

**Korektiškas valdžios nuopelnų
(įsi)vertinimas: 3 pasiūlymai**

R.K.

2016.01.17


Turinys

1. Problema 1: Sandra Bullock vyriausybėje

- pasiūlymas #1: svoriai darbams

2. Problema 2: „po to“ nereiškia, kad „dėl to“

- pasiūlymas #2: skirtumų skirtumas (diff-in-diffs) [ir Pyro pergalės]
- pasiūlymas #3: konkrečios vyriausybės pridėtoji vertė



Sandra Bullock vyriausybėje

- „Koks **svarbiausias dalykas**, kurio reikia mūsų visuomenei?“

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B1ZOWwW2agQ>

Sandra Bullock vyriausybėje

▪ „Koks **svarbiausias dalykas**, kurio reikia mūsų visuomenei?“:

1. „Harsher punishment for parole violators“;
2. „World peace“.

Vyriausybės „pasiekimai“ - pavyzdys

- „Tai bus tam tikras istorinis įvykis, kad biudžetas ruošiamas eurai. Visi asignavimai skaičiuojami eurai. <...>“, - interviu LRT televizijai sakė A. Butkevičius.

<http://www.delfi.lt/verslas/verslas/premjeras-2015-uju-biudzetas-vyriausybei-bus-pateiktas-spalio-3-seimui-spalio-15-diena.d?id=65919780>

- **Čia vyriausybės nuopelnas ar Excel???**
- **Kiek svarbus šis pasiekimas, palyginti su kitais?**

Pasiūlymas #1


- **Darbai turi turėti svorius**, tarkime, nuo 1 iki 100 – svoriai ir išrikiuos darbus pagal **prioritetiškumą**.
- **Jei svorių nėra**, tai visi darbai yra **neva lygiaverčiai**, teisėsaugoje visos bylos [a. pavogtos vištos ir b. kokios rimtos juodosios buhalterijos] **tampa lygiavertės** 😊
- **Svorius iš laimės ekonomikos** – kas žmonėms svarbu.
- **Blogas matavimas užprogramuoja blogą elgseną**:
 - **teisėsaugoje** bus daugiau polinkio tirti lengvesnes bylas, **politikoje** – trimituoti apie **menkus darbus** („istorinį biudžetą eurai“ etc.);
 - tai apgaulingai „pagražina“ **nusikaltimų ištyrimo statistiką**, valdžios **ataskaitas (Seimui)**...

Pasiūlymas #2-3

- „**Po to - reiškia, kad dėl to**“ (*lot.* post hoc ergo propter hoc) yra vieną didžiausių ir dažniausiai pasitaikančių logikos klaidų.
- Su ja kovoti galima:
 - **skirtumų skirtumo** (diff-in-diffs) metodu;
 - pažangos vertinimu per **pridėtosios vertės** prizmę.

Pasiūlymas #2-3: SGD terminalo pavyzdys

- „Po to - reiškia, kad dėl to“ – „terminalas dvigubai atpigino dujas, ko čia prie jo kabinėjatės“.




Pasiūlymas #2-3: SGD terminalo pavyzdys (2)

- „**Skirtumų skirtumas**“ – bet **Gazprom** dujos maždaug tiek pat **atpigo** ir **Latvijoje/Estijoje**, kurios **terminalo nepasistatė**.
- Todėl **SGD terminalo nuopelnas būtų tik „skirtumų skirtumas“** – jei Lietuvoje dujos po terminalo pastatymo atpigo labiau nei LV/EE.
- Tą skirtumą **irgi nekorektiška priskirti vien tik terminalui**:
 - dar buvo **arbitražo** su Gazpromu byla Stokholme;
 - **Europos Komisija** savo griežta pozicija gal būtų aptvarkiusi nedraugišką Lietuvai Gazprom kainodarą.

Pasiūlymas #2-3: SGD terminalo pavyzdys (3)

- SGD terminalo **naudą** (išmatuotą skirtumų skirtumo metodu) reikia **palyginti su...**
- **...kaštais:**
 - **brangios dujos** iš Statoil;
 - mokėjimai už **laivo nuomą** Hoegl.



