

(R)evolution of performance in the public order and safety system

Elena Casandra Ceausescu¹, Camelia Cazoni², Bogdan Petre³, Alexandra Pircalaboiu⁴ and Marian Nastase⁵

¹ Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania ORCID:0009-0007-5705-3444

² Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania, ORCID:0009-0009-7665-6106

³ Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania, ORCID:0009-0003-5150-1016

⁴ Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania, ORCID:0009-0003-4574-0395

⁵ Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania, ORCID:0000-0002-3101-198X

E-mail: casandra.nitulescu@yahoo.com

Abstract. The public order and safety system in Romania has several valences of national importance for which the internal management control mechanisms must be adapted to the general and specific objectives of the entity, so that the institutional needs related to the safety of the citizen and the preservation of a climate of public tranquility are realized at an optimal and continuous level.

In this respect, at the managerial level it is analyzed through information, communication and management of certain documents, how to achieve general and specific objectives through planning tools, the degree of achievement of targets, the performance monitoring, using the resources at hand. Case study was used as qualitative research in order to emphasize the particularities and evolution of performance evaluation in the public order and safety system. Thus, we can talk about the effectiveness of performance that is examined and evaluated in order to provide reasonable assurance that all the objectives of the public entity will be achieved.

This study attempts to establish the evolution of performance indicators in the system of public order and safety, from the perspective of legislative changes in the field and the opinion of the authors based on the method of observation on the revolution of the system to the advantage or detriment of the entity. Also, a case study will indicate the results obtained and their evolution reported to the performance indicators at the level of the preventive arrest structure in Bucharest for the period 2019-2023.

Keywords: *criteria of performance, evaluation criteria, legislative amendments, preventive arrest, case study.*

1. Introduction

Monitoring performance was point of general interest being framed by standards provided by legal, methodological and procedural regulations.

At the level of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the general and specific objectives were established having a double foundation, respectively, the peculiarities of the public order and safety system and the basic principles found in the internal management control system according to the Orders issued by the General Secretariat of the Government, of the Government Ordinances, but also of the system procedures that follow the general rules, which establish the way of evaluation, analysis, planning and responsibility of performance in public institutions.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs has a central and decisive role in maintaining a climate of stability, safety and public order in the Romanian society. Its role and tasks are complex and approach a wide range of activities, based on various factors more or less predictable ; and predictable, obligations of different types interested in phenomena from all spheres of activity. Its performance is therefore a very important element of the good progress of society, contributing to the achievement of all the objectives assumed at national and international level.

Subsequent, the field under review is the structure of preventive arrest in Bucharest. Through the study, the performance indicators for the 2019-2023 period are analyzed in relation to the specific objectives reported to the superior hierarchical structure, their monitoring, adaptability to the identified risks of the structure, and, with possible remedial or coercive measures. The recommendations and limits identified are exposed to be useful to interested researchers from similar fields of activity, and not only.

Thus, from the case study it will be found that the performance indicators established for the preventive arrest system in Bucharest do not correspond to the evolution of the operational situation specific to the criminal execution field. As such, by correctly predicting them, the means of achieving the desired results would have been based on coherent and convergent tools of phased tracking, the end turning into real performance indicators.

Specifically, the results noted in the documents analyzed as a result of the performance indicators established for the years referred to, reflect a note of habit, although the concrete results in the activity are diversified and much more efficient, but not properly confirmed. That is why the authors want to signal the need for adaptive implementation of performance standards in correlation with the specific objectives of the preventive arrest structure in Bucharest.

As such, the authors' recommendations will concern syncope regulation measures that can be landmarks for interested persons, but also from legislative limitations, to extract topics of connection for scientific research in the near future The authors appreciate that the relevance of indicating the dynamics of legislative changes in the field of internal managerial control, so that the final nuances and regulatory limitations give the consistency of the case study and milestones as a whole to the researchers.

