Violence Prevention Evidence Compass

Platform documentation: data sources, tools, workflows and multilingual operation

Innovaforte · Working documentation · 2 October 2026

Platform: evidencecompassvp.innovaforte.com

Status: Independent pilot implementation. Economic Impact remains under development.

Purpose of this document: Explain how Evidence Compass brings together international and national evidence, works with sources that do not provide APIs, supports analysis and reporting, and presents evidence in multiple languages.

This document describes the functionality and processing approach presented by the current demonstration, together with its intended development direction. It is functional and architectural documentation, rather than an audit of the deployed source code, infrastructure or security controls. Current capabilities and planned extensions are distinguished throughout.

Table of contents

1. Purpose and scope
2. How the platform works
3. Connecting international and national sources
4. Morocco case study: working without an API
5. The shared evidence model
6. Methodology, comparability and evidence quality
7. Platform tools: purpose and operation
8. How the tools work together
9. Economic Impact: current development and future coverage
10. Multilingual operation: front end and back end
11. Extending countries, sources and languages
12. Current limitations and implementation priorities
13. Glossary
14. Platform reference pages

1. Purpose and scope

1.1 What Evidence Compass does

Violence Prevention Evidence Compass brings evidence from different official systems into a common environment for exploration, comparison and interpretation.

Its purpose is to help users answer practical questions:

- What evidence is available for a country, population or form of violence?
- What do international and national sources report?
- Are apparently similar figures measuring the same thing?
- Which trends can be interpreted with confidence?
- Where is evidence missing, and what work could resolve the gap?
- Can information published in a report be converted into usable structured evidence?
- How can the findings be communicated in a traceable report?
- As the economic module develops, what can the evidence support about prevention costs, impacts and investment?

The platform combines structured evidence exploration with an evidence assistant, report analysis, reporting and methodological assessment.

A central principle is that **every number needs context**. A value is useful only when the user can understand its source, population, period, unit and method of measurement.

1.2 Pilot coverage

The demonstration covers six countries, providing examples of different national evidence systems and publication practices.

Pilot country	WHO regional grouping used in the demonstration	Examples of national evidence sources
Canada	Region of the Americas	Statistics Canada
France	European Region	SSMSI, within the Ministry of the Interior
South Africa	African Region	South African Police Service and Statistics South Africa
Morocco	Eastern Mediterranean Region	Haut-Commissariat au Plan
Thailand	South-East Asia Region	National Statistical Office
Philippines	Western Pacific Region	Philippine Statistics Authority, including publications carrying DSWD and police data

This selection demonstrates geographical and methodological diversity. **A country's results do not represent its WHO region.** Regional organisation helps users navigate the pilot; regional estimates require their own evidence and aggregation methodology.

1.3 Independent demonstration

Evidence Compass is an independent Innovaforte pilot using official public sources and a curated demonstration corpus.

The presence of WHO or government data does not imply institutional endorsement. The platform's comparison, trend and gap assessments are analytical outputs of the demonstration.

2. How the platform works

2.1 A common evidence layer

Different organisations publish evidence in different ways. Some provide APIs. Others publish downloadable workbooks, statistical tables, PDFs or web reports.

Evidence Compass accommodates these differences through source-specific connectors and extraction processes, then represents the resulting observations in a common evidence model.

This allows the analytical tools to work consistently even when the source formats differ.

```
flowchart TD
    A["International and national sources"] --> B{"Available publication format"}
    B --> C["API or machine-readable table"]
    B --> D["Official report or spreadsheet"]
    C --> E["Source-specific retrieval and mapping"]
    D --> F["Structured extraction and provenance"]
    E --> G["Validation and methodological checks"]
    F --> G
    G --> H["Shared evidence layer"]
    H --> I["Exploration, comparison and trends"]
    H --> J["Evidence assistant and reports"]
    H --> K["Economic analysis in development"]
```

Figure 1. Different acquisition routes feed a shared evidence layer. The source format changes how information is obtained; it does not remove the need for validation.

2.2 Three evidence-acquisition routes

Route	How evidence enters	Typical use
Live connector	A server-side process requests structured data from an official service	WHO and national statistical APIs
Official-report connector	A process reads structured text or tables from an official publication	Morocco's HCP reports and selected statistical yearbooks
Curated evidence	Observations are transcribed and reviewed in advance	Pilot baseline, unsupported sources and fallback records

These routes can coexist within one country.

For example, a country may provide a machine-readable homicide series while publishing child-protection evidence only in a PDF. The platform can use a different acquisition method for each source family.