Pasiūlymas #2-3: SGD terminalo pavyzdys (4)

Su SGD	2014	2015	
Vartojimas (m3)	2.000.000.000	2.000.000.000	
Gazprom	2.000.000.000	1.500.000.000	
Statoil	0	500.000.000	
Kaina (EUR/m3)	0,4	0,25	
Gazprom	0,4	0,2	
Statoil		0,4	
Memo: Gazprom LV/EE	0,35	0,22	
Išlaidos (EUR)	800.000.000	550.000.000	
Gazprom	800.000.000	300.000.000	
Statoil	0	200.000.000	
Hoegl		50.000.000	
Be SGD	2014	2015	
Vartojimas (m3)	2.000.000.000	2.000.000.000	
Gazprom	2.000.000.000	2.000.000.000	
Statoil	0	0	
Kaina (EUR/m3)	0,4	0,22	
Gazprom	0,4	0,22	
Statoil		0	
Memo: Gazprom LV/EE	0,35	0,22	
Išlaidos (EUR)	800.000.000	440.000.000	
Gazprom	800.000.000	440.000.000	
Statoil	0	0	
Hoegl		0	
"Po to - dėl to" (P pokytis)	0,4	0,2	-50,0%
Skirtumų skirtumas	0,4	0,33	-17,5%

Pasiūlymas #2-3: SGD terminalo pavyzdys (5)

- Taigi, [SGD terminalas yra daugiau Pyro pergalė nei pasiekimas.](#)
- Deja, valdžia nesiėmė **gudresnės strategijos**:
 - iš esmės [atsikratyti nuo dujų vartojimo](#), nes LT beveik neturi sunkiosios pramonės:
 - tam reikia protingos **renovacijos** ir perėjimo prie **biokuro** šildyme;
 - **Elektrėnų elektrinės kuo trumpesnio panaudojimo.**
 - tada **nebūtų tiek svarbu, kas tave „mausto“ – Gazprom ar Statoil...**
 - **...ir kiek kainuoja dujos** – jums nesvarbu kiek kainuoja degtukų dėžutė, jei reikia vienos per metus.

Plačiau žr. www.ekonomika.org 2013.03.01: pranešimas "**Ekonomiškai pagrįstos energetikos strategijos link**".

Pasiūlymas #2-3: šilumos ūkio pavyzdys

- „Ryžtingi Vyriausybės veiksmai, skaidrinant energetikos sektorių bei karpant subsidijas, per trejus metus leido pasiekti įspūdingų rezultatų – **šilumos kaina Vilniaus mieste sumažėjo** 19 procentų, Kaune – 31 procentų, Klaipėdoje – 26 procentų. **Dujų kaina** buitiniams vartotojams šildymui – 30 procentų.“

<http://www.delfi.lt/news/ringas/politics/a-skardzius-kieno-interesus-gina-a-sekmokas.d?id=70147970>

- Vienoje pastraipoje:
 - ir „ryžtingi vyriausybės veiksmai“;
 - ir „dujų kaina“...
- ...ir **lieka neaišku**, kiek šilumos kaina krito dėl a) **dujų** kainų sumažėjimo, kiek b) dėl **vyriausybės veiksmų** (VIAP mažinimo), bet **„laurai“ pasiimami už abu**.


