EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities DG

General Coordination, Interinstitutional Relations

Brussels. 01/FB D(2008)

PROGRESS/003/2008

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMME IN THE SPHERE OF EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SOLIDARITY – PROGRESS

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMUNITY PROGRAMME FOR EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SOLIDARITY - PROGRESS - 2007-2013

DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING A MONITORING FRAMEWORK FOR PROGRESS 2007-2013

INTRODUCTION

This paper sets out the proposed approach to monitoring and reporting on performance of the Community programme for employment and social solidarity – PROGRESS for the period 2007-2013 (hereafter 'PROGRESS'). The ultimate aim of the programme is to ensure that "Member States implement laws, policies and practices in a manner that contributes to the desired outcomes of the Social Agenda". The programme has a budget of €743.2m for 2007-13. The programme will involve interventions across a broad range of policy areas, hence performance monitoring aspects will be subject to a number of issues and challenges which are outlined below.

Performance monitoring can be defined as a "continuing function that aims primarily to provide the management and main stakeholders of an ongoing intervention (project, programme) with early indications of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of results"¹. Hence performance monitoring serves two equally important, closely interlinked purposes: a) improving management (internal function); and b) strengthening accountability and transparency (external function). The internal function aims at making management of the programme more efficient, while the external function is focused at providing empirical evidence on the outcomes of the EU co-financed activities and thus showing how EU policies really create value-added.

Monitoring the performance of PROGRESS will be carried out in accordance with the performance management plan, namely the Strategic Framework for the Implementation of PROGRESS. The latter document defines the PROGRESS programme's mandate, sets out the logic model (outputsimmediate outcomes-intermediate outcomes-ultimate outcomes) behind the programme and lists the performance measures to be used to determine the extent to which PROGRESS has delivered on its expected outcomes. The Monitoring Framework supplements the Strategic Framework by elaborating important practical aspects of performance monitoring such as defining more precise quantitative and qualitative information to be collected, selecting methods and strategies of collecting monitoring data, etc.

¹ DG BUDG Publication on "Evaluating EU activities" – July 2004http://ec.europa.eu/budget/evaluation/pdf/pub_eval_activities_full_en.PDF

Following a call for tenders, external contractors² have been appointed to elaborate the Monitoring Framework to monitor the performance of PROGRESS through the collection of quantitative and qualitative monitoring information as well as to analyse it and to report back findings to the Commission. Additionally, *ad hoc* technical assistance will be provided by the contractors so as to improve the programme's effectiveness and performance during its implementation as well as to assist beneficiaries in meeting their reporting obligations.

1. PROGRESS PERFORMANCE MONITORING: KEY ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

1.1. Balance between a general and specific approach to monitoring

PROGRESS covers five different, but inter-linked policy areas – employment, social inclusion and protection, working conditions, non-discrimination, and gender equality. At the same time the PROGRESS logic model, which is common to all the policy areas, sets out 7 types of outputs to be delivered under PROGRESS, which are expected to lead to 5 immediate outcomes and eventually contribute to 3 intermediate outcomes and the final, overarching outcome of contributing towards the achievement of the European Social Agenda.

There is a need to strike a balance between monitoring information which is specific to a particular policy area on the one hand, and the necessity of collating monitoring information which allows for aggregation and reporting at the level of programme as a whole on the other.

In this respect, an important distinction can be made between programme-level monitoring and monitoring at project/activity level. For example, during 2008 it has been estimated that PROGRESS will fund 129 different activities, which in turn should lead to the delivery of almost 600 different outputs. Given the large number of activities, there is a need to ensure a focus on ensuring that the monitoring system facilitates performance monitoring of the PROGRESS programme overall.

Meaningful assessment of what has actually been achieved through PROGRESS' implementation will only be possible through the analysis of information which can be aggregated and hence compared at the programme level. Therefore as a rule, the Monitoring Framework seeks wherever possible to collect monitoring information which is sufficiently 'general' and hence applicable and relevant to all policy areas covered. Importantly, such information will allow benchmarking and comparisons to be made between policy areas (including their supporting instruments) as well as across various types of outputs, or when relevant, stakeholders.

