

## FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Monetary value of illegally imported/exported goods seized/confiscated</b></p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 65816</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of Measure:</u> Euro.</p> <p><u>Type of Indicator:</u> Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Non-cumulative (reporting period-specific).</p> <p><u>Level of Measurement:</u> This is an <b>Outcome</b> indicator. It would logically be associated with outcomes such as “Increased effectiveness of border authorities in detecting and intercepting high-value illicit goods”, “Strengthened enforcement of trade and customs regulations in line with international standards”, or “Enhanced national ability to quantify and respond to illicit trade flows”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> None</p>
3. Description
<p>This indicator measures the total monetary value of illegally imported or exported goods that have been seized or confiscated as a direct result of EU/FPI-supported interventions. It reflects the effectiveness of actions aimed at preventing illicit trade and enhancing border security. The sectors involved are security, international partnerships, and reforms.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>The indicator is calculated by summing the estimated monetary value of all illegally imported or exported goods seized or confiscated during the reporting period, directly attributable to the concerned EU/FPI intervention.</p> <p><u>Technical definitions:</u></p> <p><b>Illegal goods:</b> In the context of EU/FPI interventions, illegal goods refer to items that are banned or tightly regulated by national or international law, and whose cross-border movement constitutes a violation of legal norms. These typically include: Narcotics and controlled substances (e.g., cocaine, heroin, synthetic drugs); Weapons and explosives (e.g., firearms, ammunition, grenades); Counterfeit or falsified goods (e.g., fake medicines, documentation, currency); Environmental contraband (e.g., protected wildlife species, illegal timber, ivory); Other prohibited goods linked to trafficking or smuggling operations (e.g., undeclared luxury goods, chemical precursors). This definition is aligned with the typologies targeted in EU-funded operations such as COLIBRI, CRIMJUST, and the Global Illicit Flows Programme.</p> <p><b>Seizure:</b> The temporary taking into custody of property by law enforcement or customs authorities based on suspicion of legal violations, pending further investigation or legal proceedings.</p> <p><b>Confiscation:</b> The permanent deprivation of property by order of a court or administrative procedure, transferring ownership of assets derived from criminal activity to the State. This can occur through conviction-based or non-conviction-based processes.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Attribution of support:</b> Include only seizures/confiscations that can be directly attributed to the concerned EU/FPI intervention, e.g., via trained personnel, equipment provided, or operations supported.</li> <li>• <b>Valuation method and consistency:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Market Value Estimation:</u> The value is typically assessed based on the fair market value of the goods at the time and place of seizure. This may involve, e.g.: Appraisals by customs authorities, Reference to standard valuation databases, or Consideration of the quality and quantity of the goods.</li> <li>- <u>Currency Conversion:</u> If the valuation is initially in a currency other than euros, it should be converted using the official exchange rate applicable at the time of seizure.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- Ensure that the valuation method is consistent across all reported cases. Use standardized units and reference prices where available.
- **Avoid double counting:** Each seizure event must be counted only once per reporting cycle, even if: (1) Multiple agencies (e.g. customs, police, military) were involved in the operation; (2) The same seizure appears in multiple sources or reporting systems; (3) The seizure was made possible by different elements of the same EU/FPI intervention (e.g. training, equipment, and coordination support). If a joint task force supported by the concerned EU/FPI intervention seizes, e.g. 500 kg of cocaine, that event should be reported as one unit of seizure, not separately by each agency involved. In the case of recurrent reporting (e.g. monthly or quarterly figures), ensure that values are not summed across periods unless they refer to distinct, non-overlapping incidents. Only seizures that occurred within the defined reporting period should be included. Where there is doubt over the uniqueness of an event, implementing partner/s should cross-reference seizure reports, attach appropriate justifications in narrative sections, and clearly describe the method used to prevent duplication.

#### Quality Control Checklist:

1. Are the seizures/confiscations supported by verifiable documentation from competent authorities?
2. Is there a clear and traceable attribution of the seizure/confiscation to the concerned EU/FPI-funded intervention?
3. Have valuations been conducted using consistent and appropriate methods?
4. Has double counting been avoided (including all potential cases)?
5. Where potential duplication exists, has the reporting partner provided justification and a clear explanation of the methodology used to avoid it?

#### Example:

In reporting year Y, under an EU/FPI intervention aimed at enhancing border security in general aviation across regions X and Z, authorities seized: 2,200 kg of cocaine (estimated market value: €88 million); 14 unregistered aircraft used in smuggling (estimated market value: €7 million); 90 firearms (estimated market value: USD 500,000, equivalent to €465,000 at the official exchange rate at the time of seizure); 1,500 rounds of ammunition (estimated market value: €15,000). All seizures were reported through standardised operational forms and verified through joint reports compiled by participating national authorities. These were considered direct results of training and surveillance systems provided through the concerned EU/FPI intervention. The reported value for year Y would be: €95,480,000.

### **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: Seizure/confiscation records from customs, police, and border enforcement units; Official statistics validated by national or regional authorities; Project reports including surveillance logs or operational summaries; Joint statements or communiqués from international collaborative missions.

### **6. Other Uses / Potential Issues**

This indicator may support reporting in internal dashboards, project-level results monitoring, and external communication materials related to EU support for border security and transnational crime prevention. It contributes to the assessment of the operational impact of EU/FPI-funded interventions in curbing illicit trade and enhancing law enforcement capacities at national and regional levels. Data from this indicator can also feed into strategic evaluations and thematic reviews in the area of security and governance.

Potential Issues: Attribution difficulties may arise when seizures/confiscations result from multi-agency or joint international operations. Inconsistent valuation methods across countries or institutions may reduce data comparability and reliability. Double counting can occur if the same event is reported by multiple entities or sources. Underreporting may happen due to lack of access to sensitive data or limited monitoring capacity. Mitigation measures include requiring clear documentation linking each seizure/confiscation to the EU/FPI-funded intervention, promoting standardised valuation methods and use official price references where available, implementing cross-checking procedures and requesting narrative justifications to prevent duplication, and strengthening monitoring systems of implementing partners and applying confidentiality protocols as needed.