



ONLINE TRAINING SESSIONS

**Partner Instrument / NDICI – Foreign Policy Needs  
Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI) – FPI.3 (ex FPI.4)**

**PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION  
AND MONITORING SYSTEM**

Training delivered under Contract No. 300032200 FWC PSF 2019 Lot 2. Project FPI - Project implementation and monitoring support, implemented by the consortium led by Particip GmbH with Idem Concept, along with Tetra Tech International as subcontractor.



**Project Implementation and Monitoring System (PIMS)**

**Online General Training**

**Sessions on Partner Instrument / NDICI – Foreign Policy Needs  
Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI) – FPI.3 (ex FPI.4)**

**Questions and Answers**

1.	<i>Logframe matrix (LFM) template</i> .....	2
2.	<i>Monitoring</i> .....	11
3.	<i>Reporting</i> .....	24
4.	<i>Data collection</i> .....	28

Updated on: 27/04/2023

## 1. Logframe matrix (LFM) template

Questions	Answers
<p><b>1.1. What is the PIMS applicable to?</b></p>	<p>The PIMS, or Project Implementation and Monitoring and reporting System is applicable to projects funded by specific instruments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Under the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) 2014-2020, the PIMS is applicable to all projects funded by the Partnership Instrument (PI);</li> <li>➤ Under the MFF 2021-2027, the PIMS is applicable to all projects funded by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Foreign Policy Needs component of the Rapid Response, and</li> <li>• the Geographic pillar for the cooperation with High Income Countries of NDICI-GE (Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe) which are managed by FPI.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>If you receive funding from any other EU instrument, please refer to your Contracting Authority for further guidance.</p>
<p><b>1.2. Is the PIMS relevant for projects using the Global Europe Results Framework?</b></p>	<p>The PIMS is relevant to all projects receiving funding from FPI. The Global Europe Results Framework is built on using core indicators. Implementing Partners will only see the relevant core indicators for their specific projects in the drop-down menu in OPSYS, depending on the source of the funding they receive.</p>
<p><b>1.3. What's the relationship between the Logframe and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)? Are they similar notions?</b></p>	<p>There are a number of specific objectives and overarching objectives defined at the level of FPI, because this particular service is managing the funding from NDICI. KPIs are indicators: they tell us how to provide evidence on the specific and overall objectives, and the extent to which they are achieved. Objectives and KPIs are by definition aligned.</p> <p>In turn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The specific and overarching objectives of FPI frame everything that is done at individual project level. Being an Implementing Partner, as you are designing or further revising the logframe for the project you are implementing, you will 'fall' under one of these specific objectives and you will be expected to contribute to these overarching objectives. Your project logframe is in a sense inspired by the specific and overarching objectives, but it is also more specific because it is the thematic or the geographic breakdown of a particular objective and a link to the activities that you will implement in e.g. specific policy area, a particular third country or region.</li> <li>➤ KPIs frame individual indicators applicable to the individual project level.</li> </ul> <p>KPIs and logframes are not the same. Logframes cover both project design and monitoring arrangements. Logframes are a more specific notion. They are defined at individual project level as opposed to the instrument level or the particular service, in this case, FPI.</p>
<p><b>1.4. How to approach the preparation of the LFM?</b></p>	<p>Adopt a top-down approach: first set the overall objective(s) of the project concerned, thinking about what/how it will contribute to the overall objectives of the EU's financing instrument. In the Action Fiche, Terms of Reference (ToR), or other strategic documents, you will find a reference to one or two of these overall objectives: they <i>frame</i> the project concerned.</p> <p>Then think backwards: define the steps (expressed as specific objective(s), outputs, and activities) needed to deliver the expected overall objective(s).</p>

