

ANNEX 3: Evaluation methodology

This annex outlines the methods used in the Nicaragua country study by the evaluation team. Specific sources of information are given in the main report text. This annex describes the processes and principles which guided the evaluation.

Background and objectives of the evaluation

These are described in the introductions to the analytical study and the main report.

Context

The 5 areas of strategic focus, institutional arrangements, policy reform and advocacy, strengthening RH services and promoting RH information and education were assessed against the Nicaraguan context described in section 1 of the report, with a special focus on the priority needs of young people identified in that section and in the stakeholders' workshop.

Organisation of the team's work

Before commencing the in-country work, we decided to allocate specific responsibility for each organisation to different members of the team. The CTL took overall responsibility for the review of UNFPA, and the international consultant for the review of PROFAMILIA. As the CTL is resident in Nicaragua and the international consultant was not familiar with the country, we decided that the young national consultant should spend the majority of his time with the international consultant, particularly during the field work and site visits, in which his local knowledge was an invaluable input. All team members participated in key meetings throughout the consultancy (for example, the initial introductory meetings, meeting with the Vice-Minister of Health, the stakeholders' workshop and the de-briefing session), and the team held regular discussions to exchange information and findings.

The CTL spent some time prior to the evaluation in discussions with the local management institution (Marie Stopes Nicaragua), and in preliminary meetings with senior staff of UNFPA and PROFAMILIA to clarify the objectives and methods to be used in the evaluation, and to request their input on suitable sites to visit.

At the start of the in-country work, a team meeting was held to clarify objectives and terminology, to ensure that all the team were using the same conceptual framework, to exchange information on the principal themes to which each team member already had access, and to agree on the methods to be used for interviews and site visits. Interview guides were developed on the basis of the report format, which was adapted into a grid format with columns to identify the sources of data for each section (documents and research; in-country studies and the stakeholders' workshop; UNFPA; PROFAMILIA; government departments; donors and multi-laterals; NGOs; service users; site visits and observation). In practice the interview guide grid was used as a checklist rather than a rigid format, interviews were allowed to flow freely and the checklist was used to ensure that the principal points in the ToR had been covered in each interview or site visit.

During the data collection phase information from the several sources identified for each section was cross-referenced for validation purposes. Each team member was requested to collect information outside their own particular brief in interviews and meetings which covered aspects relevant to the evaluation of both organisations. Frequent discussions were held to exchange and compare information, and analyse the differences and/or complementarity in the approach of the two organisations to young people's SRH and rights.

Before commencing the site visits in the second week, the team analysed the information collected in the stakeholders' workshop and initial interviews, and additional key points to be covered in the site visits were identified. UNFPA and PROFAMILIA were asked to arrange meetings with a wide range of people in each site, including young people, civil society representatives, parents and community leaders. Several of these meetings evolved into mini-workshops and group discussions, providing a rich source of qualitative data on the impact of both organisations' work.

Analysis of the findings commenced early in the consultancy, and was refined as more data was collected. Potential problems of repetition in the drafting of the report due to the structure of the report format were identified, together with the danger of getting bogged down in detailed descriptive writing rather than analysis. Preparation of the aide-memoire for the de-briefing session was an important opportunity for the team to step back from the mass of data and analyse the key issues for the two organisations in tackling major problems of young people's SRH and rights in Nicaragua.

Data sources

The team had access to a number of documents on UNFPA, IPPF and PROFAMILIA supplied by Options before the evaluation started. The team leader also had a good deal of documentation collected during previous work which was relevant to this theme. Additional documentation was obtained during the evaluation from UNFPA, PROFAMILIA and other people interviewed. Sources of secondary data are indicated in the main report text where appropriate. Primary data was collected from interviews, discussions, observations and site visits. Annex 1 shows the itinerary and the people interviewed. Useful discussions were held in the field with groups of young people, parents and Municipal Adolescent Support Committees made up of government and civil society representatives. The team also had access to the 3 in-country studies commissioned by MSN (see below).

