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Foreword

The European Commission’s Service for Foreign Policy Instruments was set up in January 2011, at the same time as the European External Action Service. Under the direct authority of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy / Vice President of the European Commission, and in close coordination with the European External Action Service, its mission is to help the EU achieve its foreign and security policy objectives. The Service for Foreign Policy Instruments handles on a daily basis a diverse and complex set of financial and regulatory instruments: the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace, the Partnership Instrument, Common Foreign and Security Policy actions, Election Observation Missions, EU restrictive measures, the Kimberley Process on conflict diamonds, and the Anti-Torture Regulation.

The Service has developed organically, and so has its corporate culture. Every staff member who became part of this new Service or joined our service over the past years brought in their own professional culture, experience and approaches. This broad and rich professional diversity has become one of our Service’s fundamental strengths. This diversity helps us to develop and nurture the much-needed resilience and flexibility to adapt all kinds of EU interventions – quickly, intelligently and with utmost professionalism and in full respect of the relevant rules - to rapidly changing circumstances and needs. This richness of experience we have all collectively brought to FPI allows us to build an FPI corporate culture that is fit for purpose, suited to the needs of the EU’s foreign policy objectives, and allows delivering results that matter on the ground.

Our Service needs to be fast and flexible – like a speed-boat that can go where rapid and flexible action is needed. It needs to function as an inter-connector, linking up the objectives of the Global Strategy with the priorities set forward by President Juncker, and ensuring that "speed-boat" actions are followed up wherever needed by structural measures through other EU instruments.

It is this capacity to react swiftly and flexibly to specific needs in a given foreign policy context, and in a way that ensures optimal synergies with all other relevant instruments, that makes the Service for Foreign Policy Instruments so special. And it is this unique role and function that calls for a Project Management Methodology and way of working that is at the same time specific and in line with the methodology of the Commission’s external relations family.

This Manual, as a living document, provides us all with a single repository that brings together summary information on our Service’s Strategic Plan, on the Project Management Methodology, Monitoring & Evaluation tools as well as knowledge on Service level Reporting within our Service and within the Commission. It also provides the link with the EC corporate culture (Better Regulation, PM²) and contributes to the progressive alignment of concepts and tools for Project Management across the external relations family, principally through the OPSYS system, to the development of which our Service is actively contributing.

I hope this Manual will help us to continuously improve our way of working and the quality of the results we deliver. It is a living tool that will continue to be updated.
I would like to thank all who have contributed to this process. I encourage all of you to make the most of this useful toolbox, and contribute to keeping it up to date and suited to our Service’s mission and the specific challenges we face.

Hilde Hardeman
Director and Head of Service
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1 Who is this Manual for?

This manual has been drafted for the benefit of all FPI staff involved in FPI strategy implementation, programme management, monitoring, evaluation and reporting, whether they work in Headquarters, in Delegations or in the Regional Teams.

2 What is this Manual for?

The objective of the Manual is to provide a clear and harmonised understanding of the terminology, concepts and processes used within FPI in the 4 areas below:

1. FPI Strategy
2. Project management
3. Monitoring & Evaluation
4. Reporting

For this, the Manual refers to 7 main sources of information:

1. FPI know-how, culture, management habits, best practices
2. TEU (CFSP) and Regulations (EIDHR, IrSP, PI, CIR)
3. FPI Strategic Plan 2016-2020, FPI Results Framework and FPI Annual Management Plans
4. Better Regulation Guidelines & Toolbox
5. Court of Auditors’ Performance Manual
6. Capacity4Dev (evaluation guidelines)
7. European Commission Project Management Methodology (PM²)

Other horizontal or global documents have also been taken into account as:

- EU Global Strategy
- EU Gender Action Plan 2016-2020¹;
- Europe 2020 Strategy;
- Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development².

3 How was the Manual drafted and why?

In the context of budget discipline and competing demands on the EU budget, a strong focus on performance and delivering results on the ground remains an imperative.

The clear policy focus on results was outlined in 'The Working Methods of the Commission’ in 2014 where services were mandated by President Juncker 'to foster a true performance culture in the

² United Nation General Assembly resolution 65/1 of 19 September 2010.
Commission and ensure a focus on results [...], structured performance measurement, monitoring and evaluation frameworks should be included in each significant Commission initiative and serve as a basis for result-oriented Management Plans and Annual Activity Reports'.

This emphasis on results has been progressively incorporated into the Strategic Planning and Programming cycle (SPP) and the Activity Based Management (ABM) of the Commission.

Consequently, a Strategic Plan 2016-2020 has been developed in 2015 for each DG, service and agency while Annual Management Plan and Programme Statement templates have been modified to integrate clear general and specific objectives to be reached, identify results as well as the necessary set of indicators to measure progress towards their achievement.

In addition, the Better Regulation methodology has also been developed to foster the results-based approach within all Commission services.

The EU 'Budget Focused on Results' (BFOR) initiative launched in 2015 by VP Georgieva is designed to deliver further on this commitment. Under the guiding principles of 'Focus, Speed and Results', it invites all services inter alia to reflect on:

- how to implement a streamlined and realistic performance framework, including reporting on legality and regularity;
- how to ensure effective communication providing easily-accessible and understandable information on results for the wider EU public and for the benefit of stakeholder dialogue, including with industry and civil society;
- how to identify indicators which are backed up by good data that provide clear and comprehensive performance information.

The Court of Auditors has also begun to conduct an increasing number of performance audits alongside regular financial audits by analysing in particular the way information is collected on performance and the methodology used to show the results achieved.

The European Parliament has broadly concurred with the observations of the Court but goes further by demanding in its discharge of the 2014 budget that the Commission develop gender-specific indicators to allow for a better assessment of the budget from a gender perspective.

Consequently, on 24 June 2016, FPI Director asked all Units to work on drafting an FPI Results Framework and an FPI Manual.

An inter-Unit Task force was created in September 2016 to draft these documents and accompany and support the change process within and between Units to harmonize our way of working.

The Manual was adopted on 15 September 2017, and updated in July 2018.

For any questions linked to the Manual, please contact FPI.1 Evaluation Officer or secretariat.
4  FPI vision and Strategic Plan 2016-2020

4.1  FPI Strategic Plan 2016-2020

Since 2015, each DG, Service and agency of the Commission established a Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan explains where FPI should be at the end of 2020, what it should have achieved by this date and what should count as its major achievements. To reach its 2020 targets, FPI has adopted in December 2016 a Strategic Plan that governs and encompasses the operational activities of each FPI Unit. It provides the framework in which every FPI staff member whether in Headquarters, Delegations or in Regional Teams should work. The FPI Strategic Plan is detailed and further spelled out at the beginning of every year under the FPI Annual Management Plan and its annual achievement described in the FPI Annual Activity Reports at the end of every year.

4.1.1  FPI vision

FPI will contribute to the realisation of EU General Objective number 9 'A stronger global actor' as set out under the 10 political priorities of the Juncker Commission. Every single FPI activity should contribute to the achievement of this General Objective.

General Objective 9 is complex and encompasses several EU external policies reflecting different facets of EU external action. The EU is simultaneously a political/diplomatic power (in its capacity to negotiate international agreements, to impose sanctions on a country or to accompany peace and democratic processes for example), an economic power (as 2nd economic area in the world) as well as a cultural power (in its role of transmitting humanist values, the basis of its own construction⁴).

At its level, FPI will contribute to strengthening these elements of the EU as a global actor by focusing its interventions on the achievement of 2 results:

Thanks to FPI intervention and in close cooperation with the EEAS and other Commission Services, it is hoped that, by the end of 2020:

- the EU will have increased its position as a peace actor on the international scene;
- the EU and mutual interests will have been advanced and promoted on the international scene.

These two results constitute the main FPI vision.

At EU level, FPI will contribute, together with particularly DEVCO, ECHO, NEAR and TRADE as well as with the EEAS to the achievement of the EU general objective 'A stronger global actor' by working specifically on the achievement of these two results above.

---

⁴ As stated in the Treaty of Lisbon in Article 21 (1), "The Union's action on the international scene shall be guided by the principles which have inspired its own creation, development and enlargement, and which it seeks to advance in the wider world: democracy, the rule of law, the universality and indivisibility of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for human dignity, the principles of equality and solidarity, and respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law"
4.1.2 FPI Strategic Plan

During the period 2016-2020, FPI will use different financing and legislative instruments to reach the general objectives of the EU mentioned in the FPI vision that are to be achieved by 2020.

4.1.2.1 EU General Objectives


This General Objective highlights the need for the EU to develop a strong common foreign policy to:

- respond efficiently to global challenges, including the crises in its Neighbourhood,
- project its values, and
- contribute to peace and prosperity in the world.

The EU General Objective No 9 is also underpinned by the EU Global Strategy, which involves all EU Institutions and Member States: Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe, A Global Strategy for the European Union’s Foreign and Security Policy. This strategy is developed in a dedicated document which sets out 5 main priorities: the security of the Union; state and societal resilience to the East and South; an integrated approach to conflicts and crises; cooperative regional orders and global governance for the 21st century. FPI is directly concerned with most of these priorities and will contribute to them. The EU Global Strategy also informs the broader policy framework in which all FPI interventions need to be placed.

4.1.2.2 FPI Overall Objectives

FPI has 2 Overall Objectives:

- **FPI Overall Objective (FPIOO1): Increase EU position as a peace actor on the international scene**

The credibility of the EU in this particular area is linked to its capacity to act and intervene quickly and in an efficient way. This entails that FPI develops specific tools and trains high-level experts who can be deployed when a crisis emerges or needs to be addressed by a single measure or structurally (by the Common Foreign Security Policy, the Election Observation Missions and the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace).

---

5 https://ec.europa.eu/priorities/publications/president-junckers-political-guidelines_en
6 General Objectives are at the EU level or international level, they refer to the President Juncker’s 10 priorities, see also 4.1.2.1
7 https://ec.europa.eu/priorities/stronger-global-actor_en
Apart from providing EU short-term responses to crises or to emerging crises, FPI works on a long-term basis through civilian stabilisation missions (CFSP), sanctions, or by promoting strategies to limit the use of lethal weapons at international level (NPD).

FPI promotes conflict prevention and peace-building and contributes to enhancing the capacity, preparedness and resilience of third countries prone to crises (IcSP).

⇒ Linked to FPI specific objectives No 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5

- **FPI Overall objective (FPIOO2): Advance and promote EU and mutual interests on the international scene.**

As a global actor, the EU should have the capacity to provide an impetus to tackling challenges of global concern such as starting a negotiation at international level or bringing these challenges to the attention of the world community and working on solutions through international coordination and consensus. By tackling these challenges, the EU also projects its values abroad (democracy, gender, minorities, biodiversity, etc.). FPI provides the necessary tools (Partnership Instrument) to reinforce the EU in its global actor role in addressing and tackling challenges of global concern in complementarity with the DCI thematic programme “Global Public Goods and Challenges”.

FPI works on enhancing widespread understanding and visibility of the EU and of its role on the world scene among third country/region audiences, mainly through outreach and targeted communication.

FPI facilitates access to new economic markets, for this, FPI works at 2 levels:

- at macro level, supporting the negotiation and/or implementations of Free Trade Agreements (together with TRADE), or reducing standards and norms gaps between the EU and a third country or an economic region;
- at micro level, enhancing the access of EU companies to new economic markets through dedicated support programmes.

⇒ Linked to FPI specific objectives No 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 and 1.9

### 4.1.2.3 **FPI Specific Objectives**

FPI Strategic Plan is focused on the attainment of 9 Specific Objectives that will contribute in their turn to the achievement of the 2 Overall Objectives. The FPI Specific Objectives are described in Figure 1 and further explained below. Every action managed by FPI will have to directly contribute to one or several FPI Specific Objectives.

**Specific Objective 1.1:** In a situation of crisis or emerging crisis, to swiftly contribute to stability by providing an effective response designed to help preserve, establish or re-establish the conditions essential to the proper implementation of the Union’s external policies and actions

**Purpose of the specific objective:**

The purpose of the specific objective is to swiftly contribute to stability in situations of crisis or emerging crisis by providing an effective response to help preserve, establish or re-establish the conditions essential to the proper implementation of EU external policies and actions in accordance with Article 21 of the Treaty on European Union.

Interventions under this specific objective must be consistent with CFSP actions, must be complementary to external assistance provided under other EU instruments and foresee, where appropriate, the possibility to achieve continuity of actions under those instruments. Due attention to the promotion of democracy and human rights, gender, women’s empowerment and conflict prevention are also important principles and cross-cutting issues.

*How will this specific objective contribute to the achievement of the overall objective 'Increase EU position as a peace actor on the international scene'*?

By providing for the swift and rapid mobilization of resources in response to situations of crisis or emerging crisis in highly-charged political and security contexts where recourse to other EU external instruments is not available for reasons of timeliness or the nature of the crisis or where it is necessary to contribute to a comprehensive EU response.

Short-term crisis response interventions allow the EU to address the security and development nexus and where possible, to create better linkages with and complementary support to CSDP missions as well as with other EU instruments (IPA, ENI, DCI, EIDHR, EDF) and to gain greater leverage over authorities and international partners to seek more integrative and gender-sensitive responses to crises and conflict. An effective response is facilitated precisely because it is provided at EU level which combines the operational and diplomatic resources of the EU and its Member States.

In this way, crisis response interventions enable the EU to assume its role as a global player as envisaged under Article 21 of the Treaty on European Union "to preserve peace, prevent conflict and strengthen international security" thereby increasing the EU position as a peace-actor on the international scene.

**Specific Objective 1.2: To contribute to the prevention of conflicts and to ensure capacity and preparedness to address pre- and post-crisis situations and build peace**


*Purpose of the specific objective:*

The purpose of this specific objective is to contribute to global conflict prevention, peace-building and crisis preparedness by building and strengthening the capacity of the EU and its partners to prevent conflict, build peace and address pre- and post-crisis needs.

Interventions under this specific objective are designed and implemented in close coordination and cooperation with the United Nations and other international, regional and sub-regional organisations as well as with EU Member States and civil society organisations in order to create the necessary structures and responses to prevent conflicts, build peace and enhance local resilience. Interventions should also aim to realise full coordination, where
possible, with other EU Instruments (IPA, ENI, DCI, EIDHR, EDF) as well as to create better linkages and complementary support to CSDP missions and the Kimberley Process.

Due attention is paid to combating gender-based violence and promoting the participation of women in peace-building in line with EU commitments on the Women, Peace and Security Agenda (WPS) while the promotion of democracy and human rights, children’s rights and rights of indigenous peoples are also important considerations.

How this specific objective will contribute to the achievement of the overall objective 'Increase EU position as a peace actor on the international scene'?

By providing resources to contribute to conflict prevention, peace-building and crisis preparedness worldwide, long-term interventions allow the EU to build and strengthen its own capacity and that of its partners – international, regional, sub-regional organisations, States and civil society – to prevent conflicts, enhance resilience and build peace. A structural engagement with governments, international partners and with civil society in conflict-prone and post-conflict contexts helps create better conditions for achieving sustainable peace and development. This form of cooperation promotes the emergence of local initiative and grassroots-based solutions and prioritises conflict prevention thereby preserving lives and livelihoods that might otherwise be destroyed if and when violent conflict erupts.

In this way, crisis preparedness interventions enable the EU to assume its role as a global player as envisaged under Article 21 of the Treaty on European Union "to preserve peace, prevent conflict and strengthen international security" thereby increasing the EU position as a peace actor on the international scene.

**Specific Objective 1.3: Support to preservation of stability through substantial CSDP missions and EUSRs mandates**

**Legal basis:** relevant Council Decisions

**Purpose of the specific objective:**

The purpose of the specific objective is to preserve peace and strengthen international security in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter, to promote international cooperation and to develop and consolidate democracy and rule of law as well as respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in line with Article 21 and 42 of the Treaty on European Union and Part Five of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

Interventions under this specific objective must be consistent with other areas of the Union’s external action including development assistance as well as ensure coordination with international organisations and foresee the possibility of contribution by third country states to CSDP civilian stabilisation missions.

How this specific objective will contribute to the achievement of the overall objective 'Increase EU position as a peace actor on the international scene'?

By providing resources for the deployment of civilian stabilisation missions in conflict and post-conflict affected countries and regions and for deployment of EU Special Representatives to countries and/or issues of particular political interest and relevance, CSDP missions and EUSR mandates allow the EU to contribute to preserving peace, strengthen
international security, consolidate democracy and rule of law as well as human rights and fundamental freedoms.

It also achieve greater linkages and synergies with IcSP crisis response interventions and with other EU instruments thereby gaining greater leverage over authorities and international partners to seek more integrative and structural responses to conflicts and enhance prospects for peace and international security.

In this way, CSDP and EUSR mandate interventions enable the EU to assume its role as a global player as envisaged under Article 21 of the Treaty on European Union "to preserve peace, prevent conflict and strengthen international security" thereby increasing the EU position as a peace actor on the international scene.

**Specific Objective 1.4:** Support the implementation and promotion of:
1) strategy on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in order to increase security in this area (WMD);
2) strategy on combating illicit accumulation and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) as well as measures against illicit spread and trafficking of other conventional weapons;
3) EU’s policies in the field of conventional arms exports, in particular on the basis of Common Position CFSP/944/2008.

**Legal basis:** Relevant Council Decisions

**Purpose of the specific objective:**

The purpose of the specific objective is to preserve peace and strengthen international security in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter and to promote strategic cooperation with international partners on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, on combatting the illicit accumulation of small arms and light weapons and other conventional weapons and support EU policy on conventional arms exports in line with Article 21 of the Treaty on the European Union.

**How this specific objective will contribute to the achievement of the overall objective:** 'Increase EU position as a peace actor on the international scene'?

By providing resources for the implementation and promotion of an EU strategy on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), on combatting the illicit accumulation and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) and for measures against the illicit spread and trafficking of other conventional weapons as well as for the implementation and support of EU policy in the field of conventional arms exports, non-proliferation and disarmament, interventions (NPD) increase the pool and quality of technical expertise in these areas and allow the EU to engage with a broad range of international partners and national agencies on cooperation and dialogue on critical issues of international security thereby gaining greater leverage over key international partners and a greater voice in influencing current debate on proliferation and related security issues in various multilateral fora.

In this way, non-proliferation and disarmament interventions enable the EU to assume its role as a global player as envisaged under Article 21 of the Treaty on European Union "to preserve peace, prevent conflict and strengthen international security" thereby increasing the EU position as a peace actor on the international scene.
**Specific Objective 1.5:** Support and consolidate democratic reforms in third countries, by enhancing participatory and representative democracy, strengthening the overall democratic cycle, and improving the reliability of electoral processes, in particular by means of election observation missions.


*Purpose of the specific objective:*

Election observation is a tool used in the context of the EU’s wider policy of support for democracy, the rule of law and human rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights stipulates that citizens have the right to participate in the government and public affairs of their country by voting or being elected at genuine periodic elections. The right to participate cannot however be exercised in isolation: genuine and democratic elections can only take place when all citizens, without discrimination, are able to enjoy their fundamental freedoms and political rights. These include freedom of expression, association, assembly and movement. In addition, human rights, the right to participation and other associated fundamental freedoms can be enjoyed only through the protection afforded by the rule of law.

Elections provide the means for the people’s will to be freely expressed when choosing their government. Governing institutions have democratic legitimacy when they have been granted the authority by the people to govern in the name of the people, and be accountable to the people for the exercise of that authority, through genuine and periodic elections.

The EU also recognises that international election observation provides a comprehensive, independent and impartial assessment of an electoral process. As election observation enhances transparency and accountability, it can promote public confidence in the electoral process and may serve to promote electoral participation. This in turn can mitigate the potential for election-related conflicts. Together with other international observation groups, an EU EOM seeks to make a positive contribution without interfering in the conduct of an election.

*How this specific objective will contribute to the achievement of the overall objective 'Increase EU position as a peace actor on the international scene'?*

A genuine and democratic electoral process can contribute to ensuring sustainable peace and stability. Elections provide groups with an opportunity to express their political voice in competition with others without resorting to violence and contribute to the peaceful transfer of political power. In this regard, election observation by the EU can complement and enhance other EU crisis management and peace-building initiatives in partner countries.

In this way, election observation interventions enable the EU to assume its role as a global player as envisaged under Article 21 of the Treaty on European Union “to preserve peace, prevent conflict and strengthen international security” thereby increasing the EU position as a peace actor on the international scene.
Specific Objective 1.6: To enhance EU bilateral, regional, inter-regional and multilateral cooperation and partnership strategies through:
- Reinforcement of policy dialogues and/or
- Development/adoption/implementation of collective approaches and responses to challenges of global and/or mutual concern, in particular in the areas of climate change, energy and the protection of the environment.


Purpose of the specific objective:

The purpose of this specific objective is to enhance EU bilateral, regional, inter-regional and multilateral cooperation and partnership strategies through two means: i) reinforcement of policy dialogues and/or ii) development/adoption/implementation of collective approaches and responses to challenges of global and/or mutual concern, in particular in the areas of climate change, energy and the protection of the environment.

How this specific objective will contribute to the achievement of the overall objective ‘Advance and promote EU and mutual interests on the international scene’?

The achievement of the EU’s goals in an area where urgent international action is necessary (e.g. climate change, biodiversity protection) or where policy dialogue needs to be advanced requires the cooperation with partner countries. The Partnership Instrument provides the necessary tools to allow the EU to influence or initiate some processes, often political, to create enabling conditions to push forward possible solutions of issues and/or challenges of mutual or global concerns in line with Article 21.2.f and h of the Treaty on European Union.

Specific Objective 1.7: To promote the uptake of approaches and practices beneficial to the achievement of EU 2020 strategy in partner countries (not covered under Objectives 1 and 3)


Purpose of the specific objective:

The purpose of this specific objective is to cooperate with partner countries with a view that they take up approaches and practices beneficial to the achievement of the EU 2020 Strategy.

How this specific objective will contribute to the achievement of the overall objective ‘Advance and promote EU and mutual interests on the international scene’?

By effectively influencing partner country’s approaches and practices in terms of their policies, objectives, legislation or standards that are beneficial to the achievement of the EU 2020 strategy, the EU is promoting the external dimension of the strategy with a view to enhance its internal smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.

The Specific Objectives for the PI have been redrafted to better represent PI actions, these new versions of the objectives slightly differ from the Specific Objectives mentioned in the FPI Strategic Plan 2016-2020.
Specific Objective 1.8: To enhance widespread understanding and visibility of the EU and of its role on the world scene.


Purpose of the specific objective:

The purpose of this specific objective is to enhance and widen understanding and visibility of the EU and of its role on the world scene.

How this specific objective will contribute to the achievement of the overall objective 'Advance and promote EU and mutual interests on the international scene'?

By means of public diplomacy, people-to-people contacts, promotion of cooperation activities in the field of education and academic matters, think tank cooperation and outreach and targeted communication activities, the EU aims to have an enriched intercultural dialogue going beyond the elites and official level. Such interventions spread the visibility and understanding of the EU and facilitate future cooperation among actors from the EU and strategic partners.

As a result, the EU is contributing to build mutual trust and understanding by reducing cultural, social and political misunderstanding between the EU and third countries/regions audiences while promoting the EU's values and interests.

Specific Objective 1.9: To improve access to partner country markets


Purpose of the specific objective:

The purpose of this specific objective is to improve conditions for accessing partner country markets.

How this specific objective will contribute to the achievement of the overall objective 'Advance and promote EU and mutual interests on the international scene'?

Increasing EU's share in foreign trade and investment is an EU interest. To do so, interventions at two levels are pursued: at a macro-level, by supporting the negotiation, implementation and/or enforcement of Free Trade Agreements (together with TRADE), or reducing standards and norms gaps between the EU and a third country or an economic region; and at a micro level, by enhancing the penetration of new economic markets by EU companies with dedicated support programmes.

In this way, the influence of processes related to the improvement of conditions for accessing partner country markets enables the EU to assume its role on the international scene as envisaged under Article 21.e of the Treaty on European Union.
Figure 1: FPI Intervention Logic and its link with EU General Objective No 9 Europe 2020 Strategy, EU Global Strategy and SDGs

**EU General Objective**

**FPI Overall Objectives**

**FPI Specific Objectives**

**SDG No 5**
Gender equality

**SDG No 16**
Peace, justice and strong institutions

**SDG No 7**
Affordable and clean energy

**SDG No 13**
Climate action

**Other SDGs**

**EU Global Strategy**

**EUGO9. Increase the position of the EU as a stronger global actor**

**FPIOO1. To increase EU position as a peace actor on the international scene**

- **SO 1.1.** In a situation of crisis or emerging crisis, to swiftly contribute to stability by providing an effective response designed to help preserve, establish or re-establish the conditions essential to the proper implementation of the Union’s external policies and actions

- **SO 1.2.** To contribute to the prevention of conflicts and to ensure capacity and preparedness to address pre- and post-crisis situations and build peace

- **SO 1.3.** Support to preservation of stability through substantial CSDP missions and EUSRs mandates

- **SO 1.4.** Support the implementation and promotion of:
  1) strategy on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in order to increase security in this area (WMD);
  2) strategy on combating illicit accumulation and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) as well as measures against illicit spread and trafficking of other conventional weapons;
  3) EU’s policies in the field of conventional arms exports, in particular on the basis of Common Position CFSP/944/2008

- **SO 1.5.** Support and consolidate democratic reforms in third countries, by enhancing participatory and representative democracy, strengthening the overall democratic cycle, and improving the reliability of electoral processes

**FPIOO2. To advance and promote the EU and mutual interests on the international scene**

- **SO 1.6.** To enhance EU bilateral, regional, inter-regional and multilateral cooperation and partnership strategies

- **SO 1.7.** To promote the uptake of approaches and practices beneficial to the achievement of EU 2020 strategy in partner

- **SO 1.8.** To enhance and widen understanding and visibility of the Union and its role on the world scene

- **SO 1.9.** To improve access to partner country markets

**FPI Intervention Logic**
From FPI Strategic Plan 2016-2020
FPI is not the only DG/Service contributing to the EU General Objective No 9, other DGs such as DEVCO, ECHO, NEAR or TRADE also contribute to its achievement.

Figure 2: DGs/services contribution to achievement of EU General Objective No 9

4.1.3 FPI and the Sustainable Development Goals

The General Objective 'a stronger global actor' should be seen as an 'internal' General Objective, it is an EU corporate objective. SDGs are 'external' General Objectives, created by the international community, endorsed by all EU Member States and defined by the United Nations General Assembly
Resolution of the 25 September 2015: 'Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development'. As a Foreign Policy Service, FPI is part of this process and should contribute - at its level - to the achievement of SDGs (see Figure 1: FPI Intervention Logic and its link with EU General Objective No 9 Europe 2020 Strategy and SDGs).

According to FPI Strategic Plan, the Service should contribute mainly to:

- **SDG 16**: 'Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels'

More specifically, FPI should contribute to

- Sub-Goal 16.1 'Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere,
- Sub-Goal 16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all'
- Sub-Goal 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.'
- Sub-Goal 16.7 'Ensure responsive, inclusive and participatory and representative decision making at all levels'

- **SDG 5**: ‘Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls’

More specifically, FPI should contribute to

- Sub-Goal 5.2: ‘Eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation’
- Sub-Goal 5.5: ‘Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life’

Other SDGs relevant for FPI interventions:

Implementing the external dimension of the EU 2020 Strategy and Actions on global challenges the PI contributes to more than 10 SDGs, among which particularly to the following two:

- **SDG 7**: ‘Affordable and clean energy’
- **SDG 13**: ‘Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts’

More specifically, FPI should contribute to

- Sub-Goal 13.2: ‘Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning’
- Sub-Goal 13.a: ‘Implement the commitment undertaken by developed-country parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to a goal of mobilizing jointly $100 billion annually by 2020 from all sources to address the needs of developing countries in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation and fully operationalize the Green Climate Fund through its capitalization as soon as possible’.

---

The achievement of these SDGs is assessed through dedicated indicators provided by the United Nations\textsuperscript{11}, FPI does not monitor the indicators related to these Goals. However, FPI should be able, - through a narrative - to explain the logical link between its own interventions and their contribution to SDGs achievement.

4.2 FPI Intervention Logic and Results Framework

4.2.1 FPI Intervention Logic

Based on the FPI Strategy 2016-2020, it is possible to draw the FPI Intervention Logic (IL). The FPI IL follows Theory of Change (see part: 5.3) principles, where outputs produced by FPI Interventions should lead to a behavioural change (of a person or an entity) that will in turn change or influence the economic, social or environmental context (impact).

\textsuperscript{11} See http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/?Text=&Goal=16&Target=
Figure 3: FPI Intervention Logic

**FPI Impact (Overall Objective)**
- FPI OO1: To increase the EU position as a peace actor on the international scene
- FPI OO2: To advance and promote the EU and mutual interests on the international scene

**FPI Outcome (Specific Objectives)**
- SO1.1: In a situation of crisis or emerging crisis, to swiftly contribute to stability by providing an effective response designed to help preserve, establish or re-establish the conditions essential to the proper implementation of the Union’s external policies and actions
- SO1.2: To contribute to the prevention of conflicts and to ensure capacity and preparedness to address pre- and post-crisis situations and build peace
- SO1.3: Support to preservation of stability through substantial CSDP missions and EUSRs mandates
- SO1.4: Support the implementation and promotion of:
  1) strategy on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in order to increase security in this area (WMD);
  2) strategy on combating illicit accumulation and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) as well as measures against illicit spread and trafficking of other conventional weapons;
  3) EU’s policies in the field of conventional arms exports, in particular on the basis of Common Position CFSP/944/2008
- SO1.5: Support and consolidate democratic reforms in third countries, by enhancing participatory and representative democracy, strengthening the overall democratic cycle, and improving the reliability of electoral processes

**FPI Output (Operational Objective)**
- OP1. People have participated in events funded by FPI
- OP2. Knowledge-based products have been developed
- OP3. FPI has produced outcome statements
- OP4. FPI has produced advocacy/awareness-raising products
- OP5. FPI has provided emergency and on-going medical care assistance
- OP6. FPI has built or rehabilitated infrastructure
- OP7. FPI has provided the necessary technical equipment
- OP8. FPI has managed actions

**FPI Intervention Logic**
The logical chain between outcome and impact is explained in paragraph 4.1.2.2 and 4.1.2.3.

4.2.2 FPI Results Framework

4.2.2.1 What is a Results Framework (RF)?

A Results Framework (RF) is a monitoring tool that allows showing in a clear and understandable way, how FPI performs in achieving its mission.

The FPI Results Framework links three levels of objectives to results and performance indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Type of objectives</th>
<th>Type of results expected</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Overall Objectives</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Impact indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Specific Objectives</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Outcome indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Operational Objectives</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Output indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 'level 4' could be added to the table above, it corresponds to the EU General Objective Nr 9: 'a stronger global actor'. As this general objective is monitored directly by the Secretariat-General using an indicator based on EU ODA, FPI does not have to monitor it in its Results Framework. The same logic applies to SDG (level 5), monitored directly by the United Nations and EUROSTAT.

