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Foreword

Maternal mortality represents the greatest health inequity in the world. No other health indicator as starkly illustrates global disparities in human development. The recent United Nations (UN) report *Trends in mortality: 1990 to 2010* indicates that during the past decade maternal deaths fell from 543,000 to 287,000; yet this decline of 47 per cent has been uneven and marked by persistent disparities among – and within – countries. In 2010, an analysis published by *The Lancet* suggested that an annual decrease in maternal deaths of roughly 5.5 per cent worldwide would be necessary to achieve by 2015 the Millennium Development Goal for maternal mortality (MDG 5 - a reduction by three quarters from the 1990 level). While a handful of developing countries have now attained MDG 5 - including Nepal, Vietnam, Iran and Maldives - globally, the rate of reduction is currently under 1 per cent and a mere 0.1 per cent in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Improving maternal health is a key priority for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). To achieve this end, the Fund has developed a broad scope of programmatic interventions – at global and regional levels as well as in about 150 countries – and has ensured critical linkages between the Fund’s three core areas: reproductive health and rights, gender equality, and population and development. In particular, in its position alongside United Nations agencies, governments, civil society and other development partners, UNFPA has adopted a three-pronged strategy aimed at ensuring that: all women have access to contraception to avoid unintended pregnancies; all pregnant women have access to skilled care at the time of birth; all those with complications have timely access to quality emergency obstetric care. More specifically, UNFPA interventions in the field of reproductive health and rights are meant to address maternal mortality, gender-based violence, harmful practices against women, sexually transmitted infections including HIV, adolescent reproductive health, as well as improve family planning.

In 2008, in response to the slow and uneven progress towards MDG 5, UNFPA launched the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF). The MHTF was designed as a rapid and flexible funding mechanism complementing UNFPA core resources in those programme countries that present the greatest maternal health needs. The MHTF now operates in 30 countries and has been conceived as a country-owned and country-driven initiative to support the capacity of national health systems to achieve results in reducing maternal mortality and morbidity.

This evaluation analyses the support of UNFPA in maternal health and assesses its contribution to the objectives as set out in the Multi-Year Funding Frameworks (from 2000 to 2007) as well as the Sexual and Reproductive Health framework under the UNFPA Strategic Plan (2008-2013). The evaluation also looks into the specific contribution of the MHTF, and therefore provides comprehensive and detailed insight into the thematic area of maternal and reproductive health at UNFPA. The scope of this thematic evaluation covers programmatic interventions supported by
all sources of funding – core resources, co-financing and a number of thematic funds. It specifically focuses on the three sets of interventions most effective in reducing maternal mortality and morbidity: universal access to family planning; skilled birth attendance; and emergency obstetric and newborn care. The evaluation also presents a comparative analysis of those countries which, in recent years, have benefited from the MHTF and those which have not. A detailed analysis of the contribution and performance of the MHTF – including its internal coordination and management processes – may be found in a separate volume.

The evaluation concludes that UNFPA has made significant, sustained and, at times, innovative contributions to improve maternal health by acting as a knowledge broker able to promote use of data as well as surveys and research-generated evidence into sexual and reproductive healthcare policies and practices. As an active advocate for maternal health issues, UNFPA has positioned itself at the interface between development partners and governments. This has helped to align donor assistance more closely with national structures while harmonizing maternal health support from a wide array of partners. In particular, UNFPA has helped programme countries to anchor family planning more firmly within their policy frameworks as well as to scale-up access to emergency obstetric and newborn care in their national health services. The evaluation shows that UNFPA has been a driving force to raise awareness of, and build capacity to address shortcomings and barriers in national health systems which prevent beneficiaries from accessing maternal health services.

However, the evaluation also identifies a number of challenges which have affected the ability of UNFPA to contribute to results. In particular, the report points at the insufficient guidance available to country offices for planning and targeting maternal health support strategies for the medium to long-term. Similarly, the evaluation shows that programmatic interventions should be complemented by a rigorous monitoring system for measuring results rather than tracking inputs and activities. In an area where the causes of poor maternal health are numerous and complex, the evaluation finds that the role of knowledge broker requires significant time as well as a shift in the use of financial and human resources by country offices to make use of UNFPA comparative advantage and create partnerships, notably with those organizations normally outside of the sphere of reproductive health.

To conduct this evaluation of an area and themes central to the mandate of UNFPA, the Evaluation Branch collaborated closely with the Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch from the UNFPA Technical Division. This partnership generated valuable insights to help identify a number of critical issues, thus optimizing the focus and utility of the evaluation. The Evaluation Branch also relied on independent consultants from AGE+G Consultants eG, led by Martin Steinmeyer whose professionalism was pivotal in guiding the evaluation team through the design, data collection and analysis and reporting phases. I am most grateful to him for his commitment and dedication. I also would like to thank Isabelle Cazottes whose work was more specifically focused on the contribution of the Maternal Health Thematic Fund and who authored the specific report on the MHTF. Their work, together with the whole team of consultants (including local consultants for the field phase), enabled the complex scope of the evaluation to be addressed despite problems with availability of information.
To accompany the whole evaluation process, the Evaluation Branch also established a reference group consisting of UNFPA staff with expertise in sexual and reproductive health issues or in evaluation methodology. The evaluation benefited greatly from their insightful contributions and the reports produced at the different stages of the evaluation were revised on the basis of their comments, feedback and suggestions. I would like to express my gratitude to all the colleagues who participated in the reference group for their valuable time and active collaboration. Within the Evaluation Branch, quality enhancement is indeed a cornerstone of our approach to all evaluations, and I would especially like to thank Valeria Carou-Jones whose careful review and valuable support have contributed to improve the quality of the present report.

Without the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders, the Evaluation Branch could not have completed this evaluation. I am grateful to all UNFPA staff in headquarters, regional and country offices who took part in this exercise. In particular, my sincere gratitude goes to colleagues in Burkina Faso, Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Sudan, and Zambia who generously shared their time and knowledge with the evaluation team. They played a key role in facilitating the evaluation fieldwork and its extensive data collection process that involved interviews, site visits, and focus group discussions in order to obtain the perspective of all key stakeholders as well as the views of the beneficiaries.

I hope that this evaluation will help UNFPA to strengthen the impact of its programmes, to achieve more sustainable results, and to further leverage strategic partnerships in order to become an ever more relevant, effective and valuable actor in the progression towards MDG 5.

Louis Charpentier
Chief, Evaluation Branch
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THEMATIC EVALUATION OF UNFPA SUPPORT TO MATERNAL HEALTH

Purpose and scope of the evaluation

The present evaluation assesses the extent to which UNFPA support has been relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable in contributing to the improvement of maternal health.

The evaluation covers all programmatic interventions that have been directly relevant to maternal mortality and morbidity within the UNFPA mandate, including all activities financed from core and non-core resources such as UNFPA reproductive health thematic funds (the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF), the Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security (GPRHCS) and the joint UNFPA-UNICEF Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting Programme). Across these interventions and instruments, the maternal health thematic evaluation focuses on key elements of reproductive health including family planning, skilled birth attendance and emergency obstetric and newborn care (EmONC) - the “three pillars” of reducing maternal mortality (thematic scope). Following the terms of reference, the evaluation covers the period from 2000 until 2010, and also includes information related to a number of interventions implemented in 2011.

Background of the evaluation

In 1987, UNFPA was one of three UN agencies that launched the Global Campaign to Reduce Maternal Mortality at the first international Safe Motherhood Conference in Nairobi. The current mandate of UNFPA to support maternal health builds on the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD, 1995) and the Millennium Summit (2000), and the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by UNFPA, including MDG 5 to improve maternal health.

UNFPA has developed a broad range of programmatic interventions to support the improvement of maternal health at global, regional and country level within its three programmatic core areas of reproductive health, gender equality and population and development. UNFPA resources support integrated reproductive health services, including interventions to address maternal mortality, gender-based violence, harmful traditional practices, and sexually transmitted infections including HIV, adolescent reproductive health, as well as family planning. Between 2000 and 2011, UNFPA provided support to 155 countries, areas and territories.

In 2008, UNFPA launched the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) to help accelerate progress towards the achievement of MDG 5. The MHTF represents a focused effort in some of the poorest countries in the world with the greatest maternal health needs. It was intended to be a quick and flexible funding mechanism and a tool to make available additional technical expertise to UNFPA programme countries. The Campaign to End Fistula and the UNFPA-International Confederation of Midwives (ICM) Midwifery Programme were integrated into this umbrella fund in 2009. In addition, UNFPA has used the GPRHCS to provide technical assistance, commodities and financial support to programme countries.

Methodology

The scope of the evaluation is defined by twelve evaluation questions examining key components of the maternal health approach of UNFPA. For each evaluation question, a small number of judgment criteria specify which aspects of UNFPA-financed activities form the basis for the evaluators’ assessment and stand at the centre of the answer to each of the evaluation questions.

The evaluation used a staged sampling process to select the countries to be included in the evaluation. From a list of 55 programme countries with a maternal mortality ratio (MMR) higher than 300 deaths per 100,000 live births in the year 2000, 22 countries were selected for a desk study. From this sample, 10 countries were selected for more in-depth country case studies, of which, eight were recipients
of MHTF support: Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Sudan, and Zambia. Another two countries do not receive MHTF funding: DRC and Kenya.

The evaluation draws on information from a desk review of UNFPA documents compiled from headquarters and country offices, individual interviews with UNFPA staff in headquarters, regional offices and country offices and additional interviews with partner governments and development partners. An online survey that was disseminated to UNFPA country offices in 55 programme countries provided information on country office capacity and availability of technical support from headquarters and regional offices. In addition, 10 country case studies provided an in-depth view of UNFPA operations at country level. Data collection for the case studies included the desk analysis of additional documents, key informant interviews with UNFPA partners, site visits and focus groups with beneficiaries. The combination of different types of information, data collection methods and data sources (triangulation) maximized the validity of the findings.

Findings

Neither has UNFPA sufficiently focused maternal health support on the countries with the greatest needs nor on the most vulnerable groups within countries. Headquarters and regional offices based the distribution of resources for maternal health support on criteria such as “degree of political support to the agenda of the International Conference on Population and Development”, “absorptive capacity” or the “humanitarian response, transition and recovery situation in each country”. This allowed some leeway to consider aspects other than the scale of maternal health needs in these decisions. Furthermore, UNFPA has not developed clear, operational definitions of “maternal health vulnerability”. Only country offices that made use of data from surveys and socio-economic studies for needs-oriented targeting of specific groups were able to address existing socio-economic service barriers, such as cost, distance or lack of means of transportation.

UNFPA has contributed to an improved harmonization of maternal health support, in particular through UNFPA participation in strategic and multi-sectoral partnerships.

UNFPA has utilized research and data collection, evidence-based advocacy and technical assistance to improve the harmonization of maternal health support in programme countries. Successful interventions were part of long-term working partnerships with development partners and governments. In these circumstances, country offices were able to generate momentum for the government-led development and review of maternal health policies. Revised policies helped to align donor assistance more closely with government structures and simultaneously harmonize maternal health support from development partners. However, it should be noted that global and regional aid harmonization campaigns, such as the H4+ Campaign, the Campaign on Accelerated Reduction of Maternal, New Born and Child Mortality (CARMMA) or the Maputo Road Map have so far had little effect on aid harmonization at country level.

UNFPA has contributed to a stronger involvement of communities and increased demand for reproductive health services.

UNFPA-supported initiatives have helped to raise maternal health awareness in targeted communities. However, not all approaches aiming at sensitizing communities were equally successful in increasing demand for maternal health services. Successful approaches coupled awareness raising and community empowerment efforts with national strategies to address financial barriers to access maternal health services in national health systems.

UNFPA partnerships with non-governmental organizations have historically been an important part of UNFPA community outreach and mobilization campaigns. However, country offices have begun to shift resources
UNFPA has contributed to an increased availability of human resources for maternal health although these efforts remain insufficiently linked to the wider health system framework.

UNFPA has helped to develop reproductive health-specific human resource regulatory frameworks and tools and to train technical reproductive health staff in key areas. However, UNFPA country offices encountered challenges in linking these efforts appropriately to mechanisms and agencies in the wider health system beyond reproductive health. Furthermore, system-wide challenges to human resources for health, such as low staff retention or inappropriate deployment have reduced the impact of UNFPA technical trainings on the availability of skilled reproductive health service providers.

The MHTF has helped UNFPA to contribute to human resource-related policy revisions for midwifery, emergency obstetric and newborn care and family planning, curriculum reviews and the strengthening of midwifery training facilities. These are important reproductive health components of the larger human resources for health systems in programme countries. However, as a thematic fund with limited scope, the MHTF was not able to help country offices to better address the inappropriate deployment or low retention of staff (particularly midwives) which undermine the beneficial effects of UNFPA skill-building activities.

UNFPA has showed a good response capacity to reproductive health threats in the context of humanitarian emergencies.

UNFPA has reacted to the need to anticipate and respond to reproductive health threats in humanitarian situations globally and at country level. At global level, UNFPA has provided guidance on reproductive health programming and maternal health support in the context of humanitarian emergencies, especially between 2005 and 2010. Country offices have responded by way of: a) joining international humanitarian campaigns; b) working with countries to include sexual and reproductive health and maternal health components in national emergency preparedness plans; and c) developing the capacities of national counterparts to dispense Minimum Initial Service Packages (MISP) for reproductive health during emergencies.

UNFPA country offices have faced a number of operational challenges when working on humanitarian issues and have struggled to adequately integrate and link assistance in humanitarian situations to UNFPA support in more stable circumstances.

UNFPA has contributed to the scaling up and the increased utilization of and demand for family planning commodities.

UNFPA has helped to anchor family planning more firmly in policy frameworks of programme countries and to develop national capacities to manage commodity procurement and distribution. Country offices that combined the procurement of contraceptives with initiatives to strengthen reproductive health commodity security systems have contributed to increase access to family planning commodities. UNFPA support for community-based distribution helped to open alternative channels for the delivery of commodities to beneficiaries in areas where people have limited access to public health systems.

Prerequisites for scaling-up access to EmONC services have been put in place, although health system-wide bottlenecks remain insufficiently addressed.

By supporting the development of national emergency obstetric and newborn care (EmONC) plans, UNFPA has helped programme countries to put in place important prerequisites for scaling-up access to EmONC services. The MHTF contributed to accelerate the development of these plans by providing templates, tools and expertise that country offices used to contribute to the implementation of EmONC assessments. Despite these successes, UNFPA country offices struggle to define their roles and responsibilities for addressing health system-wide bottlenecks, including capacity gaps in line ministries, problems with staff retention, inadequate health management information systems or inadequate referral systems.

UNFPA has not been able to rely on its monitoring and evaluation system in order to inform strategy development, programming and programme implementation.
UNFPA has utilized evidence from macro-level surveys and other studies to design relevant maternal health interventions and to target its support in programme countries, albeit mostly geographically. However, UNFPA has not been able to use its monitoring and evaluation system to the same extent to generate information on the performance of its interventions. This weakness is partly linked to deficits in UNFPA planning processes and templates that inhibit the articulation of complete and coherent intervention strategies (also called intervention logic or theory of change). This shortcoming consequently often made it difficult to design quality indicators to help gauge the contribution of UNFPA to improved maternal health outcomes. Another factor has been the low technical capacity of country office staff for results-oriented monitoring.

Integration of maternal health into national development instruments and sector policy frameworks has been partially achieved.

UNFPA record of contributing to a stronger integration of maternal health into national policy frameworks has been mixed. UNFPA country offices were able to generate momentum for maternal health-related policy changes when they combined support for data generation, surveys and research with targeted advocacy campaigns and technical assistance. Partnerships with influential governmental and non-governmental stakeholders also contributed to the success of policy campaigns. However, UNFPA-supported policy initiatives that originated at regional level, such as CARMMA or the Maputo process, failed to affect the national maternal health policy agenda in the long-term.

The UNFPA contribution to an improved national capacity to monitor maternal health-related policies has been limited, as assistance in refining maternal health indicators neither addressed the larger, systemic weaknesses of national health management information systems, nor the shortcomings of other monitoring and evaluation systems.

There has been insufficient use of synergies between maternal health, gender and population and development focus areas.

Seeking and exploiting synergies between programming in gender and reproductive health has not been a firmly established practice in UNFPA. Despite the availability of data on many gender-related reproductive and maternal health issues from standard macro-level assessments, such as censuses and demographic and health surveys, not all country offices have pursued opportunities to apply this information in specifically integrated reproductive health interventions. Country offices have generally taken advantage of external opportunities to finance integrated interventions. However, only country offices with appropriate internal planning or management mechanisms were able to create these kinds of opportunities themselves.

Country offices have not sufficiently benefited from technical support provided by regional offices and headquarters.

Inadequate staffing levels have created major bottlenecks in the capacity of country offices. These gaps have made it very challenging for country offices to adequately implement maternal health interventions and have reduced the visibility of UNFPA in programme countries. Since 2008, the MHTF has provided some additional resources to hire much needed human resources, particularly in areas like EmONC, midwifery and obstetric fistula. Regional offices and headquarters have provided technical support to country offices in family planning and reproductive health commodity security. However, they have not sufficiently focused on other areas, such as EmONC, midwifery and human resources for the overall health sector.

