

Global Europe Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator name
GERF 2.23: Number of state institutions and non-state actors supported by the EU on security, border management, countering violent extremism, conflict prevention, protection of civilian population and human rights
2. Technical details
<i>Please use the information provided in OPSYS or the SWD.</i> <u>Results Dashboard code(s)</u>: 72953. <u>Unit of measure</u>: Number of (#). <u>Type of indicator</u>: Quantitative (not Qualitative) – Numeric (not Percentage); Actual ex-post (not estimated or ex-ante); Cumulative (not annual); Direct (not indirect). <u>Level(s) of measurement</u>: Specific Objective – Outcome; Direct Output; Output. <u>Disaggregation(s)</u>: Sector (Public sector; Private sector; Civil society sector). <u>DAC sector code(s)</u>: 15110 - Public sector policy and administrative management, 15111 - Public finance management, 15113 - Anti-corruption organisations and institutions, 15125 - Public Procurement, 15130 - Legal and judicial development, 15142 - Macroeconomic policy, 15150 - Democratic participation and civil society, 15151 - Elections, 15152 - Legislatures and political parties, 15153 - Media and free flow of information, 15160 - Human rights, 15170 - Women's rights organisations and movements, and government institutions, 15180 - Ending violence against women and girls, 15190 - Facilitation of orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility, 15210 - Security system management and reform, 15220 - Civilian peace building, conflict prevention and resolution, 15230 - Participation in international peacekeeping operations, 15240 - Reintegration and SALW control, 15250 - Removal of land mines and explosive remnants of war, 15261 - Child soldiers (prevention and demobilisation). <u>Main associated SDG</u>: 16.a Strengthen relevant national institutions, including through international cooperation, for building capacity at all levels, in particular in developing countries, to prevent violence and combat terrorism and crime. <u>Other associated SDGs</u>: 16.3 rule of law and justice; 16.6 accountable institutions; 16.10 protect fundamental freedoms; 17.9 capacity building. <u>Associated GERF Level 1 indicator</u>: 1.19 Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) Global Peace Index. <u>Associated GERF Level 3 indicators</u>: 3.3 Amount and share of EU-funded external assistance contributing to strengthening investment climate 3.8 Amount and share of EU-funded external assistance directed towards fragile states 3.13 Number and share of EU- external interventions promoting gender equality and

<i>women's empowerment</i> <i>3.14 Number and share of EU-funded external interventions promoting disability inclusion</i> <i>3.16 Amount and share of EU-funded external assistance qualifying as ODA</i>
3. Policy context and rationale
The indicator is aligned with the New Consensus for Development priority to promote shared solutions to security and development challenges, by supporting the democratic governance of the security sector and by preventing conflicts and radicalisation leading to violent extremism. It is also aligned with the priority to promote the universal values of democracy, good governance, the rule of law and human rights for all and efficient, transparent, independent, open and accountable justice systems. This indicator follows the policy priority of supporting improvements in overall good governance, in particular by promoting conflict prevention, addressing human rights abuses and enforcing the rule of law, including through capacity building for security and development, and law enforcement, including border management. Some actions will also help prevent radicalisation and extremism.
4. Logframe inclusion
If an intervention generates the result measured by this indicator, then it must be reported in OPSYS. Corporate targets have been set for the indicators used to monitor the Strategic Plan and the Multiannual Financial Framework (see Section 9). Progress towards these targets is reported annually in the Annual Activity Plan (for the Strategic Plan) and the Programme Performance Statements (for the Multiannual Financial Framework). These values are calculated by aggregating the results reported in OPSYS. These reports ultimately contribute to the Annual Management Performance Report submitted by the European Commission to the Council and Parliament during the annual budgetary discharge procedure. If targets are not met, explanations must be provided. Therefore, it is crucial that all results are recorded in OPSYS. There are two ways of doing this: 1. Include the indicator directly in the logframe (recommended approach); 2. Match the indicator to the closest logframe indicator (only if the indicator was not originally included in the logframe and modification is not possible). Why? The matching functionality in OPSYS only accommodates reporting current values and does not yet support encoding baselines and targets. This is a significant drawback because targets are a valuable piece of information, especially at the beginning of a Multiannual Financial Framework. Indeed, results take time to materialise as they are the last step in the chain, appearing only after programming, commitments, contracting, and spending have occurred. Targets allow to see what results are expected long before they materialise, which is reassuring to the different stakeholders concerned with accountability. Therefore, include all corporate indicators directly in the logframe whenever possible, and reserve the matching

