

## IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name
<p><b>IPA III RF 1.7.1.1:</b> Number of central and/or local public authorities [supported by EU] that (a) issue and/or (b) implement enabling policies and rules for community organisations and civic initiatives</p>
2. Technical details
<p><b><u>OPSYS and Results Dashboard code:</u></b> 260211, 260212.</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 generally an <b>outcome indicator</b> since it is understood that the support provided to organisations results in their endowing themselves with enabling policies and rules for community organizations and civic initiatives. As such it requires a change in behaviour by public authorities, namely, <u>to adopt</u> rules or policies enabling community organizations and civic initiatives. Note that it is not enough if these rules or policies are merely drafted (this would likely be a direct output of the TA supporting the public authorities).</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u></p> <p>The indicator is to be disaggregated at intervention and reporting levels according to whether the central and/or local public authorities [supported by EU]:</p> <p>(a) issue, or (b) implement enabling policies and rules for community organizations and civic initiatives</p> <p>No further disaggregation is foreseen. But at level of intervention it may be useful to disaggregate according to (i) central public authorities and (ii) and/or local public authorities.</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> <b>SDG 16:</b> Governance, Peace and Security, more specifically targets 16.6 (Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels) and 16.7 (Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels).</p> <p><u>Other associated SDGs:</u> n/a .</p> <p><u>Associated IPA III Level 1 indicator:</u> Civil Society Participation Index (Source: sub-index of Participatory Component Index – [V-Dem]) (Ind. 1.7.1).</p> <p><u>Associated IPA III Level 3 indicators:</u> none.</p>
3. Policy context and Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>IPA III PF:</b> This indicator is included in IPA III Results Framework for its relevance to <b>Window 1</b> Rule of law, Fundamental rights and Democracy – <b>Thematic priority 7</b> Civil society.</li> <li>• <b>Chapter of the Acquis:</b> The indicator responds to interventions related to fundamental political criteria (democracy) related to the Accession process. Civil society involvement is appropriate to many sectors and activities covered by interventions relevant to many <i>Acquis</i> Chapters especially <b>Chapter 19</b> : Social Policy and Employment; <b>Chapter 11:</b></li> </ul>

Agriculture and Rural Development and preparations for future European Structural and Investment Funds under **Chapter 22: Regional policy and coordination of structural instruments**

- The stated Specific Objective for Thematic Priority 7 “Civil Society” is “...to strengthen the enabling legal and policy environment and support the basic needs of CSOs” (p. 20 of the IPA III Programming Framework). The same document also notes that “Civil society remains a crucial partner in strengthening democratic societies. 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”. (p.13)
- This indicator provides insight into the extent to which government institutions are doing what they can to capitalize on this and thus ensure that EU integration is based on genuine civic participation in the public debate.
- “Civil society plays a vital role in shaping policies and partnerships, in overseeing their implementation, and in promoting a gender responsive rights-based approach. In the context of preparing for accession, Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) have two main functions that require support (i) as a democratic watchdog, and (ii) by contributing to the alignment with and implementation of the EU acquis by bridging the gap with real needs of citizens in the decision-making process and by monitoring implementation.
- Both these functions depend on a vibrant, sustainable, independent civil society with adequate resources to perform its tasks. The role of IPA III is to assist in developing such a sector and in helping ensure its long-term sustainability.” (p. 20)

#### 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 **public authorities** (central or local) 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 authorities** (central or local) 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<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup>) 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 authorities** (central or local), meaning any type of public governance structure at any geographical level, including regional., using the Technical Definitions and Counting Guidance provided below. Please double check your calculations using the Quality Control Checklist below.

