the efficiency of budget programmes implementation.

24. Operational evaluation of the performance of central public authorities shall be based on the following criteria:

- 1) attainment of the objectives of the development plan;
- 2) efficiency of budget programmes execution in achieving the goal of the development plan;
- 3) interrelation of the development plan goal with budget programmes.

25. An opinion on the results of the operational evaluation of the goals achievement cluster of the central public authority shall be formed in the form as per Annex 5 to the Methodology.

**Paragraph 1: Evaluation under criterion “Ai”
“Achievement of the Objectives of the Development Plan”**

26. The Supreme Audit Chamber shall evaluate the achievement of the objectives of the development plans of public authorities.

Efficiency shall be evaluated by determining the level of achievement of the objectives of the development plan of the public authority.

27. The evaluation for criterion “Ai” “Achievement of the Objectives of the Development Plan” shall be calculated by the following formula:

$$A_i = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m h_j,$$

where:

h_j – is the coefficient of achievement of each target indicator stipulated in the achievement of the relevant goal of the development plan of the public authority;

m is the number of target indicators envisaged to achieve the relevant goal of the development plan of the public authority.

If the dynamics of the target indicator is positive, the coefficient of achievement of the target indicator shall be equal to the ratio of actual fulfilment to the planned value:

$$h_j = \text{fact}/\text{plan}.$$

If the dynamics of the target indicator is negative, the coefficient of achievement of the target indicator shall be equal to:

$$h_j = 2 - \text{fact}/\text{plan}.$$

When the actual value of an indicator with negative dynamics exceeds the planned value by 2 times or more, the coefficient of achievement of this target indicator shall be equal to 0.

In this case:

if $h_j \geq 1$, then $h_j = 1$,

if $h_j < 1$, then $h_j = \text{ratio of actual to planned value} / \text{ratio of planned value to actual performance}$;

if $h_j < 0$, then $h_j = 0$.

A target indicator with no planned value for the reporting period shall not be included in the calculation of the coefficient of achievement of the goal of the development plan of the public authority.

It shall be prohibited to reduce the planned values of target indicators and performance indicators for the relevant financial year, excluding the cases of non-fulfilment of activities and obligations due to factors beyond the control of the public authority (orders of the Government, consequences of emergency situations).

When the unit of measurement of the target indicator is time (hour: minute), the single unit format (hours or minutes) shall be considered when calculating the indicator achievement).

In case of impossibility to report data for 12 months, the target indicator shall not be included in the calculation of the coefficient of achievement of the goal of the development plan of the public authority.

A target indicator whose planned and actual values are equal to 0 (in case of positive dynamics) shall not be included in the calculation).

Absence of positive dynamics of the fact in comparison with the fact of the previous year shall be considered when calculating the coefficient of achievement of the objectives of the development plan of the public authority, the existence of facts of over-fulfilment of the indicator, adjustments of the planned values of the indicator towards reduction.

If there are these facts, the result of achieving the target indicator h_j shall be multiplied by a coefficient of 0.9 (unless the planned values of the indicator are adjusted downwards and/or their non-achievement (non-fulfilment of activities and obligations) due to factors beyond the control of the public authority (Government orders, consequences of emergencies).

When the fact of over-fulfilment exceeds 100 %, the result of achieving the target indicator h_j shall be multiplied by a coefficient of 0.8.

The evaluation shall not include goals and target indicators labelled “classified”.

28. “Di” macro-indicator evaluation shall be calculated by the following formula:

$$D_i = \frac{1}{f} \sum_{j=1}^f h_j$$

where:

h_j is the coefficient of achievement of each macro-indicator envisaged in the achievement of the respective strategic direction;

f is the number of macro-indicators envisaged to achieve the relevant strategic direction.

If the macroindicator dynamics is positive, the macroindicator achievement ratio shall be equal to the ratio of actual fulfilment to the planned value:

$$h_j = \text{fact}/\text{plan}.$$

If the character of macroindicator dynamics is negative, the coefficient of macroindicator achievement shall be equal to:

$$h_j = 2 - \text{fact}/\text{plan}.$$

Where the actual value of an indicator with negative dynamics exceeds the planned value by 2 times or more, the coefficient of achievement of this macroindicator shall be equated to 0.

In this case:

$$\text{if } h_j \geq 1, \text{ then } h_j = 1,$$

if $h_j < 1$, then $h_j = \text{ratio of actual to planned value}/\text{ratio of planned value to actual performance}$;

$$\text{if } h_j < 0, \text{ then } h_j = 0.$$

A macro-indicator that does not have a planned value for the reporting period shall not be included in the calculation of the coefficient of achievement of the strategic direction.

It shall be prohibited to reduce the planned values of macro-indicators for the relevant financial year, excluding cases of non-fulfilment of activities and obligations due to factors beyond the control of the public authority (Government assignments, consequences of emergencies).

Where the unit of measurement of a macro-indicator is time (hour: minute), the single unit format (hours or minutes) shall be included in the calculation of achievement).

Should it be impossible to present data for 12 months, the macro indicator shall not be included in the calculation of the coefficient of achievement of the strategic direction.

A macroindicator whose planned and actual values are equal to 0 (in case of positive dynamics) shall not be included in the calculation.

Macro indicators labelled “Classified” shall not be considered in the assessment.

Paragraph 2: Evaluation under the Bi criterion

“Efficiency of Budget Programme Execution in Achieving the Goal of the Development Plan”

29. Efficiency assessment of public authorities in achieving the indicators of budget programmes shall be done by the authorised public authority for budget execution.