Good overall visibility of UNFPA in maternal health initiatives at global and national levels although to a lesser extent for country offices suffering from staffing shortages.

UNFPA has been a visible advocate for maternal health issues at global and at country level. The visibility of UNFPA was affected by the capacity of country offices to bring technical knowledge to bear in multilateral maternal health initiatives, such as the review of maternal health policies or the development of maternal health programmes. By supporting the development of maternal health policies and programmes, UNFPA also helped to leverage more funds for maternal health support from governments. Country offices that suffered from staffing shortages were less able to actively participate in maternal health coordination forums and technical working groups. In these cases, bigger and better-resourced
development partners overshadowed the role of UNFPA in maternal health.

Conclusions

C1 UNFPA maternal health support in programme countries has not been sufficiently based on country-specific medium or long-term strategies. Neither the templates for country programme action plans (CPAP) nor the formats for annual work plans (AWP) required any kind of detailed multi-annual planning. Nonetheless, country offices that followed a multi-annual strategic vision to support maternal health made better use of the organizational resources of UNFPA. The longer-term visions led them to exploit synergies between their sub-programmes, for example, by combining data collection and dissemination with evidence-based policy advocacy over a period of several years. In the absence of a multi-annual perspective, country offices were more likely to manage individual interventions separately hence missing the opportunities for synergies.

C2 In its support to maternal health, UNFPA has not sufficiently focused on addressing the root causes of poor maternal health of the most vulnerable. UNFPA has not yet defined the operational implications of the commitment to focus on the maternal health needs of the “most vulnerable”. Without this guidance, country offices have encountered difficulties in developing country-specific and detailed analyses of the important social, political, cultural and economic root causes of poor maternal health of vulnerable groups. As a result, country offices did not consistently tackle the systemic weaknesses of health systems and other social inequities that keep women from vulnerable groups from accessing maternal health services.

C3 UNFPA support to the provision of maternal health services at sub-national level has not consistently reflected the relative comparative strengths of UNFPA as a primarily knowledge- and evidence-based organization. Working at sub-national level has committed a significant portion of the relatively small UNFPA budget for reproductive and maternal health support. In spite of this, country offices have not consistently used their engagement at sub-national level to generate data and lessons to further the maternal health policy agenda at central level and to strengthen the capacity of UNFPA to generate and disseminate maternal health-related knowledge and expertise. Weaknesses in the UNFPA monitoring and evaluation system also limited opportunities to learn from these interventions.

C4 Insufficient staff capacity and gaps in the skills available in country offices have negatively affected the ability of UNFPA to act as brokers of maternal health-related expertise and to be a facilitator of national and international maternal health commitments and strategic partnerships. The small numbers of reproductive health staff in country offices made it difficult or, at times, impossible for UNFPA to be present in relevant technical working group meetings or policy forums. Time constraints prevented reproductive health advisors from preparing technical inputs or to launch and pursue innovative approaches to support maternal health.

C5 Country offices have not yet received sufficient technical support from regional offices and headquarters to fulfill their central role in delivering maternal health support. The availability of technical support from regional offices in areas such as human resources for health, EmONC and midwifery, but also on operational issues like strategic planning, results-based management or monitoring and evaluation was limited. These gaps in technical support affected the capacity of country offices to adequately plan, manage and evaluate their own maternal health portfolio.

C6 The variable capacity of country offices to establish and maintain long-term partnerships within, as well as outside of the reproductive health arena has influenced the ability of UNFPA to sustainably address service access barriers and other root causes of poor maternal health and to help strengthen the maternal health system in programme countries. In some cases, long-term partnerships have allowed UNFPA to place specific maternal health-
related topics on the agenda of donor coordination meetings and other government-led policy forums. Partnerships also enabled UNFPA to ensure that initiatives spearheaded by UNFPA were subsequently implemented by government agencies, thus increasing the chances for their sustainability. However, not all country offices were able to engage in the long-term process of forging and maintaining partnerships that helped in the delivery of maternal health support.

C7 Weak monitoring and evaluation mechanisms have prevented UNFPA from assessing the results of maternal health support and from optimizing its corporate and country-level maternal health strategies over time. Monitoring indicators focused primarily on activities or higher level societal changes in the maternal health situation in programme countries. The monitoring systems did not provide data on the direct effects of UNFPA-supported interventions on immediate target groups. This made it impossible to draw a link from monitoring data to intervention results and to gauge the contribution of these interventions to improvements in maternal health in programme countries.

C8 The Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) has helped to provide much needed financial and staff resources to UNFPA country offices and headquarters in the short and medium-term, in particular in EmONC, midwifery and obstetric fistula. Staff positions financed by the MHTF bolstered the staff capacity of country offices and allowed them to intensify their engagement in these thematic areas. In addition, partnerships fostered by MHTF gave country offices access to additional technical support in key areas of the UNFPA maternal health portfolio. This has reinforced UNFPA support to improve maternal health and has increased the visibility of the Fund.

C9 The MHTF has not been sufficiently embedded into the organizational structure of UNFPA and the overall UNFPA planning process at country level to ensure sustainability of all of its results. A majority of country offices have not systematically planned the mobilization of resources required to support the continuation of MHTF initiatives. In some instances, country offices have used MHTF funds to supplement core resources in a large number of different interventions, instead of intensifying their engagement in few specific areas such as EmONC or midwifery. This weakened the catalytic role of the MHTF.

**Recommendations**

R1 UNFPA should revise its internal procedures, tools and templates for strategic planning. The new process should require country offices to develop maternal health support strategies for the medium to long-term, and to detail how resources from the different sub-programmes will be used to implement these strategies. The overall rationale and theory of change should be described in a comprehensive planning document. The programming documents should also include the presentation of detailed analysis of the specific political, administrative, cultural and socio-economic challenges related to maternal health that need to be addressed in the four to five years covered by the programme. Finally, the planning process should be multi-annual rather than based on annual work plans.

R2 UNFPA needs to better define the operational implications of targeting maternal health support towards the needs of the “most vulnerable”. The concept is a relevant part of the UNFPA maternal health strategy yet it is too vague in its current form to guide maternal health programming at country level. The concrete ways in which characteristics of health systems, social support structures, and socio-economic conditions determine and shape the vulnerability of specific population groups to maternal health threats and risks should be assessed. UNFPA at corporate level should then provide programming and operational guidance to country offices on how to support the most vulnerable in their specific country programmes and interventions.
UNFPA needs to increase the focus on knowledge generation, learning and evidence-based policy advocacy when supporting maternal health service delivery at sub-national level. Country offices should provide the rationale for supporting maternal health service delivery at the sub-national level. Country offices should track progress, identify successes and failures and extract and use lessons from interventions implemented at sub-national level. In particular, they should collect, analyse and disseminate information from interventions, and notably pilot interventions, in support of maternal health service delivery on the ground.

UNFPA needs to better align the capacity and skill mix of staff and managers to the work-related demands of country programmes with a view to fulfilling the role of country offices as knowledge brokers and facilitators of evidence-based approaches to improve maternal health. Country offices should develop a resource plan as part of the country programme action plan to explain the allocation of staff time to the different components of the strategy. This, in turn, may require a stronger focus of country offices staff on health care issues specifically related to policy and management. Such a plan should also identify the additional resources which may be required to implement the strategy, and how these shall be mobilized.

UNFPA needs to better integrate the planning process for technical support from regional level with the proposed long-term strategic and operational planning for maternal health support at country level. Regional offices need to support the current country-level programming and must also be able to anticipate the future support requirements of country offices.

UNFPA needs to anchor the concept of partnerships more firmly in strategic documents, operational guidelines and job descriptions of management staff. Strategic documents need to explain the importance of developing partnerships as a means to: increase the sustainability of results; ensure the appropriate positioning of UNFPA in the national and regional space; and to add value and identify opportunities for further cooperation in maternal health. Operational guidelines need to explain how country offices can foster partnerships and UNFPA senior managers need to be responsible for setting up such partnerships at country, regional and global level.

UNFPA needs to strengthen results-oriented monitoring systems in country offices to measure results and not only activities and inputs. In addition, country offices need to strengthen support to implementing partners to put in place appropriate monitoring mechanisms for UNFPA-funded interventions.

UNFPA must develop operational guidance for results-oriented monitoring. Detailed guidelines on results-oriented monitoring should be produced so that country offices can develop specific monitoring mechanisms for their maternal health portfolio.

UNFPA should strengthen the capacity of the MHTF as a catalytic UNFPA tool that facilitates the implementation of evidence-based maternal health interventions in programme countries. The MHTF Business Plan needs to emphasize that the MHTF is not only responsible for launching initiatives (like those in EmONC and midwifery), but also to mobilize required technical and financial resources to support country offices and programme countries in following through with these initiatives until their completion.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

The objectives of the maternal health thematic evaluation are to assess to what extent UNFPA support to maternal health has been relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable in contributing to the improvement of maternal health. The evaluation covered all programmatic interventions that have been directly relevant to mortality and morbidity within the UNFPA mandate, including all relevant activities financed from core and non-core resources and those financed through UNFPA reproductive health thematic funds. Across these interventions and instruments, the evaluation focused on key elements of reproductive health including family planning, skilled birth attendance and emergency obstetric and newborn care (EmONC), the “three pillars” of reducing maternal mortality.

The thematic evaluation of the UNFPA support in maternal health was carried out in parallel to the mid-term evaluation of the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) to make use of the potential for synergies in the evaluation portfolio of UNFPA. The findings of the MHTF mid-term evaluation are presented in a separate report that is available on the web page of the Evaluation Branch.2

1.2 Mandate and strategy of UNFPA in the field of maternal health

Since the first international conference on maternal mortality in 1987, the Safe Motherhood Conference sponsored by UNFPA, the World Bank and the World Health Organization (WHO), a wide range of international development agencies have supported maternal health and reproductive health. Two frameworks serve to focus international efforts: the Programme of Action adopted at the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD, 1995) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs, 2000).

The Secretary General’s Global Strategy for Women and Children Health has been a key maternal health initiative. A range of global partners supported the Strategy and committed US$ 40 billion for improved maternal and child health programmes and services. UNFPA, the World Health Organization (WHO), UNICEF and the World Bank (known as the H4 group) have joined forces to concentrate support in countries with the highest maternal mortality rates, starting with Afghanistan, Bangladesh, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, India and Nigeria. The H4 group (and with UNAIDS H4+) aims to help countries to strengthen their own health systems to reduce the maternal mortality ratio by 75 per cent and achieve universal access to reproductive health by 2015. Furthermore, Women Deliver, a global advocacy organization, and a wide range of non-governmental organizations work globally and locally to generate political and financial commitments to achieve MDG 5 to improve maternal health.

Globally, funding for maternal, newborn and child health activities have increased by 103 per cent between 2003 and 2008.3 Sixty eight high-needs countries that had been selected as priority countries by the Countdown initiative4 have received more than 70 per cent of those funds. In

---

1 The Maternal Health Thematic Fund; the Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health. Commodity Security, the Midwifery Programme and the joint UNFPA-UNICEF female genital mutilation programme).
2 http://www.unfpa.org/public/home/about/Evaluation/EBIER/TE/pid/10094
4 A collaboration of individuals and institutions, including UNFPA, to stimulate progress towards MDG5 and other Millennium Development Goals.
Between 2000 and 2011, UNFPA has provided support to 155 developing countries, areas and territories across the sub-Saharan African region (45), the Arab States (14), Eastern Europe (20) and Central Asia (20), Latin America and the Caribbean (40), and in Asia and the Pacific (36). In 2009, UNFPA offices worldwide carried out a total of 221 joint programmes with other UN organizations. These partnerships included initiatives to stop gender-based violence, increase demand for HIV-prevention services, advance gender equality and expanded access to maternal health services. Recent UNFPA initiatives include the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (see below) and the Campaign to End Fistula.

The mandate of UNFPA to support maternal health builds on the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD, see above) and the Millennium Summit (2000) with its adoption of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), including MDG 5 (improve maternal health). UNFPA has developed a broad scope of programmatic interventions to help improve maternal health at global, regional and country level within its three core areas (reproductive health and rights, gender equality and population and development). Each of the core areas addresses critical factors for reproductive health and cross cutting issues, such as gender equality, fundamental human rights and women-specific strengths and vulnerabilities. UNFPA uses resources from these areas to support integrated reproductive health services, including interventions to address maternal mortality, gender-based violence, harmful practices, and sexually transmitted infections including HIV, and adolescent reproductive health, as well as family planning. UNFPA supports all functions of a health system with relevance to reproductive health: leadership/governance, health workforce, information, service delivery, financing, medical products, vaccines and technologies.

In 2008, UNFPA launched the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) to help accelerate progress to the achievement of MDG 5. The MHTF represents a focused effort in some of the poorest countries in the world with the greatest maternal health needs. It was intended to be a quick and flexible funding mechanism and a tool to make additional technical expertise available to UNFPA programme countries. The work supported by the MHTF is meant to be country-owned and country-driven. The specific activities supported by the MHTF in each country are intended to be identified by the government through a consultative process with key partners and stakeholders and in close coordination with other UNFPA programmes. The Campaign to End Fistula and the UNFPA-International Confederation of Midwives (ICM) Midwifery Programme were integrated into the MHTF. In addition, the Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security (GPRHCS), one of the UNFPA reproductive health thematic funds, has provided technical assistance, commodities and financial support to UNFPA programme countries. The following table presents an overview of the expenditures of UNFPA in the field of maternal health from 2008 to 2010.


---


Table 1: Overview of UNFPA expenditures in the field of reproductive/maternal health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total for the period 2008–2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall UNFPA expenditures (in US$,000)7</td>
<td>340,400</td>
<td>366,200</td>
<td>347,800</td>
<td>1,054,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall UNFPA expenditures for reproductive health (including maternal health) (regular sources, in US$,000)8</td>
<td>165,200</td>
<td>170,100</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>509,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries receiving support from UNFPA</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures of MHTF (total in US$,000)9</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>36,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries receiving funding from MHTF10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of MHTF expenditures to UNFPA reproductive health expenditures</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures of the Global Programme on Reproductive Health Commodity Security (total in US$,000)11</td>
<td>25,63512</td>
<td>87,100</td>
<td>93,550</td>
<td>206,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries receiving funding from GPRHCS13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of GPRHCS expenditures to UNFPA reproductive health expenditures</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 MHTF mid-annual review 2010.
10 MHTF mid-annual review 2010.
11 UNFPA GPRHCS annual report 2009.
12 Estimation according to UNFPA GPRHCS annual report 2009.
CHAPTER 2

Methodology

The following sections describe the overall evaluation process and the main components of the methodology used for the evaluation. They include the approach used to define its scope, the methodology and the tools selected to collect data and information, and the methods used to analyze this information. This chapter also describes how evidence was used as a basis for formulating answers to the evaluation questions.

2.1 Overview of the evaluation process

This evaluation was carried out in four phases:

- **An inception phase** - to finalize the evaluation design (see Section 2.2 for methods and tools used during this phase to finalize the evaluation design).

- **A desk phase** - to collect and analyze information from relevant existing evaluations and other documents, and to prepare the subsequent phases of this evaluation.

- **A field phase** - to implement the country case studies and to conduct interviews with key stakeholders at global and regional levels (see Sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 for information on the methods and data collection tools used during this phase).

- **An analysis and reporting phase** - to develop answers to the evaluation questions based on the evidence collected in the previous phases (see Section 2.4 for methods and tools used for data analysis previous to and during reporting).

2.2 Methods and tools used in evaluation design

The following sections provide information on the different tools and methods used in the design of this evaluation.

2.2.1 Analysis of UNFPA strategic framework

The specific scope of the evaluation was determined on the basis of the review of the UNFPA strategic frameworks in maternal health. The evaluators constructed a series of effects diagrams to help visualize the UNFPA results chains in maternal health. The diagrams, a type of logic model, showed the theory of change that UNFPA had intended to use to improve the maternal health situation in programme countries.

These effects diagrams helped the evaluators to:

i. comprehensively analyze the main elements, overall logic and intervention theory underlying UNFPA support to maternal health; this helped the evaluators improve and deepen their understanding of the UNFPA approach to maternal health over the last 10 years;

ii. compare changes in UNFPA maternal health approach support over time and establish the common characteristics of the different results frameworks, partly with a view to narrowing the focus of the thematic evaluation (see below);

iii. compare and contrast the approach and strategy of the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) with that of the overall strategy with regard to reproductive and maternal health, and also prepare the analysis of
the added value of the thematic fund vis-à-vis that of maternal health support from other sources;

The development of these diagrams occurred in two distinct phases:

• The drafting of a diagram that depicts the elements and linkages specifically mentioned in the UNFPA strategies;

• The logical reconstruction of the intervention logic of UNFPA by adding, where necessary, the elements (intermediate outcomes, etc.) and linkages needed to make the diagrams more logically coherent.

• The resulting diagrams can be found in Volume 2.

