

## FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>The intervention minimised negative risks and maximised positive outcomes on peace and security (Y/N)</b></p> <p>OPSYS Code: 65132</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure</u>: Qualitative judgement (Yes/No).</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 “Reduced likelihood of conflict escalation in the target area” or “Enhanced conditions for peacebuilding, reconciliation or stabilisation”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation</u>: Not applicable.</p>
3. Description
<p>This “indicator” provides an overarching assessment of whether the intervention successfully reduced potential negative impacts and enhanced positive contributions to peace and security. It is used as a contextual and qualitative measure rather than a stand-alone indicator of success. The indicator is particularly relevant for crisis response, conflict prevention and peacebuilding actions where interventions may generate unintended risks or benefits affecting local stability. It supports reflection on both mitigating harm and promoting constructive change.</p> <p><u>Note</u>: This indicator is obligatory for all crisis response and conflict prevention, peace-building and crisis-preparedness actions. 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 justification for the chosen response (Yes/No)</u>.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>This indicator is measured through a <u>qualitative assessment that determines</u> whether the intervention demonstrably contributed to minimising negative risks and maximising positive outcomes on peace and security. The assessment is binary (Yes/No) but must be based on multiple sources of evidence and a clear justification explaining the rationale for the selected response.</p> <p><u>Technical definitions</u>:</p> <p><b>Minimised negative risks</b>: Actions taken to reduce or mitigate unintended adverse impacts of the intervention on conflict dynamics, social tensions, human security or governance.</p> <p><b>Maximised positive outcomes</b>: Measures implemented that contributed to strengthened peacebuilding, improved stability, enhanced cooperation or reconciliation among stakeholders.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Measurement approach</b>: The assessment should draw on documented monitoring data, stakeholder feedback, independent evaluations and other evidence demonstrating whether relevant risks were actively mitigated and positive contributions were pursued. <u>Attribution</u>: The assessment must be based on evidence of the EU/FPI intervention’s specific contributions.</li> <li>• <b>Rating basis</b>: The judgement should be expressed as <u>Yes</u> if there is credible evidence that both risk mitigation and positive outcome enhancement were undertaken and had observable effects attributable, at least in part, to the intervention. The judgement should be <u>No</u> if evidence of such contributions is lacking, partial, or insufficiently substantiated.</li> </ul>

- **Narrative justification:** Because this indicator relies on subjective assessment, it requires an accompanying narrative explanation in the OPSYS comments box. This justification should include: The main evidence sources consulted; A description of positive and negative dynamics observed during implementation; An explanation of how the intervention mitigated risks and fostered positive outcomes.
- **Avoid double counting:** Ensure that evidence used here is not duplicated across other indicators without clarifying how it supports separate assessments.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Has the assessment been based on multiple credible sources?
2. Is there documented evidence confirming actions to mitigate risks and promote positive impacts?
3. Has the attribution of contributions to the intervention been clearly described?
4. Is a narrative justification included in the OPSYS comments box explaining the reasoning behind the Yes/No selection?
5. Has the assessment been cross-checked for consistency with related reporting and other indicators?

Example:

In Year Y, an EU/FPI-funded intervention in Country X provided support for conflict-sensitive service delivery and capacity building of local authorities. Monitoring reports and external assessments confirmed that the programme integrated risk mitigation measures, including conflict sensitivity training and community consultations to prevent exacerbation of tensions. Positive contributions were documented, such as improved intergroup cooperation and strengthened early warning mechanisms. Based on this evidence, the assessment was: Yes.

## 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 documenting risk mitigation measures and peacebuilding activities; Independent evaluations assessing intervention impact on local conflict dynamics and stability; Stakeholder feedback from community representatives, beneficiaries and local authorities; Records of early warning, mediation or conflict sensitivity actions implemented during the intervention; Observation reports and field visit documentation; Triangulated evidence combining quantitative indicators with qualitative findings.

## 6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator provides an overall judgement of whether the intervention contributed to reducing potential negative effects and strengthening positive impacts on peace and security. It complements more specific quantitative and qualitative indicators by offering a holistic perspective on the intervention's conflict sensitivity and stabilisation relevance.

Potential issues: The binary (Yes/No) format may oversimplify complex situations and mask nuances in performance. Attribution of outcomes can be challenging where multiple actors are involved or where contextual dynamics evolve rapidly. There is a risk of bias if the judgement relies mainly on self-reported data or lacks triangulation. To mitigate these risks, the assessment should be supported by diverse, independent evidence sources, a clear narrative justification in OPSYS, and cross-checking against other monitoring data.