2.3 What "live" means

A live connector retrieves data from an official endpoint. It does not mean that the underlying evidence describes events occurring today.

An API queried today might return:

- A survey conducted several years ago.
- An annual statistical series.
- A modelled estimate with an earlier reference year.
- A revised historical value.

The retrieval date, publication date and observation period therefore need to remain distinct.

2.4 Continuity when a source is unavailable

The current demonstration describes a fallback approach: if an external source cannot be retrieved, the relevant curated observations remain available.

This supports continuity, but the interface must disclose the acquisition status. Users should be able to distinguish a successful current retrieval from a retained curated record.

Source availability and evidence validity are separate questions. A successful API response still needs methodological checks; an unavailable endpoint does not automatically invalidate a previously reviewed observation.

3. Connecting international and national sources

3.1 What an API provides

An application programming interface, or API, provides a structured way for one system to request information from another.

For statistical evidence, a request may specify:

- Country or geographical area.
- Indicator.
- Reference year or time range.
- Sex.
- Age group.
- Unit.
- Population or other published dimensions.

The source returns records in a machine-readable format. A connector interprets the response and maps the source's fields onto Evidence Compass's evidence model.

An API reduces manual handling. It does not, by itself, establish that two datasets are comparable.

3.2 The role of a connector

Each connector must understand the source it reads.

Its responsibilities include:

1. **Retrieve the relevant records.** Request a defined dataset or table from the official source.

2. **Interpret dimensions.** Identify which rows refer to the intended country, population, period and measure.
3. **Map fields.** Translate source-specific codes and column names into the platform's common structure.
4. **Preserve meaning.** Retain units, definitions, age limits and other methodological distinctions.
5. **Attach provenance.** Record the agency, dataset or publication, source location and retrieval information.
6. **Check replacement rules.** Determine whether a retrieved record corresponds to an existing curated observation.
7. **Expose exceptions.** Report unavailable sources, unexpected structures and conflicting values.

A connector should not silently convert a case count into a rate, combine incompatible populations or substitute a broader measure for a missing indicator.

3.3 International sources: WHO

The current demonstration includes a connector to the WHO Global Health Observatory using its OData interface.

Its documented scope is deliberately narrow:

- Homicide-rate estimates.
- Lifetime intimate partner violence estimates.
- Previous-12-month intimate partner violence estimates.

WHO country profiles and publications also contribute to the curated evidence base.

International evidence can provide common definitions or estimation frameworks across countries. National evidence may offer more detail, more recent administrative records or additional topics.

The platform retains both perspectives because they can answer different questions. WHO-modelled homicide estimates, for example, are not automatically interchangeable with police-recorded homicide statistics.

The WHO connector is described as preserving national observations rather than overwriting them.

3.4 National sources and acquisition methods

Source	Current documented acquisition approach	Important distinctions
Statistics Canada	Web Data Service for selected Canada-level annual series	Homicide rates and hate-crime counts remain separate
SSMSI, France	Official machine-readable time-series base	Population scope, recorded victims and recorded offences must be preserved
SAPS, South Africa	Connector to an official machine-readable quarterly crime workbook	Quarterly counts and fiscal reporting periods must not be treated as annual prevalence
HCP, Morocco	Structured extraction from official PDF publications	Report-derived observations are not labelled as live API data

NSO, Thailand	Hybrid: open-data catalogue plus official-report extraction	Survey prevalence remains separate from administrative domestic-violence counts
PSA, Philippines	Hybrid: OpenSTAT machine-readable tables plus a report-extraction route	Rates, crime counts and child-welfare service records remain distinct

These descriptions concern the selected source families implemented in the pilot, rather than the complete data holdings of each organisation.

3.5 Source-specific examples

Canada. The connector retrieves selected annual series from Statistics Canada. A matching live Canadian observation may supersede its curated equivalent, but it must not replace a WHO observation measuring a different construct.

France. The SSMSI connector retrieves selected national series on recorded violence. Age-specific figures remain curated when the connected table lacks the necessary age dimension. A total-population series cannot supply a missing child-specific value.

South Africa. The SAPS route illustrates that a machine-readable source need not be an API. An official workbook can also support structured retrieval. The demonstration reports a retrieval failure during the review and retains curated records.

Thailand. Child violent-discipline prevalence is retrieved through an official open-data catalogue. Domestic-violence administrative figures use a report-based route. The two acquisition methods feed the same analytical environment while retaining different meanings.

Philippines. OpenSTAT supplies selected SDG and statistical-yearbook tables. DSWD cases served measure contact with services; they do not measure the prevalence of child abuse in the population.