2.2.2 Evaluation questions and judgment criteria

Based on the effects diagrams (see above), the evaluators developed a set of twelve evaluation questions that:

i. reflect on the topics raised in the terms of reference (ToR) for this evaluation; and

ii. focus on key components of the UNFPA intervention logic as analyzed and mapped out in the effects diagrams;

iii. analyze the UNFPA maternal health strategy in accordance with four of the five standard DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability).

A corresponding set of judgment criteria were developed to ensure a transparent assessment of UNFPA performance for each evaluation question. The judgment criteria specified which aspects of UNFPA maternal health support the evaluators would focus on when answering the evaluation questions. Each judgment criterion was specified by a set of qualitative and quantitative indicators, to further increase the transparency of the assessment and to streamline the collection and analysis of data.

In many areas, the ToR suggested a correspondence between the key issues to be addressed in the MHTF midterm evaluation, and those to be covered by the Maternal Health Thematic Evaluation (MHTE). In order to facilitate a comparison between the two assignments, the evaluators defined a set of evaluation questions that covered the same issues in both studies, but in ways that reflected the differences between the strategic orientation of the MHTF and overall UNFPA maternal health support.

2.2.3 The typology of UNFPA-funded activities

The UNFPA multi-year funding frameworks (MYFF), UNFPA Strategic Plan (2008-2013), the country programme documents (CPD) and action plans (CPAP) and annual work plans (AWP) did not provide sufficient information to comprehensively reconstruct the intended theory of change in maternal health. As a result, the initial set of judgment criteria and indicators developed on the basis of these strategic and planning documents were not specific enough to reliably guide data collection (see section 2.3). The evaluators therefore developed a typology of UNFPA-funded activities to refine the theory of change and to complement the initial judgment criteria and indicators for each of the evaluation questions with additional criteria. These additional criteria allowed the evaluators to collect information during the subsequent evaluation phases in a more focused manner. The typology was developed on the basis of a selection of approximately 120 annual work plans (AWPs) that were made available to the evaluators by country offices.

2.2.4 Staged sampling to define the geographical scope of the evaluation

The countries included in this evaluation were selected in a staged sampling process. The first sampling stage resulted in the selection of all 55 UNFPA programme countries with a maternal mortality ratio (MMR) higher than 300 deaths per 100,000 live births in the year 2000.15 In the second sampling stage, 22 countries out of the initial 55 were selected for inclusion in the extended desk phase. To ensure that different types of country context were included in

---

15 The sampling criterion was selected so as to establish a close link to the MDG 5 indicators. The data were taken from the H4 report “Trends in Maternal Mortality: 1990-2008” in agreement with UNFPA.
In the third sampling stage, 10 countries from the desk phase group of 22 were selected for in-depth case studies (field phase). Eight of these countries were recipients of the MHTF support: Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Sudan, and Zambia. Another two countries did not receive MHTF funding: DRC and Kenya.

### 2.3 Methods and tools used for data collection

The following sections explain the methods and tools used for collecting data throughout this evaluation.

Data for the evaluation were then collected by means of:

- a desk-based review of existing evaluations, reviews and other documents;

- ten country case studies conducted in UNFPA programme countries: Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Sudan (North) and Zambia (see Section 2.3.2);

- an online survey covering 55 country offices to collect quantifiable information on the technical support that country offices had received, and solicit feedback on the organizational capacity of the country offices (see Section 2.2.4);

- a series of face-to-face and telephone interviews with UNFPA staff both at headquarters, in the regional and sub-regional offices\(^ {16}\), in case study countries, with other external partners, such as the H4+\(^ {17}\) group (see Annex 3).

#### 2.3.1 Desk review

The first round of data collection consisted of a review of existing documents, in particular available country programme evaluations, and country office annual reports (COAR, see Volume 2). These documents provided the most comprehensive presentation and analysis of UNFPA activities in maternal health for the countries included in the desk phase. Where available other relevant evaluations, including evaluations of joint programmes, were also analyzed. Unfortunately, the quality of decentralized country programme evaluations was low, with findings often not sufficiently supported by data, and conclusions inadequately linked to findings. This made it impossible to compile a complete set of preliminary answers to the evaluation questions for the desk assessment (see Section 2.3.5) and to identify a list of issues to be assessed during the field phase (see Section 2.4 below).

In addition the evaluation team also reviewed internal procedures such as resource allocation and resource distribution processes, the envisaged approach to monitoring and evaluation, and the planning process for country programmes. The team also assessed a number of common country assessments (CCA) with a view to identifying the quality of the maternal health-related analysis included in these documents.

#### 2.3.2 Country case studies

Ten country case studies were conducted in UNFPA programme countries (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Sudan (North), Zambia). The case studies provided information on the most critical parts of the UNFPA maternal health strategy that were identified during the desk phase, the issues to be assessed during the field phase (see Section 2.4.2).

---

\(^{16}\) Technical Advisor, Regional Team Coordinator, and Senior Programme Advisor.

\(^{17}\) UNFPA, UNICEF, the World Bank, WHO and UNAIDS.
All case studies followed a common format. However, the overall list of issues to be assessed was adapted to the specific contexts of each country case study. During each country visit, the evaluation teams used a range of different tools to collect data and information from UNFPA, its partners and other stakeholders:

- Individual interviews and collection of documents from UNFPA country offices and UNFPA partners in 10 programme countries. The team focused on collecting qualitative and quantitative data that would help describe the specific role of UNFPA in the country and provide contextual information on the UNFPA portfolio, its contributions to reducing maternal health, and its role in partnerships;

- Field visits to ascertain how UNFPA contributions were translated into maternal health services on the ground;

- Focus groups with beneficiaries of UNFPA support, often carried out at project sites;

- Follow-up interviews with key partners including the implementing agencies in the capitals, and staff of other UN agencies, donors and non-governmental organizations.

### 2.3.3 Online survey

The evaluators also carried out an online survey that was disseminated to UNFPA country offices in all 55 countries included in the evaluation (see Volume 2). The survey focused on collecting quantifiable information on the technical support that country offices had received, and soliciting feedback on the organizational capacity of the country offices. The response rate of the survey was 100%.

### 2.3.4 Key-informant interviews at global and regional level

Evaluators conducted individual interviews with UNFPA staff in headquarters and in the regional and sub-regional offices, both face-to-face and by telephone. A second round of individual interviews was conducted with global representatives of key UNFPA partners, such as the World Health Organization (WHO), UNICEF, and the World Bank. The purpose of the interviews was to complement the insights gained from country-level interviews with the opinions and impressions of UNFPA partners at global and regional levels.

### 2.3.5 Limitations to data collection

Table 3 lists the main limitations relating to data collection.

As indicated above, the scarcity of data available at desk phase has entailed a shift in the data collection strategy. Evaluators had to approach the field phase with a view to filling the data gaps identified in the desk phase report. As a result, the interventions portfolio examined by the evaluators was – when relevant – extended to include a number of activities implemented in 2011. Thus, the evaluation de facto covers a broader period of time (2000-2011) than the one originally set in the terms of reference (2000-2010).

### 2.4 Methods and tools used for data analysis

The evaluation team analyzed the data and information obtained from the different sources in the following ways:

**Figure 1: Analysis of data and information obtained**

![Figure 1: Analysis of data and information obtained](image)
Table 3: Limitations related to data collection for the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitation regarding data collection</th>
<th>Evaluators’ response/Implication for the evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The MYFF, the Strategic Plan, CPD, CPAP, and the annual reports from country offices (COAR) provided an overview that was not specific enough on the types of activities funded. The portfolio of UNFPA activities and interventions by country could not be established on the basis of data from the ATLAS financial database. Unfortunately, ATLAS data do not provide sufficient details on UNFPA interventions such as full programming titles, description of activities, outputs and outcomes etc.. This situation, in combination with the absence of other suitable documentation, meant that at the end of the inception phase the evaluation team did not have a clear idea of what types of activity and interventions country offices had carried out in support of maternal health. This limited the extent to which the evaluators could develop a clear analysis of the theory of change underlying UNFPA maternal health interventions. It also meant that many of the judgment criteria and indicators proposed for assessing UNFPA performance and contributions remained relatively vague.</td>
<td>A typology of activities from individual annual work plans (AWP) was compiled during the desk phase. This typology was used to refine the analysis of UNFPA intervention logic and to develop a more concrete data collection strategy for the subsequent evaluation phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The available country programme evaluations, annual reports and other documents that would have provided an ex post review and analysis of UNFPA maternal health support were of very variable quality and often did not contain specific enough information to allow the evaluators to provide reasonably detailed preliminary answers to the evaluation questions.</td>
<td>The evaluators conducted a gap analysis based on the typology of activities (see above) and refined the data collection for the field phase and country visits. This information was identified in a list of issues to be assessed during the field phase, on the basis of which the evaluators developed the data collection strategy for each country case study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA monitoring reports (CPAP and AWP monitoring tools) did not contain any information on the results of individual interventions. This made it impossible to track progress of results indicators at country level over time, or to make a firm link between UNFPA interventions and changes in maternal health outcomes.</td>
<td>The evaluators analyzed the quality and logical consistency of the strategies of UNFPA along the reconstructed chain of results or intervention logic. This helped the evaluators to construct logical arguments that supported or contradicted a presumed contribution of UNFPA to any observed changes in maternal health outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An evaluation matrix* guided the analysis of data and information during the desk phase. The evaluation matrix helped evaluators to compile relevant information for each of the indicators and judgment criteria for all 12 evaluation questions. Moreover, the matrix provided a template for evaluators to formulate their findings on the basis of the collected information at three different levels:

- At the level of the indicators, i.e., taking into account all information that had been collected for each indicator
- At the level of judgment criteria, across all indicators associated with the respective criterion
- At the level of the evaluation question itself.

Similar findings and evaluations matrices were also used during subsequent phases of the evaluation, i.e. for the analysis of country case studies and the analysis for the final report (see the following page).
findings that were subsequently used to inform the comprehensive answers to each evaluation question in this final evaluation report. The country level results matrices are annexed to the 10 country reports and summarise the findings of each country case study.21

Data from the online survey were analyzed statistically. In a first round of analysis, the team prepared an overview of the data for each of the survey questions. A second round of analysis was then used to deepen the analysis arising from selected questions - for example to identify differences in responses between regions, between MHTF recipients and countries without MHTF, etc. (see Volume 2).

A series of team workshops allowed the evaluation team to compare and contrast the findings from the desk review, the country case studies, the online survey and the individual interviews. The team used both internal workshops and collaborative sessions together with UNFPA staff and partners to formulate the overall findings and to reflect on conclusions and recommendations. Evaluators used the Metaplan™ visualization approach22 and mind maps23 to identify patterns and draw conclusions on the basis of the entire body of evidence (see Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Limitations associated with data source</th>
<th>Implications for validity of findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document analysis (desk phase)</td>
<td>The country evaluation reports for the 22 desk study countries within the evaluation period were of low quality. This made it difficult to compile a comprehensive picture of UNFPA maternal health support in these countries that should have helped to put the findings from the country case studies into the context of a larger sample of UNFPA programme countries. The limited availability of information from country programme evaluations also meant that the evaluators were not able to develop complete hypotheses, or preliminary answers to the evaluation questions that could be verified during the country case studies (see below).</td>
<td>The limited availability of quality evaluation reports made it more difficult to apply the findings from this evaluation to programme countries outside of the sample of case study countries. Nonetheless, the evaluation findings can be used to inform programming in countries other than those included in the field phase if staff members familiar with the country contexts confirm the applicability of the evaluation findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country case studies</td>
<td>Without sufficiently detailed preliminary answers to the evaluation questions from the desk phase (see above), the evaluators had to collect a wider range of data during the country case studies than originally expected. This made it difficult to explore the contributions of UNFPA to progress in maternal health in the case study countries in the required depth.</td>
<td>The need to reduce the depth of the inquiry during country case studies made it more challenging to establish a well-documented link between UNFPA interventions and changes in maternal health in case study countries. This notwithstanding, the evaluators used information from complementary data sources in case study countries (e.g., donors, governments, civil society) to increase the credibility of claims of UNFPA contributions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 The country notes can be found at http://www.unfpa.org/public/home/about/Evaluation/EBIER/TE/pid/10094
22 The Metaplan™ moderation method is a proven and effective means of reaching a shared understanding in group discussion. Visualization makes all the important contributions to the discussion visible for the entire group. These contributions can be recorded and organized, and any relationships between them will emerge.
23 A mind map is a diagram used to represent words, ideas, or other items linked to and arranged around a central key word or idea. The elements of a given mind map are arranged intuitively according to the importance of the concepts, and are classified into groupings, or areas, with the goal of representing connections between portions of information.
The judgment criteria, which form the basis for the answer for the evaluation questions, are specified for each evaluation question in Chapter 4 and in Volume 2.

### 2.6 The approach to triangulation in this evaluation

The evaluation used different types of information, a range of sources and various data collection methods to increase the reliability of the data collected and to maximize the validity of the findings and conclusions derived from the data. Specifically, the evaluators ensured methodological and data triangulation in the following ways:

- Employing a mix of data collection methods for the evaluation process, including both qualitative and quantitative methods ranging from documentation review to interviews, case studies and an online survey;
- Using a comparable mix of data collection methods during the country case studies (interviews, document review, focus groups, observation - see country reports);
- Ensuring the careful selection of a variety of sources of documented data (primary and secondary sources, from within UNFPA and from other donors or organizations at country, regional and global levels, etc.) during both the desk review and the in-depth documentation review for the country case studies (see Volume 2 and country case studies);

The following table provides an overview of the different data collection tools that were used to collect information for each of the evaluation questions.
Table 5: Collection of data for different evaluation questions by data collection tool/approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Desk review</th>
<th>Country case studies</th>
<th>Online survey</th>
<th>Individual interviews HQ24/RO25</th>
<th>Individual interviews UNFPA partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relevance</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Harmonization and coordination</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community involvement and demand orientation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Human resources for health</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maternal health in humanitarian contexts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Family planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EmONC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evidence orientation of maternal health support</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Support of maternal health frameworks and policies</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Coherence of sexual and reproductive health, population and development and gender</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Coherence between country, regional and global programme</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Visibility</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:  XXX: Provided extensive data for answering evaluation question  
         XX: Provided some data for answering evaluation question  
         X: Provided little data for answering evaluation question

24 Headquarters.  
25 Regional offices.
Main findings and analysis

The following section presents the summary findings that emerged from the evaluation questions. The detailed findings are presented in the “evaluation findings matrix” and the “presentation of results from the online survey” in the volume 2 of this report. Where examples are drawn from specific case studies, these are indicated by listing the name of the country in brackets. The detailed findings include examples and descriptions from the desk review, 10 country case studies, the online survey and interviews, and can be used for further reading. Furthermore, the “analytical matrix” (Volume 2) presents an in-depth analysis for each of the evaluation questions.

3.1 Evaluation question 1 - Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION QUESTION 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is UNFPA maternal health support adequately focused on addressing the reproductive and maternal health needs of the vulnerable groups among countries and within countries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

► Judgment criteria

1. Correspondence between levels of UNFPA sexual and reproductive health/maternal health support and maternal health needs of vulnerable groups across programme countries

2. (Increased) availability of accurate and sufficiently disaggregated data for targeting most disadvantaged/vulnerable groups

3. Needs orientation of planning and design of UNFPA supported interventions

► Evaluation criteria covered

Relevance

Summary

UNFPA has not fully used the financial and technical resources at its disposal to focus maternal health support on the most vulnerable beneficiaries, neither between countries, nor within programme countries. The organization did not consistently allocate its resources in proportion to the relative severity of national maternal health needs, because the resource allocation system did not consider the relative levels of the prevailing needs in each country. Headquarters and regional offices were allowed to base the distribution of resources on imprecise criteria such as “degree of political support to the agenda of the International Conference on Population and Development”, “absorptive capacity” or the “humanitarian response, transition and recovery situation in each country”. This resulted in aspects other than the severity of maternal health needs being considered in these resource decisions.

UNFPA has not developed clear, operational definitions of maternal health-related vulnerability to adequately direct maternal health programming toward the most vulnerable. In the absence of these definitions, UNFPA country offices have focused maternal health support geographically and have invested primarily in those regions within programme countries that had highest relative prevalence of maternal mortality. This helped to alleviate resource shortfalls in these areas, at least in the short- to medium term. Only country offices that made use of data from surveys and studies for needs-oriented targeting of specific socio-economic groups were able to address existing socio-economic service barriers, such as cost, distance or lack of transportation.