UNFPA and PROFAMILIA were willing to accompany the team in site visits, but fully understood the need for independent analysis and the possible effect on interviewees' responses should a staff member of the organisation being evaluated participate in the interviews. The team members were therefore able to work independently, referring back to UNFPA and PROFAMILIA to clarify particular points or queries raised in interviews and field work.

Working sessions with UNFPA and PROFAMILIA head office staff

One full-day working session was held in each organisation, with a number of follow-up visits. These meetings were an important means of exploring key issues in depth prior to the field trips, and of confirming field trip findings and the extent to which they could be generalised.

Interviews with multi-lateral and bilateral development assistance agencies, government ministries, UNFPA partner organisations and other civil society groups

The team were able to meet with representatives of all the key organisations which interact with UNFPA and PROFAMILIA. The interview guide grid was used to plan full coverage of the main points to be included in the report, identifying beforehand which of the points should be covered in each interview. In practice many interviewees provided additional relevant information and important insights into the impact of UNFPA and PROFAMILIA at national level.

In-country studies

The field work was completed for the in-country studies shortly before the evaluation started. The team had access to the draft reports by the second week of the evaluation, which was very useful. The reports covered:

1. The legal status of SRH in Nicaragua
2. IEC materials
3. Focus group discussions with young people on key SRH issues

Results of the in-country studies and comments from the FGD are included in the main report where appropriate. The evaluation team leader and MSN worked with the in-country consultant to ensure that the final presentation of the reports fully reflected the information collected in the studies, and answered the key questions in the in-country study ToRs. This required some re-drafting of the in-country study reports to ensure they included all the necessary information in the correct order. The in-country consultant was helpful in following up specific queries, particularly on legal structure.

The in-country consultant presented her draft findings at the stakeholders workshop. There was some confusion about the role of the in-country studies, several participants thinking that they were in fact the evaluation. There was also some concern about the extent to which a brief focus-group based study could really reflect the complexity of the issues facing young people in SRH and rights in Nicaragua. The evaluation team explained that this was one input to the evaluation, to be used in conjunction with all the other evaluation data sources.

Evaluation framework

The evaluation framework developed ahead of the international team mission is attached to this annex. The framework was used to identify the key questions to be addressed in interviews, and other data sources which should be accessed.

In practice the framework was used as a preliminary guide rather than a working tool, as interviews were planned around the report format, as mentioned above. It was however useful as a source of ideas and potential data sources.

Participatory approach

To ensure that UNFPA and PROFAMILIA felt a full sense of ownership of the evaluation preliminary meetings were held with both organisations well before the start of the evaluation mission. They were asked to select suitable places for site visits and suggest important counterparts who should be interviewed. They were also asked for suggestions on participation in the stakeholder workshop, and for assistance in arranging the field visits. A de-briefing session was held with both organisations together before the international team member left Nicaragua.

During the in-country work both organisations responded positively to the evaluation, and expected it to be useful for helping define a way forward in their work with young people. In practice the evaluation and the report format were not designed to provide direct input which could be useful in the two organisations' operations and project implementation. This may have been a disappointment to them.

The evaluation team in discussion with UNFPA and PROFAMILIA agreed that the principal group whose participation should be sought were the young people themselves. UNFPA and PROFAMILIA were keen to include large numbers of young people in the stakeholders'

workshop, but this had to be restricted to 6 per organisation because of space limitations. The evaluation team decided to give the young people the protagonist role in the workshop, asking them to moderate the group discussions and present the conclusions. In practice they were the most vocal group throughout the workshop. This continued throughout the evaluation, young people taking the lead in discussions and organisation of site visits.

Local consultants

A young local consultant was a member of the evaluation team. His presence was a great asset as he had excellent local knowledge of work with adolescents, personal contacts with many of the organisations visited, and related well to the young people involved in interviews and discussion groups. The 2 international team members assisted him in familiarising himself with evaluation procedures, ethics and processes. We all agreed that it had been a positive experience and Fidel felt he had learned a lot.

