

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p>Number of processes, practices and policies of relevance for the EU that have been a) influenced</p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 10053740</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Number of processes, practices and policies.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Cumulative (not annual).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an Outcome indicator. It would logically be associated with an outcome such as “Improved (national or regional) governance, policies or decision-making practices”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> Disaggregation can be mandatory or optional (i.e. where relevant / possible).</p> <p>Mandatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Reform-sensitiveness: Linked to reform processes in the partner countries; Not linked to reform processes in the partner countries. • By Civil Society sensitiveness: That includes Civil Society concerns or recommendations; That don't include Civil Society concerns or recommendations. • By Gender-sensitiveness: Include gender equality objectives; Don't include gender equality objectives. • By type of policy, practice or process supported: Interfaith dialogue, Basic service and related awareness, Combating misinformation/disinformation, Promotion of Human Rights and Civic Rights, Combating GBV, Governance and planning process, Monitoring of policies and accountability, Mine action, Combating radicalisation, Protection, Emergency preparedness and response (including early warning systems), OECD Due Diligence Guidance, Conflict prevention and peace building, Kimberly process, Crisis management, Cultural diplomacy, Promoting the external dimension of EU policies, Integrated border security management, Transitional Justice, Anti-torture, Media freedom, Trade, People-to-people diplomacy, Electoral assistance, Regional partnerships, Other challenges of global concern, Related to the Europe 2020 strategy, Recommendations from regional and international oversight, Integrating the nexus between climate, environment and security/displacement/fragility, Demobilisation and reintegration, Cybercrime, Cybersecurity, Maritime security, Addressing CBRN risk mitigation, Others, Disarmament. <p>Optional: By country.</p>
3. Description
<p>This indicator measures the number of distinct policy, legal, institutional or procedural mechanisms that have been influenced as a result of an EU/FPI-funded intervention, in alignment with EU values or strategic priorities.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <p><u>Prevalence of GERP indicators:</u> Use this indicator <u>only</u> if GERP indicators do not include the concerned processes, practices and policies to be counted, i.e.:</p> <p>GERP 2.15: For <u>Trade, Investment and Business-related</u> processes or practices.</p> <p>GERP 2.29: For policies developed <u>with the participation of CSOs</u> (should meet the criteria set in the corresponding methodology note of the GERP).</p> <p>GERP 2.05: For <u>climate change or disaster risk reductions</u> (should meet the criteria set in the corresponding methodology note of the GERP).</p> <p><u>Chose the adequate FPI indicator:</u></p>

If the concerned processes, practices and policies of relevance for the EU have been **implemented** (i.e. beyond influenced"), then use FPI indicator 10053745.

4. Calculation of Values and Example

The value of the indicator is calculated by counting number of processes, practices and policies that have been influenced by the concerned EU/FPI intervention.

Technical definitions:

Process: A structured sequence of activities or steps designed to achieve a particular policy or operational outcome. These may include decision-making procedures, coordination mechanisms, implementation workflows, or multi-stakeholder dialogues.

Practice: Established ways of working, informal or formal, that shape how actors behave or interact in a given domain. These may be sectoral norms, professional routines, or community-based responses that are not necessarily codified.

Policy: Formal written documents adopted by public authorities that provide guidance, rules or frameworks for action in a specific area. Policies typically include goals, principles, and institutional responsibilities. Public policies are broadly defined and include government programmes, strategies and legislation at the national or sub-national level.

Counting Guidance:

- **Counting basic rules:** Each process, practice or policy should be counted once during the lifespan of the intervention.
- **Level of Influence:** Refers to a demonstrable contribution by the concerned EU/FPI intervention to the development, adaptation, implementation, improvement or formal endorsement of a specific process, practice or policy. Influence may occur at various stages: initiation, adoption, revision or implementation. If the concerned processes, practices and policies of relevance for the EU have been **implemented** (i.e. beyond influenced"), then use FPI indicator 10053745.
- **Verification:** Influence must be verifiable through documentation, e.g. policy drafts, meeting minutes, official adoption, references to EU inputs, etc. Influence should not be "assumed" from participation alone.
- **EU relevance:** The "process, practice or policy" must be of relevance for the EU, meaning it should reflect or contribute to EU strategic interests, values, or thematic priorities, e.g. governance, human rights, digital transition, gender equality, etc.
- **Avoid double counting:** Do not count the same "element" more than once within a reporting cycle, even if it evolves from a process (or practice) into a policy, or if it affects or impacts different sectors or geographic areas. Likewise, avoid counting again the same "element" in different reporting periods (e.g.: in year 1 and again in year 2).

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is there documented evidence supporting the influence?
2. Is the reported element relevant for EU strategic interests or priorities?
3. Has the influence been clearly attributed to the concerned EU/FPI intervention?
4. Is the influence demonstrable and not assumed from participation alone?
5. Has double counting been avoided, within the same or across different reporting cycles?
6. Have all disaggregation levels (mandatory and optional -if relevant) been reported?
7. Has it been confirmed that the element is not covered by a relevant GEF indicator?
8. Has it been confirmed that the element should not be covered by the FPI indicator 10053745, i.e. if "implemented" (as opposed to "influenced") is the main feature to consider?

Example:

An EU/FPI-funded intervention in region X aimed to strengthen institutional responses to community security challenges and promote human rights. The intervention led to the following two distinct "influences": The local police units began to apply new community engagement practices, including monthly dialogue sessions with civil society groups and minority representatives in Country A; and Country B adopted a national policy revised by the Ministry of Social Affairs on gender-based violence prevention to include monitoring responsibilities for women's organisations. The total reported value for year Y would be 2 (1 practice and 1 policy influenced),

disaggregated as follows: By Type of policy/practice/process supported: Protection (the practice), Combating GBV (the policy); By Country: Country A (practice), Country B (policy).

5. Data Sources

Reported values should derive primarily from the internal monitoring systems of EU-funded interventions. Data must be collected and reported by the implementing partner and verified by the OM. Examples of data sources: policy documents, meeting records, legal texts, implementation roadmaps, and external M&E missions/reports.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator is relevant for assessing EU influence on public governance systems and policy development. It supports results reporting for political dialogue, regulatory alignment, and technical cooperation.

Potential issues: Attribution may be difficult when multiple actors are involved. Clear documentation and narrative justification are necessary to ensure traceability of the EU/FPI contribution. Risk of overlap with GEF indicators must be managed carefully during reporting.