OPSYS Results: Logframes and indicators

14th March 2022

Agenda

1. Which logframe to encode for on-going Agreements

2. How to use the available indicators in OPSYS – core *vs* customised

3. Core indicators in OPSYS

4. Corporate indicators

5. How to treat indicators very similar, but not the same as a CORE in OPSYS

6. Matching functionality

7. Use of CORE indicators in OPSYS to design logframes for new Agreements

8. Q&A

1. Which Logframe to encode for on-going Agreements?

❖ The Logframe is the one available as per <u>last formal exchange</u> between the Commission and the Implementing Partner, i.e.:

- ▪ Description of the Action (Annex I to the Agreement)

- ▪ Inception/progress/interim report(s)

- ▪ Amendment(s)

- ▪ Final report

- ▪ Exchange of letters among the parties

❖ It is not requested to make any change, unless the logframe does not respect the standard structure → *case by case check*

European Commission

2. How to use the available indicators pre-encoded in OPSYS? – core *vs* customised

- The indicators to be encoded for **on-going Agreements** are the ones as per last available formal exchange

- However, frequently used quality assessed indicators are available in OPSYS via a drop-down menu → CORE indicators in OPSYS

- As a first step, while encoding indicators as per logframe, the Organisation should use the "word search function" to see if the indicators are already in the system as CORE (using key words)

- This allows harmonisation of approaches and avoids duplications (i.e. same indicator encoded slightly differently)

- If the indicator in the Logframe does not appear among the CORE lists in OPSYS – it is to be encoded as new, i.e. CUSTOMISED

- If a CUSTOMISED indicator is used often, please flag it to the Commission to verify if it could be made CORE in OPSYS

- Not blocking in case a logframe does not include any indicator among the CORE ones

3. Core indicators in OPSYS

- <u>Frequently used-quality assessed-possible to aggregate-encoded in OPSYS</u> – not exhaustive sets for all sectors

- "Fast track" indicators while encoding logframes structure in OPSYS

- CORE indicators in OPSYS are also clustered by Groups – one CORE can belong to more than one Group (i.e. SDG indicators belong to SDG <u>and</u> GERF Level 1 Groups)

- Corporate indicators are also CORE in OPSYS - not all CORE in OPSYS are corporate indicators (see next slide on Corporate indicators)

- Examples of CORE indicators in OPSYS: SDGs indicators, GAP III indicators, etc.

- CORE in OPSYS extracted *as of March 2022* for easier check off-line and available on Capacity4Dev https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/core-indicators-design-and-monitoring-eu-funded-interventions

- List of CORE in OPSYS is <u>growing regularly</u>

European Commission

4. Corporate indicators

- Corporate indicators are <u>also</u> CORE in OPSYS (already encoded to be selected from drop-down menu)

- Not all CORE in OPSYS are corporate indicators

- Corporate indicators are the ones that the Commission will use for corporate reporting – <u>to be aggregated against methodological notes</u>

- Corporate indicators are:

  - EURF/GERF https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/eu-rfi

  - IPA Performance Framework

  - FPI Performance Framework https://ec.europa.eu/fpi/key-documents_en?page=1

- If a logframe does not include any corporate indicator: this is very possible for on-going Agreements as corporate indicators most probably did not exist when the Agreement was signed. Still, it is good to keep them in mind and, <u>if relevant, use the functionality to "match"</u>

5. How to treat indicators very similar, but not the same as a CORE one in OPSYS?

- If the difference is minimum (i.e. swapped words, typos, etc.) but the unit of measure is exactly the same (i.e. Number of, Ratio of, MW, etc.) it is suggested to contact the EU Operational Manager and agree to select it as CORE – this would ease future exchanges on the indicator (and avoid the matching! See next slide)

- If the difference is substantial (different unit of measure, etc.) the indicator is to be encoded as new – CUSTOMISED

- If still there is high chance that the indicator CUSTOMISED contributes to a CORE it is possible to flag it via the <u>functionality of MATCHING</u>

6a. Matching functionality: same unit of measure

Indicator	Current Value	EU RF Indicator	EU RF Value
Number of people newly connected to electricity services grid by the intervention	580	2.9 - Number of individuals with access to electricity with EU support through: a) new access, b) improved access	580

- Commission services (Quality Managers) will verify the matching and make the necessary calculations

- Intervention indicator corresponds to EU RF indicator's methodological notes

- Same unit of measurement

- Current value and EU RF value are the same

European Commission

6b. Matching functionality: different units of measure

Indicator	Current Value	EU RF Indicator	EU RF Value
Number of households newly connected to electricity services grid by the intervention	240	2.9 - Number of individuals with access to electricity with EU support through: a) new access, b) improved access	840

- Commission services (Quality Managers) will verify the matching and make the necessary calculations

- Find average household size:

  - intervention survey

  - national census or nationally representative household survey (DHS, MICS)

  - Otherwise, UN Database of Household Size and Composition: https://population.un.org/Household/index.html

- Calculate number of individuals: 240*3.5 (average HH size)

European Commission

6c. Matching functionality: very different units of measure

Indicator	Baseline value	Current value	EU RF Indicator	EU RF Value
Rate of modern contraceptive use (%) by Women of Child-Bearing Age (WCBA) in XXX Counties	13.1%	18.5%	EU RF 2.6 Number of women of reproductive age using modern contraception methods with EU support	**4,320**

Current value comment:
"This is the ratio of usage of modern contraceptive methods found by the evaluation mission (through structured surveys) to the target population of 80,000 in the XXX district."

EU RF calculation:
(18.5% - 13.1%) * 80,000 = 4,320

European Commission

6d. Matching functionality: key principles

- Is it mandatory to match a CUSTOMISED indicator with a CORE? → <u>NO</u> – if straightforward, please propose the match

- Is it the Organisation responsibility to decide if a match is accurately made? → <u>NO</u>

- For INTPA/NEAR: an indicator in the Logframe can be matched to an EURF/GERF/IPA PF indicator if it fits into the scope defined in the respective methodological notes and following discussion with OM/QM

- For FPI: an indicator in the Logframe can be matched to a FPI CORE indicator if it fits into the scope defined in the methodological notes and after discussions with responsible Operational Manager

- <u>In the future the match could be made with any indicator that is CORE, not limited to CORPORATE ones</u>

7. Use of CORE indicators in OPSYS to design logframes for new Agreements

- The use of indicators that are corporate, hence pre-encoded as CORE in OPSYS is strongly recommended, not mandatory nor imposed → contracting phase allows for exchanges between the parties on the logframe (off-OPSYS)

- The use of CORE indicators would allow the Commission DGs of the Relex family to comply with NDICI-GE and IPA III Regulations and establish a contribution to SDGs

- Also, the more indicators are selected from the list of CORE in OPSYS, the less the "matching" functionality will be needed

- CORE indicators are quality assessed and easy to select in the system – fast track while encoding

- Harmonisation of approaches between the Commission and its Partners