A local consultant and her team were responsible for the 3 in-country studies. They completed the field work on a tight schedule before the evaluation mission started. Time was spent by MSN and the team leader on reviewing draft reports and ensuring that they were presented in the required format and covered the ToR. This was completed soon after the end of the mission, and again the local consultant said she felt it had been a positive learning experience.

Recognising the contrasting roles of UNFPA and PROFAMILIA

The different roles and capacities of UNFPA and PROFAMILIA were recognised at all times in the evaluation. UNFPA has a greater role in policy development and reform, whilst PROFAMILIA is focussed specifically on service delivery. These differences are made clear in the main report. UNFPA and PROFAMILIA themselves clearly recognise their different roles. The evaluation and especially de-briefing session were a useful opportunity to bring the two organisations together.

Current situation of PROFAMILIA

As described in the evaluation report, PROFAMILIA is currently facing a financial crisis due to the termination of USAID funding on which it had been dependent for the last 11 years. Despite this, PROFAMILIA staff were prepared to spend considerable time and effort with the evaluation team. We have also noted in the report that IPPF has been a relatively minor donor for PROFAMILIA and has not had a great deal of influence on its youth programme.

Report format

The report format used as the structure for presentation of the results. In practice this caused some problems due to a degree of repetition in the information required in different sections of the report. It also limited more in-depth analysis of particular issues which UNFPA and/or PROFAMILIA considered essential, and which could have provided more useful input to the future development of their work.

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK – PROFAMILIA

1. The Country Programme: Strategic Focus and Priorities		
Assessment Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources
Relevance	<p>What are <u>the objectives, priorities and strategic approach</u> of PROFAMILIA's national programme; how do they relate to priority RH&rights issues of young people (eg early age of sexual initiation & child bearing, poor access to information & services, HIV/AIDS vulnerability)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were priorities determined and how was the balance between focus on young people balanced against other priorities as reflected in budgetary commitments and staff resources? • Is there coherence in approach between PROFAMILIA's youth programmes & other programmes supported by PROFAMILIA? • What proportion of PROFAMILIA's activities with young people is devoted to policy development, service strengthening, education & information as reflected in budgetary commitments and staff resources? • What strategic role is played by PROFAMILIA in influencing & implementing the national RH and HIV/AIDS control programme & other sectoral programmes (health & education)? <p>How does PROFAMILIA's programme <u>respond to the range and diversity of needs of young people</u> (eg does it address specific issues related to poverty & access to economic resources, gender relations and status of women, urbanisation and migration, inadequate sex education programmes in schools)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are projects implemented by PROFAMILIA differentiated according to specific needs of different groups of young people? • How do PROFAMILIA projects and programmes (including services) respond to the prevailing socio-cultural and economic determinants of reproductive health? <p>To what extent does PROFAMILIA <u>promote the involvement of young people</u> in identifying and articulating their needs and rights in relation to policy and legislative reforms?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PROFAMILIA Strategic Plan, Annual Reports, Five Year Plan (5YP) and other programme documents • Surveys and research reports on young people's sexual and reproductive health and rights (by PROFAMILIA and independent sources, including the DHS) • Interviews with PROFAMILIA promoters, management and programme staff. PROFAMILIA project documents and MIS • Interviews with programme staff • Interviews with young people/ programme users; testimonials of young people; documented success stories • Field observations (by international team) and field research by counterparts • National and sectoral programme documents • Interviews/discussions with key national and sectoral stakeholders

1. The Country Programme: Strategic Focus and Priorities		
Assessment Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources
Integration of rights	<p>To what extent <u>are the reproductive rights of young people integrated into PROFAMILIA's approach</u> (eg strategic goal and project and programme objectives)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the components of current project activities that PROFAMILIA considers to be rights-based, and what rights are addressed (eg freedom from sexual violence and abuse) • How gender-sensitive is PROFAMILIA's approach to reproductive rights, and how is gender equity promoted through activities for young people? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PROFAMILIA policy & programme docs • Interviews/discussions with PROFAMILIA promoters, management and programme staff. • In-country data gathering. Review of legislation relevant to young people, as undertaken by MSN.
Sustainability	<p>How sustainable are FPA programmes for young people:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What proportion of PROFAMILIA's youth programmes are dependent on time-bound external funding? • Is there a strategy for the incorporation of externally funded time-bound activities/projects relating to young people into PROFAMILIA's regular programmes • How does PROFAMILIA engage with government and other civil society organisations to promote the reproductive health and rights of young people? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PROFAMILIA Strategic Plan, Annual Reports, 5YP, other programme Documents • Interviews with PROFAMILIA promoters & management • Interviews/discussions with key national partners/funders