The efficiency of implementation of the intended results of the budget programmes envisaged to achieve the strategic objective shall be evaluated under the Bi criterion.

To estimate the coefficient of efficiency of budget programmes execution in achieving the goals, the analysis of budget programmes of the assessed central public authorities for the reporting period shall be made by April 1 of the year following the reporting year. Working calculations shall be made to assess the efficiency of implementation of budget programmes envisaged to achieve the objectives (the percentage of achievement of average values of direct and final results of the budget program shall be divided by the percentage of actual disbursement of allocated funds for the relevant fiscal year and multiplied by 100).

30. Bi criterion "Efficiency of the Budget Programmes Implementation in Achieving the Development Plan Goal" shall be calculated using the following formula:

$$B_i = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{z=1}^t r_z,$$

where:

r_z – coefficient of efficiency of each budget programme in achieving the goal;

t – number of budget programmes in achieving the goal.

The coefficient of efficiency of each budget programme in achieving the objective (r_z) shall be calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean of the coefficients of achievement of indicators of direct and final results by the coefficient of budgetary funds utilisation of the budget programme.

Should the indicators of achievement of direct and final results be exceeded, a value not exceeding 100 per cent shall be counted for the indicator.

For budget programmes with a delivery rate of 90% or less and a higher achievement of results, the efficiency factor shall be 0.9.

For example, if a programme uses 84.5% of its funds and 100% of its results are achieved, the budget programme execution efficiency coefficient shall be 1.2 (100/84.5).

Another example: 63% of funds have been disbursed, 75% of results have been achieved, the budget programme execution efficiency ratio shall be 1.2 (75/63).

In these cases, a performance coefficient of 0.9 shall be applied to such programmes.

All budget programmes (excluding subventions) involved in achieving the goals and/or target indicators of the development plan of the public authority shall be subject to evaluation.

Indicators of final results shall be evaluated for transfers and allocated budget programmes at the administrator of budget programmes, directing transfers and allocating allocated budget programmes.

Direct results indicators shall be evaluated for the administrators of budget programmes receiving funds from the allocated budget programmes.

Paragraph 3: Evaluation under criterion Ci

“Interrelation of the Goal of the Development Plan with Budget Programmes”

31. Interrelation of the goal of the development plan with the indicators of budget programmes shall be estimated by the authorised public authority for budget execution.

The degree of interrelation of the development plan goal with the indicators of the implemented budget programmes shall be estimated by the criterion Ci.

32. The coefficient of interrelation of the development plan objective with budget programmes shall be established by expert analysis of each budget programme for interrelation and compliance.

For instance, if in a budget programme 2 out of 10 indicators do not describe the achievement of the goal and/or target indicators, the correlation coefficient shall be calculated by the ratio 8/10. In this case, the correlation coefficient will be equal to 0.8.

The correlation coefficient of each goal shall be calculated by the arithmetic mean of the correlation of all budget programmes involved in its achievement.

$$C_i = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{r=1}^t C_r,$$

where:

C_i is the coefficient of correlation between the development plan goal and budget programmes;

C_r is the coefficient of interrelationship of the budget programme in achieving the goal;

t is the number of budget programmes in achieving the goal.

Paragraph 4. Final calculation of the achievement of the development plan goal and the efficiency of execution of budget programmes of central government bodies

33. Formula for calculating the achievement of the development plan goal and budget programme indicators in achieving the goal:

$$R_i = (A_i + B_i)/2 \times C_i,$$

where:

A_i is the development plan goal attainment rate;

B_i is the coefficient of efficiency of budget programme execution in achieving development plan goals;

C_i is the coefficient of correlation between the development plan goal and budget programmes.

A coefficient shall be calculated for each target indicator in the final calculation of the achievement of the development plan goal and the efficiency of budget programme execution.

34. The coefficient for assessing the efficiency of achieving the goals and indicators of the budget programmes of central public authorities shall be generated with mathematical rounding to two decimal places.

Paragraph 5: Overall evaluation on the “Achievement of the Goal” of the central public authorities

35. The overall performance evaluation for “Achievement of the Goal” of the central public authorities shall be calculated by the following formula:

$$R_{\text{цго}} = \left[\left(\frac{R_{i1} + R_{i2} + R_{in} + D_{i1} + D_{i2} + D_{in}}{n + n_1} \right) * 100 \right] - W,$$

where:

R_{gpa} is the final efficiency evaluation of achieving the goals and indicators of the budget programmes of the central public authority;

R_i is the coefficient of achievement of the development plan goal and budget programme indicators in achieving the goal;

D_i is the achievement rate of macro indicators of the development plan;

n is the number of the development plan goals;

n_1 is the number of strategic directions of the development plan, under which macro-indicators are envisaged;

W is the penalty points.

36. The final score of the operational evaluation for the block of achieving the goals of central public authorities shall be formed with regard to mathematical rounding to two decimal places.

37. The degree of efficiency of the public authority in achieving its objectives shall be identified based on the result of the evaluation.

A high degree of efficiency of a public authority shall correspond to the evaluation indicator from 90 to 100 points, an average degree shall be from 70 to 89.99 points, a low degree shall be from 50 to 69.99 points. Ineffective activity of the public authority shall be recognised as the activity of the public authority, which has scored less than 50 points based on the results of the evaluation.

Chapter 6. Operational evaluation of achievement of the goals of the strategic plan of the National Bank of the Republic of Kazakhstan, development plans of the Agency for Protection and

Development of Competition of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Regulation and Development of the Financial Market

38. Operational evaluation of the efficiency of the National Bank of the Republic of Kazakhstan (hereinafter - the NBRK) shall be performed based on the criterion of achieving the goals of the strategic plan, the Agency for Protection and Development of Competition of the Republic of Kazakhstan (hereinafter - the APDC) and the Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan for Regulation and Development of the Financial Market (hereinafter - the ARDFM) based on the criterion of achieving the goals of the development plan.