Pasiūlymai #2-3: kieno nuopelnas yra SGD terminalas

- Nuolat girdime dar vieną „**po to – reiškia dėl to**“ tipo **kalbėjimą**:
 - A. Butkevičius: „**atidarėme terminalą**, įvedėme eurą“;
 - A. Kubilius: „**abu darbus pradėjome mes**, jau buvome gerokai pasistūmėję“;
 - A. Butkevičius: „ne, dar A.Brazauskas apie tai kalbėjo...“
- Todėl reikia **sveiko proto sprendimo**, taikomo, pavyzdžiui, statybų sektoriuje – „**pastato užbaigtumo laipsnio**“, tada „juostelės perkirpimas“ nebus vertinamas 100% svoriu, o gal tik 5%.
- Tada **korektiškas pažangos įvertinimas** bus:

Pažanga = darbo svoris * pridėtoji vertė

Pasiūlymai #2-3: apibendrinančiosios lentelės ir pažangos švieslentės pavyzdys

Pavyzdys Darbas	Svoris	Pažanga			Svertiniai taškai
		2014 buvo	2015 pridėta	Liko	
Kaštų ir naudos analizės įdiegimas	100	0%	100%	0%	100
Mokesčių nesistemos reforma	100	5%	5%	90%	5
Lietuvos išlaisvinimas nuo dujų	100	30%	60%	10%	60
SGD terminalo pastatymas	20	50%	50%	0%	10
Biudžeto sudarymas eurais	1	0%	100%	0%	1
Viso					175



