IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name

IPA III RF 1.4.1.1: Number of migration management or forced displacement strategies or policies (a) developed/revised, or (b) under implementation with EU support

2. Technical details

OPSYS and Results Dashboard code: 65237, 65238*.*

Unit of measure: Number of (#)*.*

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

Level of measurement: this is an **outcome indicator**. It would logically be associated with an outcome such as "Strengthened national regulatory frameworks for the management of migration or forced displacements in compliance with the respect of human rights, fundamental rights and international law".*.*

Disaggregation:

The indicator is to be used at intervention and reporting levels according to whether the public policies are:

a) developed/revised with EU support;
b) under implementation with EU support.

Furthermore, where relevant / possible, please disaggregate according to the level of implementation:

- Fully implemented
- Partially implemented
- Initial stage of implementation

Within each category above, figures should be disaggregated by: the type of measure (legal migration/asylum/irregular migration).

Any other disaggregation should be agreed with the relevant ministry or IP in advance.

DAC sector codes: 13010; 15130; 15190

Main associated SDG: **SDG 10** - Reduce inequality within and among countries & **& SDG 16:** Peace, Justice and Strong institutions.

Other associated SDGs: n/a.

Associated IPA III Level 1 indicator:

- Number of countries with migration policies that facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people (source: SDG 10.7.2) (Ind. 1.4.1).

Associated IPA III Level 3 indicators:

- Amount and share of EU-funded external assistance directed towards migration and forced displacement-related interventions [SP].

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 4:** Migration and Border Management.
- **Chapters of the *Acquis*:** The main concerned chapter of the EU *acquis* under this section are in cluster 1 (Fundamentals)**,** which includes **Chapter 23** (Judiciary and Fundamental Rights) and **Chapter 24** (Justice, Freedom and Security).
- This indicator was also included in the previous **IPA II Performance framework**, **IPA PF 2.13** *(2020): "Number of migration management or forced displacement public policies a) developed/revised, or b) under implementation with EU support ".*
- This indicator was also included in the **Global Europe Results Framework**, **GERF 2.21:** *"Number of migration management or forced displacement public policies a) developed/revised, or b) under implementation with EU support".*

The New Consensus for Development highlights the positive contribution that well-managed migration and mobility can make to inclusive growth and sustainable development. Nevertheless, migration has become a pressing issue for both developing and developed countries. In some situations, migrant populations are being denied human rights and access to health and education, and risk becoming victims of forced labour and human trafficking.

The general objective of IPA III laid down in Article 3 of the IPA III Regulation is to support the candidate countries and potential candidates in adopting and implementing the political, institutional, legal, administrative, social and economic reforms required to comply with the EU values and to progressively align to the EU rules, standards, policies and practices (the 'acquis') with a view to future EU membership thereby contributing to mutual stability, security, peace and prosperity.

"In complementarity with the Integrated Border Management Fund, IPA III assistance will also focus on increasing operational capacities, fostering further compliance of law enforcement institutions with rule of law and good governance principles, and stepping up international police cooperation. [...] IPA III will work towards supporting the development of systems that could enhance information and data exchange at regional level. This includes the establishment of National Coordination Centres for Border Control (NCCs) in line with EU/Schengen acquis (the EUROSUR framework) and a regional Western Balkans network between them. Moreover, IPA III will also support the establishment and deployment of interoperable national biometric registration/data sharing systems that can facilitate exchange of information/data between Western Balkans partners, and could be connected to EU systems, such as Eurodac, upon accession to the EU. With regard to the right to asylum, IPA III beneficiaries will receive support to strengthen and develop their capacity to examine applications for international protection [...] as well as efficient referral mechanisms. [...] It is also important to develop integration strategies and programmes for beneficiaries of international protection; as well as information campaigns and other initiatives to address negative public attitudes towards migrants and refugees. [...] In the area of legal migration, the beneficiaries will be eligible receive support to implement temporary and circular migration for specific professions, [and] mitigating measures to manage the possible negative effects of emigration from IPA III benefiting countries will be supported, while also engaging diaspora from the region to support the socio-economic development of their home countries" (IPA III Programming Framework, pp. 17-18).

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 policies 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 policies by 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].
  - 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 policies**, using the Technical Definitions and Counting Guidance provided below. Please double check your calculations using the Quality Control Checklist below.

Technical Definitions

---

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

[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.

- **Public policies** for this indicator are understood in a broad manner, including Government programme, strategies and legislations at national or sub-national levels. They include sector or crosscutting reform strategies (including the Government Programme), annual and multi-annual budget and primary and secondary legislation. Strategies, policies, frameworks, memoranda, development plans, agreements, etc may be included. Sub-national refers to any government entity below the national level, regardless of the political, financial and administrative design of the country.
- **Migration and forced displacement policies:** examples of migration management/forced displacement strategy/policy areas include border management, labour and facilitated migration, assisted voluntary return, non-voluntary returns, assistance for vulnerable migrants/displaced persons, socio-economic inclusion of migrants/forced displaced person, etc.
- **Developed/under implementation**: Developed policies are those endorsed by the authorities relevant for the local context. This indicator can include the case of policies being revised with EU support but to be accounted for the revisions must be endorsed by the relevant authorities (not necessarily the national Parliaments in the case of strategies or plans). Under implementation is taken to mean cases where EU resources are supporting the implementation of the policies (all or part).