---

12 According to SPP-ABM guidelines (Strategic Plan, Annual Management Plan) and Better Regulation toolbox, p. 100.
13 The word 'outcome' is mentioned in the Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union’s instruments financing external action (CIR). As stated in Article 19 of CIR, results should encompass output, outcome and impact. The word 'outcome' corresponds to the word 'result' in the Better Regulation Guidelines. See part 4.8 of the Manual for an explanation on the difference between OECD-DAC and EC wording.
14 Indicator: EU Net Official Development Assistance (ODA), total and to Less-developed Countries (LDCs), as percentage of EU GNI. Source: OECD-DAC.
15 See: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/sdi/indicators/global-partnership
Figure 4: FPI Results Framework scheme

**FPI Impact (Overall Objective)**

**FPI I1: the EU position as a peace actor on the international scene has increased**

- FPIO1.1: In a situation of crisis or emerging crisis, the EU has swiftly contributed to stability by providing an effective response designed to help preserve, establish or re-establish the conditions essential to the proper implementation of the Union’s external policies and actions
- FPIO1.2: The EU has contributed to the prevention of conflicts and to ensure capacity and preparedness to address pre- and post-crisis situations and build peace
- FPIO1.3: The EU has supported the preservation of stability through substantial CSDP missions and EUSRs mandates
- FPIO1.4: The EU has supported the implementation and promotion of: 1) strategy on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in order to increase security in this area (WMD); 2) strategy on combating illicit accumulation and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) as well as measures against illicit spread and trafficking of other conventional weapons; 3) EU’s policies in the field of conventional arms exports, in particular on the basis of Common Position CFSP/344/2008
- FPIO1.5: The EU has supported and consolidated democratic reforms in third countries improving the reliability of electoral processes

**FPI I2: the EU and mutual interests have been advanced and promoted on the international scene**

- FPIO1.6: EU and partner countries bilateral, regional, inter-regional and multilateral cooperation and partnership strategies have been enhanced
- FPIO1.7: The uptake of approaches and practices beneficial to the achievement of EU 2020 strategy in partner countries has been promoted
- FPIO1.8: EU widespread understanding and visibility and its role on the world scene has been enhanced
- FPIO1.9: Access to partner country markets has been improved

**FPI Outcome (Specific Objectives)**

**FPIO1.1:** In a situation of crisis or emerging crisis, the EU has swiftly contributed to stability by providing an effective response designed to help preserve, establish or re-establish the conditions essential to the proper implementation of the Union’s external policies and actions

**FPIO1.2:** The EU has contributed to the prevention of conflicts and to ensure capacity and preparedness to address pre- and post-crisis situations and build peace

**FPIO1.3:** The EU has supported the preservation of stability through substantial CSDP missions and EUSRs mandates

**FPIO1.4:** The EU has supported the implementation and promotion of: 1) strategy on non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in order to increase security in this area (WMD); 2) strategy on combating illicit accumulation and trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW) as well as measures against illicit spread and trafficking of other conventional weapons; 3) EU’s policies in the field of conventional arms exports, in particular on the basis of Common Position CFSP/344/2008

**FPIO1.5:** The EU has supported and consolidated democratic reforms in third countries improving the reliability of electoral processes

**FPIO1.6:** EU and partner countries bilateral, regional, inter-regional and multilateral cooperation and partnership strategies have been enhanced

**FPIO1.7:** The uptake of approaches and practices beneficial to the achievement of EU 2020 strategy in partner countries has been promoted

**FPIO1.8:** EU widespread understanding and visibility and its role on the world scene has been enhanced

**FPIO1.9:** Access to partner country markets has been improved

**FPI Output (Operational Objective)**

**OP1.** People have participated in events funded by FPI
**OP2.** Knowledge-based products have been developed
**OP3.** FPI has produced outcome statements
**OP4.** FPI has produced advocacy/awareness-raising products
**OP5.** FPI has built or rehabilitated infrastructure
**OP6.** FPI has provided the necessary technical equipment
**OP7.** FPI has managed actions

**FPI Results Framework**
## FPI Results Framework Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>FPI Results</th>
<th>Indicators[^16]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 1: the EU position as a peace actor on the international scene has increased</td>
<td>Conflict Barometer – number of violent and nonviolent conflicts worldwide (Source: Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research [HIIK])[^17]&lt;br&gt;Global Peace Index (Source: Institute for Economics and Peace)&lt;br&gt;Worldwide Governance Indicator (Source: The World Bank)</td>
<td>Number of countries having ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty&lt;br&gt;Number of countries having submitted the National Implementation Plan following UN Resolution 1540&lt;br&gt;Number of countries having ratified the amendment on the Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material&lt;br&gt;Number of countries having ratified the Arms Trade Treaty adopted in April 2013&lt;br&gt;Number of EU bilateral, regional, inter-regional and multi-lateral cooperation partnership strategies which have been enhanced&lt;br&gt;Number of collective approaches and/or practices to challenges of global and/or mutual concern which have been developed/adopted/implemented&lt;br&gt;Number of approaches and/or practices beneficial to the achievement of the EU2020 strategy which have been taken up in partner countries&lt;br&gt;Number of barriers to market access, investment and business development which have been removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 2: the EU and mutual interests have been advanced and promoted on the international scene</td>
<td>Number of peace and mediation processes influenced&lt;br&gt;Number of regional/national/local peace and security plans influenced&lt;br&gt;Number of partners active on the prevention of conflicts and peacebuilding&lt;br&gt;Number of actions supported that are complementary with other EFIs intervention, CFSP, actions of MS and actions of multilateral, regional and sub-regional organisations and other donors</td>
<td>To be drafted for CFSP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

[^16]: The numbering of indicators has been removed from this version of the document pending clarification within OPSYS architecture.

[^17]: https://www.hiiik.de/en
multilateral cooperation and partnership strategies through:
1 - Reinforcement of policy dialogues and/or
2 – Development / adoption / implementation of collective approaches and responses to challenges of global and/or mutual concern, in particular in the areas of climate change, energy and the protection of the environment
FPI01.7. To promote the uptake of approaches and practices beneficial to the achievement of EU 2020 strategy in partner countries (not covered under Objectives 1 and 3)
FPI01.8. To enhance widespread understanding and visibility of the EU and of its role on the world scene
FPI01.9. To improve access to partner country markets

| Output | FPI01. People have participated in events funded by FPI  
FPI02. Knowledge-based products have been developed (sectoral reports, studies, policy briefs, press releases, etc.)  
FPI03. FPI has produced outcome statements  
FPI04. FPI has produced advocacy/awareness-raising products  
FPI05. FPI has built or rehabilitated infrastructure  
FPI06. FPI has provided the necessary technical equipment  
FPI07. FPI has managed actions | Number of processes related to partner country approaches to challenges of global concern which have been influenced  
Number of processes related to partner country practices on challenges of global concern which have been influenced  
Number of processes related to the positions partner countries take in the run-up to or during regional/international fora which have been influenced  
Number of processes related to partner country approaches beneficial to the achievement of the Europe 2020 strategy which have been influenced  
Number of processes related to partner country practices beneficial to the achievement of Europe 2020 strategy which have been influenced  
Number of processes related to partner country approaches on trade, investment and business which have been influenced  
Number of processes related to the negotiation, implementation or enforcement of EU trade and investment agreements with partner countries which have been influenced  
Percentage of EU companies which acknowledge a positive change in their perceptions of the business, trade and investment climate in partner countries  
Percentage of participants targeted by outreach and advocacy events who acknowledge a positive change in their perception of the EU and/or international policies and standards  
Percentage of participants targeted by outreach and advocacy events who acknowledge having engaged further on the topic on their own initiative as a result of their exposure to the events  
Number of articles published in print and/or digital media about an event |

|  | Number of participants in an event funded by FPI (Women/Men/Girls/Boys)  
Number of knowledge-based products developed, funded by FPI (reports, surveys, analysis, implementation plans, etc.)  
Number of outcome statements produced by events funded by FPI  
Number of communication products developed  
Number of public/media/communication campaigns designed and implemented  
Number of infrastructure built or rehabilitated (in m²)  
Number of technical equipment provided (in value)  
Number of actions managed by FPI  
Number of countries where FPI intervenes  
Number of people who have received emergency and on-going medical care assistance (including psychological assistance)  
Number of EU companies that participated in an event  
Percentage of participating EU companies which report having benefited from an event |
4.2.2.2 **FPI Corporate indicators (FPI Results Framework indicators)**

Corporate indicators are indicators that monitor **FPI achievements as an EC Service**. They monitor the implementation of the **FPI Strategic Plan 2016-2020** and the extent to which FPI is achieving the Objectives described in the FPI Intervention Logic. They can also be used to monitor an Instrument.

**NB!** The FPI impact indicators measuring the achievement of the **FPI’s Overall Objective 1** - to increase the EU position as a peace actor on the international scene (Conflict Barometer; Global Peace Index; Worldwide Governance Indicator), and **FPI’s Overall Objective 2** – to advance and promote the EU and mutual interests on the international scene are simultaneously core and corporate indicators for the FPI.

**FPI RF Overall Objective 1: the EU position as a peace actor on the international scene has increased – Impact indicators**

- Indicator: Conflict Barometer
  - Data source: Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research (HIIK)
  - Update: once a year (February)

- Indicator: Global Peace Index
  - Data source: Institute for Economics and Peace
  - Update: once a year

- Indicator: Worldwide Governance Indicator
  - Data source: The World Bank
  - Update: every 5 years

**FPI RF Overall Objective 2: the EU and mutual interests have been advanced and promoted on the international scene – Impact indicators**

- Indicator: Number of EU bilateral, regional, inter-regional and multi-lateral cooperation partnership strategies which have been enhanced
  - Data source: FPI

- Indicator: Number of collective approaches and/or practices to challenges of global and/or mutual concern which have been developed/embraced/implemented
  - Data source: FPI

- Indicator: Number of approaches and/or practices beneficial to the achievement of the EU2020 strategy which have been taken up in partner countries
  - Data source: FPI

- Indicator: Number of regulations and standards relating to trade, investment and business in partner countries which have been aligned to EU / international standards
  - Data source: FPI

---

18 Number of violent and nonviolent conflicts worldwide
19 [https://www.hiik.de/en/](https://www.hiik.de/en/)
Indicator: Number of barriers to market access, investment and business development which have been removed

**FPI RF Outcome indicators**

FPI RF Outcome indicators monitor the extent to which FPI has reached its Specific Objectives as stated in the Strategic Plan 2016-2020.

**For the IcSP and EOMs (core and corporate indicators):**

- Number of peace and mediation processes influenced
- Number of regional/national/local peace and security plans influenced:
- Number of partners acting to combat violence against women and promote the participation of women in peace building
- Number of partners active on the prevention of conflicts and peacebuilding
- Number of actions supported that are complementary with other EIIs intervention, CFSP, actions of MS and actions of multilateral, regional and sub-regional organisations and other donors
- Worldwide Governance Indicator (voice & accountability dimension) in countries where an EOM has been organised (Source: World Bank)

**For the Partnership Instrument (core AND corporate indicators):**

**General**

- Number of processes related to state-level and sub-state level (bilateral, regional, multi-lateral) partnership strategies and policy dialogues which have been influenced
- Number of processes related to non-state level partnership/agreements which have been influenced
- Number of processes related to partner country approaches to challenges of global concern which have been influenced
- Number of processes related to partner country practices on challenges of global concern which have been influenced
- Number of processes related to the positions partner countries take in the run-up to or during regional/international fora which have been influenced
- Number of processes related to partner country approaches beneficial to the achievement of the Europe 2020 strategy which have been influenced

**External promotion of internal EU policies**

- Number of processes related to partner country practices beneficial to the achievement of Europe 2020 strategy which have been influenced

**Trade specific**

- Number of processes related to partner country practices on trade, investment and business which have been influenced
- Number of processes related to the removal of barriers to market access, investment and business which have been influenced

---

20 The numbering of indicators has been removed from this version of the document pending clarification within OPSYS architecture.
Number of processes related to the negotiation, implementation or enforcement of EU trade and investment agreements with partner countries which have been influenced

Percentage of EU companies which acknowledge a positive change in their perceptions of the business, trade and investment climate in partner countries

Advocacy
Percentage of participants targeted by outreach and advocacy events who acknowledge a positive change in their perception of the EU and/or international policies and standards
Percentage of participants targeted by outreach and advocacy events who acknowledge having engaged further on the topic on their own initiative as a result of their exposure to the events
Number of articles published in print and/or digital media about an event

Source: FPI.4

FPI RF Output indicators

FPI RF output indicators monitor the output produced by the actions managed by FPI, based on objectives defined.

Number of participants in an event funded by FPI (Women/Men/Girls/Boys)
Number of knowledge-based products developed, funded by FPI (reports, surveys, analysis, implementation plans, etc.)
Number of outcome statements produced by events funded by FPI
Number of communication products developed
Number of public/media/communication campaigns designed and implemented
Number of infrastructure built or rehabilitated (in units)
Number of technical equipment provided (in value)
Number of actions managed by FPI
Number of countries in which FPI intervenes
Number of people who have received emergency and on-going medical care assistance (included psychological assistance)
Percentage of participants who report having benefited from an event
Number of EU companies that participated in an event
Percentage of participating EU companies which report having benefited from an event

4.3 Annual Management Plans

Purpose:

The Annual Management Plan (AMP) is a blueprint for implementation of the FPI strategic Plan implementation for a specific year, it provides a description of what we should implement, how and why in relation to the realisation of the FPI Strategic Plan. At the end of the year, the progress achieved is gathered in another document: the Annual Activity Report (see section 12.1). The AMP is also a way to communicate FPI activities to the general public; in fact, the AMP is published on the EC Website21. It is therefore a management tool as well as a means of public communication and accountability.

Who?

The Secretariat-General sends the instructions and the template for the completion of the AMP to the FPI Director. FPI.1 prepares a Note to be signed by the Director to all Head of Units explaining the process and asking them to clearly indicate their main target achievements for the coming year (N+1). FPI.1 coordinates the contributions of the different Units and provides the necessary guidance. It also ensures consistency between the different contributions and the output indicators provided.

When?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and AMP template sent by SECGEN</td>
<td>Mid-October N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Units send contribution to FPI.1</td>
<td>Mid-November N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPI.1 to send draft AMP to SECGEN</td>
<td>End-November N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from SecGen, DG BUDG, DG COMM</td>
<td>End November-Mid-December N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from HRVP Cabinet</td>
<td>End November-Mid-December N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPI.1 sends final AMP N+1 to SECGEN for publication</td>
<td>End December N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The adopted Management Plans are available on the Intranet:

5 EU Intervention and Action

The FPI Strategic Plan and FPI Annual Management Plans are implemented through policy, Instruments, programmes, projects and activities. They contribute, at their respective levels, to the realisation of the FPI Vision.

Like Russian dolls, activities, projects, programmes, instruments and policies are closely interlinked; activities contribute to the achievement of project objectives, projects to the achievement of programme objectives, programmes to the achievement of Instruments’ objectives, Instruments to realisation of the FPI Vision and at the end of the chain, FPI Vision contributes to the realisation of the EU Vision (as set out in the Treaties – Article 21 (1) TEU - but also in global political strategies such as Horizon 2020, the 10 political priorities of the Juncker Commission and the EU Global Strategy).

This logical chain is summarized in the FPI Results Framework and monitored through a set of indicators able to demonstrate FPI activity as a Service (see 4.2.2. FPI Results Framework).

In practice, this cut-out is often mixed up: programmes are not necessarily composed of different projects but directly of activities, in this scenario 'programme' and 'project' are synonymous.

Projects and programmes are often brought together under the generic nouns 'action' or 'intervention'22, less frequently under the noun 'measure'23.

Even if the different Regulations under FPI’s remit use, in an undifferentiated manner, these 3 words (and sometimes the word programme), a convergence within the Commission has started as of May 2015 with the launch of Better Regulation Guidelines24 where the word ‘intervention’ is used to encompass each type of action (policy, instrument, programme, project, etc.) that the Commission can implement and/or fund25. The word 'intervention' joined with the acronym EU, so 'EU intervention' is now in current use. These two letters highlight the fact that it is not only an EC intervention but, because of the decision making process (involvement of the Commission, the Parliament and the Council) an EU intervention. Use of the term allows also for the inclusion of other EU bodies, such as the EEAS or the EU agencies as a full part of the programming or implementing phases of an intervention.

The word 'Action' should preferably be used to designate programmes and projects. In this Manual when we speak about project management, we refer exclusively to the Action level. In this case, the definition of EU intervention below is used to define the word 'Action'.

---

22 For the purpose of same understanding of terms in OPSYS, DG DEVCO, DG NEAR and FPI have harmonised 5 key terms, including “Action” and “Intervention”. See DEVCO Note number Ares(2018)960951. More on OPSYS in Chapter 11.
23 It should be noted that the IcSP Regulation uses the term 'measure' in relation to Articles 3, 4 and 5.
25 The European Court of Auditors gives the following definition: ‘any action or operation, carried out by public authorities or other organisations, regardless of its nature (policy, programme, measure or project). Means of intervention employed are grants, loans, subsidised interest rates, guarantees, participation in equity and risk capital schemes or other forms of financing’ in Performance audit manual, European Court of Auditors, 2015, p. 4.
An EU intervention is 'a set of financial, organisational and human resources mobilised to achieve, in a given period of time, an objective or set of objectives, with the aim of solving or overcoming a problem or difficulty affecting targeted groups'\textsuperscript{26}.

### 5.1 The Change Process

An EU intervention can be considered as a change process, with a point of departure (the current situation) and a point of arrival (the results that are expected to be produced by the intervention). In order to generate this change, a set of activities will be designed and implemented such as for example conferences, missions, trainings, publications, methodologies or websites (see 7.5.1).

Prior to thinking about the change process itself, a particular focus has to be given to 'the current situation' (point of departure). In principle, the EU intervention should only take place if the EU (or FPI) has been able to answer the following 3 questions:

- Is there a need? (the current situation is not desirable and a change is needed);
- Is the EU (or FPI) willing to intervene to answer this need? (in order to change the current situation);
- Does the EU (or FPI) have the legitimacy and ability to change this situation?

The EU intervention should be able to demonstrate how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context by implementing the activities foreseen. The EU intervention should describe the 'logical chain' between the outputs produced that will create a change in behaviour (outcome) that will in its turn produce changes in the social, economic or environment spheres. This chain of consequences is called the **Theory of Change** (see 7.5.1).

### 5.2 How Policy, Instrument, Programme and Project are inter-related

In most cases, Instrument or policy objectives are too far from the reality on the ground and could be seen, from the point of view of the Action, as impossible to reach. Nevertheless, a link must be created between both (or three) levels (Action/Instrument/Policy).

In order to avoid creating extra levels between the objectives of an action and the objectives of an Instrument, actions must directly contribute to achieving the objectives of the Instrument that fund them. In other words, the Overall Objective of the Action should be directly related and clearly contribute to the Specific Objective of the Instrument that funds it and by corollary, the impact of the action should be directly related and clearly contribute to the outcome of the Instrument.

*Figure 5: Correspondence between instrument objectives/results and action objectives/results*

\textsuperscript{26} Performance Audit Manual, EU Court of Auditors, 2015, p. 16.
Ideally, the Overall Objective of an Action could use parts of the wording of the Specific Objective of the Instrument that funds it when possible adapting it to the particular context of the Action and its scope.

This cascade chain has been used continuously by the RELEX family since 2001\textsuperscript{27}.

Figure 6: Design/programming phase: hierarchy and links between policy, Instrument and Actions objectives

Figure 7: Implementation phase: hierarchy and links between policy, Instrument and Actions objectives
The Specific Objectives at Instrument level are listed in 4.1.2.3 FPI Specific Objectives above and in Figure 1: FPI intervention logic and its link with EU General Objective and SDGs.

5.3 Project Management Basic Knowledge:

5.3.1 What is Project Management?

Project Management has been progressively formalised since the 50’s to answer specific needs related to the management of complex projects where improvisation and personal skills may not be enough to manage the multiplicity of factors of reality on the ground, dialogue with stakeholders and all the intricacy and complexity involved.

In the 70’s, Project Management was broadly understood as the management of 4 different phases inherent to all kind of projects: Initiating, Planning, Executing, Closing plus a horizontal one: Monitoring and Controlling.

From the 2000’s onwards, the European Commission started to formalise its own Project Management Methodology adapted to its needs and specificities: PM² (Project Management Methodology). In parallel EuropeAid released in 2001 a first manual on Project Management responding to the specific context of the external action of the EU. It adapted the 4 phases usually used internationally into: identifying, formulating, implementing, closing. Another manual on Aid Delivery Methods²⁸ developed by EuropeAid and DG Development was published in 2004 and went deeper on the definition of the 4 phases.

Since its creation, FPI has been also using these phases and terminology but without clearly defining them or adapting them to its needs and specificities: the FPI Manual constitutes the first formalisation of FPI approach.

'Project Management can be described as the activities of planning, organising, securing, monitoring and managing the necessary resources and work to deliver specific project goals and objectives in an effective and efficient way²⁹'.

The Project Manager is the person in charge of the Project Management she/he acts as a ‘conductor’ managing all aspects related to the 4 phases (identifying, formulating, implementing, closing) and to the horizontal task (Monitoring & Evaluation), as the relations with the Implementing Partners and other stakeholders involved (including in the context of FPI: Commission Services, the EEAS, the European Parliament, Member States, International Organisations, the civil society, think tanks, etc.).

5.3.2 The Logic Model

The Current situation (point of departure), the results (point of arrival) and the intervention can be presented schematically in 'the logic model' (see Figure 8: Logic model).

The Logic Model is a descriptive way to illustrate the change process in a linear, causal manner, but does not explain why one thing will lead to another (the 'why' issue could be addressed by a narrative explaining the Theory of Change that underpins the Logic Model).

²⁹ PM² Project Management Methodology, European Commission, 2016.
The Logic Model could be considered as the backbone of the Logical Framework. It allows formulating or presenting a clear idea of the steps to follow.

Figure 8: Logic model

'Needs' are influenced by or go through the intervention process and end up being transformed. At the end of the intervention, initial needs do not exist anymore or have been changed to 'no needs' (the EU has been able to address the initial need so it has disappeared) or new needs have been identified. In the latter case, the intervention has to be re-shaped to 'stick' again or begin to address the real needs (initial needs have been influenced or changed by the intervention, so a new intervention should be designed and adapted to these new needs).

5.3.3 What is a need?

A need is a problem or difficulty affecting concerned groups, which the intervention aims to solve or overcome.

The better 'needs' are identified, the better the EU (or FPI) can address it in a proper way. If 'needs' are difficult to identify, then the launch of an ex-ante evaluation, can be considered as it will help to better identify the 'needs' scope and length and the target groups.

---

30 From Programme Logic Model, Performance audit manual 2015, Court of Auditors, p. 17.
31 Ibid.
5.3.4 What is an objective?

Objectives are the initial statement of the results intended to be achieved by an intervention. Objectives are identified and designed from the needs; they correspond to a ‘translation’ of negative findings observed in the reality (needs) into positive one (objectives). In terms of the Logical Framework Approach, the Problem Tree is translated into the Objectives Tree during the design phase of the action.

In the area of EOMs for example, needs could be: in country X, elections are not well organised; but by turning this sentence into a positive one (objective) it will become: elections will be well organised. Therefore, objectives have to be seen as the expected point of arrival of the intervention, the ideal situation which will or should emerge after having implemented the intervention. In a word, it is a ‘bet’, a projection into the future of the results that the intervention would like to achieve.

Four main types of objectives exist: general objectives, overall objectives, specific objectives (also called purpose) and operational objectives.

Objectives should be ‘S.M.A.R.T.’:32

Specific: Objectives should be precise and concrete enough not to be open to varying interpretations by different people.

Measurable: Objectives should define a desired future state in measurable terms, to allow verification of their achievement. Such objectives are either quantified or based on a combination of description and scoring scales.

Achievable: Policy aims must be set at a level which is ambitious but at the same time realistically achievable.

Relevant: The objectives should be directly linked to the problem and its root causes.

Time-Bound: Objectives should be related to a fixed date or precise time period to allow an evaluation of their achievement.

5.3.5 What is an input?

An input is all possible financial, human, and material resources that are mobilised for the implementation of an intervention.33

5.3.6 What is a result?

A result is the effects (positive or negative) that an intervention will produce in the short, medium and long-term on the economic, social and environmental areas in which it is implemented. Results are composed of outputs, outcomes and impacts.34

---

32 Better Regulation Toolbox, tool #16.
33 Ibid.
34 Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 on common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union’s instruments for financing external action, paragraph 19.
5.3.7  What is an output?

Output is the direct product of activities, produced or accomplished with the resources allocated to an intervention.

Outputs are in the sphere of control of the intervention.\(^{35}\)

Example: conclusions of a conference, knowledge acquired by training attendees at the end of a training session, knowledge created by specific studies and shared.

5.3.8  What is an activity?

An activity is a specific tool put in place to generate outputs. It is not considered as part of the Results Chain (see Figure 18 under Section 7.5.1)

Example: seminars, workshops, trainings, conferences, exchanges, surveys, website creation, etc.

5.3.9  What is an outcome?

Outcome is the medium-term result of an intervention expected to be achieved in the social, economic and environmental area (of the intervention) and/or on direct addressees of the intervention. Basically, an outcome is something that addressees do differently as a result of the outputs produced and the activities organised. Other external actors also influence the area and addressees.

Outcomes are in the sphere of direct influence of the intervention.

Example: conclusions of a conference are taken into account by the country X when shaping its new renewable energy policy.

5.3.10 What is an impact?

Impact is the long-term result of the intervention expected to be achieved in the social, economic and environmental global context involving other stakeholders.

Impacts are in the sphere of indirect influence of the intervention.

Example: a new education policy has been drafted by country X.

5.4  Correspondence between objectives and results

The terminology used differs according to whether we are referring to the design/programming phase (objectives) or to the implementation phase (results).

During design, the thinking is top-down with a first focus on intended objectives i.e. what we want to achieve or in other words, the Overall Objective (OO), then the Specific Objective(s) (SO) which are

\(^{35}\) From Programme Logic Model, Performance audit manual 2015, Court of Auditors, p. 17.
conducive to achievement of the OO. Legal texts are often limited to these objectives. When concrete projects are designed, attention is also given to the lower levels of the intervention logic i.e. to the Outputs (also called Operational Objectives) which will lead to the achievement of the SOs, and the Activities that need to be carried out to deliver these Outputs. Inputs are also considered, not least in terms of necessary financial and human resources. When an intervention is well designed, it is generally known which types of Inputs, Activities and Outputs will be needed to achieve the stated objectives.

During implementation, the approach shifts to bottom-up; it becomes essential to follow-up on resources consumed (inputs) and to carry out concrete activities which in turn deliver outputs. The aim is to contribute to the Specific and Overall Objectives, but the terminology changes to what has actually been achieved, i.e. outcomes at the level of Specific Objectives and impacts at the level of Overall Objectives. The tenses used to describe the objective or result also change, present or future to describe objectives, past tense for results.

This difference in terminology is summarised in the table below:

**Figure 9 Terminology used during identification/ formulation phases and implementation phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification/ formulation phases (Hierarchy of Objectives)</th>
<th>Implementation phase (Chain of results)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(intended) OVERALL OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>(achieved) IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(intended) SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>(achieved) OUTCOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(programmed) OUTPUT</td>
<td>(produced) OUTPUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(programmed) ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>(carried out) ACTIVITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(programmed) INPUT</td>
<td>(consumed) INPUT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Election Observation Missions

**Transforming Objectives into Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy of Objectives</th>
<th>Chain of results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the electoral reform process and democratization in the partner country</td>
<td>The electoral reform process and democratization in the partner country have been improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE</td>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner country discusses/considers EU recommendations</td>
<td>Partner country have discussed/considered EU recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer and Core Team experts perform better in their respective domains</td>
<td>Observer and Core Team experts have performed better in their respective domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU observation methodology is used as a reference to the benefit of EOM members as well as</td>
<td>EU observation methodology has been used as a reference to the benefit of EOM members as well as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The change process can be detailed or tracked using the different levels of objectives in order to link them to the different results that the intervention will produce; these links are described in the following scheme:

*Figure 10: Logic model with objectives split up and correspondences established between objectives and results*
5.5 **Correspondence between OECD wording and EC terminology**

There is a difference in terminology between the OECD and the EC, which may create some confusion. For the EC, an outcome is composed of outputs and results while for the OECD, a result is composed of outputs, outcomes and impacts. FPI (like DEVCO and NEAR) uses OECD wording when programming/implementing an Instrument or an action, but uses EC wording for some reporting documents (Strategic Plan, Management Plan, Annual Activity Report and Programme Statement). This can make matters complex but above all, underlines the need to establish clarity of thought at all operational levels.
### Figure 11: Correspondence between OECD and EC wording regarding programming and effect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of responsibility</th>
<th>Type of objectives (EC wording)</th>
<th>Type of objectives (FPI)</th>
<th>Outcomes (EC wording)</th>
<th>Results (FPI)</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU level</td>
<td>General Objective</td>
<td>General Objective</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Sphere of indirect influence at EU/world level</td>
<td>Very long-term change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Overall Objective</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Sphere of indirect influence</td>
<td>Long-term change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG/service level</td>
<td>Specific Objective</td>
<td>Specific Objective (or Purpose)</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Sphere of direct influence</td>
<td>Medium-term change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units’ level</td>
<td>Operational Objective</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Sphere of control</td>
<td>Short-term change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is important is to have a clear view on who uses which vocabulary and where in order to avoid all misunderstandings.

The Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 of the European Parliament and the Council of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action\(^\text{36}\) that defines the rules that apply for 10 EU External Financing Instruments and measures (EFIs), clearly mentions that "results" cover outputs, outcomes and impact\(^\text{37}\). Consequently, FPI should preferably use this terminology in relation to the Instruments, programmes and projects that it manages.

---

\(^{36}\) Also called CIR – Common Implementing Regulation.

6 FPI Project Management Methodology

6.1 FPI Project Management Methodology: 4 phases, 1 horizontal activity

Regarding existing Project Management Methodologies’ limitations within and outside the EC\textsuperscript{38} and for the purpose of its own requirements, FPI has developed its own methodology, combining different available tools and adapting them to its specificities and needs, that is to say a Project Management Methodology customized for:

- mainly non-programmable Actions;
- mainly Actions in the sole interest of the EU;
- mainly Actions responding to political criteria;
- mainly Actions to be delivered quickly.

The FPI Project Management Methodology provides 3 types of information:

- A set of questions that could be addressed during the different phases of an Action;
- Templates, documentation and tools that could be used during each particular phase;
- Key documents to draft during each phase to formalize and document the Action.

FPI Project Managers are invited to follow the FPI Project Management Methodology and its different phases applicable to their specific action. However for each phase, they have to decide how far they want to go in formalizing the Action in terms of key documents. For some very quick Actions, a Concept Note, an Action Document, an Action Work Plan and a Logical Framework could be enough to formalise the approach. For other more complex Actions, these 4 tools can be complemented or added to as part of an in-depth analysis (SWOT, Conflict Analysis, Stakeholders Mapping, etc.) and a full description of the Action (Action Charter). The latter are, of course, optional but their consideration could be very useful in terms of improving the design of Actions as well as interaction with key stakeholders including the EEAS, Member States and civil society.

Use of the FPI Project Management Methodology will assist Project Managers to better design Actions, to clarify the results to be achieved and to better track and document them in cooperation with the implementing partner and other stakeholders, including the EEAS, Member States and civil society.

