# FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

## 1. Indicator Name and Code

**Extent to which legislation and/or policy prohibiting/addressing VAWG has been developed, strengthened and/or implemented**

OPSYS Code: 172554

## 2. Technical Details

Unit of measure: Qualitative scale.

Type of indicator: Qualitative; Practice-based; Actual (ex-post).

Level of measurement: This is an **Outcome** indicator. It is typically used to measure results such as " "Improved institutional and policy response to violence against women and girls" or "Reduced violence against women and girls".

Disaggregation: Not applicable.

## 3. Description

This indicator assesses whether EU/FPI-funded interventions have contributed to measurable improvements in the institutional, procedural or operational environment concerning violence against women and girls (VAWG). It focuses on the extent to which supported frameworks have resulted in more effective prevention, protection, response and accountability mechanisms. The indicator is applicable in contexts where interventions aim to align national systems with international and regional standards on gender equality and human rights. It is particularly relevant in settings marked by discriminatory practices, limited enforcement capacities or gaps in victim-centred approaches that hinder access to justice and the realisation of rights.

## 4. Calculation of Values and Example

This indicator is measured through a qualitative assessment using the following five-point scale: 1 – To no extent, 2 – To a limited extent, 3 – To a medium extent, 4 – To a significant extent, 5 – To a full extent.

Counting Guidance:

- **Developed:** The process of drafting, formulating or preparing new legislation or policies addressing VAWG, including stakeholder consultations, regulatory impact assessments or technical reviews. This stage does not require formal adoption or enactment.
- **Strengthened:** The revision or amendment of existing legal or policy frameworks to improve scope, clarity, enforcement mechanisms or alignment with international standards.
- **Implemented:** The systematic and verifiable application of the adopted or amended measures in practice by relevant institutions and stakeholders.
- **Measurement approach:** The assessment should be based on documented evidence collected during the reporting period. Sources may include official records, regulatory documents, budgetary allocations, operational manuals, reports confirming enforcement or use, and triangulated stakeholder interviews. Each framework or policy should be evaluated for its level of development, strengthening and/or implementation, and an overall rating assigned to reflect the degree of progress achieved.
- **Rating Basis:** A rating should be assigned based on the level and consistency of practical change documented. The assessment must consider the scope and quality of development or revision, the extent of operationalisation, and whether improvements are sustained and systemic rather than occasional or symbolic.
- **Attribution:** Assessment requires clear evidence that the observed changes can be attributed, in whole or in part, to the concerned EUFPI intervention (e.g., technical assistance, capacity-building, policy dialogue, or financial support).

- **Avoid double counting:** Each legal or policy instrument should be assessed only once per reporting cycle. If several institutions are involved in implementation, a single consolidated score should be reported, justified by the overall extent of change.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is there documented evidence confirming development, strengthening and/or implementation during the reporting period?
2. Does the assessment distinguish clearly between development, strengthening and implementation stages?
3. Is the rating based on the level and consistency of practical change, not only formal adoption?
4. Are information sources triangulated and sufficient to justify the rating?
5. Is attribution to the EU/FPI intervention explicit and supported by evidence?
6. Has each instrument been assessed only once per reporting cycle?

Example:

In Year Y, an EU/FPI-funded project in Country X supported the preparation of a new law on the prevention of gender-based violence, facilitated multi-stakeholder consultations, and trained relevant authorities on operational procedures. During the reporting period, the law was formally adopted, budget lines were allocated, and enforcement protocols were introduced in multiple districts. Monitoring reports confirmed systematic application. Attribution to EU support was documented. Based on the evidence, the assessment was: 4 – To a significant extent. The value to be reported is "4 – To a significant extent".

## 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: Official records confirming the preparation, revision or adoption of legislation or policies (e.g., gazettes, decrees, parliamentary records); Regulatory documents and operational manuals developed or updated; Budgetary allocations and financial commitments supporting implementation; Enforcement or service delivery reports demonstrating application in practice; Training records and capacity-building documentation; Triangulated stakeholder interviews and surveys providing evidence of operational use; National monitoring or compliance reports, where attribution to the EU/FPI intervention is clearly established.

## 6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator helps track the real-world effects of EU support in strengthening legal and policy frameworks to address violence against women and girls. It provides insight into institutional performance, systemic changes, and the alignment of national practices with international commitments on gender equality and human rights.

Potential issues: Attribution challenges when reforms are supported by multiple donors or actors. Risk of overestimating progress based on formal adoption without verifying consistent application. Limited documentation or reluctance to share sensitive data. Political sensitivity around gender-based violence legislation. Mitigation measures include triangulating sources, ensuring attribution is clearly documented, encouraging systematic evidence collection by implementing partners, and applying structured interviews where written records are incomplete.