IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name

IPA III RF 2.1.2.2: Number of costed sectoral strategies regularly monitored whose implementation is supported by the EU

2. Technical details

OPSYS and Results Dashboard code: 260837.

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 assesses whether a given sector strategy has been costed, is under implementation and is subject to some form of monitoring. Each of these elements is considered standard practice in policy making and implementation and appropriate to future EU member states. The indicator could also be used for **budget support** as an indicator for an **induced output.**

Disaggregation:

Disaggregation can be done by:

- Sector (of strategy)
- *Acquis* or non-*Acquis* related
- 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:** Governance, Peace and Security .

Other associated SDGs n/a: .

Associated IPA III Level 1 indicator:

- Composite indicator on economic criteria (source: European Commission - – Enlargement Reports) (Ind. 2.1.2, same indicator Window 4 - OO).

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 Programming Framework: Window 2 Good governance, EU acquis alignment, good neighbourly relations and strategic communication; Thematic Priority 1 Good governance.
- The indicator cuts across the EU Acquis chapters and political priorities (Copenhagen criteria) as public administration reform is considered a horizontal accession theme. The indicator broadly relates to OECD SIGMA1 Principles for Public Administration chapter 5 (Service Delivery), Principle 3: Mechanisms for ensuring the quality of public service are in place.

---

[1] Principles of Public Administration for EU candidate countries and potential candidate.
https://www.sigmaweb.org/publications/Principles-of-Public-Administration-2017-edition-ENG.pdf

- Window 2 aims to address overall public governance, in particular public administration reform at all levels of government, as well as legislative and institutional alignment with the EU acquis.
- Under TP1 Good governance, "IPA III will continue to support public administration reform at central government level in line with the SIGMA normative framework of the Principles of Public Administration. The principles cover the following core areas: strategic framework; policy development and coordination; public service and human resources management; accountability; service delivery and public financial management. The focus of assistance will gradually shift towards supporting implementation of new rules and standards in line institutions, while maintaining necessary support to coordinating institutions. There will be also an increased focus to supporting managerial accountability, evidence-informed policymaking and improved internal control culture across administration". (IPA III Programming Framework, p.26)
- Under TP2 Administrative capacity and EU acquis alignment, "effective administrative and institutional capacity encompasses a range of requirements i.e., setting up specific sector institutions required by the EU acquis; ensuring staff to implement new policies and legislation; sector institutions operating under the same standards, rules and procedures that the governments have either already adopted or are committed to adopt under ongoing public administration reform efforts." (IPA III Programming Framework, p.29)
- Whilst this indicator applies directly to TP1 (governance), it could also be used to track how IPA beneficiaries (such as line ministries) are delivering on their accession commitments in relation to sectoral reforms (thus linking to TP2) i.e. actions which fall within the scope of both these Window 2 TPs.

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 costed strategies 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 costed strategies 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[2].

---

[2] 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.

- 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[3]) 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 costed strategies**, using the Technical Definitions and Counting Guidance provided below. Please double check your calculations using the Quality Control Checklist below.

Technical Definitions

- A '**costed strategy'** is a strategy that explicitly includes a statement describing the approximate cost of the key elements of the strategy's implementation for the national public budgets (national or local).
- The strategy should be **under implementation** (i.e. not a draft, nor awaiting approval/adoption).
- The strategy's implementation should be **subject to regular monitoring**. The monitoring should be carried out by a national governmental body that is mandated for this task (for example, national PAR Agency, relevant sectoral ministry)
- The strategy's elaboration or implementation should have benefitted from **EU/IPA support** – either partly or fully.
- The strategy relates to a **sector** – and this could be any sector. It is assumed that this would a sector related to an *Acquis* Chapter related to EU Accession (e.g. Copenhagen Criteria).
- It is essential to understand the term "**monitoring**" in a flexible sense, customised to the reality of policymaking and policy-implementation. Thus, for purposes of this indicator "monitoring" is understood as including at least the following elements:
  - Monitoring is a continuous process
  - It involves tracking progress related to implementation of the respective strategy
  - It involves collecting and analysing data to the extent to which the strategy is being implemented
  - The monitoring uses baselines, targets, milestones and/or benchmarks
  - The monitoring is completed by reporting to a higher level.
  - The monitoring is undertaken by an IPA beneficiary public body (ministry, agency etc). Monitoring undertaken by the European Commission or other EU bodies does not count.
- This understanding does not define "**progress**" but clearly it will relate to deployment of resources, further positive steps in implementation, identification of problems, observation

---

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

[3] 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.

of lessons. To meet the requirements of the indicator, it is essential only that monitoring as defined occurs.

<u>Counting Guidance</u>

- To be eligible for counting, the sector strategy should:
  - Be costed and
  - Be (have been) supported by IPA/EU support and
  - Be under implementation and
  - Be subject to monitoring
- Any sector strategies that do meet all these four criteria should <u>NOT</u> be counted.

<u>Quality Control Checklist</u>

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

As part of public administration reform, all ministries in an IPA Beneficiary are requested to monitor their sectoral strategies.

A 3-year Twinning project (2020-2022) supports five ministries to set-up a monitoring system for their respective sector strategies.

The Twinning project provides support that leads to the set-up of monitoring systems for all five strategies in year 1. And by year 3, four ministries have monitored the implementation of the strategy and issued a report detailing progress in implementation over the previous year. To note however that only three of the four sector strategies have benefitted from IPA support.

This can be reported accordingly in the intervention as follows (in brackets the cumulative values):

Baseline: Start 2020 = 0

End 2020 = 0

End 2021 = 0

End 2022 = 3 (even though four ministries have regularly monitored their costed sectoral strategies, only three of these strategies benefitted IPA support for their implementation).

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 data that would be expected to come from the policy managers of the strategies being implemented e.g. line ministries that are implementing an IPA-supported strategy.
- 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:

- Not available

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.
  The IP is to report annually on values of indicators from IPA III RF used in their interventions and ensure that on-going collection of relevant data is built into their internal monitoring and reporting system for the intervention.
- 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. **2.1.2.2** can be found in the following groups of EU predefined indicators available in OPSYS, along with other related indicators:

- IPA III RF Window 2: Good governance, EU acquis alignment, good neighbourly relations and strategic communication (IPA III W2)

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

10. Other issues

None