2. Institutional Capacity and Arrangements		
Assessment Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources
Relevance	<p>Is PROFAMILIA's <u>constitution and organisational structure</u> appropriate to achieving the objectives of its national programme?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there coherence between PROFAMILIA's programme/project objectives and its resource allocation to young people's projects/sub-programmes? Are monitoring and evaluation systems of good quality and capturing the right sort of data (eg reach to different socio-economic groups and marginalised groups; users perspectives of quality; trends in utilisation/behaviour change)? Are M&E findings used effectively? <p>Are PROFAMILIA's partnerships and collaborations with government and civil society appropriate for their priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is PROFAMILIA's approach to young people's reproductive health and rights complementary to, and coordinated and coherent with approaches of key partners (eg in context of sector programmes). To what extent do UNFPA and PROFAMILIA complement each other in their choice of partnerships with other agencies at the level of policy development and service delivery? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PROFAMILIA organogram and policy documents Interviews with promoters and staff Review of work programme budgets Interviews with finance staff Five year plans and annual work plans Project proposals and logical frameworks Monitoring and evaluation systems/ interim M and E reports Output/service data/MIS Interviews with senior management and programme staff of key partner agencies (UNFPA, national government, NGOs and civil society groups including youth networks, private sector, multilaterals eg PAHO, UNAIDS, UNICEF, and bilateral donors)
Integration of rights	<p>How has the definition and operationalisation of young people's rights influenced PROFAMILIA's working norms, processes and practices?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are young people's RH & rights reflected in internal/organisational policy (eg equal opportunities/employment policies, internal policies on HIV/AIDS, gender equity policies etc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal policy documents
Capacity	<p>What is the <u>capacity of staff</u> (competence, skills and commitment) to manage, promote and support the concepts and practices of young people's RH programmes in the country context?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do PROFAMILIA staff & promoters demonstrate a clear understanding of socio-cultural and economic factors influencing young people's RH & rights, eg needs of male & female, married & unmarried, sexually active & non-sexually active, in-school & out-school, rural/urban, employed/unemployed What institutional arrangements and mechanisms are in place to enable young people to participate actively in planning, implementation, monitoring & evaluation of PROFAMILIA projects/programme? Does PROFAMILIA's programme demonstrate willingness and capacity to reach marginalised and excluded young people? What is the capacity of staff to support policy development and promotion of lesson learning and best practice? What is PROFAMILIA's capacity to pursue, acquire and manage fiscal resources? Is adequate capacity building and support provided by IPPF Regional Office to PROFAMILIA? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with PROFAMILIA senior management and programme staff Interviews with youth representatives, youth committees etc on level of satisfaction with levels of participation and consultation. Site visits/observations Discussions with IPPF Regional reps (if available in-country) IPPF Regional Office trip reports

3. Enabling Policy Development		
Assessment Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What components of PROFAMILIA's programme focus on influencing reform of policies and legislation which relate to young people's RH and rights? (notably health and education sector reforms; the National Population Policy; laws/policies relating to domestic violence and abuse; access of unmarried young people to services)? • To what extent do PROFAMILIA staff and promoters demonstrate a clear understanding of the policy and laws which affect young people's RH and rights? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PROFAMILIA Strategic Plan, 5YP, Annual Reports, other programme & project documents • Interviews with key PROFAMILIA staff and promoters
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent is PROFAMILIA's approach contributing to stimulating an enabling environment for policy support to young people's RH and rights? • What resources (human and material) are allocated to wider policy reform/ advocacy? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with PROFAMILIA staff and promoters • Interviews with key partners
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has PROFAMILIA been able to influence development of national policy (through technical support and advocacy) to promote the reproductive health and rights of young people? • To what extent has PROFAMILIA had a positive impact on development of professional norms/standards, tools and guidelines for reproductive health? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review national policy documents and extent to which they conform to the ICPD Programme of Action. • Review of national RH norms, standards, guidelines and protocols • Review of norms and standards, and curricula of national professional bodies (eg Obs/gynae, nurses etc) and extent to which they conform to IPPF 'best practice'.

