

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p>Status of the national laws, policies, strategies, procedures and national mechanisms supported by an EU-funded intervention</p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 10070368</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Qualitative scale.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Qualitative; Norm-based; Actual (ex-post).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an Outcome indicator. It is typically used to measure results such as “Improved institutional frameworks” or “Increased legal and policy reform”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u></p> <p>Optional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By type of policies, practices, and processes supported. • By country.
3. Description
<p>This indicator tracks progress along the institutional and policy cycle for normative or procedural frameworks of strategic interest to the EU. It applies to a wide range of national instruments—such as laws, policies, strategies, and mechanisms—across sectors including governance, security, and human rights. The indicator is particularly relevant in interventions involving legal drafting, policy advice, strategic planning or implementation support. It helps assess how EU engagement contributes to institutional development, without evaluating the effectiveness or outcomes of the supported frameworks.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>This indicator is measured by assessing the status reached by each supported framework at the time of reporting, using the following qualitative scale: Not in existence, Under development, Developed, Approved / Adopted, Under implementation, Implemented, Improved. Each status reflects a distinct phase in the lifecycle of normative or institutional frameworks. The reported value must correspond to the most advanced stage verifiably reached during the reporting period.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic counting rules: Each framework should be assessed individually and counted once per reporting cycle. If the intervention supports a broader reform process involving multiple components, each component may be counted separately if it constitutes a distinct framework. The reported status must reflect verifiable progress, supported by documentary or institutional evidence (e.g. draft texts, approval records, implementation reports). If multiple items are supported under the same intervention, each should be listed and assessed separately. If several EU interventions contribute to the same framework, coordination is required to ensure joint reporting. • Assessment: The rating must be based on credible and dated documentation that confirms the current status. The assignment of a status should reflect the most recent milestone achieved. For instance: “Under development” applies when the drafting process has formally begun; “Approved/Adopted” applies only if the framework has been officially endorsed by the competent authority; “Implemented” requires that the provisions are operationalised; “Improved” applies when a previously existing framework has been strengthened, clarified or updated through EU support. Note: The scale is not strictly linear: in some

contexts, a framework may be “Under implementation” before being formally “Adopted”, particularly in iterative or informal policy environments.

- **Attribution:** Attribution to the concerned EU/FPI intervention must be substantiated. Support may include technical assistance, stakeholder consultation, capacity building, legal advice, or facilitation of policy processes.
- **Avoid double counting:** Each framework should be reported only once per reporting cycle. If a framework progresses from one status to another within the same period, only the most advanced status should be recorded. Disaggregation by country and by type of framework should avoid overlap or fragmentation of reporting.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is the framework clearly defined and distinct from other supported items?
2. Is the current status supported by recent and credible documentation?
3. Is the EU/FPI contribution to the process identifiable and plausible?
4. Has the framework been reported only once per cycle and under the correct disaggregation category?
5. If marked as “Improved”, does evidence show concrete changes from a prior version?

Example

In Year Y, an EU-funded action supported the revision of the national anti-trafficking strategy in Country X. Technical experts facilitated a multi-stakeholder consultation process and provided legal drafting support. By the end of the intervention, the revised strategy had been formally approved by the Ministry of Justice and published in the national gazette. Based on verifiable documentation and attribution to the EU-supported process, the reported value is: “Approved / Adopted”, disaggregated under “Strategy” and tagged for Country X.

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: Draft texts, legal proposals, policy documents, or strategic frameworks produced with EU support; Official records or gazettes confirming approval or adoption by competent authorities; Implementation reports, operational plans or institutional records demonstrating application or enforcement; Meeting minutes, stakeholder consultations, validation workshops or technical assistance outputs; Baseline and endline assessments showing progress in the development or revision of frameworks; Third-party reviews or external evaluations confirming the existence or implementation status of the framework.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator provides structured evidence of institutional development supported by the EU, particularly in areas such as governance, security, justice, or sectoral reform. It supports results-based reporting by capturing progress across distinct stages of legal and policy processes.

Potential issues: Difficulties in verifying status changes, especially in politically sensitive or informally governed contexts. Risk of over-reporting progress without sufficient documentation. Attribution may be unclear in multi-donor environments or when reforms are largely domestically driven. Some frameworks may exist in draft or de facto form without formal approval, leading to classification challenges. Mitigation measures include supporting partners in documenting each stage of the process, validating evidence through independent sources where possible, ensuring consistent use of the status categories, and triangulating qualitative information with institutional outputs.