2. Methodology

The work is based on the qualitative method materialized in the case study and observation. The two tools used are interdependent, taking into account the fact that all the documents available for substantiating the case study were analyzed by observation by the authors. The method of data collection had as starting point the institutional archive of the Independent Service of Detention and Preventive Arrest, the materials being from the call of the unclassified documents, being able at any time to be requested for consultation by interested persons, following of course a specific procedure according to the regulations in force. Moreover, the legislation invoked in the study is also, accessible within virtual environments related to justice portals. The authors state that through observation, the documents submitted to attention were analyzed from the perspective of specialists in the field, systematically and chronologically, being followed characteristics common to performance indicators in the structure of preventive arrest, rigorously defined in law.

The authors showed a neutral attitude and did not intervene in any way in the evaluation of the actions observed by studying the documentation, the authors have stability research tracks starting from the existing items in documents that generated the subscribed results. Later, the results were compared, being indicated the findings for the chosen calendar interval, respectively 2019-2023.

Regarding the legislative changes of the internal management control system, the authors compared the legislation related to the field and showed the main changes, opinion in the results chapter and discussions about the needs of the legae ferenda.

3. Evolution of performance indicators

The legislative evolution in the field of internal managerial control and implicitly of the performance standard has adapted to societal needs, this is why periodic repeals of the legislative framework justify the interest (r)evolution of the public system in general, but with specific applicability to public

entities, depending on the profile of activities.

The table below will indicate the legislative changes in the field of internal managerial control from 2005 until 2018 when the last issuance of a normative act in force took place currently.

Table 1. Legislative changes in the field of internal managerial control from the perspective of the foreseen standards [1], [2], [3]

Applicability	Abrogated 12.06.2015	Abrogated 20.04.2018	In force from the date of 20.04.2018
Normative framework	ORDER of the Ministry of Public Finance no. 946 of July 4, 2005 [1] for the approval of the Code of internal control, including management/internal control standards at public entities and for the development of management control systems [1]	ORDER of the General Secretariat of the Government no. 400 of 12 June 2015 for the approval of the Code of internal control/managerial of public entities [2]	ORDER of the General Secretariat of the Government no. 600 of April 20, 2018 on the approval of the Code of internal managerial control of public entities [3]
Legal provisions	Article 2 (1) The public entities encoders will have - taking into account the peculiarities of the legal, organizational, personnel, financing and other specific elements, as well, as well as the standards set out in the annex to this order - the necessary measures for the development and/or development of management control systems of each organization, including procedures, formalized by activities.	Article 2 The head of each public entity has, taking into account the peculiarities of the legal framework of organization and functioning, as well as the standards of internal managerial control, the following, the control measures necessary for the implementation and development of the internal management control system, including for updating risk registers and formalized procedures on processes or activities, including, which may be system procedures and operational procedures.	Article 2 The head of each public entity has, taking into account the peculiarities of the legal framework of organization and functioning, as well as the standards of internal managerial control, the following, necessary measures for the implementation and development of the internal management control system.
Essential changes	The legislator has successively removed the applicability peculiarities from the text, giving the head of the entity the general authority to order measures according to the peculiarities of the legal framework of organization.		
	<u>Management standards/internal control at public entities</u> a) <i>Control environment</i> Standard 1 - Ethics,	<u>List of management standards/internal control at public entities</u> - a) <i>Control environment</i> Standard 1 - Ethics and Integrity	<u>List of management standards/internal control at public entities</u> a) <i>Control environment</i> Standard 1 - Ethics and Integrity