Priedas 1: Kanados vyriausybės projektų švieslentė

Executive Project Dashboard (draft sample)																																																																																					
Organization: Export Services Branch Project: Modernization of G&C			Project Phase: Planning Report as of: 2010-Oct-31			Project Complexity and Risk Rating: Level 3 - Evolutionary Next Project Gate: 4 – Project Charter/FMP			Project Health Y																																																																												
Executive Summary Current Period: Continue with Phase 2. Risks closely monitored and mitigation options analyzed. Forecast: Overall budget will remain on track within acceptable variances; approval will be requested for schedule rebaseline. Overall Status: Although some course correction in schedule is needed, the project is expected to deliver its outcomes.			Project Sponsor: Jacques Smith			Project Cost: Approved Budget: \$124.7 million Actual/Forecast Cost: \$103.1 million G			Costs G Schedule R Scope G Risk Y Issues R																																																																												
Business Outcomes • Service levels, service quality and client satisfaction of Canadian exporters increased • Canadian exporters' accessibility to capital funds and investment loans increased • Number of viable opportunities for Canadian exporters increased			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>YYYYYY</th> <th>Prior</th> <th>2007/08</th> <th>2008/09</th> <th>2009/10</th> <th>2010/11</th> <th>2011/12</th> <th>2012/13</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Approved</td> <td>\$0.5</td> <td>\$1.5</td> <td>\$4.2</td> <td>\$19.5</td> <td>\$34.8</td> <td>\$33.4</td> <td>\$30.8</td> <td>\$124.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Actual/Forecast</td> <td>\$0.4</td> <td>\$1.3</td> <td>\$2.3</td> <td>\$6.8</td> <td>\$32.5</td> <td>\$30.7</td> <td>\$29.1</td> <td>\$103.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			YYYYYY	Prior	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	Total	Approved	\$0.5	\$1.5	\$4.2	\$19.5	\$34.8	\$33.4	\$30.8	\$124.7	Actual/Forecast	\$0.4	\$1.3	\$2.3	\$6.8	\$32.5	\$30.7	\$29.1	\$103.1																																																					
YYYYYY	Prior	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	Total																																																																													
Approved	\$0.5	\$1.5	\$4.2	\$19.5	\$34.8	\$33.4	\$30.8	\$124.7																																																																													
Actual/Forecast	\$0.4	\$1.3	\$2.3	\$6.8	\$32.5	\$30.7	\$29.1	\$103.1																																																																													
Financial Summary (6 Quarters) <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Approved</th> <th>Actual / Forecast</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Q1 - 10/11</td> <td>\$8.70</td> <td>\$2.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q2 - 10/11</td> <td>\$8.70</td> <td>\$4.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q3 - 10/11</td> <td>\$8.70</td> <td>\$11.09</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q4 - 10/11</td> <td>\$8.70</td> <td>\$13.95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q1 - 11/12</td> <td>\$8.70</td> <td>\$7.73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q2 - 11/12</td> <td>\$8.70</td> <td>\$7.73</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Quarter	Approved	Actual / Forecast	Q1 - 10/11	\$8.70	\$2.78	Q2 - 10/11	\$8.70	\$4.68	Q3 - 10/11	\$8.70	\$11.09	Q4 - 10/11	\$8.70	\$13.95	Q1 - 11/12	\$8.70	\$7.73	Q2 - 11/12	\$8.70	\$7.73	Project Schedule Project Launch Date: 2006-Jan-15 R			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Key Milestones/Deliverables</th> <th>Approved Completion Date</th> <th>Forecast Completion Date</th> <th>Variance (months)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Requirements Gathering - Business Process Workshops</td> <td>2009-Sep-30</td> <td>2011-Jan-31</td> <td>-15.74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Business Requirements Documentation</td> <td>2009-Nov-16</td> <td>2011-Mar-15</td> <td>-15.61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Joint Application Design (JAD) sessions</td> <td>2010-Feb-15</td> <td>2011-May-19</td> <td>-14.77</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Independent Third-Party Review - Requirements Review</td> <td>2010-Apr-09</td> <td>2011-Jun-15</td> <td>-13.94</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gate 4 Governance Meeting</td> <td>2010-Apr-15</td> <td>2011-Jun-20</td> <td>-13.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Functional Specifications and Detailed Project Plan</td> <td>2010-Aug-27</td> <td>2011-Oct-19</td> <td>-13.48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gate 5 Independent Review and Governance Meeting</td> <td>2010-Sep-24</td> <td>2011-Nov-30</td> <td>-13.94</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Design and Construction</td> <td>2011-Jan-30</td> <td>2012-Feb-27</td> <td>-12.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unit Test, Systems Integration, User Acceptance Testing</td> <td>2011-Apr-05</td> <td>2012-Jun-28</td> <td>-14.55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Migration to Production</td> <td>2011-May-30</td> <td>2012-Jul-16</td> <td>-13.32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Final Maintenance and Transition, User Training</td> <td>2011-Jun-24</td> <td>2012-Aug-30</td> <td>-13.97</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Close-Out</td> <td>2011-Aug-01</td> <td>2012-Oct-15</td> <td>-14.23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Post-Implementation Review</td> <td>2011-Oct-31</td> <td>2012-Dec-26</td> <td>-13.68</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Key Milestones/Deliverables	Approved Completion Date	Forecast Completion Date	Variance (months)	Requirements Gathering - Business Process Workshops	2009-Sep-30	2011-Jan-31	-15.74	Business Requirements Documentation	2009-Nov-16	2011-Mar-15	-15.61	Joint Application Design (JAD) sessions	2010-Feb-15	2011-May-19	-14.77	Independent Third-Party Review - Requirements Review	2010-Apr-09	2011-Jun-15	-13.94	Gate 4 Governance Meeting	2010-Apr-15	2011-Jun-20	-13.90	Functional Specifications and Detailed Project Plan	2010-Aug-27	2011-Oct-19	-13.48	Gate 5 Independent Review and Governance Meeting	2010-Sep-24	2011-Nov-30	-13.94	Design and Construction	2011-Jan-30	2012-Feb-27	-12.68	Unit Test, Systems Integration, User Acceptance Testing	2011-Apr-05	2012-Jun-28	-14.55	Migration to Production	2011-May-30	2012-Jul-16	-13.32	Final Maintenance and Transition, User Training	2011-Jun-24	2012-Aug-30	-13.97	Project Close-Out	2011-Aug-01	2012-Oct-15	-14.23	Post-Implementation Review	2011-Oct-31	2012-Dec-26	-13.68
