

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;">Number of people with increased skills or knowledge as a result of a training process supported by EU funded intervention</p> <p>OPSYS Code: 10054195</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure</u>: Number of individuals.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator</u>: Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Cumulative (not annual).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement</u>: This is an Output indicator. It would typically be associated with an output such as "Improved skills / capacities".</p> <p><u>Disaggregation</u>: Disaggregation can be mandatory or optional (i.e. where relevant / possible).</p> <p>Mandatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Type of Skills Development: Mediation, Conflict prevention & resolution, Risk management, Combating GBV, Combating radicalisation, Forensic – related, Human Rights – related, Justice administration, Legal investigation, Combating dis/misinformation, Cyber, Media, De-mining, Maritime Security, Disarmament, CBRN risk mitigation, System Operation, Equipment Operation, Service provision, Policy making, Policy monitoring, GERF 2.14: TVET, Others. • By Target Groups: Security/Armed Forces personnel; Electoral Body; Human Rights duty bearers; Government staff at the central level; Government staff at the local level; Civil Society; Ex-combatants; Media; Host-communities; Communities; Youth groups/members; Religious groups/members; Ethnic/language group members; Human Rights defenders; International bodies / mechanism; Women Organisation; Parliamentary Member; Judiciary Member; Professional Body; Researchers; Academy; Non-EU company; EU company ; Migrants/IDPs/Refugees; Media target audience; Political Parties; Others • By Sex: Female; Male; Intersex. <p>Optional:</p> <p>By Country.</p> <p>Note: When the training process belongs to <u>Technical and Vocational Training modalities</u> as defined in GERF 2.14, the definitions in the <u>GERF methodology note should apply</u> with the corresponding result reported under the GERF 2.14 disaggregation criteria.</p>
3. Description
<p>This indicator captures the number of individuals whose skills or knowledge <u>demonstrably</u> increased due to a structured training activity supported by an EU/FPI-funded intervention. The training must have a defined objective, curriculum, and method for assessing learning progress. It applies across thematic areas such as crisis management, rule of law, cybersecurity, media literacy, democratic governance, or technical and vocational education.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>The value is calculated by counting each individual who has completed the training process and demonstrated increased knowledge or skills.</p> <p><u>Technical definitions</u>:</p>

Training: A structured set of activities designed to enhance participants' knowledge, skills or competencies. Training can be understood as a process or as a one-off session, but it must include defined learning objectives, a curriculum or plan of delivery, and a method of evaluating whether the intended learning has occurred.

Counting Guidance:

- **Evidence of improvement:** May include comparison between pre- and post-training test results; evaluation forms or observation by trainers; certificates granted only upon demonstration of learning; self-reported gains supported by triangulated evidence.
- **Tips for designing pre- and post-training tests:** Questions should directly reflect the intended knowledge or skills covered in the training. The same or very similar questions should be asked in both pre- and post-tests to enable comparison. Ideally, combine multiple choice and short answers. Avoid ambiguous wording and ensure questions don't guide the learner toward the "correct" answer. Establish clear scoring criteria to quantify improvement objectively (e.g. a minimum score increase of 20% from pre- to post-test). Limit the number of questions to avoid fatigue (e.g. 10–15 well-constructed items).
- **Avoid double counting:** The same individual should only be counted once per training cycle even if s-he undertook different trainings within a single intervention. To avoid the double counting of people over time, two approaches are possible. If it is possible to reliably estimate the number of people supported in the first year and in the following years (i.e. not yet supported during the reporting period in question), these numbers can be added up without the risk of double counting. However, if this information is not available, the maximum number/result of all the reporting periods should be used instead.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Was the training process implemented during the reporting period?
2. Does the training have documented objectives and assessment methods?
3. Is there clear evidence of increased knowledge or skills (e.g. pre- and post-test)?
4. Were disaggregation levels (mandatory and optional) recorded, including GEF 2.14 when relevant?
5. Were individuals counted only once?
6. Are results consistent with participation and certification records?

Example:

An EU/FPI-funded regional intervention provided a training course on climate security and media resilience in countries A and B. A total of 215 participants completed the course and demonstrated measurable learning improvements through valid/robust pre- and post-tests. The initiative included a diverse set of stakeholders. The value to be reported is 215 individuals, disaggregated as follows: By Type of Skills Development: 120 GEF 2.14: TVET, 95 Strategic communication and media literacy; By Target Groups: 60 Government staff at the central level, 40 Government staff at the local level, 35 Media, 25 Civil Society, 20 Human Rights duty bearers, 15 Security/Armed Forces personnel, 10 Researchers, 10 Academy; By Sex: 100 Female, 110 Male, 5 Intersex; By Country: 120 in country A and 95 in country B.

Note: A matching indicator for GEF 2.14 has been added with current value 120 and sex-disaggregation 40 Female, 60 Male.

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: Test results, attendance records, training reports, certification lists, evaluation forms and feedback surveys.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator is valuable for assessing capacity development outputs of EU external action. It also contributes to gender-sensitive reporting and portfolio-level analysis of skills-building activities.

Potential issues: Lack of evidence on actual learning outcomes (vs. mere attendance); Confusion between participation and demonstrable skills acquisition; Inconsistent or missing disaggregation data; Weak or unstandardised pre/post-training assessment methods; Insufficient improvement thresholds. Mitigation measures include verification mechanisms and clear definitions to ensure accuracy.