

FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

| 1. Indicator Name and Code |
|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">% of families with livelihood support who have materially improved living conditions</p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 65753</p> |
| 2. Technical Details |
| <p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Percentage.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Non-cumulative (frequency based on reporting calendar).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an Outcome indicator. It would logically be associated with outcomes such as “Improved living conditions” or “Increased household resilience / quality of life”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u></p> <p>Mandatory:</p> <p>By Sex: Female, Male, Intersex (based on the sex of the respondent or main beneficiary within the household).</p> |
| 3. Description |
| <p>This indicator measures the proportion of families who, after receiving livelihood support through an EU/FPI-funded intervention, report that their living conditions have <u>materially</u> improved. It captures the <u>perceived outcomes of support</u> designed to enhance household-level resilience, income generation, or basic well-being. The focus is on tangible changes experienced by beneficiary families that they attribute to the intervention. This is a perception-based outcome indicator and does not aim to measure long-term socio-economic transformation, but rather self-reported improvements in living standards resulting from livelihood assistance.</p> |
| 4. Calculation of Values and Example |
| <p>The indicator is calculated as the percentage of households that report a material improvement in their living conditions after receiving livelihood support through the concerned EU/FPI intervention.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livelihood support: Targeted actions aimed at enabling households to improve or stabilise their income-generating capacity and meet basic needs, e.g. vocational or business training, provision of tools or equipment, micro-grants or loans, agricultural inputs, job placement services, or cash-for-work schemes. • “Materially improved living conditions”: Refers to a self-reported enhancement in the household’s tangible living standards as perceived by the beneficiary. Improvements may relate to food security, housing, clothing, access to clean water, sanitation, education, energy, or ability to cover essential expenses. The definition must be clearly operationalised in the survey tools used. • Basic counting rules: Include all families who respond positively to a standardised question regarding material improvement, from all families surveyed that received livelihood support through the intervention. Each household must be counted only once per reporting cycle. • Survey Implementation Tips: <u>Question phrasing:</u> Surveys must include a question such as “As a result of the support received from this project/programme, would you say that your family’s living conditions have materially improved?”. <u>Response scale:</u> A Likert-type scale is recommended; only “Strongly agree” and “Agree” are counted as positive responses. <u>Target population:</u> Only families that were directly targeted by the livelihood component of the concerned EU/FPI intervention should be surveyed. <u>Timing:</u> Data should be collected after a reasonable period has passed since the delivery of livelihood support—typically 3 to 12 months—depending on the nature of the intervention. |

- **Representative sampling:** Where full coverage is not feasible, a representative and documented sampling method must be used. Limitations and methodology should be recorded in the narrative and OPSYS comment box.
- **Attribution of support:** The question must clearly refer to the livelihood support provided through the EU/FPI-funded Action.
- **Avoid double counting:** One response per family per reporting cycle.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Are only families who received livelihood support by the concerned EU/FPI intervention included in the survey?
2. Is the question clearly phrased and explicitly linked to the support received?
3. Is “material improvement” defined or contextualised in the survey tool?
4. Was the data collected after a suitable interval following the support (e.g. 3–12 months)?
5. Has double counting been avoided (one response per household per cycle)?
6. Are results disaggregated by sex of the (main) respondent?

Example:

In a follow-up survey conducted six months after the completion of an EU/FPI-funded livelihood programme in regions A and B, 320 families that had received vocational training and small business grants were surveyed. Out of these, 231 respondents (72.2%) reported that their living conditions had materially improved as a result of the support. Sex-disaggregated results showed that 76.9% of women respondents (100/130), 69.8% of men (120/172), and 84.6% of intersex respondents (11/13) reported a positive change. The value to be reported is 72.2%, disaggregated by sex as follows: 76.9% for women, 69.8% for men, and 84.6% for intersex respondents. Note for comments in OPSYS and in the Progress Report: Women represented 40.6% of respondents (130/320), men 53.8% (172/320), and intersex individuals 4.1% (13/320). As a perception-based indicator, results should be interpreted in the context of the types of support received and the timeframe since delivery.

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 household perception surveys conducted with recipients of livelihood support; Post-distribution monitoring tools including questions on perceived improvement; Semi-structured interviews or focus group discussions (for triangulation); and external M&E reports containing perception-based outcome data.

6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator helps assess whether short- to medium-term livelihood interventions are translating into meaningful improvements in living conditions. It is particularly relevant in fragile, conflict-affected, or post-emergency contexts where material recovery and family well-being are key outcomes.

Potential issues: Beneficiaries may feel compelled to report improvements due to perceived expectations. What constitutes “material improvement” may vary across households and contexts. Effects of livelihood support may take time to materialise and be perceived. Mitigation measures include using anonymous survey tools and clarify that responses will not affect future support; including context-specific explanations and examples of “material improvement” in the survey instrument; and timing the survey appropriately (e.g. minimum 3–6 months after delivery of support) to allow observable change.