3.6 Extending international coverage

The architecture can support additional international sources through new connectors or report adapters.

Each addition requires explicit decisions about:

- Which indicators are useful.
- Whether the source is primary or republishes another organisation’s data.
- How definitions align with existing evidence.
- Whether records duplicate an existing source.
- How revisions and conflicting estimates will be handled.

Adding a source expands the evidence base only when its meaning and provenance remain clear.

4. Morocco case study: working without an API

4.1 The practical problem

Useful evidence is often published in reports rather than exposed through a stable API.

Morocco illustrates this situation through official publications from the **Haut-Commissariat au Plan**, or HCP.

The relevant evidence includes violence against women, electronic violence and violence experienced by adolescent girls. The information is available in official documents, but must be identified, extracted and mapped before the platform can analyse it.

For these selected publications, Evidence Compass uses a **report-first approach**. This does not imply that HCP has no APIs or machine-readable products elsewhere.

4.2 The publications used

The current source documentation describes three report-based examples:

Publication or evidence family	Evidence extracted	Distinctions retained
Violence against women: 2009/2019 comparison	Published prevalence values by form of violence and residence	Survey years, violence categories, total/urban/rural populations
La femme marocaine en chiffres 2020	Electronic violence against women, using 2019 evidence	Publication year versus observation year; residence categories
Violence against children in Morocco	Violence against girls aged 15–19, using 2019 survey evidence	Age range, sex, reference year and residence

The platform's source-status page reported 30 validated report-derived observations across these three sources at the time of review. This is the application's reported processing result, not an independent re-extraction undertaken for this document.

4.3 Processing steps

Step 1 — Identify the official publication.

The source is associated with its publishing agency, title, URL, publication year and language.

Step 2 — Read structured document content.

The documented adapter reads PDF text and tables. The current Morocco implementation explicitly excludes OCR-based inference.

This is an important scope boundary: a scanned page or a chart embedded as an image is not equivalent to a structured table that can be read reliably.

Step 3 — Locate candidate observations.

The extraction process identifies numerical values together with the row labels, column labels and surrounding context needed to interpret them.

Step 4 — Preserve the source location.

The record retains the relevant page, figure or table reference. A reviewer can return to the original publication to inspect the evidence.

Step 5 — Map each candidate to a defined series.

A percentage must be associated with the correct population, age group, form of violence, residence category and reference year.

Step 6 — Check against the curated baseline.

In the current Morocco connector, an extracted value is used when it reproduces the validated curated observation for the corresponding series and scope.

If it does not match, the curated observation is retained and the candidate requires validation.

Step 7 — Make validated evidence available to the analytical tools.

The resulting observations can support exploration, comparison, trends and reports, with their report-derived status preserved.

4.4 Why the contextual details matter

Consider a report published in 2025 that analyses a survey conducted in 2019.

The correct interpretation is:

- **Publication year:** 2025.
- **Survey or observation year:** 2019.
- **Retrieval date:** when the platform accessed the report.

Calling the resulting figure “2025 prevalence” would misrepresent the evidence.

Similarly, an observation concerning electronic violence against adult women must not be relabelled as cyberbullying among schoolchildren. The subject matter overlaps, but the populations, definitions and measurement instruments differ.

4.5 Residence categories remain distinct

The HCP examples include total, urban and rural observations.

These categories must remain identifiable. The platform should not average urban and rural percentages to create a national estimate unless a justified weighting method and the necessary denominators are available.

Where the publication supplies a national total, that published total should remain the reference.

4.6 Identifying possible gap resolutions

A report can reveal evidence that may help address an existing gap.

For example, material on electronic violence among adolescent girls could be relevant to a broader cyber-violence evidence gap. It cannot automatically close a gap defined around a different age group or bullying measure.

The sequence is:

Identify the candidate → assess its definition and coverage → validate its intended use → update the gap assessment where justified.

4.7 What the Morocco case demonstrates

The Morocco implementation shows how the platform can use official evidence without depending on an API.

It also shows that document extraction is only one part of the work. The more consequential task is preserving what each value means.

The current matching approach provides a controlled demonstration of extraction and validation. Expanding to new editions and previously unseen values will require a review process that can approve genuine updates, rather than accepting only values already present in the curated baseline.

5. The shared evidence model

5.1 An observation is more than a number

An observation is a measured or published value with sufficient context to interpret it.