\textsuperscript{38} DEVCO Project Cycle Management, NEAR Project Management Methodology, European Commission Project Management Methodology (PM\textsuperscript{2}), Council of Europe Project Management Methodology, PRINCE2, PMBOK, etc.
Figure 12: FPI Project Management Methodology

**Identifying**
- **Tasks:**
  - Identify the ‘needs’
  - Identify key stakeholders
  - Define the Intervention Logic
- **Tools:**
  - SWOT template
  - Intervention Logic template
  - Concept Note template

**Formulating**
- **Tasks:**
  - Organise a formulation meeting
  - Formulate a strategy
  - Design the architecture of the Action
  - Assign roles & responsibilities
  - Develop the Action Work Plan
- **Tools:**
  - Meeting Agenda template
  - Minutes of Meeting template
  - Action Document template
  - Action Charter template
  - Stakeholders matrix template
  - Action Work Plan template

**Implementing**
- **Tasks:**
  - Organise a kick-off meeting
  - Coordinate Action implementation
  - Monitor performance
  - Control schedule, cost and quality
  - Monitor risks
  - Manage stakeholders
- **Tools:**
  - Meeting Agenda template
  - Minutes of Meeting template
  - Action Status Report template
  - Narrative Report template
  - Results Acceptance Note template

**Closing**
- **Tasks:**
  - Organise an Action-End review meeting
  - Capture lessons learned and post-action recommendations
  - Get final Action Acceptance
  - Conduct financial and administrative closure
  - Archive Action information
- **Tools:**
  - Action-End Meeting agenda
  - Action-End Minutes of Meeting
  - Action-End Report

**Monitoring & Evaluation**
- **Tasks:**
  - Monitor Action performance
  - Control schedule
  - Control cost
  - Control quality
  - Monitor risks
  - Manage stakeholders
- **Tools:**
  - IT tool for monitoring: OPSYS
  - IT tool for evaluation: EVAL module
- **Documents:**
  - Action Logical Framework indicators updated in OPSYS
  - Action Status Reports
  - Interim Reports
  - Final Reports
  - Action Evaluation Reports
6.1.1 Identifying

The aim of this phase is to identify Action ideas, consistent with the EU strategy and that of the Instrument being used (where relevant) and which respond to a need or address a particular problem. During this phase, an analysis of the context is undertaken to identify the stakeholders that should be involved in the future Action or who could be its final beneficiaries. An Intervention Logic should also be drafted proposing the Specific Objectives and an Overall Objective of the Action (or several when necessary). All this information should be summarized in a Concept Note.

For CFSP only, the identifying phase is done by the EEAS and the Council with a consultation of FPI.3, the responsibility of the Commission in this case is limited and no Concept Note is drafted. Nevertheless, an equivalent document formalizes the Action to be further developed: the Crisis Management Concept.

For IcSP, early and swift identification of Actions under Article 3 depends on good cooperation and coordination between FPI Headquarters (Crisis Response team), the FPI Regional Team involved, the EEAS, relevant Commission services as well as EU Delegations. For reasons of efficiency, effectiveness and synergy, it is essential that discussion and cooperation between EU Delegations, FPI Regional Teams, EEAS Desks and FPI Headquarters staff gets underway at the earliest opportunity. Close association with EU Member States, including in the field, is also recommended to help build consensus on the opportunity of the Action and to seek complementarity with bilateral cooperation/assistance.

For PI, due to the process of upstream consultation with line DGs and the EEAS as part of identifying Actions, a specific Concept Note is used (see Annexes 8, 9 and 14 for IcSP an PI Concept Note templates).

6.1.2 Ready for formulating

The Concept Note is then approved by the appropriate body; it is the 'ready for formulating'.

For CFSP, COREPER\textsuperscript{39} approves the Crises Management Concept (equivalent of the Concept Note). FPI.3 does not have the responsibility of formulating the Action. This responsibility lies with the EEAS (CPCC).

For EOMs, the HRVP approves yearly Election Priorities, prepared by EEAS in consultation with Member States, the European Parliament and the European Commission.

For IcSP Article 3 projects, following consultations with the EEAS, relevant Commission services and the Cabinet, when necessary, FPI prepares on a regular basis an information note setting out proposals for new crisis response measures, as well as updates on the implementation of ongoing measures. This information note is reviewed by EEAS management and then submitted for the endorsement of the HR/VP through the EEAS Secretary General before being presented at a meeting of the Political and Security Committee (PSC), in accordance with the provisions of Art. 7(4) of the IcSP Regulation.

\textsuperscript{39} In French “Comité des représentants permanents” (CO-RE-PER), is the Committee of Permanent Representatives in the European Union, made up of the Head or Deputy Head of Mission from the EU Member States in Brussels. The COREPER prepares the agenda for the meetings of Ministerial Council of the European Union.
For Actions under Article 4, the Concept Note is validated by the Head of Unit as part of a single package of Actions under the Annual Action Programme following upstream discussions on programming between the Project Managers (in Headquarters and/or in Regional Teams), relevant EEAS divisions, EU Delegations, relevant Commission services. Consultations are held with civil society organisations and with Member States in order to promote consistency and complementarity of activities.

For PI, Quality Support Groups assembling relevant EC DGs, EEAS and EU Delegations assess and validate the Concept Note under the overall coordination of FPI.

6.1.3 Formulating

During this phase, the initial idea described in the Concept Note is deepened. What should be the exact scope of the Action, the results expected, which stakeholders should be involved during the implementation, does the Action need to be outsourced by a service contract or a grant, with one or several contracts?

Which rules will apply (PRAG, Vademecum, or other rules) and what will be the rules of the game (FPI Manual, Better Regulation, Evaluation methods for the European Union’s external assistance, etc.). Who will implement which part of the Action? What is the Action Work Plan?

This information is gathered in the Action Document or in the Action Charter.

6.1.4 Ready for implementing

A new Action is ready for implementing when the Action Document has been approved by the Commission (adoption of the Financing Decision). In very exceptional circumstances in situations of crisis, the implementation of an Action may start prior to the adoption of the Financing Decision to ensure timely EU intervention.

6.1.5 Implementing

During the implementing phase Project Managers coordinate the implementation of the Action, working with Implementing Partners who are responsible for putting the Action (or a part of it) into motion, communicating with key stakeholders, verifying the cost, schedule and quality of the Action, supervising results achievement, validating the final results.

6.1.6 Ready for closing

The “ready for closing” is given by the Project Manager after having approved the final report(s) of the Implementing Partner(s) and after having drafted the Results Acceptance Note) which formalize that the results expected have been achieved.

6.1.7 Closing

The purpose of the closing phase is to have a retrospective look at the previous phases of the Action. Was the Action well designed? Was the division of labour between Implementing Partners well defined? Did the Action produce the expected results? If not, why? If yes, why? What recommendations could be formulated? What are the lessons learnt from the Action? How to administratively and financially close and archive the Action?
6.1.8 Monitoring & Evaluation

Monitoring & Evaluation are horizontal activities which should be able to collect, gather and analyse Action-related information on the achievement of results in order to identify/rectify any deviations from the objectives previously agreed.

6.2 Over-planning vs fire-fighting

The numerous tools presented in the next sections and related to each phase of the FPI Project Management Methodology, are not compulsory. Nevertheless, Project Managers have to carefully analyse which of these may better help understand the context or the design of a new EU intervention.

Remember that methodologies and tools are there to serve the Action, not the other way around.

The following figure can help Project Managers decide how far the formalization of the Action by key documents should be developed. Project Managers should decide where to put the cursor between 'over-planning' (describing the entire context with several context analyses, formalizing the Action in complex documents such as Action Charter, Risk Mitigation Plan, Stakeholders Management Plan, etc.) and 'fire-fighting', that occurs when the context has not been well identified and when the Action has not been well defined and formalized. It is however recognised that planning in situations of crises often implies accepting a certain degree of flexibility and rapid formulation that may not allow for all tools to be fully used.

Figure 13: Over planning vs fire-fighting

---

https://hbr.org/2000/07/stop-fighting-fires
The project management tools *Risk Mitigation Plan* and *Stakeholders Management Plan* mentioned in the left of the figure 13 are not described in this manual but can be found on the PM² (EU Project Management Methodology) website: [http://intracomm.ec.testa.eu/PM2/](http://intracomm.ec.testa.eu/PM2/) or contacting EC-PM2@ec.europa.eu.

### 6.3 Further reading on Project Management

- Project Management Methodology (PM²), Project Management tools & techniques, European Union, 2015.

### 6.4 Be trained!

On EU Learn:

DEVCO - Introduction to PPCM - Project and Programme Cycle Management.
7 Identifying an Action

Key questions to address during the identifying phase

- Does the Action correspond to and/or support an EU strategy or policy?
- Does the Action address at least one of the FPI Specific Objectives?
- Is undertaking the Action in the interest of the EU?
- Should FPI intervene?
- Is the Action feasible?
- What should be the main objective of the Action?
- Are the objectives clear and achievable by the Action only?
- What is the Theory of Change of the Action?
- Who should be the main stakeholders involved?

Key tools of the identifying phase

- SWOT analysis template
- Political Economy analysis
- Conflict analysis
- Stakeholders analysis
- Intercultural analysis
- Concept Note template
- Intervention Logic template

Key documents of the identifying phase

- Context analysis
- Concept Note
- Intervention Logic

7.1 What is identifying?

The purpose of the identifying phase is to identify a need, an opportunity that could be addressed by FPI through a particular Action, as this need or opportunity corresponds to FPI mandate and objectives (as described in the FPI Strategic Plan 2016-2020 and in section 4.1 of this Manual).

The identifying phase will help better define what exactly the 'need' is and how FPI could better address it (by which means). Several tools exist to better qualify the 'need' and better understand the context where it appears such as its root causes and the main stakeholders involved. Using these tools can be very useful as part of important upstream discussions and reflections, particularly those with key stakeholders.

The key document to be drafted during the identifying phase is the Concept Note (and its Intervention Logic). The Concept Note formalises for the first time what could be the future Action
and its objectives. The Concept Note provides also enough information to help decision makers to estimate if the Action is worth undertaking or not.

If the Action identified in the Concept Note is legal, pertinent, opportune, aligned with FPI Strategic Plan and seems to be feasible it should lead to the drafting of an Action Document (and Action Charter where necessary) and to a Financing Decision (see formulating phase)\(^4\).

### 7.2 Identifying of a new Action: step by step

**Figure 14: identifying phase**

1. **Identify needs and causes**
   - What are the needs/problems/gaps/challenges?
   - What are their causes?

2. **Identify stakeholders**
   - Who are involved in the needs or in their resolution?

3. **Identify a strategy (the Action)**
   - What is the solution (response) to address the causes?
   - What is the link of the Action with the EU Strategy/Policy/Instrument?
   - What is the change the Action is expected to produce and how?
   - What are the objectives foreseen?
   - What is the Theory of Change of the Action?

\(^{41}\) For the IcSP, additional specific guidance is available in the IcSP Guidance Note.
7.3 How to identify needs and causes

'Need' is the generic term used in Project Management to describe the 'current situation' that an Action would change (see 5.1); other terms can also be used as 'problem', 'gaps', 'demand', 'challenge', 'window of opportunity', 'point of departure' or 'original state'.

The better 'needs' are identified, the better the Action can address them in an effective way. Needs can be identified using internal European Commission staff resources (in HQ, RT or EUDEL) or with the help of external consultants (using a Framework Contract for example, see 11.2.5.3.3).

If the EU intervention is a policy or an Instrument, it is compulsory to launch an ex-ante evaluation, called 'Impact Assessment'. A complete guideline to launch Impact Assessment is provided in Better Regulation toolbox Chapter II.

Where 'needs' come from?

HQ, RT or EUDEL can receive a direct request from a partner country, it could also come from Member States or the HR/VP (it is the case for CFSP for example). The identified needs could also be the consequence of a first project that has ended, its Final Report could have mentioned that another phase should be implemented; 'needs' could also be a part of the conclusions of an evaluation that could recommend that the EU should intervene to cover a specific gap. 'Needs' could also have already been identified in EU strategies (Global Strategy, FPI Strategic Plan 2016-2020) or in Regulations (IcSP, PI, EIDHR).

Wherever the 'needs' come from, for each type of EU intervention (policy, instrument, programme, and project) the use of the available tools should be considered to go deeper in terms of the 'needs' analyses and in terms of understanding its main causes, to the extent possible depending on the nature of the Action (taking into consideration the specificities of crisis situations, for example).

7.3.1 Context analysis

Context analysis is a method using different tools to describe the context within which a change is needed. It helps to understand the causes of the needs and the conditions, factors and change drivers related to these causes and upon which the Action should concentrate.

Several tools can be used and combined to identify as precisely as possible the context of a future Action. It is very much up to the Project Manager – whether in Headquarters or in Regional Teams - to consider the opportunity of using some or all of these tools.

In this section some are presented as:

1. Political Economy analysis
2. Conflict analysis
3. Cultural dimensions analysis
4. SWOT analysis

---

42 Every 7 years as the identification of a new Instrument depends on the Multiannual Financial Framework cycle. Impact Assessment could also be done to revise/amend an existing Instrument. It has been the case in 2016 for IcSP adding a Capacity building in support of security and development (CBSD) dimension to the Instrument.
When used, all these tools should mention that the gender aspects have been taken into account in the identifying phase. In fact, according to the Gender Action Plan II objective 4: ‘Robust gender evidence used to inform all EU external spending, programming and policy making’. By June 2016, all FPI Units, RTs and EUDs undertook a gender analysis in relation to all spending, programming and policy making. The European Commission defines a gender analysis as the study of differences in the conditions, needs, participation rates, access to resources and development, control of assets, decision-making powers, etc. between girls/women and boys/men in their assigned gender roles. It could be included in one of the tools listed above or be undertaken as an autonomous analysis. Other cross-cutting issues should be also taken into account when drafting context analysis documents (see 9.15).

7.3.1.1 Political Economy Analysis

What is a PEA?

‘Political economy analysis investigates how political and economic processes interact in a given society and support or impede the ability to solve development problems that require collective action. It takes particular account of the interests and incentives driving the behaviour of different groups and individuals, the distribution of power and wealth between them and how these relationships are created, sustained and transformed over time. These relationships are crucial in explaining how politics works, how wealth is created, and how developmental change happens’.

The aim of the Political Economy Analysis is to gather in one report all this information in order to better understand the context and possibly identify the root causes of the need the EU intervention would like to address.

Why use PEA?

To have a better understanding on institutions (political, social, cultural, administrative) and key stakeholders’ roles, interests and interrelations in a particular sector/country/region. It helps define how to engage them according to their ‘functioning’ and what they have to gain or lose with the Action.

PEA is very useful when traditional institutions (State, Ministries, local authorities, etc.) which are well established and legitimate in the EU could be blurred, unstable or not fully legitimate in partner countries. In those cases other forms of governance and "rules of the game" could exist outside these institutions. In some countries in Africa for example, the social rules of a particular ethnic group can be much more powerful than the administrative rules within a Ministry. In that case, it could be more relevant to use the social rules of the ethnic group as a change driver than the administrative rules of a Ministry or state agencies.

PEA could be used to:

- understand better the context and the change drivers behind the traditional institutions ‘façade’;
- go deeper on needs analysis;

43 Please refer to the Gender Action Plan II and its objectives and indicators: https://myintracomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/fpi/HowWeWork/ProjectManagement/Pages/Index.aspx
44 Using Political Economy Analysis to improve EU Development Effectiveness, a DEVCO Background Note Draft January 2012.
- identify the root causes of a problem (or a need);
- identify change drivers;
- find a possible solution to address the need and its causes;
- identify key stakeholders;
- identify risks.

**Where and when to use PEA?**

It is better to use Political Economy Analysis within EU bodies only as it can contain sensitive information on the partner country(ies) or particular stakeholders. The PEA can also be shared with other key actors (Member States, United Nations) when needed for example when the EU intervention should be articulated with other non-EU interventions.

The context analysis is done during the identifying phase but serves as a reference during the different FPI Project Management Methodology phases.

**How to use PEA?**

Project Managers can refer regularly to the PEA to better understand the context where the Action will be (or is) implemented. It is a useful tool to define which particular activities need to be implemented to lead to the expected change. PEA also allows you to understand how specific stakeholders have to be managed or be used during the implementing phase to facilitate the Action implementation and results achievement. It helps also to identify possible risks during the implementation.

7.3.1.2 **Conflict analysis**

**What is a conflict analysis?**

A conflict analysis is a structured process of examining a conflict situation in order to better understand the context in which one is operating and to identify entry points for possible Action. A conflict analysis usually consists of the following components:

- An analysis of the context
- An analysis of the (possible) causes of conflict
- An analysis of the actors (see also stakeholders analysis in section 7.4 of this Manual)
- An analysis of conflict dynamics
- An outline of possible scenarios, possible future directions of conflict
- An analysis of the existing and planning responses
- The identification of key gaps, options and realistic strategies to respond to the conflict

The EU employs 2 tools for conflict analysis:

- Light-touch conflict analysis

  Conflict-affected settings are often characterised by developments that move at a quick pace. Provided that EU-actors involved already have a lot of knowledge and information on the situation, a light-touch conflict analysis (the most commonly used analysis within the EU)

may inform critical decision making at a time when it is needed. The light-touch approach allows a broad range of EU staff to participate in it and therefore own its results.

It can be organized at the Delegation or at Headquarters and can be undertaken in 1-2 days. This analysis seeks to draw on the perspectives and knowledge of a broad range of EU actors, and, when possible, include a few external experts (academics, civil society, etc.). In sensitive cases, the inclusion of external experts may not be appropriate.

The final product of a light touch conflict analysis must be adapted to the needs of its end-user. An executive summary can help brief senior management to support their decision making. A longer meeting report can also set out initial areas of further engagement, including a more detailed conflict analysis or options for practical responses to address the conflict analysis findings.

- Conflict sensitive political economy analysis

Where an in-depth analysis is required, the EU methodology for Political Economy Analysis (PEA) can be employed. The PEA methodology provides a framework to understand key aspects of the political and economic processes, relationships and dynamics at work in a given country or sector.

Political economy analysis investigates how political and economic processes interact in a given society, and support or impede the ability to solve problems. It takes particular account of the interests and incentives driving the behaviour of different groups and individuals, the distribution of power and wealth between them, and how these relationships are created, sustained and transformed over time. These relationships are crucial in explaining how politics works, how wealth is created, and how change happens. The framework is intended to help deepen EU staff's understanding of the country context or of specific sectors as well as to promote discussion of how the EU can best interact with the dynamics of national political economy.

Contact EEAS - Prevention of conflicts, Rule of Law/Security Sector Reform, Integrated Approach, Stabilisation and Mediation (PRISM) in charge of conflict analysis: prism@eeas.europa.eu

The EU conflict Early Warning System (EWS) can help in the conflict analysis. The EWS is a robust, evidence-based risk management tool that identifies, assesses and helps prioritise situations at risk of violent conflict for non-EU countries, focusing on structural factors and with a time horizon of four years. It also identifies conflict prevention and peace building opportunities.

There are also several resources at hand that can feed into a conflict analysis process. The European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) is the EU’s foreign policy think tank dealing with the analysis of foreign security and defence policy issues. FPI.2 also supports several organisations (think tanks, civil society organisations) to provide independent field based analysis from conflict affected contexts which have been instrumental in bringing different perspectives in the analysis process.

---

46 *Idem.*


Contact PRISM and/or FPI2 for more information on resources available to support conflict analysis processes.

Other methodologies and guidance exists to draft a conflict analysis\(^{49}\).

The conflict analysis could be the basis to establish and list the risks that can mitigate (or hamper) the achievement of results under an Action (see also 0 ‘Risk indicators and context indicators’).

**Why use a conflict analysis?**

80% of FPI-funded Actions take place in fragile and/or conflict-affected countries. Therefore undertaking a conflict analysis should be compulsory to better understand the needs, challenges and opportunities of the context and better understand the risks related to the Action and the context within which the Action will operate\(^{50}\). Undertaking a conflict analysis is therefore a critical step to enhance our own effectiveness, i.e. ensuring the Actions we are supporting are better targeted and tailored to each context, responding to specific needs and that risks are clearly assessed and steps taken to mitigate them.

Conflict analysis could be used:

- To understand better the context of the future Action;
- To go deeper on needs analysis;
- To identify the root causes of a problem (or a need);
- To facilitate a ‘do no harm’\(^{51}\) approach;
- To set objectives (what the EU is going to do);
- To find a possible solution to address the need(s) and its/their causes;
- To identify key stakeholders;
- To identify risks;
- To take a decision on whether to fund the Action (or not).

**Where and when to use a conflict analysis?**

Conflict analysis should be used during the whole FPI Project Management Methodology phases. Project Managers can refer regularly to the Conflict Analysis to better understand the context where the Action will be (or is) implemented. It remains a critical tool to inform project identification and formulation and implementation, from the articulation of a Theory of Change and a work plan, to the management of stakeholders and the monitoring project’s results. The conflict analysis should also be the basis to establish and list the risks that can mitigate (or hamper) the achievement of results under an Action (see also 11.1.4.6 ‘Risk indicators and context indicators’).

Finally, it helps to develop a 'do no harm' approach by identifying the potential impacts of the Action on the socio-/political divisions/cleavages that cause, or have the potential to cause, violence between different groups.

---


\(^{50}\) See ‘Guidance note on the use of conflict Analysis in support of EU external action’, EEAS/European Commission, 29 October 2013.

**How to use a conflict analysis?**

Project Managers can refer regularly to the Conflict Analysis to better understand the context where the Action will be (or is) implemented. It is a useful tool to define which particular activities need to be implemented to lead to the expected change. Conflict Analysis allows you to understand how specific stakeholders have to be managed or be used during the implementing phase to facilitate the Action implementation and results achievement. It helps also to identify possible risks during the implementation. Finally, it helps to develop a ‘do no harm’ approach by identifying the potential impacts of the Action on the socio-/political divisions/cleavages that cause, or have the potential to cause, violence between different groups.

### 7.3.1.3 Cultural dimension analysis

**What is a cultural dimension analysis?**

A cultural dimensions analysis is an analysis that provides information on how a social group (specific community, village, country, region, etc.) organises its social links and institutions, what are its main values, norms, attitudes, beliefs, and meanings. The cultural dimension analysis could also provide indications on how to interact, in the framework of the Action with these different cultures (intercultural management).

The cultural dimension analysis can be included in a Political Economy Analysis.

The cultural dimension analysis allows to better define the type of culture where the Action will take place. Several tools to do this analysis have been created and can be used during the identifying and formulating phases.

The 6 dimensions model of national cultures (Geert Hofstede model):

1. Power Distance Index (PDI)
2. Individualism versus Collectivism (IDV)
3. Masculinity versus Femininity (MAS)
4. Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI)
5. Long Term Orientation versus Short Term Normative Orientation (LTO)
6. Indulgence versus Restraint (IND)

The 7 dimensions of culture (Fons Trompenaars and Charles Hampden-Turner model):

1. Universalism versus particularism
2. Individualism versus communitarianism
3. Specific versus diffuse
4. Neutral versus emotional
5. Achievement versus ascription
6. Sequential time versus synchronous time
7. Internal direction versus outer direction

---

Why using a cultural dimension analysis?

A majority of FPI interventions take place in foreign countries with particular local institutions, rules, beliefs, social organisation, norms. During the identifying, formulating and implementing phases, the Action should take into account these particular aspects to better identify the 'needs', to better design the Action (including its activities) or to focus Project Manager attention on particular 'cultural risks' to be managed on a continuous basis in order to improve the Action efficiency and effectiveness.

The least desirable approach would be to ignore that cultural differences exist and maintain the belief that the stakeholders involved in the Action share the same general culture as the Project Manager, FPI or the Commission (even within these two entities, several cultures already exist).

Such a feeling is reinforced by the fact that in most of the cases, Project Managers and stakeholders use the same vehicular language: English (or French for some parts of Africa, Asia or North America or Spanish for a large part of Latin America) and the temptation is high to believe that because the same language is used between them, that they/we all 'share the same culture'. This is a false premise upon which to work or plan.

Where and when to use cultural dimensions analysis?

Cultural dimensions analysis is a useful tool to understand how stakeholders involved in the Action could behave and on what social norms their behaviours are based. It could be shared with the main stakeholders of the Action in order to better define the 'rules of the game' before the Action is formulated and implemented.

How to use cultural dimensions analysis?

By using the 6 dimensions model of national cultures (Geert Hofstede model) and/or the 7 dimensions of culture (Fons Trompenaars and Charles Hampden-Turner model), Project Managers should be able to find and identify the cultural particularities of the territory in which the Action will take place. Once it is done, it will ease the definition of the Action methodology and activities to this particular context.

Example:

On the Fons Trompenaars and Charles Hampden-Turner model, there are 2 opposite dimensions: Individualism versus communitarianism.

For countries where 'individualism' is predominant, people believe in personal freedom and achievement. They believe that people make their own decisions and that they must take care of themselves.

For countries where 'communitarism' is predominant, people believe that the group is more important than the individual. The group provides help and safety, in exchange for loyalty. The group always comes before the individual.

Most African and Asian countries are based on 'communitarism', individuals will never take decisions in their own interest particularly if it contradicts prevailing or 'usual' community rules. Within this particular context, to base an Action on a limited number of people even if they have great formal power in a State institution can seriously limit the impact of the Action. Instead, it could be relevant
to design activities that target a large range of people that can influence and help change or influence prevailing community rules.

### 7.3.1.4 SWOT analysis

**What is a SWOT?**

SWOT means Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats, it is a snapshot of a situation, a problem, a need, an administration, a policy, a company, a project, it allows with a simple tool to have the main information needed to describe a subject. After having done Political Economy, Conflict, and/or cultural dimensions analysis, Project Manager has a comprehensive understanding of the context and should be able to draft a SWOT matrix when necessary.

**Figure 15: SWOT matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Threats</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why using SWOT?**

- To go deeper on needs analysis;
- To identify the root causes of a problem (or a need);
- To set objectives (what the EU is going to do);
- To identify positive aspects that can work together (strengths, opportunities);
- To identify potential combined problems (weaknesses, threats);
- To find a possible solution to address the need and its causes;
- To identify risks;
- To communicate clearly using a simple visual tool;
- To take a decision to fund the Action (or not).

**Where and when to use SWOT?**

Drafting a SWOT matrix can be done during a workshop, a specific meeting, a retreat with a part of the stakeholders already identified (key stakeholders). Specific methods, as the Metaplan®, exist to gather the information and reach a consensus between stakeholders on the proposed SWOT analysis. It can also be done by the Project Manager when meeting/interviewing directly key stakeholders.
A Desk phase could be conducted to analyse key documents such as sector analyses, economic reports, sociocultural analysis, socioeconomic analysis, political economy analysis, Pestle analysis, previous evaluations, etc.

The SWOT methodology can be used to analyse different scales of a problem/need (country level, sector level, State level, ministry level, local authority level, project level, programme level, policy level, etc.).

How to use SWOT?

Using the knowledge available (reports, analysis) and the expertise of key stakeholders, the SWOT matrix can be filled in by applying the following definitions:

**Strengths** (internal/positive):
Internal factors that could be helpful for the EU intervention: 'internal' should be understood as internal to the EC or internal to the project, internal to the organisation/institution concerned by the 'need', internal to the body in charge of implementing the EU intervention, etc.

Examples: Implementing Partner know-how, trained staff available, budget, internal procedures in place, M&E system working, etc.

**Weaknesses** (internal/negative):
Internal factors that could hamper or mitigate the EU intervention implementation or achievement.

Examples: Reluctance to change, lack of specific skills needed for the intervention, scarce budget, no staff availability, etc.

**Opportunities** (external/positive): favourable external factors that can help or facilitate the implementation of an EU intervention and/or the resolution of the identified needs.

Examples: FPI funds a project on SALW in Mali. The UN has foreseen to organise in Algeria an international conference on SALW during the time period of the FPI project. The UN conference will raise SALW issue in the whole Sahel region that includes Mali. This conference is largely covered by local media and Malian policy makers are invited to participate. The conference is a positive external factor (to the project funded by FPI) because it will help increase the awareness and importance of SALW issue included in Mali where the project is implemented, and consequently, probably facilitate its implementation.

**Threats** (external/negative): External factors that can harm the EU intervention, its implementation and/or the delivery of the expected results.

Example 1: FPI should draft its own Results Framework instead of using the existing DEVCO Results Framework

The SWOT analysis has been done here to better define the results of drafting an own Results Framework for FPI.
Strengths | Weaknesses
---|---
- Increase FPI corporate culture  
- Increase productivity (speaking the same language and sharing the same objectives within FPI)  
- Increase transparency toward FPI own performance | - Potential difficulties using DEVCO Framework contracts for FPI Project Managers (difference of vocabulary used for example)

**Opportunities**
- Increase FPI image as an autonomous entity towards other RELEX family DGs  
- NEAR is currently developing its own RF

**Threats**
- Potential difficulties to manage Instruments shared with DEVCO (IcSP, EIDHR)

The same exercise could be done for the process itself of drafting an FPI Results Framework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Director commitment in drafting an FPI RF  
- Current work done by Operational Units to monitor FPI programmes and projects performance  
- No extra-cost | - Potential reluctance to change  
- Lack of Project Management knowledge from some FPI staff  
- Difficulty to monitor non-programmable actions related to crisis-response |

**Opportunities**
- Better Regulation update in 2017 will lead to an alignment between the RELEX family and SG regarding performance measurement concepts and methodology  
- NEAR is currently developing its own RF (possible knowledge sharing)

**Threats**
- Possible political demand to align NEAR and FPI RF to the EU RF developed by DEVCO

This very simple analysis allows us to have an idea of potential activities linked to setting up an FPI Results Framework according to the strengths/weaknesses/opportunities/threats identified:

**Activities related to the strengths identified:**

Activity 1. Support and follow work done by Operational Units to draft indicators in order to define same concepts and methodology.

**Activities related to the weaknesses identified:**

Activity 2. Organise training sessions on Project Management methodology and tools (as logical frameworks).
Activity 3. Draft a Note to be signed by the Director explaining the process of drafting an FPI Results Framework and its consequences for the Project Managers daily work.
Activity 4. Identify a specific methodology to 'capture' the results produced by crisis-response actions.

**Activities related to Opportunities:**

Activity 5. Participate in the revision/updating of Better Regulation guidelines and its toolbox.
Activity 6. Organise regular meetings with DG NEAR on concepts and methodology to use in drafting a Results Framework.
Activities related to the threats identified:

Activity 7. Keep HR/VP Cabinet fully informed on the drafting of the FPI Results Framework.

7.3.2 Problem Tree

A problem tree is a simple tool to illustrate the main problems the future Action would intend to tackle and solve (or influence). It maps the problems and tries to determine their 'cause' and 'effect' links. It is presented in a diagram presenting at the upper level the consequences of a need or problem and its causes underneath.

The definition of the problem tree should be done in close cooperation and interaction with stakeholders in order to have the closest possible understanding of the reality. Specific tools exist to build knowledge and reach a consensus between stakeholders as Metaplan®. Both processes, problem tree drafting and stakeholders analysis, can be conducted in parallel as new stakeholders identified can bring their own perception of a problem and supplement the problem tree.

Using the information gathered in the context analysis, the Project Manager would be able to propose a first problem tree draft to be discussed with key stakeholders.

Using the problem tree, FPI will be able to decide which problems will be covered by the Action and which will not be covered; this decision is the basis upon which to draw the Action strategy.

7.3.3 Validate the needs analysis by key stakeholders

The context analysis should allow for a clear understanding of who does what and which stakeholders are key to the change process the Action sets out to achieve and produce. It could be relevant to have an exchange of views with these stakeholders in order to validate that all the different perspectives and points of view have been taken into account in the context analysis and that the needs identified correspond to the reality and are the ones that matter.

During the identifying phase, both the stakeholders' analysis and the context analysis are often done in parallel (see the light blue arrows in the Figure 14: identifying phase). The context analysis provides information on stakeholders that "gravitate" around the needs to address because they are a part of the problem and/or a part of the solution, while the stakeholders analysis provides information on the context in which information is exchanged with them.

7.4 How to identify stakeholders?

7.4.1 Stakeholders analysis step by step

What is a stakeholders analysis?

'Stakeholder analysis is a process of systematically gathering and analysing qualitative information to determine whose interests should be taken into account when developing and/or implementing a policy or programme'\textsuperscript{53}.