4. Strengthening RH Services		
Assessment Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has PROFAMILIA used an appropriate <u>evidence base</u> for the design of programmes to support service delivery? Are PROFAMILIA's service delivery programmes responsive to the <u>diverse needs</u> of different socio-economic groups (eg according to gender, age, ethnicity, socio-economic status, religion etc)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PROFAMILIA project documents; PROFAMILIA monitoring and evaluation and research reports Research reports from counterpart organisations on responsiveness of services to needs, supplemented by: Field visits to PROFAMILIA intervention sites to examine different service delivery approaches being supported: clinic-based and non-clinic based (eg peer approaches, community based interventions), and field observations, and interviews with project staff
Integration of rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are rights incorporated into PROFAMILIA's approach to service delivery (eg is explicit attention being paid to serving marginalised and vulnerable groups)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As above
Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do PROFAMILIA service providers have the competencies and skills necessary to provide accessible, acceptable and high quality services to young people? To what extent do PROFAMILIA & public services for young people concur with IPPF best practice? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As above
Efficiency	<p>Do PROFAMILIA service providers deliver <u>accessible, acceptable and high quality</u> services to young people?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are service components appropriate to young people's needs? Have young people been involved in service design, monitoring or evaluation? What monitoring systems does PROFAMILIA have to assess quality within service programmes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research reports from counterpart organisations (which will include interviews and focus group discussions with young people and service users to elicit young people's views on service quality). Field visits PROFAMILIA service delivery sites including observations and interviews with programme staff
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What evidence is there that PROFAMILIA's service delivery approaches are effective at increasing young people's access to services (eg that they are reaching unmarried, out-of-school and rural young people, and young males as well as females)? How effective is PROFAMILIA in advocating to government to adopt best practice in service delivery (including clinical) to increase young people's access to services (eg to married & unmarried, in-school and out-of-school, rural and urban youth; and to reach young males as well as females)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PROFAMILIA project documents, PROFAMILIA M&E and research reports Research reports from counterpart organisations Review MIS and service delivery data Field visit to PROFAMILIA and government service delivery sites In-country focus group discussions with young people on access and quality of services
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are externally-funded young people's services being incorporated into PROFAMILIA's regular programmes? Is there any policy of cost-recovery (eg user fees) and if so, how is this affecting access for the poor? To what extent are communities involved in planning, financing and managing PROFAMILIA's services for young people? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PROFAMILIA 5YP Interviews with key PROFAMILIA promoters & staff, and main funding partners In-country FGD's by counterparts will assess access issues (and community involvement)

