

IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name
IPA III RF 5.0.1.1: (Number of) Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion
2. Technical details
<p><u>OPSYS and Results Dashboard code:</u> 260047.</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 outcome indicator. It may be used together with output indicator 2.3.1.1 <i>Number of organisations participating in cross-border networks/partnerships formed</i>, which is related to ERDF Common Output Indicator RCO 87 <i>Organisations cooperating across borders</i>.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> This indicator could be disaggregated by type of organisation (NGO, local government...).</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> SDG 17 <i>Partnerships for the goals.</i></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"> Attitudes on regional cooperation and EU integration (source: Regional Cooperation Council’s Balkan Barometer) (Ind. 2.3.1, same indicator presented under Window 2 – TP3) <p><u>Associated IPA III Level 3 indicators:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount and share of EU-funded external assistance qualifying as ODA.
3. Policy context and Rationale
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator is included in IPA Results Framework for its relevance to Window 5 Territorial and cross-border cooperation of IPA III Programming Framework¹, as it is one of the outcome indicators most commonly included in Interreg-IPA CBC and Interreg/Interreg NEXT transnational programmes supported with IPA III funds. It is an Interreg-specific indicator of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF): Common Result Indicator RCR 84². Its characteristics and intended use under the ERDF are defined in Commission Staff working document (2021)198 final³. It can also be relevant to other Windows of IPA III Programming Framework, in particular Window 2 Good governance, EU Acquis alignment, Good neighbourly relations and

¹ Annex to Commission implementing decision C(2021) 8914 final

² As defined in Regulation (EU) 2021/1058

³ Commission Staff working document on *Performance, monitoring and evaluation of the ERDF, the Cohesion Fund and the Just Transition Fund in 2021-2027* SWD(2021) 198 final

Strategic communication, Thematic Priority 3 Good neighbourly relations and reconciliations.

- **Chapter of the Acquis:** The indicator cuts across the EU Acquis chapters and political priorities.
- As mentioned under **Window 5** of IPA III Programming Framework (p.56), the *European Territorial Cooperation (ETC)* provides the necessary framework for implementation of joint actions and policy exchanges between national, regional and local actors across Europe and external borders. The strategic objectives of cooperation between Member States, IPA III beneficiaries and/or Partner Countries covered by the NDICI-GE regulation is notably to reinforce the cross-border relations (including through people-to-people cooperation) and enhance effective coordination of regional and urban multilateral, regional and bilateral policies at the level of the concerned partners.
- **Window 2** Thematic Priority 3 *Good neighbourly relations and reconciliation* targets support to actions that contribute to confidence building, social cohesion and strengthening neighbourly relations.

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 organisations 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 organisations 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 targets⁴.
 - 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 options⁵) and this selection triggers the

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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.

<p>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.</p>
<p>5. Calculation of values</p>
<p>The value for this indicator is calculated by counting the Number of organisations, using the Technical Definitions and Counting Guidance provided below. Please double check your calculations using the Quality Control Checklist below.</p> <p><u>Technical Definitions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisations counted in this indicator are the organisations cooperating across borders after the completion of the supported projects. The organisations are the legal entities that were formally involved in project implementation, including project partners and associated organisations, as mentioned in the financing agreement of the application. Organisations that cooperated formally in small projects (for instance under a Small Project Fund) are also counted. • The cooperation concept should be interpreted as having a statement that the entities have a formal agreement to continue cooperation after the end of the supported project. The cooperation agreements may be established during the implementation of the project or within one year after the project completion. The sustained cooperation does not have to cover the same topic as addressed by the completed project. <p><u>Counting Guidance</u></p> <p>At programme level, double counting of the same organisation should be avoided at the level of project partners and associated organisations</p> <p><u>Quality Control Checklist</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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?
<p>6. Examples of calculations</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Interreg-IPA CBC project aims to reduce pollution on a cross-border lake and its shores, focusing on the prevention and reduction of litter. The environmental issue is perceived by the project partners as requiring a long-lasting cooperation, so they have described in their application their willingness to formally engage to continue cooperation after the end of the project. • This 2-year project is implemented in cross-border partnership between 4 project partners: a lead beneficiary (an environmental NGO in region X) and three beneficiaries (a regional authority in region X, an environmental NGO and a local authority in region Y). • However, in the second year of project implementation, local elections change the political priorities of the local authority in region Y, and the environment is not perceived as a key topic of interest anymore. The local authority will respect its contractual commitment as project beneficiary within the existing project until its completion, but it is not willing to

engage for follow-up environmental cross-border actions and therefore it will not sign the foreseen long-lasting cooperation agreement with the other partners.

- The other 3 partners are still committed and they sign by the end of the project an agreement to continue environmental cross-border cooperation after project completion.
- In this example, the values are:
 - **Baseline** (at project start): 0
 - **Target** (after 24 months): 4 organisations cooperating across borders after project completion (*the 4 organisations formally involved in project implementation, expected to sign a long-lasting cooperation agreement*).
 - **Final value** (after 24 months): 3 organisations cooperating across borders after project completion (*the 3 organisations formally involved in project implementation that actually signed the long-lasting cooperation agreement*). The final value is below the target.

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 studies conducted and budgeted by the EU-funded intervention ; Baseline and endline surveys conducted and budgeted by 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.
- In the framework of CBC/transnational programmes the indicator value will be monitored and reported by lead beneficiaries, based on their contractual obligations, checked by the Joint Secretariats and included in the Managing Authorities monitoring system. After project completion data collection may be carried out via a survey.
- As for all ERDF indicators, progress towards the indicator targets should be reported by the Interreg-IPA CBC and Interreg/Interreg NEXT transnational programmes to DG Regio every 6 months (31 January and 31 July)⁶. The cohesion open data platform⁷ will present for all Interreg programmes the monitoring data notified as programme managers report on implementation.

⁶ As provided for in Staff working document SWD (2021) 198 final

⁷ <https://cohesiondata.ec.europa.eu/>

- 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 5.0.1.1 can be found in the following groups of EU predefined indicators available in OPSYS, along with other related indicators:

- IPA III RF Window 5: Territorial and cross border cooperation (IPA III W5)

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

10. Other issues

n/a