Quarter	Approved	Actual / Forecast																																																																																			
Q1 - 10/11	\$8.70	\$2.78																																																																																			
Q2 - 10/11	\$8.70	\$4.68																																																																																			
Q3 - 10/11	\$8.70	\$11.09																																																																																			
Q4 - 10/11	\$8.70	\$13.95																																																																																			
Q1 - 11/12	\$8.70	\$7.73																																																																																			
Q2 - 11/12	\$8.70	\$7.73																																																																																			
Key Milestones/Deliverables	Approved Completion Date	Forecast Completion Date	Variance (months)																																																																																		
Requirements Gathering - Business Process Workshops	2009-Sep-30	2011-Jan-31	-15.74																																																																																		
Business Requirements Documentation	2009-Nov-16	2011-Mar-15	-15.61																																																																																		
Joint Application Design (JAD) sessions	2010-Feb-15	2011-May-19	-14.77																																																																																		
Independent Third-Party Review - Requirements Review	2010-Apr-09	2011-Jun-15	-13.94																																																																																		
Gate 4 Governance Meeting	2010-Apr-15	2011-Jun-20	-13.90																																																																																		
Functional Specifications and Detailed Project Plan	2010-Aug-27	2011-Oct-19	-13.48																																																																																		
Gate 5 Independent Review and Governance Meeting	2010-Sep-24	2011-Nov-30	-13.94																																																																																		
Design and Construction	2011-Jan-30	2012-Feb-27	-12.68																																																																																		
Unit Test, Systems Integration, User Acceptance Testing	2011-Apr-05	2012-Jun-28	-14.55																																																																																		
Migration to Production	2011-May-30	2012-Jul-16	-13.32																																																																																		
Final Maintenance and Transition, User Training	2011-Jun-24	2012-Aug-30	-13.97																																																																																		
Project Close-Out	2011-Aug-01	2012-Oct-15	-14.23																																																																																		
Post-Implementation Review	2011-Oct-31	2012-Dec-26	-13.68																																																																																		
Project Risk Y			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Top Risks</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Impact (Consequence)</th> <th colspan="3">Probability (Likelihood)</th> <th rowspan="2">Risk 1: Potential disruption of business activities due to activation of new IT system. Category: Medium Impact and High Probability Response: ACCEPT: Potential disruption acceptable due to temporary status and non critical nature of system.</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Low</th> <th>Medium</th> <th>High</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>High</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>Risk 2: Potential for unplanned system outage. Category: High Impact and Medium Probability Response: TRANSFER: A contract with a certified government supplier has transferred system uptime responsibility to them and guarantees 99.9% uptime with redundant servers.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medium</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>Risk 3: Resistance to business process and system changes. Category: High Impact and High Probability Response: MITIGATE: Established change management strategy and plan. National stakeholder network established to engage the organization in developing understanding, awareness, and commitment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Low</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Top Risks				Impact (Consequence)	Probability (Likelihood)			Risk 1: Potential disruption of business activities due to activation of new IT system. Category: Medium Impact and High Probability Response: ACCEPT: Potential disruption acceptable due to temporary status and non critical nature of system.	Low	Medium	High	High	0	1	1	Risk 2: Potential for unplanned system outage. Category: High Impact and Medium Probability Response: TRANSFER: A contract with a certified government supplier has transferred system uptime responsibility to them and guarantees 99.9% uptime with redundant servers.	Medium	3	1	1	Risk 3: Resistance to business process and system changes. Category: High Impact and High Probability Response: MITIGATE: Established change management strategy and plan. National stakeholder network established to engage the organization in developing understanding, awareness, and commitment.	Low	4	2	2		Project Completion 2011-Oct-31 2012-Dec-28 -13.68																																																				
Top Risks																																																																																					
