

IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name

IPA III RF 2.1.1.1: Number of EU funded interventions (Twinning, TA- *Technical Assistance Programmes*, SBS - *Sector Budget Support*) producing results that are consistent with *Public Administration Reform (PAR)* principles

2. Technical details

OPSYS and Results Dashboard code: 260252.

Unit of measure: Number of (#)

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

Level of measurement: The indicator will generally respond to outcome level results – on the assumption that counted interventions have produced outcomes (and not simply outputs) consistent with PAR principles.

Disaggregation:

Disaggregation should be by:

- Type of funded intervention i.e. Twinning or Technical Assistance (TA) or Sector Budget Support (SBS).

Depending on advice from the implementing Partner, further disaggregation may be by:

- Type of key PAR issues supported (Strategic framework of Public Administration reform; Policy Development and co-ordination; Public Service and human resource management; Accountability; Service Delivery; Public Financial management, other)
- Sectors covered by interventions, especially in cases of sectoral mainstreaming

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 and in particular

- 16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels
- 16.7: Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels .

Other associated SDGs: n/a .

Associated IPA III Level 1 indicator:

- Public Administration Reform (PAR) (source: European Commission - – Enlargement Reports) (Ind. 2.1.1) .

Associated IPA III Level 3 indicators:

- 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

- **IPA III PF: Window 2** Good governance, EU *acquis* alignment, good neighbourly relations and strategic communication, **Thematic priority 1** Good governance. The indicator may also be responsive to interventions under Window 2, Thematic priority 2 Administrative capacity and EU *acquis* alignment
- This indicator was also included in the previous **IPA II Performance framework**, as **IPA PF 2.12 (2020): "Number of EU Funded Sectoral Interventions (Twinning, Sector Budget Support, Other Types of Technical Assistance Programmes) Producing Results that are consistent with Horizontal Public Administration Reform Principles "**.
- **EU Acquis chapters.** The indicator does not respond to a particular chapter of the EU *Acquis*. However Public administration reform (PAR), together with rule of law and economic development, is a fundamental pillar of the enlargement process
- Candidate and potential candidate countries must bring its institutions, management capacity and judicial system up to Union standards with a view to implementing the *Acquis* effectively in the path of EU accession and closer cooperation. According to the EU guide on required capacities for implementing the EU *Acquis*, IPA beneficiaries must ensure a well-functioning and stable public administration built on an efficient and impartial civil service, and an independent and efficient judicial system. In this context, PAR is at the heart of the overall progress of partner countries in the accession process, and is linked to the political criteria for EU accession and to the capacity to adopt the EU *acquis*.
- **"Public administration reform (PAR), together with rule of law and economic development, is a fundamental pillar of the enlargement process, a part of cluster 1 (Fundamentals) under the enhanced enlargement methodology, and a basis for effective implementation of EU policies and legislation. A well-functioning and de-politicised public administration is necessary for democratic governance."** (IPA III Programming Framework, p. 24). *"IPA III will continue to support public administration reform at central government level in line with the normative framework of the Principles of Public Administration. [...]. There will be also an increased focus to supporting managerial accountability, evidence-informed policy making and improved internal control culture across administration.* (ibid. p. 26). In addition to interventions that focus directly or mainly on PAR, there may arise sectoral interventions which include elements that mainstream PAR in the relevant sector.
- In this context, **mainstreaming of PAR** can be understood as an approach that ensures integration of the key Principles of Public Administration and the approach advocated by the EU Better Regulation agenda systematically in the sectoral EU financial assistance and policy dialogue in order to ensure more implementable laws and policies and more streamlined administrative structures and procedures in partner countries. For this specific indicator, the focus will be on PAR mainstreaming in the framework of 'policy development and co-ordination'.
- To assess whether PAR has been mainstreamed in sectoral interventions supported via Twinning, sector budget support or other types of technical assistance, at least questions 1, 3, 4 and 5 of the following questions should be answered positively (based on the sources of information foreseen under § 6):
Has the EU funded intervention specifically contributed to the public policy/ strategy supported in the sense of:
 1. being developed based on a gap assessment and available (statistical) data?
 2. being respectful of the standards defined for sector strategies (where national guidance exists)?
 3. having clear baselines and targets and indicators to measure progress in reaching the set targets?
 4. being costed in accordance to the established methodology? Does policy financing clearly indicate donor funding?
 5. having coordination, monitoring and reporting mechanisms?

6. Having a mid-term revision foreseen? Is (external) evaluation foreseen as well?
7. being consulted among other institutions that have a stake on the policy before its adoption?
8. being prepared in consultation with external stakeholders (e.g. civil society)?
9. being realistically reflected in the Mid-Term Budgetary Framework?
10. being sufficiently funded in the annual budget?

4. Values to report

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

Baseline value: The value measured for the indicator in the baseline year. The baseline value is the value against which progress will be assessed.

Current value: The most recent value measured for the indicator by the time of reporting. Current values will be collected at least once a year and reported cumulatively across the whole implementation period.

Final target value: The expected value for the indicator in the target year.

Intermediate target values (milestones). A tool has been developed in OPSYS to automate the generation of intermediate targets¹.

- 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).

¹ This has been done in the framework of the Primary Intervention Questionnaire for the EAMR. Three KPIs have been developed to provide an overall assessment of the ongoing interventions' current implementation and future prospects, and the completed interventions' final performance. Scores will be calculated for all INTPA and NEAR interventions participating in the annual results data collection exercise.

