

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 b) implemented</p> <p>OPSYS Code: 10053745</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, <u>policies</u> or <u>decision-making practices</u>".</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 captures tangible instances where supported actors have operationalised reforms or institutional changes — such as adopting new procedures, enforcing regulations, or applying agreed practices — as a result of EU-funded engagement. It focuses on implementation that demonstrates a shift from commitment to action, in line with EU priorities and values, particularly in governance, policy alignment, and rule of law contexts.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <p><u>Prevalence of GERP indicators</u>:</p> <p>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</u>-related 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> <p>If the concerned processes, practices and policies of relevance for the EU have not been implemented but <u>only influenced</u>, then use FPI indicator 10053740.</p>

4. Calculation of Values and Example

The value of the indicator is calculated by counting number of processes, practices and policies that have been implemented 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.
- **Implementation:** Includes operationalisation, enforcement, institutional uptake or application in practice. If the concerned processes, practices and policies of relevance for the EU have not been implemented yet, but only influenced, then use FPI indicator 10053740.
- **Verification:** Implementation must be verifiable through documentation, e.g. operational protocols, institutional reports, service delivery records, enacted legislation, documented procedures or formal agreements.
- **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 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 implementation, e.g. official protocols, enacted policies, monitoring reports, activity records?
2. Is the reported element relevant for EU strategic interests or priorities?
3. Has the implementation been clearly attributed to the concerned EU/FPI intervention?
4. Is the implementation demonstrable and not assumed from intent or design 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 GERF indicator (2.15, 2.29 or 2.05), which take precedence over this indicator?
8. Has it been confirmed that the element should not be covered by FPI indicator 10053740, i.e. if only “influenced” but not yet implemented?

Example:

An EU/FPI-funded intervention in Region Z supported the formal implementation of three mechanisms in different countries: In Country A, a national policy on disaster preparedness was officially adopted and operationalised through regional civil protection units; In Country B, local authorities institutionalised a previously piloted practice of community policing through standard operating procedures and annual budget allocations; In Country C, a conflict early warning process was formally launched and integrated into the national crisis response framework. The total reported value for year Y would be 3 (1 policy, 1 practice, and 1 process implemented), disaggregated as follows: By Type of policy/practice/process supported: Emergency

preparedness and response (policy), Protection (practice), Conflict prevention and peace building (process);
By Country: Country A (policy), Country B (practice), Country C (process).

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: implementation records, institutional procedures, performance reports, budget documents, enacted laws, or external M&E missions/reports.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator is relevant for assessing concrete and operational uptake of EU-supported governance mechanisms, standards and practices. It supports results reporting on institutionalisation, sustainability and regulatory impact.

Potential issues: Overestimation may occur if implementation is declared without operational evidence. Double counting or overlap with "influenced" indicators must be carefully checked. Verifiability and clarity in the scope of each reported element are critical.