

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p>Number of community members who feel that the ex-combatants and their families are “very well” or “well” integrated and do not feel threatened by their presence</p> <p>OPSYS Code: 18372</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Number of individuals.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Quantitative (with perception-based input); Actual (ex-post), Non-cumulative (frequency based on reporting calendar).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an Outcome indicator. It would typically be associated with outcomes such as “Increased social cohesion (or security)” or “Improved integration”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> Mandatory</p> <p>By sex: Female, Male, Intersex.</p>
3. Description
<p>This indicator measures the number of community members who express a positive perception regarding the integration of ex-combatants and their families. It captures not only a sense of acceptance but also the absence of fear or perceived threat, which is essential for long-term reintegration and peacebuilding. This indicator is particularly relevant in post-conflict settings where EU support is directed towards Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR), community stabilisation, or reconciliation efforts. This indicator is relevant to the DDR sector and broader post-conflict peacebuilding interventions.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>The value of the indicator is calculated by counting the number of respondents from the target community who report both: (a) that ex-combatants and their families are “very well” or “well” integrated into their community, and (b) that they do not feel personally threatened by their presence.</p> <p><u>Technical definitions:</u></p> <p>Ex-combatants: Individuals who were formerly members of armed forces or armed groups—whether regular or irregular, state or non-state—who have laid down their arms and formally exited those structures, typically in the context of a peace process, ceasefire, or demobilisation programme. This includes both those who were combatants by function (e.g. fighters) and those who provided direct support roles (e.g. cooks, messengers, porters, spies), particularly if recognised by DDR programmes.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic counting rule / particularity: Although this is a quantitative indicator (number of individuals), the value is derived from perception-based questions (qualitative opinions), typically embedded in community-level surveys. Only responses indicating that reintegration is going “well” or “very well” and that there is no perceived threat from ex-combatants or their families should be counted. • Survey / interview tips: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The information is collected through surveys or structured interviews and must be clearly linked to the EU-funded intervention. - Question formulation: Surveys/interviews should include a close question allowing respondents to express their view on both the integration level and the sense of safety in relation to ex-combatants and their families. - Eligible responses: Only individuals who respond affirmatively to both aspects—perceived good integration and no personal threat—should be included in the reported value.

- Survey integrity: The survey should follow a consistent methodology (randomised or stratified sampling if possible), and results must be representative of the target population or community segment.
- **Avoid double counting:** Individuals should not be counted more than once within the same reporting cycle.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is the question wording clear and consistent with the two components (integration + no threat)?
2. Is the reported value based on a valid data collection method (e.g. structured survey or interviews)?
3. Have only the respondents meeting both criteria been included in the total?
4. Has the sex-disaggregated data been correctly applied and reported?
5. Has the data collection occurred within the current reporting cycle?
6. Has double counting of respondents been avoided?

Example:

An EU/FPI-funded intervention in Country A supported the social reintegration of ex-combatants and their families in three regions. A perception survey was conducted among 1,200 community members. Of these, 735 respondents stated that they feel that ex-combatants and their families are either “very well” or “well” integrated and that they do not feel personally threatened by their presence. The total reported value for year Y would be 735, disaggregated as follows: By Sex: Female (415), Male (305), Intersex (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: structured perception surveys, community interviews with validated sampling, external M&E reports. Documentation should include sampling methodology, survey questions used, disaggregation by sex, and justification for any extrapolation.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator supports evidence-based reporting on social acceptance of reintegration efforts and complements more operational indicators (e.g. number of ex-combatants employed, number of reintegration sessions held). It is particularly useful in peacebuilding dashboards, political reporting, and external communication on community-level change.

Potential issues: Risks include social desirability bias in responses, lack of representativeness in sampling, or ambiguity in how “well integrated” is understood. These can be mitigated by using standardised questions, pre-testing tools, and ensuring interviewer neutrality.