

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;">Number of networks, platforms, dialogues, or mechanisms set up or supported by the EU-funded intervention</p> <p>OPSYS Code: 10068896</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Number of entities.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Cumulative (not annual).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an Output indicator. It would logically be associated with outputs such as “Improved/Increased opportunities/networks for cooperation and joint action”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> Disaggregation can be mandatory or optional (i.e. where relevant / possible).</p> <p>Mandatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Type of membership: Civil society organisations; Private entities; Public entities; Multi-stakeholders; Others. • By Type of policies, practices, and processes supported: Regional partnerships; Addressing maritime security; Addressing challenges of global concern; Related to the Europe 2020 strategy; Recommendations from regional and international oversight mechanisms; Integrating the nexus between climate, environment and security/displacement/fragility; Integrating data-based climate risks; Related to the Kimberley Process; Integrated border security management; Addressing cybercrime; Addressing cybersecurity; People-to-people diplomacy; Addressing CBRN risk mitigation; Integrated border security management; Promoting Human Rights; Early warning systems. <p>Optional:</p> <p>By Country.</p>
3. Description
<p>This indicator captures efforts to promote structured engagement (including possible collaboration) among relevant stakeholders through formal or informal arrangements supported by the EU/FPI. It reflects the EU’s contribution to enabling sustained interaction, mutual learning, policy convergence, or operational coordination among actors engaged in a shared thematic or geographic area.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>The value of the indicator is calculated by counting the total number of distinct networks, platforms, dialogues, or mechanisms that meet the criteria of being either newly set up or actively supported by the concerned EU/FPI intervention.</p> <p><u>Technical definitions:</u></p> <p>Network: A structured group of actors regularly communicating and collaborating around a shared objective.</p> <p>Platform: A formalised space (physical or digital) for interaction, often thematic or policy oriented.</p> <p>Dialogue: A structured process of discussion or consultation among defined stakeholders.</p> <p>Mechanism: An operational process or system for coordination, implementation, or decision-making.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p>

- **Basic counting rules:** Count each distinct structure, including both newly created and pre-existing entities that received active support from the concerned EU/FPI intervention during the reporting period.
- **Type of support:** May include funding, facilitation, technical assistance, or formal endorsement.
- **Tracing:** Document the type of membership and thematic/policy focus.
- **Avoid double counting:** Each structure should be counted once per reporting cycle. It should not be counted again in the following reporting cycle, even if it “evolves or expands”, unless it becomes a clearly separate entity.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is the structure clearly defined (objective, membership, and functioning)?
2. Is the EU/FPI-funded intervention’s contribution documented?
3. Is the type of membership disaggregated (mandatory -and optional if relevant)?
4. Is the type of policy/practice/process supported clearly recorded?
5. Has double-counting been avoided?

Example:

A multi-country EU/FPI-funded intervention on environmental governance supported the creation of 1 multistakeholder platform on climate adaptation including public entities and CSOs (in Country A), 1 civil society dialogue mechanism on forest governance (in Country B), 1 public-private dialogue platform on sustainable trade (country A). The total reported value is 3 structures. Disaggregation is as follows: By Type of Membership: Multistakeholder: 1, Civil society organisations: 1, Public and private entities: 1; By Type of Policies/Practices: Integrating data-based climate risks: 1, Other: 2; By Country: Country A: 2, Country B: 1.

Note: In OPSYS, the comments box of the current value will specify the nature of the mechanisms supported and reported as “Other”.

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: terms of reference, activity reports, coordination minutes, memoranda of understanding, stakeholder lists, and external M&E missions/reports.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator is useful for tracking the operationalisation of inclusive processes, cooperation structures, and participatory mechanisms promoted by EU external action. It contributes to visibility, stakeholder engagement tracking, and thematic alignment.

Potential issues: Risk of overstatement if informal or inactive groups are counted. Double counting if evolving platforms are recorded multiple times. Mitigation measures include clear definitions, documentation, and a conservative counting approach.