IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name

IPA III RF 5.0.1.2: Number of organisations directly involved in the implementation of the projects

2. Technical details

OPSYS and Results Dashboard code: 260040.

Unit of measure: Number of (#)

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

Level of measurement: This is an **output** indicator. It should be distinguished from indicator 2.3.1.1 *Number of organisations participating in cross-border networks/partnerships formed*, also applicable to Window 5, which has a different scope.

Disaggregation: It is foreseen within IPA-IPA CBC Regional Monitoring System that this indicator will be disaggregated by type of organisation

DAC sector codes: 15110; 15111; 15112; 15113; 15114; 15125; 15130; 15142; 15150; 15151; 15152;15153; 15160; 15170; 15180; 15190

Main associated SDG: **SDG 17** *Partnerships for the goals*.

Other associated SDGs: n/a*.

Associated IPA III Level 1 indicator:

- 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) .

Associated IPA III Level 3 indicators: .

- Amount and share of EU-funded external assistance qualifying as ODA

3. Policy context and Rationale

- This indicator is included under **Window 5** *Territorial and cross-border cooperation* of IPA III Programming Framework (indicator 33) as part of the measurement for *Reconciliation, Confidence Building and Good Neighbourly Relations*. It is **included in all IPA-IPA CBC programmes**.

- It does not have an equivalent under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) common indicators applicable to Interreg-IPA CBC, Interreg NEXT/Interreg transnational and interregional programmes, and is not included in these programmes.

- **Chapter of the *Acquis*:** The indicator cuts across the EU A*cquis* chapters and political priorities.

- The EU actively promotes territorial cohesion to reduce disparities between regions and backwardness of the least favoured territories.

- This indicator is relevant to the three **strategic objectives** of the cross-border cooperation programmes between IPA III beneficiaries defined in the Programming Framework, which are:

o Promotion of reconciliation and confidence building and good neighbourly relations;

o Economic, social and territorial development of border areas, fostering the cooperation among national local/regional authorities, associations, non-governmental organisations and enterprises from neighbouring regions;

o Building the capacities of local, regional and national institutions to manage EU programmes and to prepare them for the management of future Structural Funds under the territorial cooperation goal, which will be implemented upon accession.

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 targets[1].
  - 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[2]) 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 organisations**, using the Technical Definitions and Counting Guidance provided below. Please double check your calculations using the Quality Control Checklist below.

Technical Definitions

- The **organisations** counted in this indicator are the legal entities including all project partners implementing the project, stakeholders directly involved in project activities and organisations targeted by the project. It does not include those organisations from which individual participants in events come, unless they participated in the event in their capacity as official representatives of the organisation.

Counting Guidance

- The **time measurement** achieved is upon project finalisation.

- Please **avoid double counting** of the same organisation, as far as possible. If the same organisation is involved several times/over several years within the same project, it should only be counted once in the project monitoring/reporting. If the same organisation is involved in several projects, it should only be counted once in the programme monitoring/reporting.

  Currently, the system cannot provide data without double counting. For the time being, the JTS has to make sure there is no double counting (from the aggregated value extracted from the system they need to deduct the organisations that appear in more than one project from their list of projects).

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

- An IPA-IPA CBC project aims to reduce pollution on a cross-border lake and its shores, focusing on the prevention and reduction of litter. This 2-year project is implemented in cross-border partnership between a lead beneficiary (an environmental NGO in region X) and three beneficiaries (a regional authority in region X, a local authority and an environmental NGO in region Y). The project organises awareness-raising activities, with children as a specific target group. For this purpose, the project strives to involve schools in the project activities (to organise with them e.g. children drawing competitions about the lake and cleaning campaigns). By the end of the first year, 3 schools have agreed to be involved in the implementation of these activities, and 5 schools in total in the second year.

- In this example, the values are:
  - Baseline (at project start): 0
  - Target (after 24 months): 10 organisations directly involved in the implementation of the project (4 beneficiaries + 6 schools expected to be involved in project implementation)
  - Current value (after 12 months): 7 organisations directly involved (4 beneficiaries + 3 schools)

Final value (after 24 months): 9 organisations directly involved (4 beneficiaries + 5 schools). 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).

Data source categories specified in OPSYS:

- EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems (Progress and final reports for 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.
- For IPA-IPA CBC programmes, the Joint Secretariat will verify the data. It is collected into a common electronic Regional Monitoring System. Programmes extract relevant data from this system for their annual reporting to DG NEAR.
- 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 5.0.1.2 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

None