The stakeholders analysis should basically answer the question 'who does what?' and analyse to what extent stakeholders will:

i) be affected by the EU intervention,
ii) be part of the implementation of the EU intervention,
iii) have a stated interest in the EU intervention.

Why use a stakeholders analysis?

- To go deeper into needs analysis and to better use stakeholders' knowledge;
- To help identify the root causes of a problem (or a need) using stakeholders' knowledge;
- To find possible solutions to address the need and its causes;
- To better identify the activities to implement (defining specific activities for each key stakeholder);
- To identify risks (related to the behaviour of stakeholders);
- To decide on a possible division of labour between key stakeholders (to fund and/or implement the Action).

Where and when to use a stakeholders analysis?

- During the identification/formulation phase with some stakeholders already identified.
- During the evaluation process.
Figure 16: How to use a stakeholders analysis: step by step

1. **List the stakeholders**
   - Who are affected by the intervention?
   - Who take part of the implementation of the intervention?
   - Who have a stated interest in the intervention?

2. **Fill in the stakeholders’ Importance-Influence Matrix**
   - Who can influence the EU intervention?
   - To whom the EU intervention matters?

3. **Do a Social Networks Analysis (SNA)**
   - Which type of relations stakeholders are linked by?

4. **Build a stakeholders map**
   - Where stakeholders are placed in the whole EU intervention picture?

### 7.4.2 List the stakeholders

The table below gives examples of type of stakeholders that could be listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target groups of the intervention</th>
<th>EU citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partner country citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demobilised military personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syrian refugees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

54 From Better Regulation Guidelines, Chapter VII.
| Industry/business | Multi-national/global  
| National  
| Small and medium-sized enterprises  
| Business organisation  
| Chambers of commerce |
| EU or foreign platform, networks | Representing for-profit interests  
| Representing not-for-profit interests  
| Representing professions/crafts  
| Representing religious denominations |
| EU or foreign organisation/association | NGOs  
| Civil Society Organisations  
| Workers’ organisations, trade unions  
| Lobbying organisations  
| Churches and non-confessional and philosophical organisations |
| Public authorities | United Nations bodies (UNICEF, UNDP, the World Bank, etc.)  
| EU Institutions  
| Regional or supranational organisations (ASEAN, Mercosur, African Union, etc.)  
| National government  
| National Parliament  
| Regional/local/municipal authorities  
| National competent authorities/agencies |
| Consultancy | Think Tanks  
| Professional consultancy  
| Law firms |
| Research | Universities  
| School & education establishments  
| Research institutes |
7.4.3 Fill in a stakeholder Importance-Influence Matrix (SIIM)

After having compiled the list of stakeholders (see 7.4.1) involved in the ‘needs’ or in their identification, it is possible to classify them by their importance for the EU intervention and/or by the influence they could have on the EU intervention.

The importance of a stakeholder indicates the extent to which its needs and interests will be prioritised by the activities foreseen by the Action.

The influence of a stakeholder on the Action is the power it has over the planning and implementation of the activities foreseen by the EU intervention\(^5\).

Step 1: List the stakeholders involved directly or indirectly in the Action (see 7.4.1)

Step 2: For each stakeholder assess the importance of the EU intervention for it

Step 3: For each stakeholder assess the influence it has on the EU intervention

Step 4: Fill in the Stakeholder Importance-Influence Matrix below

Figure 17: Stakeholder Importance-Influence Matrix (SIIM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFLUENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPORTANCE</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 5: Take the necessary measures to follow and address the particular needs of each stakeholder according to their position in the SIIM and the ‘way to handle them’ as described below:

**A**: PROTECT:
This group is composed of stakeholders who are directly concerned by the EU intervention but have low influence on it. Special attention is needed to protect their interests as they do not possess the required influence to project or articulate their own needs.

---

\(^5\) From PM\(^2\) Project Management Tool & Techniques, European Commission, 2015, p. 17.
B: GOOD RELATION:
This group of stakeholders is directly concerned by the EU intervention and can influence its planning and implementation. They have to be informed regularly about the EU intervention (implementation, results). A specific communication strategy could be developed to address their needs in terms of regular information/involvement in the EU intervention implementation.

C: LOW PRIORITY:
This group of stakeholders has a low priority in relation to the Action and a low influence. Project Manager’s involvement with them should be at a minimum. However, as they have to kept 'on board' in terms of maintaining a positive attitude towards the EU intervention, they should not be fully neglected. They should have access to a minimum level of information.

D: MONITOR:
This group of stakeholders has a high influence on the Action but the importance they attach to it is low. They should be carefully monitored and managed to make sure that they do not lose interest in the EU intervention or become a blocking factor.

The SIIM is also used for risk identification and management, in fact, according to which group stakeholders are placed in; a risk mitigation strategy could be implemented (see 7.5.2.5 identify risks).

Example 1: Low carbon business action in Brazil and Mexico (Partnership Instrument).

The aim of the project is to strengthen cooperation partnerships between Brazilian, Mexican companies in the field of CO² emissions reduction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>INFLUENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A
Brazilian and Mexican SMEs in wastewater sector
Etc.

B
Big Brazilian and Mexican companies in wastewater sector
Brazilian and Mexican Ministries of industry
Mexican National Water Commission
Etc.

C
Universities specialised in clean energy and environmental management
Etc.

D
Research and technology centres (high influence on the clean technology to be adopted)
SFNA (Subsecretaría de Fomento y Normatividad Ambiental)
Etc.
7.4.4 Do a Social Network Analysis (SNA)

The Social Network Analysis (SNA) will study the type and quality of existing ties or links (relationships or interactions) that connect the different stakeholders listed in the stakeholder analysis. It provides an analysis of the relations between stakeholders (the stakeholder analysis provides an understanding of relations between the stakeholders and the intervention) and complements the Venn diagram by providing additional information about the types of links, attitudes or ties (relationships or interactions) that connect the different identified stakeholders.

The SNA could also be used to place the different stakeholders in a Venn diagram qualifying the quality (subordination links, information or data flux, etc.) and the strength of these links (strong/weak, regular/irregular, daily/monthly, Kbytes of data exchanged/month, number of emails exchanged/month, etc.).

7.4.5 Build a Stakeholders Map (Venn diagram)

'A picture is worth a thousand words!' Thanks to the stakeholders analysis (list, SIIM and SNA) it is possible to build a stakeholders map, showing in one page who are the stakeholders involved in the EU intervention, where they are in relation to each other in the global picture and what are the types of relations that link them.

Example 1 and 2 show how a stakeholders map could be built even if they are not related to Project Management (FPI links with key stakeholders for example 1, legal decision-making processes for example 2). The Example 4 provides a stakeholders map of an Action.

Example 1: FPI stakeholders map (please see on the next page)
Example 2: CFSP stakeholders map
Example 3: Low carbon business action in Brazil and Mexico (Partnership Instrument) stakeholders map (categorised by research & innovation processes in Mexico in wastewater sector)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Research &amp; Technology Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Universidad Autónoma de Chiapas</td>
<td>- Centro de Calidad Ambiental, IITESM (CCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Universidad Autónoma de México (UNAM)</td>
<td>- Centro del Agua para América Latina y el Caribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León</td>
<td>- Centro Mario Molina para Estudios Estratégicos en Energía y Medio Ambiente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (UAM)</td>
<td>- Centro Nacional de Investigación y Capacitación Ambiental (CENICA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Universidad de Guadalajara (UdeG)</td>
<td>- Instituto Nacional de Ecología y Cambio Climático</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Universidad de las Américas en Puebla</td>
<td>- Instituto Mexicano de Tecnología del Agua (IMTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TEC de Monterrey</td>
<td>- Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales, Agrícolas y Pecuarias (INIFAP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companies</th>
<th>Clusters &amp; associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- ACCIONA Group</td>
<td>- AMEHDRO (Asociación Mexicana de Energía Hidroeléctrica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Atlante SA de CV</td>
<td>- Asociación de Empresas de Agua y Saneamiento de México (AGUA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- AGUASAN</td>
<td>- CCMEX CleanTech Cluster México</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grupo CARSO SA</td>
<td>- CESPEDES (capítulo Mexicano World Business Council for Sustainable Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grupo Procepa SA de CV</td>
<td>- ANILAS (Asociación de Organismos Operadores de Agua Potable y Alcantarillado)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hidrocal Fernández</td>
<td>- ANNCA (Asociación Nacional para una nueva cultura del agua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- O-IUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Veolia Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Servicios de Agua y Drenaje de Monterrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sistema de Agua de la Ciudad de México</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public entities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- CONAGUA (Comisión Nacional del Agua)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PROFEPA (Procuraduría Federal de Protección al Ambiente)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SAGARPA (Secretaría de agricultura, ganadería y desarrollo rural, pesca y alimentación)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SE (Secretaría de Economía, Industria y Comercio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SEDUVI (Secretaría de desarrollo urbano y vivienda)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SEMARNAT (Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Watershed Councils (28 councils within Mexico)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.5 Identify a strategy

Based on the Context Analysis, the Stakeholders Analysis and on the Problem Tree, FPI should be able to define a strategy to intervene. This strategy - most of the time - will address only a part of the problems or needs identified and mapped in the Problem Tree. The strategy will show the logic of the Action and its articulation tackling the different level of problems or needs encountered.

For that, 2 main tools are used:

- The Theory of Change
- The Intervention Logic
7.5.1 Use the 'Theory of Change'

The Theory of Change (ToC) is a method that allows to explain in a clear, simple and logical way what are the 'cause and effect' links between the outputs, outcomes and impacts that an EU intervention should produce and how the 'cause and effect' links will lead to a change between these 3 levels.

Figure 18: Links between Logic Model and Theory of Change:

The method is rather simple: it consists of using an 'if'...'then'...'because' sequence to explain the cause and effect link.

Examples:

**If** the Police staff in the country X is trained on how to conduct an investigation in line with international best practice and human rights standards (output), **then** Police forces will move from repression and social control model to prevention, investigation and accountability model (outcome), **because** Police staff will see itself as a protector of the population and not as a repressive body.

**If** community development workers are trained in conflict prevention, mediation and dialogue techniques (output), **then** community development workers engage with conflict parties to identify peaceful solutions (outcome), **because** the training increases their legitimacy to act as a mediator within the community and between conflict parties.

**If** people have changed their behaviours toward mined areas by adapting a more cautious approach and **if** people in charge of mine survey operations act in a more professional way (outcome), **then** less people die or are injured because of mines (impact), **because** both changes in behaviour decrease the likelihood of a person stepping on a mine.

The Theory of Change of an EU intervention can be synthetized in a specific tool: the Intervention Logic (see 7.5.2). The Intervention Logic focuses more on the results (or objectives) to be achieved than on the processes and logical chains between the different levels of results (or objectives). Nevertheless, it does provide a good idea of the change the EU intervention should produce. Ideally,
both tools: Intervention Logic and Theory of Change should come together in any Concept Note, Action Document (under the Logical Framework for the intervention logic), Terms of Reference for any kind of EU intervention.

7.5.2 Use the Intervention Logic

7.5.2.1 What is an Intervention Logic?

The Intervention Logic provides a description or diagram summarising how the intervention is expected to work. Usually this shows how different inputs/activities/outputs triggered by the EU intervention are expected to interact to deliver the promised changes over time and ultimately achieve the objectives.\(^{56}\)

This definition applies to the policy, Instruments, programmes or projects managed by FPI but it applies also to FPI as a Service and to its Strategic Plan 2016-2020 (see 4.2.1).

An Intervention logic is an explanation of how an EU intervention is expected to work. It shows the logical relationships between the different elements of an intervention, specifically its resources (inputs), activities and intended results (outputs, outcomes and impacts). These are referred to as the 'levels' of the intervention logic.

An Intervention Logic is a useful tool that helps with the initial design of an intervention as well as providing a conceptual framework for monitoring and evaluation.

It is important to bear in mind that an EU intervention is never implemented in a vacuum, but rather in an interactive environment influenced by other actors and by the evolving global context. In order to achieve its objectives as planned, an EU intervention therefore needs to take account of these externalities which are referred to as pre-conditions, i.e. what needs to be in place before an intervention starts.

Consequently, an Intervention Logic should not be seen as a straitjacket but as a guide that can be adapted to the complexity of the reality on the ground and its evolution during the implementing phase of the Action.

\(^{56}\) Better Regulation toolbox #46, p. 334.
Figure 19: Links between Logic Model and Intervention Logic:
Example: Partnership Instrument Intervention Logic

**TO PROMOTE AND ADVANCE EU AND MUTUAL INTERESTS**

- **Within the European Commission General Objective No. 5: “The EU as a Stronger Global Actor”**

1. To influence processes related to EU partnership strategies and agreements
2. To influence processes related to partner country approaches to challenges of global concern
3. To influence processes related to partner country practices on challenges of global concern

**Outputs**

- **Type 1: Direct benefits of events (e.g., increased knowledge, understanding, awareness, networking, engagement)**
- **Type 2: Knowledge-based products**
- **Type 3: Outcome statements**
- **Type 4: Advocacy, awareness-raising products**

**Activities**

- **Type 1: Exchanges, events, knowledge sharing**
- **Type 2: Provision of expertise, technical assistance**
- **Type 3: Promotion, outreach, engagement**

**Inputs**

- **Political inputs**
- **Technical inputs**
- **Financial & human inputs**

**Assumptions at Outcome Level**

- Relevant, well-designed and of good quality
- Well targeted
- Implemented by a suitable implementing partner
- Having a good knowledge of the policy and institutional context
- Well managed and monitored
- Clearly identifiable and aligned to IPs
- Agreed by all Action stakeholders

**Assumptions at Activity Level**

- Relevance of the intervention and intervention partners
- The intervention partnerships are in line with the action’s logic and criteria
- The intervention is designed and implemented in cooperation with all stakeholders

**Assumptions at Input Level**

- Actions (standalone PIF and TALEX)
  - are aligned with PIF objectives
  - have a relevant and well-articulated intervention logic
  - are properly budgeted
  - are consistent with good practices of reference
- PIs (EU Services) are capable of translating their objectives and priorities into real-world actions
- Clear documentation of outcomes and impact
- Clear and transparent use of the programming cycle - PIF management procedures are transparent, efficient and easy to apply
7.5.2.2  **Spheres of control, direct and indirect influence**

The level of control and certainty as regards the different levels of the intervention logic varies.

The lower levels of inputs, activities and outputs are considered to be within the sphere of control of the intervention (more specifically within the control of the Implementing Partner(s) (IPs).

All these aspects are carefully monitored and Implementing Partners are accountable for them. This means that the availability of planned inputs and their conversion into outputs through a series of planned activities are considered to be under the control of project management.

This level of the IL is referred to as the sphere of **direct control**.

Beyond outputs, we have the sphere of direct influence. According to the intervention logic, the outputs are supposed to bring about direct short-term effects and thereby deliver the Specific Objectives. These short-term effects, in other words outcomes, are the concrete achievements of the specific objectives. Nevertheless, at this level of the intervention logic, the Implementing Partners no longer have full control, i.e. they do not fully control the transformation of outputs into outcomes.

Factors such as the timely implementation of activities and the adequate quality and quantity of outputs are necessary but not sufficient for the outcome(s) to materialise. There are also externalities at work i.e. other external factors and players that influence the achievement of outcomes. For example, a study can contain valuable knowledge and suggestions on best practice examples to be implemented, but it depends on the will or interest or capacity or resources etc. of the stakeholders to whom this study was addressed whether they apply that knowledge and implement the proposed best practices.

There could also be other actors trying to influence the stakeholders in other directions. It therefore cannot be assumed that the materialisation of an outcome is guaranteed by the intervention. Only when stakeholders act in the intended direction of an EU intervention, will the intended outcome be achieved. While we do not have control over the materialisation of these outcomes we do have influence over their achievement.

Hence this level of the IL is referred to as the sphere of **direct influence**.

It is important to note that even though Specific Objectives/outcomes remain beyond the control of the Implementing Partners, they are accountable/responsible for their achievement.

Outcomes, when achieved, contribute to the Overall Objective(s) and therefore to the achievement of impact. However, at this level the link becomes even looser and we now talk about the sphere of **indirect influence**. On this level, developments in the political, economic, social and environmental context as well as interventions by other actors have even more influence on whether the Overall Objective (impact) of the intervention will be achieved.
7.5.2.3 Attribution vs contribution

**Attribution** is when the results of an Action can be directly attributed to the Action itself.

**Contribution** is when the results cannot be directly attributed to the Action because other factors can influence the achievement of results such as other funding bodies, other projects, local partners, etc.

At the EC there is a general consensus regarding attribution/contribution issue, in fact, it is considered that only outputs can be attributed to the Action, for outcome and impact the Action will contribute to their achievement together with other stakeholders or other actions. A strong Theory of Change can explain the cause and effect links at outcome and impact level and should be able to justify in a logical way how the Action contributes to the expected results.

7.5.2.4 Pre-conditions and assumptions

For an intervention to deliver as planned, a series of pre-conditions need to be met prior to the start of implementation. Without these pre-conditions being met, an intervention cannot and should not take place i.e. no activity should be implemented.

Typical pre-conditions would refer to commitment of key stakeholders to the Overall Objective, a conducive context, availability of necessary resources etc. Further on, during the implementation of an EU intervention, we need the assumptions that we have made during our design process to hold true in order to move from one level of the intervention logic to the next, i.e. from inputs to the implementation of activities, from activities to outputs, from outputs to outcomes and from outcomes to impacts.
These assumptions acknowledge that change is not linear (i.e. if I do this, then that will happen); instead, there are other factors beyond the scope of the intervention which can affect the achievement of outputs, outcomes and impact. The assumptions therefore relate to those factors which need to be present or need to happen, so that activities deliver the planned outputs and so that outcomes and impacts are achieved. Assumptions can be internal (referring to the features of the intervention) or external (referring to the “environment” of the intervention), they also could be monitored by specific indicators.

Obviously, the implementation of a given intervention as conceived and in particular the materialisation of its outputs, outcomes and impacts are dependent on these pre-conditions and assumptions, which are not always constant and which may change during implementation thus creating problems and the need for programme adaptation(s).

A risk analysis is usually implemented to predict potential changes of assumptions and to determine ways of dealing with them, if/when they happen.

### 7.5.2.5 Identifying risks

#### 7.5.2.5.1 What is a risk?

A risk is an uncertain event or set of events, that should it occur, will have an effect on the achievement of the objectives of the Action.\(^{57}\)

A risk is measured by the combination of the likelihood of a perceived threat or possibility occurring and the magnitude of its impact on the objectives of the Action.

It is possible to score the risk according to these 2 factors in order to have a better view on which risks should be absolutely monitored during the implementing phase (see Annex 23 Risk Matrix template) which could seriously impact Action objectives achievement, if they were to occur.

When identifying an Action, Project Managers could consider 3 types of risks:

- Risks related to the Action context (security, buy-in by partner countries, political instability, etc.);
- Risks related to the Implementing Partner(s) (legitimacy to act in the field, human resources skills, robustness of the internal financial controls, etc.);
- Risks related to the Action management (time, resources, scope, quality of the activities, etc.).

#### 7.5.2.5.2 How to identify risk?

For the risks related to the Action context, all the work done to analyse the context will help Project Managers to identify them. The Political Economy Analysis, the Conflict Analysis, the Cultural Dimensions analysis, the SWOT analysis, the Stakeholders’ Analysis as well as the assumptions of the Logical Framework of the Action, should already provide information on the main risks Project Managers could face during the implementation of the Action. Lessons learned and evaluation reports from previous Action(s) could also be used to identify risk.

---

\(^{57}\) From PM² training module C3 – Managing Risk.
Project Managers should be able during the formulating phase (see 0 'Formulating an Action') to identify activities that can limit the likelihood of their occurrence or their impact on the Action.

Specific tools exist within the EC to assess Action context risks as:

- The Index for risk management (INFORM) developed by DG ECHO. INFORM is a global, open-source risk assessment index for humanitarian crises and disasters.


- The Global Conflict Risk Index (GCRI) developed by European Commission Joint Research Centre (JRC) for FPI and the EEAS. GCRI is an index of the statistical risk of violent conflict in the next 1-4 years.


For the risks related to the Implementing Partner(s), Project Managers - if they know it - should evaluate to what extent the Implementing Partner has the capacity to implement the Action and reach the results assigned. Calls for tender and calls for proposals are there to limit those risks as the financial and technical capacity of the Implementing Partner is assessed before the signature of the contract. For direct contracts, the risks linked to financial and technical capacity should be assessed upstream and not left to be worked out just before (or even after) contract signature. Otherwise, the risk of some form of financial irregularity or fraud downstream is likely to increase.

For the risks related to the Action management, they can be linked to several factors such as the change of the Project Manager during the implementing phase, new financial rules to be implemented within the Commission, availability of payment appropriations, etc.

### 7.6 Further reading on context analysis and Intervention Logic

**On context analysis**


Additional resources on Capacity4Dev:
https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/search?text=political%20economy

**On stakeholders mapping**


**On cultural dimensions analysis**

Cultures and organizations: software of the mind, Geert Hofstede, 1991.
Riding the Waves of Culture, Fons Trompenaars, 2008.
7.7 Be trained!

On context analysis

FPI - CSDP Conflict Analysis Course - From Conflict Analysis to Integrated Action: Generating Strategies for intervention
For more information contact: HR B3 ESDC (90505)

DEVCO-Module I Stakeholder Analysis with Elements of Political Economy Analysis
DEVCO-Module II Public Policy Analysis
DEVCO-Module III Fragility and Conflict Sensitivity

DEVCO - Conflict Sensitive Approaches - online course (developed jointly by FPI, /DEVCO and NEAR)

On stakeholders analysis

Secretariat General - ARIANE II - Workshop Preparing for Stakeholder Consultation: Phase 1 - The Consultation Strategy
DEVCO-Module I Stakeholder Analysis with Elements of Political Economy Analysis

On cultural dimension analysis

DEVCO - Context for development - Stakeholder Analysis with Elements of Political Economy Analysis
DEVCO - Intercultural Competences in Development

On Intervention Logic/Logical Framework

DEVCO - LFA & Indicators – Logical Framework Approach and Indicators for the results measurement of programmes and projects
8 Formulating an Action

Key questions to address during the formulating phase

What will be its architecture?
Who will do what?
How the Action will be implemented?
When the activities will be implemented?

Key tools of the formulating phase

Meeting agenda template
Minutes of Meeting template
Logical Framework template
Stakeholders Matrix template
Action Fiche template
Action Charter template
Terms of Reference
FPI Manual
OPSYS manual

Key documents of the formulating phase

Meeting agenda
Minutes of Meeting
Logical Framework
Stakeholders Matrix
Action Fiche
Action Charter
Terms of Reference
Action Work Plan

8.1 What is ‘formulating’?

The aim of the formulating phase is twofold:

- verify if the Action identified in the Concept Note is still relevant;
- go deeper on the Action architecture and implementation modalities.

In order to answer these two needs, Project Managers could cover all the topics described below, as a minimum, the information collected should be gathered in the 2 compulsory documents of the formulating phase: the Action Fiche, the Logical Framework. The use of the Action Work Plan during this phase is recommended.

The formulating phase should include cross-cutting issues aspects if relevant (see 9.15).

---

58 For IcSP crisis response component (art.3) due to its nature, a lighter process is applied. See FPI2 specific guidance.
8.2 Formulating meeting

It is highly recommended to set up at least one formulating meeting with key stakeholders already identified during the identifying phase in order to:

- Verify if the future Action described in the Concept Note is still valid;
- Verify if the needs the Action intends to address still exist;
- Verify if the objectives foreseen in the Concept Note are still valid;
- Verify if the context has not evolved since the Concept Note drafting;
- Validate the risks already identified;
- Go deeper on the Theory of Change (logic chain between output, outcome and impact);
- Draft a Logical Framework with the Stakeholders (or submit the Logical Framework for their endorsement);
- Draft the global architecture of the Action (how the Action will be implemented);
- Identify and assign responsibilities (who does what?);
- Draft the Terms of Reference (respecting confidentiality rules);
- Draft a first Action Work Plan.

8.3 Use the Logical Framework (what, how)

8.3.1 What is a Logical Framework (logframe)?

A Logical Framework is a project management tool that synthetizes in a single matrix the Intervention Logic, the assumptions and the means to measure the achievement of the results of a particular Action.

The logframe template used by FPI is based on the logframe annexed to the PRAG. It has been adapted to FPI needs and specificities (absence of country strategy, absence of development focus, absence of activity indicators). This logframe is OPSYS compliant.

For a template in Excel version see Annex 1a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Objective / Impact</th>
<th>Intervention Logic - Chain of results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Current value</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain what impact the EU intervention should lead to.</td>
<td>Impact indicators measure the extent to which outcomes change social, economic and/or environmental conditions. To be disaggregated by sex (M/W/G/B) where possible</td>
<td>Assessment of the 'point of departure' level</td>
<td>The value of the indicator at the indicated date (it could be daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, yearly for the mid-term report or the final report)</td>
<td>Expected 'point of arrival' level</td>
<td>Explain how and when the information to feed the indicators is collected and by who</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objective / Outcome</td>
<td>Explain what outcome the EU intervention should produce.</td>
<td>Outcome indicators measure the extent to which outputs produce, create, lead to the expected behavioural changes from individuals and/or organisations. To be disaggregated by sex (M/W/G/B) where possible</td>
<td>Assessment of the behaviours before the launch of the EU intervention</td>
<td>The value of the indicator at the indicated date (it could be daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, yearly for the mid-term report or the final report)</td>
<td>Assessment of the behaviours at the end of the EU intervention</td>
<td>Explain how and when the information to feed the indicators is collected and by who</td>
<td>What are the external factors and risks outside the EU intervention control that may impact on the outcome-impact linkage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Objective / Output</td>
<td>List what outputs the EU intervention should produce.</td>
<td>Output indicators measure the quantity and/or quality of outputs produced by activities. To be disaggregated by sex (M/W/G/B)</td>
<td>Zero for outputs produced by new activities or total number of outputs produced by past activities</td>
<td>The value of the indicator at the indicated date (it could be daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, yearly for the mid-term report or the final report)</td>
<td>Total number of outputs produced</td>
<td>Explain how and when the information to feed the indicators is collected and by who</td>
<td>What are the external factors and risks outside the Project Manager (or Implementing Partner) control that may impact on the output-outcome linkage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3.2 Guidelines to identify output, outcome and impact

Output

Definition:

Output is the direct product of activities, produced or accomplished with the resources allocated to an intervention.

Outputs are in the sphere of control of the intervention, that is to say that the entity in charge of organising the activities is responsible for the outputs to be produced. The outputs produced can be attributed to the work done by this entity.

Outputs are sometimes also called 'deliverables'.

Types of outputs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of outputs</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1: Direct benefits of events</td>
<td>This refers to the skills, knowledge, awareness and understanding, etc. that have been created in, or transferred between, individuals and companies as well as engagement and networking, etc. These benefits come as a result of participation in some type of event organised by an action where the term “event” includes: visits, exchanges, study tours, business missions, technical meetings (of experts), conferences, debates, workshops, seminars and training sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2: Knowledge-based products</td>
<td>Knowledge expressed through language (including mathematics, music, etc.) and thus capable of being stored on a physical support (i.e. transferrable knowledge). Examples include inter alia publications, patents, websites, reports, publications, assessments, databases, examples of best practice, roadmaps, guidelines, systems etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3: Outcome statements</td>
<td>Outputs of meetings, conferences, fora etc. that list the specific outcomes that the parties to the event plan to achieve. They are written statements rather than verbal ones and indicate a clear commitment by the parties involved to achieve a specific goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4: Advocacy/awareness-raising products</td>
<td>Such as press releases, opinion pieces, video clips or other audio-visual products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 5: Infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure built or rehabilitated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 6: Equipment</td>
<td>Equipment provided (mine detectors, beds, tents, IT systems)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of outputs:

Conclusions of a conference, knowledge acquired by training attendees at the end of a training session, knowledge created by specific studies and shared, leaflets distributed to target audiences, a well which has community or public access.

Exception: the knowledge acquired through trainings

The definition of output states that outputs are in the sphere of control of FPI, but in the case of trainings, FPI does not control the fact that trainees learn or not what is taught. FPI is only
responsible to deliver the training and the information or message linked to this training. Nevertheless, the knowledge acquired by the attendees is considered as an output not as an outcome.

According to the Kirkpatrick Model, learning goes through 4 main steps:

Level 1: Reaction

The degree to which participants find the training interesting, favourable, engaging and relevant to their jobs.

Level 2: Learning

The degree to which participants acquire the intended knowledge, skills, attitude, confidence and commitment based on their participation in the training.

Level 3: Behaviour

The degree to which participants apply what they learned during training, when they are back on the job.

Level 4: Results

The degree to which targeted outcomes occur as a result of the training having taken place, and the support and accountability package.

Levels 1 and 2 are considered as outputs while levels 3 and 4 are considered as outcomes (change in behaviour).

Outcome

Definition:

Outcome is the medium-term result of an intervention expected to be achieved in the social, economic and environmental area (of the intervention) and/or on direct addressees of the intervention. Other external factors and players also influence the area and addressees. Outcomes are in the sphere of direct influence of the intervention.

Types of outcomes:

The outcomes are Action specific and cover a large range of possible change in behaviour. For this reason they are difficult to classify.

Examples:

Conclusions of a conference are taken into account by the country X when shaping its new climate change mitigation policy.

Accountability package is all means put in place to assess the extent to which outcomes are producing the expecting impacts, as Logical Frameworks, indicators, monitoring systems.
Impact

Definition:

Impact is the long-term result of the EU intervention expected to be achieved in the social, economic and environmental global context involving other stakeholders. Impacts are in the sphere of indirect influence of the intervention.

Types of impacts:

Impacts can be on the social sphere (improvements to education, governance, political and administrative institutions, health, social cohesion, well-being, etc.), economic sphere (livelihood, companies, exports, etc.) or environmental sphere (CO² emission, climate change mitigation, biodiversity, etc.). The different spheres can be combined as the impact should be sustainable⁶¹.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sphere(s)</th>
<th>Type of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and economic</td>
<td>Equitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and environmental</td>
<td>Bearable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and environmental</td>
<td>Viable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, economic and environmental</td>
<td>Sustainable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the size of FPI interventions, the spheres described above should be adjusted and focused to the impact the interventions can really generate. Instead of using as impact 'decrease the CO² emission in Mexico', which is too broad, it is preferable to narrow down the scope of the impact: 'decrease the CO² emission in the wastewater industry in the Oaxaca region'.

Usual confusions between the different levels:

In theory, these 4 levels (activities, outputs, outcomes, impact) are relatively easy to distinguish using the definitions and examples provided above. In practice, it could be much more complex and complicated to do so. Three usual sources of confusion can be created when trying to distinguish these 4 levels:

Usual confusion between activities and outputs

Very specific activities can be sometimes perceived as outputs. It is the case for example of activities that require a certain amount of technicity, a particular knowledge or activities that need a long period of time to be implemented. Even so they should remain activities.

Example:
To dig a well is an activity, the well is the output, even if to dig a well requires a particular knowledge and some technical analysis.

---

⁶¹ For Sustainable Development concept definition please refer to Our Common Future, also known as the Brundtland Report, from the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) and published in 1987.
Usual confusion between outputs and outcomes

The key criterion to use to distinguish outcomes from outputs is: do we see a change in behaviour? Does the policeman trained (output) act differently after the training (outcome)? Does the organisation/administration we have restructured (output) act differently vis-à-vis its own staff and/or end users (outcome)?

If the behavioural change is not seen, it could be because we are still at the output level; if this behavioural change is observed, we are at outcome level.

Taking into account different perspectives when drafting the Logical Framework

It is sometimes difficult to define if a particular result is an output or an outcome as it really depends on where we stand vis-à-vis the Action and what are FPI responsibilities.

