# FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

| 1. Indicator Name and Code |
|---|

**Extent to which host community members feel that the refugees/Internally Displaced Persons and their families are "very well" or "well" integrated and do not feel threatened by their presence**

OPSYS Code: 17239

| 2. Technical Details |
|---|

Unit of measure: Qualitative scale.

Type of indicator: Qualitative; Perception-based; Actual (ex-post).

Level of measurement: This is an **Outcome** indicator. It is typically used to measure results such as "Improved social cohesion and peaceful coexistence", "Reduced tensions between displaced and host populations", or "Improved integration of refugees and IDPs."

Disaggregation:

Mandatory: **By sex:** Female; Male; Intersex.

| 3. Description |
|---|

This indicator captures the perceived level of integration of refugees or internally displaced persons (IDPs) and their families, as experienced by members of the host community. It reflects both the perceived success of integration efforts, and the absence of perceived threat or tension linked to the presence of displaced populations. Perceptions may relate to economic, social, cultural or security aspects of integration. The indicator is particularly relevant in fragile or post-crisis contexts where tensions between displaced groups and host communities can undermine peacebuilding, recovery, and inclusive development. It supports EU/FPI priorities related to conflict prevention, durable solutions for displacement, and social stability in affected areas.

| 4. Calculation of Values and Example |
|---|

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.

Technical definitions:

**Host community:** A host community refers to the local population that receives and coexists with refugees or internally displaced persons. These communities may be directly or indirectly affected by the presence of displaced populations, particularly in terms of access to services, housing, employment, or infrastructure (UNHCR).
**Refugees:** Refugees are persons who have been forced to flee their country of origin due to persecution, conflict, generalised violence, or other circumstances that have seriously disturbed public order, and who are unable or unwilling to return due to a well-founded fear of being persecuted (UNHCR).
**Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs):** IDPs are persons or groups who have been forced to flee their homes, particularly due to armed conflict, generalised violence, violations of human rights, or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognised border (UN OCHA).

Counting Guidance:

- **"Very well" or "well" integrated:** Refers to the perception that refugees or IDPs and their families are accepted, socially connected, economically active, and have access to basic services without major tensions or discrimination. Integration may be viewed through the lens of participation in local life, peaceful coexistence, and mutual respect between groups.

- **"Do not feel threatened by their presence":** Refers to the absence of perceived risk, competition, or insecurity among host community members as a result of the presence of refugees or IDPs.
- **Assessment:** The judgement should be based on structured perception surveys or qualitative assessments conducted with members of the host community. Recognition of integration and safety must be explicit, and may relate to employment, education, health services, social cohesion or security.
- **Attribution:** Only include assessments that can be reasonably linked to the effects of the concerned EU/FPI intervention, such as social integration programmes, conflict mitigation efforts, or public information campaigns.
- **Survey implementation tips:** Respondents must be members of host communities with direct exposure to the displaced population. Filter questions should confirm this exposure. Questions must be culturally sensitive, gender-balanced, and neutrally phrased to avoid social desirability bias. Triangulation with focus groups or third-party observations is recommended to strengthen reliability.
- **Avoid double counting:** Each community or target area should be assessed only once per reporting cycle. Where multiple groups are assessed, consolidate findings unless disaggregation is relevant and justified.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Does the assessment cover both perceived integration and absence of threat?
2. Is the judgement based on documented evidence (e.g. surveys, focus groups) and triangulated where relevant?
3. Is attribution clearly linked to the EU/FPI intervention?
4. Were surveys conducted exclusively among host community members with confirmed exposure to displaced populations?

Example:

In Year Y, an EU/FPI-funded intervention in Country X supported community engagement initiatives and conflict-sensitive dialogue in urban neighbourhoods hosting large numbers of IDPs. The project organised joint community activities, supported local integration committees, and funded public messaging campaigns on coexistence. At the endline, a perception survey was conducted among 600 host community residents (310 female; 270 male; 20 intersex) in areas directly targeted by the intervention. The findings indicated that most respondents perceived the IDP families as socially integrated and expressed no sense of threat. Based on this, the overall judgement was reported as 4. To a significant extent, with disaggregation as follows: Female – 4; Male – 3; Intersex – 4.

| 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: Perception surveys conducted with members of the host community; Focus group discussions or key informant interviews conducted by implementing partners or third-party evaluators; Field visit reports or observation notes by EU Delegations or partners; Monitoring or evaluation reports containing structured assessments of community integration and cohesion; Media content analysis or documentation of public messaging campaigns and dialogue initiatives; Minutes from local integration committees or community meetings.

| 6. Other Uses / Potential Issues |
|---|

This indicator can be used to assess social cohesion, stability, and local acceptance of displaced populations as part of broader peacebuilding, migration, or recovery efforts. It may inform conflict sensitivity analyses, contribute to 'do no harm' approaches, and support the design of inclusive service delivery or community development interventions.

Potential issues: As the indicator relies on perception, it may be influenced by external narratives, recent events, or biases within the community. Variability between sub-groups or locations may also be significant and should be documented when relevant. Where perceptions appear positive despite objective tensions, triangulation with qualitative or contextual analysis is recommended to verify robustness. Results should always be interpreted in relation to the local context and the actual level of interaction between host and displaced populations.