Impact (Consequence)	Probability (Likelihood)			Risk 1: Potential disruption of business activities due to activation of new IT system. Category: Medium Impact and High Probability Response: ACCEPT: Potential disruption acceptable due to temporary status and non critical nature of system.																																																																																	
	Low	Medium	High																																																																																		
High	0	1	1	Risk 2: Potential for unplanned system outage. Category: High Impact and Medium Probability Response: TRANSFER: A contract with a certified government supplier has transferred system uptime responsibility to them and guarantees 99.9% uptime with redundant servers.																																																																																	
Medium	3	1	1	Risk 3: Resistance to business process and system changes. Category: High Impact and High Probability Response: MITIGATE: Established change management strategy and plan. National stakeholder network established to engage the organization in developing understanding, awareness, and commitment.																																																																																	
Low	4	2	2																																																																																		
			Project Scope / Requests for Change (RFC) G			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Approved RFC</th> <th>Estimated # Effort Days</th> <th>Estimated Cost</th> <th>Impact on Project</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>This Period</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>\$0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>To Date</td> <td>1</td> <td>660</td> <td>\$19.6M</td> <td>Scope was rebaselined 8 December 2009.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Approved RFC	Estimated # Effort Days	Estimated Cost	Impact on Project	This Period	0	0	\$0		To Date	1	660	\$19.6M	Scope was rebaselined 8 December 2009.																																																														
	Approved RFC	Estimated # Effort Days	Estimated Cost	Impact on Project																																																																																	
This Period	0	0	\$0																																																																																		
To Date	1	660	\$19.6M	Scope was rebaselined 8 December 2009.																																																																																	
			Project Issues R			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="4">Issues</th> <th rowspan="2">Due Date</th> <th rowspan="2">Accountability</th> </tr> <tr> <th>This Period</th> <th>New</th> <th>Open</th> <th>Closed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td></td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Open Issues</td> <td colspan="4">Resolution Plan</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Possible exposure of information considered to be personal</td> <td colspan="4">Factor into business requirements gathering; alternative data source required.</td> <td>2010-Mar-15</td> <td>J. Smith</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Delays in funding caused significant slippage and impacted other milestones</td> <td colspan="4">Funding secured. Seeking approval for rebaselined schedule (previously rebaselined 2009/03).</td> <td>2010-Nov-30</td> <td>J. Smith</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Conflicting release schedules in legacy systems</td> <td colspan="4">Working with stakeholders to modify release schedules, as per PMP. Escalate to Governance committee of June 20.</td> <td>2010-May-15</td> <td>J. Smith</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Issues				Due Date	Accountability	This Period	New	Open	Closed	Total		3	1	0			Open Issues	Resolution Plan						Possible exposure of information considered to be personal	Factor into business requirements gathering; alternative data source required.				2010-Mar-15	J. Smith	Delays in funding caused significant slippage and impacted other milestones	Funding secured. Seeking approval for rebaselined schedule (previously rebaselined 2009/03).				2010-Nov-30	J. Smith	Conflicting release schedules in legacy systems	Working with stakeholders to modify release schedules, as per PMP. Escalate to Governance committee of June 20.				2010-May-15	J. Smith																															
	Issues				Due Date	Accountability																																																																															
	This Period	New	Open	Closed																																																																																	
Total		3	1	0																																																																																	
Open Issues	Resolution Plan																																																																																				
Possible exposure of information considered to be personal	Factor into business requirements gathering; alternative data source required.				2010-Mar-15	J. Smith																																																																															
Delays in funding caused significant slippage and impacted other milestones	Funding secured. Seeking approval for rebaselined schedule (previously rebaselined 2009/03).				2010-Nov-30	J. Smith																																																																															
Conflicting release schedules in legacy systems	Working with stakeholders to modify release schedules, as per PMP. Escalate to Governance committee of June 20.				2010-May-15	J. Smith																																																																															

Pasiūlymas dėl vyriausybių programų

- Nauja vyriausybė neturi rašyti savo programos
- Ji turi **taisyti** bendrąją „Lietuvos kūrimo programą“ savo prioritetais
 - daugiau tęstinumo;
 - mažiau improvizacijų;
 - daugiau ekspertinio input'o;
 - matosi progresas, kad ne tavo vyriausybė „viską padarė, o prieš tai nieko nebuvo“.
- Programa galėtų būti kuriama **Wikipedijos** principu:
 - yra redaktorius,
 - bet pasiūlymus gali teikti visuomenė, ekspertai, net ir lobistai, kas bus skaidru

Literatūra

- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Difference_in_differences

Pabaiga