IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name

IPA III RF 1.2.1.2: Number of individuals from key national and local authorities and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) trained by the EU-funded intervention who increased their knowledge and/or skills for preventing and countering corruption, or organised crime, or violent extremism or environmental crime

2. Technical details

OPSYS and Results Dashboard code: 260224.

Unit of measure: Number of (#).

Type of indicator: *Quantitative: Numeric; Actual (ex-post); Cumulative (not annual).*

Level of measurement: This is an output indicator (it measures a result that is directly within the control of the IPA-funded intervention to deliver).

Disaggregation**:**

Where relevant / possible, please disaggregate by:

- Gender
- Entity from which they originate (central government/local government/civil society)
- Sector in which they are active and trained (corruption/organised crime/violent extremism/environmental crime)

At programme/window level, disaggregation is possible by IPA beneficiary

DAC sector codes: *15110; 15111; 15112; 15113; 15114; 15125; 15130; 15142; 15150; 15151; 15152; 15153; 15160; 15170; 15180; 15190*

Main associated SDG: **SDG 16**: Peace, Justice and Strong institutions. In particular, SDG 16a (Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime).

Other associated SDGs: n/a.

Associated IPA III Level 1 indicator:

- **Thematic priority 2** Fight against corruption: Fight against corruption (source: European Commission - – Enlargement Reports) (Ind. 1.2.1).
- **Thematic priority 6** Democracy: Voice and Accountability score (Source: WGI) (Ind. 1.6.1)
- **Thematic priority 7** Civil Society: Civil Society Participation Index (Source: sub-index of Participatory Component Index – [V-Dem]) (Ind. 1.7.1)

Associated IPA III Level 3 indicators: None.

3. Policy context and Rationale

- **IPA III PF:** This indicator is included in IPA III Results Framework for its relevance to **Window 1** – Rule of law, Fundamental rights and Democracy - **Thematic priority 2** Fight

against corruption; **Thematic priority 6** Democracy**;** and **Thematic priority 7** Civil Society.

- **Chapter of the _Acquis_.** The indicator responds especially to issues falling under Fundamental rights and Rule of Law and within this "Democracy". It is also relevant to **Chapter 23** Judiciary and Fundamental rights and **Chapter 24** Justice, Freedom and Security.

- "*The overall objective of IPA III under [window 1] is to strengthen the rule of law, democracy, the respect of human rights and international law, civil society and security as well as to improve migration management including border management. Providing a robust level of security, including fostering law enforcement as well as judicial cooperation in civil and criminal matters, strengthening police cooperation and fight against organised crime, cybercrime, terrorism, violent extremism and gender-based violence remain crucial while upholding fundamental rights. With this in mind, EU's assistance will focus on further developing the legislative framework, […], strengthening relevant institutions and capacities, and continue encouraging IPA III beneficiaries to step up operational cooperation with the aim of establishing a convincing track-record and concrete results. Civil society remains a crucial partner […]. Therefore, IPA III will support both the creation of an enabling environment for a strong and vibrant civil society and the capacities of civil society itself*". (IPA III Programming Framework, p. 13)

- Within this framework, the indicator aims to measure how members of public organisations or non-governmental organisations have improved their knowledge or skills relating to issues linked to aspects of good governance and the rule of law.

4. Values to report

All of the following values must be determined according to the definitions provided in Section 5 below.

- **Reporting values in the logframe:**
  - **Baseline value**: The value assumed by the indicator at time t0, against which progress will be assessed.
  - **Reporting of current value** is done at least once a year: actual latest value on the total number of individuals by the time of reporting and according to the applicable definitions provided in section 5 of the note. Values will be reported cumulatively across the whole implementation period.
  - **Final target value**: estimated total number of individualsby the target year and according to the applicable definitions provided in section 5 of the note.

- **Intermediate targets (milestones).** A tool has been developed in OPSYS to automate the generation of intermediate targets[1].

---

[1] This has been done in the framework of the **Intervention Performance Assessment.** Two composite indicators have been developed to provide an overall assessment of an intervention's current implementation and future prospects. These scores will be calculated for all NEAR interventions participating in the annual results data collection exercise.

- The **implementation score** reflects the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness already achieved by the intervention. The information on relevance is provided by the Operational manager's response to a question in a survey. The information on efficiency and effectiveness is provided by the logframe data, if sufficiently available, or the response to a question in a survey, if not.