The report-analysis interface describes a 20-field observation model. Conceptually, the essential information falls into the following groups:

Information group	Examples
Geography	Country and regional association
Subject	Topic, indicator and series
Population	Population group, sex, age and residence scope where applicable
Time	Observation period, survey year and publication year
Measurement	Value and unit
Source	Agency, dataset, publication title and source URL
Provenance	Page, table, row, column or dataset identifier
Methodology	Survey prevalence, administrative record, modelled estimate or another defined method
Assessment	Validation status, comparability judgement and explanatory notes
Acquisition	Live retrieval, report-derived extraction or curated entry

This common model allows data obtained through different routes to appear in the same tools without losing its origin.

5.2 Units must remain explicit

Examples of distinct units include:

- Percentage of children.
- Percentage of ever-partnered women.
- Homicides per 100,000 population.
- Recorded offences.
- Recorded victims.
- Cases served by a welfare agency.

These values cannot be combined merely because they relate to violence.

A rise in service contacts may reflect improved access to assistance, changes in recording, increased underlying need, or a combination of factors. Its interpretation differs from a population-survey prevalence estimate.

5.3 Matching and replacement

A newly retrieved record should replace a curated record only when they correspond closely enough to represent the same observation.

Relevant matching dimensions include country, series, period, unit and population scope.

When a conflict appears, the task is to establish its cause. Possibilities include:

- A revised official release.
- Different coverage.
- A changed definition.
- Incorrect field mapping.
- A transcription error.
- Different editions of a publication.

The curated value is a reviewed baseline, but it should not be treated as permanently correct when credible conflicting evidence emerges.

6. Methodology, comparability and evidence quality

6.1 Four evidence views

View	Purpose	Interpretation
WHO	Focus on WHO-published, WHO-modelled or WHO-maintained evidence	An international-source perspective
National	Focus on official national evidence	A national-source perspective
Compare	Present relevant WHO and national measures alongside one another	Differences remain visible

Harmonised	Restrict analysis to evidence that meets compatibility requirements for the intended use	Inclusion requires methodological justification

“Harmonised” should not be read as permission to average all included values. Any combination still needs an appropriate method.

6.2 Comparability categories

The platform presents four categories:

Category	Meaning
Harmonisable	Definitions, populations, units, periods and methods are sufficiently compatible for the stated comparison or combination
Comparable with caution	The measures address similar phenomena, but meaningful methodological differences remain
Not comparable	Direct numerical comparison or merging would be misleading
Not yet assessed	The necessary methodological assessment has not been completed

Comparability is a relationship between measures for a particular purpose. A label on an observation should therefore be read with its assessment explanation.

6.3 Trend interpretation

Trend analysis requires successive observations measured on a sufficiently consistent basis.

A time series should not be constructed by joining:

- Survey prevalence to administrative counts.
- Different age groups without an appropriate adjustment.
- Annual and quarterly totals.
- Different recall periods.
- Figures with materially changed definitions.

Recorded increases or decreases also need careful wording. More recorded offences do not, on their own, establish the same proportional change in underlying violence.

6.4 Evidence gaps

The platform identifies gaps and describes the work that could resolve them.

Possible causes include:

- A relevant source has not yet been located.
- Evidence exists in a report but has not been extracted.
- A necessary age or sex breakdown is missing.
- Two measures cannot yet be compared.

- No suitable evidence is available in the current corpus.

A gap in the platform does not necessarily mean that no evidence exists anywhere. The distinction helps users prioritise source discovery, extraction, methodological review or new data collection.

6.5 The role of human review

Automation supports retrieval, extraction and organisation. Review remains necessary where interpretation or validation cannot safely be automated.

The current uploaded-report workflow describes accepted observations as entering a session-scoped layer. They do not automatically alter the curated baseline.

A persistent operational service would need defined reviewer roles, approval records and version management.

7. Platform tools: purpose and operation

7.1 Overview

Purpose: Introduce the evidence landscape and provide a starting point for investigation.

The Overview combines evidence-selection controls with coverage summaries, a country/topic matrix, gap information and observations.

Users can select a topic, country or source perspective, then move into a more detailed tool.

7.2 Dashboard

Purpose: Present the current evidence landscape at a glance.

The Dashboard brings together summary measures such as observations, country coverage, source records, connector activity and unresolved gaps.

It also presents coverage and analytical summaries.

Counts have different meanings: one source publication can contain many observations, while one connector can retrieve multiple series. These should remain separately labelled.

7.3 Evidence Compass — the explorer

Purpose: Inspect individual observations and their provenance.

Users filter the evidence by dimensions such as country, topic, population, sex, age, source and period.