Example: mine clearance.

Does mine clearance create an output or an outcome?

If the Action funds UN, MS or partner country authorities to demine a field it is an output (no behavioural change, UN, MS or partner country authorities are service providers).

If the Action is intended to help partner country authorities to clean a field alongside providing training and advice, it is an outcome (behavioural change: before the training and provision of technical advice partner country authorities were not in a position to clean the field in line with international standards, for example while after receiving the training and technical advice they have changed their behaviour (causality) and now assume their responsibilities and act in a more professional way).

If you are in doubt about how to distinguish output from outcome, always go back to the output definition. FPI is responsible for the output delivery as these are in its sphere of control, not the outcome. In the first case above, FPI is responsible for the mine clearance (even if it uses external service providers). In the second case, the partner country authorities are responsible for the mine clearance not FPI, FPI is only responsible for training the staff of the partner countries authorities and for advising them. The staff trained and advised are free to use this knowledge or not. If they use it, it leads to a behavioural change (they assume their responsibilities and act in a more professional way when demining fields).

8.3.3 Always start from the outcome level

The outcome level is the behavioural change the Action is expected to produce, it is easier to start with this level to fill in the Logframe and ask 2 questions to complete and fill in the output and impact levels:

- for the output: what should be put in place to bring about the behavioural change expected (outcome level)?
- for the impact: what will this behavioural change (outcome level) lead to?

8.3.4 Examples of Logframes

Please see on the next page.
### Example 1: EOMs Logical Framework (partial)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Impact</th>
<th>Intervention Logic - Chain of results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Objective Impact</td>
<td>The electoral reform process and democratization in the partner country have been improved. Awareness among the domestic actors on the flaws of the election framework has been increased.</td>
<td>Vade-mecum/UN and/or World Bank indicators (quantitative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Objective Outcome</td>
<td>Outcome 1: Partner countries have discussed/considered EU recommendations. Civil Society discussed/considered the EU EOM/EEM recommendations The EU EOM/EEM recommendations have been raised during EU-partner countries political dialogues Outcome 2: Observer and Core Team experts can better perform in their respective domains Outcome 3: EU observation methodology is used as a reference to the benefit of EOM members as well as domestic and international partners.</td>
<td>Outcome Indicator 1. Extent to which recommendations have been considered by partner countries during the electoral cycle following presentation of the Final Report (to be measured qualitatively) Outcome Indicator 2. Number of trained Observers and CT experts recruited in EOMs within 2 years following training (Women/Men) Outcome Indicator 3. Extent to which EU publications and EU election observation methodology are referred to in the documents/academic analysis and in discussions by partners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Objective Output</td>
<td>Output 1. EU reports on electoral processes observed or assessed in partner countries have been transmitted to internal and/or external stakeholders. Observers and Core Team experts have been trained on electoral observation issues. Publications have been produced in the context of EU electoral activities</td>
<td>Output Indicator 1. Number of final reports transmitted to stakeholders on total number of countries observed or assessed. a) EOM, EAT interim reports (internal), preliminary statements of the Chief Observer and final reports b) EEM interim reports (internal) and final reports c) EFM Final reports d) Election-related Legislation Reviews Output Indicator 2. Number of observers and Core Team experts trained (Women/Men) Output Indicator 3. Number of publications produced in the context of EU electoral activities (papers, guidelines, handbooks – excluding those drafted in the context of EEMs, EATs and EOMs).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 2: Action in country X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic – Chain of results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Targets (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall objective: Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Number of distribution cycles at the berm interrupted due to security incidents.</td>
<td>1 – The first cycle of distribution (in the new distribution area) was interrupted at least 14 times due to security incidents.</td>
<td>1 – At least 3 consecutive cycles of humanitarian aid distributions occur with no interruptions due to security incidents.</td>
<td>Security reports issued by Y and the Country X authorities. Reports from field staff. Humanitarian field updates. Monitoring of local and international media. Surveys conducted among partners. Meetings with border guards and reports shared with Country Z and partners. Inputs provided by the Country X government to the Global Compact on Migration process. Laws published in the Official Gazette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 – % of security threats at the Country X berm addressed in line with Country Z border management standards.</td>
<td>2 – Due to a lack of documentation, no baseline can be determined at this point. However, the attack which occurred on the XX/XX/XX led to the closure of the border, preventing the population at the berm from accessing assistance.</td>
<td>2 – 100% of security threats at the Country X berm are addressed in line with border management standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Number of policies and instructions adopted through inclusive mechanisms addressing safe, orderly and regular migration.</td>
<td>3 – No policy and instructions adopted through inclusive mechanisms addressing safe, orderly and regular migration.</td>
<td>3 – At least one policy or instructions adopted through inclusive mechanisms addressing safe, orderly and regular migration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. The first cycle of distribution (in the new distribution area) was interrupted at least 14 times due to security incidents.
2. Due to a lack of documentation, no baseline can be determined at this point. However, the attack which occurred on the XX/XX/XX led to the closure of the border, preventing the population at the berm from accessing assistance.
3. No policy and instructions adopted through inclusive mechanisms addressing safe, orderly and regular migration.
### Specific objective(s): Project Purpose Outcome(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective(s)</th>
<th>Project Purpose</th>
<th>Outcome(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO1 - Country X authorities respond to migration and refugee flows.</td>
<td>1 – % improvement in physical border infrastructure to ensure improved security in the target area.</td>
<td>1 – Baseline to be determined by Rapid Needs Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO2 - Country X authorities develop policies and practices in line with the principles of safe, orderly and regular migration, within the context of the refugee crisis.</td>
<td>2 – % improvement in preparedness skills to address migration and refugee flows reported by Country X authorities.</td>
<td>1- 70% increase in physical border infrastructure to ensure improved security in the target area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Number of indicators designed to measure safe, orderly and regular migration as part of the Global Compact for Migration process.</td>
<td>2 – 50% improvement in preparedness skills to address migration and refugee flows reported by Country X authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 – At least three indicators to measure Country X’s progress towards safe, orderly and regular migration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Political situation in Country X remains stable. Security threats don’t increase drastically. Sustained government commitment to enhancing in-line ministries’ capacity. Government commitment to adopt and implement improved policies concerning border and migration management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1 – Country X border management equipment and infrastructures are improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 - Knowledge of Country X Authorities and other stakeholders on Border and Migration Management, within the context of the refugee crisis, is improved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 – Number of equipment responding to gaps in border management response provided. (R1)
1.2 – Number of border posts built between A and B (R1).
1.3 – % of border posts built have infrastructure to accommodate female staff (R1)
1.4 – % of participants in needs assessment dedicated roundtable discussions evaluate the needs identified have been met. (R1)
2.1 – Number of participants trained on border management technical skills. (R2).
2.2 – % increase in border management knowledge of individuals trained (R2)
2.3 - % increase in knowledge of individuals trained on gender issues specific to border

1.1 – Baseline will be established by the Rapid Needs Assessment (RNA). (R1)
1.2 – No border posts between Hadalat and Ruqban. (R1)
1.3 – No border posts between A and B are fitted to accommodate female officers. (R1)
1.4 – Initial agreement on needs reached during the first roundtable discussion on refurbishing and equipment organized. (R1)
2.1 – 534 participants trained on border management technical skills. (R2)
2.2 – Results of pre-training evaluation (R2)
2.3 - Results of pre-training evaluation (R2)

1.1 – Target will be established by the Rapid Needs Assessment (RNA). (R1)
1.2 - Five border posts built between the city 1 and the city 2. (R1)
1.3 – 100% of border posts built have infrastructure to accommodate female staff (R1)
1.4 – 90% of participants in needs assessment dedicated roundtable discussions evaluate the needs identified have been met. (R1)
2.1 – 734 participants trained on border management technical skills (R2)
2.2 – 50% increase in border management knowledge of individuals trained. (R2)
2.3 – 50% increase in knowledge of individuals trained on gender issues specific to border management.

Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 1.3:
- Logistics documentation, list of items purchased, deeds of donations
- Logistics documentation, technical report on each border post, pictures from border posts.
- Rapid needs assessment to define the specific needs of the border posts to accommodate female staff (sanitation, privacy, safety etc.)
- Attendance sheets from roundtables, roundtable notes, reports from roundtables, pictures from roundtables.

Indicators 2.1, 2.2, 2.3:
- Attendance sheets from trainings/roundtables, individual evaluation forms, pre- and post-training evaluations from trainers, pictures.
- Training sheets from roundtables, reports from roundtables.

The situation at the borders remains stable enough in order to carry out the implementation of the project.
The Government of country X cooperates to identify most relevant officers to attend trainings and roundtable discussions.
The cooperation among UN agencies, NGOs and authorities remains solid.
The analysis of the situation in Syria remains relevant.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 – Number of attendants involved in roundtable discussions on migration management, refugee response and policies. (R2)</td>
<td>2.4 – No roundtable has been organized. (R2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 – % of government officials attending the roundtable discussions on migration management, refugee response and policies are high-level. (R2)</td>
<td>2.5 – No roundtable has been organized. (R2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 – % of participants to the roundtable discussions on migration management, refugee response and policies are non-government stakeholders. (R2)</td>
<td>2.6 – No roundtable has been organized. (R2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 – Number of reports submitted to the Country X Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the results of each roundtable (R2)</td>
<td>2.7 – No roundtable has been organized. (R2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 – 220 attendants involved in roundtable discussions on migration management, refugee response and policies (20 per roundtable discussion). (R2)</td>
<td>submitted to W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 – 25% of government officials attending the roundtable discussions on migration management, refugee response and policies are high-level. (R2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6 – At least 25% of participants to the roundtable discussions on migration management, refugee response and policies are non-government stakeholders. (R2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 – A minimum of 6 reports submitted to the Country X Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the results of each roundtable (R2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4 Drafting an Action Document (and an Action Charter)

The purpose of the Action Document is to design the Action, going deeper on the information provided in the Concept Note and to define the whole architecture of the Action, its implementation modalities and its work plan.

The Action Fiche should gather the following information:

- What is the need/problem/opportunity and why FPI should address it?
- What is the strategy FPI will implement to address the need/problem/opportunity?
- What will be the architecture of the Action?
- Who will do what?
- How the Action will be implemented?
- When will the activities be implemented?
- At which cost?

See Annexes 10 and 16 for Action Document templates.

The Action Document is an annex to the Financing Decision.

Under Article 3 of the IcSP a simplified version of the Action Document is used, to comply with the necessity of rapid formulation in crisis situations. It constitutes the Annex to the Financing Decision but is not per se an "Action Document" as provided in the templates to this Manual (please use the agreed IcSP template) but more a 'customised' Concept Note.

For both IcSP and the PI, a specific Action Document template applies.

During the formulation phase, it can appear that the Action goes beyond the description provided in the Action Document or beyond FPI financial investment. Most of the time, the drafting of the Action Document is already oriented by the fact the implementation of the Action will be outsourced to an Implementing Partner, so the Action Document provides only information that will be used to draft the Terms of Reference after the Decision is taken. As the Action Document is a public document, for the purpose of confidentiality, information provided on several aspects of the Action will be limited.

Project Managers may also describe how other key stakeholders can/should intervene in the close context/political environment of the Action.

This could be the case, for instance, when diplomatic work should be handled by the EEAS or by a Member State or when other sources of pressure or activities than FPI Action should be put in place to influence a key stakeholder (advocacy NGOs, political opposition, etc.). If it is the case, Project Managers can draft an Action Charter (see Annex 27 Action Charter template).

The Action Charter can also include confidential information related to the stakeholders analysis and how to approach a particular stakeholder.

The Action Charter should be drafted with the stakeholders involved in the strategy implementation. It should crystallize and clarify the political or policy agreement reached between them in relation to the future Action.
The **Action Charter** should gather the following information:

- What is the need/problem/opportunity and why FPI and other stakeholders should address it?
- What is the strategy the main stakeholders will implement to address the need/problem/opportunity?
- What is the division of labour between stakeholders?
- What will be the architecture of the Action?
- How the Action will be implemented?
- What is the governance of the Action? How the decisions are taken?
- What are the roles and responsibilities of the main stakeholders?
- When will the activities be implemented? How they will be coordinated among stakeholders involved?
- How the information will circulate between the stakeholders?
- How 'sensitive' stakeholders will be managed, how and by whom?
- What is the global cost of the Action, who will fund what?

### 8.5 Drafting Terms of Reference/guidelines for applicants

The vast majority of FPI-funded Actions is outsourced through a call for tenders or a call for proposals. In that case this is not FPI who implements directly the Action but private (NGOs, companies) or public bodies (local authorities, ministries, international organisations). These bodies, called Implementing Partners, can implement the Action entirely or only a part of it.

Project Managers have to decide if it is necessary to split the Action into several contracts (so between several Implementing Partners) or to keep the whole implementation in the hands of one single Implementing Partner. This decision should have already been taken when the Action Document is drafted and the whole architecture of the Action described.

The Terms of Reference/guidelines for applicants will fix what the Implementing Partner has to do or what it could propose as a possible action to be funded by FPI. These documents should also provide information on what the contribution of the Implementing Partner will be in the global FPI results achievement.

The Terms of Reference describe:

- The background of the Action (where it comes from, why FPI would like to intervene, who are the main stakeholders, what is the purpose of the Logical Framework)
- What is the purpose of the Action and its objectives?
- What are the results Implementing Partners have to achieve to meet these objectives?
- The main assumptions and risks
- Indication on the Action Work Plan
- Indication on how FPI will monitor Implementing Partners performance

The guidelines for applicants describe:

- The background of the Action (where it comes from, why FPI would like to intervene, who are the main stakeholders)
- What is the purpose of the Action and its objectives?
- The eligibility of the applicants
8.6 Drafting the Action Work Plan (Gantt chart)

Also called Gantt chart or Schedule, the Action Work Plan identifies and organises the Action into activities to be implemented during the time span of the Action. The activities and their duration are filled in in an Excel sheet calendar usually arranged by week or month. The Action Work Plan establishes a base to estimate the duration of the Action, the sequencing of the activities and their interrelations (for example, which activities should be implemented before others).

The Action Work Plan will be used during the implementing phase as the basis to monitor the progress and control the Action implementation.\textsuperscript{62}

See Annex 26 Action Work Plan (template).

\textsuperscript{62} For IcSP refer to specific guidance.
9 Implementing an Action

Key questions to address during the implementing phase

Is the Action on track regarding performance, cost, schedule and quality?
Are the stakeholders involved regularly informed?

Key tools of the implementing phase

Meeting agenda template
Minutes of Meeting template
Action Status Report
Interim Report template
Final Report template
Results Acceptance Note template

Key documents of the implementing phase

Meeting agenda
Minutes of Meeting
Action Status Report
Interim Report
Final Report
Results Acceptance Note

9.1 What is ‘implementing’?

The purpose of the implementation phase is to organise and execute the activities foreseen to produce the expected results. It consists also in the management of the necessary inputs (financial resources, staff, etc.) and of a monitoring and reporting system able to ‘catch’ the changes (the results) expected to appear during the implementation.

9.2 Implementing kick-off meeting

The kick-off meeting may be the first time Project Managers meet with the Implementing Partner and/or key stakeholders. Its cost is relatively high (depending on the number of attendees) so it should already produce concrete outputs.
Prepare the meeting: plan the meeting, draft the Agenda based on the points to be discussed during the meeting, send the Agenda in advance to the attendees, prepare logistic needs (flip chart, beamer, documentation, etc.). Decide who will take meeting minutes.

Conduct the meeting, give the necessary information on the EU intervention background (SWOT analysis, context analysis, stakeholders analysis, etc.) and implementation (Gantt chart), fix the role and responsibilities of the persons/entities involved in the implementation process (who does what), inform on the 'rules of the game' that will be used during the implementation (“fr”s, PRAG, FPI Manual, RELEX family evaluation methodology, etc.) in order to share as much as possible the same culture.

Communicate the results of the kick-off meeting to relevant stakeholders (what are the main conclusions, statements, misunderstandings, points of view, etc.).

Follow the conclusions during implementation by assigning who is in charge of/responsible for their delivery and when the tasks should be delivered.

Keep in mind that a kick-off meeting is an activity so it should produce already a change (output). Outputs could be for example, the minutes of the meeting and the knowledge acquired by the attendees.

9.3 Fixing objectives and indicators with the Implementing Partners

Every single grant contract, delegation agreement and service contract has to contribute to Specific Objectives foreseen in the FPI Strategic Plan and Management Plan because they are part of the global change process that FPI works towards.

During the preparation of the contract to be signed between the Commission and the Implementing Partner or just after its signature, a review should be undertaken of the Logical Framework proposed by the EC (if it has been included in the Terms of Reference of the call) or by the Implementing Partner (in its proposal or technical offer) in order to fix the results to reach (output, outcome and impact) and the means (indicators) to assess their achievement. This is critical to ensure mutual agreement on which results are to be achieved.

9.4 Fixing the rules of the game

What rules will apply during the implementing phase? This should involve administrative rules, financial rules and also operational rules. The Project Manager should explicitly explain to the
Implementing Partner (IP) under which rules, guidelines, manuals, the Action should be implemented.

The Project Manager should also explain to the Implementing Partner what is her/his main role and responsibilities during the implementing phase, how she/he will coordinate with the IP what will be the communication channel, etc.

9.5 Set up of a monitoring and reporting system

The Project Manager and the Implementing Partner should agree on the use of a monitoring system to collect and gather the information during the implementing phase in order to follow to what extent the Action is on track for achieving the expected results.

When OPSYS is on-stream, it will be used it to monitor the Action as Implementing Partners will also have access to this tool developed by the EC (for description of OPSYS results & monitoring module see 11.1.3).

9.6 Implementing activities

Most of the time activities are implemented by Implementing Partners and not directly by FPI services. Project Managers should nevertheless have a pro-active role, facilitating the implementation of activities foreseen by Implementing Partners (IP) when possible. Because Project Managers represent the European Commission they can - under certain conditions - have more legitimacy than a local NGO or a service provider vis-à-vis partner country authorities and can often solve a potential problem quicker than the IP acting on its own.

9.7 Monitoring performance

During the implementing phase, the main task of the Project Manager is to monitor the performance of the Action and to regularly check if the Action will deliver the expected results. For that she/he will use the monitoring and reporting system put in place with the Implementing Partner.

9.8 Controlling schedule

The Action Work Plan is the main tool to use to control if the Action is facing delays and if activities should be reorganized to keep the Action on track. An adaptation of the Action Work Plan is a normal activity as most of the time, an Action is not linear and should adapt to the context in which it takes place.

9.9 Controlling cost

The Project Manager should be able to regularly compare the cost and the results achieved in so far as all activities foreseen in the Action Work Plan should produce a result. The reporting documents such as the Action Status Report, the Interim Report and the Final Report as well as the monitoring system should help the Project Manager handle this task.

This task is part of the core responsibility of the Project Manager. It is not optional at all.
9.10 Managing quality

The Project Manager should closely follow up the outputs delivered by the Implementing Partner, verifying if they have reached the level of quality expected. Have participants in a training course understood the message the training intended to deliver? Is there any existing means of control of a final exam for example? Were the leaflets printed distributed to the target audience? Is there any means of verification (survey)?

This task is also part of the core responsibility of the Project Manager.

9.11 Managing changes

Managing changes during the implementing phase is a normal activity that shows the adaptation capacity of the Action to its evolving context and to the stakeholders needs. Nevertheless, the changes should not concern the Overall and Specific Objectives of the Action as they have been approved as part of the Financing Decision\(^3\).

More often than not, changes relate to activities and outputs as they develop during the implementation, for example according to a better understanding of the context or a specific new stakeholder need. Where possible, activities should be adapted in order to produce greater outputs thereby facilitating the realisation of outcomes.

9.12 Managing Stakeholders

Using the stakeholders' analysis and the stakeholders' matrix, the Project Manager should be able to facilitate the Action implementation through a continuous provision of information to stakeholders, adapting the content of the information as well as its frequency to each targeted stakeholder.

This task is part of the core responsibility of the Project Manager.

A communication plan can be elaborated to foresee specific communication activities to important/influential stakeholders in order to maintain close communication channels throughout the implementing phase.

9.13 Managing intercultural aspects

The differences between two or several cultures may create a so-called 'cultural gap', this gap should be managed properly with particular techniques as it creates risks that can challenge the Action or mitigate its results. Specific tasks managed by FPI are directly linked to a reduction of this cultural gap such as public diplomacy, outreach and information activities (EUVP, Partnership Instrument Specific Objective 1.8).

For the other FPI Actions not directly related to cultural gap reduction, this gap should nevertheless be taken into account in the implementing phase.

The Cultural Dimensions Analysis should be the main document to use to understand this gap and address it properly through specific activities.

---

\(^3\) Should a modification of the Overall Objective or Specific Objectives be necessary due to evolving context or needs, a revision of the Financing Decision will be required.
9.14 Managing risks

Risk management consists of having a pro-active rather than a reactive approach toward risks in order to avoid unnecessary waste of resources or "fire-fighting". The Context Analysis, the Action Document and the Risks Matrix should have gathered and summarised the main risks the Action could encounter. The risks listed in the Risk Matrix (see Annex 23) should be monitored carefully during the implementing phase and the document updated, when necessary. If the risk appears, the Project Manager will have to respond quickly to it by:

- accepting the risk as it is;
- avoiding the risk (cancellation of activities to remove the risk);
- reducing the risk (defining mitigation measures);
- transferring the risk (insurance, specialised entities in risk management as security bodies).

This task is part of the core responsibility of the Project Manager.

9.15 Managing cross-cutting issues

9.15.1 Gender

Together, the EU and its Member States are global leaders in promoting gender equality and women’s and girls' empowerment in external relations. The EU Gender Action Plan 2 (GAP II) on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE) provides the framework for the European Commission’s (EC), the European External Action Services’ (EEAS) and European Member States’ (MS) to advance the policy objective of contributing to greater gender equality through external relations by the end of 2020. GAP II was adopted by Council Conclusions in October 2015\(^64\).

Annex I to the GAP lists a series of objectives with indicators to be achieved by 2020 in line with four themes:

A. Shifting the Commission services’ and the EEAS’ institutional culture to more effectively deliver on EU commitments;
B. Ensuring girls’ and women’s physical and psychological integrity;
C. Promoting the economic and social rights / empowerment of girls and women;
D. Strengthening girls’ and women’s voice and participation.

All FPI-funded Actions should contribute to implementing the EU Gender Action Plan 2016-2020. To do this, Project Managers should verify during the identifying, formulating and implementing phases that the Action still complies with the GAP II and that issue of gender is taken into account in all activities organised in the framework of the Action.

Specific indicators exist in the GAP II that shall be added to the Action Logical Framework. As a minimum, a gender split or sex disaggregation (women/men/girls/boys) should be systematically done for results indicators, where feasible\(^65\).

In addition, in order to clearly distinguish Actions which specifically target gender as an objective and other Actions which only take into account the issue of gender in all activities (using the GAP II for

---


\(^65\) GAP II, Indicator S.1.2.
example, see above), each FPI Action needs to systematically apply the OECD Gender Equality Policy Marker (G-Marker) when encoding the Action in OPSYS. The G-Marker allows to mark an Action as either G-0 (gender equality not targeted), G-1 (gender equality is a significant objective) or G-2 (gender equality is the principal objective). Further guidance on how to distinguish these G-markers and how to mark Actions accordingly can be found in the OECD document "Definition and minimum recommended criteria for the DAC gender equality policy marker" of December 2016.66

Use of the G-Marker will be mandatory under OPSYS.

This task is part of the core responsibility of the Project Manager.

Project Managers are also encouraged to use external gender expertise in a timely manner to better inform the design of an Action and where relevant, as a support to programming.

GAP II now forms a structural part of FPI Reporting, principally within the framework of the Annual Management Plan. The first set of GAP indicators was included in the 2017 AMP and further sets of indicators will be progressively added between now and 2020 (see also Section 12.6 below).

9.15.2 Other cross-cutting issues

The Regulation No 236/2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union’s instruments for financing external action (also called CIR – Common Implementing Regulation) lists several cross-cutting issues External Financing Instruments should systematically take into account when funding Actions as:

- democracy, rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms – § (9) and (20)
- promoting ownership (when relevant) – Art. 1.6
- climate and biodiversity – Art. 2.6 for the identifying and formulating phases and Art. 15 for the implementing phase and for Monitoring & Evaluation.
- access of disabled persons – Art. 2.7

For the IcSP specifically, Article 2(4) of the Regulation 230/2014 lists the following cross-cutting issues: promotion of democracy and good governance; human rights and humanitarian law, including children’s rights and the rights of indigenous peoples; non-discrimination; gender equality and the empowerment of women; conflict prevention and climate change.

9.16 Managing EU visibility

EU visibility is one of the horizontal tasks Project Managers should manage during the implementing phase. This can be done directly by organising specific activities or indirectly through the Implementing Partner (IP). The IP should communicate that the Action is funded by the European Union; it should also use the EU Visibility Guidelines67.

For particularly sensitive Actions, or in a particular political context (risk to life of human rights defenders), the Project Manager should analyse whether the use of EU Visibility Guidelines creates a

reputational risk for the EU or contradicts the 'do-no-harm approach'. In such cases, use of EU visibility should be avoided or reduced to the minimum.

9.17 Results acceptance

After having received the final report from the Implementing Partner, the Project Manager should draft a Results Acceptance Note (see Annex 2) explaining what results have been achieved by the Implementing Partner and how these results contribute to the achievement of the objective of the Action. This Note is added to the file to be transmitted to FPI.1 (or the Regional Teams’ contracts and finance cells) for the final payment. It serves to inform the ‘conforme aux faits’ (FR) or ‘certified as correct’ (EN). It helps also to estimate the efficiency of the Action and to validate results in OPSYS. **Use of this template (Annex 2) is obligatory.**
10 Closing an Action

Key tools of the closing phase
- Meeting agenda template
- Minutes of Meeting template
- Action-End Report template

Key documents of the closing phase
- Meeting agenda
- Minutes of Meeting
- Action-End Report

10.1 What is 'closing'?

The closing phase starts when the Project Manager has approved the final report of the Action. That is to say that all the results to be achieved by the Action have been achieved with the level of quality expected. The Project Manager assures that all the Project Management phases have been well documented and the results have been achieved. He/she gathers all the information and documentation available on the Action and archives them in an appropriate place.

10.2 Operational closure

10.2.1 Closure meeting

The closure meeting launches the closing phase of the Action after the implementing phase has been deemed as completed. The goal of this meeting is to ensure that Action stakeholders discuss the Action experience so that lessons learned and best practices are captured. In addition, ideas and recommendations for post-Action work should also be discussed. A recommendations or follow-up plan can be already drafted.

10.2.2 Lessons learned, best practices, post-Action recommendations

The purpose of a formalized lessons learned, best practices and post-Action recommendations is to allow Action stakeholders to benefit from the experience acquired during the Action. It is also important to create a forward-looking approach by capturing ideas and recommendations for future Actions, particularly if there is a realistic prospect of a second phase of the same Action.

The Closure meeting should be used to collect this experience, answering for example the following questions:

- Has the Action really answered a need?
- Did the Action reach its objectives?
- Was the Context Analysis done deep enough to have a real understanding of the context?

- Was the Stakeholders Analysis deep enough to understand the role and responsibilities of the stakeholders involved?
- What could be improved (in the future programming)?
- What recommendations should be implemented, when and by whom?

## 10.3 Financial & Administrative closure

On conclusion of the financial obligations of a contract, the corresponding individual budgetary commitment must be fully de-committed and closed.

The responsible Project Manager should initiate the financial circuit for closure of individual budgetary commitments, and act as OIA (Operational Initiating Agent)\(^{69}\).

For details on the applicable financial circuit and the financial actors involved, please refer to the latest FPI instructions published on the FPI Intranet\(^{70}\).

For details on the financial and contractual checks to be performed by the AOSD (or by staff designated by him/her), please refer to the chapter 12.2 of the DEVCO Companion ("Closure of individual budgetary/financial commitments"), and to the check-list "de-commitments and closures of individual budgetary/financial commitments" annexed to the DEVCO Companion.

Before de-committing the funds from the corresponding individual budgetary commitment, the Project Manager should send a letter/e-mail (registered in ARES) to the contractor/beneficiary announcing the intention of the Commission to administratively close the contract, and asking to express any duly justified objections to the closure within a defined deadline.

As soon as the final payment is executed and the "bank value date" is available in ABAC, the Project Manager should send the letter announcing the closure of the contract to the contractor/beneficiary. At the expiration of the deadline mentioned in the letter, the Project Manager should promptly initiate the closure and de-commitment of the corresponding individual budgetary commitment as explained above.

In case of ongoing disputes or outstanding claims by the contractor, the closure procedure should be suspended until such disputes and claims are settled. In this case, the Project Manager should liaise with FPI.1.

## 10.4 Action-End Report

The aim of the Action-End Report is to summarize the Action main information and formalize the Action experience in terms of best practices, lessons learned, pitfalls and solutions to particular problems to be used as a knowledge base for future Actions.

The Action-End Report typically mentions:

- A narrative on the Action background and implementation;
- The Action effectiveness (to what extent the objectives previously foreseen have been achieved);

---

\(^{69}\) The updated and consolidated FPI Financial Circuits were circulated on 15 June 2018: Ares(2018)3167348

- The cost;
- The Action Work Plan (realised);
- Best practices and lessons learned;
- Post-Action recommendations (and its follow up plan).

10.5 Archive the Action information and documentation

Project Managers should follow the process described in the FPI guidelines in the handling of financial documents.\textsuperscript{71}

\textsuperscript{71} FPI guidelines in the handling of financial documents, FPI1, February 2017. See: G:\FPI\5. Finance & Contracts\Administration\Archives\- Financial Document Management Guide
11 Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) at FPI

Monitoring & Evaluation transcends all the Action phases. It includes all measures taken, all means performed to monitor and evaluate the Action’s performance and identify/rectify any deviations from the objectives defined, the Action Work Plan scheduled, the budget allocated, the quality of the results expected. This includes planning and implementing corrective or preventive actions to address existing or potential problems.

11.1 Monitoring

11.1.1 What is monitoring and what we monitor?

Monitoring is a continuous and systematic process of data collection about an intervention. It generates factual information for future evaluation and impact assessments and helps identify actual implementation problems.

Monitoring is necessary to allow policy makers and stakeholders to check if policy implementation is ‘on track’ and to generate information that can be used to evaluate whether it has achieved its objectives.\textsuperscript{72}

For the OECD-DAC, monitoring is ‘a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide to management and the main stakeholders of an on-going intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of the objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.’\textsuperscript{73}

To be able to monitor properly the EU interventions it funds, FPI needs to have a clear division of labour between the different FPI Units, the EUDEL, the RTs and the Implementing Partners in order to know, for each of them, who will monitor what, when and how.

\textsuperscript{72} Better Regulation Toolbox, p. 302.

\textsuperscript{73} Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management, OECD-DAC, 2002.
11.1.2 Why monitor?

