IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name

IPA III RF 5.0.1.3: Number of new jobs resulting from programme activities

2. Technical details

OPSYS and Results Dashboard code: 260043.

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 could logically be associated with IPA III **outcome indicator 4.2.1.5** *Number of new businesses established*, also relevant to Windows 5 and 4.

Disaggregation:

- It is expected that this indicator will be disaggregated according to the:
  - gender, and
  - type of vulnerable group

of the people employed in the new jobs.

DAC sector codes: 25010; 25020; 25030; 25040

Main associated SDG: **SDG 8** *Decent work and economic growth*.

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: none.

3. Policy context and Rationale

- This indicator is included under **Window 5** *Territorial and cross-border cooperation* of IPA III Programming Framework[1] (indicator 34) as part of the measurement for *Economic, Social and Territorial Development of Border Areas*. It is **included in all IPA-IPA CBC programmes**.

- This indicator could also be relevant for interventions under other Windows, in particular under **Window 4** *Competitiveness and inclusive growth,* **though for window 4, the use of indicator** 4.1.1.4 '*Number of (a) jobs, (b) green jobs supported/sustained by the EU'* is recommended.

---

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

- Its equivalent under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) common indicators[2] is Common Result Indicator **RCR 01** *Jobs created in supported entities,* which is used under Interreg-IPA CBC*.*

- **Chapter of the *Acquis*.** The main concerned chapters of the EU *Acquis* relative to this indicator are **Chapter 19**: *Social policy and employment* and **Chapter 20**: *Enterprise and industrial policy.*

- As mentioned in IPA III Programming Framework context analysis under Window 4 (p. 45), "*Despite some (…) advances in job creation in recent years, the Western Balkans and Turkey still (…) face high unemployment rates and low labour market participation, in particular among women and youth*".

- Priorities for IPA III **Window 4 *Competitiveness and inclusive growth*** include the overall promotion of private sector development, in particular of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises. It is also mentioned (P49) that *"IPA III will focus on enhanced employment opportunities for women, youth and persons with disabilities, in addition to addressing social and employment issues for minorities".*

- *Promoting employment* is listed among the first priority for **cross-border cooperation** under the IPA III Regulation, while support to improving employment opportunities is also highlighted under ERDF policy objectives, in particular policy objectives 1 *A more competitive and smarter Europe (…)* and 4 *A more social and inclusive Europe (…).*

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 new jobs 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 new jobs 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[3].

---

[2] As defined in Regulation (EU) 2021/1058 and 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

[3] 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[4]) 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 new jobs**, using the Technical Definitions and Counting Guidance provided below. Please double check your calculations using the Quality Control Checklist below.

Technical Definitions

- The indicator counts the number of new **jobs** expressed in average **annual full-time equivalents** (FTEs) **created in line of activity supported by the intervention**. This can be the people newly employed by the businesses/companies which were targeted by the intervention, or in businesses/companies newly established as a result of the intervention (including self-employment initiatives).

- The new positions need to be filled, and they can be full time, part time or recurring seasonally. Vacant positions are not counted. Moreover, the newly created positions are expected to be retained for more than one year after project completion.

- Annual FTE is defined as the ratio of working hours effectively worked during a calendar year divided by the total number of hours conventionally worked in the same period by an individual or a group. By convention a person cannot perform more than one FTE on an annual basis. The number of hours conventionally worked is determined on the basis of normative/ statutory working hours according to the national legislation.

- A full-time person will be identified with reference to their employment status and the type of contract (full time or part time).

- This indicator should not be used for interventions that are limited to upstream activities focused on improving employment policies or the broader business environment since no direct influence can be traced between this kind of activity and the creation of particular jobs.

Counting Guidance

- The indicator is calculated as the difference between the annual FTE jobs filled before the project starts and at completion or one year after the project completion, as relevant, in the line of activity supported.

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] 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.

4.   Did you use the comment box to inform on the values encoded?

6. Examples of calculations

- A 2-year EU-funded business development programme targeting potential entrepreneurs in promising sectors resulted in the establishment in year 2 of 21 new businesses.

- From these 21 new businesses, 15 are self-employment initiatives, on a full time basis.

- The other 6 entrepreneurs work full time in the new business development but have also hired staff: 2 of them have created an additional full time position, and 4 a part-time position (50%).

- In this example, the values are:
  - Baseline (at project start): 0
  - Target (after 24 months): 25 new jobs resulting from programme activities
  - Current value (after 12 months): 0
  - Final value (after 24 months – project completion): 25 new jobs (21 + 2 + (4*0,5))
  - Final value (as relevant, if requested) (after 36 months – 1 year after completion): 25 new jobs retained

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: n/a

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 5.0.1.3 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.