#### Technical Definitions

- **Public authority** is understood as “any government or other public administration, including public advisory bodies, at national, regional or local level, and any natural or legal person performing public administrative functions under national law, including specific duties”. <https://inspire.ec.europa.eu/>: This includes e.g. individual ministries and agencies but also municipal utility companies.
- An **enabling policy** can be any officially adopted strategy, plan or other document expressing intentions or objectives, produced by the public authority in question that contains measures explicitly aimed at facilitating the work of community organizations and civic initiatives.
- **Rules** means statements that compel or prohibit certain behaviours and they are more prescriptive than policies. The indicator reads “policies and rules”, which means that the public authority should only be counted in case it has goals in this field and measures to achieve them as well as rules (separate laws, by-laws and regulations or explicit prescriptive statements in the corresponding policy document) to enforce a certain behaviour.
- **Community organisations** are organizations aimed at making desired improvements to a community's social health, well-being, and overall functioning. These can be Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) but the term also applies to “bottom up” initiatives (or projects) from within communities (sometimes referred to as community work, community projects, community development, community empowerment, community building, or community mobilization).
- **Civic initiatives** is understood as any form of active citizenship (grassroots involvement or innovation, transformative agency, collective action, organised or informal), seeking to contribute to the well-being of fellow citizens

#### Counting Guidance

---

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

<sup>2</sup> 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.

- Note that the indicator does not count “community organisations” or “civic initiatives”, nor does it count enabling policies or rules. The focus here is on how many public authorities enable their initiation, development or implementation by means of formulating specific policies to this end.
- A central or local authority may be reported within the intervention according to whether it has (a) developed and/or (b) implemented enabling policies and rules for community organizations and civic initiatives. 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 central and/or local public authority to develop and/or implement enabling policies and rules for community organizations and civic initiatives over several reporting periods. To avoid this, the same central and/or local public authority must be reported only once against the relevant indicator

#### 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

- An EU-funded intervention is launched in a candidate or potential candidate country titled “EU support for Civil Society and Local Authorities”. This Action has a total cost of 6 M€ and will be implemented under indirect management with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The indicative implementation period is three years.
- The specific objective is “*to establish sustainable partnerships between CSOs and local authorities through innovative enhanced community-based initiatives*” to be measured by the following indicator: “*number of central public authorities with enabling policies for civil society and volunteerism*”.
- A grant scheme is organised and implemented with annual calls for CSO-local authority initiatives in Year 1. In that Year it is focused on local authority led projects with CSO involvement whereby local authorities, with external assistance, seek to develop and apply processes, procedures and protocols for cooperation with CSOs in the several fields: local development and regeneration, a “green” municipality.
- In Year 2 the same scheme supports CSO-led projects involving local authorities with direct focus on local employment and social inclusion initiatives.

Of the 16 supported projects in Year 1, all continue into and are completed in Year 2. In final reports, **14 local authorities** claim that they have put in place policies and rules for cooperation with CSOs. The other 4 do not make this claim but focus exclusively on the results of their cooperation with CSOs

In Year 2, the call for proposals supports 10 projects. This call does not insist so much on developing policies or rules (in the CfP the term “processes, procedures and protocols for cooperation” is used, but rather more directly on cooperative work on the area of local employment and social inclusion. In Final Reports, filed in Year 3, **5 projects** make the claim that they have agreed and implemented processes, procedures and protocols for cooperation with local authorities: the other 5 do not make this claim.

So under this Call for Proposals the situation appears as:

Baseline: (start Year 1): 0 since no similar calls have taken place previously

Target: the IP implementing the series of calls posed a target of 23 against this indicator, in the logframe matrix developed for the entire scheme.

End Year 1: No projects are complete, and none claim to have developed enabling policies and rules for community organizations and civic initiatives. Count = 0

End Year 2: 14 are counted against the indicator

End Year 3: 5 are counted against the indicator

Final Count: 19

Note in this situation that the final count can be made only by the IP that manages the call that supports the projects. Each grant-supported project will have its own logframe with an indicator that can be correlated to the IPA RF indicator. Let us assume however that the IP considers that 2 of the 19 projects do not in fact result in public authorities putting in place enabling policies and rules. In this case it decides, after reflection, to reduce the final count from 19 to 17. It reports 17 to the EUD.

## 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.
- 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 Beneficiaries.

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

- *IPA III via the Annual Report*

## 9. Other uses

**IPA III RF 1.7.1.1** can be found in the following groups of EU predefined indicators available in OPSYS, along with other related 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