The Financial Regulation updated in July 2018 sets out that *appropriations shall be used in accordance with the principle of sound financial management, and thus be implemented respecting the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness*. ‘The use of appropriations shall focus on performance and for this purpose:

(a) objectives for programmes and activities shall be established ex-ante;
(b) progress in the achievement of objectives shall be monitored with performance indicators;
(c) progress in, and problems with, the achievements of those objectives shall be reported to the European Parliament and the Council [...].’ Specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound objectives as referred to above shall be defined, as well as relevant, accepted, credible, easy and robust indicators, where relevant. (Financial Regulation Chapter 7 Art. 33).
Who: **responsibility of HQ**

**Why:** assess Policy/Instrument performance for reporting at political level (Commissioners, Parliament, MS) and EU citizens

**What:** assess the extent to which the Policy/Instrument has reached its overall and specific objectives

**How:** evaluation following Better Regulation guidelines

**When:** mid-term review and at the end of the Instrument cycle life, every 3 years for the Policy

---

Who: **responsibility of HQ RT and EUDEL**

**Why:** verify if objectives set in Implementing Partners contracts have been achieved. Collect information as clue for Policy/Instrument specific objectives achievement

**What:** create knowledge on the effects produced at actions output and outcome levels

**How:** evaluation of a sample of actions or other means

**When:** see annual evaluation plan

---

Who: **responsibility of Implementing Partners**

**Why:** give evidence of objectives achievement to the EC

**What:** create continual knowledge on the effects produced at actions output and outcome levels. Monitor inputs and activities

**How:** follow up of input, activities, output and outcome indicators

**When:** continual monitoring

---

**Figure 21 Monitoring responsibilities (Headquarter/Regional Teams/Delegations/Implementing Partners)**
11.1.3 OPSYS Results & Monitoring module

OPSYS is the new Operational Information System of the European Commission to manage EU interventions from their planning to its evaluation. It supports the operational, legal and financial management of all FPI interventions. OPSYS is used by DEVCO, FPI and NEAR.

One of OPSYS modules is dedicated to Results Management providing a monitoring system based on an IT tool shared between the main stakeholders involved in FPI-funded Actions. The Results & Monitoring module allows to:

- manage operational entities (action, FPI Results Framework, instrument, programme, project);
- facilitate encoding, storage and consolidation of results and related monitoring through an integrated approach;
- facilitate reporting on key milestones and events related to action activities (based on logical frameworks);
- provide interoperability and integration with others systems (Ares, ABAC, EVAL module, e-procurement);
- offer an improved user-experience and a single entry point for operational information systems (internal portal);
- external users (Implementing Partners) to encode key information such as indicator values directly into the system.

The Results & Monitoring module of OPSYS (Track 1) is linked to Contract, Procurement & Decision module (Track 2) and Programming & Actions module (Track 3), thus covering the entire project lifecycle from the political decision until the final evaluation. A fully integrated architecture for OPSYS will facilitate improvements in the quality of results reporting. OPSYS will be used for results’ monitoring as of second half of 2018 with more functionalities becoming available in the course of 2019 and 2020.

Further details on OPSYS can be found here, and on Capacity for Development (C4D) https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/opsys

11.1.4 Use of indicators

11.1.4.1 What is an indicator?

'An indicator is a quantitative or qualitative measure of how close we are to achieving a set goal. They help us analyse and compare performance across population groups or geographic areas, and can be useful for determining policy priorities'74.

In other terms, indicators should measure to what extent the objectives of an intervention have been achieved or are 'on track' to be achieved. Consequently, an indicator can only exist, when objectives to reach it have been previously set. In a word, indicators do not exist or appear 'autonomously'.

To be clear and easy to use, indicators should be 'RACER'75:

---

74 Better Regulation Toolbox, tool #41: monitoring arrangements and indicators, p. 303.
75 Ibid., p. 308.
Relevant, i.e. closely linked to the objectives to be reached. They should not be over-ambitious and should measure the right thing (e.g. a target indicator for health care could be to reduce waiting times but without jeopardising the quality of care provided).

Accepted (e.g. by staff, stakeholders). The role and responsibilities for the indicator need to be well defined (e.g. if the indicator is the handling time for a grant application and the administrative process is partly controlled by Member States and partly by the EU then both sides would assume only partial responsibility).

Credible for non-experts, unambiguous and easy to interpret. Indicators should be simple and robust as possible. If necessary, composite indicators might need to be used instead – such as country ratings, well-being indicators, but also ratings of financial institutions and instruments. These often consist of aggregated data using predetermined fixed weight values. As they may be difficult to interpret, they should be used to assess broad context only.

Easy to monitor (e.g. data collection should be possible at low cost).

Robust against manipulation (e.g. administrative burden: If the target is to reduce administrative burden to businesses, the burden might not be reduced, but just shifted from businesses to public administration).

11.1.4.2 Output, outcome and impact indicators

11.1.4.2.1 What is an output indicator?

Output indicators measure the quantity and/or quality of output produced by activities.

Example: EOMs
Number of final reports transmitted to stakeholders on total number of countries observed or assessed (as EOM, EAT interim reports, preliminary statements of the Chief Observer and final reports, EEM interim reports and final reports, EFM Final reports, Election-related Legislation Reviews).

Example: IcSP
Number of ex-combatants who have benefited from a course of recognised vocational training.

11.1.4.2.2 What is an outcome indicator?

Outcome indicators measure the extent to which outputs produce, create, lead to the behavioural changes (of an individual, a company, an administration, a network, etc.) or expected changes.

Example: EOMs
Number of trained Observers and Core Team experts who have been recruited in EOMs within 2 years following their training. (Number of Women/Men).

Example: IcSP
Percentage of ex-combatants able to meet their basic needs during the transition.
11.1.4.2.3 What is an impact indicator?

Impact indicators measure the extent to which outcomes change social, economic and/or environmental conditions.

Examples: EOMs

Voice and Accountability indicator the World Bank (Voice and Accountability captures perceptions of the extent to which a country’s citizens are able to participate in selecting their government, as well as freedom of expression, freedom of association, and a free media).

Example: IcSP

Percentage of supported ex-combatants who feel they have successfully integrated into community life.

11.1.4.3 FPI corporate indicators

Corporate indicators are indicators that monitor FPI achievements as an EC Service. They monitor the implementation of the FPI Strategic Plan 2016-2020 and the extent to which FPI is achieving the Objectives described in the FPI Intervention Logic (see Figure 3: FPI Intervention Logic). They can also be used to monitor an Instrument. The list of FPI corporate indicators is available in Annex 2.

11.1.4.4 FPI core indicators

Core indicators monitor and assess the results achieved in a specific sector or area of FPI intervention (EOMs, disarmament of ex-combatants, enhancement of EU bilateral, regional, inter-regional, and multi-lateral cooperation partnership strategies, reinforcement of policy dialogue, security sector reform, border management, peace building and governance, etc.). They should also be used to monitor Actions.

Core indicators have been created by FPI HQ and EUDEL, have been quality checked (RACER criteria) and approved by HQ, they should have a specific Indicator Description Fiche (see Annex 5.).

Lists for IcSP-, PI- and EOM-specific core output, outcome and impact indicators are provided in Annexes 7, 13 and 19, respectively. Indicators are listed by FPI Overall Objectives and by instruments. The list is neither fixed nor exhaustive, it is continuously updated as further feedback from programme/project implementation is gathered.

11.1.4.5 Customised indicators

Customised indicators are those created for a particular logframe and where corporate or core indicators are not relevant according to the related theme, scope, specificities or modality of implementation of the Action.

Customised indicators are created by Project Managers and/or Implementing Partners, and have to be approved by the Quality Manager in the HQ. Customised indicators should be described by a specific Indicator Description Fiche (see template in Annex 5.).
11.1.4.6 Key Risk Indicator and context indicators

A key risk indicator (KRI) is an indicator for measuring the likelihood that the combined probability of an event and its consequence will hamper the achievement of objectives expected under the EU intervention. It could be seen as a threshold beyond which the EC, FPI, the Project Manager, or an Implementing Partner does not want to go because it will drastically increase the input needed (i.e. the costs) to implement an activity and produce the related output previously foreseen.

Example: within the programme EUCAP Sahel Mali, a field visit was foreseen in Kidal in the North-East of Mali to assess the extent to which Army forces have been redeployed by the Ministry of Defence to Kidal garrison. Recent changes in the security situation in Mali oblige mission personnel to travel across the country in an armoured vehicle and with an armed escort. This security need increases the cost of the mission by four times the original budget.

Example of Key Risk Indicator: from a Security Level ORANGE, all field missions are cancelled.

Context indicators reflect relevant aspects of the general contextual trends in the economy, environment and society that are likely to influence the implementation, achievements and performance of an EU Intervention. In the EC, this kind of indicators have been initially designed for the Common Agriculture Policy, context indicators are particularly relevant for fragile and/or conflict affected countries or for other quick-evolving contexts. These contexts should be closely monitored as they directly impact upon the implementation of the EU intervention implementation or on the achievement of results.

Example of context indicator:

Conflict Barometer
Updated once a year in February, it has been developed by the Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research (HIIK).
This index is used to assess FPI impact in countries where it intervenes.

Global Vulnerability and Crisis Assessment index
Updated twice a year (June and September) it has been developed by the JRC for DG ECHO.
This index is used to prioritize areas for DG ECHO interventions.

Other specific context indicators could be drafted/chosen to best inform on the particular situation where the EU intervention will be implemented, as for example the number of political opponents arrested, the number of newspapers articles censored, etc.

---

77 http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-indicators/context/index_en.htm
78 Number of violent and nonviolent conflicts worldwide
11.1.5 Monitoring FPI Results Framework

11.1.6 Monitoring FPI Instruments

11.1.6.1 For the IcSP

A monitoring and reporting system for the IcSP was adopted in June 2018.\textsuperscript{79}

11.1.6.2 For the PI

A Partnership Instrument Monitoring and reporting System (PIMS) has been designed to support PI staff to monitor PI performance, see 11.1.7.3. for the description.

11.1.7 Monitoring FPI Actions (programme, project)

11.1.7.1 For the IcSP

In June 2018 a revised “Manual of Indicators for the Instrument contributing to Peace and Stability (IcSP)” was approved by the Head of Service.\textsuperscript{80} This revised version of the Manual of Indicators is based on the original Manual drafted by the TRANSTEC Consultancy in May 2016. It has been revised to take account of feedback from IcSP staff based in HQ and in the field, and from the analysis of several Logframe Matrices for IcSP-funded Actions. It has also drawn on existing sources of relevant indicators such as the SDGs, the UN Rule of Law indicators, the Global Peace Index, the Global Terrorism Index and other documents such as the “EU Counter Terrorism/Counter Violent Extremism Guidelines”, “Measuring the Success of Mediation”\textsuperscript{81}, “Combating Terrorism: the Challenge of Measuring Effectiveness”\textsuperscript{82}, the EU supported COGINTA programme in Guinee, “Community level Indicators of Radicalisation”\textsuperscript{83} and the FPI Manual of September 2017.

The Manual aims to support EU Project Managers and Implementing Partners in the identification of appropriate indicators for all IcSP-funded Actions for all stages of the project cycle (from the design phase through to implementation, monitoring and evaluation), starting as early as the thinking and consultation processes which precede the preparation of IcSP financing decisions.\textsuperscript{84} The Manual presents a set of basic, sector-related indicators considered to be relevant and applicable to the broad range of IcSP-funded Actions. However, it is important to note that the proposed indicators are neither prescriptive nor exhaustive; many of the indicators may have to be adapted to fit the specificities of different Actions and contexts and additional and/or more specific indicators may need to be developed and/or added to each Action.

\textsuperscript{79} Please see the Note of 12 June 2018: Ares(2018)3077803


\textsuperscript{81} Ciprian SANDU, Conflict Studies, Quarterly Issue, 2 January 2013.

\textsuperscript{82} Raphael Perl, Congressional Research Service, March 2007.

\textsuperscript{83} START: the National Consortium for the study of terrorism and responses to terrorism.

\textsuperscript{84} A Concept Note template is annexed to this Manual.
In addition, for the IcSP specific reporting is foreseen at different levels:

- An End-of-Year report that is filled in by 15 February each year. It shall: Report on the "most" and "least" effective project according to the judgement of each IcSP project manager and provide the analysis and critical judgement of the IcSP project manager, rather than providing a comprehensive project description or summary;
- An End-of-Action report is due for each Action within two months after approval of the final report provided by the Implementing Partner(s). It shall focus the analysis and the critical judgement of the IcSP Project Manager on the final report approved and on the effectiveness of the project, with a particular focus on the underlining Theory of change, outcome indicators and lessons learnt.

11.1.7.2 For CFSP
Under construction.

11.1.7.3 For the PI

A Partnership Instrument Monitoring and reporting System (PIMS) has been designed to support PI stakeholders in monitoring the results of PI actions. PI stakeholders are (1) FPI.4 (Project Managers in Brussels and EU Delegations), (2) PI users (the thematic DGs of the European Commission, the European External Action Service (EEAS) or EU Delegations which use the PI funding) and (3) Implementing Partners (contractors, beneficiaries or other organisations implementing PI Actions).

A specific guidance manual has been drafted to provide information on how to:

- Monitor the performance of PI actions
- Collect reliable and comprehensive data on PI actions
- Build the monitoring and reporting capacity of relevant PI stakeholders

11.1.7.4 For EOM

The EU is committed to following up EU and OSCE/ODIHR EOM recommendations systematically and has for several years undertaken a wide range of actions to advance and promote these recommendations as well as those made by EOMs organised by our partners. The second Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy (2015-2019) requires consolidating best practices for leveraging EU and OSCE/ODIHR
d EOM recommendations in EU and EU Member States political dialogues and democracy support activities.

The electoral missions are monitored on a rolling basis by:

1. Online database of the missions’ recommendations and their implementation status
2. Follow-Up Missions
3. Human Rights and Democracy Country Studies (HRDCS)
4. Heads of Mission (HOMs) reports
5. EU DEL reports

The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) is the principal institution of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).
11.2 Evaluation

11.2.1 What is an evaluation and why we evaluate?

Evaluation is defined as an evidence-based judgement of the extent to which an intervention has:

- been effective and efficient,
- been relevant given the needs and its objectives, 
- been coherent both internally and with other EU policy interventions and 
- achieved EU added-value.86

Legal obligation to evaluate

The legal obligation to evaluate stems from:

- Article 318 of the TFEU87: 
  It establishes that ‘the Commission shall [also] submit to the European Parliament and the Council evaluation report on the Union’s finances based on the results achieved’;

- The Financial Regulation (FR)88: 
  FR Chapter 7 Art. 34.1. ‘Programmes and activities which entail significant spending shall be subject to ex-ante and retrospective evaluations (“evaluation”), which shall be proportionate to the objectives and expenditure’.89

- The Common Implementing Regulation90: 
  Art 12 ‘the Commission shall regularly monitor its actions and review progress made towards delivering expected results, covering outputs and outcomes. The Commission shall also evaluate impact and effectiveness of its sectoral policies and actions’.

- The Internal Control Standard #14 Evaluation of activities, which states that “evaluations of expenditure programmes, legislation and other non-spending activities are performed to assess the results, impacts and needs that these activities aim to achieve and satisfy”.

---

86 Better Regulation toolbox, tool #47, p. 346.
89 See FR Article 34.2 and Article 34.3 for more details on ex-ante and retrospective evaluations.
90 Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union’s instruments for financing external action.
Evaluate to improve decision-making process

Evaluations contribute to timely and relevant advice to decision-making and inputs to political priority-setting by providing an objective assessment based on facts and when possible, on quantitative data.

Evaluate to improve results achievement

Evaluations provide in-depth information on how the intervention is conducted and if it is on track to achieve the expected results (mid-term evaluation) or if there is any deviation that should be corrected. Final evaluations provide information on intervention performance, problems or challenges faced during the intervention and allows to draw best practices and lessons learned. Evaluations are a valuable source of information when designing new interventions, avoiding for example repeating the same mistake or running into the same problem encountered during the formulation or implementation phase.

Evaluation as a reporting tool to feed FPI monitoring system

Evaluations can be seen as one of the tools FPI can use in its monitoring system to gather and analyse information related to its interventions. An evaluation is a reporting tool showing at a given moment of the implementation of an intervention where we are, what we are achieving (mid-term evaluation) or what we have achieved (final evaluation). Evaluations can also serve to provide additional qualitative information that can complement quantitative indicators at FPI corporate level (FPI Results Framework).

11.2.2 Evaluation: basic knowledge

11.2.2.1 Evaluation criteria

European Commission evaluation criteria

These 5 following criteria are the criteria to be used for any evaluations launched and/or funded by the European Commission.

Relevance

Relevance looks at the relationship between the needs and problems in society and the objectives of the intervention.

Relevance criterion compares the reality (the field, the need, a problem) with the objectives designed for the intervention and assesses the extent to which the objectives correspond(ed) to a real need and how strong this correspondence is. Objectives could be compared to initial needs (the needs identified before the start of the intervention) or current needs (during the implementation of the intervention or after its end). Relevance criterion can also compare the objectives designed with a particular EU strategy.

Relevance criterion is also called the 'killing criterion', in fact, if the intervention does not correspond to a proven need; the intervention is no longer necessary and must be stopped.

91 Ibid.
Effectiveness

Analysis of effectiveness considers how successful an EU intervention has been in achieving or progressing towards its objectives\(^{92}\).

The Effectiveness criterion compares the results achieved by the intervention to the objectives previously foreseen and assesses the extent to which they differ. The Intervention Logic of the intervention is crucial for this purpose as it will allow to compare the logic chain of results achieved with the logic chain of objectives of the intervention.

Efficiency

Efficiency considers the relationship between the resources used by an intervention and the changes generated by the intervention\(^{93}\).

The Efficiency criterion compares the input needed to organise and manage the activities and the results (output, outcome and impact) produced.

Coherence

The evaluation of coherence involves looking at a how well or not different actions work together\(^{94}\).

As the word 'action' (or here “Intervention”) encompasses several levels (activities, projects, programmes, instruments, policies), it is convenient to distinguish between 2 types of coherence:

- **Internal coherence:**
  The different internal components of the intervention operate together to achieve the objectives (e.g. the different activities foreseen, the different outputs to be produced, the combination of several outcomes to produce a greater impact, etc.).

- **External coherence:**
  The intervention is compared to other EU interventions and/or those of other actors in order to identify complementarity, overlaps or synergies, between those interventions.

EU added value

EU added value looks for changes which it can reasonably be argued are due to EU intervention, rather than other factors\(^{95}\).

On a general level, European added value is the value resulting from an EU intervention which is additional to the value that would have been otherwise created by Member State action alone\(^{96}\).

EU added value criterion is mainly related to the principle of subsidiarity (Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union), which states that the EU should only act when the objectives can be better achieved at Union level than at Member States level.

\(^{92}\) Better Regulation Toolbox, tool #47, p. 347.

\(^{93}\) Ibid.

\(^{94}\) Ibid.

\(^{95}\) Ibid.

\(^{96}\) SEC(2011)867 final 'The added value of the EU budget', p. 2.
The EU added value could also be analysed by comparing EU interventions to interventions managed at a broader level by other major international players as the OECD or the United Nations Bodies.

**Additional evaluation criteria: the 3Cs (coordination, complementarity, coherence)**

The 3 Cs (coordination, complementarity and coherence) come from the willingness of the EC and the MSs to have a better assessment of their respective role in a particular country, region or sector. This willingness led to develop a set of evaluations conducted by the EC and the MS to analyse the extent to which their respective Actions responded in fact to these 3 criteria. These evaluations have provided several recommendations\(^97\). The 3Cs evaluation initiative was formally concluded in June 2008.

*Coordination*

Coordination has been defined as ‘activities of two or more development partners that are intended to mobilise aid resources or to harmonise their policies, programmes, procedures and practices so as to maximise the development effectiveness of aid resources’. With regard to coordination, several levels (international, regional, national, sub-national, sectoral) can be distinguished, as well as differences in content (policies/principles/priorities, procedures, practices) as in intensity (consultation, cooperation, collaboration). Coordination is seen as necessary, because a lack of coordination could lead to a donor-driven agenda, excessive demands on scarce management capacities, inconsistencies of approach, etc.\(^98\).

*Complementarity*

Complementarity is intended to ensure that the European Union development policy ‘shall be complementary to the policies pursued by the Member States’. This indicates that development cooperation is a shared competence between the Community and the Member States which can be jointly exercised. It is confirmed that the European Union has a specific, but not exclusive competence in the field of development cooperation. In this sense, complementarity differs from the concept of ‘subsidiarity’, which refers to a distribution of competence and decision-making at the most appropriate level. In the case of complementarity, both the Commission and the Member States can have competences and tasks at the same level.

The notion of complementarity poses the question of its direction, in other words, is it up to the Union to complement the activities of Member States, or the other way around? Another issue is the equal partnership between the Union and Member States, and reciprocal participation in the elaboration of their respective policies\(^99\).

---

97 http://www.three-cs.net/about-the-3cs-initiative.html

98 Ibid.

99 Ibid.
Additional OECD-DAC criteria

As FPI is part of the RELEX family and manages external actions that sometimes fit with Aid effectiveness principles, OECD-DAC criteria\(^\text{100}\) could be added to the 5 corporate EC evaluation criteria, as:

*Impact*

The positive and negative changes produced by a [development] intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. The examination should be concerned with both intended and unintended results and must also include the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of trade and financial conditions\(^\text{101}\).

*Sustainability*

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity\(^\text{102}\) are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable\(^\text{103}\).

11.2.2.2 Links between the Logic Model and the evaluation criteria

It is possible to have a clear overview regarding the links between the different elements of an intervention (the Logic Model) and what an evaluation should analyse and where in those steps.

\(^{100}\) The 5 OECD-DAC evaluation criteria are: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability

\(^{101}\) [http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm](http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm)

\(^{102}\) An Action in FPI terminology.

\(^{103}\) *Ibid.*
11.2.2.3 *Ex-ante, mid-term, final and retrospective evaluation*

**Ex-ante evaluations** are generally done during the identification phase, they allow to better design the future Action or to define different strategies to solve a particular problem or satisfy a need. The Concept Note of an Action could synthetize the ex-ante evaluation. Ex-ante evaluations consist of performing a problem analysis and a needs assessment using traditional tools described in Section 7.3.1. Context analysis.

‘For major programmes and activities that are expected to have significant economic, environmental or social impacts, the ex ante evaluation could take the form of an impact assessment [...] that analyses the various options concerning the methods for implementation [on ex-ante and retrospective evaluations in FR Chapter 7 Art. 34.1 and 34.2]¹⁰⁴¹⁰⁵. For Actions, it often refers to 'Feasibility Study'.

**Mid-term evaluations**, performed towards the middle of the period of implementation, should focus on progress to date and provide recommendations on how to improve the Action in order to achieve the stated objectives, taking into account problems and opportunities. They could serve to prepare new interventions. They encompass both forward and backward looking perspectives.

¹⁰⁴ Financial Regulation Chapter 7 Article 34.2.
¹⁰⁵ See Better Regulation toolbox Chapter 2 “How to carry out an Impact Assessment” that provides useful tools also relevant for Action ex-ante evaluation.
Final evaluations take place at the operational closure of an Action and should contribute to accountability by providing an assessment of the results achieved. They should also identify any key lessons learned that would lead to improved future Actions in the country/region/sector of operation and/or elsewhere.

Retrospective evaluations shall assess the performance of the programme or activity, including aspects such as effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, relevance and EU added value. Retrospective evaluations shall be based on the information generated by the monitoring arrangements and indicators established for the action concerned. They shall be undertaken at least once during the term of every multiannual financial framework and where possible in sufficient time for the findings to be taken into account in ex ante evaluations or impact assessments which support the preparation of related programmes and activities (Financial Regulation Chapter 7 Article 34.3).

### 11.2.2.4 Evaluation steps: overview

Evaluators usually follow the steps described below to conduct an evaluation. It is important for Evaluation Officers/Managers to understand the jargon used by evaluators in order to better understand each step. These steps do not necessarily follow the evaluation phases described in section 11.2.5.2 'Evaluation phases'. For example, the 'producing a judgement' step can start already during the Desk phase (phase 1) if enough data allows for assumptions to be made.

#### 11.2.2.5 Collecting the data

1. **Collecting the data**
   - What kind of data is needed to answer the evaluation questions?
   - How to collect the data, from whom?

2. **Analysing the data**
   - How to aggregate the data? How the data should be analysed to produce the information needed to answer the evaluation questions?

3. **Producing a judgement**
   - On which criteria the judgement is based? Which methodology will be used to judge to what extent the intervention has reached its expectations?

4. **Giving conclusions and recommendations**
   - What are the main conclusions of the evaluation?
   - What could be proposed to improve the intervention? What could be changed? When? How?
One of the main challenges for an evaluation is to collect reliable data as these data, after analysis, will be the main source of information from which to draw conclusions and propose recommendations at the end of the evaluation. Several tools can be used by evaluators to collect data related to an Action. The 4 tools presented below are the main tools used during an evaluation to collect data. Evaluators should be able to explain for example why they have chosen a particular tool to collect specific data and how this links up with the Evaluation Questions. It is highly recommended that Evaluation Officers/Managers become familiar with the different tools evaluators can use during the evaluation process. Specific trainings exist at the EC (see 11.4).

11.2.2.5.1 Primary data and secondary data

Evaluators can use primary data or secondary data, primary data are collected or created specifically for the evaluation undertaken. Secondary data are not created specifically for the evaluation, they exist in other sources, but can be used to feed it. When evaluators launch a questionnaire, they will collect primary data, when they use EU interventions final reports, EU intervention monitoring system or previous evaluation reports, they use secondary data.

11.2.2.5.2 Desk research

The Desk research is the collection of existing information relative to the EU intervention evaluated: its context, the policy framework within which the EU intervention took place, the state of play in the specific domain of the EU intervention, similar experiences from other entities (Member States, United Nations bodies, etc.).

Its purpose is to collect information, identify potential sources of data already available, apprehend the magnitude of a phenomenon or of the sector of intervention (as Security Sector Reform, migration, Counter-Terrorism, SALW, etc.) or even refine the scope of the evaluation (better defining the sector for example).

The Desk research could use:

- EU policy documentation in the field of the EU intervention evaluated
- EU Regulations, contracts, Action Documents, Concept Notes, AAP, MIP
- United Nation, OECD, OSCE positions/recommendations/reports/definitions (of a sector for example)
- Sector specific documentation as briefs and publications from the European Union Institute for Security Studies
- FPI database (CRIS, OPSYS)
- Data from EU interventions monitoring systems
- Data from EU interventions reporting documents (mid-term and final reports, previous evaluations)
- Statistical secondary sources (from the EU, the World Bank, UNDP, OECD, etc.)
- Other sources

---

106 See Eurostat: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat
11.2.2.5.3 Surveys and questionnaires

A survey is a particular method to gather information. A survey is often conducted via a questionnaire. A questionnaire consists of putting standard questions in a structured format to a sample of individuals.

The survey is used to collect the data on and opinions of many people and this set of homogenous data can be used for statistical purposes. If the audience is limited, a direct interview technique is preferred.

The key issue for a survey is the quality and the size of the sample the questionnaire will be sent to. Several techniques exist to identify a sample to best represent a particular population (simple random-sampling, systematic-sampling, stratified random-sampling, cluster-sampling, multi-stage sampling). What should be kept in mind is that if the sample has not been done randomly, the results of the questionnaire cannot be extrapolated to the whole population, i.e. one should not assume that the views expressed by the sample are the same as the views expressed by the entire population observed.

The stakeholders map is also crucial to build the sample and to identify precisely to whom the questionnaire should be sent.

It is possible to use EU Survey\(^{107}\) to build and launch evaluation questionnaires.

11.2.2.5.4 Individual interviews

The aim of individual interviews is to collect the opinion of key stakeholders about the Action, its results, its processes. It allows to explore differences between participant’s experiences and perceptions related to the Action.

An interview consists of an in-depth conversation with one or several individuals conducted by an evaluator. Several forms of individual interview exist such as informal conversation, semi-structured, guide-based and structured. Most of the time in FPI evaluations, individual interviews are structured or semi-structured, they follow standardized questions evaluators will ask of different stakeholders in order to be able to compare the answers and if the sample of individuals interviewed is significant in size, to create statistics (e.g. X% of individuals interviewed have answered that the results of the Action have been achieved).

Evaluators should propose to the Evaluation Officers/Managers the list of questions they will submit to key stakeholders, this list should also be adapted to the type of stakeholders it will be submitted to.

The decision on who should be interviewed must be linked to the stakeholders map done previously and to the consultation strategy evaluators have to describe in the Inception Report.

11.2.2.5.5 Focus groups

A focus group consists of a structured discussion with people possessing homogeneous characteristics, with a view to collecting data and/or validating initial findings (triangulation). To collect data from various stakeholders, several focus groups can be organised in parallel.

\(^{107}\) https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/home/welcome
Unlike an interview, which usually occurs with an individual, the focus group method allows members of the group to interact and influence each other during the discussion aligning their views and perceptions to answer the question asked by the evaluators. Organising different focus groups by organisations involved in the Action allows for example to collect the ‘opinions’ of these organisations (e.g. focus group with Project Managers of an EC Unit, focus group with beneficiaries of the Action in the village X, focus group with people of the same religious community, etc.).

Evaluators should provide to the Evaluation Managers, in the evaluation final report, the minutes of the focus groups they have organised.

11.2.2.6 Analysing the data

After having collected the data, evaluators should analyse it and start answering the Evaluation Questions. There are almost 6 different tools to analyse data during an evaluation. Good evaluators should perfectly master these tools. Evaluation Officers/Managers do not have to be able to use these tools but as a minimum, need to understand the purposes of these tools and how evaluators will use them.

11.2.2.6.1 Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics are statistics that allow to display, describe or summarize data in a meaningful way. They do not allow for conclusions beyond the data that have been analysed. They are simply a way of describing data by average, median and mode calculations.

Example: evaluators have launched a survey to collect stakeholders' opinions on the Action results achievement. One of the questions asked was: 'Has the action achieved its results?' Stakeholders had to give their opinion choosing from 1 'not achieved' to 5 'fully achieved'. The average of the 28 answers received for this question was 4.2.

11.2.2.6.2 Inferential statistics

Inferential statistics are statistics that allow to use random samples to make generalizations about the populations from which the samples were drawn. Therefore the sample needs to accurately represent the population; the process of achieving this is called sampling. Inferential statistics arise out of the fact that sampling naturally implies the possibility of sampling errors and thus a sample is not expected to perfectly represent the population. Inferential statistics will allow for analysis of the behaviour or opinion of a sample, taking into account that the sample behaviour or opinion can deviate from the whole population; they can also calculate this deviation.

Example: IcSP has funded 126 Actions on Security Sector Reform since 2014-2017 in 36 different countries. Evaluators will not do an in-depth analysis of all 126 Actions organising 36 missions in the countries where the Actions took place as it will be too costly for FPI. Instead, evaluators will use a sample of Actions that represents the whole population of Actions. To create this sample, evaluators will use criteria (that should be explained in the Inception Report) such as the geographic coverage, the period the Actions took place, the implementation modality, etc. Evaluators will analyse only this population of Actions and indicate the limits (sampling errors, bias) related to the extrapolation of the analysis of the sample to the population of 126 Actions.

108 This is a rough estimation.
11.2.2.6.3 Comparison groups

A comparison group study compares the results achieved by the Action in the targeted population with a similar population that has not been the beneficiary of the Action. It allows for verifying if the changes produced have been generated by the Action and not by the global context. Comparison groups can also help to answer the question: 'What would have happened if FPI have not intervened?' and the EU-added value criteria.

Example: FPI intervened in the North region of the country X to increase the participation of women voting in local elections. In the last local election, voter participation increased by 30% in the 38 villages where the FPI Action took place. Evaluators compare this figure with the participation of women in 22 villages (of similar sizes and ethnical composition than the 38 villages the FPI Action took place) from the South region, where no increase has been recorded. Evaluators conclude that the increase of women's participation and voting in local elections is clearly attributed to FPI Action.

11.2.2.6.4 Benchmarking

Benchmarking is the identification of 'best practices' in processes and results and the identification of the underlying reasons for success. Evaluators will identify the best organisations, programmes, projects, the reasons for their success and compare them with FPI programmes and projects. For each difference identified between the best organisation or Action and FPI Action, evaluators will make recommendations.