5. Promoting RH Information and Education		
Assessment Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has PROFAMILIA used an appropriate evidence base for design of BCC/IEC approaches? • How appropriate and responsive is information provided through PROFAMILIA's IEC/BCC strategies and materials to the diverse needs of male and female young people according to country context? (refer to section 1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of PROFAMILIA IEC/BCC strategies and materials by counterpart organisations, who will collect and collate IEC/BCC materials • Interviews with young people/information users
Integration of rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent do IEC/BCC materials and approaches address priority issues related to young peoples rights (eg age of marriage, equitable access to education and social resources, equitable access to information and services, issues related to sexual violence and abuse, gender equity/participation)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above
Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do PROFAMILIA's staff and service providers have the competencies and skills necessary to provide appropriate BCC/IEC to young people? • Are young people trained as peer educators and counsellors under PROFAMILIA activities. If so do they have appropriate competencies and skills to provide information and counselling on RH issues to their peers? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field visits and interviews with staff and peer educators
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are IEC/BCC materials and media timely and relevant to the current socio-cultural and economic context of young people's reproductive rights and health? • Are IEC/BCC materials and media appropriately pre-tested, and what is the level of young people's involvement in the design, review, pre-testing and monitoring of IEC/BCC strategies and materials? • Are IEC/BCC materials and strategies routinely monitored? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of PROFAMILIA IEC/BCC strategies and materials by counterpart organisations, who will collect and collate IEC/BCC materials • Research studies by counterpart organisations (which will include interviews/discussions/PLA exercises with young people and programme users) • PROFAMILIA interim monitoring and evaluation reports • Field visits to PROFAMILIA project sites • Field observations and interviews with programme staff
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the acceptability and impact of PROFAMILIA's IEC/BCC materials in terms of message recall, response and appeal among young people? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with young people. • In-country FGDs which will include questions on young peoples awareness and response to IEC/BCC materials.
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are externally-funded IEC/BCC initiatives for young people being incorporated into PROFAMILIA's regular programmes? • Have PROFAMILIA's IEC.BCC approaches been adopted by other public sector and NGO/CBO agencies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PROFAMILIA 5YP, Strategic Plan etc • Interviews with key PROFAMILIA promoters and staff, and their main funding organisations

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK – NICARAGUA UNFPA COUNTRY PROGRAMME

1. The Country Programme: Strategic Focus and Priorities		
Assessment Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources
Relevance	<p>What are the <u>core CP objectives and strategic approach</u>, and how do they relate to priority RH and rights issues of young people country (eg early sexual debut & child bearing, poor access to information & services, HIV/AIDS vulnerability, unsafe abortion)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were the CP's focus & priorities determined and how was the balance between a focus on young people balanced against other competing priorities? • Is there coherence in approach between youth programmes & other programme areas supported by UNFPA Country Office? • What proportion of the UNFPA CP is devoted to the three areas of policy development, service strengthening and education & information, and is the balance consistent with country needs? • What is UNFPA's strategic role in the national reproductive health and HIV/AIDS control programme and other sectoral programmes (esp health and education)? • What is UNFPA's strategic approach to contributing to the government and civil society response to reproductive health and rights of young people? <p>To what extent does the CP <u>respond to the range and diversity of needs of young people</u>, eg needs of male and female, married and unmarried, sexually active and non-sexually active, in-school and out of school, rural/urban, religion?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent does the UNFPA Country Office demonstrate a clear understanding of socio-cultural and economic factors influencing young people's RH & rights (eg family structure, poverty & access to economic resources, gender relations and status of women, urbanisation and migration)? <p>What approaches does the UNFPA programme support to promote positive behaviour change among young people?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are interventions supported by UNFPA, differentiated according to specific needs of different groups of young people? • What approaches does the UNFPA programme support to promote positive behaviour change among young people? • Does the CP reflect clear understanding of the socio-cultural and economic factors influencing young people's RH and rights? <p>To what extent does UNFPA promote the <u>involvement of young people</u> in identifying and articulating their needs and rights in relation to policy and legislative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNFPA Country Programme Documents, Five Year CP • Surveys and research reports on young people's sexual and reproductive health and rights • Interviews with UNFPA Country Office Staff • UNFPA policy and programme documents • National and sectoral programme documents • Interviews/ discussions with main implementing and executing partners • Interviews/discussions with key national and sectoral stakeholders

	reforms?	
Integration of rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are young people's rights defined and understood by the UNFPA Country Office? • What are the current components of the CP which UNFPA considers to be rights based? Which rights are addressed? • To what extent are the reproductive rights of young people integrated into sub-components of the CP (ie those which do not have specified rights-based objectives?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNFPA policy and programme documents • Interviews/discussions with UNFPA Country Office Staff • In-country data gathering: review of legislation relevant to young people's RH and rights as undertaken by counterpart organisation.
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a strategy for the incorporation of UNFPA funded young people's activities/projects into the programmes of government and civil society partners? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNFPA Country Programme Documents, Five Year CP • Interviews with UNFPA Country Office Staff • Interviews/discussions with key national and sectoral stakeholders