<p>Legal provisions</p>	<p>Integrity Standard 2 - Tasks, functions Standard 3 - Competence, performance Standard 4 - Sensitive functions Standard 5 - Delegation Standard 6 - Organizational structure</p> <p>b) <i>Performance and risk management</i> Standard 7 - Objectives Standard 8 - Planning Standard 9 - Coordination Standard 10 - Performance monitoring Standard 11 - Risk management Standard 15 - Assumptions, reassessments</p> <p>c) <i>Information and communication</i> Standard 12 - Information Standard 13 - Communication Standard 14 - Correspondence Standard 16 - Reporting irregularities</p> <p>d) <i>Control activities</i> Standard 17 - Procedures Standard 18 - Separation of duties Standard 19 - Supervision Standard 20 - Managing deviations Standard 21 - Continuity of work Standard 22 - Control strategies Standard 23 - Access to resources</p> <p>e) <i>Audit and evaluation</i> Standard 24 - Checking and evaluating control Standard 25 - Internal</p>	<p>Standard 2 - Tasks, functions Standard 3 - Competence, performance Standard 4 -Organizational structure</p> <p>b) <i>Performance and risk management</i> Standard 5 - Objectives Standard 6 – Planning Standard 7 - Performance Monitoring Standard 8 - Risk management</p> <p>c) <i>Control activities</i> Standard 9 – Procedures Standard 10 – Supervision Standard 11 - Continuity of business</p> <p>d) <i>Information and communication</i> Standard 12 - Information and communication Standard 13 - Document management Standard 14 - Accounting and financial reporting</p> <p>e) <i>Evauation and audit</i> Standard 15 - Evaluation of the internal management control system Standard 16 - Internal audit</p>	<p>Standard 2 - Tasks, functions Standard 3 - Competence, performance Standard 4 - Organizational structure</p> <p>b) <i>Performance and risk management</i> Standard 5 - Objectives Standard 6 – Planning Standard 7 - Performance monitoring Standard 8 - Risk management</p> <p>c) <i>Control activities</i> Standard 9 – Procedures Standard 10 – Supervision Standard 11 - Continuity of business</p> <p>d) <i>Information and communication</i> Standard 12 - Information and communication Standard 13 - Document management Standard 14 - Accounting and financial reporting</p> <p>e) <i>Evauation and audit</i> Standard 15 - Evaluation of the internal management control system</p>
--------------------------------	---	---	---

	audit	Standard 16 - Internal audit
Essential changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ In the first normative act are provided 25 standards, compared to 16 standards from the two successive normative acts. ❖ The same number of chapters are kept, but the order is different in the last two normative acts compared to the first normative act. ❖ In the chapter Medium control, in the first normative act are established 6 standards, compared to the last two normative acts in which the standards were compressed to a number of 4. Standards describing sensitive functions and delegation have been removed. ❖ In the chapter Performante and risk management, in the first normative act are provided 6 standards, compared to the last two normative acts where are established 4 standards. Coordination standards and assumptions, verifications have been removed. ❖ In the Information and communication chapter, 4 standards are established in the first normative act, compared to the last normative acts where 3 standards are established. The information and communication in the first normative act were compressed into a single standard in the two normative acts, the corresponding standard was replaced with the document management standard, the corresponding standard, and the standard of reporting irregularities was replaced by the standard accounting and financial reporting. ❖ In the chapter Control activities, 7 standards are established in the first normative act, compared to the last normative acts where 3 standards are established. ❖ Standards separation of activities, management of deviations, control strategies and access to resources have been removed. ❖ In the chapter Auditing and evaluation of the first normative act, which was renamed in the other normative acts Evaluation and audit, are established [in all three normative acts of 2 standards, each, with the specification that the first standard was renamed from the Checking and evaluation of the control in the Evaluation of the internal management control system. 	

4. Monitoring of performance in the public order and safety system

Currently, in the Romanian police, the activity of monitoring the performance of police structures is carried out in accordance with the Methodology on planning and evaluation of the activity of police structures, approved by the Romanian Police General Inspectorate Order no.91/16.09.2019 and System Procedure on monitoring and reporting performance PS-MAI—CCM-60.

In accordance with the provisions of the Standard 7 – Monitoring of Performance from the Order of the Secretary General of the Government no. 600/2018, *„the head of the public entity has the monitoring of performance for the objectives and/or activities of the compartments, and, by means of cantitative and/or qualitative indicators, including on economy, efficiency and effectiveness”*. Also, *„compartment managers monitor the performance of activities in coordination, by developing a system adapted to the size and specifics of the compartment activity. Monitoring the performance of the activities carried out is carried out at the level of each compartment in order to inform the management of the public entity regarding the achievement of the proposed objectives.”* [3]

4.1. Requirements for performance monitoring

The public entity shall ensure performance monitoring for each policy and activity using relevant quantitative and qualitative indicators, including on economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

The envisaged requirements are circumscribed to well-defined conditions, namely the fact that the management must receive systematic reports on the conduct of the activity of the public entity, assesses performance, and, noting any deviations from the objectives in order to take the necessary corrective

measures.