39. The assessment of achievement of the objectives of the NBRK strategic plan shall be calculated as follows:

$$RNBRK = (A_i * 100) - W,$$

where:

A_i is the strategic plan goal achievement rate;

W is penalty points.

40. The assessment of achievement of the goals of the APDC and ARDFM development plan shall be calculated using the following formula:

$$RAPDC, ARDFM = (A_i * 100) - W,$$

where:

A_i is the development plan goal attainment rate;

W is the penalty points.

Chapter 7: Operational evaluation of the performance of local executive bodies by goal achievement cluster

41. Operational appraisal shall be done by measuring the level of achievement of the goals of the development plan of the oblast, city of national importance, capital city and efficiency in achieving the indicators of budget programmes.

42. Operational appraisal of the efficiency of local executive bodies shall be based on the following criteria:

1) achievement of the goals of the development plans of regions, cities of national importance, and the capital city;

2) absence of violations under the current laws of the Republic of Kazakhstan, based on the findings of inspections of development programmes by state audit and financial control bodies for the period under evaluation;

3) achievement of direct results of budget development programmes;

4) efficiency of implementation of the budget development programme;

5) use of new budgeting practices (participatory budgeting).

Evaluation of the efficiency of local executive bodies with regard to the criterion “Attainment of the Goals of the Development Plan of the Oblast, City of National Importance, Capital City” shall be made by the Supreme Audit Chamber.

Efficiency evaluation based on the criteria “Absence of Infringements within the Framework of the Current Laws of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Based on the Results of Inspections of Development Programmes by State Audit and Financial Control Bodies for the Period Under Evaluation”, “Achievement of Direct Results of the Budget Development Programme”, “Use of New Budgeting Practices” (people's participation budget) and “Efficiency of Implementation of the Budget Development Programme” shall be implemented by the authorized body for budget execution.

The designated authority for budget execution shall prepare conclusions on the criteria “Absence of Infringements under the Current Laws of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Based on the Results of Inspections of Development Programmes by the State Audit and Financial Control Bodies for the Period under Evaluation”, “Achievement of Direct Results of the Budget Development Programme”, “Efficiency of Implementation of the Budget Development Programme”, and “Use of New Budgeting Practices” (people's participation budget) and send them to the Supreme Audit Chamber within the terms established by the Evaluation Schedule.

43. Opinions on the findings of the operational evaluation on the cluster of achieving the goals of local executive bodies shall be formed in the form as per Annex 6 to the Methodology.

44. The degree of efficiency of the evaluated public authority shall be measured in line with the obtained finding of the evaluation result.

A high degree of efficiency of the evaluated public authority shall correspond to the evaluation indicator from 90 to 100 points, an average degree shall correspond to 70 to 89.99 points, and a low degree shall correspond to 50 to 69.99 points. Ineffective shall be recognised the activity of the evaluated public authority that has scored less than 50 points based on the results of the evaluation.

Paragraph 1: Evaluation under criterion “D” “Achievement of the Goals of the Development Plan of the Oblast, City of National Importance, Capital City”

45. The criterion “Achievement of the Goals of the Development Plan of the Oblast, City of National Importance, Capital City” shall be calculated based on macro-indicators and target indicators interlinked with financial expenditures as follows:

$$D = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m h_j \times 100,$$

where:

D is the coefficient of achievement of the goals of the development plan of the region, city of national importance, capital city;

h_j is the coefficient of achievement of each target indicator envisaged in the achievement of the respective goal;

m is the total number of target indicators.

In this case:

if $h_j \geq 1$, then $h_j = 1$,

if $h_j < 1$, then $h_j = \text{actual to target ratio}$;

if $h_j < 0$, then $h_j = 0$.

Evaluation of the criterion "Achievement of the Goals of the Development Plan of the Oblast, City of National Importance, Capital" shall be made basing on the macro-indicators and target indicators interlinked with financial expenditures specified in Annex 9 to the Methodology.

If the dynamics of the target indicator is positive, the coefficient of the target indicator attainment shall be equal to the ratio of actual fulfilment to the planned value:

$$h_j = \text{fact}/\text{plan}.$$

If the dynamics of the target indicator is negative, the coefficient of target indicator attainment shall be equal to:

$$h_j = 2 - \text{fact}/\text{plan};$$

Where the actual value of an indicator with negative dynamics exceeds the planned value two times or more, the coefficient of achievement of this target indicator shall be equated to 0

..

In calculating the coefficient of attainment of the goals of the development plan of a region, a city of national importance, the capital city, the presence of facts of over-fulfilment of the indicator shall be included.

If there is a specified fact, the result of reaching the target indicator h_j shall be multiplied by a coefficient of 0.9. When the fact of over-fulfilment exceeds 100%, the result of achieving the target indicator h_j shall be multiplied by a coefficient of 0.8.

Over-achievement of indicators shall be recognised only for target indicators linked to financial expenditures.

46. In calculating the coefficient of achievement of the goals of the development plan of the region, city of national importance, capital city:

a target indicator that does not have a planned value for the reporting period shall not be included in the calculation of the coefficient of goal achievement;

when it is impossible to submit data for 12 (twelve) months, the target indicator shall not be included in the calculation of the coefficient of achievement of the goal of the development plan of the region, city of national importance, capital city.;

target indicator, the planned and actual values of which are equal to 0, shall not be accepted for calculation (in case of positive dynamics).

