

IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name
IPA III RF 4.1.1.1: Number of people directly benefiting from EU-supported interventions that aim to reduce social and economic inequality
2. Technical details
<p><u>OPSYS and Results Dashboard code:</u> 65257.</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 output indicator. It can exceptionally be used as an outcome-level indicator at intervention level. However, in order to qualify as an outcome indicator at intervention level, there must be a statement that clarifies that the intervention (or a part thereof) actually has directly influenced a reduction in some element of social and economic inequality. Otherwise, by default, the indicator, as formulated is to be considered an “output” indicator.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u></p> <p>As a person indicator (number of persons...) this indicator is to be disaggregated in interventions and in higher level reporting – to the extent that is relevant and possible) according to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender (Male, Female, Intersex) • Age (>18; 18-64; 65+, unless Contracting Authorities suggest otherwise) • Region (with reference to territorial disparities only) <p><u>DAC sector codes:</u></p> <p>15110; 15160; 16010; 16080</p> <p><u>Main associated SDG:</u> SDG 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries .</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"> • Public expenditure on social security protection (percentage of GDP) (source: Eurostat, online code: tps00098) (Ind. 4.1.1). <p><u>Associated IPA III Level 3 indicators:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and share of EU-funded external interventions promoting disability inclusion.
3. Policy context and Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPA III PF: Window 4 - Competitiveness and inclusive growth, Thematic priority 1 - Education, employment, social protection and inclusion policies, and health. The indicator however could conceivably be adopted for interventions under other Windows and thematic priorities with similar focus. • Acquis Chapter 19: Social policy and employment and Chapter 23: Judiciary and fundamental rights.

- This indicator is also **GERF Indicator 2.39: Number of people directly benefiting from EU supported interventions that aim to reduce social and economic inequality**

The rationale for interventions that address social and economic inequality, in the perspective of EU Accession, is grounded in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union and manifest as one of the rationales underpinning several EU policies that correspond to key Acquis Chapters (e.g. Chapter 19: Social policy and employment, Chapter 23: Judiciary and fundamental rights; as well as all chapters that aim at creating a single market economy).

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 people benefitting... EU interventions 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 people benefitting... EU interventions 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.
 - 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

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.

- 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.

The value for this indicator is calculated by counting the **Number of people benefitting... EU interventions**, using the Technical Definitions and Counting Guidance provided below. Please double check your calculations using the Quality Control Checklist below.

Technical Definitions

Number of people benefitting... EU interventions...: This refers to all persons who in any way benefit from the said interventions. “**Benefiting**” is understood in a wide, undifferentiated sense and at its most basic implies that a person was positively affected by participation in or as a result of an intervention or part of an intervention. The term “**benefit**” (as a verb), in its most basic sense, means “do good” or more simply “receive an advantage” and this captures the sense that the intervention has directly been positive for persons.

EU-supported interventions is self-evident but the indicator focuses on a particular type of intervention, namely those that aim to reduce social and economic inequality.

Social and economic inequality means all forms of undesirable social and economic difference that is considered negative for society and individual persons. Evidently this may be understood in different ways in different countries. For the purposes of IPA III RF, it is to be understood as significant disparity between groups of persons or regions/territories within the same country that strongly manifest or aggravate a lack of fairness. Typically this may include any of the following non-exhaustive examples: economic disparity: income disparity, wealth disparity and especially employment/labour market disparity; social disparity: participation in education, access to health services, access to or participation in the labour market, significantly inadequate social protection, more broadly social participation (as opposed to its opposition, i.e. social exclusion). Social participation is also to be understood as the opposite to all forms of unfair exclusion on grounds of age, gender, disability (or other disparities that would be profoundly contrary to Article 2 of the Treaty³ Article).

For an intervention to be considered as “aiming” to reduce **Social and economic inequality, at least one explicit element of social and economic inequality must be addressed in terms of objectives and/or results (output, outcome or impact)**. The indicator cannot be taken to apply to an intervention that may imprecisely imply a vague, unstated intention to reduce or alleviate social and economic inequality in a non-precise manner.