Questions	Answers
<p><b>1.5. What is the relationship between the LFM and a Theory of Change?</b></p>	<p>The Logical Framework combines the reflection on an actual design of the project and the monitoring, data collection and reporting aspects. In addition to “Theory of Change”, project teams might have heard of “Theory of Action” or “Intervention logic”. The difference between all these instruments compared to the Logical Framework is that the Logical Framework is more comprehensive. It is the so-called Results chain (also described in a Theory of Change/ Theory of Action/ Intervention Logic) plus all the information you need to do the monitoring, data collection and reporting.</p>
<p><b>1.6. You mentioned that there should not be “big jumps” between different levels of the Results chain: what does that mean?</b></p> <p><b>Can you provide good and bad examples of a big gap between impact and outcome levels?</b></p>	<p>When designing the results chain of a project, it is important to be realistic: you should set each level realistically and ensure that it is possible and logical to go from one level to the other. Avoiding “big jumps” between different levels of the results chain means that the difference between any two successive levels in the results chain should not be out of reach: any level of results should logically follow from the previous level. If you have the impression that achieving a particular level in your results chain is too far-reaching, it likely means that there is one (or more) element(s) / intermediary step(s) missing from the results chain.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Increasing the general public’s awareness on the EU:</b> if for instance your project is due to prepare a press release following an event on the EU’s action on a specific topic, the press release is one of the project’s outputs. It is unlikely that the press release which is an outcome in a partner country X will produce an increase of the general public’s awareness on the EU overall. It is more likely that you will need intermediate steps to contribute to raising the general public’s awareness on the EU (e.g. working with multipliers such as opinion leaders and target stakeholder groups, who will relay the information to the general public). Without this intermediate step, which would be one of the project’s outcomes, there would be a big gap between the press release and the general objective which is to raise the general public’s awareness on the EU.</li> <li>➤ <b>Protecting the biodiversity worldwide:</b> the objectives of a project on the protection of biodiversity worldwide are described as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At impact level: the adoption of the new legal framework for the protection of biodiversity.</li> <li>• At outcome level: creating a consensus on an inclusive draft text. This includes an engagement with partner countries and also with the civil society to create a sustainable momentum to adopt a global framework for the protection of biodiversity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>It should be noted that even though civil society organisations have a voice at the UN, they do not have voting rights; at the UN, the seats are occupied by countries and not by civil society organisations.</p> <p>Regarding the UN system and the adoption within the UN arena of the global framework, the EU should also build or leverage its influence on partner countries. The EU is also engaging with partner countries and partner regions, for instance to create a sustainable momentum.</p> <p>In the way the objectives of this project have been defined, the fact that the EU needs to work on several dimensions in parallel is rightly described. The different dimensions are complementary so that overall, they contribute to the creation of a consensus on the draft framework for the protection of biodiversity.</p> <p>None of the two dimensions (i.e. engaging with partner countries and engaging with the civil society) would be the only dimension of the EU’s engagement. The inclusion of both dimensions as outcomes of the project and with a view to contribute to the general objective of the adoption of a framework for the protection of biodiversity makes it a good example of a comprehensive description of the outcomes with a robust link to the objectives at impact level.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p><b>1.7. How to improve the quality of a Logframe Matrix?</b></p>	<p>A good place to start is to review the logframe based on the checklist we have designed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Follow a top-down logic (define your objectives first);</li> <li>➤ Keep it simple;</li> <li>➤ Cover all the relevant elements of the Action;</li> <li>➤ Be realistic about what can be achieved;</li> <li>➤ Do not make big jumps between different levels of the logframe;</li> <li>➤ Check the logic of the results chain;</li> <li>➤ Check whether the Action’s results chain aligns with the overarching objectives it seeks to contribute to;</li> <li>➤ Revise the results chain as relevant.</li> </ul> <p>Do not forget to hone-in all the (geographical and/or thematic) expertise available in the implementation team to prepare / revise the logframe.</p>
<p><b>1.8. How concretely do we, as Implementing Partners, check the relevance of our objectives and outcomes during implementation? How to check the consistency of the project’s objectives? Should this analysis not be done at EU level?</b></p>	<p>The review of project design to ensure the relevance of and consistency between different levels of objectives is done in several steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is for the EU to decide on the political relevance of the objectives in a particular policy area / partner country. It is the decision of the EU as a foreign policy actor and this decision triggers the funding of projects.</li> <li>2. Throughout the project, Implementing Partners as technical/country experts can advise on how best to deliver the different levels of objectives and what intermediary steps are needed.</li> </ol>
<p><b>1.9. Is there a minimum and maximum number of outcomes and impacts to include in a LFM?</b></p>	<p>We cannot set a minimum or a maximum number of objectives for any project. There is no rule as to how many outputs/outcomes/impacts we put in the LFM: it is specific to each Action.</p> <p>It depends on the scope and scale of the funded projects, which vary a lot and the results chain of any project should reflect this variety. One cannot expect the same results from a project with a budget of EUR 300,000 compared to the one with a budget of EUR 7 million. When thinking about any results chain, the critical element is to ensure that it is logical. Each level is the logical consequence of the previous one and supports the achievement of the higher level. What we must put in the results chain is basically what is necessary to achieve the overall objective(s). Sometimes you have one expected impact or more. As soon as you have the overall objective(s) set for a particular project, you will define the lower levels of your results chain based on what is needed to deliver the overall objective(s).</p>
<p><b>1.10. Methodologically speaking, does it make sense to have a very limited number of specific objectives (outcomes), 1-2?</b></p>	<p>There is no ‘one size fits all’ answer because it depends very much on the scope as well as the budget available for a particular project. Sometimes the budgets are relatively limited, so you would have a very limited number of outputs, an even more limited number of outcomes and only one impact. However, sometimes there are projects which are very ambitious and with very large budgets, aimed, for instance, at covering all the different thematic dimensions of a particular relationship (e.g. partnership between the EU and a third country and/or partner region) and in such cases the list of specific objectives and overall objectives would be longer. It is really important to look at the scope of the project, the budget and the level of ambition.</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>It might also depend on the political context in which you are implementing a particular project - sometimes we know that the engagement between the EU and a partner region/partner country is challenging because there is no mutual interest in engaging on a particular policy area, and partners agree on a relatively limited scope of the project.</p>
<p><b>1.11. Isn't awareness an impact of funded projects?</b></p>	<p>A result focus on awareness might be at different levels of the results chain, depending on the subject of the awareness and the target group whose awareness a project aims to raise. In addition, awareness is not systematically an end in itself, but a means to an end.</p> <p>For example, you would be working on environmental issues and aim to increase awareness among politicians of that country to pass a legislation that would be more environmentally friendly. So, the impact would be the change of the legislation, not the fact that the politicians have become more aware of environment issues.</p> <p>Ultimately, you can confirm the results chain looking at the Action fiche / ToR and how the project is framed.</p>
<p><b>1.12. Do we need to put all the activities or only the main ones in the LFM?</b></p>	<p>There is no requirement to list all the activities to be implemented when you upload the LFM of the project you are managing/implementing.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is good practice to clearly define and share a common understanding of the activities that will be delivered. Outside of OPSYS, the LFM template allows you to capture information on activities. The template is in a table format to make sure the LFM remains manageable and understandable. It is better to have a summarised presentation of your activities, and therefore to list them all. You can present them by component.</p> <p>For example, if you are to organise X events on <i>awareness raising on climate change</i>, it would be enough to explain this as a description of one component (on <i>awareness raising on climate change</i>), potentially including several activities. You do not necessarily need to describe specifically each event you will be organising.</p>
<p><b>1.13. What is the difference between an activity and an output?</b></p>	<p>An activity is the task undertaken to produce an output.</p> <p>An output is tangible goods/ service delivered by an activity and in (very) short term.</p>
<p><b>1.14. What is the difference between a result, an output and a deliverable?</b></p> <p><b>Our ToR talk about 'overarching objective', 'results', and 'activity areas'. How do these generally align with the terminology of 'overall/specific objective', 'output' and 'activities'?</b></p> <p><b>How do we match the different categories that we can find sometimes in the ToR with the terminology in the LFM?</b></p>	<p>The use of different expressions might be confusing, so the key is to focus on the content rather than the "label" used.</p> <p>The PIMS aims to contribute to the harmonisation of the terminology used in the LFM to avoid any confusion, but you will still find in project documents references to results, outputs and/or deliverables. Often, these terms are used interchangeably. Sometimes instead of talking about 'activities', 'outputs', 'outcomes', 'impacts', the ToR can talk about 'activities', 'deliverables', and 'results.' Sometimes they do not even mention 'outcomes' and seem to jump directly to the overall objective. You should make the distinction between the three levels of objectives, namely output, outcome and impact, in terms of the control you have over each type of results and the timeline of the results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ If you have full control and if the results are short term, it will be at the output level;</li> <li>➤ if you are contributing to another set of objectives/results and if these results are to be achieved by the end of the project, it will be what could be classified as 'outcome'.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, "result" is a generic term. It applies to short term, medium and long-term achievements which would broadly correspond respectively to the output, outcome and impact levels of a LFM:</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>1. For the purpose of preparing LFM, we prefer referring to “output” as it indicates at which level of the LFM we are, i.e. the level related to products directly resulting from the activities implemented. Namely, their production is fully under the control of the project teams;</p> <p>2. A deliverable can be an output: for instance, a project could prepare a wide range of knowledge-based and communication products, which are sometimes referred to as ‘deliverables’ in project description.</p> <p>Note that not all deliverables are outputs included in the LFM. For instance, you may prepare a final report at the end of the project which is a deliverable of the project but will not be included in the LFM which is results oriented.</p>
<p><b>1.15. Should we write the objectives as described in the ToR or only provide the main objectives of the EU’s financing instrument?</b></p>	<p>In the LFM, you should formulate the objectives at project level. It is critical for all project stakeholders (including the project team) to understand what this specific project is expected to do. All project stakeholders should have a crystal-clear understanding of what success looks like for the project.</p> <p>You might also find it helpful to slightly tailor the LFM template. Typically, some project teams have added one column that is not in the template. In this column, they provide additional information, when the wording of the objectives is not specific enough. Comments or additional explanations will help to define the different objectives and create a common understanding between the project team and the European Commission / EU Delegation (EC/EUD) Project Manager of what it is that this specific project will be doing.</p> <p>Teams have also reported that it helped them prepare for the reporting. With this additional column they know what success is expected to look like and therefore they also know exactly what kind of evidence they need to collect, to be in a position at the end of the project to report <i>‘yes, we have delivered this specific objective and the influence has been X,Y,Z; the project has contributed this way to the realisation of the outcome and we have these different elements to support this claim’</i>.</p> <p>It is not a requirement, but you can add this additional column to elaborate on some of the elements if you find them helpful to create a common understanding among all stakeholders.</p> <p>In your reporting, if you want to give a broader perspective, you can always explain that the objectives of this project also contribute to a particular objective of the EU’s financing instrument.</p>
<p><b>1.16. When do we have to fill in the first Logframe Matrix version?</b></p> <p><b>Should it be updated on a regular basis (monthly or quarterly)?</b></p> <p><b>Do you advise that the logframe is changed/updated every reporting year or is it normal/usual for a project to have a static logframe for a three-year project life?</b></p>	<p>LFM is a living document which can be adapted throughout project implementation.</p> <p>The first version of the LFM is prepared based on the ToR / project description, which sets the expected objectives. This is the result of the EU’s internal decision-making. When bidding for a particular project and then preparing their Inception Report, Implementing Partners are expected to elaborate further on the LFM:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revising the results chain and description of the assumptions based on the policy / country experience;</li> <li>2. Adding the monitoring-related elements (selection of indicators, baseline and target setting, and identification of data sources).</li> </ol> <p>If the context in which a project is implementing changes and if it is necessary to adjust project design during delivery, it is possible to revise the LFM provided so that there is an agreement between the EC/EUD Project Manager and the Implementing Partner on the revisions introduced. But there is no requirement to revise the LFM if no change is needed.</p> <p>There is no ‘one size fits all’ and it very much depends on what your project is doing, where it is implemented, what its scope is and to what extent it is subject to external factors. If you are reporting on a yearly basis, since there is this very specific</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>engagement with your steering group and/or your Operational Manager, it might be a good way for you to check again that the logframe is actually reflecting what the project is doing and how it is implemented. If that is not the case, then you might always suggest some revisions and agree on them with the FPI Operational Manager - either at the Headquarters or in the Delegation. Sometimes it might be necessary to revise the logframe even more often and not to wait up to a year until the next result reporting exercise, depending on the circumstances.</p>
<p><b>1.17. The logframe of the project I'm implementing does not contain any baseline data. Can the logframe be changed during the implementation of the project?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the logframe is a living document. It can be adjusted and modified as you progress and implement your project. In every case, if there are any changes made to the logframe, they need to be discussed and agreed between Implementing Partners and the EU Project Manager.</p> <p>It is unlikely that the specific and/or overall objectives will be revised (as they translate overarching objectives at the individual project level).</p> <p>It is possible that baselines are not described in the first version of the logframe that project teams receive from the European Commission. Baseline-setting might rely on the provision of country and/or thematic expertise by the project team itself. Also, in some cases, a project can foresee the implementation of a baseline study, whose results then support the description of the baselines for the indicators selected in the logframe.</p> <p>If you need to adjust milestones or targets as you go along or if there is a particular source of verification that needs to be added, they can be changed and the logframe should be revised and adjusted throughout different stages of the project. Of course, if there are any changes in the framework of your project, you would need to revise specific elements of the logframe.</p>
<p><b>1.18. How do we formulate the overall objectives (expected impacts), specific objectives (expected outcomes) and outputs in the results chain?</b></p> <p><b>Do we use the infinitive or another form at each level (ex: "To strengthen the Justice system...." Or "The Justice system is strengthened...")?</b></p> <p><b>Could you give a specific example covering each of the phases: impact, outcome, output and activity?</b></p>	<p>For the formulation of outputs, you generally use the past tense as the results are achieved in short term and are direct products of the activities organised by the project (e.g. awareness raised, stakeholders trained, processes established, etc.).</p> <p>For the formulation of outcomes and impacts in the logframe, you generally use the infinitive (e.g. to contribute to, to support, to enhance, etc.), as both outcomes and impacts materialise in medium to long term and are not fully in control of the projects.</p> <p>Examples of impacts, outcomes, outputs and activities in the framework of a project on low carbon technologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Overall objective (expected impact): To improve conditions for investment in low carbon technologies in Countryland;</li> <li>➤ Specific objective (expected outcome): To support stakeholders' engagement on low carbon technologies;</li> <li>➤ Output: Awareness raised and better understanding of Countryland stakeholders on low carbon technologies and opportunities for collaboration with the EU businesses;</li> <li>➤ Activity: Organisation of a series of awareness raising events on low carbon technologies for industry stakeholders.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.19. Regarding assumptions, could we clarify if we should fill them in at the beginning or not? In your presentation you write in the cell "not to be filled out".</b></p>	<p>Assumptions are external/contextual factors that we assume should be in place for you to progress vertically in the results chain. Sometimes, project teams also highlight risks and challenges that might have an impact on project implementation, and therefore also on the results a project can deliver. Try to be as specific as possible and tailor the assumptions/risks to the specifics of the project so that the information contained in the LFM can purposefully contribute to the steering of the project and any adjustment needed if the risks materialise.</p> <p>Assumptions read as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>If I implement these activities, and if the following assumptions are true, then I will deliver the expected outputs.</i></li> </ul>

Questions	Answers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>If I deliver these outputs, and if the following assumptions hold true, then I will (contribute to) deliver the expected specific objective(s).</i></li> <li>➤ <i>If I deliver these specific objectives, and if the following assumptions hold true, then I will contribute to deliver the expected overall objective(s).</i></li> </ul> <p>There is no assumption at the overall objective level as it is the final level of the LFM. Therefore, the template indicates at this level that the cell related to assumptions should not be filled out.</p>
<p><b>1.20. If there is no challenge for one specific activity, can we leave the ‘assumptions’ field empty?</b></p> <p><b>Or should we also describe opportunities and how the task will be delivered in more detail?</b></p>	<p>It might happen that there is no pre-identified risk or challenge, but it is extremely rare.</p> <p>It might be that you are operating in a specific context / policy area for which things are rather in control. In this case, it is a good practice to also capture this.</p> <p>For example: aspects that could strengthen an event, or that could make it easier for you to deliver a particular set of objectives or factors that will create synergies between activities you are implementing and what another project is doing. All these elements are interesting and relevant to project design, as they explain the potential of a particular project and link different issues together. This will also help you explain why an objective at a different level of the LFM might be delivered.</p> <p>You can capture all these external considerations under the ‘assumptions’.</p> <p>The assumptions column is not to be used to describe how activities will be delivered.</p>
<p><b>1.21. Can there be more than one assumption that does not link to the results chain?</b></p>	<p>Generally, at different levels, there can be more than one assumption, and assumptions are linked to project design. They are external factors that will allow you to ‘jump’ from one level to the next, conditions that should be met to move from one level to the other in the results chain. For example, if you're at the level of your outputs and you have implemented a number of events as part of your Action, and if you want to go to the next level, i.e. outcome, where you want to ensure engagement of stakeholders, partner engagement of stakeholders etc., then your assumptions would be linked to the fact that stakeholders are attending the events that you have organised and that they show engagement with the topics that you have presented. If your events are well attended and there is engagement of stakeholders, then you will be able to go to the next level (i.e. outcome level) where you will have specific objectives.</p>
<p><b>1.22. How to deal with demand-driven facilities, where it is almost impossible to draft a valid LFM for the whole implementation period as it is difficult to anticipate on the demands?</b></p>	<p>The logframe is a living document you can update it as and when relevant.</p> <p>With a demand-driven project, there are steps you can still take when preparing your LFM:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Based on the Action fiche / ToR, you will be able to identify the expected overall objective at least, and perhaps also expected specific objectives. These will help you frame the project and give a general direction (even if you do not know the details of the activities you will implement from the outset).</li> <li>2. When you deal with this kind of projects (e.g. policy support facility or dialogue facility), you can at least identify the policy areas or topics that the said project will support. Based on the team’s policy / country experience and contextual factors, you can also set tentative targets.</li> <li>3. Targets are likely to be revised over time, as per the nature of the project, but the LFM is a living document and revising it is not an issue. Make sure that there is an agreement on any changes between all stakeholders concerned.</li> </ol>