---

The UNFPA Multi-Year Funding Frameworks\textsuperscript{26} and the UNFPA Strategic Plan\textsuperscript{27} all stated that universal access to reproductive health by 2015 needed to include the most vulnerable populations. In order to follow through on this commitment, UNFPA had intended to allocate the largest share of its support to the countries with the highest incidence of maternal mortality. In each country, UNFPA maternal health support was meant to benefit in particular the most excluded and marginalized population groups and address the issues that were at the root of their vulnerability to poor maternal health.\textsuperscript{28} UNFPA-supported research and surveys that highlighted the situation of these most vulnerable group\textsuperscript{29} were meant to provide governments and development partners with the data required to formulate interventions targeted at these parts of the population.\textsuperscript{30}

In practice, however, a number of factors reduced the focus of UNFPA on the maternal health-related needs of the most vulnerable countries and demographic groups. In particular, UNFPA was not able to allocate its funding so that the share of resources was in proportion to the severity of the maternal health crisis in each country. An internal UNFPA report\textsuperscript{31} found no correlation between the levels of UNFPA investments in reproductive health in its programme countries and key reproductive health indicators, such as lifetime risk of maternal death, contraceptive prevalence, or unmet needs for family planning or other services.\textsuperscript{32}

A number of characteristics of the combined UNFPA systems for resource allocation and resource distribution have contributed to this disconnect between needs and resources:

- The resource allocation system uses a set of eight maternal health/ reproductive health indicators to assign individual countries to different needs categories or groups: group A for countries with the highest maternal health challenges, and groups B and C for countries with relatively smaller needs. This includes indicators such as the maternal mortality ratio (MMR), the proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel, contraceptive prevalence rate (modern methods), and the adolescent fertility rate. However, the resource allocation system does not fully consider the magnitude of any of these indicators. Instead, UNFPA has defined eight indicator thresholds that influence the categorization of a country. For example, the threshold for maternal mortality has been set to 100 deaths per 100,000 live births.\textsuperscript{33} Countries are assigned to one of three respective need categories in accordance with the number of indicator thresholds they meet or fail to meet.\textsuperscript{34} However, the allocation system does not consider the size of the ongoing needs in relation to these thresholds. It therefore does not distinguish if the countries in each group had failed to meet any of the indicator thresholds by a narrow or by a wide margin. As a result, the countries in the high needs category (group A) are allocated a fixed share of UNFPA programme resources\textsuperscript{35} that does not vary with the severity of the individual maternal health challenges they face: the severity of maternal mortality, problems with access to contraceptives, and the inadequacy of access to skilled birth attendance, etc.

- Regional offices use the resource distribution system to determine budget ceilings for individual countries in each of the three needs categories. This system allows the regional offices to consider relatively vague qualitative criteria, such as “degree of political support to the ICPD\textsuperscript{36} agenda”, “absorptive capacity” or the “humanitarian response, transition and recovery situation in each country” in determining the budget ceilings. This gives the regional offices and headquarters the option of basing resource distribution on criteria other than maternal health indicators and further weakens the systematic link between the severity of maternal health needs and UNFPA funding levels.

UNFPA has not developed clear, operational definitions of maternal health-related vulnerability that adequately
direct maternal health programming to the countries with the greatest maternal health needs. None of the high-level strategic documents of UNFPA, such as the MYFF, the Strategic Plan or the Sexual and Reproductive Health Framework, defined the vulnerability concept itself or explained how country offices were meant to translate vulnerability into adequately targeted programmes. At country level, none of the 17 country programme action plans (CPAP) that were analyzed for this evaluation offered clear operational definitions of maternal health vulnerability. Similarly, staff in all country offices visited during this evaluation cited only very broad definitions of the “most vulnerable” concept. The term was either meant to include all “women, girls, youth, extremely poor, disabled and elderly”, etc., or was interpreted according to geographical location, such as “remote, hard to reach or urban slums population” (Kenya, Madagascar, Sudan, and Zambia).

In the absence of clear operational guidance on the meaning of maternal health vulnerability, UNFPA country programmes have targeted the needs of specific socio-economic groups with varying success. One approach has been to use maternal health data from macro-level surveys to focus UNFPA investments in maternal health on geographic target areas (states or provinces) with particularly low maternal health indicators (geographic targeting). UNFPA programmes in eight of the 10 case study countries applied this approach to direct their investments into clinics, health centers, nursing schools and other facilities (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, DRC, Ghana, Kenya, Lao PDR, Sudan, and Zambia). These investments alleviated resource shortfalls in specific programme areas in the short- to medium-term. However, they did not target any of the more systemic barriers that often prevented health system access, such as service cost, distance or lack of transportation.

Case study country offices that performed better with regard to targeting used information from macro-level surveys and other studies, such as ‘situation analyses’ (in areas such as skilled birth attendance, human resources for health or midwifery) to advocate for changes in national health policies or for the launch of national maternal health programmes (see Box 1 for examples of this type of socio-economic targeting). UNFPA supported initiatives to provide delivery incentives to midwives (Lao PDR) or to introduce a subsidy scheme for emergency obstetric and newborn care (Burkina Faso). These interventions complemented investments in specific states or provinces in these countries. Other than geographically targeted interventions, these national policies and programmes were specifically directed at removing the barriers to access of specific demographic groups, such as women below poverty level or women in remote areas.

Box 1: Examples of the use of socio-economic studies and research for socio-economic targeting of UNFPA support

In Lao PDR, the UNFPA country office participated in the development of the national maternal, newborn and child health package over a number of years and used this cooperation to contribute to a number of initiatives. UNFPA encouraged the Ministry of Health to carry out a skilled birth attendance assessment and also financed the implementation of the study. The results of this assessment subsequently helped to define the content of the Lao PDR national skilled birth attendance plan. This plan later became part of the national maternal, newborn and child health package. The country office also used findings from the skilled birth attendance assessment to advocate for the provision of delivery incentives for midwives in remote areas and to make available free assisted delivery to women in the lowest health quintile.

In Burkina Faso, the UNFPA country office has used a number of socio-economic studies and a socio-behavioural study to investigate the provision of services for reproductive health. UNFPA has used information from this study to maintain a steady policy dialogue with the national government. The dialogue enabled the country office to help promote the idea of an emergency obstetric and newborn care (EmONC) subsidy.

---

38 See judgment criterion 1.2, Volume 2.
39 See judgment criterion 1.3, Volume 2.
40 See judgment criterion 1.2, Volume 2.
41 See judgment criterion 1.3, Volume 2.
42 See evaluation questions 4 (human resources for health), 6 (family planning), and 7 (EmONC) for information on the UNFPA investments on implementation support.
43 See judgment criterion 1.3, Volume 2.
Using the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) to target a selection of maternal health priority countries has helped UNFPA channel more maternal health support to the programme countries with the greatest maternal health needs. The national assessments supported by the MHTF, particularly the emergency obstetric and newborn care assessments, also helped UNFPA and its partners identify bottlenecks in the provision of quality maternal health services for all women. However, the MHTF has not sufficiently addressed the full range of socio-economic barriers that have kept marginalized groups from accessing maternal health services.\textsuperscript{44}

### 3.2 Evaluation question 2 - Harmonization and coordination of maternal health support and partnerships

#### EVALUATION QUESTION 2

To what extent has UNFPA successfully contributed to the harmonization of efforts to improve maternal health, in particular through its participation in strategic and multi-sectoral partnerships at global, regional and national level?

- **Judgment criteria\textsuperscript{45}**
  1. Harmonization in maternal health partnerships between UNFPA and United Nations (UN) organizations and World Bank (including H4+)\textsuperscript{46} at global, regional and country level
  2. Harmonization of maternal health support through partnerships at country and South-South/ regional levels

- **Evaluation criteria covered**
  Effectiveness, Sustainability

---

\textsuperscript{44} See judgment criterion 1.1, Volume 2 and evaluation question 1 in the final report of the MHTF mid-term evaluation.

\textsuperscript{45} Previously foreseen judgement criterion 2.3 was not considered for answering the evaluation question. No applicable UNFPA interventions were identified in case study countries. The relevance of the judgment criterion for answering the evaluation question was therefore assessed again.

\textsuperscript{46} UNFPA, UNICEF, World Bank, World Health Organization (WHO), and UNAIDS.

\textsuperscript{47} “Promoting, strengthening and coordinating partnerships” was already one of four key programme strategies of the Multi-Year Funding Framework (MYFF) 2000 – 2003.

\textsuperscript{48} See judgment criterion 2.1.

---

**Summary**

UNFPA has been able to use research and data collection, evidence-based advocacy and technical assistance to improve the harmonization of maternal health support in programme countries. In order to be successful, these interventions had to be part of long-term working partnerships with development partners and governments. Under these circumstances, country offices were able to use the three programme areas to generate momentum for government-led reviews and amendments of maternal health policies. The resulting policies then functioned as focal points for development partners to align their assistance more closely with government structures and simultaneously harmonize their maternal health support.

Global and regional aid harmonization campaigns, such as the H4+ campaign or the Maputo Maternal and Newborn Health Road Maps have so far had minimal impact on aid harmonization at country level. H4+ has been launched in most of UNFPA programme countries, but partners have not yet begun to coordinate their support according to H4+ principles. Instead, they continue to use the existing coordination mechanisms to harmonize their approaches. The Maputo Road Maps entered national policy-making arenas without a clear view of how they should be integrated into existing policy frameworks and ongoing policy-making processes. Thus, the Maputo Road Maps did not gain sufficient traction as joint policy frameworks and therefore did not lead to an increase in harmonization in maternal health.

The notion and strategy of partnership has been an inherent part of the UNFPA approach in sexual and reproductive health for the entire evaluation period since 2000.\textsuperscript{47} Partnerships with donors, implementing agencies and international and national civil society organizations were meant to enable UNFPA to advance a harmonized approach to support improvements of maternal health around the world. The UNFPA involvement in the H4+ partnership represented an intensified effort by UN organizations to avoid duplication and reduce the strain on scarce human and other resources provided by UNFPA and its partners.\textsuperscript{48} Cooperative initiatives at regional level,
‘south-south’ partnerships, were also meant to enable the sharing of experiences, development of capacity and the harmonization of maternal health approaches.\textsuperscript{49}

UNFPA partnerships with both development partners and governments played important roles in increasing harmonization of maternal health support at country level (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, and Lao PDR). UNFPA was able to use the dissemination of research findings and maternal health data to technical working groups and high-level policy forums to generate momentum for government-led policy reviews in maternal health (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, and Lao PDR).\textsuperscript{50} Policy initiatives in country case studies that UNFPA supported in cooperation with partners, like the maternal, newborn and child health package (Lao PDR), the Health Equity Fund and the EmONC scale-up plan and the EmONC subsidy policy (Cambodia), were able to galvanize the support of other development partners (see Box 2). The increased alignment of donors with these government-owned reproductive health frameworks then led to advances in the harmonization of approaches between UNFPA and its development partners (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, and Lao PDR). UNFPA successes in advancing harmonization have therefore been closely linked to the success of its country offices in integrating of maternal health into policy frameworks in its programme countries (see evaluation question 9).

The membership and active participation of UNFPA country staff in technical working groups and other coordination bodies in reproductive health has been an important pre-requisite for the ability of UNFPA to increase harmonization (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, and Lao PDR). These coordination forums have provided country offices with the opportunity to advocate for required policy changes with partner governments and at the same time to work with development partners on elaborating a harmonized approach to support the implementation of the new or revised reproductive health frameworks.\textsuperscript{51}

The country offices in Burkina Faso, Cambodia and Lao PDR have also participated in the respective coordination forums actively, consistently and regularly over a number of years. This allowed UNFPA to earn credibility and trust among both government and development partners and strengthened the capacity of the country offices to further advance harmonized maternal health support.\textsuperscript{52}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Box 2: Advancing aid harmonization through evidence-based advocacy and partnerships}

In Cambodia, UNFPA has utilized evidence-based policy advocacy to help increase aid harmonization in its long-term partnerships with the Government and development partners. At the time of evaluation, UNFPA also served as the Chair of the Health Sector Support Programme (HSSP) and had taken the lead on maternal health issues. This helped the country office to advocate and publicize its maternal health initiatives. It also illustrates that development partners had come to view UNFPA as a leader on maternal health.

The country office had used findings from the midwifery review of 2007\textsuperscript{53} to advocate for increased funding, the extension of midwifery programming and to lobby for financial incentives for deliveries.

The MHTF-funded EmONC assessment played an important role in flagging deficits in the national EmONC situation. These initiatives caught the attention of development partners. For example, the EmONC improvement was taken up as a priority in the HSSP II of Cambodia. This allowed development partners to support EmONC in a coordinated manner.

In contrast, UNFPA has been less successful in helping to harmonize maternal health support when staffing shortages forced country offices to be absent from some of the key coordination bodies, both at technical and at policy level (Ethiopia, Kenya, Zambia). As a result of these shortages, UNFPA country offices played a less prominent role in aid coordination forums. This meant that UNFPA maintained a much lower profile in these groups and was not able to help launch major policy initiatives in maternal health (Ethiopia, Kenya, and Zambia).\textsuperscript{54}

Lower visibility of UNFPA in these bodies also meant
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{49} See judgment criterion 2.2.
\textsuperscript{50} See judgment criterion 2.1, Volume 2.
\textsuperscript{51} See judgment criterion 2.1, Volume 2.
\textsuperscript{52} See judgment criterion 2.1, Volume 2.
\textsuperscript{53} Ministry of Health (2007): final report of comprehensive midwifery review.
\textsuperscript{54} See also evaluation question 9 on the integration of maternal health into policy frameworks.
that UNFPA enjoyed less support among its partners. This limited its capacity to promote joint maternal health initiatives. The contribution of UNFPA to aid harmonization was therefore also lower in these circumstances (Ethiopia, Kenya, and Zambia).55

Internal financial and administrative procedures have made it challenging for UNFPA to remain a closely integrated member of the aid harmonization forums in some countries (Burkina Faso, Cambodia). In Burkina Faso, UNFPA-specific fiduciary and administrative procedures have regularly led to disbursement delays. At the time of evaluation, the UNFPA country office in Cambodia was considering abandoning the joint financing mechanism in place for the Health Sector Support Programme (HSSP) II that it had recently joined in 2010 because of internal procedural difficulties. This suggests that cumbersome internal fiduciary and administrative rules are one reason country offices continue to rely on parallel funding and why joint funding mechanisms have remained relatively underused.56

Although H4+ had been launched in all of the case study countries at the time of the evaluation, the initiative had not changed how United Nations agencies cooperated at the level of programme countries. Partners continued to work the same way as before the launch of H4+ and used the previously existing mechanisms, such as the UNDAF subgroup for health (Zambia), to convene meetings (all 10 case study countries). The pilot initiative launched by the H4+ partners at global level was more successful. It led to the submission of a number of joint H4+ maternal health programmes for funding (Zambia, Burkina Faso). At the time of the evaluation, these programmes had just been approved and implementation had not yet started.57 By the time of the evaluation, the H4+ had therefore not yet made a significant contribution to donor harmonization in maternal health support (all 10 case study countries). Together with development partners, UNFPA had intended to contribute to a more harmonized and intensified support to maternal health in African programme countries by helping to translate the Maputo Plan of Action into national-level maternal health road maps. The intention had been to establish these road maps as focal points for harmonized donor support of maternal health. However, although many programme countries58 had developed a road map, only a minority had created operational plans and mechanisms for their implementation and to integrate the road maps into their health sector policies.59

Turning the maternal health road map into a widely accepted and supported strategic document to guide government investment and harmonize donor support to maternal health was challenging because the road maps were superimposed on already ongoing policy making processes (Ghana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, and Zambia). In some instances, neither UNFPA nor its partners had detailed how these different policy frameworks, the Maputo

| Box 3: Difficulties in using the Maputo Maternal and Newborn Health Road Maps to advance aid harmonization in maternal health |

In Madagascar, the maternal health road map had already been developed in 2004/05. However, neither the government nor development partners established concrete interventions or programmes to put the road map into action. Instead, the objectives of the road map were picked up in the H4+ business plan that was developed five years later and also in the United Nations strategic vision – again, without specifying the operational implications of the road map for either UNFPA or its partners.

Similarly, the Maternal and Newborn Health Road Map in Zambia was referred to in the government “National Health Strategic Plan” (2006 – 2010), but again, without stating any of the operational implications that would arise from this additional strategy. In addition, UNFPA did not actively promote the road map as a central document for donors to focus around, with the result that it was virtually unknown among development partners. It therefore had no effect on the extent of aid harmonization in the donor community.

55 See judgment criterion 21, Volume 2.
56 See Volume 2 for information from country case studies and interviews with H4+ partners.
57 Based on a review of 35 countries; See de Bernis, L., Wolman, Y. (2009), Maternal and Newborn Health National Plans (Road Map) Assessments - African MNH Road Maps Assessment Report; New York: UNFPA Technical Division.
58 Only 16 out of 35 countries assessed in a UNFPA study on the progress of implementing the road map had a plan for scaling-up or an operational plan at the district level. Several strategic elements of maternal health planning still had to be developed and incorporated in the existing maternal health Road Maps of a number of countries, in particular EmONC planning, Human resources planning and monitoring and evaluation. See de Bernis, L., Wolman, Y. (2009).
Road Map and the existing maternal health policies, should be unified (Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar and Zambia). The ability to adopt and implement the road map was also affected by administrative and resource-related bottlenecks in the national health sectors (Ethiopia, Madagascar and Sudan). These problems either stemmed from a limited absorption capacity in the Ministry of Health (Ethiopia, Madagascar) or from a lack of financial resources in the health sector to fund the extensive maternal health strategy (Sudan). The road maps were therefore integrated only in a very general and formulaic way and did not gain a sufficiently high status among development partners to drive aid harmonization (Ghana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar and Zambia; see also Box 3).

