FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code

% of trainees who claim they are able to provide for themselves and for their families

OPSYS Code: 17231

2. Technical Details

Unit of measure: Percentage (%).

Type of indicator: Quantitative (perception-based); Actual (ex-post); Non-cumulative (frequency based on reporting calendar).

Level of measurement: This is an **Outcome** indicator. It would logically be associated with outcomes such as "improved economic self-reliance", "enhanced livelihoods", or "reduced economic dependency among targeted individuals".

Disaggregation: In this case, disaggregation should be specified in percentages (%), reflecting the percentage of population groups along the disaggregation lines.

Mandatory:

By Sex: Female, Male, Intersex.

Optional:

- **By Age Group**, e.g. 0-15; 15–24; 25–64; 65+.
- **By Geographic Origin**: urban, rural, other
- **By Country.**

3. Description

The indicator measures the percentage of trainees who perceive themselves as capable of supporting their own and their families' basic needs as a result of an EU/FPI-funded intervention training process. This is a perception-based indicator: it reflects self-assessed economic empowerment, collected through structured data collection methods such as surveys or interviews. This measure is especially relevant in fragile or post-crisis contexts where objective economic outcomes (e.g. income level, employment contract) may not be immediately available or reliable.

4. Calculation of Values and Example

The value of this indicator is calculated in percentage terms, i.e. the percentage of trainees (targeted by the EU/FPI intervention) claiming that they are able to provide for themselves and for their families. To ensure this percentage is meaningful, the total size of the target population must be known, even if only a representative sample is surveyed.

Technical definitions:

Trainee: A person who has completed a training course under an EU/FPI-funded intervention. The training should be of a minimum duration and relevance to self-reliance or employability.

Counting Guidance:

- **Perception criteria:** Responses must be based on direct self-assessment (e.g. "Do you feel able to provide for yourself and your family?"). Responses should be categorised clearly (e.g. Yes/No; Likert scale), and thresholds for "claiming ability" should be defined in advance.

- **"Claim they are able to provide for themselves and their families":** This refers to the trainee's self-perception that they are able to meet, at least partially, the basic needs of their household. This typically includes food and water security, access to housing or shelter, healthcare and/or medicine, education for dependents (where applicable), other basic needs relevant to the local context (e.g. energy, transport, communication). It may vary based on household size, local cost of living, and cultural expectations regarding family responsibility. For reporting purposes, the perception must be clearly linked to the trainee's economic activity resulting from the training.
- **Data collection method:** Structured surveys, conducted at intervention's completion or follow-up stage. Where possible, triangulate with other data (e.g. employment records, income data, interviews with family members or supervisors).
- **Survey quality:** Ensure that sampling, question phrasing, and data processing follow good practices for perception-based indicators.
- **Avoiding double counting:** Each trainee should be counted only once per intervention, even if they participate in multiple training modules.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is the respondent a verified trainee under an EU/FPI-supported intervention?
2. Was the data collected through a standardised and documented survey?
3. Are the response categories and scoring thresholds clearly defined?
4. Was the sample representative or the total target population known?
5. Was the response directly given by the trainee (not inferred or reported by others)?
6. Was the respondent counted only once for this indicator in the reporting period?
7. Are disaggregation variables recorded consistently?

Example:

In a livelihood support intervention for returnees in a post-conflict region, 800 trainees completed vocational skills training and received toolkits to start small businesses. A perception survey was conducted six months after intervention completion. Out of 800 trainees, 520 stated that they feel able to meet their basic needs and support their families, based on their new income-generating activities. The indicator value reported would be: (520 / 800) × 100 = **65%.** The value must be further disaggregated by sex (e.g. 68% of men, 61% of women), age group, and country (if relevant).
Note: The percentual values are transformed into numerical values in the comment box in OPSYS for further data aggregation across interventions).

5.	Data Sources

Reported values should derive primarily from the internal monitoring systems of EU-funded interventions. Data must be generated and verified by the implementing partner. Examples of data sources: Trainee perception surveys (namely); complemented with post-training evaluation forms; third-party assessments (if available); baseline/endline comparisons (where applicable).

6.	Other Uses / Potential Issues

Other possible uses: This indicator is useful for evaluating the perceived economic impact of EU/FPI-funded training initiatives, particularly where quantitative income tracking is not feasible. It supports gender-sensitive, dignity-centred programming and can inform targeting strategies for future interventions.

Potential issues: Subjectivity and social desirability bias in responses. Economic self-perception may fluctuate depending on context (e.g. inflation, household size). Risk of over-reporting in environments where respondents believe it may affect future assistance.