Paragraph 2: Evaluation under criterion “L” “Absence of any Breaches of Budgetary and Other Legislation Based on the Findings of Audits of Development Programmes of State Audit and Financial Control Bodies for the Evaluated Period”.

47. When assessing the criterion “Absence of Breaches under the Current Legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan, based on the Findings of Audits of Development Programmes by State Audit and Financial Control Bodies for the Evaluated Period”, the following shall be specified:

the body of state audit and financial control that performed the audits;

the number of audits covering the reporting period;

the total amount of budgetary funds of the public authority and its subordinate institutions covered by the audit;

identified violations under the current laws for the reporting period, including:

financial offences;

breach of the laws on accounting and financial reporting;

infringements of legislation on public procurement, excluding infringements detected by desk control and the amounts of infringements that the organisers of tenders have appealed against in a court of law.

Data on whether the internal audit service has analysed the attainment of the goals of the development plans of oblasts, cities of national importance, and the capital city in relation to budget expenditures shall be indicated.

48. The point for this criterion shall be assigned as per Annex 7 to the Methodology and shall be calculated in the form of an average point in the context of administrators of budget development programmes.

Paragraph 3: Evaluation under criterion “Z” “Attainment of Direct Results of the Development Budget Programme”

49. The point for the criterion “Attainment of Direct Results of the Budget Development Programme” shall be calculated using two indicators: “Attainment of Direct Results of the

Budget Development Programme” and “Quality of Planning of Performance Indicators of Budget Programmes”.

Direct performance indicators shall be the indicators reflecting quantitative characteristics of the volume of performed state functions, authorities and rendered public services within the limits of budgetary funds under this budgetary programme.

The direct performance indicators for budget development programmes shall include a nominal list of budget investments. Herewith, in case of realisation of long-term objects, the volume of works and services to be performed for the current financial year shall be shown, and in case of their completion, the names of investment projects completed in the current financial year shall be specified. The volume of works and services to be performed shall be specified in physical terms.

Should the development programmes include current expenses (repayment of accounts payable, expenses for tenders, acquisition of assets, inventory, obtaining title and supporting documents, payment of advance payment), the above mentioned current activities shall not be included in the evaluation and 0.2 penalty points shall be deducted for each recorded fact.

When the certificates of completion are signed in January of the following financial year, it shall be recognised as a direct result as achieved.

The point of attainment of a direct result for one budget programme shall be based on the following formula:

$$Z = F/Q * 18$$

where:

Z is the point of attainment of a direct result for one budget programme;

F is the number of actually attained indicators of each measure;

Q is the total number of indicators of budget programmes;

18 is the maximum score of achievement of direct results of the budget development programme.

Maximum point for the criterion of reaching a direct result shall be 20, including reaching direct results of budget development programmes - 18 points; ensuring the quality of planning indicators of budget programmes - 2 points.

However, indicators with a result of 80 per cent or more shall be deemed to have been actually achieved.

The average grade of achievement of direct results for all budget programmes shall be measured for the administrator of the budget programme by summing up the grades for each budget programme and dividing the resulting sum by the total number of budget programmes.

The average grade on the criterion of achieving direct results of budget development programmes for all administrators of local budget programmes shall be calculated for the local executive body.

When the indicators of this criterion are exceeded, the value of 100 % shall be included in the indicator.

For budget programmes envisaging an increase in the charter capital, the achievement of results shall be measured by the activities specified in the financial and economic justification, the implementation thereof is envisaged in the assessed financial year. For ongoing projects (according to the yearly activities specified in the financial and economic feasibility study), it shall include the actual year-end work performed.

Where direct performance indicators for budget programmes stipulate, the outputs instead of quantitative characteristics, not allowing to estimate the achievement of a direct result, this budget programme shall be estimated as a result of poor planning.

Within the framework of implementation of budgetary development programmes, data on delivery (commissioning) of planned facilities in due time (plan and actual) and the list of facilities not commissioned in the reporting period with indication of reasons for delayed commissioning shall be submitted for analytical information.

Evaluation by the indicator “Quality of Planning of Performance Indicators of Budget Programmes” shall be done by analysing the performance indicators of budget programmes approved by the administrators of budget programmes.

The maximum points shall be assigned in the presence in all budget programmes of a public authority of performance indicators that are quantifiable and subject to evaluation, as well as corresponding to the goals and objectives of the administrator of budget programmes and documents of the state planning system.

If there are no direct and (or) final results in the budget programme, the presence of activities instead of quantitative characteristics that do not allow to evaluate the achievement of direct results, duplication of direct results with final results, duplication of indicators of the budget programme with indicators of another budget programme, unmeasurable values, understating planned values, discrepancy of direct results indicators to the goals and objectives of the budget programme administrator and documents of the state planning system, as well as overestimation of normative terms of construction (reconstruction) of objects, then 0 points shall be assigned.

Further, the average point for all budgetary programmes evaluated by this indicator shall be calculated, for which the corresponding point shall be assigned.

Sources of information shall be approved budget programmes and reports on their implementation, as well as documents confirming the actual achievement of direct indicators for the reporting period, including acts of completed work, acts of acceptance of facilities, delivery notes, acceptance of transfer, conclusions of state expertise in the development of design and estimate documentation.

Paragraph 4. Evaluation under criterion

“G” ‘Efficiency of Implementation of the Budget Development Programme’

50. An evaluation of the criterion “Efficiency of Implementation of the Budget Development Programme” shall be done by dividing the percentage of achievement of the

direct result of the budget programme by the percentage of actual disbursement of allocated funds for the relevant financial year.