3.3 Evaluation question 3 – Community involvement/demand orientation and civil society organizations partnerships

| EVALUATION QUESTION 3 |
| To what extent has UNFPA support contributed to a stronger involvement of communities that has helped to increase current levels of demand and utilization of services, in particular through its partnerships with civil society? |

- **Judgment criteria**
  3.1. Government commitment to involve communities translated in sexual and reproductive health and maternal health strategies through UNFPA support
  3.2. Civil society organization involvement in sensitization on maternal health issues and facilitating community-based initiatives to address these issues supported by UNFPA

- **Evaluation criteria covered**
  Effectiveness, Sustainability

**Summary**

UNFPA-supported initiatives have helped to increase maternal health awareness in targeted communities. However, not all approaches aiming at sensitizing communities were equally successful in increasing demand for maternal health services. Successful approaches coupled awareness raising and community empowerment efforts with national strategies to address financial barriers to access maternal health services in national health systems.

UNFPA partnerships with non-governmental organizations have historically been an important part of UNFPA community outreach and mobilization campaigns. However, country offices have begun to shift resources and attention away from civil society in favour of channeling their support through government mechanisms.

UNFPA helped to shape the official strategies for community involvement in programme countries as part of the national maternal health strategies. Country offices contributed to operationalizing the community involvement components of the national maternal health strategies (Burkina Faso, Lao PDR, Ethiopia and Cambodia) and advanced specific individual concepts for community mobilization that subsequently were integrated into national maternal health strategies (Zambia) (see Box 4).  

**Box 4: Examples of UNFPA advocacy for community empowerment and participation**

In Burkina Faso, the concept of community involvement had been introduced by the Maputo Maternal and Newborn Health Road Map. The Road Map had been developed in Burkina Faso primarily by WHO. However, UNFPA had supported the Maputo process at regional level.

In Lao PDR, community mobilization was part of the national maternal, newborn and child health package. Strategic Objective 3 of the maternal, newborn and child health package calls for the mobilization of “individuals, families and communities for maternal, newborn and child health at different levels”. UNFPA had taken part in the coordination of community mobilization and awareness and demand creation interventions. It had also helped to develop the respective capacities at national level.

In Zambia, UNFPA introduced the concept of Safe Motherhood Action Groups (SMAGs) and helped to integrate them into the national maternal health policy frameworks. UNFPA also piloted the use of SMAGs in its own three focal provinces in Zambia.

---

60 See judgment criterion 2.2, Volume 2.
61 Judgment criterion 3.1, Volume 2.
UNFPA country offices have utilized a variety of approaches to sensitize communities about maternal health issues. The range of concepts include community conversations (Ethiopia, Kenya), community health workers (CHW) or community midwives (Kenya, Sudan, Ethiopia, Madagascar), and the mobilization of traditional leaders, such as elders, chiefs, or traditional initiators (Kenya, Sudan, Zambia).62 Some other country offices have supported and promoted a range of approaches to facilitate increased involvement of communities in maternal health planning and management, which include community-based maternal health committees, such as Safe Motherhood Action Groups (SMAGs) (Zambia), obstetric emergency committees (Burkina Faso) or Women and Child Health Committees (Cambodia).

Country offices in case study countries have differed in their level of success in using community participation in maternal health interventions to create stronger links between beneficiaries and the national health systems. In Zambia, the rate of skilled attendance at birth in two of the focal provinces of UNFPA has declined, despite UNFPA support for SMAGs (see Box 5). Feedback from focus groups suggested that barriers such as lack of transport or the absence of lodging at health centers prevented women in these provinces from seeking out skilled birth attendance. Although the UNFPA-supported SMAGs had helped to increase awareness on the importance of professional care during pregnancies, the absence of complementary support to overcome access barriers reduced the effect of this support to increase skilled attendance at birth.63

In Burkina Faso, Cambodia and Lao PDR, the UNFPA-supported community mobilization approaches coupled awareness-raising efforts with empowering individuals, families and communities (IFC) to take action to address maternal health issues such as establishing transportation schemes or emergency funds and to establish closer linkages with the respective health systems. In Cambodia, UNFPA has used the decentralized governance structures to support community mobilization. In Burkina Faso and Lao PDR, the country office piloted forms of the WHO IFC approach. These mechanisms have helped Burkina Faso and Cambodia to considerably increase the rates of facility-based deliveries between 2003 and 2007 (see Box 6).

---

Box 5: Example of a UNFPA initiative for community mobilization – the Safe Motherhood Action Groups (SMAGs) in Zambia

In Zambia, UNFPA helped to establish Safe Motherhood Action Groups (SMAGs) during the fifth country programme (2002 – 2006). Since then, SMAGs have been integrated in the national maternal health strategies of Zambia, and UNFPA continues to support them in its three focal provinces. The SMAGs allowed UNFPA and its implementing partners to reach communities, families and individuals with information, education and communication (IEC)/behavioral change communication (BCC) campaigns. Nevertheless, the percentage of women who seek out professional services during delivery has decreased in two out of the three provinces that UNFPA has supported. In Luapula Province, the rate of births attended by skilled personnel fell from 36 per cent in 1997 to 34 per cent in 2007. In North-Western Province, the rate of assisted deliveries decreased from 50 per cent to 41 per cent in the same period (Zambian Demographic and Health Survey, 2007).

Box 6: Examples of integrated approaches for community mobilization and provision of complementary support

In Burkina Faso, UNFPA has helped to create *cellules villageoises de gestion des urgences obstétricales* to organize communities and to raise awareness of individuals and families. In addition, UNFPA advocacy and technical assistance has encouraged the government to put in place EmONC subsidies. Since 2007, these grants cover up to 80 per cent of the costs of childbirth and have considerably decreased financial risks of poor households. Facility-based deliveries have increased by 27.4 per cent overall, and even by 28.99 per cent in rural areas between 2005 and 2010 (country report Burkina Faso).

In Cambodia, the emerging decentralized governance structures have helped to link communities to the national health system. Village Health Support Groups help to organize communities. These groups are also represented in the Health Centre Management Committees, which are also supported by UNFPA. In addition, the Village Health Support Groups can also access resources from the Health Equity Fund of Cambodia. The money is used to provide transport costs to pregnant women who need to access health service. Between 2005 and 2010, facility-based deliveries have increased by 37.8 per cent overall, and even by 37.9 per cent in rural areas (Country Report: Cambodia).65

---

63 Judgment criterion 3.1 and judgment criterion 3.1, Volume 2; see also evaluation question 7 (EmONC).
64 Judgment criterion 3.2, Volume 2 for details.
65 The country notes are available at http://www.unfpa.org/public/home/about/Evaluation/EBIER/TE/pid/10094
UNFPA country offices have played an active role in setting up partnerships between non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and governments to enable civil society organizations to play a more active role in the promotion of maternal health. NGO partners were responsible for both maternal health outreach and advocacy and for service delivery and the management of community-based delivery of contraceptives (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ghana, Madagascar, and Zambia).

In two case study countries (Cambodia, Zambia), UNFPA country offices have started to shift resources away from civil society and have begun to promote community participation in partnerships with national government and local governance bodies. These changes helped to increase the government ownership of the respective programmes. However, they weakened the role of civil society as service providers and as independent advocates for maternal health concerns (see Box 7).66

### Box 7: Examples of resource shifts from civil society to government

In Cambodia, UNFPA has shifted resources away from non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to support the Government Community Investment Plan and the associated local governance bodies (Commune Councils, Village Health Support Group, Village Health Committees, Health Centre Management Committee). Between the second and the third country programme, non-core reproductive health funding to NGOs had been reduced from 62 per cent to 13 per cent. Core funding to NGOs had been cut from 16.2 per cent to 9 per cent.

In Zambia, UNFPA also shifted resources away from civil society. While during the fifth country programme (2002 – 2006) UNFPA had still assigned the role of “executive agency” for its PPP programme67 to a Zambian NGO, the country office transferred the responsibilities for managing these interventions to the government at the beginning of the sixth country programme (2007 – 2010) and the NGO remained only responsible for implementation.

---

66 See judgment criterion 3.2, Volume 2.
67 A programme supporting peer education, service provision and supports the role of parents in maternal/sexual and reproductive health education.

---

### 3.4 Evaluation question 4 - Capacity development - human resources for health

#### EVALUATION QUESTION 4

To what extent has UNFPA contributed to the strengthening of human resources for health planning and human resource availability for maternal health?

- **Judgment criteria**
  4.1. Development strengthening of national human resources for health (HRH) policies, plans and frameworks (with UNFPA support)
  4.2. Strengthened competencies of health workers in HIV/AIDS, family planning, obstetric fistula, skilled birth attendance and EmONC to respond to sexual and reproductive health/maternal health needs

- **Evaluation criteria covered**
  Effectiveness, Sustainability

#### Summary

UNFPA has helped develop reproductive health-specific human resource regulatory frameworks and tools and train technical reproductive health staff in key areas. However, UNFPA country offices encountered challenges linking these efforts appropriately to mechanisms and agencies in the larger human resources for health system. This has weakened the implementation of reproductive health human resource policies that country offices had helped to develop. Furthermore, system-wide challenges in human resources for health, such as low staff retention or inappropriate deployment, have reduced the effect of UNFPA technical trainings on the availability of skilled reproductive health service providers.

The Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) has helped improve UNFPA capacity to contribute to assessments of human resources for health policies for midwifery, EmONC and family planning, curriculum reviews and the strengthening of midwifery training facilities. These are important components of the larger human resources for health systems in programme countries that are specific to reproductive health. However, as a thematic fund with limited scope, the MHTF was not able to help country offices to address the larger challenges, particularly the inappropriate deployment or low retention of staff (particularly midwives), which undermine the beneficial effects of UNFPA skill-building activities.
Logistical and financial support of technical training of nurses, midwives and doctors in HIV/AIDS, family planning, obstetric fistula, skilled birth attendants and EmONC has been one of the major components of UNFPA maternal health-related support (all 10 case study countries) and has been provided by UNFPA country offices around the world. However, these trainings have not been sufficiently aligned to the human resources for health of UNFPA programme countries, particularly in the period 2000-2005. Sustained results from these earlier trainings have therefore been rare.

During the latter half of the period covered by this evaluation (i.e., approximately the period between 2005 and 2010), UNFPA country offices shifted more of their resources from in-service trainings to the support of pre-service trainings (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Lao PDR, Zambia). For this purpose, country offices developed partnerships with the government agencies responsible for regulating and overseeing training of health cadres and used these partnerships to channel their maternal health contributions. These included the development and review of training curricula for nurses and midwives and assistance in the development of regulatory frameworks for the delivery of reproductive health services (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lao PDR, Sudan and Zambia). The UNFPA partnerships with national training institutions helped to closely align UNFPA assistance with the existing training systems (nursing schools, midwifery schools, etc.) in programme countries (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Lao PDR and Zambia). This increased the effectiveness and the sustainability of UNFPA support in this area although quality concerns remain in most case study countries. The MHTF-financed staff members at country level, i.e. (international) country midwife advisors (CMA and ICMA) and further advisors in other disciplines, were able to raise UNFPA profile in these forums (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Madagascar and Zambia).

However, despite these successes, UNFPA and its partners faced difficulties to make trained reproductive health staff available in the most remote and vulnerable regions of their programme countries. Inappropriate staff deployment (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, DRC, Ethiopia, Lao PDR, Sudan and Zambia) and high turnover and mobility of staff (Burkina Faso, Sudan and Zambia) prevented reproductive health services from becoming available in many programme countries. These types of challenges had not been caused by deficits of the reproductive health system alone. Instead, they were linked to systemic weaknesses of the larger system for human resources for health in these countries (see above): inadequate planning capacities in national human resource departments; difficulties with coordination, communication and cooperation between national human resource departments and their counterparts in local administrations; or the lack of reliable data to track the availability of health workers across the country.

A number of the UNFPA country offices visited for this evaluation had found it difficult to approach these interrelated challenges with their sexual and reproductive health programmes (Burkina Faso, DRC, Ethiopia and Zambia). They struggled to position themselves to accommodate both (i) the need to remove these systemic bottlenecks to improve the availability of skilled reproductive health staff in health facilities across their programme countries and (ii) the necessity to keep UNFPA involvement in human resources for health reforms at a manageable level for the often over-burdened reproductive health teams. As a result, UNFPA was unable to help to address these systemic challenges in those countries. It also meant that inadequate deployment and retention continued to limit the effects of UNFPA training assistance (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and Zambia) (see Box 8).

Among the case study countries, UNFPA offices in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Madagascar had attempted to address this challenge by investing time and effort to build strong working relations with the human resources for health departments of Ministries of Health in their countries. The UNFPA country offices were able to use these partnerships to place their support of reproductive

---

68 Based on review of approximately 100 annual work plans from 22 UNFPA programme countries; for list of countries and additional information on analysis, see judgment criterion 4.2, Volume 2.
69 See judgment criterion 4.2, Volume 2.
70 See judgment criterion 4.2, Volume 2 and separate report of MHTF mid-term evaluation.
71 See judgment criteria 4.1 and 4.2, Volume 2.
72 See judgment criterion 4.2, Volume 2.
73 See judgment criteria 4.1 and 4.2, Volume 2.
74 See judgment criterion 4.2, Volume 2.
health-specific skill-building interventions more firmly in the institutional context of the wider human resources for health policies. They facilitated the official endorsement of reproductive health human resource plans, involved the departments in implementing these plans (Cambodia, Lao PDR and Madagascar) or called for salary increases for reproductive health staff (Cambodia) (see Box 9).

In contrast, none of the country offices in Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya or Zambia had well-established relations with the human resources departments in the national Ministries of Health. This made it more difficult for UNFPA to link human resources for health advocacy for reproductive health to the overall human resources for health framework. Bottlenecks such as the lack of overall human resources for health plan to improve retention of nurses and midwives (Burkina Faso, Zambia) or insufficient budget allocations for reproductive health staff (Ghana) were not addressed.76

3.5 Evaluation question 5 - Maternal health in humanitarian contexts (relief, emergency/crisis, post-emergency/-crisis) health

To what extent has UNFPA anticipated and responded to reproductive health threats in the context of humanitarian emergencies?

Judgment criteria

5.1. Inclusion of sexual and reproductive health in emergency preparedness, response and recovery plans

5.2. Accessibility of quality EmONC, family planning and reproductive health/ HIV services in emergency and conflict situations

5.3. Accessibility to medical products in emergency and conflict situations

Evaluation criteria covered

Relevance, Effectiveness

Summary

UNFPA has anticipated and responded to reproductive health threats in humanitarian emergencies by providing guidance on reproductive health programming in emergencies at global level. Country offices have used this guidance to strengthen emergency preparedness (continued)

Box 8: Insufficient integration of reproductive health trainings in human resources for health reforms

In Burkina Faso, where UNFPA had not established close working relations with the Human Resource Department of the Ministry of Health, mobility of trained reproductive health personnel was a problem throughout the period of the evaluation. Staff members are often transferred from their original posts to another area after just a few months. Effects from UNFPA trainings in Ethiopia are also limited by high staff turnover and the poor capacity of the health system to retain employees. In Zambia, UNFPA was involved in human resources issues at a technical level (namely in relation to curriculum review for midwifery trainings), but had not conducted complementary advocacy on human resources for health at policy level, despite the fact that UNFPA was formally a member of the SWAp-related technical working groups and policy-level coordination forums.

Box 9: UNFPA partnerships and their significance for promoting reforms of the human resources for health system

In Cambodia, UNFPA has been financing the full-time position of human resources for health adviser in the Human Resource Development Department of the Ministry of Health since 2002. This expert supported the country office as a focal point in the government and has helped to deepen the relationship between both organizations over time. UNFPA and its partners have been able to use the proximity to the Human Resource Department to successfully push for a number of salary increases for reproductive health staff since 2006, including a 20 per cent increase of base pay to midwives to limit dual practice75 by health workers. The partnership with the Human Resource Department was also important to maintain the recruitment and transfer policy, which limits recruitment and transfers to Phnom Penh and is the basis for providing additional funds for health staff payroll in the Cambodian provinces.

75 The term “dual practice” applies when clinicians combine salaried, and often public-sector clinical work with a fee-for-service private clientele.

76 See judgment criteria 4.1, Volume 2.
UNFPA has advocated for the institutionalization of reproductive and sexual health in emergency preparedness, humanitarian response and post-conflict recovery in its global reproductive health strategies. The Reproductive Rights and Sexual and Reproductive Health Framework 2008–201177 called for the sexual and reproductive health package to include the same services in emergencies and humanitarian crises as in other situations. The Framework also finds that the most effective and cost-efficient way to ensure that sexual and reproductive health issues are part of a humanitarian response is to incorporate them into emergency preparedness plans and to develop national capacities for preparedness. Operationally, UNFPA country offices have faced challenges in responding to the added responsibility of working on humanitarian issues in addition to providing development assistance. More importantly, country offices have also struggled to adequately integrate and link assistance in humanitarian situations to UNFPA support in more stable circumstances.