Counting Guidance

- A policy may be reported within the intervention according to successive stages of (a) development/revision and (b) under implementation. Note that in such case, the reporting is done under two different indicators a) first, and then b).
- **Possible double-counting**: There is some risk of double counting when the intervention supports the same reform and same stage over several reporting periods. To avoid this, the same policy reform must be reported only once against the relevant indicator. There is also a risk of double counting when:
  - Within the same intervention, a policy, as per definitions provided in section 3 of this note, is further unpacked into several other instruments, plans or budgets. In this case, the number of policies will be considered as being part of an overarching policy and must be accounted for just once.
  - Within the same intervention, a policy, is under implementation with the support of the EU and, as part of the implementation of the policy, some other items which may qualify as policies as per definition in section 3 are developed/revised. In this case, there will be no data reported against indicator 1.4.1.1.a.

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?

6. Examples of calculations

The EU is supporting the Government of a candidate country to increase national capacities in the management of legal migration flows to and from the country. The development of two policies is envisaged, one to set up a fully functional circular migration scheme and, a second one, to facilitate the recognition by the EU of professional diplomas obtained in the country. By the end of the intervention the first policy has been developed, validated by all relevant stakeholders in the country and is under implementation, while the policy for recognition of diplomas is not yet under implementation. The regulation for harmonising the diplomas and degrees of national professionals with EU requirements has been drafted with support of the EU intervention, but has not yet been approved by the Ministry of Education of the candidate country which is the entity with the mandate to do so according to the national law.

Values reported in the LF:

Baseline value (Y0):

- Indicator 1.4.1.1 a) *Number of migration management or forced displacement strategies or policies developed/revised with EU support* is assumed to be **0** as there is no information provided on previous support.

- Indicator 1.4.1.1 b) *Number of migration management or forced displacement strategies or policies under implementation with EU support* is assumed to be **0** as there is no information provided on previous support.

Target values:

- Indicator 1.4.1.1 a) **= 2,** legal migration (a policy on circular migration and a revised regulatory framework on diploma's recognition);
- Indicator 1.4.1.1 b) **= 2,** legal migration (a circular migration scheme and a revised regulatory framework on diploma's recognition);

Values at the end of the Intervention:

- Indicator 1.4.1.1 a) = **1** circular migration policy, in the field of legal migration, developed with EU support (Narrative: the policy has been endorsed by all relevant stakeholders while the revised draft of the regulatory framework to facilitate the recognition by the EU of degrees and diplomas obtained in the country has not been validated by the relevant instance);
- Indicator 1.4.1.1 b) = **1** circular migration scheme, in the field of legal migration, implemented with EU support. (Narrative: the fully functional circular migration scheme is under implementation).

Note: the narrative explanations can be provided in footnotes to the logframe. It is recommended to complement indicators 1.4.1.1 a) and b) in the intervention logframe with a qualitative indicator such as 'Status of the strategy X or Status of the migration scheme……' (baseline, milestones and final target would be along the lines of: no strategy/system in place, strategy/system developed, strategy/system tested, strategy/system rolled-out, strategy/system fully functional). Keeping with the example, the final targets would not be yet reached as the development of the regulatory framework and the implementation of the circular migration scheme are not sufficient to be accounted for the achievement of the outcome).

Method: Note that the reporting is done cumulatively (sum of new policies). Note that policies developed/revised and policies implemented are reported under indicator 1.4.1.1 a) and 1.4.1.1 b) respectively. Note that the regulation developed with EU support has not been accounted for under indicator 1.4.1.1a) because it was not approved by the Ministry of Education as is the requirement according to the definitions provided in Section 3 of this note.

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) based on **primary sources** such as countries' Official Journals and official records.
- 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; Baseline and endline surveys conducted and budgeted by the EU-funded intervention ; ROM reviews);
- Public sector reports (Strategies and policy documents)

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. When reporting on the number of policies, a narrative around the status of such relevant policies is to be added.
- Data verification:
  - For indirect management by beneficiary countries, the National IPA Coordinator will verify the data.
  - 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
- NEAR Strategic Plan via the Annual Activity Report

This indicator has been included in the following other Results Measurement Frameworks:

- NDICI (GERF 2.21a and GERF 2.21b)

9. Other uses

IPA III RF 1.4.1.1 can be found in the following groups of EU predefined indicators available in OPSYS, along with other related indicators:

- EU RF - Level 2 (EURF L-2);
- Forced Displacement (ForcedDisp);
- GE RF - Level 2 (GERF L-2);
- IPA III RF Window 1: Rule of law, fundamental rights and democracy (IPA III W1);
- IPA Performance Framework (IPA PF 2);
- NEAR EU RF level 2 (EU RF 2);
- NEAR GERF L2 (GERF 2)

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

UNDP reports on a related indicator: Number of countries with plans and strategies under implementation for the reintegration of displaced persons and/or former combatants.

10. Other issues

None