

## FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Number of refugees/IDPs intending to return to their community of origin</b></p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 65754</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Number of individuals.</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Quantitative; Actual (ex-post); Cumulative (not annual).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an <b>Outcome</b> indicator. It would logically be associated with an outcome such as “Increased refugees/IDPs’ voluntary return to / reintegration in their communities of origin”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u></p> <p>Mandatory:</p> <p><b>By Sex:</b> Female, Male, Intersex.</p>
3. Description
<p>This indicator captures the number of displaced individuals—refugees or internally displaced persons (IDPs)—who express their intention to return to their original community. The key measurement is the expressed personal intention to return, not the act of returning itself. The indicator is typically used in the context of voluntary return support, reintegration strategies, or conflict/post-conflict recovery interventions.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>The value of the indicator is calculated by counting the number of individuals who declare their intention to return to their community of origin, as measured through survey or structured interview instruments.</p> <p><u>Technical definitions:</u></p> <p><b>Refugees:</b> Individuals who have been forced to flee their country of origin due to persecution, conflict, violence, or human rights violations, and who have crossed an international border seeking protection. Refugee status is recognised under international law, notably the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, and is typically granted by host country authorities or UNHCR (Source: UNHCR).</p> <p><b>Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs):</b> Persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or leave their homes or places of habitual residence—due to armed conflict, generalised violence, human rights violations, or natural or human-made disasters—and who have not crossed an internationally recognised State border. IDPs remain under the protection of their own government, even if that government is the cause of their displacement (Source: UN OCHA).</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Basic counting rules:</b> Each individual/respondent should be counted only once per reporting cycle. Do not include individuals who did not clearly state “intention”.</li> <li>• <b>Concept of “intention”:</b> This concept should be captured via direct self-reporting from respondents using clear, neutral, and consistent wording. Tools such as IOM’s Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) and UNHCR’s intention surveys are often used to collect such data. Questions should refer to a defined future timeframe (e.g. “Do you intend to return in the next 12 months?”), and care must be taken not to infer intent based on proxy behaviour or opinions from third parties. Sample must be clearly defined, e.g. representative of a specific camp, region, or target group.</li> </ul>

- **Attribution:** Only individuals directly supported by the concerned EU/FPI-funded intervention should be counted, i.e.: there must be a clear causal link between the intervention's activities (e.g. information provision, reintegration support, confidence-building measures) and the data collection process used to capture "intention". If multiple donors are involved, EU/FPI support must be identifiable and significant in scope or contribution.
- **Avoid double counting:** Each individual should be counted only once within the same reporting period, even if they are surveyed multiple times or in different locations. Individuals should also not be counted again in subsequent reporting cycles unless it is confirmed that their intention was recorded in a different context or timeframe.

#### Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is the respondent's intention to return clearly self-declared, based on direct and neutral questioning?
2. Was the question linked to a defined future timeframe, e.g. "within the next 12 months"?
3. Has the sample been clearly defined and relevant to the intervention context?
4. Has double counting been avoided within and across reporting cycles?
5. Is there a demonstrable link between the data collected and the EU/FPI-funded intervention?
6. Has the mandatory disaggregation by sex been included in the reported values?

#### Example:

In Year Y, under an EU/FPI-funded intervention in the eastern part of country X, a return intention survey was carried out among displaced populations living in five temporary settlements. Out of a total of 950 individuals surveyed, 535 declared they intended to return to their original communities within the next 12 months. The value reported for Year Y is 535, disaggregation by sex: Female: 280, Male: 245, Intersex: 10. Possible OPSYS comment box: Survey conducted using standardised IOM-DTM questionnaire. Intention captured via direct question: "Do you intend to return to your place of origin within the next 12 months?" All responses were self-declared and recorded during face-to-face interviews by trained enumerators.

### **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: Return intention surveys conducted by implementing partners or international agencies (e.g. IOM, UNHCR); Baseline or endline assessments; Structured interviews with displaced populations; Mobile or digital survey platforms used by humanitarian actors; Third-party M&E reports.

### **6. Other Uses / Potential Issues**

This indicator is commonly used to assess the willingness of displaced populations to reintegrate and to monitor the perceived viability of return processes. It can serve as an early proxy for the success of confidence-building, information provision, or reintegration support activities. Disaggregated data also contribute to conflict sensitivity and gender analysis in return programming.

Potential issues: Intention may not translate into actual return and can fluctuate with changing circumstances. Poorly phrased questions, lack of a defined timeframe, or indirect reporting may lead to misinterpretation. Risk of double counting or weak attribution where sampling is unclear or data is not directly linked to EU/FPI support. Mitigation measures include using standardised tools and neutral phrasing with defined timeframes; ensuring robust sampling strategies, applying disaggregation, and documenting attribution to the EU/FPI intervention; and implementing cross-checks or anonymised IDs to minimise duplication.