

IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name
IPA III RF 1.6.1.2: Number of public policies developed and/or revised with internal and external consultations with EU support
2. Technical details
<p><u>OPSYS and Results Dashboard code:</u> 17115.</p> <p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Number of (#).</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> <i>Quantitative: Numeric; Actual (ex-post); Cumulative (not annual).</i></p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an outcome indicator as it relates to actions by the beneficiary country governments. In the case of budget support, it would be considered an induced output.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> The figures should be disaggregated according to those <i>Acquis chapters</i> or other policies to which supported actions refer.</p> <p><u>DAC sector codes:</u> 15110; 15111; 15112; 15113; 15114; 15125; 15130; 15142; 15150; 15151; 15152; 15153; 15160; 15170; 15180; 15190</p> <p><u>Main associated SDG:</u> SDG 16: Governance, Peace and Security, more specifically targets 16.10 Public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms and 16.b Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development. .</p> <p><u>Other associated SDGs:</u> n/a.</p> <p><u>Associated IPA III Level 1 indicator:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Window 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Thematic Priority 6: Democracy: Voice and Accountability score (Source: WGI) (Ind.1.6.1) ○ Thematic Priority 7: Civil Society Participation Index (Source: sub-index of Participatory Component Index – [V-Dem]) (Ind. 1.7.1) • For Window 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Thematic Priority 1 Good governance: Public Administration Reform (PAR) (source: European Commission - – Enlargement Reports) (Ind. 2.1.1) <p><u>Associated IPA III Level 3 indicators:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Window 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Amount and share of EU-funded external assistance directed towards fragile states ○ Share of EU-funded external interventions responding to situations of a new and/or emerging crisis
3. Policy context and Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPA III PF: Window 1 - Rule of law, Fundamental rights and Democracy; – Thematic priority 6 Democracy. • Chapter of the Acquis. The main concerned chapters of the EU <i>Acquis</i> relative to this indicator are Chapter 23 ‘Judiciary and Fundamental rights’ and Chapter 24 ‘Justice,

Freedom and Security'. The indicator however may be relevant to certain other interventions responding to other *Acquis* chapters.

- This indicator was also included in the previous **IPA Performance framework, IPA PF 2.11 (2020): "Number of public policies developed and/or revised with internal and external consultations with EU support"**
- The specific objectives of IPA III in the area of Democracy are to ensure democratic institutions are properly resourced and function in line with constitution, principles of effective government as well as recommendations of the Venice Commission. IPA III support in this area also aims at guaranteeing the effective scrutiny of legislation, the compliance of the electoral legislation with the international and European standards and that effective parliamentary procedures are in place. Democratic institutions must be inclusive of the plurality of groups in society and must promote the equal distribution of power.
- Proper functioning of democratic institutions remains a key challenge in most of the beneficiaries. The central role of parliaments, and constructive cross-party dialogue also need to be embedded in the political culture. Parliamentary accountability, oversight of the executive and democratic scrutiny need to be enhanced.
- The objective of strengthening of public administration and good governance at all levels is also a key objective of IPA III. It contributes measuring participatory decision-making and public access to information.
- Finally, this indicator is in line with the better regulation agenda (development of policies and legislation in an inclusive and evidence-based process). One of the aspects of the better regulation agenda is that there must be effective institutionalised mechanisms to ensure wide stakeholder consultations with various businesses and civil society. This has been one of the key initiatives proposed under the Juncker Commission to improve the quality of policy- and law-making, in order to ensure that legislation better serves the people it affects.
- The importance of civil society as a crucial component of any democratic system is reflected in the 2012 Commission communication on civil society in external relations. CSO's participation in policy and legislative processes is key to ensure inclusive and effective policies and CSOs contribute to building more accountable and legitimate states.

4. Values to report

- **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 public 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 public 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 targets¹.

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.

- 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 options²) 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 public policies**, using the Technical Definitions and Counting Guidance provided below. Please double check your calculations using the Quality Control Checklist below.

Technical Definitions

- **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. Sub-national refers to any government entity below the national level, regardless of the political, financial and administrative design of the country.
- The definition of CSO follows the **2012 EU Communication on Europe's engagement with Civil Society in external relations**. The EU considers CSOs to include all non-State, not-for-profit structures, non-partisan and non-violent, through which people organise to pursue shared objectives and ideals, whether political, cultural, social or economic. Operating from the local to the national, regional and international levels, they comprise urban and rural, formal and informal organisations. The EU values CSOs' diversity and specificities; it engages with accountable and transparent CSOs which share its commitment to social progress and to the fundamental values of peace, freedom, equal rights and human dignity.
- **Consultation** can be defined as a process through which the government (the specific entity in charge of developing a public policy) actively seeks and takes into account the opinions of other ministries/public entities and/or CSOs (interested and affected groups) for a policy initiative. It is a two-way flow of information, which may occur at any stage of regulatory development, from problem identification to evaluation of existing regulation. It