2. Institutional Capacity and Arrangements		
Assessment Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources
Relevance	<p>Is the <u>organisational structure</u> appropriate to achieving the objectives of the CP?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there coherence between CP and component objectives and resource allocation and financing of young people projects/sub-programmes? Are monitoring and evaluation systems of good quality and capturing the right sort of data? (eg reach to different socio-economic groups and marginalised groups; users perspectives of quality; trends in utilisation/behaviour change) Are M&E findings used effectively? <p>Complementarity, coherence and coordination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the UNFPA Country Programme approach to young people's reproductive health and rights complementary to, and coordinated and coherent with the approaches of key partners (eg in context of sector programmes). To what extent do UNFPA and PROFAMILIA complement each other in their choice of partnerships with other agencies at the level of policy development and service delivery? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organogram Interviews with Country Office Staff Review of budgets Interviews with finance staff Country Programme Document, CP logical framework and annual work plans Monitoring and evaluation systems/ M&E reports Output data/MIS Interviews with senior management and programme staff of key partner agencies (PROFAMILIA, national government, NGOs and civil society groups including youth networks, private sector, multilaterals eg PAHO, UNAIDS, UNICEF, and bilateral donors)
Integration of rights	<p>How has the definition and operationalisation of young people's reproductive health and rights influenced UNFPA's working norms, process and practice?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are young people's RH & rights reflected in internal policies (eg equal opportunities/ employment policies, policies on people with HIV/AIDS, gender equity policies etc)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal policy documents Interviews with staff
Capacity	<p>What is the <u>capacity of staff</u> (competence, skills and commitment) to manage, promote and support the concept and practice of reproductive rights and young people-sensitive programmes in the country context?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the capacity of staff to support policy development and lobby effectively within the national policy and legislative sectors? What institutional arrangements/ mechanisms are in place to enable young people to participate actively in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the UNFPA CP? Is adequate capacity building and support provided by the regional Country Support Team (CST) to the Country Office? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with UNFPA Country Office Staff Interviews with youth representatives, youth committees etc. Site visits/observations Discussions with reps of CST (if available in-country) CST country visit reports

3. Enabling Policy Development		
Assessment Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What components of the UNFPA Country Programme focus on influencing reform of policies and legislation which relate to young people's RH and rights (notably health and education sector reforms; the revised National Population Policy; laws/policies relating to early marriage, domestic violence and abuse; access of unmarried young to services)? • To what extent do UNFPA staff - and those staff and agencies supported by the UNFPA CP – demonstrate a clear understanding of the policy and laws which affect young people's RH and rights? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with UNFPA staff and with agencies supported by UNFPA CP • UNFPA Programme documents
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the UNFPA Country Office contributing to stimulating an enabling environment for policy support to young people's reproductive and rights? • What is the extent of resources and staff time directed to policy reform efforts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with UNFPA Country Programme Staff • Interviews with key partners
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has UNFPA been able to influence development of national policy and guidelines (through technical support and advocacy) to promote young people's RH & rights? • What is the perception of key partners of the extent to which UNFPA is having an impact on national policies, protocols and standards/norms for reproductive health? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review national policy documents and extent to which they conform to the ICPD Programme of Action. • Review of national RH norms, standards, guidelines & protocols • Interviews with key partners (government, NGOs and civil society groups including PROFAMILIA, youth networks, private sector, multilaterals – esp World Bank, PAHO, UNAIDS, UNICEF - & bilaterals) • Review of documents of key partners agencies
4. Strengthening RH Services		
Assessment Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have UNFPA and/or implementing/executing partners used an appropriate <u>evidence base</u> for design of programmes to support service delivery? • Is UNFPA providing an appropriate level of support to strengthening RH services for young people, which are responsive to the <u>diverse needs</u> of different socio-economic groups (eg according to gender, age, ethnicity, socio-economic status, religion etc)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNFPA country programme documents, monitoring and evaluation and research reports • Research reports from counterpart organisations on responsiveness of services to needs, supplemented by: Field visits to UNFPA supported intervention sites to examine different service delivery approaches being supported: clinic-based and non-clinic

