

## FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p><b>Number of investigations conducted by the Inspector General into military forces, per calendar year</b></p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 17014</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Number of investigations.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Non-cumulative (annual).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an <b>Outcome</b> indicator. It would logically be associated with outcomes such as “Improved internal accountability within armed forces”, “Increased oversight and transparency in military operations” or “Improved adherence to human rights and legal standards within the security sector”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> None.</p>
3. Description
<p>This indicator measures the number of formal investigations initiated and conducted by the Inspector General (IG) into the activities of military forces within a given calendar year. Tracking this indicator provides insight into the functioning and effectiveness of internal oversight mechanisms within the military, reflecting progress in security sector reforms and the promotion of rule of law principles. The sectors involved are conflict prevention, DDR, peacekeeping, and security reforms.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>The value of the indicator is calculated by counting the total number of investigations conducted by the IG into military forces during the reporting year.</p> <p><u>Technical definitions:</u></p> <p><b>Inspector General (IG):</b> The IG is typically an independent oversight entity within the military structure, responsible for ensuring accountability, adherence to laws and regulations, and the integrity of military operations. Such investigations may cover areas including, but not limited to, misconduct, corruption, human rights violations, and breaches of military codes.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Inclusion criteria:</b> Only investigations that have been supported by the concerned EU/FPI intervention and formally initiated and documented by the IG within the reporting year should be counted.</li> <li>• <b>Exclusion criteria:</b> Preliminary inquiries or informal reviews that do not result in formal investigations should not be included.</li> <li>• <b>Avoid double counting:</b> Each investigation should be counted once -regardless of its duration or if it spans multiple reporting periods-, and the same investigation should not be counted again in the next reporting period (e.g.: in year 1 and again in year 2).</li> </ul> <p><u>Quality Control Checklist:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there documented evidence that the investigations were officially launched and completed by the Inspector General within the reporting year?</li> <li>2. Is there a clear and verifiable link between the investigations and the concerned EU/FPI-funded intervention?</li> <li>3. Are the investigations formal in nature (not preliminary reviews or informal complaints)?</li> <li>4. Has the same investigation been counted only once, even if it spans multiple months?</li> </ol>

5. Are the data sources reliable and available for verification, e.g. IG annual reports, official logs, third-party evaluation reports?
6. Has the reporting team ensured consistency in the definition of “investigation” across time and contexts?

Example:

In year Y, under an EU/FPI-funded security sector reform intervention in Country X, the office of the Inspector General of the armed forces was strengthened through technical assistance and institutional capacity-building. As a result, the IG conducted 15 formal investigations into various allegations, including misconduct, misuse of resources, and breaches of military protocol. Each investigation was officially documented and concluded within the calendar year. The value to be reported for year Y is 15.

#### **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 and reports of the Inspector General's office, including annual reports, investigation logs, and official communications; external M&E missions/reports.

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

This indicator helps track the effectiveness of internal oversight mechanisms within military institutions and supports monitoring of progress in security sector reform. It informs strategic planning, capacity-building, and EU engagement on accountability and governance in defence sectors.

Potential issues include limited access to data due to confidentiality, inconsistent definitions of “formal investigation”, and risks of political interference or weak institutional independence. Reliable verification and contextual understanding are key to ensure data quality.