Questions	Answers
<p><b>1.23. In the light of the current COVID-19 pandemic, we have had to develop a contingency plan to adjust project implementation.</b></p> <p><b>Is there a need to update the LFM to reflect the contingency plan?</b></p>	<p>It depends on the exact impact the pandemic has had on your project.</p> <p>If the adjustments are substantial, namely they modify the activities implemented and possibly the objectives set initially, then you should revise the LFM accordingly. Remember that the results and success delivered by the end of the project will be assessed against the objectives and targets set in the LFM: if these change over time – for instance because of the pandemic – it is important to reflect the changes in the LFM for future evaluations.</p> <p>If the adjustments relate to some implementation modalities (such as replacing face-to-face events with online events) but do not have implications on the policy objectives, it might not be necessary to revise the results chain of your LFM. We advise you nonetheless to assess whether it is relevant to update the description of the assumptions, risks and challenges in the LFM, in case the new implementation modalities introduce challenges for the project.</p> <p>In all cases, please consult with the EC/EUD Project Manager and confirm the preferred option.</p>
<p><b>1.24. What is the usefulness of the milestones regarding the targets?</b></p>	<p>We usually consider that the milestones are intermediary targets that you can include so you can see progress more easily. Your milestones are short-term targets.</p> <p>For example, if your target is to reach participation of 100 given stakeholders throughout the lifetime of your project, it is good to have some medium-term milestones to track how you are doing.</p> <p>Setting milestones will help you confirm you are on the right track to reach your final target or if you need to make some adjustments, be more specific on an aspect for instance to reach the final target.</p>
<p><b>1.25. Does setting of quantitative target mean that quantity is better than quality (for instance, it would be better to deliver 10 average policy briefs rather than 2 good policy briefs)?</b></p>	<p>Setting of targets reflects the expectations for any project in any context. It does not mean that quantity is better than quality at all. A higher (quantitative) target will not systematically be better than a lower (quantitative) target.</p> <p>As a matter of fact, targets are in most cases set in both quantitative and qualitative terms. This reflects the importance attached to the content. This is something you will be held accountable for, too: when reporting on the results delivered, you will also be asked to report both quantitative and qualitative data, to describe the results both in quantitative and qualitative terms.</p>
<p><b>1.26. If the project is closed, should any of the documents be updated based on the PIMS?</b></p>	<p>If the project is closed, and the project-related documents have been approved by the EC/EUD Project Manager, no further update is necessary. If you are currently not implementing a project, you are not eligible to the technical assistance made available by the Service for Foreign Policy Instruments through the organisation of coaching sessions and the possibility to address to the PIMS functional email queries related to the implementation of the PIMS.</p>
<p><b>1.27. How do you define a RACER indicator?</b></p>	<p>The core indicators respond to the quality standards of indicators, as set by the European Commission in the <i>Better Regulation Guidelines</i>. Indicators are RACER, i.e. relevant, accepted, credible, easy and robust as defined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Relevant:</b> relates / measures only the design element which is intended for measurement and not any other elements;</li> <li>➤ <b>Accepted:</b> accepted by all stakeholders (Project Managers and Implementing Partners – especially since the latter are responsible for reporting back on indicators);</li> <li>➤ <b>Credible:</b> a measure of the targeted issue which is unambiguous and easy to interpret;</li> <li>➤ <b>Easy:</b> to track, to make sure information can be collected;</li> </ul>

Questions	Answers
	<p>➤ <b>Robust:</b> as valid measure of the targeted issue, as objective as possible, well explained and documented, not subject to manipulation.</p>
<p><b>1.28. Can we create a new core indicator?</b></p>	<p>No, you cannot create a new core indicator. Only the European Commission can create core indicators because, by definition, they are created for the Commission’s aggregation purposes. If you create a new indicator, it is called a customised indicator. They can only be created under very specific conditions and should be approved by the Service for Foreign Policy Instruments.</p>
<p><b>1.29. Are there still customised matched and customised non-matched indicators?</b></p>	<p>As the Commission is rolling out OPSYS, there are only two categories of indicators to choose from:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Core indicators – menu of predefined indicators;</li> <li>2. Customised indicators – any new indicator created in exceptional cases, which requires approval by the Service for Foreign Policy Instruments.</li> </ol>
<p><b>1.30. Is it possible to use customised indicators?</b></p>	<p>In principle, the core indicators cover almost everything that funded projects are doing; in most cases no other indicators will be necessary.</p> <p>When selecting the relevant and necessary indicators for a particular project, you first need to look at the list of core indicators and select from this menu of indicators. Some project teams may feel slightly lost because the wording of core indicators is general: the generic wording of the core indicators gives flexibility to the system.</p> <p>One can use a core indicator even if all details of a project are not included in the title of this core indicator. Instead, these specific elements will be an integral part of the <u>qualitative reporting</u>. A general indicator title gives flexibility to cover many different situations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When you set the baseline and the target for this indicator, you provide a qualitative description of the specifics of the project, which explains how the indicator will be used / what it will measure;</li> <li>2. Then, when you report against this indicator you can provide in the qualitative description all the specifics that you want, which relate to the project you are implementing.</li> </ol>
<p><b>1.31. What does ‘number of processes’ mean and what is an ‘approach’ (generic indicators)?</b></p>	<p>The logic behind the title of the indicators is to have a flexible system that can adapt to the reality of different Actions implemented in a wide range of policy areas and different regions / countries.</p> <p>For example, a process can be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EU and a partner country working together on a new legislation in the field of labour law to include provisions related to women’s economic empowerment;</li> <li>• The EU and a regional organisation working together ahead of the COP 15 in the field of biodiversity to try to create a consensus or momentum for the need for a new framework for the protection of biodiversity;</li> <li>• A partner country that has just committed to the implementation of the Paris Agreement in the fight against climate change and is now developing an emission trading scheme (ETS) and the EU is engaging with this country because the EU can bring expertise / technical solutions when it comes to the ETS;</li> <li>• The work done between the EU and several partner countries to manage the black carbon in the Arctic.</li> </ul> <p>All these could qualify as processes. That shows how flexible the wording of core indicators is. Simply referring to ‘processes’ in the title of core indicators (and not specifically to labour law, biodiversity, climate change or the Arctic) gives all projects the</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>possibility to use the core indicators, while making sure that in the reporting each project team provides the necessary explanatory information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ You select the core indicator because it can cover what the project aims for and then you provide information in the baseline, target and reporting. You do not change the title of the indicator, but you specify the process that you are working on, what is the influence that a project has contributed and how things have changed by the end of the project.</li> <li>➤ The wording of these core indicators refers to processes that have been ‘influenced’. You are not required to ensure that a process is implemented. What is key to remember is the kind of process, the context where the project is implemented, the kind of process a particular project will influence, whether we can expect that a particular process will be adopted and/or implemented, etc. When you set a target for these indicators, you also define what is possible to achieve in a particular policy area or country and this is what you will try to evidence by the end of the project.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.32. In the case of Implementing Partners sharing an Action for their projects, we have different LFMs, with, for example, an activity in the EU Action being an output in the individual project.</b></p> <p><b>Should we clarify these differences in the monitoring process?</b></p>	<p>If the LFM follows the logic between the levels, it should be fine. When implementing a project, in <i>your</i> expected results, you should not include the results delivered by another project or report on these. It might only be relevant to include a reference to another project in the assumptions’ column, when the other project might have an influence / create particular conditions that could benefit / weaken the project you are yourself implementing.</p>

## 2. Monitoring

Questions	Answers
<p><b>2.1. Is there a minimum/maximum number of monitoring indicators per level of the LFM?</b></p>	<p>You should select and use all indicators which are <i>relevant and necessary</i> to monitor and report on the results delivered.</p> <p>It is not possible to define a priori a minimum / maximum number of indicators per level. The EU’s financing instrument supports a wide range of projects, which creates different monitoring needs. What is critical is that once you have selected monitoring indicators in the LFM, you will be expected to cover all the indicators selected in your reporting. This means that it is very important to ensure that for each indicator selected, you are in a position to collect the data required and to analyse the data (as relevant) to report on the results delivered.</p>
<p><b>2.2. Output indicators related to products are relevant but are merely quantitative. What about measuring the level of satisfaction of stakeholders regarding the knowledge-based products or similar?</b></p>	<p>Although core indicators look very quantitative because they all start with ‘number of’ or ‘percentage of’, these indicators are actually both quantitative and qualitative. You will find the exact definitions of core indicators, including whether they are quantitative, or quantitative and qualitative in what we call the “core indicator fiches”. So, it means that, for instance, when you use the ‘number of events organised/ supported’, you should not only report the quantitative value (e.g. ten events you have organised) in your result reporting, but you are actually expected and required to also provide a qualitative description of the topics covered by the events you are organising or supporting as an Implementing Partner. So, whenever you use these</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>indicators, you have both the quantitative and qualitative dimension and they go together, otherwise, your reporting is not complete.</p> <p>On measuring the level of satisfaction of stakeholders regarding the knowledge - based products or similar, it is true that there is indeed no core indicator related to the level of satisfaction of the knowledge - based products or the communication products, while there are indicators related to the benefits from the participation in the events. In this particular case, to make your life easier and because it is not recommended to create new indicators, but use the core indicators instead, you should report on this qualitative dimension, the level of satisfaction of stakeholders, in the qualitative description of 'knowledge - based products' indicator.</p>
<p><b>2.3. What is the actual relevance of the indicator 'Number of participants in the events organised/supported'? What does number say? Perhaps add which type / segment (level of seniority, tasks, etc.) that is relevant to participate. But also is number of participation a real good indicator if an objective is achieved?</b></p>	<p>It is true that the number and the quantitative information don't provide the full picture of the project you are implementing. However, remember that for every indicator, there needs to be a mix of quantitative information provided as well as a qualitative narrative that supports the numbers that you are providing. It is important to note that, when reporting on this indicator, you are not only providing the number of participants, but that there is also information to be disaggregated. In the case of the indicator on the number of participants, they will have to be disaggregated by gender, sector, type of event. So, all of these elements together will give you a full picture of participation in events, etc., and are linked to the benefits that participants get from events and the distinction between individual participation, participation of new companies, etc.</p> <p>We need to move away from the idea that the higher the quantitative value, the better the project is doing. The point is not to aim for a really important quantitative participation. In most cases, the information about the targeting of the participation (e.g. the different sectors that participants represent) would be a much more interesting variable and that is something that you would also collect and would report on through this particular indicator. Again, the idea is not to put pressure on the project team to have the highest number of participants as a target because it is not necessarily relevant, and it is not the way the project would be evaluated. FPI is not comparing projects, but the results achieved through your activities with your targets set within the project. For example, if you were targeting ten permanent secretaries in different Ministries in your target narrative, when you report, you would explain if you reached those targets, but FPI would still be counting participants. The fact that you are aiming for very high-level participants should be presented in the narrative description.</p>
<p><b>2.4. How can we provide all compulsory data re disaggregation on each indicator for events with versatile profiles of participants?</b></p>	<p>In principle, in the design of your data collection tools, you should be aiming to capture the disaggregation required. Ideally, you should be in a position to provide the disaggregated information as required in the Core Indicator Fiches.</p> <p>However, when it is not possible to provide this information, please remember to explain / justify why this information was not available (e.g. by describing the challenges that you encountered when attempting to disaggregate the data collected) in the qualitative narrative.</p>
<p><b>2.5. Could you please explain, what is the reason for tracking the number or percentage of (private?) companies, but not media organisations, the EU or national missions, NGOs, or other? Could that be adjusted or replaced?</b></p>	<p>Tracking the number of companies is included in core indicators, because trade is an important aspect of EU foreign policy. That being said, all the other groups mentioned are actually subcategories of the 'number of participants' indicators and that's where you would indicate how many people come from NGOs, how many are from academia, etc. The number of participants obviously does not mean you have achieved your higher-level objectives, which is something that would be looked at on the outcome level indicators (i.e. are we achieving the change we want?).</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>As for the reporting on the participation of media organisations, the EU or national missions, NGOs or other categories of stakeholders you should look in the core indicator fiches, which include all the definitions and methodological hints and tips on how to use core indicators.</p> <p>If you look at the description of the ‘number of participants in the events organised/supported’, you will see that there is already a breakdown of different categories, which indicate the type of information that can be captured there:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Academia and students;</li> <li>2. Government;</li> <li>3. Business and private sector;</li> <li>4. Media;</li> <li>5. Civil society;</li> <li>6. Other.</li> </ol> <p>Since there was no predefined/pre-agreed category to report on the participation of the EU and/or national missions, you could, depending on the situation, use the ‘government’ subcategory, which has been agreed or if this is a really specific situation and includes different type of missions, you can report on it under the ‘other’ category and explain what it is.</p> <p>The answer to the question if this could be adjusted or replaced, the answer would be no. You cannot change the wording of the core indicators, you need to take them as they are, because if you introduce any changes to the core indicators, then it means that you made the aggregation impossible. So, no change of the wording of core indicators is possible.</p>
<p><b>2.6. Where can I find additional guidance on core indicators?</b></p>	<p>Please refer to the so-called “core indicator fiches”: you will find these documents in the PIMS guidance. They provide the definition of each core indicator and confirm how to use the indicator, if disaggregated data are required, the reporting requirements, etc.</p>
<p><b>2.7. At what stage in the project cycle are the indicators selected?</b></p>	<p>The selection of the relevant core indicators should generally be finalised during the inception phase of a project and is part of the revision of the results chain and the logframe matrix. Implementing Partners are tasked with selecting the most relevant indicators at output, outcome and impact levels, and defining the corresponding baselines, targets and sources of verification for each core indicator selected. The selection of indicators is validated with the relevant EU/FPI Project Manager.</p>
<p><b>2.8. For projects that have already uploaded a logframe with the corresponding core indicators in OPSYS, is it possible to add some of the newly created core indicators that were not available before?</b></p>	<p>The new core indicators are being progressively added in OPSYS and they available for selection when encoding a project logframe. If any of the new indicators are relevant for an ongoing Action, they can be added. The logframe is a living document, so changes can be made during the implementation of the Action. Any changes need to be validated with the EU Project Manager.</p>
<p><b>2.9. If in the framework of a particular contract, we organise different types of events, would you use one indicator per event or one indicator for all events?</b></p>	<p>You will use only one core indicator (<i>‘number of events organised/supported’</i>).</p> <p>The EU has already predefined different types of events. If you look at the core indicator fiches, you will find that under the above-mentioned core indicator, it is required to disaggregate the data you report against 6 different event types:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Visits, exchanges, study tours;</li> <li>2. Business missions;</li> </ol>