		based (eg peer approaches, community based interventions), and field observations, and interviews with project staff
Integration of rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are rights incorporated into UNFPA's approach to supporting the strengthening of service delivery? • Is explicit attention being paid to serving marginalised and vulnerable groups? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do service providers supported by UNFPA deliver appropriate, acceptable and high quality services to young people? How do the services compare with those provided by NGOs and the private sector? • How does UNFPA evaluate cost-effectiveness of their support to health service programmes? Do they appear to be cost-effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research reports from counterpart organisations (which will have used interviews, PLA exercises, discussions with service providers, young people and service users), supported by Field visits to UNFPA supported interventions Field observations and interviews with programme staff
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effective is the UNFPA CP in supporting government to improve service delivery? • How effective is the UNFPA CP in promoting national adoption of best practice to increase young people's access to services (eg to married and unmarried, in-school and out-of-school, rural and urban youth; and to reach young males as well as females)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNFPA CP monitoring and evaluation and research reports • Field visit to government services • Field observations • In-country FGD's: Counterpart organisations will undertake studies with young people regarding the accessibility and acceptability of services.
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are externally-funded services for young people being incorporated into the regular programmes of UNFPA's partners? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNFPA Country Programme Documents, Five Year CP • Interviews with UNFPA Country Office Staff • Interviews/discussions with key national partners

5. Promoting RH Information and Education		
Assessment Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have UNFPA and/or implementing/executing partners used an appropriate <u>evidence base</u> for design of BCC/IEC approaches? • Is UNFPA contributing to and supporting coherent and integrated BCC/IEC policies and programmes which are responsive to <u>diverse needs</u> of young people (refer to section 1)? • How appropriate is information provided through UNFPA support to the diverse needs of male and female youth according to country specific context? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of UNFPA supported IEC/BCC strategies and materials by counterpart organisations, who will collect and collate IEC/BCC materials • Interviews with young people/information users
Integration of rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent do IEC/BCC materials and approaches address priority issues related to young peoples rights (eg age of marriage, equitable access to education and social resources, equitable access to information and services, issues related to sexual violence and abuse, gender equity/participation)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of UNFPA supported IEC/BCC strategies and materials by counterpart organisations, who will collect and collate IEC/BCC materials • Interviews by counterparts with young people/information users
Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do UNFPA staff and providers supported by UNFPA programmes have the competencies and skills necessary to provide appropriate BCC/IEC to young people? • Are young people trained as peer educators and counsellors under UNFPA supported activities? If so do they have appropriate competencies and skills to provide information and counseling on RH issues to their peers? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field observations and interviews with programme staff
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the types of information being produced and distributed timely and relevant to the socio-cultural and economic context of young peoples reproductive rights and health? • Are IEC/BCC materials and media appropriately pre-tested and what is the level of young people's involvement in the design, review, pre-testing and monitoring of IEC/BCC strategies and materials? • Is there routine monitoring of IEC/BCC materials/strategies/staff training supported by UNFPA? • Are strategies and approaches cost-effective given alternatives in the country? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of UNFPA supported IEC/BCC strategies and materials by counterpart organisations, who will collect and collate IEC/BCC materials • Research studies by counterpart organisations (which will include interviews/discussions/PLA exercises with young people and programme users) • UNFPA interim monitoring and evaluation reports • Field visits to UNFPA supported interventions
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the acceptability and impact of IEC/BCC materials produced with the support of UNFPA in terms of eg message recall, response and appeal among young people? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with young people • In-country FGDs: Counterpart organisations will undertake studies with young people, evaluating response to IEC/BCC materials.
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are externally-funded IEC/BCC initiatives and materials for young people being incorporated into regular programmes of UNFPA partners? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNFPA Country Programme Documents • Interviews with UNFPA Country Office Staff and with key national partners