UNFPA produced a number of tools to advance the inclusion of sexual and reproductive health into emergency preparedness and response. These include:

- The Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health Toolkit for Humanitarian Settings (2009)
- The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) guidelines on gender-based violence (2005)
- The Inter-Agency Standing Committee gender handbook in humanitarian action (2006)
- A distance-learning module on Minimum Initial Service Packages (MISP) for reproductive health in crisis situations (2007)81

UNFPA country offices in case study countries played a leading role in integrating sexual and reproductive health in emergency preparation. Country offices were involved in the preparation or amendment of emergency response plans with sexual and reproductive health components (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Lao PDR, Madagascar, and Sudan).82 They have also been members of the respective disaster management and coordination committees of the United Nations system and the international humanitarian community overall, such as the United Nations Disaster Management Teams (UNDMT) (Cambodia, Ethiopia), and the various clusters, sub-clusters and other committees to coordinate humanitarian responses in emergencies (DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Sudan).83

In order to help increase the capacity of governments and their partners to ensure the accessibility of emergency obstetric and newborn care (EmONC), family planning and other reproductive health-related services in emergencies, UNFPA country offices have financially and technically supported national emergency management agencies or other relevant national stakeholders to prepare for humanitarian disasters (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Sudan; see Box 10).84

UNFPA offices in Ethiopia, Ghana and Kenya had intensified their efforts to make emergency preparedness a permanent component of their country programmes since

---

77 UNFPA (2008); Making Reproductive Rights and Sexual and Reproductive Health a Reality for All - Reproductive Rights and Sexual and Reproductive Health Framework; New York City: UNFPA.
78 See judgment criterion 5.1, Volume 2.
80 See judgment criterion 5.1, Volume 2.
81 See judgment criterion 5.1, Volume 2.
82 Judgment criterion 5.1, Volume 2.
83 Judgment criterion 5.1, Volume 2.
84 Judgment criterion 5.2, Volume 2.
In Kenya, this increase in emergency-related support was a reaction to the humanitarian impact of the post-election violence in 2008 (see Box 11).

Among the case study countries, country offices in DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya and Sudan have integrated humanitarian issues into their core programming. Case study countries with lower prevalence of recurring or persistent emergencies had instead chosen to adopt internal contingency plans for disasters (Lao PDR, Burkina Faso). This was viewed as a more cost-effective approach to respond to the UNFPA mandate for emergency preparedness.85

Country offices have provided a range of medical products and reproductive health commodities in emergencies (Burkina Faso, DRC, Ghana, Kenya, Lao PDR, Sudan), both as part of international humanitarian response mechanisms and their regular maternal health programming, including emergency preparedness support. Supplies include delivery and hygiene kits, contraceptives and other reproductive health commodities, including those required for the delivery of the MISP. UNFPA has also supported the availability of MISP by training service providers and emergency coordination agencies (see Box 12).86

In Ethiopia and Kenya, the involvement in emergency preparedness has increased demands on country office staff.87 The country office in Ethiopia has joined more than 10 additional coordination forums since it increased its engagement in emergency preparation.88 In Sudan,
humanitarian emergencies have existed alongside more stable situations throughout much of the last decade, not just in Darfur, but also in the Eastern States of the country. The experiences of the Sudan country office have shown that UNFPA global standard procedures for maternal health support in development frameworks are not appropriate for this kind of context. Logistical and financial infrastructure and other prerequisites for project management and financing are often not in place, and the social, political and security situation is often in flux. UNFPA financial accountability requirements foresee quarterly advances and limit the possibility of rolling-over funds from one quarter to the next. However, where financial transfers from UNFPA to implementing partners can take up to two quarters, it is difficult for the country office to comply with UNFPA finance requirements (Sudan).

3.6 Evaluation question 6 - Sexual and reproductive health services - family planning

EVALUATION QUESTION 6
To what extent has the UNFPA contributed to the scaling up and increased utilization of and demand for family planning?

▶ Judgment criteria

6.1. Increased capacity within health system for provision of quality family planning services in UNFPA programme countries
6.2. Increased demand for and utilization of family planning services in UNFPA programme countries, particularly among vulnerable groups
6.3. Improved access to contraceptives (commodity security)

▶ Evaluation criteria covered
Effectiveness, Sustainability

UNFPA has helped to anchor family planning more firmly in policy frameworks of programme countries and to develop national capacities to manage commodity procurement and distribution. In particular, country offices that were able to combine long-term policy support on family planning, communication campaigns and the procurement of contraceptives (three of UNFPA well-established types of family planning support) with focused initiatives to strengthen key stakeholders of reproductive health commodity security systems have helped to increase access to family planning commodities. UNFPA use of community-based distribution helped to open alternative channels for the delivery of commodities to beneficiaries in remote areas where there is limited access to public health systems.

Family planning has been one of three pillars of UNFPA support for reducing maternal mortality and morbidity. The UNFPA approach was to help develop the capacity of health systems in programme countries to provide quality family planning services. Support in case study countries was designed to include trainings for managers and service providers in family planning, as well assistance in the establishment of appropriate regulatory frameworks and quality assurance systems. UNFPA also had pledged to help develop the capacity of national reproductive health commodity security systems (RHCS) to ensure access to family planning commodities in health centers, particularly in remote areas. Research on socio-economic barriers to family planning utilization and support of communication and community mobilization campaigns were meant to help increase demand for family planning services and the use of contraceptives among beneficiaries. UNFPA also aimed to support community-based distribution of commodities for this purpose.

UNFPA has provided technical and financial support to help develop the family planning policy frameworks of programme countries. Country offices in case study countries have helped to develop a broad range of national policies, service protocols and other frameworks for family planning.

---

89 The UNFPA engagement in the humanitarian effort in Darfur is not covered by this evaluation.
86 Judgment criterion 5.2, Volume 2.
87 Judgment criterion 5.2, Volume 2.
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90 Judgment criterion 6.2.
91 Based on review of 120 annual work plans from 22 programme countries and the findings from ten country case studies.
and contraceptive security (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Zambia). In some of these countries, UNFPA was also able to ensure that family planning was included in national health plans and national development plans (Burkina Faso, Madagascar).

UNFPA has helped to train health staff (nurses, midwives and doctors) to improve the delivery of family planning services in health facilities (all 10 case study countries). However, the training has been not been planned strategically enough to improve the quality of family planning services overall.

UNFPA has contributed to the development of capacities in its programme countries for the management of health commodities, in particular in the forecasting, financing, procurement and also the distribution of contraceptives and related logistics. Here, the Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security (GPRHCS) also has intensified UNFPA efforts (especially in its “Stream one countries”). UNFPA helped to strengthen the national commodities agencies as important nodal points of the national reproductive health commodity security systems (Ethiopia, Lao PDR and Madagascar). This allowed the country offices to align their support to existing national health commodity management systems. UNFPA was also better able to harmonize its support of reproductive health commodities with the assistance of other donors that worked in this area (Ethiopia, Lao PDR and Madagascar) (see Box 13). In other case study countries, the continued existence of several commodity management systems made harmonized support of commodity management difficult (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, DRC and Sudan).

UNFPA has also successfully used joint government-development partner steering committees to help harmonize donor support to reproductive health commodity security (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ghana and Zambia). UNFPA country offices have initiated the creation of reproductive health commodity security committees in some of the case study countries (Burkina Faso, Cambodia and Zambia). However, the success of these initiatives varied. In Burkina Faso and Cambodia, the creation of these committees was part of a long-term strategy to improve commodity security. The country offices used their staff resources to support the committees with technical assistance and to mobilize support among the governments and development partners. By the time of the evaluation, the committees in both countries were well-established. In Zambia, staffing shortages made it difficult for UNFPA to maintain its presence.

---

**Box 13: Supporting national commodities agencies to improve integrated commodities management**

In Ethiopia, the Government created the Pharmaceutical Fund Supply Agency (PFSA) in 2009 in response to a UNFPA-supported review of commodity procurement and distribution. The PFSA was charged with reforming forecasting, establishing a quality-controlled procurement system, improving storage and distribution, reducing waste and improving the logistics management information system. UNFPA has since supported PFSA with technical assistance and equipment. This helped to improve the management of reproductive health commodities, and also benefited the commodity management system overall. For example, UNFPA funds were used to provide computers for health commodity warehouses and to support the national logistics management information system.

In Lao PDR, family planning logistics used to be managed through the National Maternal and Child Health Centre. When the Centre faced difficulties to ensure the regular supply of contraceptives, UNFPA helped forge a partnership with the national Medical Product Supply Centre. This improved the supply situation and also helped harmonize UNFPA support of reproductive health commodities with the support of other development partners of one single commodities management system. The Government, development partners and UNFPA agreed that this new system held promise for a more unified approach.
in coordination bodies. This reduced its ability to sustain sufficient support for the commodity security committee from among the Government and development partners to ensure its continued operation (see Box 14).101

**Box 14: Examples of joint government-development partner steering committees to harmonize donor support to reproductive health commodity security**

In Burkina Faso, the country office helped create a steering committee to guide the implementation of the country Plans Stratégiques de Sécurisation des Produits en Santé de la Reproduction of 2006, which had also been drafted with UNFPA support.

In Cambodia, UNFPA created a “Contraceptive Security Working Group” in 2001, with support and involvement of multilateral, bilateral and private stakeholders, which continues to operate.

In Zambia, UNFPA also attempted to launch a “Reproductive Health Commodity Security Committee”. The country office provided technical input to communicate the concept of the Committee. However, staffing constraints prevented UNFPA from following-up with targeted and persistent advocacy among the Government and development partners. The Committee ceased to function after four meetings.

To ensure the availability of commodities in remote areas, UNFPA country offices have embraced the support of community-based distribution of contraceptives, particularly since 2005 (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lao PDR) (see Box 15). The earlier programmes have periodically achieved significant increases in the prevalence of contraceptives and are seen as candidates for scale-up in other regions (Lao PDR, Cambodia). In Lao PDR, UNFPA has supported community-based distribution in very remote and underprivileged areas of the country. The use of contraceptives has increased from 17.5 per cent at the beginning of the intervention to 43.1 per cent in 2010.102 In Cambodia, contraceptive prevalence rate in rural areas (any modern method) has increased from 26.5 per cent to 35.8 per cent between 2005 and 2010.103

**Box 15: Community-based distribution of contraceptives**

In Cambodia, UNFPA introduced the concept of community-based distribution of contraceptives, and initiated a corresponding programme that started implementation in 2004, targeting areas that were far from health centers (approximately 10 kilometers or more). After initially providing only basic training to the community-based distribution in 2004 and 2005, UNFPA developed a training manual for community-based distribution, in conjunction with the National Health Promotion Centre. The training consists of a five-day accredited package that all implementers must follow. Non-governmental organizations now use the community-based distribution manual, and the National Maternal Newborn Child Health Centre is responsible for all community-based distribution programming. UNFPA and USAID updated the community-based distribution guidelines in 2008.

Financial, logistical and technical support to IEC/BCC interventions on family planning has been a standard component of UNFPA country programmes (in all 10 country case studies).104 Country offices in Burkina Faso, Cambodia Ethiopia and Lao PDR utilized research to inform the design of individual communication campaigns and to decide on the kinds of messages to be communicated. IEC/BCC campaigns were also rarely monitored or evaluated (see Box 16). Among the countries visited, only the CO in Cambodia had monitored the results of its communication campaigns, using KAP (knowledge, attitudes, and practices) baseline and end-line surveys.105

The financial sustainability of commodity security systems and commodity procurement is uncertain. In case study countries, financing for reproductive health commodity security has become almost exclusively dependent on external support from development partners (Cambodia, DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Sudan, and Zambia). In a number of case study countries, UNFPA has been one of relatively few providers of contraceptives (Cambodia, Ghana, Lao PDR, DRC, Madagascar, and Sudan).106 In Madagascar and Sudan, contraceptives for family planning have been
nearly exclusively supplied by UNFPA. The GPRHCS has provided the majority of funds for the provision of family planning commodities since 2007, and between 2007 and 2010, the GPRHCS contributed over US$101.9 million for commodities in UNFPA programme countries. The GPRHCS has also intensified UNFPA involvement in strengthening national systems for commodity management, particularly in its Stream One countries (included in this evaluation are Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Lao PDR and Madagascar). In crisis or post-crisis countries (Sudan, DRC and Madagascar), this situation is acceptable and even inevitable. However, even in more stable situations (Cambodia, Ghana, Lao PDR), UNFPA and its partners have neither managed to convince governments to take on a greater share of the financial responsibility for reproductive health commodities, nor implemented a phase-in strategy to obtain greater financial contributions from government in the future (see Box 17). The only case study countries that had assumed more financial responsibility for reproductive health commodities were Burkina Faso and Kenya.

3.7 Evaluation question 7 - Sexual and reproductive health services – EmONC

EVALUATION QUESTION 7
To what extent has UNFPA contributed to the scaling up and utilization of skilled attendance during pregnancy and childbirth and EmONC services in programme countries?

- Judgment criteria
  7.1. Increased access to EmONC services
  7.2. Increased utilization of EmONC services

- Evaluation criteria covered
  Effectiveness, Sustainability

Summary

UNFPA has been able to help its programme countries implement important prerequisites for scaling-up skilled attendance during pregnancy and access to emergency obstetric and newborn care (EmONC) services. Although UNFPA country offices had already supported the scale-up of EmONC in the years prior to the launch of the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF), the MHTF did help to accelerate the development of national EmONC plans. The MHTF provided useful templates, tools and know-how that country offices used to contribute to the implementation of EmONC assessments and to support

Box 16: Using research to develop messages for IEC/BCC campaigns

In Burkina Faso, the country office had supported the Directorate of Public Hygiene and Health Education (DHPFES) to develop a strategic communications plan for reproductive health (2007 – 2010), including family planning. Studies provided information that suggested targeting communications and other strategies toward a greater involvement of men and opinion leaders.

Box 17: Reliance on external funding for reproductive health commodities

In Ghana, now considered a middle-income country, UNFPA, DFID and USAID together provide approximately US$4 million for contraceptive security. This leaves a national annual funding gap of approximately US$8.5 million. Despite past efforts of UNFPA and other development partners, the Government has so far refused to take on greater financial responsibility for family planning commodities. A past government pledge to provide almost US$1 million per annum towards the funding gap has not been fulfilled. After the maiden launch of family planning week in September 2011, the Minister pledged approximately US$3 million to support contraceptive procurement. “UNFPA and partners are following up on this pledge to ensure that it is implemented.” (Interview with UNFPA.)


UNFPA aimed to increase access to emergency obstetric and newborn care (EmONC) services by assisting in the development of health system capacity in programme countries to deliver such services. Evidence from needs assessments and other surveys were meant to help in the development of customized national and sub-national EmONC strategies. The UNFPA strategy had also included support in the development of appropriate referral systems. In addition, UNFPA worked to increase demand for EmONC services among beneficiaries. Interventions aimed at sensitizing communities on the importance of emergency obstetric care and empowering them to demand and access affordable quality EmONC services.

UNFPA efforts to anchor EmONC on the sexual and reproductive health agenda pre-dated the launch of the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lao PDR, Madagascar, and Sudan). Country offices have used information from situational analyses, needs assessments and EmONC surveys to increase commitment of partner governments to scale-up EmONC over time (Cambodia, Ghana and Sudan) (see Box 18).

From 2008 onwards, the human resources and the financial means provided by the MHTF helped to speed up the planning of national EmONC needs assessments (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Lao PDR and Madagascar). UNFPA country offices used data from these surveys on the existing EmONC service gaps to advocate for the development of national EmONC scale-up plans (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ghana, Lao PDR and Madagascar). The tools made available through the UNFPA partnership with the Averting Maternal Death and Disability (AMDD) allowed countries to apply clear and well-established procedures to implement their EmONC assessments. This helped to effectively contribute to the implementation of EmONC assessments and to support the evidence-based development of EmONC plans. As a result, UNFPA was able to help anchor emergency obstetric and newborn care more firmly in national policy frameworks, and thereby helped to put in place one important prerequisite for the government-led improvement of access to EmONC services at national level.

Administrative gaps in health ministries, inadequate health management information systems, inadequate referral systems (see Box 19) and problems with staff retention have negatively affected the availability of and access to EmONC services (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Sudan and Zambia). Unless these bottlenecks are addressed, they will also hinder the implementation of UNFPA-supported EmONC scale-
up plans. However, UNFPA offices in several countries (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, DRC, Kenya, Sudan, and Zambia) have found it challenging to adequately define their roles and responsibilities for addressing these types of health system-wide, capacity-related, bottlenecks. In some country offices, UNFPA staff were not sure if these types of larger, health system-wide issues were covered by the UNFPA mandate (Ethiopia, Kenya and Zambia). As a result, the country offices had not established sufficiently strong partnerships with organizations outside of the immediate sphere of reproductive health to approach these larger, health system-wide issues (Ethiopia, Kenya and Zambia). In Sudan, the country office had recognized the negative implications of these kinds of bottlenecks, but was challenged to address them in the absence of viable candidates for corresponding partnerships.