The performance monitoring system is influenced by the size and nature of the public entity, by the change/change of objectives and/or indicators, by the way employees access information.

For maximum efficiency, at the level of the public entity will be exploited the means available to achieve specific objectives, aiming at identifying risks and early warning of management factors. The measures taken to develop internal mechanisms, legislation, technology and infrastructure, as well as the process of gathering and merging information, shall also be adopted, it represents requirements without which performance indicators will not be reached.

In the decision-making area, the capabilities of the institution in tandem will be developed with an integrated management of complex actions, special situations and crisis in the field of public order and safety, and, in the current technological and security context.

4.2.Objectives of management internal control system

According to Annex no.1, item 6 of Order no.600 of 20.04.2018, „organization of the internal management control system of any public entity is considering the achievement of three categories of objectives, namely, which can be grouped as follows:

a) operational objectives - include the objectives related to the purposes of the public entity, the effectiveness and efficiency of its functioning, respectively the economical use, efficiency and effectiveness of resources, and, including the objectives of protecting public entity resources from misuse or loss;

b) reporting objectives - include objectives regarding the reliability of external and internal information, respectively related to the maintenance of adequate accounting, the quality of information used in the public entity or disseminated to third parties, as well as protecting documents against two categories of fraud: concealing fraud and distorting results;

c) Compliance objectives - include compliance objectives with internal laws, regulations and policies, namely related to ensuring that the activities of the entity are carried out in accordance with the obligations imposed by laws and regulations, as well as in compliance with internal policies”. [3]

5. Case study. The evolution of the performance of the preventive arrest structure in Bucharest between 2019-2023 in relation to the specific objectives of the structure.

. 5.1. Aim

Presentation of the design in a unitary manner for each relevant activity of the performance indicators associated to the specific and customized objectives for the preventive arrest structure in Bucharest, Romania, allowing the analysis based on objective criteria of the efficiency and effectiveness of the actions undertaken, the purpose being to establish the evolution of the results activities and their improvement, as the case may be.

. 5.2. Internal legislative references

According to point 5.2.1.3 of the PS-MAI-CIM-60, the types of performance indicators that can be used are quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative ones are expressed in numerical and percentage terms, while the qualitative ones are expressed through an appreciation of the kind realized/unrealized, yes/no, approved/unapproved. [13]

According to point 5.2.1.6 of the PS-MAI-CIM-60, the achievement of the performance indicator means the ratio between the value/situation/reference state and the value/situation/state reached.

The minimum criteria for establishing performance indicators, according to PS-MAI-CIM-60, can be the choice of the most relevant indicators related to specific objectives, to express the expected result simply and objectively, to be represented by a mathematical formula or by an objective appreciation. [13]

. 5.3. Documents evaluated

The documents analyzed for the case study are:

Questionnaire of the Independent Service of Detention and Preventive Arrest 2019, number 1210560 of 21.01.2020 [4]

Questionnaire of the Independent Service of Detention and Preventive Arrest 2020, number 860685 of 19.01.2021 [5]

Questionnaire of the Independent Service of Detention and Preventive Arrest 2021, number 1015808 of 20.01.2022 [6]

Questionnaire of the Independent Service of Detention and Preventive Arrest 2022, number 810704 of 17.01.2023 [7]

Questionnaire of the Independent Service of Detention and Preventive Arrest 2023, number 921028 of 16.01.2024 [8]

The activity plan of the General Police Department of Bucharest no.1218488/30.07.2020

The activity plan of the General Police Department of Bucharest no.88998/10.06.2021

The activity plan of the General Police Department of Bucharest no.132768/20.07.2022

The activity plan of the General Police Department of Bucharest no.22785/22.12.2023

5.4. Periodicity of performance evaluation at the level of preventive arrest structure

The monitoring of the performance status of the activities according to the performance indicators established is carried out annually for the year ended.