Questions	Answers
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Technical meetings (to discuss a specific technical subject);</li> <li>4. Group events (conferences, debates, workshops, seminars);</li> <li>5. Training;</li> <li>6. Outreach and advocacy (including networking events, cultural collaboration activities).</li> </ol> <p>You will report the total number of events you organise, and breakdown this number of event type.</p>
<p><b>2.10. What if an event we organise could ‘fall’ under several of the event types predefined under the indicator: ‘number of events organised/supported’?</b></p>	<p>You should report on the results delivered only once: select the event type which matches the primary objective of the event you organise. In the qualitative narrative accompanying the value you report, you can explain then that some / all events had multiple purposes.</p> <p>This is essential to avoid double reporting.</p>
<p><b>2.11. Could you clarify if activity indicators are now part of the outcome indicators?</b></p>	<p>They are not. In OPSYS, activity indicators (<i>‘number of events organised / supported’</i> and <i>‘number of public/media/communication campaigns designed and implemented’</i>) have been re-categorised as output indicators.</p>
<p><b>2.12. Should all outputs be measurable?</b></p>	<p>You should be able to evidence the results (in this case, outputs) that a project has delivered.</p> <p>What is important is to select indicators that are measurable: if you select an indicator without identifying data sources, or if you select an indicator which would require analytical capacity that your project team does not have, it means that you will not be in a position to use the indicator. In turn, it means that you will not be able to evidence the results delivered.</p>
<p><b>2.13. Regarding the ‘Number of outcome statements emanating from the events’, do they just apply to high-level statements, or could we consider statements between the EU and third- country companies as well?</b></p>	<p>They do not only apply to high-level statements between state actors. They can also apply to events and progress made between the EU and third-country companies. Outcome statements are different from a press release for instance - they express a commitment made by the participants, the state and non-state stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>2.14. What is the difference, at output level, between communication and knowledge-based products? Can one product be reported against both categories?</b></p>	<p>The difference between communication products and knowledge-based products is based on the <i>objective</i> of the products considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The primary objective of a communication product is to communicate, disseminate information;</li> <li>2. The primary objective of a knowledge-based product is to provide technical information.</li> </ol> <p>The PIMS wants to <i>avoid any double reporting</i> so if a product could ‘fall’ under both categories, you should make a choice: <i>you should report against the category which corresponds to the primary purpose of the product (it should never be reported twice)</i>.</p> <p>For instance, what about a project website where you would also make available technical documents: is the website a communication product or a knowledge-based product? The primary objective of a project website is to communicate about a project so we would report it as a communication product. But we would also add in the qualitative narrative in the reporting that the website makes technical documents available to stakeholders.</p> <p>There might be links between knowledge-based products and communication products, to the extent that a project team would develop communication products to disseminate the knowledge-based products it has also prepared. For instance, you prepare a policy brief on women’s economic empowerment: the policy brief constitutes a knowledge-based product. But you can also</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>have a communication campaign through which you disseminate the policy brief. For example, you might prepare a factsheet based on this policy brief, so the factsheet will be reported as a communication product.</p> <p>It is also possible that, for instance, the communication products you are developing are linked to other activities implemented under your project. For example, if you organise a series of events like a festival of European films, you might also prepare communication materials around the festival. In this case, you will report both on the festival you organised and the communication materials you prepared (this would not constitute double reporting).</p>
<p><b>2.15. How should we categorise PowerPoint presentations that we provide publicly on the website after the event took place? Can this go under output results or communication results?</b></p>	<p>A PowerPoint presentation could be either, depending on what you define as the main objective of that particular output. If it is more technical (e.g. the presentation of what was discussed in the event), you would be including it as a knowledge-based product. But if that particular presentation has more of a communication objective and you are trying to promote a specific topic or the project through that presentation, then you would categorise it as a communication product and count it as such. What you need to be careful is not to count it as both a knowledge - based product and a communication product. This is a decision that you need to take, based on what you define as the main objective.</p>
<p><b>2.16. How to report on social media?</b></p>	<p>Different projects will have different usages and objectives regarding social media. Let's use a few examples to illustrate how to report on social media.</p> <p>For instance, social media is an important dimension of your dissemination strategy. You are posting about the events you are organising in the framework of a project on social media, and you are expecting to generate engagement on social media.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The fact that you are posting on social media will be translated into an active [social media] account reported against the core output indicator: <i>'Number of communication products developed'</i> (do not report individual [social media] posts as communication products);</li> <li>➤ You can also report on your "social media campaign" against the core output indicator: <i>'Number of public/media/communication campaigns designed and implemented'</i>;</li> <li>➤ If you are monitoring engagement on social media, such as the number of retweets or the use of particular hashtags, you will report these data against the core output indicator: <i>'Level of engagement online and on social media'</i>.</li> </ul> <p>Another example would be that of a project which prepares social media content for an EU Delegation social media (the content would not be posted by the project team on the project social media, but by the EU Delegation concerned).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The preparation of the social media materials will be reported against the core output indicator: <i>'Number of communication products developed'</i>, and you will specify in the qualitative narrative in your reporting that the materials were prepared for publication by the EU Delegation concerned on their social media account.</li> </ul> <p>If you are in this situation, and if you would like to include information on the EUD social media account(s) in the project reporting, remember to agree with the EUD the provision of analytics on these accounts (if you don't have admin privileges for these accounts, you will not be able to retrieve the analytics by yourself).</p>
<p><b>2.17. Could you please explain how to quantify the level of engagement in social media if we don't have a project account? Our project uses</b></p>	<p>The breakdown for this particular output indicator gives you an idea of the different categories that would 'fall' under this engagement online on social media and you will see that it is not a requirement to have a project account, but that proxies can be used as well. So the breakdown includes the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number of visitors and/or signed up users on a particular site or web page;</li> </ol>



Questions	Answers
<p><b>the EUD account. Can we quantify the number of likes, retweets or views of an event?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Number of followers on any social media accounts, like Facebook, Instagram, Twitter LinkedIn, etc.;</li> <li>3. Number of likes, shares, retweets of the contents prepared by the project team and published on any social media accounts;</li> <li>4. Number of times the hashtag promoted by the project is used on social media;</li> <li>5. Number of views;</li> <li>6. 'Other'.</li> </ol> <p>From this list it is clear that the European Commission has also accounted for the engagement notifications on any social media accounts. If you have access to the analytics for these accounts, then you can report on this using 'number of likes, retweets' or 'number of views' of the contents that you are developing. You will explain what the situation of the project you are implementing is, whether you have set up the project's dedicated online presence and social media, or whether you have developed content that is published otherwise.</p>
<p><b>2.18. What indicator and data sources would you use to provide evidence that a project raised awareness on a topic or strengthened understanding of the EU partners on a topic?</b></p>	<p>These two examples of results are typically at output level in the project portfolio when they are related to a targeted stakeholder group (namely a clearly defined stakeholder group).</p> <p>Among core output indicators, one indicator is relevant: <i>'Percentage of participants who report having benefitted from the event organised'</i>.</p> <p>The key word in this indicator is "benefit": there can be different benefits for participants resulting from their participation in the events you organised, e.g. their enhanced awareness / better understanding on a particular topic.</p> <p>To use this indicator, the project team will identify benefits that can reasonably be expected from event participation and select a data collection tool that will allow to collect participants' feedback (so that the team has evidence to report on the benefits actually delivered). The quantification and description of the benefits in your reporting will be based on the responses provided by the participants.</p> <p>Typically, the data collection tool will be a satisfaction survey, circulated to the event's participants after the event took place.</p> <p>To evidence this type of results, you can also use proxies. If you are preparing knowledge-based products and/or communication products, the fact that you can report that these products have been delivered also contributes to evidencing that the targeted stakeholder group is more informed / more aware of a particular topic.</p> <p>More generally, if you have any questions related to possible sources of verification and data collection tools, please refer to the PIMS guidance: it includes a mapping of common data collection tools against the core indicators.</p>
<p><b>2.19. How to be sure about what is an output and what is an outcome?</b></p>	<p>The key consideration when you want to draw a line between outputs and outcomes is the level of control that a project will have on the achievement of the results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ If the result you are considering is fully under the control of the project, it should be set at output level;</li> <li>➤ If the result you are considering is not fully under the control of the project, it should be set at outcome level.</li> </ul> <p>Please also keep in mind that the results chain is relative in the sense that an output or an outcome of a project might be an input to another project.</p>
<p><b>2.20. Is the provision of data broken down by gender always necessary?</b></p>	<p>It is indeed important and required because the European Commission reports on gender indicators at the overarching level.</p>



## Questions

## Answers

When the core indicator fiches ask to provide data broken down by gender, it is a requirement. For instance, this is the case when you use the indicator ‘*Number of participants in the events organised or supported*’. In this case, you will report the total number of participants in all the events you have organised/supported, and you will also report the breakdown by gender (please also remember that when you use this indicator, you are required to cover other breakdown categories, e.g. related to participants’ background).