51. The efficiency of budget programme execution shall be measured as follows:

$$E_{b/p} = \% PR / \% EX * 20,$$

where:

$E_{b/p}$ is the efficiency of budget programme execution;

% PR is the percentage of direct result achieved;

% EX is the percentage of expenditure of budgetary funds;

20 is the maximum point.

If the results are achieved less than 80%, the efficiency of the budget programme execution shall be regarded as 0 points.

An average efficiency point for all budget programmes shall be calculated for the budget programme administrator by summing up the points for each budget programme and dividing the resulting sum by the total number of budget programmes.

Then, for a local executive body, the evaluation shall be measured in the form of the average score of the efficiency criterion for the implementation of the budgetary development programme for all administrators of local budgetary programmes.

Paragraph 5: Evaluation under criterion

“N” “Application of New Budgeting Practices (Participatory Budgeting)”

52. This criterion shall be used for evaluating the planning and execution of a certain share of the region's budget with the participation of citizens, the public (“participatory budget”), as a new instrument of budgetary relations. The criterion shall be focused on the participation of the population in the management of public finances, its involvement in the real process of public decision-making and the possibility to influence these decisions (by forming projects of local importance, implementation and control over the targeted and effective execution of budget funds provided for these purposes).

When distributed from 5% of the annual budget expenditures planned for functional group 07 "Housing and Communal Services", in cities of regional significance, in districts of cities of national and regional importance, the capital with the participation and on the proposals of citizens, the bonus adjustment factor of 1.2 shall be applied, from 3% - 1.1.

Paragraph 6: Final score of the operational evaluation of local executive bodies by the goals achievement cluster

53. The final score of the operational evaluation of local executive bodies shall be calculated based on the following formula:

$$RLEB = ((0,3 * D + 0,7 * T) * 0,5) + ((L + Z + (G * N)) - W,$$

where:

RLEB is the final score of the operational evaluation of the local executive body by the goal achievement cluster;

D is the achievement of macro-indicators;

T is the achievement of target indicators interrelated with financial expenditures;

L is the absence of breaches under the current laws of the Republic of Kazakhstan, based on the results of inspections of development programmes by state audit and financial control bodies for the period under evaluation;

Z is the achievement of direct results of the budget development programme;

G is the efficiency of implementation of the budget development programme;

N is the use of new budgeting practices (participatory budgeting);

W is the penalty points.

Chapter 8: Procedure for appealing evaluation results

54. From the day of receipt of the opinion, in case of disagreement with the evaluation results, the public authority under evaluation shall send its objections to the public authorities authorised for evaluation within 5 working days. Upon expiry of the established term, the objections of the public authorities under evaluation shall not be accepted.

55. Appeals against evaluation results shall be argued and justified with submission of supporting documents. Objections lacking supporting documents and justifications, as well as those contradicting the provisions of the regulatory legal acts in the field of state planning and order of the Minister of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan № 93 of October 25, 2021 “On Approval of the Methodology for the Development, Monitoring, Implementation, Evaluation and Control of the National Development Plan of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Territorial Development Plan of the Country, Concepts, Development Plans of Public Authorities, Development Plans of the Region, City of National Importance, Capital City” shall not be considered (entered in the Register of State Registration of Regulatory Legal Acts under № 24908).

56. Should the public authority being appraised fail to submit objections to the results of the appraisal within 5 working days, the opinion shall be deemed “agreed” by default.

57. Under paragraph 59 of the Evaluation System, a special commission shall be established to conduct the appeal procedure in the public authorities empowered to evaluate, which shall not include employees who participated in the evaluation of the efficiency of the public authorities that submitted objections.

The number and members of the special commission shall be decided independently by the public authorities entitled to evaluate, but not less than 5 persons.

58. Within five working days from the date of receipt of objections from the public authorities under evaluation accompanied by supporting documents, the public authorities responsible for the evaluation shall form and submit for consideration by the special commission the Tables of Disagreements on the results of the operational evaluation of the

ors, budget progra mmes, sub-pro gramm es, output and direct result indicat ors	Units o f measur ement	Expenses			Achievement of direct results			Achievement of final results			achieve ment of outcom e and direct result indicat ors	to achieve the indicat ors of budget progra mmes
		plan	fact	%	plan	fact	%	plan	fact	%		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Strategic focus 1												
Goal 1.1.*	thousan ds of tenge	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Target indicat or **	%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Budget ary progra mme	thousan ds of tenge	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Final result indicat or	%									x	x	
Sub-pr ogram me 100	thousan ds of tenge	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			
Direct result indicat or	Unit						x	x	x			
Target indicat or	%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			
Sub-pr ogram me 102	thousan ds of tenge	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			
Direct result indicat or	Unit						x	x	x			
Direct result indicat or	Unit						x	x	x			

Strategic direction n												
Goal n												
...												

Note:

* This line shall be filled in with planned and actual values for the goal.

** This line shall be filled in with planned and actual values for the target indicator.

“X” shall denote the boxes required to be filled in.