Opening an observation allows the user to examine the underlying agency, source reference and methodology.

This is the detailed evidence-inspection tool supporting the platform’s summaries and narratives.

7.4 Compare Sources

Purpose: Explain similarities and differences between related international and national measures.

The tool places selected measures alongside one another and explains whether their definitions and coverage permit comparison.

It is especially useful when two figures appear contradictory. The explanation may show that one is a lifetime survey estimate and the other a count of recorded incidents within a year.

The tool's value lies in making those distinctions explicit.

7.5 Trends

Purpose: Examine change over time within defined series.

The Trends tool presents time-based observations and classifications, with access to the underlying evidence.

Users should inspect:

- The measure and unit.
- The beginning and end periods.
- Whether the population and instrument remain consistent.
- Whether the classification describes underlying prevalence or recorded activity.

Trend conclusions should remain tied to the series that supports them.

7.6 Evidence Gaps

Purpose: Turn missing evidence into an actionable work list.

Each gap includes an explanation and a possible resolution.

For example, a missing cyberbullying series may call for locating an official education survey, extracting a published table or reviewing whether an existing national definition matches the intended indicator.

The tool helps distinguish evidence-development tasks from analytical findings.

7.7 WHO Regions

Purpose: Organise the pilot geographically.

The regional view shows the demonstration's country coverage and associated evidence counts.

It should be used as an entry point into the evidence. With one pilot country per region, it does not constitute a regional prevalence estimate or regional performance ranking.

7.8 Countries

Purpose: Provide a country-centred view of evidence coverage.

Country profiles summarise the source mix, observations and gaps, with routes into the explorer.

This is useful for users beginning with a national programme or policy question.

7.9 Ask the Evidence

Purpose: Allow users to query the evidence in ordinary language.

The documented processing approach is:

1. Interpret the question.
2. Convert it into a structured evidence query.
3. Retrieve the relevant observations and assessments.
4. Explain the result in the selected language.

The site states that comparability, harmonisability, trend and gap classifications come from the platform's defined methodology. The language model's role is to explain the evidence.

The assistant is scoped to the platform's evidence base and connected official sources. It is not presented as an unrestricted open-web research assistant.

Examples of useful questions include:

- "Where do WHO and national figures disagree?"
- "What evidence exists on electronic violence in Morocco?"
- "Which measures can be harmonised?"
- "Which sources are live and which come from reports?"

7.10 Analyse a Report

Purpose: Turn an official document into candidate structured observations.

The interface accepts PDF, XLSX, XLS, CSV and HTML files, with a stated demonstration limit of 50 MB.

Its five stages are:

Stage	Function
Document intake	Capture the document and confirm source metadata
Structured extraction	Read supported text, cells and tables
Field mapping	Associate values with the observation model
Methodological assessment	Examine quality, scope and relationships to existing evidence
Human validation	Review candidates before accepting them into the session evidence layer

The source agency, country, title, publication year, reference year, URL and language help establish context.

The interface states that processing is server-side and that uploaded documents are not stored as application assets. Those statements describe the demonstration's declared behaviour; a deployment-specific privacy and retention review would still be needed for operational use.

7.11 Generate a Report

Purpose: Assemble an evidence report from the current evidence base.

The interface provides controls for geography, evidence view, report depth and language, plus PDF export.

The reporting design includes an executive narrative supported by evidence, graphics, methodological explanations, gaps and references.

The report should preserve the same values and assessments available in the analytical tools. Narrative generation must not introduce unsupported figures.

Reports are snapshots: their content reflects the evidence available at generation time. Where live retrievals or session-validated observations change, a regenerated report may differ.

An optional economic annex currently relates to the Thailand demonstration.

7.12 Sources & Methodology

Purpose: Explain where the evidence comes from and how it is processed.

This section includes:

- Source publications.
- Comparability definitions.
- Trend methodology.
- Connector descriptions.
- Retrieval or extraction status.
- Validation discrepancies.
- Coverage and planned ingestion information.

It is the main reference point for understanding the platform's evidence-handling approach.

7.13 Economic Impact

Purpose: Develop the connection between violence-prevention evidence, intervention costs and potential economic consequences.

The module is under development. Its current scope and intended expansion are described in Section 9.

8. How the tools work together

8.1 A connected analytical workflow

The tools are intended to use a shared evidence foundation.