Project teams have experienced a challenge with this requirement because it is based on two predefined categories (male/female). The Commission’s reporting on gender data is binary. But in some countries, it might be an issue as (a) you might want to have other categories or (b) the question on gender is not appropriate.

When you are faced with situation (a), you can design your data collection tools as appropriate for the context in which you are implementing the project (for instance, adding a third category and a “prefer not to say” category, etc.) and then report the monitoring data against the two set categories while explaining, in the qualitative narrative, that a share of participants provided another response. So that explains that if we add up the number of male and female participants, this will not correspond to the total number of participants.

When you are faced with situation (b), you can do an estimate. For example, if you organise a conference, and when you set up a registration form, you know it is too sensitive to ask the participants about their gender, so it might not be possible to put it in the form. But the day of the conference, the project team can do a sample of the participants and see the overall proportion of women and men.

Then, when you report on the data, caveat the results by explaining that the information could not be collected from the participants and why, and adding that you have estimated the number of M/F participants.

Overall, the requirement to provide data broken down by gender is also a prompt for each project to reflect on gender and whether a differentiated approach is needed to deliver a project based on gender.

### **2.21. How to reflect Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) considerations, as core indicators at outcome and impact levels do not refer to GESI?**

The wording of core indicators is flexible to give you the possibility to monitor and report on GESI-related progress.

Each core indicator at outcome and impact level refers to processes, stakeholders’ engagement in particular policy areas, development of approaches / practices. The key for you if you are implementing a project related to GESI is to *qualify* the process, engagement, approaches/practices you are aiming to influence.

You will do so by providing qualitative narratives on the baseline and target of your project, as well as on the indicator value in your reporting. These qualitative narratives give you the possibility to define exactly what the project is aiming to influence (in this case, in relation to GESI) as well as to elaborate on the results achieved.

You should not change the title of the core indicators. If, and only if, the project has expected objectives which cannot ‘fall’ under any of the categories defined in the core indicators would you consider creating a customised indicator. Please note that the new indicator proposed should be approved by the Service for Foreign Policy Instruments.

Besides, the European Commission has revised the list of core indicators to include one core outcome indicator and one core impact indicator related to gender equality. Consider if these indicators are the relevant ones to monitor the project you’re implementing / managing.

Questions	Answers
<p><b>2.22. Regarding gender mainstreaming, are there any EU guidelines to help conduct a gender analysis and include this perspective in projects?</b></p>	<p>EU gender funding is guided by a number of strategies, including the <a href="#">European Gender Equality Strategy for 2020-2025</a> and the EU Gender Action Plan III - <a href="#">GAP III</a>. The ‘<a href="#">European Consensus on Development</a>’ and the <a href="#">EU Global Strategy</a> identify equality and women’s empowerment as a cross-cutting issue for all EU policies and set out priorities including empowering women and girls, ending violence against women and girls, and ending harmful practices.</p> <p>Methods and tools for gender analysis are available online at <a href="https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/methods-tools/gender-analysis">https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/methods-tools/gender-analysis</a>.</p> <p>The possibility of setting a new Helpdesk on gender is being discussed at the European Commission.</p> <p>Guidelines on gender mainstreaming have also been issued by other donors, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UN - Handbook on gender mainstreaming for gender equality results,</li> <li>- UN - Gender Analysis in Technical Areas: Energy Infrastructure;</li> <li>- UN - Gender mainstreaming principles, dimensions and priorities for preventing violent extremism, etc).</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.23. How to avoid double counting?</b></p> <p><b>To avoid duplications, should we focus on one outcome indicator even if several outcome indicators could be used?</b></p>	<p>You should use only the monitoring indicators which are <i>relevant and necessary</i> to report on the results delivered.</p> <p>If you think that several core indicators would help you to monitor progress against one of your expected outcomes, it is likely that you will need to refine the definition of your objectives, the key features of the process(es) you are aiming to influence and what success will look like. On this basis, you will be able to choose the relevant and necessary indicator.</p> <p>The key is to think about what you are describing in your results. Very often it is quite straightforward to notice the duplication in your result reporting, even if you are using, for instance, two different indicators. If you read again both the current value that you are reporting against each of these two indicators, and then possibly the qualitative description of this result/value that you are reporting against each indicator, you will notice yourself that you are presenting the same result twice. This is typically what would be qualified as ‘double counting’ or ‘double reporting’ and it should be avoided.</p> <p>When it comes to the number of indicators to select in a logframe, there is no threshold or a minimum number. What you need to consider is to select the relevant and necessary indicators, which provide a good description of the results that your project is delivering or contributing to. They should not only be <i>relevant</i>, but also <i>sufficient/necessary</i>, to make sure that every result delivered by the project is reported and reported only once and not several times.</p> <p>In some cases, several core indicators will be relevant and necessary to report on one expected outcome. To double check that you are not at risk of double reporting, ask yourself: is the information I will report under each of the two indicators considered different? Or is it the same information? If the latter, there is a high risk it will constitute double reporting and you should reconsider.</p> <p>For example, when the EU was preparing for the Paris summit, it was deploying its climate change diplomacy at several levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At state level, implying the core indicator ‘<i>Number of processes related to the positions partner countries take in the run-up to, or during, regional/ international fora which have been influenced</i>’ could be used;</li> <li>2. At sub-state level, implying the core indicator ‘<i>Number of processes related to state-level and sub-state level (bilateral, regional, multi-lateral) partnership strategies and policy dialogues which have been influenced</i>’ could be used;</li> <li>3. With non-state stakeholders, implying the core indicator ‘<i>Number of processes related to non-state level partnerships / agreements which have been influenced</i>’ could be used.</li> </ol>

Questions	Answers
	<p>Depending on the different dimensions your project tackles, it might be relevant and necessary to use all 3 indicators or a mix of them, or only one.</p> <p>Therefore, it is critical to define exactly what process(es) you are aiming to influence.</p>
<p><b>2.24. What is considered a “partnership” in core indicators? This seems open to different interpretations, so how do we make it more specific?</b></p>	<p>You will provide all necessary details when you are reporting against the core indicator concerned, using notably the qualitative information which is required to provide, together with the baseline, target and current indicator value.</p> <p>The title of core indicators is relatively general to give the flexibility to the monitoring system to cover all projects funded by the EU and to allow for the aggregation of results across this project portfolio. For these reasons, you cannot change/revise the title of core indicators.</p> <p>Instead, the PIMS has another built-in feature which allows you to define exactly what “partnership” (or approach, process, practice, etc.) means for the project you are implementing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <u>The system is using qualitative data.</u></li> </ul> <p>If you look at the reporting requirements, you will notice that for almost all indicators (especially at outcome and impact levels), you are required to provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A qualitative narrative to explain the baseline;</li> <li>2. A qualitative narrative to explain the target and define what success will look like;</li> <li>3. A qualitative narrative to justify the indicator value you report.</li> </ol> <p>All details and specifics you want to provide on a project, you will do so in these qualitative narratives.</p>
<p><b>2.25. How do we make the difference between an approach and a practice by a partner country?</b></p>	<p>Typically, an approach is a political commitment while a practice is a policy, a piece of legislation, etc. that the partner country will implement. A political commitment is good and a first step but does not systematically translate into a practice.</p> <p>For example, the signature of the Paris Agreement signalled all signatories were committing to a certain approach to tackle climate change. The “practice” would be any instrument adopted by the signatories to implement the Paris Agreement.</p>
<p><b>2.26. Why are approaches and practices aggregated at impact level although the impact is quite different?</b></p>	<p>The wording of an impact indicator reflects the ultimate objective of the approaches and practices the funded projects are aiming to influence: a project is not trying to influence an approach or a practice for the sake of the approach or the practice, but because the approach/practice is a means to an end (e.g. addressing challenges of global concern).</p>
<p><b>2.27. Can you change the wording of the indicator ‘Number of processes related to non-state level partnerships / agreements which have been influenced’, replacing “non-state level” by “governance agencies”?</b></p>	<p>Core indicators allow for aggregation of everything delivered across the project portfolio to assess what the EU’s financing instrument overall is achieving. You <u>should not change the wording of core indicators</u> because a change would imply that aggregation is not possible anymore.</p> <p>Looking at the core indicators, you might either focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ‘Number of processes related to state level and sub state level (bilateral, regional, multilateral) partnerships strategies and policy dialogues which have been influenced’</li> <li>or on:</li> <li>➤ ‘Number of processes related to non-state level partnership/agreements which have been influenced’.</li> </ul>