Yet the need to reflect the specificities of the policy areas covered within PROGRESS as well as goal-bound and context-related nature of outcomes will be respected both during monitoring of and reporting on the programme. At output level, the ability to benchmark variations by type of outputs across all policy sections will be further supplemented by more in-depth analysis of outputs which are typical for a given policy area (for example, in 2008 most training and mutual learning activities are planned in the non-discrimination and gender equality areas, while the development of statistical tools and methods is more typical of employment and working conditions areas).

Likewise, in order to allow more specific information to be collected at outcome level the Monitoring Framework foresees running 5 annual surveys (one for each policy area); these will be based on largely uniform questionnaires, which will be adjusted to reflect the specific issues pertaining to a particular policy area. Similarly, more in-depth desk research will be needed at the intermediate outcome level to enable the analysis and interpretation of achievements across policy areas to be tracked and reported on.

-

² Public Policy and Management Institute (PPMI), Lithuania.

1.2. Balance between objective (schematic) information and knowledge-based (expert) judgement

Among the key functions of performance monitoring are the collection of data and its subsequent analysis/interpretation, so that raw data is turned into monitoring information which is useful for management (internal process improvement) and/or reporting (external accountability) purposes. To be useful such information has to be timely, reliable, relevant, and also neutral (i.e. 'schematic' or 'objective'). To satisfy these criteria monitoring systems are commonly developed centred around the collection (and analysis/interpretation) of quantitative data on outputs, which can typically be directly linked back to the activities supported. In the case of PROGRESS, examples of such data include the number of participants in training and other events (by gender), the number of seminars or pieces of research carried out, etc.

However, there will also be a need to collect and interpret qualitative information in order to monitor the programme's implementation effectively. Performance monitoring of PROGRESS, especially at the level of outcomes, is impossible without qualitative analysis. While the primary purpose of monitoring is to obtain objective and neutral data (with evaluators then being asked to interpret monitoring data to determine what has been achieved through discussions with programme stakeholders, etc.), at the level of immediate and intermediate outcomes, an element of judgement will be required in order to determine progress towards the programme's aims.

There is a common view that qualitative data is prone to be less reliable, harder to aggregate, compare longitudinally or use for benchmarking, its interpretation has inherent bias, etc (i.e., such information is more 'subjective'). Yet, for example, expert insights collected through focus groups, interviews and similar methods can be more useful for managers and decision-makers than 'mechanistic' quantitative raw data. Therefore the assessment of success (e.g. extent to which policy advice feeds into policy development and implementation) will always have an interpretative aspect. Subsequently, the importance of expert knowledge when monitoring and assessing actions implemented under PROGRESS shall not be underestimated.

Thus, the Monitoring Framework is designed to deliver monitoring information which is as 'objective' as possible, yet at the same time integrates expert judgements where necessary. For example, in some instances the EU policy makers themselves are expected to be the primary beneficiaries and users of reports and studies which provide policy advice. They are therefore best placed to make a judgement as to the extent to which what has been produced has been more or less usable/useful, of high quality and to assess its value in contributing towards evidence-based policy making.

In many instances, policy research, studies and reports will also be expected to reach out to a broader audience of EU and national actors (for example, in the case of good practice publications). It will therefore be important to monitor the extent to which research financed through PROGRESS has contributed towards effective learning in EU and across Member States. This will be monitored through annual surveys of EU and national officials, NGOs, legal and academic experts, social partners and civil society more widely (hereafter 'stakeholders'). To make qualitative data more reliable, such surveys will be based on a questionnaire (which will be the same each year in order to track progress being made), with stable groups of target respondents. A limited number of openended questions will also be included however to allow practical illustrations to be identified on best practice, examples on how PROGRESS outputs have actually contributed to outcomes.

Similarly, the degree to which there is a shared understanding between EU policy officials and national authorities in the Member States in respect of the aims set for each of the Progress policy areas (and overall, in line with the aims of the Social Agenda) can be tracked through desk research to assess the degree of alignment between the National Reform Programmes and EU policies.

