

## ANNEX 5

This annex outlines the methods adopted by the international evaluation team in Burkina Faso. Annexes 1, 2 and 4 describe key people met, including the team's schedule/itinerary of work, the process used in the stakeholder's workshop and the material consulted and referred to in the main text of this report. This annex highlights some of the processes used, constraints that were met by the team, and includes tools developed to assist the team during interviews, fields visits and to ensure that additional needed information was obtained from the UNFPA and ABBEF.

### In-country Studies

Various methods and sources of information were used in assessing both UNFPA and ABBEF's performance and achievements in promoting and delivering rights and RH services for young people. Prior to the actual country visit of the evaluation team, three in-country studies were undertaken to provide additional secondary and primary data for the evaluation, they were: "Legal Status Review", "IEC Review" and "Youth Opinion Study".

The "Legal Status Review" concisely summarized current national laws and policies directly relevant to reproductive and sexual health and rights, including how they relate to young people. This study proved useful as a rapid and global view of the legislative framework that concerns SRH, as well as for the contextual background and understanding of the progress that Burkina has made in terms of rights and reproductive health and discerning the areas that still need to be worked on in the future.

The other two reviews, the "IEC Review" and the "Youth Opinion Study", were done too superficially to be of any substantive use to the team. The limited value that the IEC Review offered was, it allowed the evaluation team the possibility to look over some samples of IEC material produced by ABBEF and UNFPA.

### Documentation

The evaluation team received large quantities of documentation related to UNFPA, ABBEF as well as country related background information. This came in the form of photocopied documents and some burnt on to a CD ROM. This material was both important and useful to the team. The CD Rom in particular was very useful and easy to transport. Unfortunately, the quantity of photocopied documents was much too extensive to transport to BF and back. Consequently, it was necessary to request many of these same documents again in country.

While budgets were made available to the evaluation team, these did not always meet the demands of the framework. Budgets did not consistently indicate what percentages of project or programme budgets are allocated specifically to young people, unless an entire project targets young people. At times, these percentages may have been estimated with the CO.

On the same note, rights based activities were most often integrated into projects and programmes and not developed in parallel to a comprehensive approach to SRH of young people in BF. Sometimes it was easy to identify specific or sub-objectives that relate directly to rights based issues within programme and project documents, at other times it was nuanced.

### Interviews and Observational Visits

Once in country the evaluation team met with UNFPA and ABBEF staff, as well as representatives of the MoH and other ministries concerned with the reproductive health needs of young people. The team equally met with other principle partners, including bi and multilateral donors, international and national NGOs and others involved in reproductive health issues and young people. Site visits were made in Ouagadougou as well as to the field (Koudougou, Ouahigouya, Koupéla and the Fada Region), where UNFPA, ABBEF, public and private programmes were visited. A list of key people met and site visits may be found in Annex 1. A list of the participants at the stakeholder workshop held at the beginning of the evaluation may be found in annex 2.

The in-country evaluation was to be 3 full weeks; however, due to unforeseen circumstances the mission had to be postponed by a week. Moreover, the schedule and timing of the evaluation team in country was cut down by several days. The time in country also included 3 weekends plus a national holiday. The team met with all appropriate staff of the UNFPA, ABBEF (the FPA) and most key partners; however, due to limitations of time and changes in schedule it was not possible to meet with all organizations or institutions involved in young people's SRH. For example, the team was unable to meet with a representative of the Ministry of Economy and Development (of its dependent CONAPO), the MoSA or the MoLEY other than during the stakeholder workshop.

### Framework

The suggested framework of the evaluation was too detailed to be covered in the reduced time (even teams who had the three full weeks felt it was not enough) by a small team of consultants. The team found that the revised framework still had a good number of repeated questions and overlap. This duplication and overlap was dealt with in the main text and in the interviews by developing interview tools. There was also overlap between UNFPA and ABBEF in specific aspects of work, such as the development of IEC material. As such, the main report treats this section as a collective endeavour.

Both UNFPA and ABBEF have to varying degrees, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, and prior to beginning project activities determine the basic needs of the target population. However, neither of the organizations has used outcome indicators; consequently, it was not possible to fully address some of the framework's issues concerning effectiveness.

In addition, some UNFPA staff had a difficult time being objective in looking at the degree to which UNFPA funded projects have or have not been evaluated or persist without the support of UNFPA. The team had to rely on interviews with government and NGO staff who were either involved with projects in the past or at present. These basic weaknesses on the part of UNFPA, evaluating and sustainability, are discussed further in the main report. However, it is also noted that some of these issues are presently being addressed in UNFPA by using an evidence-based approach to programming.

