

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

| 1. Indicator Name and Code |
|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Number of cases reported</p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 10068915</p> |
| 2. Technical Details |
| <p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Number of cases.</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 is typically associated with results such as “Improved access to justice” or “Increased accountability for rights violations or criminal acts”.`</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> Disaggregation can be mandatory and optional (where possible / relevant):</p> <p>Mandatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By gender-based approach: Addresses gender-equality objectives and adopts gender-responsive methods; Assumes that men and women have the same needs and interests or don't know about the gender approach. • By case jurisdictions: National jurisdiction; International jurisdiction; Outside judicial system; Others. • By type of cases: Human Rights violations; Gender-based violence; Ethnic discrimination; Organised Crime; Terrorism; Cybercrime; Electoral fraud; Torture; Crimes against Humanity / War crimes; Others; Fraud. <p>Optional: By target group.</p> |
| 3. Description |
| <p>This indicator tracks the number of cases <u>submitted</u> to relevant entities capable of initiating follow-up action—whether through investigation, referral, or preparation for formal adjudication. It focuses on whether EU/FPI-supported interventions help surface incidents that require legal or institutional attention, particularly in settings where violations may be under-reported due to fear, stigma, or limited access to justice mechanisms.</p> |
| 4. Calculation of Values and Example |
| <p>The value of this indicator is calculated by counting the number of individual cases formally reported to relevant organisations or bodies with the authority to investigate, refer, or otherwise act upon the information provided.</p> <p><u>Technical definition:</u></p> <p>Reported case: Refers to any incident or situation that is formally <u>submitted</u> to a recognised entity with the capacity to receive and process case-related information for the purpose of assessment, investigation, referral, or resolution. This includes judicial authorities, national or international human rights mechanisms, law enforcement bodies, independent commissions, complaint handling offices, or verified civil society-led monitoring and referral systems. The entity must have either the mandate or demonstrated ability to initiate follow-up steps or transfer the case to a body that can do so.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic counting rules: Count each reported case once per reporting cycle. Only cases that were <u>documented and submitted</u> through a traceable mechanism should be included. Cases may be submitted by individuals, organisations, or groups, as long as the reporting is formally recorded. |

- **Verification:** Acceptable sources include official complaint logs, referral tracking systems, monitoring databases, incident reports, or written submissions to competent bodies. Anonymous reports may be included if they are recorded through a structured mechanism with sufficient traceability.
- **Attribution:** Count only those cases reported through mechanisms supported or facilitated by the EU/FPI-funded intervention.
- **Avoid double counting:** A case should not be counted more than once per cycle, even if referred to multiple entities. If the same case appears in multiple systems, it should be reported only once.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Has each reported case been submitted to a recognised body capable of taking follow-up action?
2. Is the reported case formally recorded and traceable in logs, databases, or documentation?
3. Does the report fall within the scope of the concerned EU/FPI-funded intervention?
4. Has each case been counted only once, regardless of the number of referrals or channels involved?
5. Were reporting mechanisms or systems used consistent, secure, and reliable during the period of data collection?

Example:

In Year Y, an EU/FPI-funded intervention in Country X supported a multi-stakeholder reporting mechanism for human rights and accountability cases. During the reporting period, 72 cases were submitted through the system. Of these: 20 involved gender-based violence, 12 related to electoral fraud, 10 concerned ethnic discrimination, 8 were classified as torture, and the remaining 22 addressed various types of organised crime and abuse of power. The value to be reported is 72 cases, disaggregated as follows: By gender-based approach: 45 cases were recorded through gender-responsive mechanisms, while 27 were processed through channels without a defined gender lens. By case jurisdiction: 38 cases fell under national jurisdiction, 15 under international mechanisms, 12 were handled outside the judicial system (e.g. traditional or independent commissions), and 7 were categorised as “others”. By target group (optional): Cases concerned actions affecting civil society organisations (21), human rights defenders (18), public officials (10), local communities (15), and others (8).

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 Operational Manager (OM). Examples of data sources: Case reporting logs or databases maintained by implementing partners or referral mechanisms; Official submission records from national or international authorities, complaint bodies, or human rights institutions; Referral tracking forms or follow-up records indicating that a case was submitted and registered; Monitoring reports from civil society organisations or field teams involved in incident documentation; Online or physical registries of complaints, where supported or facilitated by the intervention.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator supports monitoring of access to justice, institutional accountability, and reporting behaviour in sensitive or high-risk contexts. It is particularly relevant for capturing otherwise under-reported violations or criminal acts.

Potential issues: Risks include over-reporting due to duplicate or multi-channel submissions, and under-reporting in contexts with weak, inaccessible, or unsafe reporting systems. Attribution may be challenging when mechanisms are shared with non-EU actors. Mitigation requires reliable traceability, careful disaggregation, and contextual interpretation of reporting trends.