- KPI 10 reflects the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness already achieved by the ongoing 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.
- KPI 11 reflects expectations regarding the most probable levels of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability to be achieved by the ongoing intervention in the future. In this case, all the information is provided by the Operational manager's responses to questions in a survey.
- KPI 12 reflects the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness already achieved by the completed 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.

- **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 EU funded interventions**, using the Technical Definitions and Counting Guidance provided below. Please double check your calculations using the Quality Control Checklist below.

Technical Definitions

- **Twinning** refers to the European Union instrument for institutional cooperation between Public Administrations of EU Member States and those of beneficiary or partner countries. More specifically, in the IPA region, Twinning aims to provide support for the transposition, implementation and enforcement of the EU legislation (the *Union acquis*). It builds up capacities of beneficiaries' public administrations throughout the accession process, resulting in progressive, positive developments in the region. Twinning strives to share good practices developed within the EU with beneficiary public administrations and to foster long-term relationships between administrations of existing and future EU countries
- **Technical assistance (TA)** means support and capacity-building activities necessary for the implementation of a programme or an action (i.e. preparatory, management, monitoring, evaluation, audit and/or control activities)
- **Sector Budget Support (SBS)** support involves direct financial transfers to the national treasury of partner countries engaging in sustainable development reforms. These transfers are conditional on policy dialogue, performance assessment, and capacity building.
- **Principles of Public Administration Reform (PAR)** refers to six key issues of reform: i) Strategic framework of Public Administration reform; ii) Policy Development and co-ordination; iii) Public Service and human resource management; iv) Accountability; v) Service Delivery; vi) Public Financial management. These six key reform areas form the basis of the 47 Public Administration Principles. The description of these principles is available through link: <https://www.sigmaweb.org/publications/Principles-of-Public-Administration-2017-edition-ENG.pdf>
- **Intervention:** For purposes of this indicator the number of interventions is taken to be the number of primary interventions, as defined by EU services.
- **EU funded interventions** are interventions financed in full or in part by IPA III

Counting Guidance

- The terms "Interventions producing results that are consistent with PAR Principles" indicate that for an intervention to be counted against this indicator, there must be some form of assessment of the results produced by the intervention are in line with PAR principles. The intervention should define the initial situation and measure the progress made in applying at least some of PAR principles. In the absence of such an assessment, to be counted, the intervention must have contributed - via Twinning, sector budget support or other types of technical assistance - to the development / implementation of a public

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.

policy/ strategy that complies with issues indicated in questions 1, 3, 4 and 5 outlined in section 4 (mainstreaming of PAR).

- These results must have been directly influenced with support from IPA funded interventions (Twinning, TA, SBS).
- This indicator, by its very nature, refers to the entire intervention and not to a particular result in an intervention logframe. Within an intervention logframe, this indicator will have to be adapted or translated into the form of “Number of results produced consistent with PAR principles mainstreaming”.

Quality Control Checklist

1. Have all relevant disaggregations been reported?
2. Has the baseline and final target been encoded with the right dates?
3. Did you encode the latest current value available?
4. Did you use the comment box to inform on the values encoded?

6. Examples of calculations

In Country A in Year 1 a Twinning intervention (let us call it A) demonstrably produces initial outputs consistent with PAR principles. In Year 2 it continues to produce outputs which drive initial outcomes.

In Country A further SBS starts in Year 2 and continues through Year 3 and into Year 4. It produces some induced outputs in Year 3 and more in Year 4.

In both cases the evidence for assessing each intervention has produced results, is provided by other indicators within respective intervention logframes which clearly show progress consistent with PAR principles, as manifest in the values informing relevant logframe indicators.

From the above, it can be concluded:

- Baseline 0 (assuming no previous interventions are taken into account or have been undertaken)
- End Year 1: the current value is 1. Only 1 intervention has produced results consistent with PAR principles (the type (i.e. output or outcome and number is not relevant to the value, since the value pertains to the intervention).
- End Year 2: The same intervention produces more results. However, since it is the same intervention as produced these in Year 1, then it is not counted again for Year 2. For Year 2 the score is 0, but the cumulative score at this point is 1. Note that in Year 1, the SBS produces no results
- End Year 3: Here SBS produces results and indeed continues to do so in Year 4. For Year 3 the score is 1.
- End Year 4: the score is again 0. While SBS produces results it has already done so in Year 3, so to avoid double counting we do not count again.

In country B, an EU intervention is supporting via a Twinning intervention the strengthening of the health policy. This support does not include a consideration of the financial resources required to implement the said policy.

In this case, the number of EU funded sectoral interventions (Twinning, Sector budget support, other types of technical assistance programmes) producing results that are consistent with horizontal public administration reform (PAR) principles is 0. The fact that policy development is not accompanied by a costing strategy allowing securing the resources needed for its implementation is considered to be un-consistent with PAR principles. (see question 4 in section 3 ‘4. being costed in accordance to the established methodology? Does policy financing clearly indicate donor funding?’

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). • 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"> • EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention)
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. • 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 Beneficiary countries. <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.2.1.1.1 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 2: Good governance, EU acquis alignment, good neighbourly relations and strategic communication <p>For more information, see: Predefined indicators for design and monitoring of EU-funded interventions Capacity4dev (europa.eu)</p>
10. Other issues
None