One part of the framework requests the evaluation team to assess the capacity of staff within their role and responsibilities of carrying out their programmes/projects. The evaluation team was able to have a sense of how well staff understood SRH and rights issues and young people, as well as the role and implications that the socio-cultural facets have on these issues; however, it was difficult to determine and would be unfair to make any "work appraisal" of any staff encountered.

### Participatory Approach and Young People's Participation

A basic premise of the country evaluation was to ensure that both young people and UNFPA CO and the FPA were involved in and had a sense of ownership of the evaluation. This was ensured through a number of tactics.

The evaluation team was firm about having young people included in the stakeholder workshop. While there was some resistance to this suggestion, it was made possible and proved to be both effective for the evaluation team as well as for others at the workshop. They were fully participatory (there were 3 young people) during group work and the plenary sessions. Young people (peer educators, volunteers, and users of facilities) were also interviewed during site visits and at the ABBEF centres.

Staff from both UNFPA and ABBEF was consulted throughout the evaluation. The initial meeting ensured that they were clear about the objectives and methods, as well as ensuring their input about key people to be interviewed and sites to be visited. The evaluation team made sure to return to various staff members for clarification on points or issues that may have been unclear or contradictory. The full and active participation by both organizations during the debriefing, demonstrated their continued support and interest in the evaluation exercise.

The stakeholder's workshop was overwhelmingly attended even though the date and venue were changed with short notice (due to the evaluation team's delayed arrival). This was a reflection of the exceptional organization of the workshop by CRSN and the commitment and importance that the stakeholders hold regarding SRH of young people and the work that UNFPA and ABBEF have been carrying out.

### Logistical Difficulties

In addition, for reasons outside the control of CRSN, logistical difficulties (repeated and frequent electricity cuts limited use of computers, fax and telephone, and computer and internet problems) complicated and impeded the evaluation team's work.

## Questions Pour les Interviews

### **Contexte:**

1. Dans quel mesure les jeunes ont été impliqués dans la définition des stratégies et des programmes? Fournir des exemples.
2. Avez-vous des rapports à nous conseiller sur les problèmes spécifiques auxquels face les jeunes ? (mariage et fertilité; accès aux services reproductives; maternité sans risques; violence à l'égard des femmes; travailleurs de sexe; drogues et alcool; excision)

### **Priorités Stratégiques:**

1. Les stratégies de santé reproductive en direction des jeunes ont-elles évoluées depuis la conférence du Caire (1994)? Comment?
2. Comment les priorités ont-elles définies? (Niveau d'implication des jeunes? Niveau d'implication de la société civile? Prise en compte des besoins spécifiques des jeunes?) Rôles respectifs du gouvernement et des différents partenaires?
3. Existe-t-il un mécanisme de coordination des interventions des principaux acteurs dans le domaine de la santé reproductive? A quels niveaux cette coordination intervient-elle? Y-a-t-il une coordination spécifique des activités en direction des jeunes? Comment voyez-vous la coordination entre les activités soutenues par le FNUAP et celles soutenues par l'ABBEF?
4. Quelles ont été dans les dix dernières années les actions destinées à faire évoluer le cadre législatif vis à vis des droits des jeunes (et en particulier les jeunes femmes) dans la santé reproductive ou à faciliter son application?
5. Qu'avez-vous prévu pour assurer la pérennité des actions entreprises?

### **Aspects Organisationnels:**

1. Pouvez-vous nous décrire le dispositif de monitoring et évaluation que vous avez mis en place? Comment utilisez-vous les résultats du monitoring et évaluation?
2. Comment les droits des jeunes, et en particulier les jeunes femmes, ont-ils été pris en compte au niveau du fonctionnement de votre propre organisation (recrutement, conditions de travail – soit pour le staff ou des bénévoles, PVVIH)? Ont-ils entraîné une meilleure participation des jeunes aux décisions et à la définition des programmes?

**Contribution au Processus de Reforme :**

1. Quelles ont ete vos contributions a la definition des politiques et legislations visant a repondre aux besoins specifiques des jeunes en matiere de la sante sexuelle et reproductive?
2. Selon vous qui a influence la definition de ces politiques?