Questions	Answers
	Choose whichever indicator reflects best the process you are trying to influence and the stakeholder / governance level you are targeting.
<p><b>2.28. Regarding the “number of processes” that are influenced (as seen in the title of core outcome indicators), what will be the quantitative value reported?</b></p>	<p>Based on the objectives set for the project you are implementing we strongly advise you to define what this means in concrete terms and what success will look like. The quantitative value you will report will reflect whether or not the project was successful.</p> <p>Please keep in mind that even if the title sounds quantitative (with the reference to “<i>number of...</i>”), most indicators are actually both quantitative and qualitative: the PIMS core indicator fiches and reporting requirements explain what information you are expected to provide. In most cases, you will be expected to provide a qualitative narrative, explaining what process was influenced, how and to what extent the project influenced the process, etc. that will justify the quantitative value you reported.</p>
<p><b>2.29. Regarding core outcome indicators on processes, how can we prove that the project actually influenced a government-to-government new strategy/agreement, etc.? I find it rather impossible that the EC tends to set the new dialogues and partnerships on specific issues without involving the project. The project is usually an output of a partnership.</b></p>	<p>This is where the qualitative narrative is very important, to explain what was the specific contribution of the process to a policy dialogue or an agreement, etc. There can be different types of contributions: for example, through the events that you organised, you can provide information that can lead to specific decisions or certain elements that can lead to increasing this objective. So that's why the qualitative narrative is so important to have, because if you only provide the number of processes, it doesn't tell us anything about the specific process that the project contributed to. Even if you need to achieve this at outcome level, it is also true that it's not fully under the control of the project. Remember that you need to be realistic in terms of how you frame or what you define as a particular process, so that you can realistically measure it and show that you have been contributing to it (e.g. you can contribute to policy dialogue through having stakeholders join in meetings and discuss specific topics or providing information on the topics and main issues of the policy dialogue or the meetings). There are several ways in which you can contribute, which do not mean that your project will be fully contributing to, taking into account that there are several other factors at play when discussing these topics.</p> <p>We have seen examples where, for instance, in the framework of a particular policy dialogue or in the framework of a strategic partnership between the EU and a partner country, the declaration, a communication from the high-level sources would actually acknowledge the contribution made by the project to progress achieved through a particular agenda or particular policy areas. Even if you are not doing a policy dialogue for the EU, there is still a contribution in terms of engaging on a particular topic or moving towards a particular agenda and that can be recognised in the general framework of the relationship, e.g. a particular policy dialogue or a particular strategic partnership.</p>
<p><b>2.30. Questions on the core outcome indicator: ‘Number of articles published in print and/or digital media about an event’? What does “articles” refer to?</b></p> <p><b>How to horizontally communicate on something that is continued throughout the project without having a specific event (e.g. communication of a film festival)?</b></p>	<p>This indicator aims to capture any coverage in print / social media generated by a project on a certain topic. It is likely that the number of articles on social media will be much higher than in print media. That is something you will define when setting your target (and which will be explained in the qualitative narrative accompanying the target).</p> <p>You must make a decision on what you want to report on, i.e., either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different tools, linked to a specific event (e.g. leaflets and videos produced for the film festival), which you would communicate individually; or</li> <li>• A series of combined communication activities, which is perceived as communication campaign with one particular objective (communication about the film festival).</li> </ul> <p>Whatever you may decide, it is important not to count the same element several times, i.e. that you do not count the individual products and then the communication campaign as such.</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>Please note that this outcome indicator should not be confused with the following core output indicator: ‘<i>Number of communication products developed</i>’. The key difference between these 2 indicators is the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At output level: report the communication products which the project team has prepared itself;</li> <li>2. At outcome level: report the articles published which the project team has not prepared, but the coverage generated by the interest for a particular topic raised by the project you are delivering.</li> </ol>
<p><b>2.31. Will the EC provide a guideline on outcome and impact indicators by thematic area?</b></p>	<p>The guidance for the selection of outcome and impact indicators already exists and relates to the objectives of the EU’s financing instrument.</p> <p>There are several specific objectives / outcomes and overall objectives / impacts set at the financing instrument level. These objectives frame what the individual projects funded are doing: individual projects are expected to contribute to these overall objectives.</p> <p>The overall objectives are reflected in the wording of the core indicators. Depending on which overall objective(s) your project is expected to contribute, select the relevant indicators from the list of core indicators.</p>
<p><b>2.32. Is there a core impact indicator related to public diplomacy?</b></p>	<p>There is one core impact indicator related to the public diplomacy objective of the EU’s financing instrument, namely: ‘<i>Number of articles on the EU in the partner country</i>’. But often public diplomacy projects contribute to the overall strengthening of the partnership / policy dialogue between the EU and the partner country concerned. In this case, you would select the corresponding core impact indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ ‘<i>Number of EU regional, inter-regional, bi-lateral and multi-lateral cooperation partnership strategies (incl. strategies to address challenges of global concern) which have been developed, adopted or implemented</i>’;</li> <li>➤ ‘<i>Number of EU bilateral, regional, inter-regional and multi-lateral cooperation partnership strategies which have been enhanced</i>’ (only if the project is funded by the Partnership Instrument from the MFF 2014-2020).</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.33. Can I select a core outcome indicator related to trade even if my project is not trade-specific?</b></p>	<p>You <i>should</i> select all indicators which are relevant and necessary to report comprehensively on all the dimensions of your project. Even if trade is not the primary objective of your project, you might still be working on a trade-related dimension and as such one (or more) trade-specific core outcome indicator(s) might be relevant and necessary. In this case, select this indicator in your LFM, make sure you define specifically the process, barriers to trade, etc. you are trying to tackle and report progress against this indicator.</p>
<p><b>2.34. How to evidence that a project is delivering certain outcomes or impacts?</b></p>	<p>When you prepare / revise a project LFM, you make sure that the results chain is logical, that each of its different levels logically follows from the previous level. You also make sure to have a realistic approach to outcome setting: any project should be able to deliver the expected outcomes by the end of its implementation phase.</p> <p>Throughout implementation, you will ensure that you collect monitoring data which will evidence that certain results are being delivered and that the project concerned is contributing to these results (e.g. a strategic document issued by a partner country might formally recognise the momentum triggered by the funded project concerned in a certain policy area).</p> <p>At outcome and impact levels, it is important to recognise that the results do not depend on the project concerned only. There is likely a range of external factors playing, as well as other EU interventions and the action from other donors. By developing the “contribution story” of the project to the set objectives, you recognise that other factors are important and playing a role</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>in delivering the results. You will not be able to describe / evidence the contribution of the other factors / interventions, and you are not expected to.</p>
<p><b>2.35. What if we don't find evidence that the expected impact has been delivered by the end of a project?</b></p>	<p>It is likely that, in most cases, funded projects will not be able to provide evidence that the expected impacts have been delivered.</p> <p>In most cases, project teams will be able to report that “things are moving in the right direction”: there will be emerging evidence that in longer term the impact will be achieved. But often, impacts are very long-term results to which many different programmes / interventions / donors will contribute. Generally, impacts don't materialise within the lifetime of a project. This implies that most project teams will not be able to report actual impacts, even in their final reporting exercise.</p> <p>This is also a key distinction with the expected outcomes for any project: it is critical to remember that outcomes are expected to be delivered by the end of the project (so the project team is expected to report on these outcomes and evidence the outcomes achieved) while impacts will take more time to materialise.</p>
<p><b>2.36. What if it seems that none of the core impact indicators really fit with what a project is doing?</b></p>	<p>The wording of core indicators is relatively generic to ensure they have the broadest coverage possible and allow for aggregation of the results delivered across the whole project portfolio.</p> <p>It is important, based on your LFM, to define exactly what process(es) you are looking to influence, what the key features of this process are and to choose the corresponding indicator(s). Once you have agreed the results chain in your LFM, make sure to define the specific objectives and overall objectives in concrete terms, as well as what success will look like. It will support the selection of monitoring indicators and will help you understand how to use them.</p> <p>In very exceptional cases core indicators will not be enough to report on the progress made. In this case, you can create a “customised indicator” which requires special approval from the Service for Foreign Policy Instruments.</p> <p>For example, in the original list of core indicators, you had at output level indicators related to EU companies' participation in the events project teams were organising and their feedback on these events. But you did not have indicators related to non-EU companies. Back then, you needed to create a customised indicator to monitor the participation and feedback of non-EU companies. But the list of core indicators has been updated and indicators related to non-EU companies have been integrated as core indicators. That is one example which shows that the list of core indicators really aims to be as comprehensive as possible.</p> <p>The list of core indicators could also be revised further if it is observed that several projects are creating the same customised indicator (which would indicate that this indicator is relevant for the project portfolio as a whole). Any further revision of the list of indicators will be communicated by the Service for Foreign Policy Instruments.</p>
<p><b>2.37. What core indicator to use to report on the participation of EU Member States in an Action?</b></p>	<p>There are no core indicators related to the participation of EU Member States, because of the nature of the funding mobilised: the Actions supported should target partner countries (namely they have a non-EU focus). But it is possible to report on the participation of EU Member States by including the information in the qualitative narrative when reporting on any core indicator: the participation of the Member States will not be the expected result of an Action, but that might be a success factor or relevant to describe a baseline (also in the context of the Team Europe approach). For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ When reporting on the participation in the events organised/supported, you can detail the participation of Member States' representatives;</li> </ul>

Questions	Answers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ When reporting on the number of knowledge-based products, the description of these products might refer to (for instance) best practices identified in Member States in a particular policy area;</li> <li>➤ When reporting on a core outcome or impact indicator, you might qualify the baseline by highlighting existing Member States initiatives also implemented in the targeted policy area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.38. What if an Action is implemented by two different organisations: how to prevent double counting and double reporting?</b></p>	<p>In case an Action is implemented by two organisations, you will need to set ground rules to avoid double counting (namely while monitoring the Action, the two organisations should not collect the same information several times) and double reporting (the two organisations should not report the same information separately). A few examples you might consider and adapt depending on the situation of the Action you are implementing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ If an event is organised jointly, agree which organisation will collect data and report on the event so that it is counted and reported only once;</li> <li>➤ Depending on the contractual arrangements, each implementing organisation might report separately, and/or there might be a joint reporting exercise. For this joint reporting exercise, ensure that anything delivered jointly is reported only once. Agree how to consolidate the monitoring data for reporting;</li> <li>➤ If the respective organisations are implementing standalone dimensions of the Action, each organisation should be responsible for its own monitoring and report on the dimension it is responsible for.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.39. If the results of the previous/first phase of a project are mentioned, shouldn't they be factored for the new one/second phase?</b></p>	<p>Baselines are set at zero by definition in the PIMS - this reflects the fact that baselines are the starting point of the project (it does not mean that nothing was happening before the project started).</p> <p>When a project is a second phase or a follow up project, if the results of the previous phase of the project are mentioned, they can be factored in the new one/ the follow-up/the second phase. However, there is more than one way to factor the results delivered by the first phase, and you do not necessarily need to have a positive baseline.</p> <p>What you can do is to have the baseline as zero, but when you fill out the qualitative description of this baseline, you explain that this is a follow-up project on a particular topic, that certain activities have been delivered and a number of results have been achieved already. If you do it in this qualitative description, then it is clear that there is no duplication in terms of the quantitative aggregation, i.e. no double counting between the first and the second phase of the project. At the same time, it is still acknowledged that this is the second phase that is now being implemented and that it builds on what has been achieved during the first phase.</p>
<p><b>2.40. How does FPI.4 do the aggregation of all project results?</b></p>	<p>The FPI.4 Unit (renamed FPI.3 as of February 2023) has been preparing its annual report yearly, aggregating the monitoring evidence across the whole project portfolio. The aggregation concerned both:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quantitative data (all results reported quantitatively against the core indicators are consolidated);</li> <li>2. Qualitative data, notably to support the thematic evaluations or evaluations of individual funded projects which are delivered.</li> </ol> <p>Please be aware that from the 2023 exercise on, as reporting is to be done in OPSYS, the data uploaded in the IT platform may be used for aggregation of all results.</p>



