FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code

Number of cases documented

OPSYS Code: 10068298

2. Technical Details

Unit of measure: Number of cases.

Type of indicator: Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Cumulative (not annual).

Level of measurement: This indicator can be used either at **Output or Outcome** level, depending on the intervention's objectives. Output example: "Increased capacity to handle human rights violations". Outcome example: "Improved advocacy efforts, judicial proceedings or policy reforms."

Disaggregation:

Mandatory:

- **By Gender-based approach:** Addresses gender-equality objectives and adopts gender-responsive methods, Assumes that men and women have the same needs and interests or does not consider gender approach.
- **By Case jurisdictions:** National jurisdiction, International jurisdiction, Outside judicial system, Others.
- **By Type of cases:** Human Rights violations, Gender-based violence, Ethnic discrimination, Organised Crime, Terrorism, Cybercrime, Electoral fraud, Torture, Crimes against Humanity / War crimes, Others, Fraud.

Optional: **By country.**

3. Description

This indicator measures the number of individual cases that have been formally documented by the EU/FPI intervention. It focuses on cases relevant to justice, human rights protection and accountability, covering areas such as violations of fundamental rights, criminal acts, and abuses of power. The indicator is applicable in contexts where documentation serves as an essential basis for evidence-based advocacy, legal action, transitional justice processes, or institutional reforms. It is especially relevant in fragile or conflict-affected settings where systematic recording of incidents contributes to accountability, victim support and long-term prevention of recurrence.

4. Calculation of Values and Example

The value of this indicator is calculated by counting the number of individual cases that have been formally documented through EU/FPI-funded interventions, in accordance with recognised procedures and standards.

Technical definition:

Documented case: Refers to an incident, event, or situation that has been formally recorded using established documentation protocols, such as inclusion in a validated database, preparation of a case file, or entry in a registry of verified cases.

Counting Guidance:

- **Basic counting rules:** Count each documented case only once during the intervention's cycle. Include only cases that are verified, formally recorded, and clearly attributable, at least in part, to the concerned EU/FPI intervention.

- **Classification:** Each case must be assigned to one Type of case based on its primary classification. If an incident could be classified under multiple types, select the category reflecting the most serious or relevant aspect.
- **Jurisdictions:** If a case is relevant to multiple jurisdictions (e.g., both national and international), count it as a single unit but record all applicable jurisdictions in the disaggregation.
- **Avoid double counting:** Do not count the same case multiple times across reporting cycles, locations, or classification categories.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Has the case been verified and supported by credible evidence or corroboration?
2. Is there formal documentation demonstrating the existence and classification of the case?
3. Is the case clearly attributable, at least in part, to the EU/FPI intervention's support or activities?
4. Has double counting been avoided within and across reporting periods?

Example:

In Year Y, an EU/FPI-funded project supporting transitional justice and accountability mechanisms in Country X documented the following cases: (i) 15 cases of Human Rights violations verified through triangulated witness testimonies and recorded in the project database; (ii) 6 cases of Gender-based violence formally documented in cooperation with local authorities and classified under the relevant type; (iii) 4 cases of Organised Crime with supporting evidence transmitted to competent national bodies. All cases were verified, documented, and attributed to the intervention. The total value to be reported is 25, disaggregated as follows: By Gender-based approach: Addresses gender-equality objectives and adopts gender-responsive methods: 12; Assumes same needs/interests or does not consider gender approach: 13; By Case jurisdictions: National jurisdiction: 18, International jurisdiction: 5, Outside judicial system: 2; By Type of cases: Human Rights violations: 15, Gender-based violence: 6, Organised Crime: 4.

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 Operational Manager (OM). Examples of data sources: Official case registries or databases maintained by the intervention or partner institutions; Formal case files containing evidence, testimonies, or corroborating documentation; Monitoring reports, verification assessments, or deliverables produced by implementing partners; Records of referrals or submissions to judicial or non-judicial mechanisms; Third-party evaluations or verification missions confirming the existence and classification of documented cases; Structured interviews or testimonies corroborated through cross-checking and documented in compliance with established procedures.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator supports monitoring of progress towards strengthening accountability, access to justice, and protection of fundamental rights. It can inform analysis of institutional capacity, documentation practices, and the impact of evidence collection efforts on broader transitional justice or legal reform processes.

Potential issues: Verification and attribution may be challenging in complex environments with multiple stakeholders or overlapping mandates. There is a risk of over-reporting if cases are counted based on preliminary allegations without sufficient corroboration. Conversely, under-reporting may occur if victims are reluctant to disclose information due to security concerns, stigma, or fear of reprisals. To mitigate these risks, reported cases should be substantiated by credible evidence, formally documented, and classified in line with standard protocols. Clear audit trails should be maintained to ensure consistency and accountability in reporting.