

## FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

| 1. Indicator Name and Code   |
|--|
| <p><b>Number of a) individuals applying or using resources, procedures or systems developed or promoted with EU support</b></p> <p>OPSYS Code: 10068784</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 typically be linked to outcomes such as “Improved target groups’ practices”; “Strengthened systems”; “Enhanced preparedness or response”, etc.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation</u>: Disaggregation can be mandatory or optional (i.e. where relevant / possible).</p> <p>Mandatory:<br/> <b>By Sex (it applies to individuals)</b>: Female, Male, Intersex.</p> <p>Optional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>By Type of resource / procedure / system / tool</b>: Climate-security related; CBRN risk mitigation; Disinformation/misinformation-related; Maritime security related; Fight against money laundering and terrorist financing; Other - Fight against Organised Crime; Aviation security related; Countering radicalisation; Related to fair and free elections; Related to other democratic processes; Dual use technology; Resilience building; Others; Sustainable business model and strategy; Fact-checked and independent media content</li> <li>• <b>By Type of knowledge product</b>: Studies; Learning tools; Guidelines; Draft regulations; Draft processes and Standard Operating Procedures; Others</li> <li>• <b>By Country</b>.</li> <li>• <b>By Target Group</b>: 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; Others</li> <li>• <b>By Age Group</b>, e.g. 15–24; 25–64; 65+.</li> <li>• <b>By Satisfaction Level</b>, e.g. Very satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied.</li> </ul> |
| 3. Description   |
| <p>This indicator measures the number of individuals that actively apply or use resources, procedures, systems, or knowledge products that were developed or promoted with EU/FPI support. It focuses on behavioural uptake and practical implementation, rather than passive receipt or exposure. The indicator can apply across a wide range of thematic areas, such as climate-security, disinformation, public health, election integrity, crisis management, and media resilience.</p>  |
| 4. Calculation of Values and Example   |
| <p>The value is calculated as the number of individuals who verifiably apply or use a resource, procedure, system, or knowledge product developed or promoted with EU support during the reporting period.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Applying or using</b>: Refers to individuals who put into practice, implement, or operate a resource, procedure or system that was developed or promoted by the concerned EU/FPI intervention. This goes beyond passive participation or awareness and implies a deliberate and demonstrable action, e.g. attending a training session or receiving a document does not qualify unless followed by <u>actual use</u>.</li> </ul>   |

- **Only individuals** with documented application or usage should be counted.
- **Supporting evidence:** Can include user logs, completed forms, implementation reports, feedback surveys, system usage statistics, or observed practices.
- **Satisfaction Measurement (if applied):** If disaggregation by level of satisfaction is intended, data must be collected through a user feedback survey. The survey should target only individuals who have applied or used the resource, procedure or system. Options of surveys include full census (if the number of users is small and accessible); or representative sample (if the number is large or geographically dispersed), ensuring proportional coverage by sex, target group, and country where relevant. Survey instruments should use a standard satisfaction scale (e.g. Very satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied) and be implemented soon after the usage/application takes place. Comment in OPSYS the type or survey conducted and its potential limitations.
- **Avoid double counting:** The same individual should not be counted across similar activities from the same intervention within the same reporting cycle. Likewise, avoid counting the same individual in different reporting cycles (e.g. in year 1 and again in year 2).

#### Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is there evidence of actual usage/application, e.g. system access logs (to note that evidence in the form of likes or downloads or sign-in counts will not be sufficient to ascertain actual use), implemented procedures, signed declarations?
2. Is the link to EU/FPI-supported resources clearly documented?
3. If satisfaction data is reported, has a survey been conducted only among users, with clear methodology and disaggregation?
4. Has double counting been avoided within the same reporting cycle?
5. Are all mandatory and optional (when relevant) disaggregation options completed?
6. Was satisfaction or feedback collected and used when possible?

#### Example:

An EU/FPI-funded intervention implemented in four countries developed a digital platform for municipal actors to access real-time flood risk alerts and response protocols (classified under "climate-security related"). During the implementation period, 275 local and national officials across the four countries registered on the platform and used it to activate contingency plans or monitor live alerts. Verification was provided through system access logs and self-reporting forms submitted to national disaster response agencies. Disaggregated data showed 168 male and 107 female users, climate-security related, 200 from local/municipal level and 75 from national/central level, 32 of them were under the age of 30, and 100 were from country A, 82 from country B, 59 from country C, and 34 from country D. A satisfaction survey showed that 78% of users were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the usability and effectiveness of the system. The total reported value for year Y would be 275 individuals, disaggregated as follows: 168 male and 107 female, 200 from local/municipal level and 75 from national/central level, 32 under 30 y/o, 100 were from country A, 82 from country B, 59 from country C, and 34 from country D.

### **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: Monitoring systems of EU-funded interventions (e.g. digital usage data, implementation records); user reports or declarations; feedback surveys or satisfaction assessments; project reporting, including external evaluation reports; interviews or follow-up with beneficiaries.

### **6. Other Uses / Potential Issues**

This indicator is useful for measuring behavioural outcomes and practical adoption of EU-funded innovations. It is especially relevant for results dashboards, evaluations of technical assistance, and learning agendas focused on sustainability and impact.

Potential issues: Over-reporting of exposure without confirming actual use, and lack of clarity about what constitutes "application" (mitigation measures include triangulation of sources and clear criteria for usage). Survey limitations, e.g. satisfaction data may be biased if the survey sample is too small, non-representative, or includes non-users.