- The **risk score** reflects expectations regarding the most probable levels of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability to be achieved by the

- For outputs, the intermediate targets are generated using a linear interpolation between the baseline and target values because it is assumed that outputs materialise sooner and more progressively over implementation (than outcomes).
- For outcomes, the expected progression over the course of implementation will vary across interventions. During the creation of a logframe, the expected outcome profile must be selected (OPSYS offers four options[2]) and this selection triggers the generation of intermediate targets for all 30 June and 31 December dates between the baseline and target dates for all output and outcome quantitative indicators. All automatically generated intermediate targets values and dates can be subsequently modified by the Operational Manager or the Implementing Partner with the approval of the Operational Manager.

5. Calculation of values

The value for this indicator is calculated by counting the **number of individuals**, using the Technical Definitions and Counting Guidance provided below. Please double check your calculations using the Quality Control Checklist below.

Technical Definitions

- For purposes of this indicator, a **CSO** is understood as a non-governmental, not-for-profit entity. It should ideally have a compatible legal personality (i.e. registered as such).[3] However, the EU considers civil society organisations to embrace a wide range of actors with multiple roles and mandates which includes all non-State, not-for-profit, independent and non-violent structures, through which people organise to pursue shared objectives and ideals, whether political, cultural, religious, environmental, social or economic or related to health. They include, but are not limited to: Non-governmental organisations, organisations representing indigenous peoples, women's and youth organisations, diaspora organisations, migrants' organisations, local traders' associations and citizens' groups, cooperatives, employers' associations and trade unions (social partners), organisations representing economic and social interests, organisations fighting corruption and fraud and promoting good governance, civil rights organisations and organisations combating discrimination, local organisations (including networks) involved in decentralised regional cooperation and integration, consumer organisations, environmental, teaching, cultural, research and scientific organisations, universities, churches and religious associations and communities, philosophical and non-confessional organisations, the not-for-profit media and any non-governmental associations and independent foundations, including independent political foundations.
- See for more background: https://tacso.eu/dg-near-guidelines-for-eu-support-to-civil-society-in-the-enlargement-region-2021-2027/
- The **individual** should be a recognised member of a national / local authority or CSO, and has been the beneficiary of training delivered by an intervention that has been financed fully or partly by IPA.
- The individuals should demonstrate an **increased level of knowledge or skills** in the areas in which they have been trained. Failure to demonstrate this means they should not be counted for purposes of this indicator. Therefore, relevant interventions must foresee

---

[2] a. Constant: The outcomes are achieved continuously throughout implementation; b. Accelerating: The outcomes are achieved towards the end of implementation; c. At the end: The outcomes are mostly achieved at the end of implementation; d. None of the above.

intervention in the future. In this case, all the information is provided by the Operational manager's responses to questions in a survey.

[3] See also https://eur-lex.europa.eu/EN/legal-content/glossary/civil-society-organisation.html

an internal learning evaluation system that foresees the possibility to demonstrate knowledge or skills acquired.

- Training can take any form or combination of competence-based transfer of knowledge and skill (theoretical, practical; teaching, coaching, mentoring, peer learning, etc), as long as it is focused on ensuring that a set of competencies (alternative term for attitude, knowledge and skill) is imparted and integrated.
- The areas of training are directly dealing with preventing and countering the following:
  - o Corruption[4]
  - o Organised crime[5]
  - o Violent extremism[6]
  - o Environmental crime[7]
- Local authorities means municipal (or higher regional/provincial) public authorities or their agencies. National authorities means any national level public authorities or their agencies.

Counting Guidance

- The calculation method is a count of the number of individuals employed by national or local (government) authorities or registered members of CSOs that are trained by the intervention and demonstrate acquisition of required knowledge and skills. The IP (in cases where it is not the training provider itself and others tasked to verify data provided), should ensure that data provided does not equate to "number of persons participating or completing training …" but that only those persons who demonstrate knowledge and skill acquisition are counted.
- The calculation is made by the training provider and/or by the IP. Disaggregation should also be done by the training provider and/or by the IP.
- Unless stated otherwise (e.g. at the end of the training cycle) this would be calculated and reported on by the training provider and/or by the IP annually and stated in the relevant reporting.
- There should be some assessment of competence integrated into the calculation method i.e. the IP should, prior to the training, assess the knowledge or skill level of the persons to be trained (questionnaire, simple exercise etc). This would establish a baseline. After or during and at the end of the training, the individuals would then be assessed again (ideally according to modern practical training methods), and the result of the post-training assessment would confirm (or not) the increased skills knowledge stated in the indicator.
- Those individuals not showing an increase in their knowledge or skill level would not be included in the data set.