Country offices in Zambia and Ethiopia have supported the scaling-up of EmONC by financing EmONC scale-up activities in specific geographic areas (Zambia, Ethiopia). UNFPA offices in Burkina Faso, Cambodia and Lao PDR have taken a further step by identifying economic, cultural and social barriers that have prevented women from accessing EmONC services (e.g., costs of services, distance, and lack of transportation other than referral). The country offices analyzed the challenges faced by particular socio-economic groups in accessing EmONC services and advocated to address economic barriers at the policy level. The three offices used findings to inform the policy dialogue on EmONC with the national ministries of health, parliamentary associations and other stakeholders. In Burkina Faso, these efforts helped to convince the Government to put in place the EmONC subsidy (2009) that subsidizes 80 per cent of the costs of EmONC services. The subsidy has considerably reduced the financial burden of poor EmONC patients in Burkina Faso (see Box 20).

**Box 19: Examples of the limited UNFPA support to national referral systems**

In all case study countries, UNFPA had provided ambulances to hospitals, health centers or local authorities. In some countries, this was all the support provided by UNFPA for the improvement of referral systems (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia or Zambia). However, in all cases, the ambulances only served as partial and temporary fixes to the inadequate referral systems. Basic prerequisites for the sustained operation of the ambulances (maintenance, operating budgets) were not put in place. Moreover, the ambulances alone were not suited to address the more systemic and far-reaching shortcomings of the referral systems in these countries, such as lack of referral guidelines, or a coherent and comprehensive strategies for referrals.

**Box 20: UNFPA contribution to the development of the EmONC subsidy**

Since 2009, the EmONC subsidy in Burkina Faso ensures that patients and their families pay only 20 per cent of EmONC costs. The law evolved out of a series of policy initiatives that had been supported by UNFPA. It was recognized that cost presented a barrier to many mothers to access EmONC services, so in 2004/5 the UNFPA country office provided technical assistance to the Direction de la Famille (DSF) in the Ministry of Health and advocated with parliamentarians. This helped convince the government to pass laws to finance the implementation of an EmONC subsidy for patients. At the same time, requests to different stakeholders resulted in the prioritization of maternal health by the government and a budget commitment with the creation of several related budget lines, including one to fund the EmONC subsidy.
communities (IFC) and to strengthen their links with the national health systems. In Cambodia, UNFPA took advantage of the well-developed local governance system to support maternal health with the same integrating effect. Both Burkina Faso and Cambodia have been able to increase the share of facility-based deliveries concomitant to the introduction of these policies. In Burkina Faso, facility-based deliveries have increased by 27.4 per cent overall, between 2003 and 2010. Facility-based deliveries in Cambodia have even increased by 37.8 per cent overall, between 2005 and 2010. The increase has been the largest in rural areas in both countries, where the above-mentioned cultural, social and economic barriers typically are the most severe.

3.8 Evaluation question 8 – Results/evidence orientation of UNFPA maternal health support

**EVALUATION QUESTION 8**

To what extent has UNFPA use of internal and external evidence in strategy development, programming and implementation contributed to the improvement of maternal health in its programme countries?

- **Judgment criteria**
  8.1. Integration of relevant evidence and UNFPA results data during global strategy development and implementation (Multi-Year Funding Framework 1 and 2, Strategic Plan; Sexual and Reproductive Health Framework)
  8.2. Consideration and integration of relevant maternal health/sexual and reproductive health evidence and results data during development of country strategies
  8.3. Results and evidence based management of individual interventions throughout project life

- **Evaluation criteria covered**
  Efficiency, Coherence

Evidence from surveys and studies, such as the demographic and health surveys (DHS), censuses, skilled birth attendance or EmONC assessments have played a prominent role in the development of country programmes and in the design of individual interventions (all 10 country case studies). Data from these sources were used to target UNFPA support geographically, namely to select specific states or provinces as geographic focal areas for UNFPA financed maternal health support. Only a few of the country offices (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Lao PDR) used data from specific qualitative studies to identify systemic service barriers of particular socio-economic groups (e.g., rural poor in remote communities, etc) and to advocate for changes in national health policies that would help to remove these barriers.

UNFPA has neither adequately monitored nor evaluated the performance of its past maternal health programmes. Weaknesses in their monitoring systems have prevented country offices from collecting information on the results of their programmes, namely on the effects of UNFPA interventions on the immediate target groups. This has also been the case for interventions that UNFPA has initiated to pilot new approaches in

---

121 See evaluation question 3 on community participation.
122 Data compiled from http://www.measuredhs.com/Data/ on 4/14/2012
123 See judgment criterion 7.2, Volume 2.
124 See judgment criterion 8.2, 8.3, Volume 2; See also evaluation question 1 on the difference between geographic targeting and socio-economic targeting.
125 Often also called “expected accomplishments” or “outcomes” in the logical framework language.
maternal health. Consequently, UNFPA has not been able to gauge which contributions maternal health programmes have made to higher level maternal health outcomes and to systematically use lessons from pilot interventions for future maternal health support (all 10 country case studies).127

The weaknesses of the UNFPA monitoring system are linked to deficits in UNFPA processes and templates for strategic planning, such as the annual work plans (AWP) and the country programme action plans (CPAP) monitoring framework. The templates used to develop the CPAP and AWP have not allowed elaboration of consistent and complete theories of change for individual interventions that explain how the interventions should contribute to specific country programme outputs and the higher-level country programme outcomes (all 10 country case studies).128 This has made it difficult to define appropriate indicators to measure achievements along the expected chain of intervention effects. As a result, country offices defined indicators or selected measures from the country programme action plan monitoring framework without considering their logical relationship to the outputs of the annual work plan in question129 (see Box 21) (all 10 case study countries).130

The weaknesses of the UNFPA monitoring system were exacerbated by the insufficient staff resources of country offices to appropriately analyze and use the data that were available (Burkina Faso, Ghana, Lao PDR, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Zambia). 131 UNFPA internal guidelines had assigned the responsibility for monitoring primarily to UNFPA implementing partners. The Programme Component Manager, typically a government agency, was responsible for consolidation of these reports into annual standard progress reports (SPR), conducting periodic field monitoring visits and forwarding the results to the country offices. 132 The UNFPA country office has only been responsible for validating the reported achievements through its own field monitoring visits and forwarding the annual standard progress reports to UNFPA headquarters.133

This system has proven to be problematic at least in three ways (all 10 country case studies):

- UNFPA implementing partners have not had the capacity to develop appropriate monitoring mechanisms for their interventions, to develop relevant indicators and to design appropriate procedures to collect information on the indicators.

---

Box 21: Problems in the selection of results indicators

A maternal health intervention in Sudan (“Increased awareness of reproductive health information and improved knowledge or preventing HIV/AIDS, especially among out-of-school youths”; 2010) was meant to contribute to Output 3 of the Sudan country programme. Neither the country programme action plan nor the annual work plan described which theory of change would allow the intervention to alter the reproductive health awareness of the target group. This omission is reflected in the design of the monitoring system. The selected indicators were aimed at information on activities or their tangible products (“number of sessions conducted”, “established radio/TV broadcasting network with monthly public session”) or captured higher-level behavioral changes without a direct logical link to the intervention (“percentage of pregnant women with regular antenatal care visits”; or “percentage of pregnant women immunized”). None of the indicators measured changes in the behaviour of the direct beneficiaries of the intervention (e.g. condom use among out-of-school youths).

---

127 Judgment criteria 8.2, 8.3, Volume 2.
128 Based on review of 120 annual work plans from UNFPA programme countries and from findings of the ten country case studies.
129 It has to be noted that the UNFPA interpretation of outputs in CPAPs and CPDs is not in line with the commonly accepted definition of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD that defines outputs to be the (direct and tangible) “products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention” (OECD/DAC (2002): Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management, Paris).
130 See judgment criterion 8.2, Volume 2.
131 Based on a review of 14 country programme evaluations and findings from the ten country case studies (judgment criterion 7.3, Volume 2).
132 UNFPA Policies and Procedures: Programme Country Programme Monitoring and Evaluation (UNFPA, 2004). The policies and procedures manual notes that the note on CPAP monitoring and evaluation has to be updated substantially; however, without a new version yet in place, it is presumed that the corresponding guidance is still relevant.
133 See judgment criterion 8.2, 8.3, Volume 2.
• Internally, country offices did not build sufficient staff capacity to compensate for the weaknesses of the implementing partners, namely to redact reports of insufficient quality and to build monitoring capacity in implementing partners over time.

• Lastly, UNFPA country offices have remained without the required staff capacity to appropriately analyze the data from monitoring exercises, to disseminate the results in the country office and to draw corresponding lessons for individual interventions and the country programme overall.134

Although UNFPA country offices commissioned a large number of mid-term evaluations of country programmes, thematic evaluations or intervention level evaluations, the quality of evaluation reports in UNFPA has been low. An evaluation quality assessment carried out by UNFPA135 found that 20 out of the 37 reviewed evaluations (54 per cent) for the years 2007 and 2008 had methodological weaknesses that called into question the validity of their findings, conclusions and recommendations. Nineteen out of the 37 reviewed evaluations (51 per cent) failed to support their findings and results with data. The suitability of these studies for evidence- and results-based management of UNFPA interventions was therefore low. Without progress data on activities and outputs, the opportunities for evidence-based management of UNFPA maternal health interventions have been limited.136

These weaknesses at country level have negatively affected the ability of UNFPA to use lessons from past maternal health support to develop future support strategies at global level. UNFPA did integrate some key lessons on maternal health/ sexual and reproductive health from an independent review of the Second Multi-Year Funding Framework (MYFF) when developing the 2008 – 2013 Strategic Plan. However, the limitations of the UNFPA monitoring system detrimentally affected the quality and validity of these lessons.137

### 3.9 Evaluation question 9 - Integrating maternal health into national policies and development frameworks

**EVALUATION QUESTION 9**

To what extent has UNFPA helped to ensure that maternal health and sexual and reproductive health are appropriately integrated into national development instruments and sector policy frameworks in its programme countries?

- **Judgment criteria**
  9.1. UNFPA support improved comprehensiveness of analysis of causes for poor maternal health and of effectiveness of past maternal health policies/strategies
  9.2. Maternal health and sexual reproductive health integration into policy frameworks and development instruments based on (UNFPA supported) transparent and participatory consultative process
  9.3. Monitoring and evaluation of implementation of sexual and reproductive/maternal health components of national policy framework and development instruments

- **Evaluation criteria covered**
  Effectiveness, Sustainability

**Summary**

The UNFPA record of contributing to a stronger integration of maternal health into national policy frameworks has been mixed. UNFPA country offices were able to generate momentum for maternal health-related policy changes when they combined support for data generation, surveys and research with targeted advocacy campaigns and technical assistance. Strong partnerships between UNFPA offices and governmental and non-governmental stakeholders also contributed to the success of policy campaigns. Country offices without the staff capacity required to build and maintain partnerships and to follow-up maternal health research with targeted policy advocacy were not able to influence the policy agenda in programme countries. UNFPA-supported policy initiatives that originated at regional level, such as Campaign for Accelerated Reduction of Maternal Mortality in Africa (CARMMA) or the Maputo (continued)
Furthering the integration of maternal health in national health and sexual and reproductive health frameworks on the basis of: (i) evidence and research, (ii) targeted advocacy campaigns and (iii) technical assistance has been one of the core elements of UNFPA maternal health strategy. UNFPA country offices have provided support on a range of related issues, such as technical and financial assistance to national demographic and health surveys (DHS) and other macro-level surveys and studies, maternal health-related advocacy with decision makers and IEC/ BCC campaigns (all 10 country case studies). In particular assistance for surveys and research has helped make disaggregated data on maternal health more available to governmental and non-governmental partners.138

Country offices were able to use maternal health data to generate momentum for maternal health-related policy changes when they combined support for surveys and research with targeted advocacy campaigns and technical assistance (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Madagascar). Each of these components played a particular role in the policy campaigns: i) advocacy with government, parliamentarians and civil society made stakeholders aware that policy changes were required to improve maternal health; ii) demographic and other data on maternal health helped identify which issues needed to be addressed on the policy level and formed the evidence-base for new policies and programmes; iii) technical assistance from UNFPA helped programme countries to implement the surveys and studies (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Lao PDR). This process is illustrated by an example from Lao PDR in Box 22.

Well-established and long-term working relationships with governmental and non-governmental stakeholders in programme countries helped UNFPA to advocate for changes in maternal health policies and frameworks. Parliamentary associations, national population committees and other influential stakeholders that had become partners of UNFPA were able to act as “maternal health champions” during policy campaigns. As governments agencies, these partners were able to advocate for budget increases for maternal and reproductive health and could speak on other sensitive topics that UNFPA could not have addressed on its own (see Box 23) (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Madagascar).139

---

**Box 22: Example of a successful approach to achieve maternal health-related policy changes**

The integrated maternal, newborn and child health package (2009) in Lao PDR was the result of a multi-year campaign that involved a number of different development partners. The UNFPA country office in Lao PDR had provided this campaign with data and research, evidence-based advocacy and technical assistance between 2006 and 2009.

UNFPA initially financed the participation of a number of officials from the national Ministry of Health (MoH) in a series of international maternal health conferences and workshops, to bring the issue and the possible policy responses to their attention (advocacy with MoH). Subsequently, UNFPA built on the motivation of the MoH staff members it had financed to organize a national level maternal health workshop in 2007. This resulted in the decision of the MoH to conduct a skilled birth attendance assessment to evaluate the extent of skilled birth attendance deficits in the country (advocacy with MoH; other national stakeholders).

In 2008, the UNFPA programme provided follow-up by financing the skilled birth attendance assessment and technically supported its implementation (data collection; technical assistance). UNFPA complemented these activities by conducting related advocacy and capacity development directed at the media and parliamentarians to build support for a stronger national response to maternal health deficits among lawmakers and society overall (advocacy, technical assistance with media, lawmakers, general public).
However, staffing shortages have made it difficult for country offices to establish and maintain these kinds of partnerships and to remain active in strategic, high-level policy advocacy and donor harmonization forums (Ethiopia, Kenya, and Zambia). This has reduced the ability of UNFPA offices to follow-up maternal health related studies or surveys with complementary advocacy and diminished the visibility of UNFPA in maternal health policy debates (Ethiopia, Kenya, and Zambia).\textsuperscript{140}

The lack of follow-up also limited the significance of the Maputo Road Maps for reproductive health and maternal health policy formulation in UNFPA programme countries. UNFPA and other UN organizations had supported the Maputo Plan of Action at regional level. UNFPA country offices, with other development partners, had assumed responsibility for translating the Plan of Action into national maternal health road maps (Burkina Faso, Ghana, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Sudan and Zambia). However, with the exception of Sudan and Madagascar, these road maps were neither costed, nor used to lobby for increased resources for maternal health support among development partners. Their influence on the policy agenda of UNFPA partner governments in case study countries was therefore small.\textsuperscript{141} In the case of the African Union “Campaign for Accelerated Reduction of Maternal Mortality in Africa” (CARMMA), UNFPA country offices in African case study countries supported the launching of the campaign, but did not follow-up on its continuation (DRC, Ghana, Ethiopia and Zambia). In these cases, CARMMA remained a “one-off” campaign and did not influence subsequent maternal health programming.\textsuperscript{142}

Country offices utilized resources from their population and development sub-programmes to help define appropriate indicators for policies on reproductive health, maternal health and other areas (all 10 country case studies). However, only the country offices in Burkina Faso, Sudan and Kenya had offered more comprehensive support to develop the capacity of national monitoring and evaluation systems.\textsuperscript{143}

\section{Evaluation question 10 - Coherence of sexual reproductive health/maternal health support with gender and population and development support\textsuperscript{144}}

\begin{multicols}{2}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Evaluation question 10}
  \textit{To what extent have UNFPA maternal health programming and implementation adequately used synergies between UNFPA sexual and reproductive health portfolio and its support in other programme areas?}\textsuperscript{145}

  \item \textbf{Judgment criteria}
  10.1. Linkages established between programmes (reproductive health with gender and population and development) in intervention design
  10.2. Integration of monitoring and reporting of UNFPA operations

  \item \textbf{Evaluation criteria covered}
  Efficiency, Coherence
\end{itemize}

\end{multicols}

\textsuperscript{142} Judgment criterion 9.2, Volume 2; see also evaluation question 2 on UNFPA contributions to aid harmonization in the field of maternal health.

\textsuperscript{143} Judgment criterion 9.3, Volume 2.

\textsuperscript{144} Gender (including female genital mutilation/cutting, gender-based violence, HIV-PMTCT (prevention of mother-to-child HIV transmission)), population and development.

\textsuperscript{145} Gender (including female genital mutilation/cutting, gender-based violence, HIV-PMTCT (prevention of mother-to-child HIV transmission)), population and development.
Summary

Seeking and exploiting synergies between programming in gender and reproductive health has not been a firmly established practice in UNFPA. In spite of the availability of data on many gender-related reproductive and maternal health issues from standard macro-level assessments, such as censuses and demographic and health surveys, country offices have typically not pursued opportunities to apply this information in specifically integrated reproductive health interventions. Country offices have generally taken advantage of opportunities to finance integrated interventions (pull factors for integrated programming). However, country offices commonly lacked appropriate planning or management mechanisms to create these kinds of opportunities themselves (push factors for integrated programming).