Example: evaluators have analysed 53 PI funded Actions. Of the 53 Actions, 46 were successful with full results achievement. 100% of these 46 Actions had a Logical Framework with RACER indicators while all those unsuccessful either did not have any Logical Framework or where they had it, it was not developed consistently and many indicators were not RACER. Recommendation formulated by the evaluators: all FPI Actions should have a Logical Framework with RACER indicators to better monitor results achievement.

11.2.2.6.5 Case study

The purpose of a case study is to study intensely one set (or unit) of something (activities, villages, projects, etc.) as a distinct whole. The case study will allow having an in-depth understanding of complex interventions, study concrete good or bad practices and to identify key aspects of the intervention as well as clarify cause-and-effects relations.

Example: EU Gateway, a PI funded programme which purpose is to help European companies to establish long-lasting business collaborations in Asia, is composed of several business missions. Evaluators choose 8 missions as case studies (criteria to choose the case studies should be explained in the Inception Report) to examine in greater depth how they are managed, what are the processes they follow, what are their main achievements. The case studies conclusions will feed into the programme evaluation.

11.2.2.7 Producing a judgement

After having collected data and analysed them, based on this analysis evaluators should provide an answer to the Evaluation Questions and provide a judgement (how far the Action has met the expectations? How far the Action answers the Evaluation Questions?).

---

109 See 11.1.4.1 'What is an indicator' to have an explanation on RACER indicators.
To formulate their judgement, evaluators can use different techniques as described below.

11.2.2.7.1 Expert panels

Evaluators can call on sectoral experts to analyse the Evaluation Matrix (see 11.2.5.4.2.4 'The Evaluation Matrix) and the result of the evaluation to produce a judgement. An expert panel is usually composed of 4 to 8 experts who are asked to synthesise information from a range sources, drawing on a range of viewpoints in order to arrive at overall conclusions. Most of the time, evaluators consider themselves as the experts to do this assessment. Evaluation Officers/Managers should nonetheless ask evaluators if the expertise of the evaluation team is sufficient to produce this objective judgement and whether it would not be relevant to add an external expert that could bring to the evaluation another objective perspective.

11.2.2.7.2 Delphi method

Delphi method is used within expert panels to organise the consultation of experts on a specific subject and in a structured way. It allows for building consensus among experts who interact anonymously. The evaluation findings are circulated (in a series of rounds) among participating experts who comment on it and may modify their opinion(s) until some degree of mutual agreement is reached.

11.2.2.7.3 Multi-criteria analysis

Multi-criteria analysis is a technique to reach a judgement based on several criteria which have been ranked or weighted in a transparent manner. The multi-criteria analysis defines judgement criteria and attributes a weight to each criterion. Judgement criteria can be aggregated (if different experts assess the criteria) to provide a score to the different judgement criteria.

Example:

Evaluators have proposed an indicator to assess the relevance criteria analysing the extent to which the objectives mentioned in the Action Document correspond to the objectives of the instrument. The indicator is: 'Number of Action Documents mentioning the objectives of the instrument'. A multi-criteria analysis allows to add criteria to decide at which threshold evaluators consider that the relevance criterion is fulfilled. The criteria could be: 'if 80% of Action Documents analysed mention the objectives of the instrument so we consider that the relevance criteria is reach'.

11.2.2.7.4 Other techniques used to produce a judgement

Cost-benefit analysis

Cost-benefit analysis (CBA) is the quantification of the costs and benefits of the FPI Action, including its side effects. CBA is not limited to monetary considerations but can also include environmental and social costs and benefits when they can be reasonably quantified. In a CBA, the currency unit (€) is the comparison unit so all aspects of the Action (including the impacts) have to be evaluated in that currency. As a consequence, evaluations based on a CBA are very costly as they ask for a modelling of the Action.
Cost-effectiveness analysis

The aim of the cost-effectiveness analysis is to compare the cost of the Action with the results produced. To do so, cost-effectiveness analysis calculates a unit cost per results obtained and compares it to best practices. The cost-effectiveness analysis answer basically the questions: Could we have more results for the same cost? Or do other Actions obtain the same effects for a lower cost?

11.2.2.8 Reaching conclusions and recommendations

The conclusions must answer the Evaluation Questions. The conclusions are based on the judgement criteria and provide a summary of the main evaluation findings. They must be directly linked to the judgement criteria and be backed up by the evidence collected throughout the evaluation process. A clear objective and logical link must exist between the evidence gathered and the conclusions reached.

The recommendations must derive from the conclusions and provide advice on how to improve the Action (or future Actions). Recommendations should be shared with key stakeholders and implemented, when relevant.

11.2.2.9 Other aspects of the evaluation

11.2.2.9.1 The triangulation

The triangulation is a cross-referencing of information and a cross-referencing of tools. The evaluator will use different sources of information (different stakeholders) and different tools (interviews, questionnaires, desk research, etc.) to increase the quality of the data collected or the robustness of a finding. In fact, if a data (or finding) appears several times during the collection phase using different stakeholders and tools, these data should be 'close to the truth'.
11.2.9.2 The stakeholders consultation strategy

The stakeholders consultation strategy should identify who, when and why a stakeholder should be consulted and in relation to what purpose. This strategy should be directly linked to the stakeholder mapping and the social network analysis (see: 7.4.4) and should also establish the link with the Evaluation Questions: which stakeholder will be used by the evaluator to answer which Evaluation Question. The stakeholders' consultation strategy is part of the evaluation methodology.

For major initiatives\textsuperscript{110}, the stakeholders' consultation strategy is compulsory and includes an Open Public Consultation (OPC)\textsuperscript{111}.

11.2.9.3 The risks and mitigation measures

Evaluators should explain what are the risks related to the evaluation, that is to say what could hamper the evaluation implementation, or mitigate the validity of the data or findings. Evaluators should provide (already in their offer or at least in the Inception Report) a table with the main risks already identified and the mitigation measures that they should implement to limit them.

Example of Risks and mitigation measures table a tenderer should provide in its offer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks identified</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overwhelming amount of information to be processed</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The scope of the assignment means there will be a lot of information to be processed. Several measures are envisaged to avoid overload:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A strict relevance test to be applied to data gathering so that not strictly pertinent data is discarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The accurate use of data already available in order to not re-invent the wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The use of a common template to gather qualitative information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{110} See Better Regulation Guidelines, p. 12 on what is 'a major initiative'.

\textsuperscript{111} See Better Regulation Toolbox, tool #53, p. 392.
| **High volume of queries (also in relation to different time zones)** | High | High | We anticipate queries to be higher after the platform launches and e.g. around reporting deadlines. To be able to handle the queries, we envisage four elements of our strategy:  
- Tiered approach to online support: consisting of varying degrees of 1-2-1 support engagement: from FAQs, though online replies, to answering call-back requests.  
- Setting parameters for phone line availability / format for enquiries: an initial template for the queries will be sent by email to all of the PI Project Managers and Implementing Partners  
- Incremental approach to knowledge sharing: the FAQs will be updated regularly, taking into account the questions raised |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability of information at action level</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The availability and quality of information to be gathered at the Action level is likely to vary, leading to gaps and weaknesses in the evidence. Our two-staged approach, based on a desk review followed by Project Managers interviews, will mitigate this by making the most of existing information, then using field visits and additional research to fill gaps. We will also use triangulation to offset the inevitable imperfection of any one research tool. However if time-bound information such as baseline data was not collected there may be some gaps in the database that we cannot retrospectively complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slippage in scheduling of training</strong></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>It is possible that due to unforeseen circumstances that the training scheduling might slip. However, due to our previous work on the Partnership Instrument we already have established contacts with EU Delegations and we will be able to coordinate the process closely. If needed, we will request support of EU Delegations in scheduling of the training and we will make sure the trainings are delivered cost-efficiency (e.g. by making use of discounted hotel rates or using the EU Delegations’ premises).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11.2.3 Evaluation team at FPI HQ, who does what?**

In each FPI Unit and Regional Team there is an Evaluation Officer who is the contact point for her/his colleagues. She/he is in charge of planning evaluations and providing guidance on evaluation methodology, she/he can also act as an Evaluation Manager launching Actions and sectoral evaluations.
For the planning phase, each Unit in consultation with Regional Teams drafts its evaluation strategy and submits this document to the Director for approval after a quality check by FPI.1. This unit also coordinates the drafting of the 5-year evaluation rolling plan during the Annual Management Plan exercise that starts usually in November (see 11.2.4.2).

For the implementing phase, each Unit or Regional Team launches the evaluation as planned in the annual evaluation plan. The Evaluation Manager who is often the Project Manager in charge of the action to be evaluated, drafts the Terms of Reference if there is a call for tenders, selects the evaluators112, manages the follow up of the evaluators and the implementation of the different phases of the evaluation. FPI.1 can assist the process by contributing a quality check during the most important phases (drafting of the Terms of Reference, validation of the Inception Report, validation of the Interim Report, validation of the Final Report). This quality check is not compulsory but highly recommended as it allows maintaining consistency between the FPI Units in relation to use of methodology and the level of quality expected for evaluations launched by the FPI.

At the end of the year, FPI.1 coordinates the reporting of on-going evaluations and finalised evaluations through the Annual Activity Report (see 12.2).

11.2.4 Planning evaluations

11.2.4.1 FPI evaluation strategy

Following the legal obligation to evaluate but also for effectiveness purposes, FPI.2 – for the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace – and FPI.4 – for the Partnership Instrument – have defined their own evaluation strategies for the period 2014-2020. For EOMs, a flexible, ad-hoc, approach has been developed in consultation with the EEAS. For CFSP operations, no evaluations are planned (the Financial Regulations does not foresee specific provisions) but an ad-hoc approach has been developed in agreement with the EEAS and the Council.

FPI.2 multi-annual evaluation plan (2014-2020)113:
https://myintragcomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/fpi/HowWeWork/ProjectManagement/Pages/Index.aspx

FPI.4 multi-annual evaluation plan (2014-2020)114:
https://myintragcomm.ec.europa.eu/dg/fpi/HowWeWork/ProjectManagement/Pages/Index.aspx

11.2.4.2 The 5-year evaluation rolling plan

Every year, during the drafting of the Annual Management Plan (AMP) (see 4.3 Annual Management Plans), FPI updates its 5-year evaluation rolling plan. This document, which is an Annex of the AMP, lists the on-going evaluations and the evaluations FPI plans to launch during the next 5 years according to its multi-annual evaluation plans.

Only major evaluations are listed (instrument evaluations, sectoral evaluations, actions above €5 million). However, it does not prevent Operational Units, and EUD, from adding other evaluations if they wish.

112 FPI.1 has the role of chairman of the evaluation committee for procurement procedures, included procurement for evaluations (see Note to the Heads of Unit ARES(2016)2653402-08/06/2016


11.2.5 Implementing evaluations

11.2.5.1 EVAL module

EVAL module (e-Evaluation Tool & Library) is an IT tool developed by DEVCO\textsuperscript{115} to be used by all staff managing evaluations of 1) projects/programmes, 2) country sector level, 3) budget support or 4) thematic evaluations in DG DEVCO, DG NEAR and FPI, in Headquarters, Delegations and Regional Teams.

For FPI, it is also a formal database and repository of all evaluations undertaken since 2014, where Operational Managers and Evaluation Officers can find previous evaluations for learning/inspiration purposes. It will be fully shared with the other RELEX family members – DEVCO, NEAR – in line with OPSYS planning and schedule.

Access to EVAL module can be requested via:
DEVCO APPLICATION SUPPORT (EuropeAid-APPLICATION-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu)

Trainings, including eLearning videos can be found on:
http://www.cc.cec/wikis/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=284450872

11.2.5.2 Evaluation phases: overview

An evaluation should follow in a methodical way, specific steps in order to be able to produce the conclusions that it has to produce at the end of the evaluation process. These steps are commonly agreed by the international community and come mainly from the OECD\textsuperscript{116}.

For its evaluations, FPI fully follows the evaluation methodology described in the Evaluation Methods for the European Union's external assistance, volumes 1, 2 and 3 which are regularly updated on Capacity4Dev\textsuperscript{117}. This part of the FPI Manual provides only a summary of the different steps; a full explanation is available in the evaluation methodology mentioned above.

For each step, different tools are used to understand the context of the evaluation, collect and gather the information, analyse it, produce a judgement and propose recommendations. These steps are detailed below:

\textsuperscript{115} EVAL module will be further integrated into OPSYS end of 2019.
\textsuperscript{116} Evaluating development co-operation, summary of key norms and standards. Second edition. OECD DAC network on development evaluation.
Preparatory phase (phase 0)
Who is the Evaluation Officer?
Who are the members of the ISG?
What is the purpose of the evaluation?
What is the scope of the evaluation?
What are the Evaluation Questions?
Who will evaluate?

Desk phase (phase 1)
What is the evaluation methodology evaluators will use?
Is the Intervention Logic of the Action really 'logic'?
What are the judgement criteria and the indicators evaluators will use for the evaluation?
What are the partial answers to the Evaluation Questions?
What are the assumptions to be tested?
What is the Work Plan evaluators will follow for data collection and data analysis?

Field phase (phase 2)
Evaluators implement the Work Plan for data collection and data analysis
Are the assumptions verified in the field?

Synthesis phase (phase 3)
What are the answers to the Evaluation Questions?
What are the conclusions?
What are the recommendations?
What is the quality of the final report?

Dissemination and follow-up (phase 4)
To whom the final report should be addressed?
How?
Who will implement the recommendations?
For each step, evaluators\textsuperscript{118} will use the most appropriate tool from the evaluation toolbox depending on the evaluation step evaluators are at and what they are looking for. It is important that Evaluation Officers/Managers are familiar with the phases, terminology, concepts and tools used during an evaluation in order to follow up the work of the evaluators and to assure that the minimum quality criteria are met during each phase (regarding the methodology used, the evidence collected, the analysis of the data, etc.).

\textbf{11.2.5.3 Preparatory phase (phase 0)}

An Evaluation Officer/Manager is appointed to manage all evaluation steps and to rigorously follow up the work of the evaluators. He/she could be the Project Manager of the Action to be evaluated or an evaluation specialist within FPI Operational Units, EU Delegations or RTs.

Starting from the design phase, during the full lifecycle of an evaluation, gender aspect should be considered. For further details on how to better integrate the gender dimension into the analysis done within the evaluations of the actions funded by the EU, please refer to the new guidance towards gender-sensitive evaluations, approved jointly by the Head of Service of the FPI, the Director-General of DG DEVCO and the Director-General of DG NEAR on 20 June 2018\textsuperscript{119}.

\textbf{11.2.5.3.1 The Inter-service Steering Group}

The Evaluation Officer/Manager is in charge of composing an Inter-service Steering Group (ISG) - also called Reference Group in some Framework Contracts. The ISG is the decision-making and follow-up body of the evaluation. The ISG, if it is composed of a restricted number of members and complies with call for tenders' rules regarding its composition, could also be used to analyse the proposals submitted by bidding consortia (evaluation companies).

The ISG:

- revises the Terms of Reference for the evaluation to be launched
- analyses the proposals submitted by the bidders\textsuperscript{120} (in this case, it has to follow the rules of an Evaluation Committee)
- facilitates contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders;
- ensures that the evaluation team has access to and has consulted all relevant information sources and documents related to the Action.
- provides advice and guidance to the evaluation team;
- validates the Evaluation Questions;
- reviews and accepts the different notes and reports drafted by the evaluators;
- decides on a dissemination strategy for the evaluation conclusions and recommendations.

\textsuperscript{118} It could be evaluators from EC staff, from external private companies (consultants) or a mix of both.

\textsuperscript{119} Ares(2018)3264752.

\textsuperscript{120} It is optional that the ISG be the Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation Officer/Manager can set up an Evaluation Committee that does not involve ISG members or only a part of them.
It should be composed of:

- The EC Project Manager in charge of the Action to be evaluated;
- The EC Evaluation Officer/Evaluation Manager/Head of Sector/Head of Cooperation/Head of Unit depending on the type of evaluation and its scale (from project to Instrument and Policy evaluation);
- The Implementing Partner’s Project Manager (if the Action is not directly implemented by the EC);
- Other members can be added such as EEAS colleagues, other EC DGs colleagues, sector experts, evaluation methodology experts, representatives of the beneficiaries of the Action, other relevant stakeholders.

11.2.5.3.2 Preliminary data collection

The Evaluation Officer/Manager gathers all documentation related to the Action to be evaluated (Action Status Reports, narrative reports, previous evaluation, contracts, etc.).

He/she draws up a first list of stakeholders able to inform him/her informally of what is at stake under the evaluation and the expected results allowing him/her to precisely define the exact purpose and reason for launching the evaluation. He/she defines the scope of the evaluation (period, geographical scope, sectors covered, etc.).

He/she drafts the Evaluations Questions (see 11.2.5.3.4 Drafting the Terms of Reference)

11.2.5.3.3 Choose the right Framework Contract (FWC)

a) Launching actions (project or programme) evaluation (Framework Contract SIEA 2018)

NB! Since entry into force of FWC SIEA 2018 in June 2018, also Delegations shall use the FWC SIEA 2018 for programme and project evaluations121.

b) Launching large-scale evaluations (Framework Contract DEVCO/COM/2015)

Lot 1 “Evaluation” of the FWC COM 2015 (validity extended until 29/02/2020) serves exclusively the purpose of major strategic evaluation following the methodological guidance available on the dedicated DEVCO intranet site122. Only DG DEVCO, NEAR and FPI may use the Lot 1 of the FWC COM 2015.

---

121 Evaluation ToR with guidance and other supporting material on project and programme evaluations will be published on the page of DEVCO 04: https://myintracomm.ec.testa.eu/dg/devco/evaluation-quality-results/evaluation/Pages/project-evaluations.aspx


All templates, lot descriptions, general conditions and other documents relevant to FWC SIEA 2018 are published by DEVCO/RS: https://myintracomm.ec.testa.eu/dg/devco/finance-contracts-legal/framework-contracts/Pages/framework-contract-siea-2018.aspx
11.2.5.3.4 Drafting the Terms of Reference

Following the selection of the right Framework Contract to use, please download the right Terms of Reference template from the following webpages:

a) when launching actions’ (project or programme) evaluation (Framework Contract SIEA 2018)


b) when launching large-scale evaluations (Framework Contract DEVCO/COM/2015)


As the next step, the ToR needs to be drafted by the Evaluation Officer/Manager, specifying in the Terms of Reference:

- the purpose of the evaluation;
- the background of the Action(s), sector(s), policy, instrument to be evaluated;
- the scope of the evaluation;
- the expertise required for the evaluation;
- the schedule;
- the Evaluation Questions.

For the Evaluation Questions, it would be preferable to draft 1 to 3 questions for each criterion and not try to assess several criteria with one single question.

The questions below are only examples; they should not prevent the drafting of new ones that fit better with the intervention to be evaluated.

**Relevance**

- To what extent do the objectives of the intervention correspond to a proven need?
- To what extent is the intervention still relevant?
- To what extent are the objectives of the intervention still valid?
- How well do the original objectives of the intervention correspond to the needs previously identified?
- How well do the original objectives of the intervention still correspond to current needs?
- How relevant is the intervention to the final beneficiaries?

**Effectiveness**

- To what extent have the objectives of the intervention been achieved?
- To what extent do the observed results correspond to the objectives foreseen?
- What factors influenced the achievements observed?
- To what extent were the objectives achieved/ are likely to be achieved?
**Efficiency**

- To what extent are the costs involved justified, given the results which have been achieved?
- To what extent are the costs proportionate to the results achieved? What factors are influencing any particular discrepancies?
- To what extent was the intervention cost-efficient?
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- What factors influenced the efficiency with which the achievements observed have been attained?

**Coherence**

- To what extent is this intervention coherent with other interventions which have similar objectives?
- To what extent is the intervention coherent with other EU interventions?
- To what extent is the intervention coherent with EU international obligations?
- To what extent are the outputs foreseen coherent with each other in order to trigger the expected outcome?
- To what extent are the programmes being implemented coherent with each other in order to foster and promote the achievement of the instruments’ objectives?

**EU added value**

- What is the additional value resulting from the intervention compared to what could be achieved by Member States at national and/or regional levels?
- To what extent do the issues addressed by the intervention continue to require intervention at EU level?
- What would be the most likely consequences of stopping or withdrawing the existing EU intervention?

**Sustainability** *(OECD-DAC criterion to be used, if relevant, for the action to be evaluated):*

- To what extent did the benefits of the EU intervention continue after EU funding ceased?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the EU intervention?

The Inter-Service Steering Group should be consulted on the Terms of Reference before launching the Request for Services.

**11.2.5.3.5 Launching Framework Contract Request for Services**

*a) Launching Actions’ (project/programme) evaluation (Framework Contract SIEA 2018)*

The use of Framework Contracts COM 2015 and SIEA 2018 allows avoiding launching a call for tenders following the full process of selection that can last several months. Evaluation companies have been already selected by DEVCO; FPI Evaluation Officers/Managers only have to launch a Request for Services.
FWC SIEA 2018 (valid from 01/06/2018 to 31/05/2020) is used for project, programme and non-strategic evaluations\(^{123}\) (for policy and instruments evaluation, see below).

The 'steps to follow' described hereunder do not replace a thorough reading and understanding of the guidelines\(^{124}\) available for the FWC SIEA 2018 in DEVCO intranet.

Steps to follow:

1. Read FWC guidelines, Global Terms of Reference (ToR), FAQ and other relevant documents available in DEVCO intranet.

2. Identify the correct Lot within the FWC contract – see Global ToR (Lots are classified by sectors, e.g. lot 3: “Human rights, democracy and rule of law”)

3. Prepare the Request for Services (RfS), the template is available on the website, follow links above. Templates should be completed but heading cannot be modified.

   a. Drafting documents:
      i. Draft Terms of Reference – circulate for consultation/ comments with OPE/FIN;
      ii. Calculate estimated budget for the evaluation, on the basis of the Draft ToR (i.e. estimated number of working days, profile of experts, incidentals described in the ToR, etc.); this document is ONLY FOR INTERNAL USE;
      iii. Prepare the financial offer template on the basis of the estimated budget for the evaluation;
      iv. Prepare evaluation grid – on the basis of the ToRs (i.e. methodology and expert’s profiles);
   b. Selection of Launching RfS in CRIS (compulsory)
      - Attach the required documents\(^{125}\) in CRIS
      - Use checklist available in DEVCO Companion
      - RfS should be visaed by ENCOD-GESTOPE-GESTFIN-SIGNCC
      - After SIGNCC visa, print out a copy of the RfS and get it signed in paper by the SIGNCC.

4. Send by e-mail the RfS to the selected contractors (CRIS does automatically the selection)

   a. Click in the icon "e-mail" in the RfS in CRIS:
      - An outlook message opens with a draft e-mail and the e-mails of the contractors already in the system;
      - Update the body of the text where necessary;
      - Offers should be sent to FPI functional mail box: FPI-CRIS-FWC-OFFERS@ec.europa.eu
      - Upload the RfS signed + required documents
      - Deadline for offers – 14 days (by default)
      - Send using ARESLOOK (if available or install it)
   b. Suggestion:
      - Do not send the RfS on a Friday afternoon;


\(^{124}\) Idem.

\(^{125}\) Such as “Global price indicative financial offer”
- Send the RfS right after the SIGNCC visa given in CRIS

5. Answer request for clarifications (if any) as soon as they are received – between launch of RfS and deadline for submission of offers:
   a. Be short, clear, neutral and precise
   b. Answer to all the Framework Contractors, not only to the one that submitted the request

6. Compose the evaluation committee:
   a. 3 voting members (one from FPI.1)
   b. No need for formal appointment
   c. At least one with rights to visa in CRIS
   d. Get them to sign the "Declaration of impartiality"
   e. Agree a date for the evaluation of offers

7. After deadline for submission of offers and within 14 days:
   a. Evaluate offers
      - Share the offers with the evaluation committee
      - Meet and evaluate offers in accordance with the evaluation grid (criteria)
   b. Incorporate in CRIS the results of the evaluation and print out the evaluation report
      - Get it signed by the 3 members of the evaluation committee
      - Give necessary visa in CRIS
   c. Send notifications letter
      - One to the awarded framework contractor
      - One to each of the non-selected
      - No need for them to be signed by Sub-Delegated Authorising Officer – evaluation manager can sign the letter

8. Answer questions from non-selected framework contractors (if any)

9. Start preparing the contract in CRIS – see financial circuits\textsuperscript{126} and contact financial initiator for more information

10. Sign the contract

11. Encode the evaluation in the EVAL module

\textit{c) Launching large-scale evaluations (Framework Contract DEVCO/COM/2015)}

FWC COM 2015 (validity extended until 29/02/2020) is usually used for Policy/Instrument and strategic evaluations (for programme and project evaluations, see above).

The use of Framework Contract COM 2015 allows avoiding launching a call for tenders following the full process of selection that can last several months. Evaluation companies have been already

\textsuperscript{126} Please see the updated and consolidated FPI Financial Circuits of 15 June 2018: Ares(2018)3167348.
selected by DEVCO and within the framework contract; FPI Evaluation Officers/Managers only have to launch a request for service.

The 'steps to follow' described below do not replace a thorough reading and understanding of the guidelines available for the FWC COM 2015 on DEVCO intranet.

Steps to follow:

1. read FWC guidelines, Global Terms of Reference (ToR), FAQ and other relevant documents available in DEVCO intranet

2. Identify the correct Lot within the FWC contract – see Global ToR (Lot 1 is for evaluations)

3. Prepare the Request for Services (RfS); the template is available on the website, follow links above. Templates should be completed but headings cannot be modified.
   a. Drafting documents:
      i. Draft Terms of Reference – circulate for consultation / comments with OPE/FIN;
      ii. Calculate estimated budget for the evaluation, on the basis of the Draft ToR (i.e. estimated number of working days, profile of experts, incidentals described in the ToR, etc.); this document is ONLY FOR INTERNAL USE. For FWC COM 2015 it is compulsory to use a global price evaluation;
      iii. Prepare the financial offer template on the basis of the estimated budget for the evaluation;
      iv. Prepare evaluation grid – on the basis of the ToRs (i.e. methodology and expert’s profiles);
   b. Selection of Launching RfS in CRIS (compulsory)
      - Attach the required documents in CRIS
      - Use checklist available in DEVCO Companion
      - RfS should be visaed by ENCOD-GESTOPE-GESTFIN-SIGNCC
      - After SIGNCC visa, print out a copy of the RfS and get it signed in paper by the SIGNCC.

4. Send by e-mail the RfS to the selected contractors (CRIS does automatically the selection )
   a. Click in the icon “e-mail” in the RfS in CRIS:
      - An outlook message opens with a draft e-mail and the e-mails of the contractors already in the system;
      - Update the body of the text where necessary;
      - Offers should be sent to FPI functional mail box: FPI-CRIS-FWC-OFFERS@ec.europa.eu
      - Upload the RfS signed + required documents
      - Deadline for offers – 14 days (by default)
      - Send using ARESLOOK (if available or install it)
   b. Suggestion:

---

5. Answer request for clarifications (if any) as soon as they are received – between launch of RfS and deadline for submission of offers:
   a. Be short, clear, neutral and precise
   b. Answer to all the Framework Contractors, not only to the one that submitted the request

6. Compose the evaluation committee:
   a. 3 voting members (one from FPI.1)
   b. No need for formal appointment
   c. At least one with rights to visa in CRIS
   d. Get them to sign the "Declaration of impartiality"
   e. Agree a date for the evaluation of offers

7. After deadline for submission of offers and within 14 days:
   a. Evaluate offers
      - Share the offers with the evaluation committee
      - Meet and evaluate offers in accordance with the evaluation grid (criteria)
   b. Incorporate in CRIS the results of the evaluation and print out the evaluation report
      - Get it signed by the 3 members of the evaluation committee
      - Give necessary visa in CRIS
   c. Send notifications letter – see template in DEVCO’s intranet (links above)
      - One to the awarded framework contractor
      - One to each of the non-selected framework contractors
      - No need for them to be signed by SDAO – evaluation manager can sign the letter

8. Answer questions from non-selected framework contractors (if any)

9. Start preparing the contract in CRIS – see financial circuits and contact financial initiator for more information

10. Sign the contract

11. Encode the evaluation on the EVAL module.

---

11.2.5.4 Desk phase (phase 1)

The Desk phase comprises 4 different steps:

- the kick-off meeting with the evaluators
- the drafting of the Inception Report by the evaluators
- the drafting of the Desk Report by the evaluators
- the end of Desk phase meeting

These 4 steps are described below.

For some complex evaluations, it could be relevant to set up a meeting with the evaluators to have a face-to-face discussion when they deliver the Inception Report to FPI to be sure that the methodology evaluators will use is well understood by the Inter-service Steering Committee and that evaluators have not missed important information. This meeting should be systematically organised when the Evaluation Officer/Manager has doubts about the methodology evaluators will use and/or if the Inception Report does not meet the minimum quality standards.

During the Desk phase, evaluators can also propose to FPI to conduct a pilot field visit in order to test the methodology they propose to use to collect the data during the Field phase (see 11.2.5.5 Field phase (phase 2)).

11.2.5.4.1 The kick-off meeting with the evaluators

The kick-off meeting is often the first face-to-face meeting with the evaluators. Its cost is rather high (between €1,500 and €4,000 for respectively 1 or 3 consultants) and for this reason, it is important to well prepare the meeting in order to have good value for money.

The kick-off meeting should allow:

- To inform about what is FPI, its role and its links with other EC DGs (mainly with the RELEX family\(^\text{130}\)) and the EEAS;
- To clarify the FPI expectation regarding evaluation deliverables;
- To clarify aspects of the Terms of Reference;
- For FPI, to communicate the ‘rules of the game’ of the evaluation (the methodology used\(^\text{131}\), the role of the ISG, the validation process for the reports, etc.)
- For FPI to pass on sensitive information which cannot be sent in writing (stakeholders analysis, potential conflicts between stakeholders or institutions, etc.)
- To give to the evaluators the documentation they need (previous reports, engagement letter, etc.).

\(^\text{130}\) DEVCO, ECHO, FPI, NEAR and TRADE.

**Prepare the meeting**: plan the meeting, draft the Agenda based on the points to be discussed during the meeting, send the Agenda in advance to the attendees, prepare logistic needs (flip chart, beamer, documentation, etc.). Decide who will take meeting minutes.

**Conduct the meeting**, give the necessary information on the EU intervention background (SWOT analysis, context analysis, stakeholders analysis, etc.) and implementation (Gantt chart), fix the role and responsibilities of the persons/entities involved in the implementation process (who does what?), inform on the 'rules of the game' that will be used during the implementation (Financial Regulations, PRAG, FPI Manual, RELEX family evaluation methodology, etc.) in order to share as much as possible the same culture.

**Communicate the results** of the kick-off meeting to relevant stakeholders (what are the main conclusions, statements, misunderstandings, point of views, etc.).

**Follow the conclusions** during implementation by assigning who is in charge of/responsible for their delivery and when the tasks should be delivered.

Keep in mind that a kick-off meeting is an activity so it should produce already a change (output). Outputs could be for example, the minutes of the meeting and the knowledge acquired by the attendees.

**11.2.5.4.2 Drafting of an Inception Report by the evaluators**

The drafting of the Inception Report by the evaluators is a crucial step as the Inception Report will explain how the evaluation will be conducted describing the methodology evaluators will use to collect the data, analyse the data and formulate a judgement.

Inception Report should necessarily tackle:

- the context of the Action to be evaluated
- the purpose and scope of the evaluation (and its limitations)
- the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated
- the Evaluation Questions, proposing a rewording of the questions if necessary
- a stakeholders map and/or list
- a stakeholders consultation strategy
- criteria to select the Actions(s) and/or country(ies) to be visited during the field phase (phase 2) if not already fixed by the Terms of Reference
- an evaluation matrix
11.2.5.4.2.1 **Context of the Action to be evaluated**

The evaluators should be able to give a clear overview of the context of the Action to be evaluated, define the terms and concepts used.