Inevitably, an element of judgement will be required in interpreting the degree of alignment – here, an *ad hoc* Focus Group may be appropriate to assess the realisation of intermediate outcomes.

1.3. Manageability of the monitoring system (incl. frequency of data collection)

As mentioned above, there will be a large number of individual activities (and sub-activities) supported through PROGRESS. Given the volume of activity, it is important to organise the monitoring framework in such a way that it captures usable/useful information in a rational format but at the same time does not place too great an administrative burden on the Commission, national authorities and other key stakeholders. Therefore the right balance has to be struck between using the available information (PROGRESS files, various reports) and generating additional data (through surveys, expert panels).

A key proposition is to balance the collection of data in terms of different levels of intervention (outputs and outcomes), respondent groups and the frequency of data collection. The main sources of information to be used *at the level of outputs* include standard reporting templates (to be filled in by beneficiaries/ contractors), surveys of participants (to be executed by beneficiaries/ contractors) and checklists for quality assessments (to be filled by the EC officials). This means there will be no surveys and appraisals additional to what is being carried out anyway for reporting purposes (only some changes in reporting templates are possible). The information will be collected once, when a particular output is produced. Furthermore the information will be provided strictly by those involved in implementing the activities directly (the participants, beneficiaries, contractors) or those responsible for overseeing them (EC officials).

At the level of outcomes, key information sources will include surveys and desk research data supported by expert panels organised in each of the policy areas. The desk research will be carried out by the contractor and will analyse documents (such as annual PROGRESS work-plan), assessments (carried out by Impact Assessment Boards) and reports (produced by EC or contractors in various policy areas). Surveys will be initiated to get the opinions of stakeholders on the achievement of the programme's objectives. Expert panels will be facilitated by the contractor and reported to the Commission.

The respondent sample will include *not only* those who were involved in PROGRESS activities in one or another way but also policy and opinion makers who have a stake in knowing about PROGRESS and using its results (the European Commission officials, national authorities, networks, legal experts and others). Five surveys in each of the PROGRESS policy areas and also a separate survey targeted at EU-wide networks will be carried out. In order to avoid respondent fatigue, the surveys will be carried out online, once a year; also an effort will be made to avoid an overly extensive overlap of the respondent group (while maintaining the representativeness). If needed some *ad hoc* surveys to address some issues more deeply or to provide a longer perspective (e.g. 3-yearly survey) may be initiated. Expert panels (focus group sessions) will be organised annually and carried out in by a structured scheme to guarantee the validity and usefulness of the information gathered.

1.4. Technical Assistance to facilitate PROGRESS performance monitoring

Finally, technical assistance will be provided by the contractor to facilitate monitoring activities. It is necessary given the scale and complexity of the PROGRESS programme and the fact that development and consistent usage of the monitoring framework will be a challenge for the Commission and other stakeholders. Therefore technical assistance will aim to ensure that all the sides involved in implementation of PROGRESS have a shared understanding of the monitoring framework, buy-in to the results and are in the position to take a full advantage of them.

Specifically, the contractor will assist the Commission in developing practical guidance, common reporting templates for annual reporting, and will also provide *ad hoc assistance* to improve the quality of monitoring data during the programme's implementation. Among other aspects the contractor's role will be to advise on which areas of the programme should be measured through *performance monitoring* and which might be better tackled through *process improvement* at ex-ante and / or ex-post stage. This means that some of the performance measures may be appropriate to address ex-ante (e.g. as a compliance issue) rather than leaving it for ex-post monitoring (e.g. do trainings target relevant actors?) or some mixed approach may also be used. The contractor will also advise the Commission on the possibility to use IT-based information systems to facilitate management, monitoring and reporting under PROGRESS.

2. THE PROPOSED APPROACH TO PROGRESS PERFORMANCE MONITORING

2.1. Overall approach

Monitoring outputs

The 3 main sources of data in respect of outputs will include **standard reporting templates** (to be used by beneficiaries/contractors to report to the Commission as a part of their compulsory reporting requirements), **surveys of participants** (to be completed by beneficiaries/contractors, but based on a standardised questionnaire), both to be completed by beneficiaries/contractors and provided back to the Commission, and standard **checklist for quality assessment** (to be filled in by responsible Commission officials as a part of accepting delivered outputs). This data will be generated continuously throughout the year as various activities are initiated and finalised; data will be summarised, analysed and interpreted twice a year (for interim and annual performance monitoring reports).

