

## FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

| 1. Indicator Name and Code   |
|--|
| <p><b>Number of supported individuals who feel they have successfully integrated into community life</b></p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 10068297</p>  |
| 2. Technical Details   |
| <p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Number of individuals.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Cumulative (not annual).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an <b>Outcome</b> indicator. It would logically be associated with an outcome such as “Increased social cohesion (or psychosocial recovery, or community reintegration...) following displacement, violence, radicalisation, or social exclusion”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> Disaggregation can be mandatory or optional (i.e. where relevant / possible).</p> <p>Mandatory:</p> <p><b>By sex:</b> Female, Male, Intersex.</p> <p>Optional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>By Age group</b> (0-15; 16-24; 25-54; 55+).</li> <li>• <b>By Target Group:</b> Ex-combatants and family members; ex-radicalised individuals; refugees; internally displaced persons (IDPs); ethnic group; host communities; migrants; asylum seekers; communities hit or affected by disasters or conflicts; general population; others.</li> <li>• <b>By Country.</b></li> </ul>  |
| 3. Description   |
| <p>This indicator captures the <u>individual experience</u> of inclusion, belonging, social participation, and acceptance in a given social or geographic setting. It is especially relevant in interventions targeting returnees, ex-combatants, former extremists, migrants or displaced persons in fragile or post-crisis contexts. Because integration is experienced rather than objectively measured, <u>it requires a perception-based method</u>, typically through a structured survey.</p>   |
| 4. Calculation of Values and Example   |
| <p>The value of the indicator is calculated by counting the <u>number of supported individuals</u> who, through a structured data collection method (e.g. survey or interview), affirm that they feel successfully integrated into community life. Data collection must ensure adequate coverage of the supported individuals across relevant disaggregation categories (see above). The sample should be drawn in a transparent and consistent manner and be sufficiently diverse to reflect the different profiles of beneficiaries reached by the intervention.</p> <p><u>Technical definitions:</u></p> <p><b>Supported individual:</b> A person who directly benefits from the concerned EU/FPI-funded intervention and activity, e.g. psychosocial support, training, resettlement assistance, dialogue facilitation.</p> <p><b>Integration into community life:</b> The perceived ability to participate meaningfully and safely in social, cultural, economic and civic life (including “admin/bureaucratic integration”, e.g.: access to quality service or local government services), with a sense of acceptance and belonging.</p> <p><b>Feeling:</b> Refers to self-reported perception, not external assessments. It must be based on direct responses from beneficiaries.</p> |

**Successfully integrated:** A positive, non-neutral self-assessment of integration, using consistent criteria such as survey scoring or categorical responses (e.g. “agree” or “strongly agree” on [Likert-type statements](#)).

Counting Guidance:

- The survey question(s) must be **standardised and clearly linked to the concept of integration**. Examples include: “I feel accepted in the community where I live.” “I am able to participate in local activities without fear or discrimination.” “I have access to the same services as others.”
- **Thresholds** for “successfully integrated” should be defined in advance (e.g.  $\geq 4$  on a 5-point scale).
- In contexts where **direct surveys are sensitive**, proxy questions or triangulated qualitative methods -e.g. focus groups, key informant validation- may be acceptable, with justification.
- **Avoid double counting:** Each individual is counted only once per intervention, even if surveyed multiple times. If panel surveys are used, the latest data point should be reported.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is the individual verifiably supported by the concerned EU/FPI-funded intervention?
2. Was data collected using a structured and appropriate method (e.g. survey or validated interview)?
3. Are the questions and thresholds clearly defined and replicable?
4. Is double counting avoided, especially in repeated surveys or overlapping projects?
5. Are disaggregation levels applied consistently across all relevant categories (see above)?
6. Is the perception clearly attributable to the individual’s own assessment, not inferred?

Example:

As part of an EU/FPI-supported intervention to promote the reintegration of ex-combatants and displaced individuals in a post-conflict setting, 400 beneficiaries were selected for a structured perception survey. The sample included former members of armed groups, internally displaced persons, and members of host communities participating in social cohesion activities. The survey applied a 5-point Likert scale to assess perceived integration through questions on social acceptance, participation in community events, access to local services, and personal sense of belonging. Based on a predefined threshold (average score of all the responses per respondent is  $\geq 4$ ), 276 individuals were assessed as feeling successfully integrated. Total value to be reported: 276. Sex disaggregation is mandatory and should also be reported on.

## 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: Structured perception surveys conducted by implementing partners; individual interview forms; focus group summaries (as triangulation, not primary data); internal/external monitoring and evaluation reports; third-party assessments commissioned by the EU/FPI. Surveys must include demographic metadata to enable disaggregation. Tools should be archived and available for verification.

## 6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

Possible uses: To capture citizen-centred outcomes of reintegration, reconciliation or resettlement processes; to support gender-sensitive and age-sensitive programming; to inform the design of inclusive services and local dialogue processes.

Potential issues: Subjectivity: Perception may be influenced by external factors, e.g. media, peer expectations. Survey quality: Poorly designed tools may lead to unreliable data or social desirability bias. Access constraints: In fragile or post-conflict settings, some groups may be hard to reach (or even to identify). Standardisation challenge: Lack of a consistent definition of “successful integration” across contexts.