A user can begin with a summary, inspect a specific observation, investigate a disagreement, identify missing evidence and communicate the result without redefining the underlying measure at every step.

```
flowchart TD
    A["Overview or Dashboard"] --> B["Select a country, topic or signal"]
    B --> C["Explorer: inspect observations"]
    C --> D["Compare Sources and Trends"]
    D --> E{"Is the evidence sufficient?"}
    E -->|"Yes"| F["Explain findings and generate a report"]
    E -->|"No"| G["Evidence Gaps"]
    G --> H["Locate a source or analyse a report"]
    H --> I["Review candidate observations"]
    I --> C
```

Figure 2. Evidence gaps can lead back into acquisition and review, making evidence development part of the analytical workflow.

8.2 Example: a Morocco evidence question

A user asks what evidence is available on electronic violence in Morocco.

The tools contribute as follows:

Tool	Contribution
Ask the Evidence	Provides an accessible starting answer within the available corpus
Explorer	Shows the relevant HCP observations and their population definitions
Sources & Methodology	Identifies the official report and extraction route
Compare Sources	Explains why adult women's electronic-violence figures may not align with adolescent bullying measures
Evidence Gaps	Identifies missing or insufficiently comparable youth evidence
Analyse a Report	Supports review of an additional official publication
Generate a Report	Communicates findings with references and limitations

8.3 Example: investigating an apparent discrepancy

Suppose a national recorded-violence series increases while a survey-based measure appears stable.

The platform should support investigation of:

- Different populations.
- Different time periods.
- Changes in reporting behaviour.
- Changes in recording practice.
- Different definitions or denominators.

It should not automatically average the two measures or select whichever produces the clearest narrative.

8.4 Consistency across outputs

The same evidence selection should produce consistent values and methodological conclusions across the explorer, assistant, charts and reports.

This is an architectural requirement. Current discrepancies between pages should be treated as implementation issues to resolve, rather than alternative interpretations of the same evidence.

9. Economic Impact: current development and future coverage

9.1 Development status

Economic Impact remains under development.

The current demonstration focuses on:

- Thailand.
- Violence against children.
- Violent discipline.
- Parenting for Lifelong Health for Young Children, or PLH-YC.

This is an initial implementation through which to develop the economic evidence structure and calculation rules.

9.2 Intended coverage

The planned module will extend across **all six demonstration countries**, using national, regional and international evidence where appropriate.

Its intended scope includes:

- Country-specific economic and intervention evidence.
- Relevant regional studies and reference information.
- International evidence that can inform national analysis.
- Comparisons between prevention scenarios.
- Clear identification of where evidence cannot support a calculation.

This expansion does not imply that every country will immediately have enough data for every output. Coverage should reflect the availability and suitability of the inputs.

Regional evidence may inform an analysis, but a regional value cannot automatically be applied to every country. Equally, one country's results cannot be presented as a regional total.

9.3 Questions the module is intended to support

As the module develops, it should help users investigate:

- What does a defined intervention cost?
- Which population is eligible?

- How many participants could a programme reach?
- What implementation capacity is required?
- What prevention effect is supported by evidence?
- What economic burden might be avoided?
- Under what assumptions could benefits exceed costs?
- Which missing inputs prevent a defensible investment case?

9.4 Different classes of input

The current design separates several classes of information:

Classification	Meaning
Observed evidence	Published measurements of violence or related outcomes
Intervention-study evidence	Findings and parameters from an intervention study
Validated economic input	A reviewed cost, denominator or other economic parameter
Model assumption	A disclosed scenario choice or modelling proposition
Missing input	Information required for a calculation but not adequately available
Derived calculation	A result calculated from identified inputs and assumptions

These labels help users distinguish a published result from a scenario constructed inside the platform.

9.5 Why denominators matter

The Thailand example illustrates a fundamental issue: **a cost per caregiver requires a caregiver denominator**.

An official count of children aged 2–9 cannot simply be multiplied by a programme cost per caregiver.

The relationship between children and eligible caregivers may depend on household structure, programme eligibility and participation rules.

The module therefore distinguishes:

- The official child-population reference.
- The number of eligible caregivers.
- Study-specific beneficiary counts.
- Custom coverage assumptions.

A missing caregiver denominator leaves the corresponding budget calculation unavailable.

9.6 Published scenarios and custom scenarios

A published study may contain a national scale-up scenario with its own beneficiary counts, staffing requirements and costs.

Those inputs can support reproduction of that published scenario.

A custom scenario—such as reaching half the official child population—requires a separately justified relationship between the selected population, programme participants and costs.

The existence of a published national budget does not automatically validate every custom coverage scenario.

9.7 Transfer of intervention effects

An intervention's measured outcome may differ from the platform's national indicator.