**Renforcement des Services de Sante Reproductive:**

1. Quels activites avez-vous realise dans ce domaine?
2. Comment avez-vous pris en compte les besoins specifiques et les obstacles particuliers des jeunes et ceux lies au sexe (garcons)?
3. Comment mesurez-vous l'utilisation des services par tranche d'age et par sexe?
4. Avez-vous eu l'occasion d'echanger avec d'autres acteurs ou avec le gouvernement les lecons apprises concernant les bonnes pratiques dans la domaine de la sante reproductive des jeunes?
5. Ou sont situe les services que vous avez soutenus? Comment ces sites ont-ils ete choisi?
6. Quel est le systeme d'assurance qualite utilise?
7. Les utilisateurs et la communaute sont-ils impliquees dans le financement et la gestion de ces services (recouvrement des couts, comite de gestion, ...)?

**IEC:**

1. Comment les messages et supports en direction des jeunes sont-ils choisi (pris en compte des caracteristiques propres des differents groupes des jeunes et des pratiques specifiques aux populations cibles)?
2. Comment les jeunes ont-ils participe a l'elaboration des messages?
3. Quels sont les procedures suivi pour le pre-test et l'evaluation des actions IEC?
4. Comment avez-vous mesure la distribution et l'utilisation du materiel d'IEC?
5. A votre avis existe-t-il des messages contradictoires (sur la sante reproductive chez les jeunes) qui circulent dans le pays?
6. Existe-t-il des initiatives destinees a harmoniser et a coordonner les actions d'IEC?
7. Avez-vous rencontre des oppositions (censure) a certaines messages que vous vouliez faire passer?
8. Selon vous, quels sont les messages qui ont eu un impact chez les jeunes?

### **Check List Pour Visite de Terrain**

- Connaissance par les acteurs de terrain des strategies nationales et des lois.
- Connaissance par les acteurs de terrain des strategies UNFPA et ABBEF.
- Participation des jeunes a la mise en œuvre des activites :
  - Professionnel
  - Benevole
  - Beneficiaires
- Le personnel de terrain est-il implique dans la definition des objectifs et strategies?
- Quels sont les principaux problemes rencontres par le personnel de terrain pour toucher les populations de jeunes?
- Existe-t-il des besoins non-couverts selon les professionnels de terrain?
- Existe-t-il des moyens de faire remonter les experiences du terrain vers les decideurs de Ouaga (Ministeres, UNFPA, ABBEF)?
- Comment est-il organise la supervision?
- Quels monitoring et evaluation font-ils?
- Quelles formations les professionnels de terrain et les benevoles ont-ils recu (dans la domaine de la sante reproductive chez les jeunes)?
- Quelles sont les competences professionnelles (medicale, communication, attitude, socio-culturelle...)
- Quel est le niveau de communication, coordination et cooperation entre les differents partenaires de ABBEF et UNFPA sur le terrain?
- Les ressources humaines, materielles et financieres sont-elles adequates?
- Les activites sont-elles adaptees aux besoins et specificites des differentes categories de jeunes?
- Existence de systeme d'assurance qualite (utilisation de protocole, bonne pratique, precautions universelles, « youth friendly »...).
- Emplacement des services adapte aux population cibles.
- Cout des services et accessibilite financiere pour les jeunes.
- Qu'est qui est prevu localement pour assurer la perennite (financement, maintenance)?
- Quel est le niveau de participation de la communaute dans la programmation et la gestion?
- Quel est le materiel d'IEC disponible (themes, supports, produit par qui)?

- Ce materiel est-il utilise?
- Que pense le personnel du materiel elabore par UNFPA et ABBEF (problemes prioritaires, messages clairs et comprehensibles, observent-ils un changement de comportement)?

**Informations à collecter par écrit en rapport avec les activités  
du UNFPA et de l' ABBEF:**

1. Organigramme du bureau pays (liste des personnels, antennes dans les régions,...) et liens fonctionnels avec le bureau régional et le siège
2. Liste des programmes et sous programmes depuis 1994
3. Synthèse des principaux objectifs (généraux et spécifiques) de chacun de ces programmes et sous programmes
4. Budgets annuels par programme et sous programmes depuis 1994
5. Proportion des budgets annuels correspondant aux grandes activités suivantes:
  - Appui à la définition de politiques et de stratégies
  - Appui institutionnel (gouvernemental et ONGs)
  - Renforcement des services de:
    - PF et Santé Maternelle
    - VIH/SIDA et IST
  - Activités d'IEC
6. Proportion des budgets annuels des programmes et sous programmes dédiés aux jeunes (10 – 24 ans)
7. Si possible, proportion des budgets annuels dédiés aux jeunes par grandes activités (voir point 5)
8. Liste des associations et ONGs financées soit par année depuis 1994 ou dans chacun des cycles de programme (1992 – 1996; 1997 – 2001; 2002 – 2006)