Annex 2
to the Methodology for Operational
Evaluation
of the Goals Achievement Cluster

Document form

Data on the achievement of direct results of the budget programmes under evaluation

(name of the local executive body)

(reporting period)

Code and name of the administrator

of the budgetary programmes: _____

budgetary programme: _____

description: _____

Name	Units of measurement	Budget programme indicators planned for the reporting fiscal year	Actual compliance with the indicators	Deviation	% Indicator achievement (column 4/ column 3* 100 %)	Project implementation timeframe	Reasons for failure to achieve results and non-performance of budget programme funds/ confirmation of result achievement (number and date, name of document)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Direct result indicator, including by breakdown:							
budgetary investment projects							
activities							

Akim of the oblast, city of national importance, capital city

(signature) (printed full name)

Annex 3
to the Methodology for Operational
Evaluation
of the Goals Achievement Cluster

Document form

Report

**on the results of the state audit and enforcement of prescriptions and resolutions
of the state audit and financial control bodies for the year of _____**

Number in sequenc e	Name of the budget program me adminis trator	Name of the budget program me	Audit period	Amount of funds covered by the govern ment audit	includin g for the period under evaluati on	volume of breaches revealed in the period being evaluated				reimbur sed in the amount of	recover ed in the amount of
						total	including:				
							Financi al irregula rities	Offence s of legislati on on accounti ng and financia l reportin g	Breache s of Public Procure ment Legislat ion		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

Head of the state audit and financial control body

(signature) (printed full name)

Annex 4
to the Methodology for Operational
Evaluation
of the Goals Achievement Cluster

Document form

**Reconciliation act based on the results of double-checking the data contained in the reporting
statements**

(name of the central public authority/local executive body)

(reporting period)

№	Name	Points deducted
1	Submission/posting of incomplete data	
2	Submission/posting of inaccurate data	

3	Failure to report information in a timely manner	
4	Lack of reporting data	
5	Lack of methods for calculating target indicators (for central public authorities)	
Total:		

1. As per the Evaluation Schedule, the deadline for submission/posting of reporting data by the public authority being evaluated:

“ ___ ” _____ 20__ .

1) Actual date of submission/posting of the reporting data:

“ ___ ” _____ 20__ .

2) Reporting data of the public authority being evaluated is not available.

The deduction is: _____ points.

2. Incomplete data has been submitted/posted, with missing elements (annexes, sections, tables, values of indicators) as envisaged by the established requirements to the structure of reporting data:

1) _____

2) _____

The deduction is: _____ points.

3. Inaccurate information has been submitted/posted. The following factual inconsistencies have been found during re-verification:

No	Name of the target indicator	Plan for the reporting period	Reporting period fact	Reporting period fact based on the results of re-verification	Deduction of points	Note
1						
...						

The deduction is: _____ points.

Final deduction: _____ points.

Representative of the public authority empowered to evaluate, position

(date) (signature) (printed full name)

Representative of the public authority being evaluated, position

(date) (signature) (printed full name)

Opinion on the results of the operational evaluation on the local executive bodies' goals achievement cluster

(name of the local executive body)

(reporting period)

No	Evaluation criteria	Coefficient/actual performance	Points
1	Achievement of the goals of the development plan of the oblast, city of national importance, capital city		
2	No breaches of budgetary and other legislation based on the results of audits of development programmes by state audit and financial control bodies for the period under evaluation		
3	Achievement of direct results of the budget programme of development programmes		
4	Efficiency of implementation of the budget development programme		
5	Application of new budgeting practices (participatory budgeting)		
6	Deduction of points		
	Overall evaluation		

Analysing the efficiency of achieving the goals of the development plan of the oblast, city of national importance, capital city:

No breaches of budgetary and other legislation based on the results of audits of development programmes by state audit and financial control bodies for the period under evaluation:

Achievement of direct results of the budgeted development programme:

Efficiency of implementation of the budget development programme:

Application of new budgeting practices (participatory budgeting):

Opinions and recommendations to improve the performance of the local executive body:

Head of the public authority

(signature) (printed full name)

Head of the relevant structural unit of the public authority empowered for the evaluation

(signature) (printed full name)

" _____ " _____ 20__

Annex 7
to the Methodology for Operational
Evaluation
of the Goals Achievement Cluster

Document form

Points of criteria and indicators

№	Name of criterion/indicator	Point/coefficient
1	No breaches under the current legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan, based on the results of inspections of development programmes by state audit and financial control bodies for the period under evaluation	10
2	No offences	8
3	Presence of analysis of achievement of the goals of the development plan of oblasts, cities of national importance, and the capital city in relation to budget expenditures, conducted by the internal audit service	2
4	Lack of analysis of the achievement of the goals of the development plan for oblasts, cities of national importance, and the capital city in relation to budget expenditures, conducted by the internal audit service	0
5	Failure of state audit and financial control bodies to conduct audits in the reporting period	5

6	Presence of breaches of the total amount of budgetary funds covered by the audit (excluding inefficient expenditures) in accordance with the Classifier of Breaches Revealed at the Facilities of State Audit and Financial Control	
	up to 5%	6
	5,1 – 9,9%	3
	10,0 – 14,9%	1
	more than 15 per cent	0

Annex 8
to the Methodology for Operational
Evaluation
of the Goals Achievement Cluster

Document form

Table of Disagreements on the Results of Operational Evaluation of the Performance of Public Authorities

(name of the central public authority /
the local executive body) on the Goals Achievement Cluster

№	Opinion of the public authority responsible for the evaluation	Objection of the public authority being evaluated	Decision on appeal (accepted/rejected)	Note (justification for accepting/rejecting the objection)
1	2	3	4	5
1				
2				
...				

Conclusions:

under criterion 1: _____;

under criterion 2: _____;

The total score, based on the outcome of the appeal, was as follows _____.

