# FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

| 1. Indicator Name and Code |
|---|

**Number of b) organisations engaged in dialogues, community works or the provision of services for the community (economic, social, cultural, etc.) with the support of the EU**

OPSYS Code: 10068783

| 2. Technical Details |
|---|

Unit of measure: Number of organisations.

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

Level of measurement: This is either an **Output** or an **Outcome** indicator, depending on the intervention's scope and associated result. Typically linked to outputs such as "Strengthened civil society engagement" or outcomes such as "Improved service delivery through local actors".

Disaggregation: Disaggregation may be mandatory or optional (i.e. where relevant and possible).

Mandatory:
- **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 Target Groups:** Security/Armed Forces personnel, Electoral Body, Human Rights duty bearers, Government staff at the central level, Government staff at the local level, Civil Society, Ex-combatants, Media, Host-communities, Communities, Youth groups/members, Religious groups/members, Ethnic/language group members, Human Rights defenders, International bodies/mechanism, Women Organisation, Parliamentary Member, Judiciary Member, Professional Body, Researchers, Academy, Non-EU company, EU company, Migrants/IDPs/Refugees, Media target audience, Political Parties; Others.

Optional:
**By Country.**

| 3. Description |
|---|

This indicator reflects both the reach of the intervention and its capacity to inspire sustainable, autonomous community action. It captures two dimensions: Output dimension: Organisations engaged in these activities with direct support from the intervention; Outcome dimension: Organisations 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 during the design phase.

| 4. Calculation of Values and Example |
|---|

The value of this indicator is calculated by counting each organisation that has directly engaged in at least one eligible activity enabled by the EU-funded intervention.

Technical definitions:

**Dialogues:** Structured conversations, consultations or mediations to address community issues, often related to peacebuilding, governance or development planning.

**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 only organisations. Each organisation should be counted once per reporting cycle, even if it engages in multiple activities. Classify under the most significant activity for disaggregation. Do not count the implementing partner organisation/s. To count and report individuals engaged in the same types of activities, use indicator 10068782.
- **Active participation:** To be counted, the organisation must have played an active and documented role in the activity, such as co-organising dialogues, leading service delivery, or coordinating community works.
- **Attribution:** Participation must be directly linked to the concerned EU/FPI intervention, e.g. through funding, training, facilitation or equipment.
- **Evidence:** Participation must be supported by organisational attendance lists, activity reports, memoranda of understanding, or external validation.
- **Avoid double counting:** Count each organisation only once per reporting cycle. Avoid counting again the same organisation in different reporting cycles (e.g.: in year 1 and then again in year 2) and engaging in more than one type of activity.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Have only organisations (not individuals) been counted?
2. Is there documented evidence of <u>active</u> institutional engagement?
3. Has the EU/FPI contribution been clearly established?
4. Has double counting been avoided?
5. Have mandatory and optional (if relevant) disaggregation levels been correctly applied?

Example (outcome dimension):

Following an EU/FPI-funded capacity-building and awareness-raising intervention on interfaith dialogue and disinformation, several organisations <u>independently</u> initiated community-oriented activities. In Country A, 15 local religious associations and civil society groups began organising monthly interfaith dialogue sessions to defuse communal tensions. In Country B, 10 grassroots organisations—previously exposed to the project's training materials—launched independent media literacy campaigns targeting misinformation around elections. Although these activities were <u>not directly funded or facilitated</u> by the concerned EU/FPI intervention, they demonstrate its sustained <u>influence</u>. <u>The total value to be reported is 25 organisations.</u> Disaggregation by type of policies, practices and processes supported shows 15 under interfaith dialogue and 10 under combating misinformation/disinformation. By target group, 15 organisations targeted religious groups or members, 25 represented civil society, and 10 addressed media target audiences. Optional disaggregation by country includes 15 organisations in Country A and 10 in Country B. Such results were reported at the <u>outcomes level</u>.

| 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. <u>Examples of data sources:</u> 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 track the mobilisation and institutional engagement of diverse stakeholders in community development and service provision. It reflects the enabling role of EU interventions in enhancing organisational capacity, visibility and cooperation.

Potential issues: Inclusion of organisations that were only marginally involved or consulted. Inconsistent classification of organisations under target groups. Risk of double counting across components or years. These risks can be mitigated through consistent definitions, evidence requirements and rigorous validation.