FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code

% of people trained by the Action who are engaged in a licit and viable economic activity

OPSYS Code: 17232

2. Technical Details

Unit of measure: Percentage.

Type of indicator: Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Non-cumulative.

Level of measurement: This is an Outcome indicator. It would typically be associated with outcomes such as "Increased economic reintegration", "Enhanced self-reliance (or economic resilience)", or "Improved access to lawful and sustainable livelihoods".

Disaggregation:

Mandatory: **By Sex:** Female, Male, Intersex.

3. Description

This indicator measures the proportion of individuals who, after receiving training through an EU/FPI-funded intervention, are engaged in a licit and viable economic activity. It captures whether the support provided contributes to economic participation that is both lawful and sustainable in the given context. The indicator focuses on self-reported economic engagement, regardless of whether it occurs in the formal or informal sector, provided it is legally permitted and perceived as viable by the beneficiary. It is especially relevant in fragile, post-crisis, or reintegration settings, where economic opportunities are often limited. This includes interventions in sectors such as emergencies, reconstruction, conflict prevention and migration.

4. Calculation of Values and Example

The indicator is calculated as the percentage of individuals who, after receiving training supported by the concerned EU/FPI intervention, report being engaged in a licit and viable economic activity. The total number of trained individuals in the target group must be known and used as the denominator.

Technical definition:

Licit and viable economic activity: Any form of income-generating work that is legally permitted and perceived as stable or sustainable by the individual. This may include self-employment, wage labour, cooperative work, or temporary job schemes. The concept must be clearly defined in the survey tool.

Counting Guidance:

- **Basic counting rules:** Include only individuals who completed the training activity supported by the EU/FPI intervention and who respond positively to a standardised question about their current engagement in economic activity. Responses must be collected through a consistent and documented methodology. Each individual must be counted only once per reporting cycle.
- **Trained individuals:** All persons who completed a training activity funded or supported by the concerned EU/FPI intervention. This includes vocational or technical skills training, entrepreneurship support, or job-readiness programmes.
- **Representative sampling:** Where full coverage is not feasible, a representative and documented sampling method must be used. Sampling methodology and limitations should be clearly recorded in the reporting narrative and in the OPSYS comments box.
- **Survey Implementation Tips:** Question phrasing: Surveys must include a direct question such as "As a result of the training received through this project/programme, are you currently engaged in any lawful and

viable economic activity?" A Likert scale or a yes/no format may be used; only positive answers (e.g. "Strongly agree" / "Agree" or "Yes") should be counted. Target population: The survey must be administered only to individuals who completed a training activity supported by the concerned EU/FPI intervention. Timing: Data should be collected at least three to six months after the completion of the training, depending on the nature of the intervention.

- **Attribution of support:** The survey instrument must clearly link the respondent's current economic activity to the training or support received through the EU/FPI-funded Action.
- **Avoid double counting:** Each individual must be counted only once per reporting cycle, even if they attended multiple trainings or were involved in more than one component of the intervention.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Are only individuals who completed training supported by the intervention included in the survey?
2. Is the survey question phrased clearly and explicitly linked to the economic activity?
3. Was the data collected at an appropriate time after the completion of training (e.g. at least 3–6 months)?
4. Was a consistent and documented methodology used to collect responses?
5. Has a representative and statistically sound sampling approach been applied, where full coverage was not feasible?
6. Has double counting of individuals been avoided within the same reporting cycle?
7. Are results disaggregated by sex (Female, Male, Intersex) as required?

Example:

In reporting year Y, an EU/FPI-funded intervention in Country X provided vocational and entrepreneurial training to 620 conflict-affected individuals. A follow-up perception survey conducted six months later included 540 of those who completed the training. Out of these, 338 respondents (62.6%) stated that they were currently engaged in a licit and viable economic activity as a result of the training received. Sex-disaggregated results showed that 65.1% of women (151 out of 232), 60.9% of men (179 out of 294), and 57.1% of intersex respondents (8 out of 14) reported being economically active. The value to be reported is 62.6% (338 out of 540), with the following disaggregated values: 65.1% for women (151 out of 232), 60.9% for men (179 out of 294), and 57.1% for intersex respondents (8 out of 14).
Note for comments in OPSYS and in the Progress Report: Women represented 43% of respondents (232 out of 540), men 54.4% (294 out of 540), and intersex individuals 2.6% (14 out of 540).

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: Structured perception surveys administered to individuals who completed the training; Post-training monitoring tools including questions on economic engagement; Semi-structured interviews or focus group discussions (for triangulation); and External M&E reports containing validated outcome data on economic participation.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator can help assess the medium-term effectiveness of training interventions in enabling lawful economic participation. It is particularly relevant in fragile, post-conflict, or reintegration contexts where self-reliance and access to income are key dimensions of stabilisation.

Potential issues: Respondents may overstate their level of economic activity due to expectations or a desire to please surveyors. The definition of "viable" may vary across individuals or contexts if not clearly explained. Economic outcomes may take time to materialise, especially where markets are saturated or access to capital is limited. Mitigation measures include using anonymous survey tools; clearly defining "licit and viable economic activity" in the questionnaire; ensuring appropriate timing for data collection (e.g. several months post-training); and, where possible, triangulating results with observational or administrative data on economic reintegration.