### 3. Reporting

Questions	Answers
<p><b>3.1. Where can we find the last version of the PIMS guidelines?</b></p>	<p>The PIMS Guidelines are available on Capacity4Dev/PIMS Group at <a href="https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/pims-fpi-4-support-partnership-instrument-monitoring-system-/documents/fpi4-pims-guidelines-14-dec-2021">https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/pims-fpi-4-support-partnership-instrument-monitoring-system-/documents/fpi4-pims-guidelines-14-dec-2021</a>. They have not been revised yet to reflect the reorganisation of FPI, which was implemented in February 2023.</p>
<p><b>3.2. Is there a specific online space where we should directly input our Evaluation, M&amp;E Results?</b></p>	<p>The results reporting from this year onwards is happening exclusively in OPSYS, an IT platform/ tool that the European Commission has developed. In OPSYS you will have project-specific control, in a sense and as you select different results, you also select the corresponding indicators and whenever there is a reporting deadline you will be required to upload the monitoring data and to report against the indicators that you have selected.</p>
<p><b>3.3. Are all existing grants also now reporting everything in OPSYS?</b></p>	<p>As of now all projects, irrespective of the type of contract, report through OPSYS and the link to OPSYS, should come from your EU Project Manager. They should invite you into OPSYS. At the same time, all of the companies that Implementing Partners work for should have been invited to OPSYS in a general way. However, that does not give you access to your specific project-related information and for that, you need to be invited by your EU Project Manager.</p> <p>For further information on OPSYS please check the EU External Action Wiki at:  <a href="https://wikis.ec.europa.eu/display/ExactExternalWiki/Latest+News">https://wikis.ec.europa.eu/display/ExactExternalWiki/Latest+News</a></p> <p>There you will find:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FAQ for Implementing Partners on logframes in OPSYS  <a href="https://wikis.ec.europa.eu/display/ExactExternalWiki/FAQ+-+OPSY+?preview=/33522332/44141858/FAQ%20for%20Implementing%20Partners%20webinars%20on%20OPSY%20Logframes+Final+ENGLISH.pdf">https://wikis.ec.europa.eu/display/ExactExternalWiki/FAQ+-+OPSY+?preview=/33522332/44141858/FAQ%20for%20Implementing%20Partners%20webinars%20on%20OPSY%20Logframes+Final+ENGLISH.pdf</a></li> <li>- e-Learning videos  <a href="https://wikis.ec.europa.eu/display/ExactExternalWiki/e-Learning+Videos+-+OPSY">https://wikis.ec.europa.eu/display/ExactExternalWiki/e-Learning+Videos+-+OPSY</a></li> </ul>
<p><b>3.4. What is the reporting frequency?</b></p>	<p>When it comes to the frequency of reporting, please refer to your ToR - they define the reporting requirements and will detail how often you are expected to upload the monitoring data into OPSYS, what reports you are expected to prepare and when to submit them.</p>
<p><b>3.5. When do we have to provide (progress) reports?</b></p>	<p>When reporting in OPSYS, you are required to fill out the data fields for the monitoring indicators you selected for your project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Quantitative baseline and qualitative narrative as appropriate;</li> <li>➤ Quantitative target, and qualitative narrative as appropriate;</li> <li>➤ Data sources;</li> <li>➤ Current indicator value (including disaggregation as appropriate); and</li> <li>➤ Qualitative narrative as appropriate. Note that qualitative reporting is a requirement for all core outcome and impact indicators, with few exceptions.</li> </ul> <p>Any other reporting requirements is contract-specific: please refer to your contract / ToR to clarify what these are.</p>



Questions	Answers
<p><b>3.6. Should the decision on whether to prepare a PIMS indicator reporting template on top of narrative report or not be consulted with the EU Project Manager?</b></p>	<p>The PIMS indicator reporting template is no longer necessary and has been discontinued, since the result reporting from now on is taking place in OPSYS. In any event, please check with the Operational Manager of your project whether s/he expects something else in addition to the results reporting in OPSYS.</p> <p>If you were using the PIMS reporting template, there was relevant information and hints available (as for instance whether or not you were expected to provide qualitative reporting for specific indicators). Therefore, it may still be helpful to have everything drafted using the PIMS reporting template, so that you can more easily copy-paste the data into OPSYS.</p>
<p><b>3.7. Is reporting cumulative?</b></p>	<p>Indeed, under the PIMS, reporting is cumulative: the report should include all monitoring data, from the kick-off of the project. It is important to remember that the rule of cumulative reporting applies to both quantitative and qualitative data. You should not remove any qualitative data from the successive PIMS reports you submit. Qualitative data are critical to justify/evidence the quantitative value reported for the indicators selected.</p>
<p><b>3.8. How should the PIMS reporting be presented?</b></p>	<p>Upload the monitoring data in OPSYS against each of the indicators you selected in your logframe.</p> <p>Confirm with the EC/EUD Project Manager concerned if the monitoring evidence should be annexed too (e.g. , when you report the preparation of communication products, should you annex copies of these products to the report?).</p> <p>Please also note that you are expected to submit a financial report to the EC/EUD Project Manager on the financial execution of the contract.</p>
<p><b>3.9. What information is needed to report on core indicators?</b></p>	<p>Whenever you use core indicators, you should always refer to the core indicator fiches and the reporting requirements - they frame the reporting on the core indicators.</p> <p>If you are missing some of the data required in reporting (e.g. when you started using a core indicator, you did not account for the requirement to collect data disaggregated by gender), follow these 2 steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Caveat the historical data you present in the reporting (explaining that until a certain point in time, the data were not disaggregated as required);</li> <li>➤ Update your data collection tools to reflect all the different dimensions required and collect the necessary data.</li> </ul> <p>Also remember that the monitoring data you report against the indicators will likely inform future decision-making (e.g. decision on a follow-up project, support to the design of a future project, etc.).</p>
<p><b>3.10. Where should we write the qualitative part?</b></p>	<p>There are text boxes in the reporting interface, clearly marked, where you are expected to provide the three qualitative narratives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ One qualitative element is related to the baseline;</li> <li>➤ Another to the target; and</li> <li>➤ The third to the current value that you are reporting.</li> </ul> <p>Please refer to the PIMS core indicator fiches to confirm when it is required to provide qualitative data when using any particular core indicator.</p>

Questions	Answers
<b>3.11. What is the difference between the target and the current value?</b>	For any indicator, the target is what a project is <i>expected to deliver</i> . The current value is <i>the actual result delivered</i> .
<b>3.12. Is it possible to use the same indicator for different results?</b>	When you create your logframe in OPSYS, you shall enter each of the expected results individually and select the relevant and necessary indicator for each of these results. It is possible to use the same indicator for different results.
<b>3.13. Can the qualitative narrative of the ‘Number of processes related to partner country practices contributing to the implementation of the international dimension of internal Union policies’ be statements collected on the impacts of the Action to promote the EU solutions facilitating the low carbon practices in the target market?</b>	You should make the distinction between (1) the title of the indicator, (2) the target and (3) the data sources used to report on this core indicator. You need to define the kind of practices you are looking at, what success is expected to look like in the partner country targeted. To <i>define</i> these practices by the statement collected on the impact of the Action to promote the EU solutions in the field of low carbon technology could artificially inflate the indicator value, because you would probably want to report every single statement collected as an individual (quantitative) outcome. ➤ The way the indicator is formulated and the variable that you are trying to monitor / measure with this indicator is about what is happening in this partner country. It means that you are talking about a national practice, which is perhaps about the facilitation of transition of the partner country to low carbon technology (as an example). ➤ One source of evidence that you could use to justify the practices being taken up are the statements on the impact of the Action. They show that stakeholders in the field of low carbon technology recognise that the project has put this topic on the agenda and have engaged with it. It is likely that you would not report on each individual statement as individual outcome each, because the focus should be on the approach/practice within this partner country. The practice would rather be about the facilitation of the transition to low carbon technologies and the statements on the stakeholders would be used as evidence.
<b>3.14. When it is required to report disaggregated data, can a qualitative description suffice?</b>	When it is required to provide disaggregated data, it is a strict requirement. In these cases, providing a qualitative description will not be enough. These requirements are described in the core indicator fiches you will find in the PIMS guidance: these fiches provide the exact definition of each core indicator, and detail how you should use each of them, including when there is a requirement to provide disaggregated data. If you miss some of the data required in reporting (e.g. when you started using a core indicator, you did not account for the requirement to collect data disaggregated by gender), follow these 2 steps: ➤ Caveat the historical data you present in the reporting, explaining that until a certain point in time, the data were not disaggregated as required; ➤ Update your data collection tools to reflect on the different dimensions required and collect the necessary data moving forward.
<b>3.15. In the case of a regional project, should we report on the aggregated indicators, or should</b>	Since your contract is set at global level, you will provide the aggregated value for each indicator. For example: you will provide the total number of communication products developed across the different target countries.

Questions	Answers
<p><b>we report by country and then aggregated for the whole project?</b></p>	<p>Then, you should provide qualitative information about the value of the indicator you are reporting. There, it is relevant to provide the breakdown of the aggregated value reported to explain how that relates to each of the target countries. It is the best way to do it and it might also help you highlight some of the differences between the target countries as not all might be keen to engage with the EU on any topic to the same extent. You will use the qualitative narrative to report at the individual country level and to highlight any similarities/differences between the target countries.</p> <p>You can detail that information both in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The target narrative;</li> <li>2. The narrative accompanying the current indicator value you report.</li> </ol>
<p><b>3.16. If the feedback is positive according to the local culture but looking at the event from a professional perspective it is weak, how to report and monitor that related to quantity and realistic quality?</b></p>	<p>Explain these caveats in the qualitative narrative accompanying the current indicator value you are reporting on.</p> <p>For example: when a project team administers a satisfaction survey after an event, the response rate is often low. Thus, even if the feedback, based on the responses collected, is positive, you need to put this in perspective, indicating that it comes from e.g. 30% of the participants only. It helps the reader understand the situation.</p> <p>In any case, you can always report the numbers. When organising physical events, you can count the participants. If/when you really do not have the information afterwards, qualitative information in the report becomes even more important. This is where you can explain that you counted participants but could not ask them even to tick a box indicating they were present. You would explain this in the qualitative part. The fact that it was in fact a “weak” event is something you would put in the qualitative part.</p>
<p><b>3.17. Where can we add “open” project quality and risks information?</b></p>	<p>To the extent that qualitative elements related to project quality, or risks, are related to indicators, and if this information helps you explain the values of the indicators that you are reporting, then it needs to be included in the qualitative reporting.</p>
<p><b>3.18. Where can we make recommendations for improvements?</b></p>	<p>For those who have been implementing a project for some time and thinking about the next phase or follow on a project, there might already be some discussions with the EC/EUD Project Manager related to the formulation of recommendations. The reporting is not meant to capture these recommendations (the reporting focuses on the results delivered).</p> <p>The set of recommendations is in fact something to discuss with the project’s Steering Committee.</p>
<p><b>3.19. How is individual reporting used by the instrument at an aggregate level?</b></p>	<p>The systematic and consistent use of predefined core PIMS indicators makes it possible to consolidate results delivered by funded projects, which the Service for Foreign Policy Instruments can in turn communicate on. Hence the importance of using the core indicators, so that comparable results can be analysed in an aggregate way at the instrument level.</p> <p>In addition to using the core indicators, the qualitative narrative supporting the quantitative data provided is very important to contextualise and explain the contribution of the project to the broader objectives of the funding instrument/s.</p>

