

IPA III Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator code and name
IPA III RF 5.0.1.4: Number of organisations/institutions with increased capacities
2. Technical details
<p><u>OPSYS and Results Dashboard code:</u> 260045.</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.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> It is foreseen within IPA-IPA CBC Regional Monitoring System that this indicator will be disaggregated by type of organisation (NGOs, 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 under Window 5 Territorial and cross-border cooperation of IPA III Programming Framework¹ (indicator 36) as part of the measurement for <i>Capacity Building of Institutions at all Levels</i>. It is included in all IPA-IPA CBC programmes. This indicator could also be relevant for interventions under all the other IPA III Windows. Please note however that there is another indicator dealing with increased capacities linked to Window 1 of the IPA III Results Framework, that reads as follows: “<i>Number of EU funded interventions reporting improvement of state institutions' capacities in (a) law enforcement, (b) judiciary and (c) administration involved in the prevention and fight against organised crime and/or fight against corruption with EU support</i>” (Ind. 1.1.1.1). It does not have an equivalent under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) common indicators² applicable to Interreg-IPA CBC, Interreg NEXT/Interreg transnational and interregional programmes. Chapter of the Acquis: The indicator cuts across the EU <i>Acquis</i> chapters and political priorities

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

² As defined in Regulation (EU) 2021/1058

- Under **Window 5 Territorial and cross-border cooperation**, as highlighted in IPA III Programming Framework (p. 59) “*the thematic cluster ‘improved capacity of regional and local authorities to tackle local challenges’ should be mainstreamed by the IPA beneficiaries in each cross-border cooperation programme*”.
- Increasing the capacity of organisations/institutions is also part of other priority objectives, such as **Window 1 Rule of law, fundamental rights and democracy**, with in particular planned support to enhance the capacities of institutions from the judicial system or fighting organised crime, as well as those of civil society organisations. Under **Window 2 Good governance, EU Acquis alignment, good neighbourly relations and strategic communication**, capacity-building is expected to improve administrative capacity and governance at all levels. Under **Window 3 Green agenda and sustainable connectivity**, capacity-building of institutions at all levels is also mentioned as an important measure to “*deliver, implement, enforce and monitor effective environmental and climate change policies and legislation*” (p. 38) as well as to better manage risks. **Window 4 Competitiveness and inclusive growth** likewise foresees support to the improvement of capacities of institutions and civil society organisations.

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/institutions 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/institutions 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 targets³.
 - 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 options⁴) and this selection triggers the

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.

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.

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

Technical Definitions

- **Organisations/institutions** for the purpose of this indicator refers to legal entities, including local, regional or national authorities, private and public entities (such as education, training and research institutions, associations, non-governmental organisations, regional development agencies, business support organisations, SMEs, etc.).
- **Capacities** refer to the ability of an organisation/institution to function properly and fulfil its duties. Improvements can be made in terms of structure, human resources, systems and tools to be used. To be counted against 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 its approach and measure the progress made in improving capacity.

For this indicator, as with any other indicator related to increased capacities, one must think carefully about sources and means of verification. It is not sufficient e.g. to include under this indicator the simple fact that representatives of an organisation received capacity building. There must be a verification on whether their capacity has improved, either by a) testing the knowledge and skills of those benefiting from capacity building before and after delivery of capacity building or b) assessing the performance of the same target group /of the organisation after benefiting from capacity building.

Counting Guidance

- The **time measurement** achieved is upon project finalisation.
- Please **avoid double counting** of the same organisation/institution, as far as possible. If the same organisation/institution is involved in capacity development initiatives several times/over several years within the same project, it should only be counted once in the project monitoring/reporting. If the same organisation/institution is involved in capacity development initiatives 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 develop an integrated environmental monitoring system to improve the protection of the population from border regions exposed to natural hazards (e.g. fires), to reduce risks and prepare effective responses. This 2-year project is implemented in a cross-border partnership between 2 regional councils (from regions X & Y) and an association for transfer of technology and innovation (from region W). The project activities include the creation of an online common integrated platform and mobile application for rapid response to crisis. The project targets local authorities and emergency services with capacity building activities including practical trainings on using the platform, trainings and demonstrations to deal with unforeseen disasters, and the provision of specialized equipment. By the end of the first year, the progress report indicates that 7 local authorities started to be involved in the capacity building activities. This information alone, in the absence of some form of assessment that capacity has indeed improved, does not allow to inform the indicator with current values. It would only allow to inform an indicator such as '*Number of organisations / institutions benefitting from capacity development activities*'.
- Capacity development activities continue in the second year with the additional involvement of 4 fire and rescue services from the border regions. The final report includes highlights from an assessment carried out at the end of year 2 to verify the extent to which capacity development activities have led to an increase of capacities of the organisations involved. The assessment concludes that 6 of the 7 local authorities have indeed shown an increase in capacity as have all 4 fire and rescue services.
- In this example, the values are:
 - **Baseline** (at project start): 0
 - **Target** (after 24 months): 9 organisations/institutions with increased capacities
 - **Current value** (after 12 months): 0 organisations/institutions with increased capacities (all 7 local authorities involved have benefitted from capacity development activities but no information is provided in the progress report on improvement of capacities as a result of activities undertaken).
 - **Final value** (after 24 months): 10 organisations/institutions with increased capacities (6 of the 7 local authorities + 4 fire and rescue services), cumulative value reported.

The final value slightly exceeds 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 (Baseline and endline surveys conducted and budgeted by the EU-funded intervention ; Database of beneficiaries/participants ; Pre- and post-training test reports)

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 indicator value is regularly monitored and reported by project lead beneficiaries and checked by each IPA-IPA CBC programme Joint Secretariat. It is collected into a common electronic Regional Monitoring System. Programmes extract relevant data from this system for their annual reporting to DG NEAR. Aggregated information on indicators across IPA-IPA CBC programmes can be provided by the Regional Monitoring System.
- 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 5.0.1.4 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.