Differences may include:

- Population and age range.
- Definition of violence.
- Recall period.
- Survey instrument.
- Implementation setting.
- Follow-up period.

Applying an intervention effect to a national baseline is therefore a modelling transfer requiring justification.

An explicit user acknowledgement makes an assumption visible; it does not, by itself, establish that the transfer is scientifically valid.

9.8 Economic outputs and prerequisites

Potential output	Required foundations
Programme budget	Eligible participants, coverage, unit costs and implementation assumptions
Prevention impact	Baseline outcome, intervention effect, justified transfer and time horizon
Avoided economic burden	Prevention impact and attributable economic-cost evidence
Cost per outcome prevented	Supported programme costs and prevention outcomes
Benefit–cost ratio or return on investment	Defined costs and benefits, consistent scope, time horizon and valuation assumptions

Costs also need a stated currency, price year and perspective. Provider costs and societal costs represent different scopes and must remain identifiable.

9.9 Missing inputs remain visible

When required inputs are missing, the module should explain why an output is unavailable.

This is useful decision support. It identifies the evidence or methodological work needed before a more complete investment case can be produced.

10. Multilingual operation: front end and back end

10.1 Current site languages

The site offers six languages:

Language	Selector	Direction
English	EN	Left to right
French	FR	Left to right
Spanish	ES	Left to right
Russian	RU	Left to right
Chinese	中文	Left to right
Arabic	العربية	Right to left

These correspond to the six official WHO languages.

French and Arabic interface switching were checked during preparation of this document. Arabic also changes the page's language and direction settings.

Some newer content remains incompletely localised. For example, the Economic Impact navigation label remained in English in the inspected French and Arabic views.

10.2 Three distinct language layers

Multilingual operation involves three separate concerns:

Layer	What it controls
Interface language	Navigation, buttons, filters, explanatory text and status messages
Source language	The language of the original publication or dataset metadata
Output language	Assistant explanations, report narratives and presentation labels

These layers do not have to match.

A French publication can support an English report or an Arabic explanation, while the original source title and reference remain intact.

10.3 Front-end operation

The front end is the browser interface.

Its language setting determines how the user encounters the platform: navigation, instructions, filter labels and explanatory content.

Arabic requires additional layout handling because text direction is right to left. Mixed content—such as Arabic text alongside URLs, numbers and Latin-script source titles—also requires careful presentation.

The site's privacy notice states that the language choice is stored in the browser.

The language selector should change presentation without changing the evidence values or the methodological assessment.

10.4 Back-end operation

The back end handles source retrieval, document processing and the preparation of evidence for analysis and generated outputs.

The functional architecture separates structured evidence from its translated presentation.

For example, one observation has a defined country, series, value, unit and period. It should not become six separate factual records because the interface offers six languages.

The language layer supplies the appropriate wording around that shared observation.

The precise implementation of translation resources, services and storage would require source-code inspection. The required behaviour is clear: **language changes must preserve evidence identity and analytical meaning**.

10.5 Source-language handling

When a document is analysed, its source language forms part of the metadata.

The upload interface offers source-language options beyond the six interface languages, including Thai, Filipino, German and Portuguese.

This reflects a useful distinction:

- Interface support determines which languages the user can navigate in.
- Source processing determines which publications can be interpreted reliably.

A source-language option alone does not prove that every document layout in that language can be extracted accurately. Tables, terminology, scripts and publication formats still require testing.

Original publication titles, agency names and references should remain available alongside any translated explanation.

10.6 Multilingual evidence questions

The evidence assistant is designed to:

1. Interpret the user's question.
2. Map it to the platform's structured concepts.
3. Retrieve the relevant evidence.
4. Explain the result in the selected answer language.

The site states that answers follow the language selected at the top of the page.

The retrieved evidence and the comparability, trend and gap verdicts should remain consistent across languages. Translation must not change a cautious comparison into a confident equivalence.

This documented behaviour was not tested through a complete multilingual question-and-answer audit for this document.

10.7 Multilingual reports

The report-generation interface includes a language control.

The intended result is a report whose headings and explanatory narrative use the selected language while retaining:

- The underlying numerical values.
- Population and period definitions.
- Source references.
- Methodological qualifications.
- Evidence-status distinctions.

PDF generation also needs appropriate fonts and layout support for non-Latin scripts and Arabic text direction.

10.8 Adding more languages

The architecture can be extended to additional languages without creating separate national evidence databases.

