

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p>Number of a) individuals engaged in dialogues, community works or the provision of services for the community (economic, social, cultural, etc.) with the support of the EU</p> <p>OPSYS Code: 10068782</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 either an Output or an Outcome indicator, depending on the intervention's scope and associated result. In the first case, it would typically be associated with outputs such as "Enhanced community networking (or promotion) of civic dialogue". In the second case, it would be linked to outcomes such as "Increased social cohesion" or "Strengthened effective participation of communities in their diversity in peace building dialogues (or conflict resolution)".</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> Disaggregation may be mandatory or optional (i.e. where relevant / possible).</p> <p>Mandatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Type of policies, practices, and processes 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. • By Sex: Female, Male, Intersex. <p>Optional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Age Group. • By Country. • By Area: Rural; Urban; Other (e.g. peri-urban, isolated).
3. Description
<p>This indicator reflects both the reach of the intervention and its capacity to inspire sustainable, autonomous community action. It captures two dimensions: <u>Output dimension:</u> Individuals engaged in these activities with direct support from the intervention; <u>Outcome dimension:</u> Individuals mobilized independently, without direct support, as a result of the intervention's influence—demonstrating increased civic engagement and initiative. The right level of the indicator should be properly assessed <u>during the design phase</u>.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>The value of this indicator is calculated by counting each individual that has directly engaged in at least one eligible activity enabled by the EU-funded intervention or event influenced by it</p> <p><u>Technical definitions:</u> Dialogues: Structured conversations, consultations or mediations to address community issues, often related to peacebuilding, governance or development planning.</p>

Community works: Voluntary or organised collective actions improving local infrastructure, environment, public spaces, or solidarity initiatives.

Provision of services: Delivery of locally relevant services such as basic education, healthcare outreach, cultural or sports programmes, or social assistance.

Counting Guidance:

- **Basic counting rules:** Count individuals. If they participate in several activities, then classify under the most significant type for disaggregation by “Type of policies/practices/processes supported”. Do not count individuals from the implementing partner organisations [for Organisations, please use indicator 10068783]. If counting and reporting organisations engaged in the same types of activities, then use indicator 10068783.
- **Active participation:** To be included/counted, the individual must take a purposeful role in the activity, such as contributing ideas during dialogues, performing tasks in community works, or directly assisting in service delivery. Mere presence (e.g. attendance) or indirect benefit (e.g. receiving a service) does not qualify.
- **Attribution / Contribution:** Participation must be directly linked to the concerned EU/FPI intervention in both options: as an output or as an outcome indicator.
- **Evidence:** Participation records (e.g. attendance sheets with roles), activity reports with descriptions of engagement, or validated field observation.
- **Avoid double counting:** Count each individual only once per reporting cycle. Avoid counting again the same individual in different reporting cycles (e.g.: in year 1 and then again in year 2) and participating in more than one type of activity.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Have only individuals (not organisations) been counted?
2. Have individuals from implementing partner organisations been excluded?
3. Is there documented evidence of active participation?
4. Has active participation been verified, i.e. purposeful contribution to dialogue, community work, etc.?
5. Has the EU/FPI intervention's role been clearly established?
6. Has double counting been avoided?
7. Have disaggregation options been correctly applied?

Example (output dimension):

An EU/FPI-funded intervention to strengthen social cohesion and community participation was implemented in Country A and Country B during year Y. In Country A, 120 individuals took part in structured interfaith dialogues organised with the support of the intervention addressing local conflict and displacement; in Country B, 180 individuals engaged in community works implemented by the intervention focusing on restoring local cultural sites and organising inclusive public spaces. Additionally, 75 individuals in both countries contributed to the delivery of basic services such as literacy workshops, psychosocial support, and mobile health units. The total reported value for year Y is 375 individuals, disaggregated as follows: By Country: Country A (120), Country B (180), Joint (75); By Type of policies, practices, and processes supported: Interfaith dialogue (Country A), Cultural diplomacy (Country B), Basic service and related awareness (Joint); By Sex: Female (210), Male (150), Intersex (15); By Age group: 0–17 (35), 18 and over (340); By Area: Rural (160), Urban (180), Other (35). Such results were reported at the outputs level.

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: Attendance or participation records, project activity reports, logs of community activities, validation by external M&E missions/reports.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator is useful to demonstrate the community-level mobilisation and ownership that EU support enables. It is especially valuable in contexts of fragility, civic rebuilding, or where bottom-up service delivery is promoted.

Potential issues: Overestimation if passive participants are included. Ambiguity in defining “engaged” vs “beneficiary”. Inconsistent classification of types of community engagement. These can be mitigated through clear operational definitions and strong documentation.