-
- 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.

may be a one-stage process or, as it is increasingly the case, a continuing dialogue. Participation process comprises the following characteristics:

- it is an integral part of the policy making system, meaning that it is not something spontaneous, or a decision made on the spot by public institutions but is included in the routine processes of the institution;
 - the goal of internal and external participation is better public policy, in the sense of more responsive policies to real citizen needs and with a higher degree of public support;
 - participants have a certain degree of influence on the final decision.
- For **this** indicator, **participation of Ministries/other public entities** is defined as including at least one element of the following aspects:
 - Ministries/other public entities have been part of working groups set up by the public institutions to draft policies;
 - The lead ministry has reported on the outcome of Ministries/other public entities participation;
 - The views of participants in the consultation process have been made public;
 - A report was produced on the outcome of the consultation including explanations of how comments by Ministries/other public entities have been taken into account.
 - For this **indicator**, **participation of CSOs** is defined as including at least one element of the following aspects:
 - A written public consultation has been carried out allowing sufficient time for CSOs to provide comments and comments were made by at least one organisation;
 - CSOs have been part of working groups set up by the public institutions to draft policies;
 - The lead ministry has reported on the outcome of CSO participation;
 - The views of participants in the consultation process have been made public;
 - A report was produced on the outcome of the public consultation including explanations of how comments by CSOs have been taken into account.
 - EU interventions that support national or sub-national government with policy-making or support to CSOs to participate in policy or decision-making can be considered for this indicator.

Counting Guidance

- It is not sufficient for these policies to have been developed or revised with consultations; this will have to be done with EU support. And the consultation processes have to be clearly stated and justified (it is not enough for a report to state that the policy was developed or revised with internal and external consultations, the consultation process and stakeholders consulted will have to be mapped out).
- Also for a policy to be counted both internal and external consultation must have taken place.
- Please avoid **double counting** of policies. If the same policy benefits from different interventions (for example, when its development was supported by one intervention and the related consultations by another), it will have to be counted only once against this indicator. So for example, if an EU intervention is supporting the development of a national programme to enhance access to affordable, sustainable and high-quality health care services and at a later stage it supports the Ministry of Health to carry out both internal and external consultations on the draft programme, the policy will counted once against the indicator 'Number of public policies promoting social inclusion a) developed/revised with EU support (Ind. 4.1.2.2)', and once under this indicator (i.e. Number of public policies developed and/or revised with internal and external consultations with EU support (Ind. 1.6.1.2)).

Quality Control Checklist

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
<p>In a given country, an EU intervention is supporting the Government to carry out both internal and external consultations for a number of their key policies on public health.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two of these policies have been developed with the support of an earlier IPA II intervention. The current IPA III intervention now supports the development of an external consultation programme for both. At the same time this intervention facilitates the revision of one other policy by performing a regulatory impact assessment. • Another three policies were developed with the support of this intervention, including a series of inter-ministerial workshops in order to agree on a clear division of duties among ministries. One of these policies was also subject to a wider event with social partners and representatives of general practitioners where suggestions for amendments to this policy were collected. <p>The current values to be reported are: Policies developed/ revised with internal and external consultations: 3= 2+1</p>
7. Data sources and issues
<p>Data sources in the logframe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 (e.g. written public consultations, establishment of working groups, publication of outcomes of the consultation process). • Other possible sources include studies carried out in the framework of the interventions and external monitoring and/or evaluation reports <p>Data source categories specified in OPSYS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civil society and academic reports (Civil society reports and estimates); • EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention; ROM reviews); • Public sector reports (Laws and regulations; Strategies and policy documents; Ministry/agency administrative data and reports)
8. Reporting process & Corporate reporting
<p>Who is responsible for collecting and reporting the data?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 consultation processes (and stakeholders involved) is to be added. Depending on mode of implementation, the Operational Manager in the EUD will verify the data. Progress in supported actions may also be worth reporting in country Annual Reports as part of the Enlargement Package.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data verification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 Beneficiaries. <p>This indicator is used for corporate reporting in the following contexts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>IPA III via the Annual Report</i>
9. Other uses
<p>IPA III RF 1.6.1.2 can be found in the following groups of EU predefined indicators available in OPSYS, along with other related indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPA III RF Window 1: Rule of law, fundamental rights and democracy (IPA III W1); • IPA III RF Window 2: Good governance, EU acquis alignment, good neighbourly relations and strategic communication (IPA III W2); • IPA Performance Framework (IPA PF 2) <p>For more information, see: Predefined indicators for design and monitoring of EU-funded interventions Capacity4dev (europa.eu)</p>
10. Other issues
None