IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name
IPA III RF 2.2.2.1: Number of technical departments demonstrating improved capacity to maintain and manage respective public service

2. Technical details

OPSYS and Results Dashboard code: 65744.

Unit of measure: Number of (#)

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

Level of measurement: This is an **output level** indicator.

Disaggregation:

Where relevant / possible, please disaggregate by:

- Type of public entity (central government/regional government/local/municipal)
- Type of service provided by the department
- Type of capacity developed (human/technical/physical)

DAC sector codes: 73010

Main associated SDG: **SDG 16:** Governance, Peace and Security .

Other associated SDGs: n/a .

Associated IPA III Level 1 indicator:

- Quality of Service Delivery (source: SIGMA Assessment) (Ind. 2.2.2) .

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 2** Administrative capacity and EU *acquis* alignment. The indicator may also easily respond to results in **TP 1 (Good governance**) of the same window
- 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 SIGMA**[1] Principles for Public Administration chapter 5 (Service Delivery), Principle 3: Mechanisms for ensuring the quality of public service are in place – generally linked to the measures stated in this principle, but not to any specific theme or indicator. 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.*

---

[1] Principles of Public Administration for EU candidate countries and potential candidate. See https://www.sigmaweb.org/publications/Methodological-Framework-for-the-Principles-of-Public-Administration-May-2019.pdf

- 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)
- This indicator would be appropriate for interventions that address any of the abovementioned policy priority areas.

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

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

Technical Definitions

- A **technical department** is understood, in a broad sense as an organisational unit with its own manager located in an entity of public administration (central/regional/local) that is directly involved in the provision of any service to the public i.e. to citizens.
- It is **not** a "back-office" or a horizontal support unit to the wider administration such as human resources, finance and budgeting etc. The term "technical" should not be understood in an excessively narrow sense. The important elements is that the unit is "citizen-facing" and "service-oriented".
- The indicator aims to measure **the volume of capacity developed** within IPA beneficiaries' public administrations, targeting explicitly those **units already providing** some kind of public service (not creating new ones).
- **Improved capacity** means that the department has benefitted directly from:
  - Any improvement in any element or combination of **structure, resources (human), systems or tools that support better service provision**.
  - This can involve but is not limited to **staff training in areas of competence** related to their work (improved skills/knowledge/awareness), but it may also involve re-defined or **re-organised internal structure**, new or improved **working systems, tools or practices**, any of which may require **equipment or physical assets** (e.g. buildings)
- This capacity will have been developed directly **by EU/IPA funded** interventions. As such it is an **output indicator**.
- The term "demonstrating improved capacity" indicates for a unit to be counted into this indicator, there must be some **form of assessment** that capacity has indeed improved. Any form of internal assessment of progress relative to an initial capacity could constitute demonstration. The intervention should define the initial situation in the unit in its approach and measure the progress made in improving capacity. This is demonstration. The IP should ensure this standard of demonstration is evidenced in the unit in question.
- The term "maintain or manage respective public service" demands that the unit **plays a role in the provision of a public service**, even if it is not itself the official "manager".

Counting Guidance

---

[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.

- The IP will only count the unit within an administrative unit (i.e. 'technical department') that benefits directly from EU/IPA III support.

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

A four year, IPA-funded intervention supports an IPA III beneficiary's public administration reform programme, focusing on three key ministries. The IPA intervention works directly with eight individual departments and agencies across these ministries to improve their capacities in providing services to the public. These departments and agencies fall within the definition of an organisation unit stated in this note. The capacity development support covers staff training, creation of new procedures, upgrading of IT systems and some small-scale physical infrastructure improvements. The intervention will deliver its support in two phases, focusing initially on two pilot units, before rolling out to all eight departments thereafter. The indicator values look as follows:

No of technical departments with improved capacity (Year)	Value
Baseline (2022)	0
Milestone (2024)	2
Target (2026)	8

The IP must establish that these selected units have the improved capacity stated in the indicator. To do this it has to analyse the capacity and performance of each unit. For example, within the Ministry of Transport, a Vehicle Licencing Agency is selected as one of the two pilot departments for the IPA intervention. This agency offers several services to citizens and commercial operators: especially driving licence issuance and renewal, as well as supervisory management of vehicle testing centres.

The initial situation is that most citizens access the service by either coming to the agency's head office in person, by mail (post) or by a combination of both. Documents are not processed on-line without physical appearance at the office. A series of reforms are required to shift the administration toward a more efficient, better service- and citizen-oriented service operator. This will require, among other elements:

- Reform of management structure, work processes and procedures, new workflows; new protocols for all of this; new service standards;
- Upgrading of staff – new staff, phasing out of redundant staff, upgrading as many existing personnel as possible;
- New Systems and Tools: offices, equipment, especially IT equipment (portal etc)

The change management process is to take 24 months i.e. at the end of phase 1 of the intervention. It is expected that when fully in place and operational the reformed service will increase the number of licences issued or renewed annually from an existing situation of 5 000 to a 15 000.

Once this process is complete, the IP will verify that the three different types of capacities have been developed as planned. This would then allow the unit to be counted against this IPA III RF indicator with the value of '1'. The unit in question can be reported against this indicator only once, at latest by end of project.

It is worth observing that the increased number of licences established in the data collection can also be used to inform intervention-specific outcome indicators such as 'Number of licences issued annually' - this is not an IPA III RF indicator (so would not be collected for this indicator) but is valid to assess effectiveness of the intervention.

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: 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 will need to understand how the beneficiaries have demonstrated their improved capacity. This is likely to require some form of competence/capacity assessment at the start of (baseline) and then at the end of the intervention (target).
  The frequency of the collection and reporting (IP level), if not stated otherwise, should be annual.
- 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*

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

- FPI Results Framework

9. Other uses

IPA III RF 2.2.2.1 can be found in the following groups of EU predefined indicators available in OPSYS, along with other related indicators:

- FPI Results Framework (FPI RF);
- IPA III RF Window 2: Good governance, EU acquis alignment, good neighbourly relations and strategic communication (IPA III W2);
- RECONSTRUCTION, RELIEF AND REHABILITATION (NON-OBLIG)

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

10. Other issues
None