

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;">% of population reporting significant improvement to targeted service</p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 65745</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Percentage.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Non-cumulative (frequency based on reporting calendar).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an Outcome indicator. It would logically be associated with an outcome such as “Increased access to quality public or community services”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> In this case, disaggregation should be specified in percentages (%) at the logframe level (design), reflecting the percentage of population groups along the disaggregation lines that will report “significant improvements”.</p> <p>Mandatory:</p> <p>Sex: Female, Male, Intersex.</p> <p>Optional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Age group, e.g. 15–24; 25–64; 65+. • By Geographic Origin, e.g. urban/rural.
3. Description
<p>This indicator captures effectiveness from the perspective of service users. The service in question may vary by context—examples include public health services, legal aid, social assistance, education, or security-related functions—and must be clearly defined within the scope of the intervention. Evidently, this indicator relies on a survey mechanism that captures users’ perceptions of improvement in the targeted service, based on a clear and shared understanding of what constitutes a “significant improvement”.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>The value of this indicator is calculated in percentage terms, i.e. the percentage of the population (or group of individuals) reporting a significant improvement in the targeted service.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service specificity: The service targeted must be clearly defined and linked to the EU/FPI-funded intervention. • Significant improvement: A clear, positive change that enhances how easily, fairly, or effectively a public service meets the needs of its users. This could include, inter alia: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better accessibility: Shorter waiting times, more service locations, or simplified processes (e.g. faster hospital appointments, easier tax filing). - Higher quality: More competent staff, accurate information, or improved infrastructure (e.g. better-trained teachers, reliable electricity in schools). - Greater fairness: Reduced discrimination or barriers for vulnerable groups (e.g. services in local languages, support for people with disabilities). - Increased trust: Transparent procedures, fewer errors, or clearer communication (e.g. timely updates on tax requests, understandable health guidelines).

- Tangible outcomes: Measurable benefits like higher student pass rates, reduced disease outbreaks, etc.
- **Representative sampling:** Whenever feasible, the survey sample should reflect the target population of the intervention (e.g. geographic and demographic balance), as in a population-based survey. However, such surveys are resource-intensive and are often replaced by user-based surveys (sampling only service users), which may lack full statistical representativeness. The survey methodology used—including its limitations—should be clearly documented in reporting materials and in the OPSYS comments box.
- **Avoid duplication:** Do not aggregate responses across services unless clearly designed as a multi-service intervention.
- **Survey Implementation Tips:** The perceived improvements scale could be articulated as follows: 1 = No improvement at all (The service has stayed the same); 2 = Moderate improvement (Some noticeable enhancements, but no changes on the outcomes or no transformative change); 3 = Significant improvement (Clear, meaningful progress in quality or accessibility or fairness or trust); 4 = Major improvement (Substantial positive change, far better than before including on tangible outcomes).
- **Avoid double counting:** Individuals should not be counted more than once within the same reporting cycle.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is the targeted service clearly defined in the project design (intervention logic and logframe)?
2. Has a perception survey been implemented using valid sampling and methodology?
3. Is there a clear link to the concerned EU/FPI-funded intervention?
4. Is the concept of “significant improvement” explained and standardised in the data collection tool?
5. Are results disaggregated by sex (mandatory) and any other relevant criteria (optional)?
6. Has care been taken to avoid double counting, within the same reporting cycle?

Example:

In a user-based survey conducted to establish baseline values for an EU/FPI-funded intervention to strengthen municipal services in a post-conflict region, 15.6% of respondents (187 out of 1,200) rated access/quality of administrative services (e.g. civil registry, permits) as “significantly improved” compared to the previous year. Sex-disaggregated results showed higher perceived improvement among women (23%, 87/378) than men (12.2%, 100/822). The reported sex-disaggregated baseline values are 23% for women and 12.2% for men. Note for comments in OPSYS and in the Progress Report: Women represented 31.5% of respondents (378/1,200) and men 68.5% (822/1,200). As a user-based survey, findings may not generalise to non-users.

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: User perception surveys conducted by implementing partners or third-party evaluators; external monitoring or evaluation reports; focus group discussions (as qualitative triangulation).

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator is useful for capturing citizen-centred outcomes and for complementing more objective service performance metrics. It may be included in dashboards and strategic evaluations, particularly those assessing the social impact or visibility of EU/FPI interventions.

Potential issues: Risk of bias or low reliability if the sampling or methodology is weak. Subjectivity of responses may also affect results; this can be mitigated by using clear and consistent definitions of “significant improvement”.