In order to describe the context in which the Action takes place, or the Action itself, evaluators can draft a SWOT analysis. It allows for verifying that evaluators have well understood the issues of the Action. The SWOT analysis can be already drafted in the Inception Report if enough information is available. It can also be completed/adjusted after the Desk phase and the field phase (phase 2).

The methodology to draft a SWOT analysis is described in the section 4 'SWOT analysis'. Other methodologies to consider such as a context analysis are described in the section 7.3.1 'Context analysis'.

11.2.5.4.2.2 **The Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated**

Evaluators should first analyse the Intervention Logic of the Action to be evaluated. This analysis should be based on the logical path existing between the 3 levels (Operational Objective/Specific Objectives/Overall Objectives or Output/Outcome/Impact) and on the Theory of Change that underpins the Intervention Logic.

If the Intervention Logic does not exist, evaluators should re-build it based on the documentation available and the objectives foreseen. This Intervention Logic should be 'faithful' to the existing documents (Action Document, Concept Note, contract with an Implementing Partner) and to the documents establishing the policy/strategy in which the Action takes place.

The methodology to draft an Intervention Logic is described in the section 7.5. 'Formulate a strategy'.

11.2.5.4.2.3 **The stakeholder analysis and consultation strategy**

Evaluators should propose a consultation strategy in the Inception Report. This consultation strategy should explain who will be consulted during the evaluation, how, why and when. In order to be able to do that, evaluators should first undertake a stakeholders' analysis and a social network analysis.

Based on these two analyses, evaluators should target key stakeholders and adjust the type of tools to be used to collect their opinions (see 11.2.2.5 'Collecting the data') and in relation to particular topics.

Questions to be asked to key stakeholders will not be the same as for the beneficiaries of an Action (companies, women, police staff, etc.) and for stakeholders that have participated in implementation of the Action (an NGO, Member States staff in Embassy, EUD staff, Joint Staff, etc.).

11.2.5.4.2.4 **The evaluation matrix**

The evaluation matrix is the key tool of the Inception Report as it gives in a synthetic document a global overview on how evaluators will answer the Evaluation Questions, how they will judge the achievement of the EQ, on which data they will base their judgement and from where they will collect the data. If the Inception Report does not provide an evaluation matrix, it **should not be approved** by the Evaluation Officer/Manager.
## Criteria
The 5 first criteria are compulsory for every evaluation. Other criteria as OECD-DAC criteria could be added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Source of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Relevance** | EQ1: To what extent the project has been relevant to EU policy X  
EQ2: How well do the objectives of the project correspond to the needs of the target group | JC1. Decision of the Commission should mention clearly the Specific Objective set out in the Instrument Regulation | % of Decisions that clearly mention the Specific Objectives of the Instrument | Primary data: collection of data and analysis of the frequency with which Specific Objectives of the Instrument Regulation are mentioned in the FPI Action Decisions | FPI Action Decisions |
| **Effectiveness** | EQ3: To what extent have the objectives of the project been achieved?  
EQ4: To what extent can the foreseen changes be credited to the intervention | | | | |
| **Efficiency** | EQ5: To what extent are the costs involved justified, given the changes which have been achieved? | | | | |
| **Coherence** | EQ6: etc | | | | |
| **EU added value** | | | | | |
| **(Sustainability)** | | | | | |
Example: final evaluation of the IfS/IcSP support under Article 3 to Migration in beneficiary countries (2007-2016) – part of the evaluation matrix referring to the Relevance criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Source of data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 5 first criteria are compulsory for every evaluation. Other criteria as OECD-DAC criteria could be added.</td>
<td>Evaluators should list the Evaluation Questions (EQ) listed in the Terms of Reference or the EQ revised by them and listed in the Inception Report.</td>
<td>Evaluators should propose the judgement criteria they will use to assess the extent to which the Action evaluated is relevant, effective, efficient, coherent and has an EU added value.</td>
<td>What indicators evaluators will use to estimate that the judgement criteria are met or not?</td>
<td>What kind of data contractors need to feed the indicators? Does this data have to be created or already exist?</td>
<td>What are the sources of data? e.g: FPI monitoring system, final reports, audit reports, list of training attendees, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>To what extent have the objectives of IfS and IcSP article 3 interventions in the field of migration been consistent with the overall long term policy of the EU, taking into account their nature of short term rapid response instruments? To what extent where they relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries related to the effects of sudden population movements?</td>
<td>JC 1.1 Alignment between the objectives set out in the financing decisions and EU policies and regulations</td>
<td>1.1.1.1 % of IfS/IcSP interventions in line with the objectives described in EU policies in the field of migration</td>
<td>Creation of a database of IfS/IcSP interventions in the field of migration, listing of the objectives mentioned in each interventions and comparison with the objectives of the EU policy in the field of migration for I.1.1.1 and to the IfS/IcSP Regulations objectives for I.1.1.2. Primary data to be created</td>
<td>Analysis of Documents/data • A European Agenda on Migration • Lives in Dignity: from Aid-dependence to Self-reliance Forced Displacement and Development • Addressing the Refugee Crisis in Europe: The Role of EU External Action • Establishing a new Partnership Framework with third countries under the European Agenda on Migration • UNHCR data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JC 1.2 Extent to which the design of financing decisions respond to the needs and capacities of the beneficiary countries, stakeholders, and partners</td>
<td>1.1.2.1 % of IfS/IcSP interventions that have identified the needs of beneficiaries, stakeholders and partners during the design phase</td>
<td>For I.1.2.1. Identify the number of IfS/IcSP interventions that mention having done needs identification with beneficiaries, stakeholders and partners during the design phase. Compare this number to the list of IfS/IcSP interventions in the field of migration. Same for I.1.2.2. but with consultation in the field. Primary data to be created</td>
<td>Analysis of Documents/data • IfS/IcSP decisions • IfS/IcSP project descriptions and other contractual documents • IfS/IcSP project progress/final reports &amp; independent evaluations interviews • EU Delegations • EC HQ officials • Project stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.2.5.4.3 Drafting of a Desk Report by the evaluators

The Desk Report should provide a state of play of where evaluators are in terms of implementing the evaluation methodology described in the Inception Report.

The Desk Report provides a first analysis of the data collected and lists the hypothesis, assumptions or findings that evaluators are already able to formulate. The Desk Report should also lists the existing data gaps and propose additional tasks to be carried out and/or additional evaluation tools to be implemented to fill in these gaps.

Finally, the Desk Report should present the data collection and analysis strategy for the field phase.

In the Desk Report, evaluators should compare or confront the faithful Intervention Logic described in the Inception Report with the reality on the ground. It can happen that the faithful Intervention Logic differs significantly from the implementation reality. In such a case, a second Intervention Logic should be drafted specifically for learning purposes. This second Intervention Logic should be validated during the field phase and included as part of the final report by the evaluators.

11.2.5.4.4 End of Desk phase meeting

It is recommended to have a face-to-face meeting with the evaluators (or at least the team leader) at the end of the Desk phase to have a presentation on the information mentioned in the Desk Report in order to:

- verify if the preliminary findings make sense (for the Project Manager, the EEAS, and other stakeholders);
- provide additional information to the evaluators (political background, "off-the-record aspects");
- delve deeper in the field phase (methodology, work plan, logistical aspects).

11.2.5.5 Field phase (phase 2)

11.2.5.5.1 Implementation of the field phase

Evaluators implement the field phase work plan agreed during the Desk phase. In case several missions are foreseen, the first mission could be used to test the methodology proposed to collect and analyse the data.

The role of the Evaluation Officer/Manager during this phase is limited; she/he will mainly help the evaluators on the ground by facilitating contacts with HQ, EUD or stakeholders.

11.2.5.5.2 Debriefing meeting

The Evaluation Officer/Manager can organise a debriefing meeting with ISG members and the evaluators. It is recommended to do so if evaluators visit several countries and if the data collected and presented in the Desk Report were weak. The meeting allows for a direct feedback on the quality of the data collected in the field and if the new data corroborate the data already collected and analysed during the Desk phase.
11.2.5.6 Synthesis phase (phase 3)

During this phase evaluators will gather the information collected during the evaluation, consolidate the findings and propose a Final Report to FPI.

The Evaluation Officer/Manager receives a draft Final Report (see Annex 4 for a template) from the evaluators and undertakes a Quality Assessment (EVAL module proposes a Quality Assessment Grid to do so) of all the material received. The Quality Assessment can be discussed with the ISG and further with the evaluators during a formal meeting. If necessary, the evaluators revise the draft version and propose a final one. The final version should be Quality Assessed and formally approved by the Evaluation Officer/Manager.

Generally, evaluators are asked to present their findings, conclusions and recommendations during a meeting in HQ or in EUD. It could be relevant to invite key stakeholders to participate to this meeting.

If the evaluation is a mid-term evaluation or if the Action evaluated will lead to a second phase or to a new Action, it could be relevant and appropriate that evaluators propose an 'improved' version of the Intervention Logic.

11.2.5.7 Dissemination and follow-up phase (phase 4)

11.2.5.7.1 Dissemination

The aim of an evaluation is to provide input for the decision making process, to improve the Action management process and the results of (future) EU intervention (learning from past experience), it allows for accountability and transparency.

In this vein, the evaluation final report should be fully accessible to the public and as a minimum, to the main stakeholders involved in the Action evaluated.

A dissemination plan could be foreseen explaining how and to whom the evaluation should be addressed. This plan could include the following means:

FPI EVAL module – all evaluation reports are uploaded by Evaluation Officers/Managers in this IT tool.

EU Bookshop – all final evaluation reports must be published on the EU Bookshop and should respect the European Commission visual identity. A formal request has to be sent to the Publication Office (OP) of the European Commission following the link: https://dempub.publications.testa.eu/ in order to obtain an ISBN number and to publish the final report.

For sensitive evaluations, the FPI Unit in charge of the evaluation should stress to the OP when sending the evaluation report, that it is a non-public document.

---

132 See the Application of the European Commission’s visual identity on studies and publications on https://ec.europa.eu/info/resources-partners/european-commission-visual-identity_en
11.2.5.7.2 Follow-up

The Evaluation Officer/Manager should list the recommendations provided in the Final Report and draft a follow-up plan indicating what corrective measures will be taken, who will implement them and when.

11.2.6 FPI evaluations repository

All evaluations funded by FPI since 2014 (start of the current Multiannual Financial Framework) will be available on the EVAL module (see: 11.2.5.1 EVAL module).

11.3 Further reading on M&E

On monitoring

Better Regulation toolbox – tool #41: monitoring arrangements and indicators.

On evaluation

Evaluation methodology (used by DEVCO, FPI and NEAR):

New guidance towards gender-sensitive evaluations, developed by joint DEVCO-NEAR-FPI working group, June 2018113.


11.4 Be trained!

On monitoring

Secretariat General - Ariane II – Better Regulation Pillars - Objectives, Indicators and Monitoring (data collection, measuring performance)

DEVCO - Strengthening project and programme Monitoring

NEAR - Managing for results: linking planning/programming, monitoring and evaluation

On logical framework and indicators

DEVCO - LFA & Indicators – Logical Framework Approach and Indicators for the results measurement of programmes and projects

On evaluation

Secretariat General - Evaluation Module 1: Evaluation and its use in the Commission

Secretariat General - Evaluation Module 2: Managing the Evaluation Process

Secretariat General - Evaluation Module 3: Evaluation methods and tools

DEVCO - Tools and methods to manage an evaluation process

DEVCO - The Logical Framework Approach (LFA), Indicators and Evaluation

DEVCO - EVAL module: classroom course in Headquarters

DEVCO - EVAL module: virtual classroom for Delegations and Regional Teams
12 Reporting

12.1 Reporting on the implementation of Actions (programmes, projects)

The reporting in the framework of an Action, whether this Action is a programme or a project, refers to the Monitoring & Evaluation phase. Reporting is one of the tools available to feed the monitoring system that should exist to monitor the Action. Please refer to the paragraph 11.1. 'Monitoring' for additional guidance.

12.2 Annual Activity Report

Purpose:

The Annual Activity Reports (AARs) of the Authorising Officers by Delegation (AOD) are a key component of the accountability chain. They are the basis for the Annual Management and Performance Report (AMPR), in which the Commission takes overall political responsibility for the management of the EU budget. For that reason, the responsible Commissioners are informed of the main elements of the AAR, including any possible reservations, before they are signed by the AOD.

The AAR serves three purposes:

- It provides an annual account of the progress towards the achievement of key policy objectives by reference to the objectives set in the FPI Strategic Plan 2016-2020, taking into account the resources used. This includes an overall assessment of the extent to which the operational expenditure authorised contributes to the achievement of the EU policy objectives and generates EU added value.
- It is a management report of the Director-General to the College of Commissioners. It covers all management and internal control aspects, such as the risks associated with the operations performed, the use made of the resources provided and the efficiency and effectiveness of internal control systems. This includes an overall assessment of the costs and benefits of controls.
- It includes a formal declaration of assurance that the reported information presents a true and fair view; that the resources have been used for their intended purpose, on sound financial management and on compliance (legality and regularity) of financial operation. If necessary, the declaration may be qualified with reservations.

The report is intended to present and analyse the available evidence to convincingly reply to the following questions in an objective manner:

- Has the DG/Service delivered the expected outputs and results for the reporting year? Is it on course to meet its long-term policy, programme and operational objectives? What are the risks that threaten the achievement of the objectives? What are the challenges to be faced which may influence the objectives? Has management taken appropriate measures to reasonably ensure that, despite these risks, the objectives are to be met?
- Are the internal control and management systems working adequately, as intended? Is the performance of the internal control systems regularly assessed and reviewed?
- In particular for financial management, does management have reasonable assurance that the internal control systems ensure the achievement of the internal control objectives; i.e. compliance with the applicable contractual and regulatory provisions, sound financial...
management, prevention and detection of fraud, reliability of reporting, safeguarding of assets and information; and that the resources are used for their intended purpose?\textsuperscript{134}

Who?

FPI.\textsuperscript{1} receives the instructions and the template to fill in from SG, adapts instructions and template to FPI needs and specificities and drafts a Note to the Head of Units to be signed by FPI Director, Head of Service. FPI.\textsuperscript{1} coordinates the contribution of each Unit and sends the final version to SG via the portal \url{https://myintracomm-collab.ec.europa.eu}.

When?

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Tasks & Date \\
\hline
- Each DG with N-1 reservations provides a short written state-of-play on the remediation of its reservations, which will be consolidated by SG and BUDG for the Corporate Management Board (CMB). & Mid-December N-1 \\
DGs that consider issuing new N reservations and/or lifting previous reservations inform the SG and DG BUDG. Informal coordination meetings may be organised, either bilaterally or by groups, as part of the preparation of the peer reviews in March. & Mid-January N+1 \\
The IAS contribution to the 2016 AAR, the limited conclusion of the Internal Auditor, is submitted to every DG and EA\textsuperscript{135} and a copy is sent to SG BUDG AAR SUBMISSIONS AND HELPDESK. & Mid-February N+1 \\
DGs upload their draft AAR (which is not signed) to the collaborative workspace. & End-February N+1 \\
Peer review meetings are organised on section 2.1. The central services provide feedback on the draft AARs promptly before the peer review meeting or, in case a peer review meeting is not organised, by 20 March at the latest – to which the related DG has to respond in advance of the final draft AAR. During this month the Director-General/Head of Service brings to the attention of the responsible Commissioner(s) the main elements of his/her draft AAR. & March N+1 \\
DGs upload their final AAR (signed) to the collaborative workspace. & End-March N+1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Final and published AARs are published on FPI Intranet:


12.3 Programme Statements

Purpose:

The Programme Statements (PS) are working documents prepared for each FPI instrument ahead of the budget hearings in DG BUDG which take place in March. The final versions of each Programme Statement are attached as technical annexes to the Draft Budget in support of the Commission

\textsuperscript{134} From 'Instructions for the preparation of the 2016 Annual Activity Reports', paragraph 1.1.

\textsuperscript{135} Some EAs may require this IAS contribution sooner than 15 February. See however also the next footnote.
requests for the annual budget allocations for the operational expenditure. Programme Statements are accessible to the public on an annual basis. They are also read with interest by the Court of Auditors.

Programme Statements provide information according to Article 41 of the Financial Regulation\(^{136}\), encompassing both the ex-post information on programmes’ performance and ex-ante estimations in terms of future outputs and results. PS should allow addressing the following questions:

- Why and on what is the EU budget spent?
- What is the added value of programmes for which the money is spent?
- How the EU budget contributes to the main EU policies and objectives (e.g. the Sustainable Development Goals – SDGs)
- What are the spending programmes’ objectives, targets, and outputs? How are we progressing with the achievement of these objectives?
- How are appropriations spread across and within the spending programmes?

Growing attention is paid to the performance of programmes and to the results and impacts foreseen and achieved. This gives a major role to the PSs which are the main source of information for the Annual Management and Performance Report (see 12.4. ‘Annual Management and Performance Report’).

It is therefore of utmost importance to ensure the quality, coherence and reliability of the information provided in the PS and in other reporting documents. However, the Programme Statement narrative on performance should remain focused on spending and on results concretely achieved while explaining any divergences, as necessary.

The whole structure of PS remains stable but is adapted every year requiring updates on the performance of each FPI instrument and updates on the performance information and mainstreaming data (SDGs, Rio Markers, G-Markers under the Gender Action Plan – GAP II).

Who?

FPI.1 receives the instructions and templates from DG BUDG, adapts instructions to FPI needs and drafts a Note to the Heads of Operational Units for the signature of the Head of Service/FPI Director. FPI.1 coordinates and edits the contributions of each Unit and ensures that the draft PSs are approved by the Head of Service upstream before they are uploaded in Badgebud. After the FPI budget hearing, DG BUDG and SG send their comments in writing. FPI.1 coordinates the preparation of the final versions with the Operational Units and uploads the final version of PS in Badgebud.

\(^{136}\) See more on BudgWeb:
When?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DG BUDG circulates the budgetary instructions to DGs for the preparation of the Draft Budget N+1 including the Programme Statement (PS)s</td>
<td>January N-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGs upload their <strong>draft PS</strong> in Badgebud</td>
<td>Mid-February N-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Hearings of individual DGs where the draft PS are discussed <em>inter alia</em>. DG BUDG and Sec Gen circulate written comments to DGs on their draft PS</td>
<td>March N-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGs upload their <strong>final PS</strong> in Badgebud</td>
<td>April N-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12.4 Annual Management and Performance Report for the EU Budget

**Purpose:**

Annual Management and Performance Report (AMPR) combine both the earlier Article 318\(^{137}\) and the Synthesis\(^{138}\) reports in one document since 2016. It provides an overview of the performance, management and protection of the EU budget. It also explains how the EU budget supports the EU’s political priorities and describes the results achieved with the EU budget.

**Who?**

DG BUDG with SG coordinates the preparation and FPI contributes to the reporting on results achieved under Heading IV of the budget (Global Europe). The contribution is arranged by FPI Instrument and includes examples with budget figures, where available.

**When?**

DG BUDG circulates the requests for contribution in March/April N+1 with a view to finalise and adopt the Report by June N+1. However, the Secretariat General (SG C1) ensures the consistency of all contributions received for AMPR and in coordination with DG BUDG, takes the editorial decisions on what to include in the final AMPR.

---

\(^{137}\) Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the evaluation of the Union’s finances based on the results achieved. This report was based on the Article 318 of the TFEU that stated the obligation of the EC to report on the results achieved to the EP and the Council.

\(^{138}\) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European economic and social Committee and the Committee of Regions on the Annual Synthesis of the Commission’s management achievements. This report was based on the article 317 of the TFEU that stated the obligation of the EC to report on its responsibility regarding EU budget implementation.
12.5 Annual report on the implementation of the European Union’s instruments for financing external actions

Purpose

The Annual Report (AR) on the implementation of the European Union’s Instruments for financing external actions (EFIs) is a Report from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament. This public report consists of a Commission report to the Parliament and the Council of about 10 pages, translated in all 23 languages accompanied by a Staff Working Document (SWD) of about 400 pages including its annexes of Financial Tables, only in English in plain text.

The AR is produced each year and its objective is to fulfil legal obligations on reporting in line with Article 13 of the Common Implementing Regulation (CIR 139) but also to provide a detailed overview of EU policies to stakeholders and partners as well as the wider European and global public.

It has become an important tool in the Union’s efforts to strengthen accountability, transparency and result-orientation, as recognised by the Council.

The Council’s Working Group on Development (CODEV) requests a presentation on and discussion of the contents of the AR with Commission services. The Presidency subsequently drafts Council Conclusions on the AR in consultation with the Commission which are adopted by year end. These Council Conclusions form the basis upon which to plan and develop the structure and substance of the AR for the subsequent reporting year.

Who?

The preparation is coordinated by DG DEVCO and FPI is a contributor alongside all other the RELEX family services.

The Annual Report is reviewed by a Contractor/Editor with precise guidance from Commission services.

When?

DG DEVCO circulates the requests for contribution in March/April N+1 with a view to finalise and adopt the Report by September N+1 and present it to the Council before the end of year N+1.

Where?


139 Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union’s instruments for financing external action.
12.6 Annual report on the Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GAP II)

Purpose:

As of 2016, EC DGs and services must report annually on the implementation of the SWD Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment: Transforming the Lives of Girls and Women through EU External Relations 2016-2020. This document provides (in Annex 1) a set of indicators that FPI should use to assess the extent to which gender has been or is being mainstreamed in FPI activities and interventions at all levels. This reporting exercise is also known as GAP II – Gender Action Plan, Phase II.

Who?

DEVCO coordinates the reporting exercise for the RELEX family. FPI gathers the relevant information on FPI activities using the respective contribution of each FPI Unit and presents it in line with instructions received upstream from DEVCO B1.

When?

The timeline for the 2018 GAP report will be the same as the preceding one: slight revision of templates with participation of the network of Gender Focal Points’ testing during September-October 2018. The official launch of the call for submissions of contributions in January 2019. The Member States Gender Expert Network is requested to report in January 2019 via e-mail as well as via CODEV.

The deadline for sending the contributions to the report is 30 March 2019.

The Commission reports to the Council and the Parliament on the implementation of GAP II on annual basis in relation to all activity under Heading IV.

---

Lexicon

A

**Action**: is 'a set of financial, organisational and human resources mobilised to achieve, in a given period of time, an objective or set of objectives, with the aim of solving or overcoming a problem or difficulty affecting targeted groups'. The word 'Action' usually encompasses programme and project.

**Action Work Plan**: the AWP is a Gantt chart. It is also called 'schedule' of the Action. It shows in a calendar when the activities will be implemented during the timeframe of the Action, it shows also the link between different activities and the duration of each activity.

**Activity**: is a specific task or set of tasks put in place to generate outputs.

**Assumption**: hypotheses about factors or risks which could affect the progress or success of an action

**Attribution**: is when the results of an Action can be directly attributed to the Action itself. The identification of a causal link between observed (or expected) changes and a specific action. Attribution refers to that which is to be credited for the observed changes or results achieved. See also 'contribution'.

B

**Baseline**: starting point of the Action. A baseline provides information on the situation the action aims to change. It provides a reference point for assessing changes and expected results, as it establishes a basis for comparing the situation before and after the Action. Normally, each indicator would have a baseline quantitative value but qualitative or descriptive baselines can also exist.

C

**Contribution**: is when the results cannot be directly attributed to the Action funded by FPI because other factors can influence the achievement of results such as other funding bodies, other projects, local partners, etc. Within the EC, it is considered that above output level, outcome and impact are contribution and not attribution.

**Core indicator**: core indicators monitor and assess the Results achieved in a specific sector or area of intervention (EOMs, disarmament of ex-combatants, enhancement of EU bilateral, regional, inter-regional, and multi-lateral cooperation partnership strategies, reinforcement of policy dialogue, security sector reform, border management, peace building and governance, etc.). They are used to monitor Actions. Core indicators have been created by FPI HQ and EUDEL, have been quality checked (RACER criteria) and approved by HQ. They have a specific indicator description fiche.

**Corporate indicator**: corporate indicators are indicators that monitor FPI achievement as an EC Service. They monitor FPI Strategic Plan 2016-2020 implementation and the extent to which FPI is achieving the Objectives described in the FPI Intervention Logic and in the FPI Results Framework. They can also be used to monitor an Instrument.
**Customised indicator:** when corporate and core indicators do not fit with an Action, Project Managers and/or Implementing Partners can create their own indicator to monitor their Action, which is to be approved by the Quality Manager at the HQ. These indicators are called 'customised' indicators.

**D**

**Deliverable:** Another word for output.

**E**

**Effect:** in Better Regulation 'effects' are composed of output, results and impact. 'Effect' refers to 'Result' in OECD-DAC and RELEX family terminology. Effects can be seen as the changes the EU intervention is expected to produce in short, medium and longer term.

**EU Intervention:** is used to encompass each type of action (policy, instrument, programme, project, etc.) that the Commission can implement and/or fund. The word 'intervention' joined with the acronym EU, so 'EU intervention' is now in current use. These 2 letters highlight the fact that it is not only an EC intervention but, because of the decision making process (involvement of the Commission, the Parliament and the Council) an EU intervention. It allows also including other EU bodies, as the EEAS or the EU agencies as a full part of the programming or implementing phases of an intervention.

**Evaluation:** the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed EU intervention, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and added value.

Evaluation is different from monitoring in terms of depth, scope and purpose. Evaluations are usually more in-depth than monitoring and often involve the search for evidence-based progress towards the outputs, outcomes and impact.

**Evaluation Officer:** FPI Staff specialised in evaluation.

**Evaluation Manager:** Project Manager in charge of launching and managing an evaluation.

**Evaluator:** external consultant in charge of evaluating FPI interventions.

**Ex-ante evaluation:** is a process that supports the preparation of a new EU intervention (programmes and activities) ‘and shall be based on evidence on the performance of related programmes and activities and shall identify and analyse issues to be addressed, the added value of the Union involvement, objectives, expected effects of different options and monitoring and evaluation arrangements’[^141]. Its purpose is to gather information and carry out analyses that help understand the context, assess the needs, define a strategy, draft the objectives of the future EU intervention. Ex-ante evaluations are compulsory for any proposal or initiative submitted to the legislative authority by the Commission, the High Representative or by a Member State (Financial Regulation Art. 34 and 35).

[^141]: Financial Regulation Chapter 7 Article 34.2.
Retrospective evaluation: take place one to two years after an Action has closed and should focus on the impact and sustainability of a given Action and draw conclusions that may inform other Actions or feed the monitoring system at an upper level (Instrument or Policy level for example).

Final evaluation: takes place at the operational closure of an Action and should contribute to accountability by providing an assessment of the results achieved. It should also identify any key lessons learned that would lead to improved future Actions in the country/region/sector of operation and/or elsewhere.

General Objective: objectives identified at European Commission level. They mainly refer to the President Juncker's 10 priorities. The main General Objectives FPI is contributing to is Priority number 9: the EU as a global actor. See part 4 of this Manual.


Impact: is the long term result of the Action expected to be achieved in the social, economic and environmental global context involving other stakeholders. Impacts are in the sphere of indirect influence of the intervention.

Implementing Partner: private or public body in charge of the implementation of the totality or a part of an EU intervention. In some cases Implementing Partners could also be in charge of the identification/ formulation phase.

Indicators: quantifiable or qualitative variables or factors that can be observed, in order to provide reliable information to assess / measure performance and change, or progress towards the achievement of outputs, outcomes and impact over time.

Input: the political, technical, and financial and human resources used for the FPI action.

Instrument: set of actions put in place to implement an EU policy (or a part of it).

Interim evaluation: see mid-term evaluation.

Inter-service Steering Group (ISG): also called Reference Group in some Framework Contracts, the ISG is the decision and follow-up body of the evaluation. The ISG could also be used to analyse the proposals submitted by evaluation companies.
Intervention: see EU Intervention.

Kick-off meeting: first meeting organised by the Commission or by an Implementing Partner to officially start the implementation of an EU intervention.

Logical Framework: Project Management tool used in the design and implementation of FPI Actions. It shows the logical link from an Action's input to its output and, subsequently, to outcome and impact.

Mid-term evaluation: (or interim evaluation): performed towards the middle of the period of implementation, should focus on progress to date and provide recommendations on how to improve the Action in order to achieve the stated objectives, taking into account problems and opportunities. It could serve to prepare a new intervention(s). It can encompass both forward and backward looking perspectives.

Monitoring: a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.

Need (or Needs): is a problem or difficulty affecting concerned groups, which the Action aims to solve or overcome.

Objective: result that the Action aims to achieve in the future.

Operational Objective: during the identification and formulation phases, Operational Objectives are the outputs the Action expects to produce.

OPSYS: Operational information System of the European Commission; it supports the operational, legal and financial management of all FPI interventions.

Outcome: is the short term result of an intervention expected to be achieved in the social, economic and environmental area (of the intervention) and/or on direct addressees of the intervention. Other external factors and players also influence the area and addressees. Outcomes are in the sphere of direct influence of the intervention.
**Output**: is the direct product of activities, produced or accomplished with the resources allocated to an intervention. Outputs are in the sphere of control of the intervention.

**Overall Objective**: during the identification and the formulation phases, Overall Objectives are the impact the Action expects to reach.

**Policy**: objective(s) defined by a public body in a specific sector.

**Problem**: see need.

**Programme**: group of related projects managed in a coordinated way to generate results.

**Project**: group of activities managed in a coordinated way to generate results.

**Project Manager**: FPI staff (at Headquarters, Regional Teams or EU Delegation) who is responsible for an Action’s management and overseeing its implementation.

**Reference Group**: see Inter-service Steering Group (ISG).

**Result**: the results of an Action are the expected changes the Action should produce, they encompass the output, outcome and impact (see Common Implementing Regulation No 236/2014 § (12))

**Results chain**: the causal sequence for an intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve the desired results. It starts from inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes and impacts. This is the ‘translation’ of the Intervention Logic which is formulated with objectives into a logical results sequence.

**Specific Objective**: during the identification and the formulation phases, Specific Objectives are the outcomes the Action expects to reach.

**Target**: indicates the desired result for a given indicator at the end of the action and beyond.

**Triangulation** is the combined use of theories, sources or types of information, or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment. Triangulation is a technique mainly used for evaluation and needs assessment.

**U - Z**
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\(^{142}\) Use strongly recommended also for the CFSP operations.

\(^{143}\) Obligatory use; except for actions under Administrative Support budget lines (ex-BA) and EUSRs.
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Annex 7: List of core indicators for IcSP
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Annex 11: Interim Report – see PRAG

Annex 12: Final Report – see PRAG
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Annex 17: Interim Report – see PRAG

Annex 18: Final Report – see PRAG

EOM

Annex 19: List of core indicators for EOM

---

145 The list of templates covers only Instrument-specific templates and is to be complemented by compulsory/recommended templates.
146 Pending finalisation after receipt of BUDG comments.
147 PRAG to be reviewed by DEVCO in September 2018.
148 To be drafted.
149 [Link](#) to DEVCO Intranet.
150 PRAG to be reviewed by DEVCO in September 2018.
Annexes: C. List of recommended templates

Annex 20: Meeting agenda
Annex 21: Minutes of Meeting
Annex 22: SWOT analysis
Annex 23: Risk Matrix
Annex 24: Stakeholders Importance-Influence Matrix
Annex 25: Stakeholders Matrix
Annex 26: Action Work Plan
Annex 27: Action Charter
Annex 28: Action Status Report
Annex 29: Action-End Report