To facilitate data collection process and improve data relevance, PPMI will develop the three standard reporting templates and a **practical guidance note on the overall approach to performance measurement, the monitoring system and data requirements from beneficiaries/contractors.** The latter will aim at ensuring a common understanding among those required to complete standard reporting templates. This will include advice on what data will be required (in particular, guidance on the scope and exact content of the proposed monitoring indicators), frequency and timeliness of data collection in respect of different performance measures, etc.

The surveys of participants and checklists for quality assessment will serve as key proxies for monitoring quality of outputs. For example, the proposed checklist would be used by Commission officials in order to assess the timeliness, completeness, accuracy, quality and usefulness of reports and publications. This will be modelled on the Commission's existing *Certificat de dépot* and similar (if any) checklists which are currently used to endorse and approve reports.

A further source of information for assessing quality of outputs and their potential contribution to outcomes will be the annual survey of stakeholders (described below in a chapter on monitoring immediate outcomes), where respondents will be asked about a number of key outputs in a given policy area. In addition, where necessary PPMI could run limited number of additional surveys to gather qualitative information in respect of certain types of outputs (for example, a survey-based approach could be used to obtain the views of legal experts on the timeliness, completeness and accuracy of monitoring reports dealing with the effective application of legislation in certain policy areas, such as, working conditions and/or non-discrimination).

Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues (outputs) – the treatment of the cross-cutting issues i.e. the extent to which important principles such as accessibility requirement for people with disability and the inclusion of equal opportunities and non-discrimination concerns have been integrated into activities supported through PROGRESS will be monitored. At the output level, anex-ante verification that the cross-cutting themes have been included in PROGRESS annual plan of work or in guidance of *Calls for Proposals* could be undertaken by Commission officials. A possibility in this regard will be to include a question on the 'cross-cutting issues' into the checklist for quality assessment.

Gender mainstreaming – the promotion of gender equality through a mainstreaming approach will also need to be systematically monitored. While there are clearly links between gender mainstreaming and the mainstreaming of the cross-cutting issues more broadly, given the prominence of gender equality as an EU policy objective in its own right, monitoring gender mainstreaming should be separated out from other cross-cutting issues. At the output level, there will be a need to carry out an ex-ante verification of the treatment of gender in guidance in respect of calls for proposals or calls for tenders. Additionally, quantitative data should also be collated on PROGRESS performance in respect of gender – such as the disaggregation of participants in training and events by gender.

Monitoring immediate outcomes

There will be two main data sources for the performance monitoring of immediate outcomes – annual surveys (at least six, of which one per each policy area and a separate one aimed at EU-wide networks), and qualitative desk research to assess progress towards aims including the integration of the cross cutting themes. Specifically, the approach will involve:

Annual surveys by policy area — surveys will be carried out annually to assess PROGRESS' performance in relation to immediate outcomes for each of the 5 policy areas. They will be sent to a list of pre-defined respondents to include EU and national level officials and other relevant key stakeholders (NGOs, social partners, civil society) involved in PROGRESS. As mentioned before, a part of the survey will be devoted to obtaining complementary information on the quality (and potential influence) of outputs. The idea is to present respondents with a limited list of selected key outputs (especially the ones which have 'all stakeholders' as their target audience or aim to disseminate good practice) in a given policy area in order to establish whether they are aware of these outputs and whether they have actually used them. A separate annual survey will target EU-wide networks and serve as an important source of information to get information on capacity of national and pan-European networks.

Qualitative desk research – it will be appropriate to assess some immediate outcomes through desk research in order to form a qualitative judgement with regard to how effectively PROGRESS has been performing. Key secondary sources to be reviewed include key PROGRESS documents, such as annual PROGRESS work plan, regulatory impact assessment and Impact Assessment Board findings. While some analysis will certainly be necessary, there will be a need to avoid going into too much detail given that PROGRESS will be subject to mid-term and final evaluations.

Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues (immediate outcomes) - the extent to which the cross-cutting issues have been taken into account at the level of implementation — will also need to be assessed through desk research (review of annual work-plan, review of key studies/ pieces of research and publications to assess extent to which cross-cutting themes have been addressed) and through the annual survey by policy area, which could include a small number of questions focusing on the cross-cutting themes and on gender mainstreaming.

Monitoring intermediate outcomes

There will also be a need to assess intermediate outcomes (the third level in the PROGRESS intervention logic model). There will be three information sources to assess intermediate outcomes:

Surveys will serve as an important source of information to assess progress towards PROGRESS' key strategic aims (effective application of EU law, shared understanding of EU aims, effective partnership). The abovementioned **annual surveys by policy area** could be supplemented by additional **ad hoc survey**; this will consist of a more detailed set of questions targeted at the different stakeholders involved in PROGRESS compared with the annual survey. It would be executed every two or three years as required. The ad hoc survey will be an opportunity to take stock of progress made towards the realisation of strategic aims. The remaining issue here is whether this survey should be made an integral part of the mid-term evaluation (if there is a separate survey as part of the MTE, this may lead to duplication /over-surveying).

Qualitative desk research – it will be appropriate to assess intermediate outcomes through desk research to arrive at a qualitative judgement with regard to how effectively PROGRESS has been performing. The desk research will be based on secondary sources, such as Eurobarometer public opinion surveys, reports on the transposition and implementation of EU law, etc. This will be done each year for the purposes of the annual PROGRESS report. There will also be an attempt to influence the content of these sources (e.g., if possible – introduce questions relevant for PROGRESS performance monitoring into Eurobarometer surveys).

There is also the possibility of developing certain composite indices, which would draw both on statistics found in key secondary sources and change in perceptions as revealed by three yearly surveys as it is done in a number of other regular reports (e.g., on innovation, competitiveness) issued by the Commission.

Expert panels (focus-group meetings) – these panels will be used to deepen the understanding of the outcomes of the activities carried out under PROGRESS. A separate focus-group meeting for each of the 5 policy areas would be organised once a year. These panels will serve a number of purposes. First, they will help to *interpret* the collected monitoring information by contextualising and synthesising it, e.g., to assess the cross-policy impacts or connections between European policies and national policies in a given policy area. Secondly, such expert knowledge is needed to *capture the weak-signals* (emerging issues, trends, etc.) which may eventually have an enormous impact on policies under PROGRESS. Finally, the experts are also needed to *validate* the analysis and interpretation made by external contractors.

The proposed Monitoring Framework is summarised in the Tables 1, 2 and 3 at the end of the document.

2.2. PROGRESS Monitoring Framework Milestones

2008	
April	Monitoring Framework approved
May	Baseline Assessment Study (see below)
June	Standard document templates (reporting template, questionnaire for survey of participants, checklist for quality assessment) and Guidance note to beneficiaries/contractors on performance monitoring requirements issued
July	Questionnaires for annual surveys approved
October	Report on functioning and possible alternatives of the management information system and processes of the PROGRESS
November	Six annual surveys (five by policy area and one aimed at EU wide networks)
December	Expert panels (focus-group meetings) to verify preliminary conclusions about achievement of outcomes in 2008
31	Final cut off date (for continuously collected data at output level as well as secondary
December	sources subject to desk research)

2009			
January	Expert panels (focus-group meetings) to verify preliminary conclusions about		
	achievement of outcomes in 2008		
February	draft Annual Performance Monitoring Report 2008		
March	final Annual Performance Monitoring Report 2008		
15 May	Interim cut off date (for continuously collected data at output level to be reported in		
	Interim Performance Monitoring Report)		
June	draft Interim Performance Monitoring Report 2009 (follows up a report on		
	functioning of the management information system and processes of the		
	PROGRESS, in particular – on introduction of standard documents)		
July	Interim Performance Monitoring Report 2009		
November	Six annual surveys (five by policy area and one aimed at EU wide networks)		
December	Expert panels (focus-group meetings) to verify preliminary conclusions about		
	achievement of outcomes in 2009		
31	Final cut off date (for continuously collected data at output level as well as secondary		
December	sources subject to desk research)		

