

## FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Level of engagement online and on social media</b></p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 149643.</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Qualitative scale.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Qualitative; Actual (ex-post); Non-cumulative.</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an Outcome indicator. It would logically be associated with outcomes such as “Increased visibility and public recognition of EU-supported initiatives”; “Improved outreach to and interaction with target audiences”, or “Enhanced influence and credibility of EU narratives in online spaces”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u></p> <p>Mandatory:</p> <p><b>By type of online engagement:</b> Number of visitors and/or signed-up users on a project website/webpage; Number of followers on any social media account (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, LinkedIn, etc.); Number of likes/shares/re-tweets of content prepared by the project team and published on any social media account; Number of times a hashtag promoted by a project is used on social media; Other (specify).</p>
3. Description
<p>This indicator captures the degree of online interaction generated by EU/FPI-funded interventions through their digital communication efforts. Rather than merely counting outputs (such as number of posts or published content), it assesses the level of response and engagement from online audiences, including visibility, interest, and participation. These forms of interaction are relevant for understanding how EU-supported narratives, values, or services are perceived and amplified in online environments, particularly in the context of awareness raising, social mobilisation, strategic communication, or counter-disinformation efforts.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>This indicator is measured <u>qualitatively</u> using a five-point scale that reflects the extent of online engagement achieved through the concerned EU/FPI intervention. The assessment should consider the consistency, reach, and interactivity of the engagement across platforms and content types.</p> <p><u>Technical Definitions:</u></p> <p><b>Engagement:</b> User-initiated interactions with digital content or platforms linked to an EU/FPI-funded intervention. It includes visits, follows, shares, comments, likes, reposts, hashtag uses, or any action indicating attention and interaction. Engagement reflects the <u>behavioural response</u> to online visibility and messaging.</p> <p><b>Social Media:</b> Digital platforms designed for interactive communication and content sharing, such as Facebook, Instagram, X, LinkedIn, YouTube, and others. For this indicator, it also includes messaging apps and microblogging platforms when used for strategic communication.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Basic counting rules:</b> Each type of interaction must be traceably linked to the concerned EU/FPI intervention. Data must derive from verifiable analytics tools (e.g. Meta Insights, X/Twitter Analytics, Google Analytics, hashtag monitoring platforms). Reported values must correspond to the specific reporting period and campaign. Indirect mentions or unauthorised reposting by third parties do not count unless clearly attributable.</li> </ul>

- **What counts as engagement:** Only observable and traceable actions by users are counted—passive content views (impressions) are excluded unless accompanied by measurable interaction. Qualitative ratings must reflect a combination of volume, diversity of engagement types, and consistency across platforms.
- **How engagement is measured:** Based on verifiable metrics and analytics, but requiring a value judgement informed by both quantitative evidence and qualitative interpretation, e.g.: To no extent (No observable engagement or activity), To a limited extent (Minimal engagement, e.g. low reach, very limited interaction, only one channel), To a moderate extent (Moderate audience engagement through multiple types of interaction, e.g. likes, shares, hashtag use), To a significant extent (Consistent and expanding engagement across platforms, with growing audience and multiple interaction types), To a full extent (High, sustained engagement with strategic amplification, e.g. viral content, strong reach, and targeted impact).
- **Avoid double counting:** Engagement should not be summed across different indicators (e.g. counting the same user as both follower and hashtag user unless distinct). Multiple metrics should be presented separately in the disaggregation section. Reuse of the same content across platforms should not be double-counted unless it triggers new and distinct forms of engagement.

#### Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is there documented evidence from analytics or monitoring tools to support the engagement score?
2. Are engagement metrics traceably linked to EU/FPI-supported content or channels?
3. Has the five-point engagement scale been applied consistently?
4. Has double counting across platforms or engagement types been avoided?
5. Is the reported score accompanied by a short justification, including key figures?
6. Does the engagement reflect actual user interaction (not only impressions or automated traffic)?

#### Example:

An EU/FPI-funded intervention promoting civic engagement and peacebuilding in Country A launched a multilingual digital campaign combining a dedicated website, Facebook and Instagram accounts, and a coordinated hashtag. Over a four-month period, the intervention recorded 45,000 unique visitors and 2,500 registered users on the website; 18,000 followers across its social media channels; 62,000 likes, shares, and reposts of original content; and 5,800 hashtag uses tracked via analytics tools. Based on the variety, intensity, and consistency of these interactions, the overall engagement level was assessed as “5. To a full extent”. Disaggregation by type of online engagement: Website visitors and/or registered users: 47,500; Social media followers: 18,000; Likes/shares/retweets: 62,000; Hashtag uses: 5,800; Other: N/A.

### **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: Platform-specific analytics dashboards (e.g. Meta Business Suite, Twitter/X Analytics, LinkedIn Insights, Instagram Professional Dashboard), Website analytics tools (e.g. Google Analytics, Matomo), Hashtag monitoring platforms (e.g. Keyhole, Brand24, Talkwalker), Social media management systems (e.g. Hootsuite, Sprout Social), Digital campaign monitoring reports, Independent evaluation or third-party digital audits where available.

### **6. Other Uses / Potential Issues**

This indicator supports strategic communication assessments, visibility reporting, and evaluations of outreach, perception, and behavioural influence in digital environments.

Potential issues: Metrics may be skewed by algorithms, paid promotion, or superficial interactions. Attribution can be difficult when third parties share content. To mitigate these risks, scoring must be based on diverse, verifiable data, exclude artificial traffic, and clearly link engagement to the EU-funded action.