Chairperson of the Commission, position

(date) (signature) (printed full name)

I am familiarised with the outcome of the appeal: representative
of the public authority being evaluated, position

(date) (signature) (printed full name)

Annex 9
to the Methodology for Operational
Evaluation
of the Goals Achievement Cluster

Document form

**List of indicators for evaluation of local executive bodies by criterion
“Achievement of Goals and Indicators of the Development Plan of the Oblast, City of National
Importance, Capital City”**

№	Name of direction/indicator	Source of information
1.	Growth of real money incomes of the population, % increase from the 2019 level in 2019 prices.	Bureau of National Statistics of the Agency for Strategic Planning and Reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan (BNS ASPR RK)
2.	Share of income of the poorest 40 per cent of the population, % in total population income	BNS ASPR RK
3.	Unemployment rate	BNS ASPR RK
4.	Housing affordability, ratio of the average per capita income of the population to the average cost of 1 square metre (sale of new housing (flats in apartment buildings))	BNS ASPR RK
5.	Household expenditures on food products, % of total expenditures	BNS ASPR RK
6.	Number of compatriots (kandas/home comers) who moved to the Republic of Kazakhstan	Corporate data
7.	Total area of commissioned residential buildings	BNS ASPR RK
8.	Increase in the share of persons who started their own business after training under the Bastau Business Project	Corporate data
9.	Increase in the proportion of persons employed in permanent jobs after the establishment of subsidised jobs	Corporate data
10.	Increase the share of the private sector in enterprises participating in the organisation of subsidised jobs Increase the employment rate after short-term vocational training	Corporate data
11.	Increase the share of the private sector in enterprises participating in the organisation of subsidised jobs Increase the employment rate after short-term vocational training	Corporate data
12.	Creation of new business entities in rural areas	Corporate data
13.	Share of labour contracts registered in electronic form	Corporate data
14.	Life expectancy at birth	BNS ASPR RK

15.	Infant mortality, number of cases per 1,000 live births	BNS ASPR RK
16.	Maternal mortality, number of cases per 100,000 live births	Corporate data
17.	Level of public satisfaction with the quality and accessibility of medical services provided by health care facilities	Corporate data
18.	Coverage of rural settlements with primary health care and consultative and diagnostic assistance	Corporate data
	Coverage of rural settlements with primary health care and consultative and diagnostic assistance, including the opening of feldsher-midwifery, medical centres and medical outpatient clinics in rural settlements , including in support and satellite villages (number)	
19.	Number of population covered by the services of mobile medical complexes	Corporate data
20.	Annual number of new and modernised health care facilities that meet global standards of health care delivery	Corporate data
21.	Expansion of the volume of medical care at the outpatient level in the total volume of medical care within the framework of the guaranteed volume of free medical care and the system of compulsory social health insurance	Corporate data
22.	Increased coverage of pregnant women with individual and multidisciplinary prenatal care	Corporate data
23.	Increased coverage of children under 1 year of age with proactive surveillance and screenings	Corporate data
24.	Increased coverage of medical rehabilitation for children with disabilities	Corporate data
25.	Increase in the number of educational grants of residency in acute specialities	Corporate data
26.	Increase the share of Kazakhstani nationals living a healthy lifestyle	Corporate data
27.	Decrease in the incidence of obesity among children (0-14 years old), per 100,000 population	Corporate data

28.	Percentage of healthcare organisations providing data exchange with Ehealth Core	Corporate data
29.	Share of remote medical services provided to the population	Corporate data
30.	Bringing the number of people involved in physical culture and sport to 50 per cent of the total population	Corporate data
31.	Provision of population with sports infrastructure per 1,000 people	Corporate data
32.	Proportion of population with special needs systematically engaged in physical education and sport	Corporate data
33.	School education quality evaluation based on PISA test results (OECD report): in maths	OECD report
	Evaluation of the quality of school education based on PISA test results (OECD report): in reading	
	Evaluation of the quality of school education based on PISA test results (OECD report): in natural sciences	
34.	Level of public satisfaction with the quality of preschool/secondary education	Corporate data
35.	Coverage of children in quality preschool education and training: 3-6 years old	Corporate data
	Coverage of children in quality preschool education and training: 2-6 years of age	
36.	Coverage of children with additional education	Corporate data
37.	Percentage of primary and secondary schools provided with subject-specific physics, chemistry, biology, STEM classrooms	Corporate data
38.	Number of modernised schools in small towns, district centres and villages	Corporate data
39.	Share of daytime state general secondary education organisations subordinated to LEB, provided with video surveillance: outdoor surveillance	Corporate data
	Share of daytime state general secondary education organisations	

40.	subordinated to LEB, provided with video surveillance: internal surveillance	Corporate data
41.	Coverage of children with developmental disabilities with special psychological and pedagogical support and early correction	Corporate data
42.	Enrolment of young people in free college education in in-demand specialities (9th grade graduates)	Corporate data
43.	Share of secondary education institutions provided with Internet: not less than 100 Mb/s for internal content (within Kazakhstan) and 8 Mb/s for external content;	Corporate data
	Share of secondary education institutions having Internet: not less than 100 Mb/s for internal content (inside of Kazakhstan) and 20 Mb/s for external content;	Corporate data
44.	Proportion of textbooks digitised	Corporate data
45.	Number of qualified ICT personnel: TIPO (Technology of Information Processes and Objects)	Corporate data /(BNS ASPR RK)
46.	Population coverage by projects of the Rukhani Zhangiru Programme	Corporate data
47.	Coverage of school-age children with cultural education	Corporate data
48.	Increasing the reading activity of the population within the framework of the Reading Nation Project	Corporate data
49.	Number of facilities built and repaired by benefactors	Corporate data
50.	Proportion of participants in written communication who use the Latin script	Corporate data
51.	Increased availability of cultural facilities and services: construction of cultural facilities	Corporate data
52.	Increased availability of cultural facilities and services: renovation of cultural facilities	Corporate data
53.	Number of creative projects supported	Corporate data
54.	Coverage of youth social services	Corporate data
55.	Provision and popularisation of the Eljastary information navigator among young people	Corporate data