2010			
January	Expert panels (focus-group meetings) to verify preliminary conclusions about		
	achievement of outcomes in 2009		
February	draft Annual Performance Monitoring Report 2009		
March	final Annual Performance Monitoring Report 2009		
May	Additional ad hoc survey (if needed as a source of information for assessing		
	achievement of intermediate outcomes)		
15 May	interim cut off date (for continuously collected data at output level to be reported in		
	Interim Performance Monitoring Report)		
June	draft Interim Performance Monitoring Report 2010 (focus on assessment of		
	intermediate outcomes)		
July	Interim Performance Monitoring Report 2010		
November	Six annual surveys (five by policy area and one aimed at EU wide networks)		
December	Expert panels (focus-group meetings) to verify preliminary conclusions about		
	achievement of outcomes in 2010		
31	Final cut off date (for continuously collected data at output level as well as secondary		
December	sources subject to desk research)		

2.3. Baseline assessment

In parallel with the finalisation of the PROGRESS monitoring framework, there will be a need to produce an assessment of the baseline situation across the five PROGRESS policy areas drawing on available desk research. This work will need to be undertaken by early May 2008 by the contractors responsible for PROGRESS monitoring and the provision of technical assistance.

The mapping assessment of the baseline will involve undertaking a review of key literature able to shed light on the starting position across the PROGRESS policy areas in terms of the situation visà-vis the strategic objectives and expected outcomes outlined in the programme. The baseline study will also be used to finalise questionnaires to be used for annual surveys.

The baseline assessment will need to include:

- a short summary of the PROGRESS programme's desired outcomes;
- a review of the baseline in terms of what the position is in terms of achievement of these desired outcomes to date.

For example, in order to assess the effectiveness of the application of EU law on matters related to the five PROGRESS policy areas, a short review of recent literature produced in this area will be undertaken. Also, annual reports are produced by the Commission on social inclusion, non-discrimination and on gender equality, which should signpost to more detailed documents providing a summary of outstanding challenges and progress made in respect of the application of EU law (e.g. reports on effective application of EU law in area of non-discrimination by the network of legal experts etc.). As far as the aim of developing an improved understanding and sense of ownership among EU and national policy and decision-makers about key objectives and priorities in Progress policy areas is concerned, here, the National Reform Programmes should shed light on the extent to which there is a consensus with regard to policy priorities.

Table 1. Summary of the Monitoring Framework: Outputs

ОИТРИТ ТҮРЕ	Main data source: PERFORMANCE MEASURES	Project reports (beneficiary/ contractor)	Survey of participants (beneficiary/contractor)	Ckecklist for quality assessment (EC)	
	Regularity of data collection:	Continuous	Continuous	Continuous	
	1. number of individuals who receive training				
training and mutual learning	2. number of peer reviews or other mutual learning exercises				
	3. satisfaction of participants with training/peer reviews received				
	4. extent to which training/peer reviews target qualified and relevant EU and national actors				
Output 2:	1. number of monitoring and assessment reports				
monitoring/ assessment	2. timely, accurate and complete production of reports in relation to plan				essed through at outcome le
reports	3. satisfaction of users with reports			5a. veys	
Output 3:	1. number of tools, methods, indicators developed				-
	satisfaction of users with tools, methods, indicators which are capable of withstanding detailed scrutiny and rallying EU- wide support				essed through
Output 4:	number of publications on good practices; number of thematic seminars and web-based publications				
	2. readership of publications (incl. extent to which				
good practices	publications reach out to relevant EU and national actors);				
	attendance at thematic seminars (incl. extent to which				essed through at outcome le
	seminars are attended by relevant EU and national actors),			54.15/5	→
	downloads of web-based publications 3. relevance of good practices (incl. extent to which they			alaa aaa	
	will be acted upon and used) and range of good practices identified				essed through at outcome le
	4. accessibility of good practices (incl. disability requirements and languages availability)				
Output 5: policy	1. number of policy advice, research and analysis				
	2. timely, clear and accurate policy advice, research and analysis				ssed through t outcome lev
	3. satisfaction with policy advice, research and analysis				-
	volume of funding provided to NGOs, networks				
· ·	2. satisfaction of NGOs, networks with their relationship with EU and national authorities				ssed through at outcome lev
					-
	1. volume of participation in events				
	2. satisfaction with events				
	3. number of visits to websites related to information and communications activities				
networking					

