

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;">Number of b) stakeholders applying or using resources, procedures or systems developed or promoted with EU support</p> <p>OPSYS Code: 10068785</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Number of stakeholders.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Cumulative (not annual).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an Outcome indicator. It would typically be linked to outcomes such as “Scaled institutional technical solutions or practices”; “Strengthened institutional systems”; “Enhanced institutional preparedness or response”, etc.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u></p> <p>Optional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Type of resource / procedure / system / tool: 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. • By Type of knowledge product: Studies; Learning tools; Guidelines; Draft regulations; Draft processes and Standard Operating Procedures; Others. • By Country. • By Target Group: 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.
3. Description
<p>The indicator focuses on behavioural uptake and practical implementation at institutional level, rather than passive receipt or exposure. It can apply across a wide range of thematic areas, such as climate-security, disinformation, public health, election integrity, crisis management, and media resilience. “Stakeholders” are defined here as <u>institutions or organisations</u> rather than individuals (as opposed to the FPI indicator 10068784, which must be used for counting “individuals”). These may include, but are not limited to, government bodies (central and local), CSOs, research institutions, international organisations, media organisations, private sector entities, and networks or platforms.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>The value is calculated as the number of institutional stakeholders 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>Technical Definitions:</u></p> <p>Resources: Knowledge or operational tools such as manuals, guidelines, digital platforms, or training materials, e.g. a toolkit for fact-checking misinformation.</p>

Procedures: Standardised steps or protocols guiding actions, often formalised as Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) or workflows, e.g. a response protocol for chemical threats.

Systems: Organised mechanisms combining tools, actors, and processes for a specific function, such as platforms or institutional frameworks, e.g. an early warning system for border security.

Counting Guidance:

- **Applying or using:** Refers to stakeholders/institutions that 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.
- **Only stakeholders/institutions** 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.
- **Avoid double counting:** The same stakeholder/institution should not be counted across similar actions within the same (or subsequent) reporting cycle/s.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is there evidence of actual usage/application, e.g. implemented procedures, signed declarations?
2. Is the link to EU/FPI-supported resources clearly documented?
3. Has double counting been avoided within the same reporting cycle?
4. Are optional (when relevant) disaggregation levels completed?

Example:

In an EU/FPI-funded intervention to strengthen institutional resilience against disinformation and security threats, six institutions (including electoral bodies, a public broadcaster, a central government ministry, and a CSO-led coordination platform) apply or use EU-supported resources. These include guidelines for detecting disinformation, automated fact-checking tools, a climate-security risk assessment system, and SOPs for CBRN response. The resources fall under multiple categories, such as Fact-checked and independent media content, Climate-security related, and CBRN risk mitigation. The knowledge products being used include Guidelines, Learning tools, Studies, and Draft processes and SOPs. Stakeholders belong to various target groups: Electoral Bodies, Media, Government staff at central and local levels, and Civil Society. Activities took place in three countries: A, B, and C. The values to be reported are 6 institutions applying or using EU-supported outputs, disaggregated as follows: Type of tool: 1 Fact-checked and independent media content, 1 Climate-security related, 1 CBRN risk mitigation, 3 Other; Knowledge product: 2 Guidelines, 1 Learning tool, 1 Study, 2 Draft processes and SOPs; Target group: 2 Electoral Bodies, 1 Media, 1 Government staff at central level, 1 Government staff at local level, 1 Civil Society; Country: 2 in country A, 2 in country B, 2 in country C.

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 at institutional level through 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).