FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code

Number of practices aimed at removing barriers preventing women from market access, investment and business development

OPSYS Code: 172922

2. Technical Details

Unit of measure: Number of practices.

Type of indicator: Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Cumulative (not annual).

Level of measurement: This is an **Outcome** indicator. It is typically associated with results such as “Improved economic inclusion of women”, “Reduced structural barriers to women’s entrepreneurship”, or “Increased gender-sensitive business reform implementation”.

Disaggregation: Not applicable.

3. Description

This indicator captures the extent to which EU/FPI-funded interventions contribute to enabling environments that support women’s equitable participation in economic life. It focuses on changes that reflect progress in addressing systemic constraints affecting women’s access to markets, investment opportunities, and business development. The indicator is particularly relevant in contexts where gender inequalities persist in economic systems or reform processes, and where targeted practices can lead to more inclusive and sustainable economic outcomes. Sectors involved: Gender Equality; Market; Investments; Reforms.

Note: This indicator complements Indicator 172904, which measures the number of relevant actors influenced to adopt gender-sensitive processes. While 172904 focuses on institutional behaviour change, this indicator (172922) captures the concrete practices implemented as a result.

4. Calculation of Values and Example

The value of this indicator is calculated by counting the number of distinct practices supported or introduced through EU/FPI-funded interventions that are explicitly aimed at removing barriers preventing women from accessing markets, investment, or business development opportunities.

Technical definitions:

Practices: Refers to institutional, procedural or operational measures—whether formal or informal—that are implemented with the intention of producing structural or behavioural change. Practices may be adopted by public authorities, financial institutions, business platforms, or other relevant actors.
Barriers: Any legal, administrative, financial, cultural or informational obstacle that limits women’s capacity to access, engage in, or benefit from economic activities on equal terms with men.
Market access: The ability to enter and compete in local, national or international markets for goods or services, including access to clients, suppliers, infrastructure, and regulatory systems.
Investment: The ability to obtain or allocate capital—such as loans, equity, grants or credit guarantees—for economic activities, whether through private, public or blended finance.
Business development: The process of establishing, expanding or sustaining a business or income-generating activity, including access to skills, services, finance, technology, networks and enabling conditions.

Counting Guidance:

- **Basic counting rules:** Count each practice only once per reporting cycle. Include only those that are operational, documented, and clearly linked to the removal of one or more barriers affecting women’s economic participation. The practice must be attributable, at least in part, to the concerned EU/FPI-funded intervention.

- **Avoid double counting:** If a practice addresses more than one barrier, it should still be counted as a single unit. Practices repeated in different locations or institutions may be counted separately only if they are contextually adapted and independently operationalised. A practice may be counted again in a future reporting cycle only if it is newly introduced, significantly adapted, or scaled to a different institutional or geographic setting. Continuation of an existing practice without modification should not be re-counted.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Has the practice been clearly documented as operational during the reporting period?
2. Is there evidence that the practice is aimed at removing at least one barrier affecting women's market access, investment, or business development?
3. Is the practice attributable, at least in part, to an EU/FPI-funded intervention?
4. Has double counting been avoided?

Example:

In Year Y, an EU/FPI-funded programme in Region X supported a business reform initiative with gender focus. During the reporting period, the following practices were implemented: (i) introduction of a simplified licensing process for women-led microenterprises by a regional authority; (ii) creation of a public-private platform offering tailored investment readiness support for women entrepreneurs; (iii) integration of gender-sensitive criteria into the loan approval policy of a participating financial institution. All three practices were documented as active and traceable to the intervention. The total value to be reported is 3.

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: Policy implementation reports or reform tracking tools; Institutional documents confirming procedural or regulatory changes; Monitoring reports or deliverables from implementing partners; Public announcements, circulars or operational manuals issued by supported institutions; Stakeholder interviews or structured assessments confirming the uptake of practices; Third-party evaluations or verification missions documenting the operationalisation of practices.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator supports monitoring of gender-transformative outcomes within economic reform and market systems development. It can inform analysis of institutional responsiveness, structural inclusion, and progress towards reducing gender gaps in economic participation.

Potential issues: Attribution may be difficult in multi-stakeholder environments where reforms are jointly supported by several actors. There is also a risk of over-reporting if practices are counted based on intention rather than actual implementation. The level of formality may vary across contexts, making standardisation of what constitutes a "practice" challenging. To mitigate these risks, reported practices must be verifiable, operational, and clearly linked to the intervention.