

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;">The intervention contributed to stabilising/not worsening the situation in the target area compared to the pre-implementation period</p> <p>OPSYS Code: 65124</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure</u>: Qualitative assessment.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator</u>: Qualitative; Context-sensitive; Actual (ex-post).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement</u>: This is an ex post assessment for outcomes such as “Increased security in the target area”, or “Reduced conflict or deterioration of humanitarian conditions”.</p> <p>Disaggregation: Not applicable.</p>
3. Description
<p>This “indicator” provides a qualitative assessment of whether the situation in the target area remained stable or improved during the intervention period. It is designed to capture the extent to which EU/FPI-funded actions <u>contributed</u> to limiting deterioration or mitigating risks in highly fragile or conflict-affected environments. The “indicator” (or expected result / finding) is relevant for crisis response and conflict prevention contexts where achieving positive change may be difficult and where preventing escalation or maintaining existing levels of security, governance or humanitarian conditions can represent a meaningful result.</p> <p><u>Note</u>: This “indicator” is obligatory for IcSP Article 3 and NDICI Crisis Response. However, <u>it should not be used alone</u> to measure intervention outcomes and requires extensive explanation in the OPSYS comments box describing the <u>evidence base and relevant contextual factors that influenced the assessment</u>.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>This indicator is measured through a <u>qualitative assessment comparing the situation</u> in the target area at the end of the intervention with conditions observed or documented prior to implementation. The assessment must be based on multiple sources of evidence and should take into account the complexity of the context and the influence of external factors.</p> <p><u>Technical definitions</u>:</p> <p>Stabilising: Maintaining a level of security, governance or humanitarian conditions comparable to or better than the pre-intervention period, despite potential risks of deterioration.</p> <p>Not worsening: Preventing further decline in key aspects of the situation relative to the baseline, even if significant improvements were not achieved.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurement approach: The assessment should draw on a combination of monitoring reports, situational analyses, stakeholder feedback and, where possible, independent evaluations. <u>Attribution</u>: Changes must be linked, at least in part, to the concerned EU/FPI intervention. • Rating basis: The determination of whether the situation has stabilised or not worsened must consider the intervention’s contributions in relation to other factors and be substantiated by documented evidence. The assessment could be expressed using the following qualitative scale: <u>Clearly stabilised</u>: Evidence indicates significant intervention contribution to maintaining or improving stability. <u>Partially stabilised</u>: Evidence suggests the intervention helped reduce risks or limit deterioration, though some negative trends persisted. <u>Situation unchanged</u>: No notable change in conditions relative to the baseline; the intervention neither

improved nor worsened the situation. Partially worsened: Some aspects deteriorated despite intervention efforts, but contribution may have limited further decline. Clearly worsened: Evidence shows deterioration of the situation without meaningful mitigating effects attributable to the intervention.

- **Narrative justification**: Because this indicator cannot be expressed as a numeric value or used as a standalone outcome measure, it requires an accompanying narrative explanation in the OPSYS comments box. This justification should include: The main types of evidence consulted; A description of relevant contextual developments (e.g., security incidents, political shifts); An explanation of how the intervention contributed to maintaining or improving the situation.
- **Avoid double counting**: Ensure that the same evidence is not used to report against multiple indicators without clear differentiation of the assessment focus.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Has the assessment been based on multiple credible sources?
2. Is there clear evidence supporting the selected rating on the qualitative scale?
3. Has attribution to the EU/FPI intervention been explicitly documented?
4. Has a narrative justification been included in the OPSYS comments box?
5. Has the assessment been cross-checked to ensure consistency with related reporting and to avoid duplication of evidence across indicators?

Example:

In Year Y, an EU/FPI-funded crisis response intervention in Country X supported dialogue platforms, community protection mechanisms and delivery of essential services in areas affected by escalating tensions. Monitoring reports, independent conflict analyses and interviews with local leaders indicated that while sporadic incidents of violence occurred, the overall security situation remained comparable to pre-intervention levels, and some communities reported improved perceptions of safety. Attribution to the intervention was supported by evidence of mediation outcomes and continued service provision in high-risk areas. Based on this information, the assessment was: Partially stabilised.

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 Operational Manager (OM). Examples of data sources: Monitoring reports describing developments in the security, governance or humanitarian situation; Conflict trend analyses produced by independent organisations or specialised agencies; Situation assessments from UN missions, humanitarian actors or local authorities; Structured interviews or focus groups with community representatives and stakeholders; Records of mediation processes, protection activities or stabilisation measures implemented; Third-party evaluations documenting contextual changes and intervention contributions.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator (or qualitative assessment) provides a contextual understanding of whether EU/FPI interventions helped maintain stability or mitigate risks of deterioration in fragile or conflict-affected settings. It complements quantitative indicators by capturing results that may not be evident through numeric data alone.

Potential issues: Attribution can be challenging where multiple factors influence the situation, including parallel interventions or broader political dynamics. Perceptions may vary significantly across stakeholder groups, leading to inconsistent findings. There is also a risk of overestimating the contribution of the intervention or underreporting negative trends due to reputational concerns. To mitigate these risks, the assessment should draw on diverse and independent sources, include clear narrative justification in OPSYS, and clearly distinguish the intervention's effects from contextual developments beyond its control.