56.	Share of students engaged in volunteer activities	Corporate data
57.	Coverage of young people with environmental projects	Corporate data
58.	Youth sports coverage (14-18 years old)	Corporate data
59.	Share of non-observed (shadow) economy	BNS ASPR RK
60.	A sense of personal, property and community security	Corporate data
61.	Level of provision of infrastructure for emergency response	Corporate data
62.	Level of protection of the population of remote and rural settlements by fire stations	Corporate data
63.	Level of equipment of civil protection bodies with priority material and technical means for emergency rescue and emergency work, %, to bring it up to the norms of availability	Corporate data
64.	Level of protection of the population from flooding, meltwater and rainwater	Corporate data
65.	Level of notification of the population in case of emergency threat	Corporate data
66.	Increase in the number of video surveillance cameras in cities of national importance and regional centres (connection)	Corporate data
67.	Level of equipment of the police with digital tools	Corporate data
68.	GRP per capita in nominal terms	BNS ASPR RK
69.	Labour productivity growth by region, % growth from 2019 level in 2019 prices	BNS ASPR RK
70.	Investments in fixed capital, % real growth to 2019 level	BNS ASPR RK
71.	Share of large and medium-sized enterprises in the manufacturing industry using digital technologies	BNS ASPR RK
72.	Manufacturing industry output	BNS ASPR RK
73.	Volume of commissioned RES electric power capacities, with accumulation	Corporate data
74.	Share of medium-sized businesses in the economy, % GVA in GRP	BNS ASPR RK

75.	Number of business entities that received financial support measures	Corporate data
76.	Increase in the number of domestic tourists	BNS ASPR RK
77.	Increase in the number of inbound tourists	BNS ASPR RK
78.	Increase in the number of hotel rooms	BNS ASPR RK
79.	Increase in the volume of gross agricultural output by the level of 2019, billion tenge	BNS ASPR RK
80.	Area of land with application of water-saving technologies (drip irrigation, sprinkling)	Corporate data
81.	Increase due to growth in the volume of subsidies for high-quality seeds	Corporate data
82.	Increase due to the growth of mineral fertiliser subsidies	Corporate data
83.	Subsidising 50% of the cost of purchasing plant protection products for effective cultivation of arable land (fallow land)	Corporate data
84.	Average live weight of cattle (agricultural formation)	BNS ASPR RK
85.	Provision with food products (including socially important ones)	Corporate data / BNS ASPR RK
86.	Apple production	Corporate data
87.	Sausage production	BNS ASPR RK
88.	Poultry meat production (live weight)	BNS ASPR RK
89.	Fish production	BNS ASPR RK
90.	Vegetable production	BNS ASPR RK
91.	Increase in exports of agro-industrial complex products	BNS ASPR RK
92.	Share of processed products in the total volume of AIC exports	BNS ASPR RK
93.	Volume of attracted investments in fixed capital in agriculture	BNS ASPR RK
	Volume of attracted investments in fixed capital in food production	BNS ASPR RK
94.	Number of realised investment projects in the agro-industrial complex, number of projects	BNS ASPR RK
95.	Growth in the volume of products produced by agricultural co-operatives	BNS ASPR RK
96.	Share of digitised land data	Corporate data

97.	Level of satisfaction with the quality of work of LEB	Corporate data
98.	Level of urbanisation at the end of the year	BNS ASPR RK
99.	Access of population to water supply services:	Corporate data/BNS ASPR RK
	- in cities;	
	- in rural areas	
100.	Reduction of wear and tear of engineering and transport infrastructure in mono- and small towns included in the van, border small towns, as well as single-industry towns with a population of more than 50 thousand people	Corporate data
101.	Number of modernised reference and satellite navigation receivers aligned with the Regional Standards System	Corporate data
102.	Number of experts in the field of public health, education, social security, culture, sports and agro-industrial complex, civil servants of akims' offices of villages, settlements, rural districts, who received budgetary loans for the purchase or construction of housing, who came to work and live in rural settlements for employment and residence	Corporate data
103.	Level of wastewater treatment in cities	Corporate data
104.	Level of provision with heat and water metering devices for households	Corporate data
105.	Share of local roads in standard condition	Corporate data
106.	Reduction of the level of normative and technical losses of electricity in national and regional power grids	Corporate data
107.	Share of inventoried underground and above-ground utilities in built-up areas to create a digital planning basis for the urban planning cadastre	Corporate data
	Share of inventoried underground and above-ground utilities in built-up areas to create a digital planning basis for the urban planning cadastre (%; including RB funds)	

	Share of inventoried underground and above-ground utilities in built-up areas to create a digital planning basis for the urban planning cadastre (%; including SB funds)	
108.	Share of akimats complying with the digital standard (typical architecture, reference standard)	Corporate data
109.	Level of public satisfaction with environmental quality of life	Corporate data
110.	Share of recycling and utilisation:	Corporate data
	- MSW (from the volume of formation)	
	- agro-industrial waste	
	- hazardous medical waste (of the collected volume)	
111.	Reduction of fresh water intake in industry	Corporate data
112.	Reduction of energy consumption in the public sector and housing and communal services	Corporate data
113.	Increase in the natural population of fish resources	Corporate data
114.	Increase/expansion of the area covered by forests, including through planting trees with ensuring normative rooting in terms of species and regions of planting	Corporate data