

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;">Extent to which national laws/rules of interest or qualified recommendations are applied in practice by the relevant stakeholders</p> <p>OPSYS Code: 10070387</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Qualitative scale.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Qualitative; Practice-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 “Increased effective implementation of standards” or “Improved institutional compliance with international frameworks.”</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u></p> <p>Mandatory:</p> <p>By international framework/standard/good practice: Weapons of Mass Destruction, Ottawa Convention (Anti-Personnel Landmines), Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), Chemical Weapons Convention, Biological Weapons Convention, Budapest Convention on Cybercrime, Anti-Torture Regulation, Kimberley Process, UN Resolution 1325, Paris Principles (Human Rights), Istanbul Convention, Freedom of expression and opinion, Free and fair elections, Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Elimination of Labour exploitation and modern slavery, Recommendations from Electoral Observation Missions, and Other international framework, standard or good practice.</p>
3. Description
<p>This indicator captures the degree to which national laws, rules, or qualified recommendations—aligned with international frameworks or standards of interest to the EU—are applied in practice by relevant stakeholders. It focuses on the actual use, enforcement, or integration of such legal or normative instruments in institutional and operational settings, rather than on their formal adoption alone. The indicator is applicable across thematic areas such as disarmament, human rights, electoral integrity, gender equality, security, and governance. It aims to reflect whether normative frameworks (supported by the EU) have led to observable behavioural, institutional or procedural changes at national or local level. The indicator is especially useful for interventions that aim to promote compliance with international obligations or to strengthen rule-based governance, including those focused on post-conflict reforms, transitional justice, democratic oversight or protection of fundamental rights.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>This indicator is measured through a qualitative assessment using the following five-point scale: To no extent, To a limited extent, To a medium extent, To a significant extent, To a full extent.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National laws/rules of interest: Domestic legal or regulatory instruments—such as laws, decrees, or administrative protocols—that give effect to an international standard or framework supported by the EU. Only those aligned with one of the indicator’s predefined categories are considered valid. • Qualified recommendations: Non-binding but authoritative proposals issued by recognised mechanisms like EU Election Observation Missions or UN treaty bodies. Though not legal obligations, they are typically time-bound, politically endorsed, and intended to drive institutional reforms aligned with EU priorities. • Applied in practice means that the law, rule or recommendation is being actively and consistently implemented by stakeholders—through enforcement, service delivery, procedural change or other observable actions. One-off or symbolic efforts are not sufficient.

- **Relevant stakeholders:** Institutions formally or functionally responsible for applying the measure. These may include ministries, regulators, law enforcement, the judiciary, electoral bodies or decentralised authorities, depending on the context.
- **Assessment:** A rating should be assigned based on the level and consistency of practical application observed within the reporting period.
- **Attribution** to the concerned EU/FPI intervention—through direct support, technical assistance, policy dialogue or grants—must be documented and explicit.
- **Avoid double counting:** Each law, rule or recommendation should be assessed only once per reporting cycle and disaggregated by the relevant international framework or standard. If the same law or rule applies to multiple frameworks, it should be reported under the most relevant one. If several stakeholders are involved in its application, a single consolidated score should be provided, justified by the overall extent of implementation.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is there documented, verifiable evidence of implementation or use by at least one relevant stakeholder?
2. Does the assessment go beyond formal adoption to evaluate actual practice?
3. Are the selected stakeholders functionally responsible for applying the measure?
4. Is attribution to the EU/FPI intervention clear and supported by the intervention's scope?
5. Is each case assessed only once per reporting cycle and clearly linked to one international standard?

Example:

In Year Y, an EU-funded action in Country X provided technical assistance to the national regulatory authority for implementing the Chemical Weapons Convention. The project supported the revision of national inspection protocols, the development of operational manuals, and the training of staff. During the reporting period, the revised protocols were formally adopted and applied in 28 documented inspections. Internal reports confirmed that the new procedures were systematically followed in all relevant cases. Evidence confirmed the practical and sustained use of the revised rules. Attribution to the EU intervention was explicitly documented. Based on the evidence, the assessment was: 4. To a significant extent. The value to be reported is “4 - To a significant extent”, disaggregated by Chemical Weapons Convention.

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: official records of implementation (e.g. inspection logs, regulatory decisions), project reports or evaluations confirming use, internal procedures or operational manuals, and stakeholder interviews triangulated with documentary evidence. National compliance reports may also be used if attribution to the EU/FPI is clear.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator helps track the real-world effects of EU support to legal and normative frameworks, providing insight into institutional performance and compliance with international standards. It is relevant for governance, security, justice and human rights interventions.

Potential issues: difficulties in attribution when reforms are supported by multiple actors, and risks of overstating symbolic or one-off applications. Limited documentation, political sensitivity or weak institutions may affect data availability and quality. Mitigation measures include triangulating sources to validate findings, ensuring EU attribution is well documented, using structured interviews where documentation is limited, and encouraging systematic evidence collection by implementing partners.