Quality Control Checklist

1. Has double counting been avoided as indicated in the Counting Guidance above?
2. Have all relevant disaggregations been reported?
3. Has the baseline and final target been encoded with the right dates?
4. Did you encode the latest current value available?
5. Did you use the comment box to inform on the values encoded?

---

[4] For more on definitions of corruption prevention/countering and organised crime, see UN Office on Drugs and Crime: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/index.html?ref=menuside. Also, Council of Europe GRECO: https://www.coe.int/en/web/greco

[5] For more on EU organised crime strategy, see https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52021DC0170&qid=1632306192409

[6] See https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/counter-terrorism_en

[7] Environmental crimes are defined here as "*infringements of relevant legal obligations that can cause significant harm or risk to the environment and human health and are or can be addressed through criminal law*"

6. Examples of calculations

A major national NGO implements two training programmes under a single contract under Direct Management by an EUD: i) **Programme A**: focused on competencies in areas of corruption and organised crime; ii) **Programme B**: focused on environmental crime.

The IP reports for programme A, 26 individuals (10 organisations) enrolled; 20 individuals complete programme; 18 demonstrate competency acquisition (10 men, 8 women), 2 do not (1 refuses to be assessed). For programme B, 24 individuals (8 organisations) enrolled; 18 individuals complete programme; 17 demonstrate competency acquisition (7 men, 10 women), 1 does not. Participants enrolled were equally divided among women and men.

Thus:

Base-line (start Year 1): Programme A: 0 // Programme B: 0

Target after programme completion (10 months later): Programme A: 26 participants (= individuals from key national and local authorities and CSOs) // Programme B: 24

Final Value after programme completion (10 months later): Programme A: 18 // Programme B:17

Data to be reported against the indicator would be as follows:

	Number of individuals from key national and local authorities and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) trained by the EU-funded intervention who increased their knowledge and/or skills for preventing and countering corruption, or organised crime, or violent extremism or environmental crime
Baseline (start Year 1):	**0**
Target (after programme completion, end of Year 1)	**50** (25 men/25 women) of which: 26 individuals ... with increased knowledge/skills on both corruption and organised crime, and 24 on environmental crime
Final Value (after programme completion, end of Year 1)	**35** (17 men/18 women) of which: 18 individuals ... with increased knowledge/skills on both corruption and organised crime, and 17 on environmental crime

7. Data sources and issues

Data sources in the logframe:

- Data for this indicator must derive directly from the intervention, i.e. intervention internal monitoring and reporting systems from implementing organisations (e.g. governments, international organisations, non-state actors).
- Other possible sources include studies carried out in the framework of the interventions and external monitoring and/or evaluation reports.

Data source categories specified in OPSYS:

- EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)

8. Reporting process & Corporate reporting

Who is responsible for collecting and reporting the data?

- The implementing partner (i.e. the entity responsible for delivering the results) will need to ensure the counting starts at the lowest level of intervention and is reported upwards and aggregated for the entire intervention in the framework of regular monitoring and reporting systems. These reports should also contain data relevant for assessing the competence of individuals pre- and post-training. They should be disaggregated as appropriate.
- Data verification:
  o For indirect management by beneficiary countries, the National IPA Coordinator will verify the data.
  o For other modes of implementation, the Operational Manager in HQs/EUD will verify the data.
- It is then the responsibility of DG NEAR to centrally receive and verify data for this indicator from all relevant interventions and to eventually ensure aggregation within and across all IPA Beneficiary countries.

This indicator is used for corporate reporting in the following contexts:

- IPA III via the Annual Report

9. Other uses

IPA III RF 1.2.1.2 can be found in the following groups of EU predefined indicators available in OPSYS, along with other related indicators: (look in the SAS extraction of the core indicators - groups of indicators)

- **IPA III RF Window 1: Rule of law, fundamental rights and democracy (IPA III W1)**

For more information, see: Predefined indicators for design and monitoring of EU-funded interventions | Capacity4dev (europa.eu)

10. Other issues

None