Table 2. Summary of the Monitoring Framework: Immediate Outcomes

		Desk research	Surveys	Expert group
OUTCOME TYPE	Main data source: PERFORMANCE MEASURES	(PPMI)	(PPMI)	(EC/ PPMI)
	Regularity of data collection:	Continuous	Once a year*	Once a year
Immediate Outcome 1: effective information sharing/learning in EU and across Member States	1. greater awareness of policy-and decision-makers, social partners, NGOs, networks regarding their rights/obligations s in relation to PROGRESS policy areas	Eurobarometer		
	greater awareness of policy-and decision-makers, social partners, NGOs, networks regarding EU objectives and policies in relation to PROGRESS policy areas satisfaction of clients with information			
Immediate Outcome 2:	Substaction of chemics with information But policies and legislation are grounded in thorough analysis of	Commission		
evidence-based EU policies and legislation in PROGRESS areas	situation and responsive to conditions, needs and expectations in Member States in PROGRESS areas in accord with Better regulation principles	material		
	2. extent to which PROGRESS-supported policy advice feed into the development and implementation of EU legislation and policies	Commission material		
Immediate Outcome 3: better integration of cross-cutting issues	1. cross-cutting issues are addressed in PROGRESS policy sections	Annual PROGRESS workplan		
(e.g. gender, social integration and non-	EU policies and legislation in relation to PROGRESS issues display a common underlying logic of intervention			
discrimination) and greater consistency in	3. gender mainstreaming is systematically promoted in PROGRESS	Review of key documents		
EU policies and legislation	4. share of funding devoted to support or undertake cross-cutting issues	Annual PROGRESS workplan		
Immediate Outcome 4: greater capacity of	1. number of individuals served or reached by networks supported by PROGRESS	Reports by networks		
national and pan- European networks	2. extent to which advocacy skills of PROGRESS-supported networks have improved			
	3. satisfaction of EU and national authorities with the contribution of networks			
	4. extent to which PROGRESS-supported networks take a cross- cutting approach			
Immediate Outcome 5: high-quality and participatory policy	extent to which principles of good governance (including minimum standards on consultation) are respected in policy debate			
debate at EU and national levels	2. extent to which the outcomes of policy debates feed into the development of EU law and policy	Commission material		

Table 3. Summary of the Monitoring Framework: Intermediate Outcomes

OUTCOME TYPE	Main data source: PERFORMANCE MEASURES	Desk research (PPMI)	Surveys (PPMI)	Expert group (EC/ PPMI)
	Regularity of data collection:	Continuous	Once a year*	Once a year
Intermediate Outcome 1: compliance in Member States with EU law related to PROGRESS areas	transposition rate of EU law on matters related to health and safety, labour law and working conditions and information and consultation of workers, non-discrimination and gender equality in the Member States	Reports on transposition rate/ infringement		
	2.effectiveness of application of EU law on matters related PROGRESS areas in the Member States	Various policy reports		
Intermediate Outcome 2: shared	attitudes of decision-makers, key stakeholders and general public regarding EU objectives in PROGRESS policy areas	Euro-barometer		
understanding and ownership of EU	2. extent to which national policy discourses or priorities reflect EU objectives	Review of NRPs		
Intermediate Outcome 3: effective	1. existence of common ground/consensus among policy and decision-makers and stakeholders on EU objectives and policies			
partnerships with national and pan-	2. identification and involvement by the EU of key actors in a position to exert influence or change at EU and national levels			
European stakeholders	3. effectiveness of partnerships in relation to outcomes related to PROGRESS policy areas	Case studies		

^{* -} surveys by policy area (5) and networks (1) - once a year; ad hoc surveys - when needed