Finally social and economic inequality cannot be taken to be synonymous with issues to be addressed by “Economic and Social Cohesion”, (Articles 174 to 178 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)) and the subject of Chapter 22: Regional policy and coordination of structural instruments of the Acquis. First, economic and social cohesion is primarily understood relative to an average Gross Domestic Product per capita of EU member states. Relative to this policy all Candidate States and IPA Beneficiaries are in a state of “lesser development”. Second, “social and economic inequality” in the indicator in question is to be measured primarily against national averages or national deviations from a country mean.

Counting Guidance

- Once the consideration is made, in function of advice provided above (section 3), that an intervention does indeed aim to reduce social and economic inequality, then the number of persons benefiting from the action are to be counted.
- Should the case arise where an intervention covers other issues (or objectives/results) that do not aim to reduce social or economic inequalities, then only those persons considered to have been benefited from that part of the action that aims to reduce social and economic inequality are to be counted.

³ Treaty on European Union, Article 2: “The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail”.

- The indicator is best calculated by feedback from the persons involved (e.g. through simple questions in a survey).
- A person is to be counted only once in the life-cycle of the intervention, even if they benefit in several different ways and at several different moments. This, to avoid double-counting.

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

In a 3-year intervention focused on addressing internal territorial disparities, several major actions are proposed in the areas of public transport, employment and economic development. Let us assume that after Year 1, through various investments in transport assets and reforms, the number of passengers using public transport increases from 10 000 to 15 000 and with little further investment grows for the two succeeding years to reach 20 000 at end of Year 3. Through various actions, by end of Year 1, 500 new jobs are created, rising to 1 000 by end of Year 3. And finally, by end of Year 1 10 new micro-enterprises are created (employing 20 persons in total) and further 20 (employing 46 persons in total) by end of Year 3.

Intervention – Addressing Territorial Disparities		
Baseline (start Y1)	0 (since the count will focus only on persons benefiting from this intervention)	
Target (end Y3)	5 000 people	
	Year 1	End of Year 3
Public Transport	5 000	5 000 (cumulative = 10 000)
Employment	500	500 (cumulative = 1 000)
Economic Development	20	46 (cumulative = 66)
Total		11 066 = 10 000 + 1 000 + 66

In this case we have counted all persons who in any manner have benefited from this EU-supported intervention that aim to reduce social and economic inequality. This is based however on two key considerations:

- That the entire intervention in all its components addresses social and economic inequality (we can assume this here since the intervention is focused on regions whose GDP is less than 50% of national average).
- That all results from the intervention in all 3 areas can be considered as reducing social and economic inequality (relative to persons enjoying higher standards of living and services elsewhere in the country).

In other situations and other interventions, it may be that not all parts of an intervention or all results are considered as aiming to reduce social and economic inequality (Ind. 4.1.1.1).

Possible double-counting. In the example cited, it may well be that the same persons benefit from more than one of the intervention areas. This complicates the counting since the indicator focuses on number of persons who benefit. This being the case, within the intervention, care

needs to be taken not to count the same person more than once. In all likelihood applying, this the actual number will ultimately be somewhat less than 11 066. If no further information is available on unique beneficiaries, only the highest number of beneficiaries reached through one of the components should be retained; in this case 10 000.

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;
- Baseline and endline surveys conducted and budgeted by the EU-funded intervention ;
- ROM reviews)

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 Beneficiary countries.

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

- *IPA III via the Annual Report*
- *NEAR Strategic Plan via the Annual Activity Report*

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

- *NDICI: Global Europe Results Framework: 2.39: Number of people directly benefiting from EU supported interventions that aim to reduce social and economic inequality*
- *EFSD+*
- *TEI MORE*

9. Other uses

IPA III RF 4.1.1.1 can be found in the following groups of EU predefined indicators available in OPSYS, along with other related indicators:

- "European Fund for Sustainable Development PLUS (EFSD+);
- GE RF - Level 2 (GERF L-2);
- Human Rights (HR);
- IPA III RF Window 4: Competitiveness and inclusive growth (IPA III W4);
- IPA Performance Framework (IPA PF 2);
- NEAR GERF L2 (GERF 2);
- Nutrition (Nutri);
- Resilience, Conflict Sensitivity and Peace (Resilience);
- Team Europe Initiative - MORE Framework (TEI-MORE)"

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

10. Other issues

None