functionality only for cases when this is not feasible.
5. Values to report
The following values must be determined in line with the definitions provided in Section 6. Baseline value: the value measured for the indicator in the baseline year. The baseline value is the value against which progress will be assessed. Current value: - For logframe indicators: the most recent value for the indicator at the time of reporting. The current value includes the baseline value which is reported separately for logframe indicators in OPSYS. - For matched indicators: the most recent value for the results achieved at the time of reporting since the start of implementation of the intervention. This value is obtained by taking the most recent value for the indicator at the time of reporting and subtracting off the baseline value which is not reported separately for matched indicators in OPSYS. Current values will be collected at least once a year and reported cumulatively throughout the implementation period. Final target value: the expected value for the indicator in the target year. Intermediate target values (milestones). A tool has been developed in OPSYS to generate intermediate targets automatically¹. - 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

¹ This has been done in the context of the Primary Intervention Questionnaire (PIQ) for the EAMR. Three new KPIs provide an overall assessment of ongoing interventions (current performance and future performance) and completed interventions (final performance). Scores will be calculated for all INTPA and NEAR interventions participating in the annual results data collection exercise.

- **KPI 10** reflects the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of ongoing interventions. 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 either by the logframe data, if sufficient data is available, or the response to a question in a survey, if not.
- **KPI 11** reflects expectations regarding the most probable levels of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability that can be achieved by ongoing interventions in the future. In this case, all the information is provided by the Operational Manager's responses to questions in a survey.
- **KPI 12** reflects the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of completed interventions. 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 sufficient data is available, or the response to a question in a survey, if not.

² a. *steady progress*: The outcomes are achieved continuously throughout implementation; b. *accelerating progress*: The outcomes are achieved towards the end of implementation; c. *no progress until end*: The outcomes are mostly achieved at the end of implementation; d. *none of the above*.

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.
6. Calculation of values <i>Specify all assumptions made, list definitions for all technical terms, provide any relevant guidance on (double) counting, and include checklist for quality control.</i> The value for this indicator is calculated by counting the number of state institutions and non-state actors supported by the EU on security, border management, countering violent extremism, conflict prevention, protection of civilian population and human rights, using the technical definitions and counting guidance below. Please double check your calculations using the quality control checklist below. <u>Technical definitions</u> Supported organisations may include the following. – State institutions with a formal mandate to ensure the protection of the state and its citizens against violence and coercion. These include police, military forces with law enforcement duties, paramilitary forces, presidential guards, coast and border guards, customs authorities, environmental guards, etc. – Elected and appointed civil authorities responsible for control and oversight of these institutions. These include the parliament, ministries of defence, interior and foreign affairs, national security agencies, etc. – Criminal justice agencies. These include ministries of justice, prosecutorial and investigation services, the judiciary and the courts, human rights bodies such as ombudsmen, and independent commissions, etc. – Organisations that are part of international human rights and justice mechanisms, such as international courts, international/regional human rights commissions, etc. – Non-state actors, such as civil society organisations (CSOs) including professional organisations, non-profit organisations, international non-governmental organisations, media, lobby groups, etc. Strengthening human security aims to ensure the safety of a population, or the preservation of its basic rights, in areas at risk of conflict by, for example, improving access to justice. It is understood to be the implementation of activities in support of all stakeholders contributing directly (justice actors, military forces with law enforcement duties, police) or indirectly (women, young people, community organisations, etc.) to the stability of a given area. It may include the following. – Strengthening judicial and prosecutorial institutions; improving professional collaboration and cooperation between justice and security actors; improving the courts system and case management for criminal cases; human resources development and training, for example for legal professionals, law enforcement and penitentiary workers; rehabilitation of the legal system, particularly in fragile

or post-conflict countries, to align it with best international practice; improving international judicial cooperation in criminal matters.

- Integrated border management, meaning national and international coordination and cooperation among all the authorities and agencies involved in border security and trade facilitation for effective, efficient and coordinated border management, to achieve the objective of open but well-controlled and secure borders (2010 EU Guidelines for Integrated Border Management in European Commission External Cooperation).
- Preventing violent extremisms, meaning the implementation of activities aimed at tackling the root causes of violent extremism (government failure, political, social and economic marginalisation, injustice, etc.), including by making a society more resilient.
- Preventing conflict, meaning the implementation of activities (inter-/intra-community dialogue, building the population's trust in the state, setting up and maintaining early warning systems, fighting against impunity, transitional justice and reconciliation, etc.) intentionally trying to cause conflict and scupper prospects of peace.
- Compliance with and promotion of international humanitarian law.
- Protecting populations and human rights, meaning giving direct support for promoting and defending civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the rights of women, children, minorities, etc.