## 4. Data collection

Questions	Answers
<p><b>4.1. When should we do the data collection?</b></p>	<p>We strongly recommend that you agree your data collection strategy at the outset of the project and prepare all data collection tools. It is very important that you collect the data on an ongoing basis, throughout the implementation of the project.</p> <p>Failing to collect data on an ongoing basis means that you will likely have substantial data gaps when preparing the different reports for submission and in general it is not possible to collect the data after some time has passed (e.g. for instance, if you organise an event, it does not make sense to send event participants a survey a couple of years after the event to collect their feedback: participants will not be in a position to respond accurately to the survey question after such a long time).</p> <p>Make sure that you have clear data collection processes in place within the project team and clear roles and responsibilities. File the monitoring evidence properly and consolidate the data as you go.</p> <p>That will make it easier to prepare for the reporting every time it is required.</p>
<p><b>4.2. Are there any specific data collection tools endorsed by PIMS, e.g. online survey instruments?</b></p>	<p>Yes, there is a list of several data collection tools that you could use. Online survey instruments are currently very useful tools that are widely used. There is a comprehensive list of data collection tools, including online surveys, interviews, focus groups, desk reviews, where you can also see the pros and cons of the different tools. The information you will find in the PIMS guidance is the typology of the data collection tools and where they would be most relevant in relation to the core indicators applicable for this portfolio.</p>
<p><b>4.3. What if an indicator requires data to be collected through a survey but the response rate to the survey is low?</b></p>	<p>When you use indicators relying on the implementation of surveys, make sure that you highlight possible limitations in the qualitative narrative accompanying the value you report. The percentage you will report is out of the respondents to the survey (not the total participants in the event you are aiming to collect feedback from). It is necessary to specify the response rate achieved to put the results in perspective and give a more accurate picture of the situation.</p>
<p><b>4.4. In case we missed to include one question in the satisfaction survey of an event and therefore did not collect specific data from participants about one specific indicator value, how should we best report and reflect this in the overall results? Should we mention that for X event Z value is not available/omitted for whatever reason?</b></p>	<p>That is indeed the best way forward. This strategy can be best illustrated by an <b>example</b>: a project targeting businesses in the field of renewable energy implemented over a three-year period and expected to deliver a yearly match-making event between the EU and non-EU businesses in the field of renewable energies.</p> <p>The project team implements a satisfaction survey after each of these events and asks the participants to report on what they feel were the benefits of attending this matchmaking session. The first year was on the networking opportunities and the fact that the participants found out about funding opportunities as well. By breaking down the question after the end of the first event, for the second and third year, the project team has added to the options available, so it is not only about the networking or funding opportunities anymore, but also about the partnership agreements that businesses might have signed between themselves. For the first year, the project was able to report only on two of the benefits, while for years two and three, they could report on three different types of benefits.</p> <p>The best way to approach this particular case would be to do the following in the OPSYS result reporting interface:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Report the current value and in the ‘comment’ box, explain the results reported;</li> <li>➤ Add a methodological caveat, explaining that the options available to the respondents have slightly evolved over time, i.e. for the first year, they had the choice between ‘such’ and ‘such’ option, and then from year X, they could choose between a few more options as well. This represents a good caveat of the results reported.</li> </ul>

Questions	Answers
<p><b>4.5. Shall we select a monitoring indicator for which data is hard or impossible to find?</b></p>	<p>It is important to ensure that you can use all the monitoring indicators you select.</p> <p>Think carefully about how you can collect the monitoring data to report against any particular indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ If you cannot collect the data, it means that you will not be in a position to use this indicator in the end;</li> <li>➤ If you cannot process / analyse the data you collected, it also means that you will not be in a position to use this indicator.</li> </ul> <p>Ensure that you can collect / process / analyse the data for each indicator you select. The LFM reminds you that this is a critical consideration by asking you to identify data sources for every single monitoring indicator selected.</p>
<p><b>4.6. Could you elaborate on what would be a reliable and non-reliable source of verification?</b></p>	<p>Given the geographical scope and the thematic scope of the projects funded by the PI, the situation might vary a lot.</p> <p>In some countries, governmental sources would be considered reliable. In other countries, governments might be less transparent and therefore the availability and reliability of the information could be a challenge, so you might turn to other sources (e.g. sources from the civil society).</p> <p>Overall, we suggest trying and triangulating all the sources: this means that you would compare and contrast information from different sources to confirm the information.</p>
<p><b>4.7. Regarding reporting on impact and also partly outcome, can we consider as evidence oral statements made during events organised by a project (e.g. by partner country policy-makers or civil society representatives) and which indicate that the project is seen by these persons as contributing to the change or progress?</b></p>	<p>This would indeed be one of the data sources possible for reporting on impact and partly outcome. There would probably need to be a few conditions fulfilled about the kind of events. These events would probably need to involve relatively high-level representatives (e.g. government decision-makers, government officials, etc.). It is important to make sure that they are relevant policy makers in terms of the level of seniority, their portfolio and responsibilities with regard to the policy scope of the project. The link between these representatives, on which the argument is based, and the topics that the project is trying to influence should be made clear when reporting.</p>
<p><b>4.8. What do you expect will be the consequences of COVID-19 on the availability of monitoring evidence?</b></p>	<p>With the rise of online activities (as opposed to face-to-face activities), particular data collection tools might be more challenging: typically, sending out a satisfaction survey after an online event is likely to see a lower response rate than in the case of a face-to-face events (where there are more opportunities to encourage participants to provide their feedback).</p> <p>It will be interesting to share lessons learned and good practices on the PIMS page of Capacity4Dev.</p>
<p><b>4.9. The COVID-19 crisis has forced us to organise online events instead of face-to-face events. With online events, it is often more challenging to survey participants to collect their feedback. Can we report on the number of participants in the events only?</b></p>	<p>It is important to select indicators which are relevant and necessary for the results you are trying to evidence. These indicators should also be realistic, namely you should have a data collection solution to collect the corresponding monitoring data.</p> <p>If you want to report on the benefits for event participants, it is best to be able to collect feedback from the participants.</p> <p>But it is not always possible, and, in some cases, you will need to use proxies instead. At output level, the fact that an event was well attended, that you succeeded in engaging the stakeholders you targeted is already a good result. At outcome level, you could also think about monitoring the media coverage of an event (using the core outcome indicator: '<i>Number of articles published in print/digital media</i>'). The fact that the event has triggered some media coverage also indicates that "something is happening", and that stakeholders are more engaged on the topic addressed.</p> <p>The final selection of indicators depends on what each project is doing, the policy area you are working on and the partner countries concerned.</p>

Questions	Answers
	<p>In the case of online events, you might even find it challenging to report on the number of events' participants: if you organise a public event online, for which registration is not possible, how can you report on the number of participants? For that, you can use online data analytics, monitor the number of persons connecting, do sample checks throughout the event to confirm how many participants are/remain connected, etc.</p>
<p><b>4.10. How do you measure an output related to the improvement of the business, trade, and investment climate in a partner country, for instance?</b> <b>What is the variable?</b></p>	<p>There could be several ways to look at it, depending on what the project you are implementing is doing. One option is to use the PIMS core indicator related to the <i>'Percentage of EU companies, which report a change in their perception of the business, trade, and investment climate'</i>.</p> <p>To collect data on this variable, you can think of a survey to the EU companies in a particular country and ask them how they feel about the business, trade, and investment climate in this country. If you repeat the survey at regular intervals, you can see the evolution of the companies' perceptions.</p>
<p><b>4.11. Regarding EU companies, do you have any tips on how to engage them? Does FPI or TRADE have a list of companies under regions? Besides our collaboration with EU Delegations is there any other way you suggest? (in order to increase the number of EU companies involved in our project activities and thus respond better to the indicator)</b></p>	<p>Our suggestion would be to contact relevant Chambers of Commerce, especially if your project is geographically oriented; if your project is "sectoral" you could contact relevant Producers' Associations (EU ones are based in Brussels).</p>
<p><b>4.12. To report a change of perception, should we not use a survey before and after an event to track changes?</b> <b>If we do not have a baseline, how can we possibly ensure a perception change happened?</b> <b>Could you share different examples or instruments?</b></p>	<p>Monitoring changes of perception is a tricky and challenging area, technically speaking. There are different scenarios.</p> <p>Some projects will have the opportunity to do a baseline survey and to track the evolution of stakeholders' perceptions on a regular basis throughout the implementation of the project. It means that they have a more comprehensive view of what is happening to a particular stakeholder group.</p> <p>In other cases, it is not possible to do a baseline survey, but you can potentially use alternative sources of evidence. For instance, the EU itself has funded a study on public perceptions of the EU around the world, providing information on public perceptions on the EU in many of the strategic partners of the EU. You can review this study to extract some information relevant to the country you are working in. This study is not the only literature reference that you can use. There are other academic or any other publications related either to a particular country or to a specific policy area. So, you can do a documentary review to take stock of what is known of public perception in a specific country.</p> <p>In terms of instruments, you may have a look at Eurobarometers as these are also looking at the EU public perceptions. Even if most of the time, Eurobarometers focus on the EU and not the outside world, you might get some inspiration based on the questions and the way the feedback is collected and follow the same logic.</p> <p>You may also measure progress on these indicators qualitatively, through interviews for example, which might be easier if it is about stakeholders that are engaged with the project.</p>

Questions	Answers
<p><b>4.13. In relation to a new “perception” indicator in logframe, would you suggest any particular possible options on how to collect the needed information? (for example: ‘Percentage of participants targeted by outreach and advocacy events who acknowledge a positive change in the perception of the EU and/or international policies and standards on Intellectual Property Rights’)</b></p>	<p>When it comes to this type of core outcome indicator, the idea is that you will use data collection tools, which allow you to provide evidence on the evolution in the medium term of the perception of the stakeholders, for instance, through a baseline study at the beginning of the project to understand the background, the situation you are facing and the issues of particular concern for the stakeholders and then every year you can have a repeat of this study, asking the same questions to the same stakeholder group to show whether or not there is any evolution. Through this particular survey you can get their feedback about the factors which have triggered the change in their perception, i.e. if this is because they have attended some of the events that you are organising (e.g. training on the different tools to protect Intellectual Property Rights), and other elements which are instruments of the protection of intellectual property rights and which might make a difference for the stakeholders concerned. So most likely a tool such as a survey or stakeholder interviews could be used to collect the feedback from the participants to show an evolution in the medium term. That's something that you do not do as a ‘one-off’, but most likely repeated over time to show the evolution again.</p>
<p><b>4.14. How do we collect information from involved stakeholders while respecting the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)? How do we report on participants in a physical event when there is GDPR or policies that do not allow us to do that?</b></p>	<p>For all GDPR-related questions, please refer to your EC/EUD Project Manager to confirm the latest guidance available.</p> <p>In your contract with the European Commission, GDPR-related provisions are legally binding.</p> <p>The information that you include in the reporting is not personal information, so you would never provide the list of participants with the individual names, date of birth and job, for instance. You will provide the information in an aggregate format. You would report that X men and X women attended the event, X participants came from the private sector, X were government officials. The aggregation that you are required to do when using the PIMS might be a solution in this case.</p>
<p><b>4.15. It is sometimes challenging to identify sources of verification because of GDPR. There are often contradicting policies in the countries we work, including the prohibition to use, for example, United States based/hosted tools, with no alternative EU tools available.</b></p>	<p>GDPR is challenging to a certain extent when it comes to some data collection activities, only when these activities collect personal data.</p> <p>For example, you organise an event with a registration list of all the participants, then you need to provide evidence to the European Commission and confirm how you are dealing with these personal details. However, the source of verification is not only related to the personal details of the participants. It is also about gathering information related to policy development and in this case, it is about doing a desk review of official/strategic documents by the EU or a particular partner country on a specific topic. When it comes to the documentary review and the qualitative analysis of the high-level policy/strategic documents, there is no concern in terms of GDPR. The right balance is to have data collection that uses different sources tailored to the type of results that you will need to evidence. It is also related to the needs for triangulation and to the fact that you cannot rely on one single source to do the whole reporting on a project. It is probably better, especially in the field of foreign policy as it is the case for PI-funded projects to try to reconcile the different sources and make sure you have a robust evidence base.</p> <p>It is important to carefully think of data collection very early on, when implementing a project. When you select an indicator, you should identify a realistic data collection tool / data source. If from the beginning you know that GDPR makes the collection of these specific data that you are thinking of not possible, then you need to think of another indicator or another source of information, because if you already know it is impossible, you should not use that indicator or source.</p>