5.5. Specific objective of the preventive arrest structure, according to the activity plans of the General Police Department of Bucharest indicated, the following specific objective is revealed: Increasing the safety of the regime of enforcement of preventive measures involving deprivation of liberty and strengthening the capabilities to prevent and combat negative events at the level of detention and preventive arrest centers. [9], [10], [11], [12].

Performance indicators associated to the specific objective, according to the Activity Plans of the General Police Department of Bucharest indicated:

-Dissolution of control and monitoring activities of the 11 detention and preventive arrest centers.

-Dissolution of control and monitoring activities of detention and preventive arrest centers on ensuring and respecting the rights of persons deprived of liberty. [9], [10], [11], [12].

Table 2. Criteria for assessing the stage of implementation of the 7-Standard of performance at the level of preventive arrest structures in Bucharest [4], [5], [6], [7], [8]

General criteria	Results	Year
Is a performance monitoring and reporting system established based on indicators associated with specific objectives?	According to the legal provisions and the provisions of the upper echelon are made and communicated situations, half-yearly/annual on petitions, criminal files, administrative research, preliminary research, internal managerial control indicators, anti-corruption indicators, etc.	2019 [4]
Is there a performance evaluation based on the performance indicators established?	By the Provision no.91 of 16.05.2019 of the inspector general are established rules for monitoring strategic and operational documents. Regarding the evaluation of the subordinated personnel activity, it is made based on the qualitative indicators mentioned in the job description at E point, Performance standards associated to the job.	
If a possible deviation from the objectives is found, are the preventive and corrective measures to be taken?	Attracting attention and possible proposals to trigger the preliminary research.	
General criteria	Results	Year

Is a performance monitoring and reporting system established based on indicators associated with specific objectives?	According to the legal provisions and the provisions of the upper echelon are made and communicated situations, half-yearly/annual on petitions, criminal files, administrative research, preliminary research, internal managerial control indicators, anti-corruption indicators, etc.	2020 [5]
Is there a performance evaluation based on the performance indicators established?	By the Provision no.91 of 16.05.2019 of the inspector general are established rules for monitoring strategic and operational documents. Regarding the evaluation of the subordinated personnel activity, it is made based on the qualitative indicators mentioned in the job description at E point, Performance standards associated to the job.	
If a possible deviation from the objectives is found, are the preventive and corrective measures to be taken?	Attracting attention and possible proposals to trigger the preliminary research.	
General criteria	Results	Year
Is a performance monitoring and reporting system established based on indicators associated with specific objectives?	According to the legal provisions and the provisions of the upper echelon are made and communicated situations, half-yearly/annual on petitions, criminal files, administrative research, preliminary research, internal managerial control indicators, anti-corruption indicators, etc.	2021[6]
Is there a performance evaluation based on the performance indicators established?	By the Provision no.91 of 16.05.2019 of the inspector general are established rules for monitoring strategic and operational documents. Regarding the evaluation of the subordinated personnel activity, it is made based on the qualitative indicators mentioned in the job description at E point, Performance standards associated to the job.	
If a possible deviation from the objectives is found, are the preventive and corrective measures to be taken?	Attracting attention and possible proposals to trigger the preliminary research.	
General criteria	Results	Year
Is a performance monitoring and reporting system established based on indicators associated with specific objectives?	According to the legal provisions and the provisions of the upper echelon are made and communicated situations, half-yearly/annual on petitions, criminal files, administrative research, preliminary research, internal managerial control indicators, anti-corruption indicators, etc.	2022 [7]
Is there a performance evaluation based on the performance indicators established?	By the Provision no.91 of 16.05.2019 of the inspector general are established rules for monitoring strategic and operational documents. Regarding the evaluation of the subordinated personnel activity, it is made based on the qualitative indicators mentioned in the job description at E point, Performance standards associated to the job.	
If a possible deviation from the objectives is found, are the preventive and corrective	Attracting attention and possible proposals to trigger the preliminary research.	

measures to be taken?		
General criteria	Results	Year
Is a performance monitoring and reporting system established based on indicators associated with specific objectives?	According to the legal provisions and the provisions of the upper echelon are made and communicated situations, half-yearly/annual on petitions, criminal files, administrative research, preliminary research, internal managerial control indicators, anti-corruption indicators, etc.	2023 [8]
Is there a performance evaluation based on the performance indicators established?	By the Provision no.91 of 16.05.2019 of the inspector general are established rules for monitoring strategic and operational documents. Regarding the evaluation of the subordinated personnel activity, it is made based on the qualitative indicators mentioned in the job description at E point, Performance standards associated to the job.	
If a possible deviation from the objectives is found, are the preventive and corrective measures to be taken?	Attracting attention and possible proposals to trigger the preliminary research.	