Examples of support for the work of state and non-state organisations may include:

- *capacity building*: support for draft strategies and policies, training to make operations more effective and efficient or to increase knowledge in the areas of justice, security, border management, the prevention of violent extremism, conflict prevention, population protection in crises and the safeguarding of human rights;
- *direct operational support*: providing internal security forces with equipment, services and infrastructure, giving support to regional/international human rights/legal institutions such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, regional human rights mechanisms or the International Criminal Court, etc;
- *budget support*: financial assistance on the basis of specific security indicators negotiated with the authorities concerned.

Counting guidance

1. Double counting is not allowed: an organisation can be counted only once in the same reporting period. This means that if the same organisation benefits from one or more than one form of support, over one or more years of the same reporting period, from the same intervention or different interventions, it should be counted only once.

Quality control checklist

1. Has the indicator been included directly in the logframe? Reserve the OPSYS matching functionality only for cases when this is not feasible.
2. If the indicator has been included directly in the logframe, does the current value *include* the baseline value? If the indicator has been matched to a

logframe indicator, does the current value <i>exclude</i> the baseline value? - Is the unit of measurement correct? The GERF value counts organisations, not individuals. If the beneficiaries are individuals, consider reporting using GERF 2.24 <i>Number of people directly benefiting from EU-supported interventions that specifically aim to support civilian post-conflict peace building and/or conflict prevention</i> or GERF 2.30 <i>Number of victims of human rights violations directly benefiting from assistance funded by the EU</i>. - Is the GERF value a whole number? The number of organisations cannot be a decimal number. - Has double counting been avoided? Organisations should be counted only once. - Have the institutions and actors been listed in the comments field? This enables the cross-checking of national and regional interventions. - Have all calculations been recorded in the calculation method field? Have all relevant explanations been reported in the comment field?
7. Examples of calculations
<u>Example 1</u> An EU intervention is supporting the adoption of modern border management methods by two state border guard services in neighbouring countries A and B. Support has been provided for the upgrading of physical border posts and the implementation of institutional reforms. In addition, 2 000 staff have been trained to improve their professional skills in this area, including in using an upgraded IT system, implementing better border control procedures, etc. from 2014 to 2016. For a coordinated approach, the intervention did not only involve border agencies, but also seven other partner authorities working in drug control, customs and agriculture over the same period. For this intervention, the total number of state institutions supported on border management was nine from 2014 to 2016. <u>Example 2</u> An EU-funded intervention supporting CSOs works with five community-based organisations from different ethnic groups on establishing a community-based mechanism to prevent and manage conflict in region X. For this intervention, the number of non-state actors supported is five in the year in question.
8. Data sources and issues
<i>Please use the data source categories specified in OPSYS.</i> <u>EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems</u>: <i>Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention; ROM reviews; Baseline and endline surveys conducted and budgeted by the EU-funded intervention.</i> <i>Include any issues relating to the availability and quality of the data.</i>
9. Reporting process & Corporate reporting

The data collected on this indicator will be reported in OPSYS by the Implementing Partner. The values encoded in OPSYS will be verified, possibly modified and ultimately validated by the Operational Manager. Once a year the results reported will be frozen for corporate reporting. The methodological services in HQ that are responsible for GERF corporate reporting will perform quality control on the frozen data and aggregate as needed to meet the different corporate reporting requirements.

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

- *NDICI via the Annual Report*
- *NDICI via the Programme Statements*
- *INTPA Strategic Plan via the Annual Activity Report*
- *NEAR Strategic Plan via the Annual Activity Report*
- *FPI Strategic Plan*

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

- *EFSD+*
- *GAP III*
- *IPA III*
- *TEI-MORE*

10. Other uses

GERF 2.23 can be found in the following thematic results chains, along with other related indicators:

- [Countering Violent Extremism](#)
- [Human Rights](#)
- [Sustainable cities](#)

GERF 2.23 can be found in the following groups of EU predefined indicators available in OPSYS, along with other related indicators:

- Countering Violent Extremism
- Human Rights
- Security Sector Reform
- Sustainable cities

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

External bodies using the same or similar indicator:

- UNDP Integrated Results and Resources Framework 2018-21: Number of countries with national plans of action for prevention of violent extremism under implementation.

11. Other issues