Adding a language requires more than adding a selector button:

1. Translate interface text and methodological explanations.
2. Review technical terminology.
3. Add appropriate labels for indicators, units and statuses.
4. Test question interpretation and answer generation.
5. Verify report and PDF output.
6. Check fonts, text direction, dates and number formatting.
7. Confirm that equivalent questions preserve the same evidence and assessments.
8. Review fallback behaviour where a translation is missing.

Translation quality is part of evidence quality. Terms such as “recorded victim”, “survey prevalence” and “modelled estimate” must retain their distinctions.

11. Extending countries, sources and languages

11.1 Adding a country

A new country requires a defined evidence scope, official source inventory and methodological review.

The process should establish which topics are covered, which acquisition routes are available and where gaps remain.

Adding the country's name to the interface is only the presentation step. The substantive work is mapping and validating its evidence.

11.2 Adding a source

A source onboarding process should document:

Step	Result
Establish authority and scope	Clear publishing organisation and dataset coverage
Identify format	API, table, workbook, report or another supported route
Define mappings	Indicators, populations, periods and units
Validate retrieval	Correct values with traceable references
Assess relationships	Comparability with existing series
Define maintenance	Update, revision, failure and review procedures

11.3 Extending to another evidence domain

The underlying Evidence Compass concept is reusable.

A further implementation could retain the core mechanisms for provenance, source retrieval, comparison, gaps, reporting and multilingual presentation while supplying its own:

- Domain vocabulary.
- Indicators.
- Sources.
- Methodological rules.
- User workflows.

Violence-prevention-specific logic must remain explicit. Reuse of the software structure does not justify reuse of unrelated definitions or comparability rules.

12. Current limitations and implementation priorities

12.1 Pilot rather than production service

The site identifies itself as a private demonstration and not a production system.

Its public descriptions provide useful functional documentation, but do not establish production readiness, independently verified security, continuous availability or complete validation of every analytical result.

12.2 Documentation consistency

The Sources & Methodology page contains both active retrieval descriptions and older text saying that live connectors are not enabled.

The connector inventory and explanatory copy need reconciliation so that each source has one clear current status.

12.3 Validation discrepancies

The source-status page exposes unresolved discrepancies, including:

- Thailand domestic-violence totals whose extracted and curated values suggest a possible column-order mismatch.
- Philippine child-welfare records where retrieved values differ from the curated baseline.

These require source-level review. Neither the incoming values nor the existing curated records should be assumed correct solely because of their acquisition route.

12.4 Consistent analytical classifications

Trend wording needs alignment across tools.

The Dashboard describes careful use of recorded increases and decreases, while the Trends page was observed using “Improving” for a recorded murder-count series.

The same methodological rules should govern all views, assistant explanations and reports.

12.5 Complete localisation

Core language switching is present, but newer modules need a complete translation review.

Testing should cover the interface, methodological explanations, source statuses, assistant output, reports and PDFs.

12.6 Economic expansion

Economic Impact needs country-specific inputs and validated methods before extending its calculations across the six-country pilot.

The expansion should make differences in evidence availability visible. An unavailable result with a clear explanation is preferable to a calculation based on an undisclosed assumption.

13. Glossary

Term	Meaning
API	A structured interface through which software requests data from another system
Connector	A source-specific component that retrieves and maps information
Observation	A value together with its population, period, unit, source and methodological context
Curated evidence	Evidence transcribed or assembled and reviewed in advance

Live retrieval	A current request to a source endpoint; the underlying data may be historical
Report-derived evidence	Structured observations extracted from a publication
Provenance	Information showing where evidence originated and how it reached the platform
Harmonisation	Establishing sufficient compatibility for a defined analytical use
Administrative data	Records produced through operational processes such as policing or service delivery
Prevalence	The proportion of a defined population experiencing a condition or event within a defined period
Reference year	The year or period to which the observation relates
Publication year	The year in which a source was published
Model assumption	A disclosed proposition used to construct a scenario
Methodological transfer	Applying evidence from one measure, population or setting to another
Session-scoped evidence	Evidence available within the current session without automatically changing the curated baseline
RTL	Right-to-left text direction, required for Arabic

14. Platform reference pages

This document draws on the current demonstration and recovered development context. Its main functional reference pages are:

- Platform overview
- Dashboard
- Evidence explorer
- Compare Sources
- Trends
- Evidence Gaps
- Ask the Evidence
- Analyse a Report
- Generate a Report
- Economic Impact
- Sources & Methodology

Document basis: Functional review dated 2 October 2026. Connector availability, source releases and evidence counts can change after that date.