5.6. Findings

According to Annex no.1, item 7 of Order no.600 of 20.04.2018, „Design, the continuous implementation and development of a viable internal control system is only possible provided that the system complies with the following requirements:

- a) be adapted to the entity's specific size, complexity and environment;
- b) to cover all levels of management and all activities/operations;
- c) be built with the same „instrumental“ in all public entities;
- d) ensure that the objectives of the entity are achieved;
- e) the costs of applying the internal management control system are lower than the benefits resulting from it;
- f) be governed by the minimum general management requirements contained in the standards of managerial internal control”.

Analyzing the above legislative requirements, reported to the case study for the years subjected to 2019-2023, the general criteria for assessing performance indicators are the same, the results from the received answers are similar in form, form, and the performance indicators established according to the specific objective of the preventive arrest structure do not correspond to the general criteria related to the Standard - 7 Monitoring of performances~ from the self-assessment questionnaires subject to the case study.

However, through daily professional activities, one can notice the increase of the performance of the preventive arrest structure by modernizing the conditions of detention, increasing the level of professional training among employees, improving the tactical endowment, and, modernized premises, transport-specific acquisitions, decrease in the number of operational incidents through identified punctual measures and sessions of best practices and lessons learned, which also, they led to the development of the structure of preventive arrest.

It is found that the evolution of performance in the structure of preventive arrest, although it is notable, it has not been materialized by setting specific objectives that would involve identifying performance criteria and result indicators, and, so as to predict remedial measures or coercion for tasks not performed after a judicious evaluation.

5.7. Useful recommendations

Biannual evaluation of the activities specific to the criminal execution field in order to identify the

specific objectives and implicitly to adapt and establish on their basis the performance indicators to be implemented by specific measures.

Example performance indicator by quantitative method:

Activity: Carrying out mentoring activities regarding....

Proposed performance indicator (assumed): Number of guidance activities

Calculation formula: number of activities performed/number of activities planned

Targets (expected results): 3 guidance activities

Monitored indicator: 2 guiding activities were carried out at the compartments..., the third being to be rescheduled in the next period. It could not be done because....

Example of performance indicator by qualitative method:

Activity: Realization of prevention activities in the field.....

Proposed performance indicator (assumed): Decrease in negative media impact on....

Targets (expected results): decrease by 2% of negative references in the media regarding....

Monitored indicator: Negative media impact decreased by 1.3%, resulting from....

5.8. Limitations and Future Studies

The result of this study can be used by some other researchers who works in the arrest environment, so that they have the mirror of legislative changes in the field of internal managerial control, and through the syncopations found in the case study, they can help in tracking, establishing and predicting performance indicators adapted to the specific of the activity of the structure which they are leading.

6. Results and discussions

Considered in its entirety, the scientific research establishes a set of findings that highlight some shortcomings related to both legislative changes in the sphere of internal managerial control in general, but also from the vision of applying performance standards at the level of preventive arrest structure in Bucharest related to specific objectives.

Thus, as was clear from the case study, the performance indicators chosen to be attributed to the preventive arrest structure do not have the consistency of the evolution of the operational situation over time, the, so that they were adapted to the new professional requirements and challenges, which would have helped to improve decisional transparency, to a realistic vision of the syncope and the design for each period of time of the specific objectives to be achieved. *Recomandarile din studiul de caz sunt pragmatice si formulate in asa fel incat sa reprezinte un flux eficient pentru analiza cantitativa si calitativa a masurarii indicatorilor de performanta.*

At the beginning of each year, public entity managers should objectively set their professional targets to be followed in relation to the operational situation assessed in the previous year, with the establishment of qualitative and quantitative performance indicators to be followed, so that residual and inherent risks do not affect the well-being of the institution and the results obtaine

At the same time, a plus value is also attributed to the legislative limitations, which were mentioned precisely for the studies in the near future in the field of applicability of the internal managerial control system for both preventive arrest structures, but also for the entire administration of internal affairs.

The authors consider that the standards of internal managerial control found in the legislation in force should be readjusted and associated with the standards in the repealed regulations, having as support that the breakdown by important areas at the level of functioning of an institution helps the employer to easily determine the strategic and specific objectives to be followed in an entity, tracking them and achieving the projected targets.

7. Conclusions

Implementation and development of internal management control system in general in the system of public order and safety, and in particular the structure of preventive arrest , its self-assessment operations, as well as the elaboration of supporting documents in context, are performance indicators for the head of the public entity.

Without the involvement of the management factors, their knowledge of the risks and vulnerabilities in the structure they manage, so that they can easily identify based on their knowledge and professional expertise, measures adapted to institutional challenges, the performance system of the entity will not develop efficiently.

As proof the case study highlighted that although a structure can note remarkable results over time, without their systematic implementation and at a certain period of time and monitoring the way of realization, the performance criteria, how they were met and the improvements that should have been made, are not properly evaluated, realistic and adapted to current needs.

Regarding the legislative changes in the three normative acts indicated, we consider that the standards stipulated in the first normative act issued in order to regulate the internal managerial control system in the financial field, as follows, it would have been appropriate to find it in its entirety in the normative act in force that rules the same field, but at the level of the entire ensemble of public institutions, as well as the legislator, stipulated, motivated by the fact that restricting the analysis of standards in detail leads to managerial substance unpredictability at the level of public entities.

Also, in the context of the ensemble of presented dysfunctions, both in general and in particular, the rapid and safe realization of a future based on performance challenges that are based on a constructive collaborative evolution, prompt reactions to increasingly demanding answers is profiled, the rise of digitalization and staff training in this regard.

All these desiderata can only be possible in the light of a common understanding on the importance of clarifying the legislative provisions at the right time, identifying the mechanisms adaptable to the specific of each entity in order to obtain the desired and efficient results both from the local perspective, but also as societal implication.

References

- [1] Order of the Ministry of Public Finance no. 946 of July 4, 2005 for the approval of the Code of internal control, comprising the standards of management/internal control at public entities and for the development of management control systems, Published in the Official Gazette No.675 of 28 July 2005.
- [2] Government General Secretariat Order no. 400 of 12 June 2015 for the approval of the Code of internal control/managerial of public entities, Published in the Official Gazette No.275 of 28 April 2016.
- [3] Order of the General Secretariat of the Government no. 600 of 20 April 2018 on the approval of the Code of internal managerial control of public entities, Published in the Official Gazette No.387 of 07 May 2018.
- [4] Questionnaire of self-assessment of the Independent Service of Detention and Preventive Arrest 2019, number 1210560 of 21.01.2020.
- [5] Questionnaire of self-assessment of the Independent Service of Detention and Preventive Arrest 2020, number 860685 din 19.01.2021.
- [6] Questionnaire of self-assessment of the Independent Service of Detention and Preventive Arrest 2021, number 1015808 din 20.01.2022.
- [7] Questionnaire of self-assessment of the Independent Service of Detention and Preventive Arrest 2022, number 810704 din 17.01.2023.
- [8] Questionnaire of self-assessment of the Independent Service of Detention and Preventive Arrest 2023, number 921028 din 16.01.2024.
- [9] The activity plan of the General Police Department of Bucharest no.1218488/30.07.2020
- [10] The activity plan of the General Police Department of Bucharest no.88998/10.06.2021
- [11] The activity plan of the General Police Department of Bucharest no.132768/20.07.2022
- [12] The activity plan of the General Police Department of Bucharest no.22785/22.12.2023
- [13] System Procedure of the Ministry of Internal Affairs on monitoring and reporting of PS-MAI—CCM-60 performances.