UNFPA country programmes have helped to increase the availability of data on sexual and reproductive health including gender-related maternal health challenges, such as gender-based violence. All country offices visited during the field phase of the evaluation have helped to include gender-specific data in censuses and demographic and health surveys (DHS) (all 10 country case studies) (see Box 24). However, only the offices in Ethiopia and Madagascar had supported additional studies to analyze the gender-specific constraints women experienced when accessing maternal health services.

Box 24: Examples of UNFPA support to gender-disaggregated data collection

The country offices in Kenya and Ghana spearheaded the inclusion of gender-based violence indicators in the respective country demographic and health surveys (DHS). The UNFPA office in Ethiopia helped to develop maternal health, HIV/AIDS and family planning indicators for the 2005 DHS. The UNFPA country office in Cambodia facilitated gender-specific data collection and compilation through several surveys (Cambodia gender assessments 2004, 2008). In Cambodia, UNDP and several other donors benefited from the availability of a number of UNFPA-supported surveys, including the Cambodian Inter-census Population Surveys (2004) and the Cambodia DHS. UNFPA also supported a central database for storing gender-disaggregated data.

Box 25: Examples of pull factors for integrated programming in UNFPA

UNFPA staff in Sudan were aware of the importance to integrate reproductive health and gender programming in the country. However, at the time of the evaluation, the country office had not yet developed internal mechanisms to facilitate integrated planning on a regular basis. This situation notwithstanding, the country office succeeded in financing a number of interventions that consciously integrated gender and reproductive health. The country office did so in partnership with implementing partners with long-term experiences in integrated programming and the corresponding internal management mechanisms.

In Cambodia, the UNFPA country office took advantage of the well-integrated governance structures at sub-national level to support integrated programming. UNFPA had trained a number of gender focal persons that represented the Ministry of Women Affairs at provincial level. These focal persons were part of the local structures of the Department of Local Administration (the department responsible for the process of decentralization, de-concentration and the commune investment plans). In addition, the gender focal points served as gender advisers to the commune councils. In this capacity, they were also members of the management committees for health centers that UNFPA has been supporting to develop EmONC capacities.

Ethiopia was also the only case study country office to establish internal organizational mechanisms to promote integrated planning and programming between the three sub-programmes. The country office in Ethiopia has been using an internal, country-level Project Appraisal Committee. The Committee allowed heads of the thematic units to review and endorse project proposals prior to their approval by the UNFPA country representative. Country office procedures also encouraged the selection of joint implementation sites for reproductive health and gender sub-programmes. In Madagascar, UNFPA has been holding joint planning sessions for staff from the three sub-programmes. These mechanisms have helped to achieve a closer integration between reproductive health interventions and gender support than in the other case study country offices.

---

146 Judgment criterion 10.1, Volume 2.
147 Judgment criterion 10.1, Volume 2.
149 Based on a review of annual work plans from Madagascar and Ethiopia, see judgment criterion 10.1, Volume 2.
Other country offices also financed integrated reproductive health and gender interventions, albeit on a smaller scale (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, DRC, Ghana, Kenya, Sudan and Zambia). In the absence of well-established internal mechanisms for integrated programming, these country offices depended on opportunities from outside of the country office to promote integrated programming (pull factors) (see Box 25).\(^{150}\)

Without sufficient human resources or technical support for monitoring, country offices were not able to establish systems to monitor their sub-programmes in gender, reproductive health and population and development in an integrated way. The monitoring function remained attached to individual annual work plans in the respective sub-programmes (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, DRC, Ghana, Kenya, Lao PDR, Sudan and Zambia).\(^{151}\)

### 3.11 Evaluation question 11 - Coherence between country, regional, global programmes

**EVALUATION QUESTION 11**

To what extent has UNFPA been able to complement maternal health programming and implementation at country level with related interventions, initiatives and resources from the regional and global level to maximize its contribution to maternal health?

**Judgment criteria**

11.1. Clarity of division of labor and delineation of responsibilities between UNFPA global, regional and country offices

11.2. Alignment of UNFPA organizational capacities at country level and the (intended) division of labor and delineation of responsibilities

11.3. Enhancement/improvement of UNFPA country level programming and interventions through technical and programmatic support from global and regional level

**Evaluation criteria covered**

Efficiency, Coherence

---

\(^{150}\) Judgment criterion 10.1, Volume 2.
\(^{151}\) Judgment criterion 10.2, Volume 2.

**Summary**

Inadequate staffing levels have created major bottlenecks in the capacity of country offices. Staffing gaps have made the adequate implementation of maternal health interventions very challenging and have reduced the profile of UNFPA in programme countries. The Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) has provided resources to hire required additional staff members, in particular in areas like EmONC, midwifery and obstetric fistula.

Technical support from regional offices and headquarters has been skewed towards family planning and reproductive health commodity security. EmONC, midwifery (and human resources for health overall) and the prevention and treatment of obstetric fistula were neglected, although they have been important focus areas of the UNFPA reproductive health strategy.

Numbers of technical and management staff have been too low to allow country offices to respond to their maternal health programming requirements. Country offices reported various types of problems with fulfilling their programming responsibilities due to insufficient staffing levels. These included the inability to attend important meetings of development partners, to prepare technical contributions to multi-lateral meetings and to follow-up on information from monitoring reports (Cambodia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lao PDR, and Zambia). A majority of the 55 country offices that had participated in the online survey considered their staffing levels to be insufficient to respond to all responsibilities linked to the implementation of their sexual and reproductive health sub-programme (see Box 26).

The number of staffing positions funded with core resources has not been adapted to changing programming priorities. At technical level, these shortfalls prevented country offices from being adequately represented in key United Nations and government technical working groups as well as other coordination forums with programme countries. It also prevented country offices from consistently providing sound technical contributions to their partners (Ethiopia, Kenya and Zambia), which contributed to low profiles and visibility of UNFPA in maternal health in some countries (Kenya, Zambia).
Box 26: Findings from online survey – adequacy of staffing level in country offices

Of the 55 country offices that responded in the online survey, 49 per cent disagreed with the statement “The number of staffing positions in maternal health in the last three years has been fully adequate to fulfill all of our responsibilities related to the overall maternal health component of the country programme”, 47.2 per cent agreed with the statement and 3.6 per cent found the statement “not applicable”. Thirty six per cent of country offices questioned in the online survey considered their staffing capacity for technical contributions in maternal health to be insufficient, 38 per cent of country offices saw gaps in their staffing capacity for high-level policy advocacy.

Vacancies of existing positions have been a significant cause for the insufficient staffing capacities of UNFPA country offices. Nineteen out of the 55 UNFPA country offices (36 per cent) responding to the online survey of countries with high maternal mortality ratios reported vacancies in the area of sexual and reproductive health in their staffing roster. Technical reproductive health positions make up the biggest share of these vacancies. On average, positions of national programme officers for reproductive health had been vacant for approximately one and one-half years. Management positions, such as those of deputy representative or country representative had been vacant for nearly 16 months. The longest reported vacancy for a national programme officer position in reproductive health has been four years.

The MHTF has made a noticeable contribution to improve the skill mix in country offices. Approximately 88 per cent of country offices that had received MHTF assistance since 2008 reported that they have seen at least “limited improvements” in the technical skills available in their office. Among the MHTF recipients, 72.5 per cent of country offices thought the MHTF had led to “considerable improvements” in the skill-mix available for maternal health programming. The country case studies confirmed that the availability of resources from the MHTF to hire additional technical expertise was an important asset for UNFPA country offices (Cambodia, Ethiopia, Lao PDR, Madagascar and Zambia) (see Box 27). In a number of countries, the recruitment of MHTF-funded country midwifery advisers or other advisers represented the only increase of staff capacity that country offices had recently experienced (Cambodia, Ethiopia and Zambia). MHTF resources also have been used to compensate for losses in staff positions funded with core funds (Ethiopia; see Box 27).

The responsibilities between the global and regional programme and individual country programmes have not been delineated clearly. According to the global and regional programme guidelines, the global and regional programme is meant to “complement country

Box 27: Effects of MHTF funding on country office staffing

The country office in Cambodia initially used MHTF resources to hire an international midwifery expert. After launching the EmONC assessment in 2009 (also MHTF funded), the office re-dedicated the resources to hire a full-time EmONC adviser to manage and supervise the future EmONC support of UNFPA.

The country office in Lao PDR used MHTF resources to continue hiring a full-time skilled birth attendance coordinator to support its intensified involvement in this subject area.

In Ethiopia, overall staff numbers have been reduced in the last three years from approximately 65 to 55 in 2011. One of the positions that had not been filled again was the International Reproductive Health Adviser. The country office used MHTF resources to hire two midwifery advisers, who now cover the midwifery, nurse anesthetist and obstetric fistula programmes.

References:

Based on findings from the online survey and the country case studies; see judgment criterion 11.2, Volume 2.

Maternal mortality rate (MMR) above 300 deaths in 100,000 live births, according to estimates of the MMR in the year 2000 (WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, World Bank, 2010).

Judgment criterion 10.2, and online survey, Volume 2.

40 country offices of the 55 country offices that had participated in the online survey had received MHTF assistance in either 2008, 2009 or 2010.

See judgment criterion 11.2 in Volume 2 for more detailed information on the different aspects of staff capacity.

Regional offices have focused on supporting country offices in family planning and reproductive health commodity security and have not addressed other important subjects to the same extent, such as the prevention and treatment of obstetric fistula, EmONC, midwifery and human resources for health overall. Between 50 and 60 per cent of country offices in countries with high maternal mortality ratios responded in the online survey that they had not received technical support from regional offices in these areas (see Box 28). The results from the online survey also indicated that integration of gender, population and development with maternal health was rarely addressed in technical support from regional offices. These gaps have limited the ability of the regional programme to adequately support the implementation of sexual and reproductive health sub-programs in programme countries, particularly because EmONC, midwifery and human resources for health are focus areas in the UNFPA reproductive health strategy.

The quality of support from regional offices, as opposed to support coverage, has been adequate overall, with little differences in levels of satisfaction between the different technical areas reported in the survey.

One of the causes for the insufficient coverage of technical support has been low staffing levels at regional and sub-regional level. Regional offices stated that they consequently felt the need to select a small set of priority country offices from the larger pool of UNFPA offices in order to be able to focus their support in a manageable number of cases.

---

**Box 28: Findings from online survey – support of country offices from UNFPA regional offices**

Eighty two per cent of the 55 country offices responding to the online survey had received support in family planning and reproductive health commodity security from their regional office in the recent past. Only slightly more than half of country offices had received technical support from regional offices in EmONC and obstetric fistula, 58 per cent in the case of obstetric fistula and 53 per cent in the case of EmONC. 75 per cent of country offices that had received support in these areas had found the support useful. Forty seven per cent of country offices had received support in midwifery and just 42 per cent had received support in human resources for health overall. Less than 50 per cent had received support on the integration of gender, population and development with maternal health.

Overall, across different thematic areas and types of support, 66 per cent of country offices have been “rather satisfied” (53 per cent) or “very satisfied” (13 per cent) with technical support from regional offices. 31 per cent have been dissatisfied (22 per cent “rather dissatisfied”; 9 per cent “very dissatisfied”).

Findings from the survey show that this approach has left those country offices not on the priority list without the assistance they required.

Regional offices have supported country offices primarily through standardized workshops on topics that had been proposed by the regional office, the provision of guidance documents in issues related to maternal health and corresponding programmes, and through technical assistance over phone, Skype or e-mail. More customized forms of assistance, such as in-country technical assistance (other than workshops) by regional office staff or by external consultants or on-demand workshops have been less common (see Box 29).
UNFPA headquarters has been at least as active in providing technical support as UNFPA regional offices, and in some areas even more active. Country offices have not just benefited from technical guidance documents, but have also sought assistance from headquarters staff by means of direct phone calls, Skype, or e-mail messages. In areas like obstetric fistula, emergency obstetric and newborn care (EmONC), family planning & reproductive health commodity security and midwifery, country offices rated technical support from headquarters as more “useful” than the technical support from regional offices (see Box 30). These are also the areas in which country offices have seen the greatest improvements in technical support since the launch of the MHTF,166 with most of the MHTF-related technical support provided directly from the Technical Division at UNFPA headquarters (see Box 30).167 The high rating (see Box 30) of country office support from headquarters in these four technical areas are therefore linked to the additional staff resources the MHTF had provided for the Technical Division.

In 2008, UNFPA moved the geographical divisions that had technically supported country office operations from UNFPA headquarters to their respective regions. This process is often referred to as the regionalization of technical support. UNFPA strengthened already existing offices in the regions and established additional regional and sub-regional offices. The main aim of this reform was to strengthen the capacity of UNFPA country offices to provide integrated technical, programmatic and management support to programme countries. However, this regionalization so far has failed to improve the technical support to country offices in the majority of countries evaluated (see Box 31).168

---

**Box 29: Findings from online survey – types of support received from regional offices**

Only 37 out of 55 country offices (67 per cent) had received in-country technical assistance (other than workshops) by regional office staff; 31 country offices out of 55 (56 per cent) had received in-country technical assistance by external consultants. Finally, only 36 per cent of country offices (20 out of 55) had received technical assistance in the form of customized workshops on a topic of their choosing.

**Box 30: Findings from online survey – support of country offices from UNFPA headquarters**

Eighty-nine per cent of country offices (49 out of the 55 surveyed) had received assistance from headquarters through e-mails, phone or Skype, in comparison to 82 per cent of country offices (45 out of 55) that had received the same kind of support from regional offices. Roughly 54 per cent thought that support from headquarters on obstetric fistula had been useful or very useful, in contrast to only 44 per cent that thought the same about obstetric fistula support from regional offices. Twenty-seven out of 55 country offices thought that headquarters support on EmONC had been useful, compared to only 24 offices that thought the same for support in this area from regional offices.

**Box 31: Findings from online survey – effect of regionalization on quality of technical support**

Only 13 per cent of country offices that have experienced technical support under both models (from headquarters and regional) think that the regionalization of technical support has led to improved technical support. In the Johannesburg sub-region, 40 per cent of the countries found that the technical support has worsened; overall, 27 per cent of country offices think that the quality of technical support has declined. Twenty-four per cent of country offices think quality of technical support has remained unchanged.

---

**3.12 Evaluation question 12 - Visibility**

**EVALUATION QUESTION 12**

To what extent has UNFPA maternal health support contributed to the visibility of UNFPA in global, regional and national maternal health initiatives and helped the organization to increase financial commitments to maternal health at national level?

---

166 See judgment criterion 11.3, Volume 2.
167 See final report of the MHTF mid-term evaluation.
UNFPA has been a visible advocate for maternal health issues at global and at country level. At the level of programme countries, the reputation of UNFPA was determined by the capacity of country offices to bring technical knowledge to bear in multilateral maternal health initiatives, such as the review of maternal health policies or the development of maternal health programmes. By supporting the development of maternal health policies and programmes, UNFPA also helped to leverage additional funds for maternal health support from governments in programme countries. Country offices that suffered from staffing shortages were less able to actively participate in maternal health coordination forums and technical working groups. In these cases, bigger and better-resourced development partners overshadowed the role of UNFPA in maternal health.

Maternal health-specific advocacy campaigns, such as the Campaign on Accelerated Reduction of Maternal, Newborn and Child Mortality (CARMMA) or the International Day of the Midwife have added to the visibility of UNFPA. However, UNFPA partners criticized the low level of follow-up to the highly publicized CARMMA launches (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar and Zambia).

In two case study countries (Kenya, Zambia), UNFPA was overshadowed by larger and better-funded agencies, even in family planning which is a traditional core area of UNFPA. Staffing shortages had made it difficult for these country offices to actively contribute to donor coordination and policy dialogue forums. This had limited their opportunities to make technical contributions that could help launch maternal health-related policy initiatives. Partners in both countries regretted that UNFPA had not been playing a more pro-active role in maternal health.

Helping to draft and cost comprehensive maternal health strategies has allowed UNFPA country offices to help leverage resources from partner governments to improve maternal health (Burkina Faso, Lao PDR). The development of high-profile maternal health strategies created political and social momentum in programme countries to expand maternal health support. This also motivated national governments to increase maternal health budget allocations (Burkina Faso, Lao PDR and Cambodia).

UNFPA has been a visible and well-recognized partner and leader of maternal health campaigns at global level and in its programme countries. Partners from government, civil society and the development community have overwhelmingly acknowledged the leadership role of UNFPA in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana and Lao PDR. In other countries, UNFPA has been almost the sole provider of maternal health support, and in some instances continued, when other development partners discontinued their support (Madagascar, Sudan).

UNFPA has been able to establish itself as a maternal health leader and a respected partner in case study countries through the pro-active involvement of country office staff in technical working groups and other similar forums (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia and Lao PDR). Country offices have used their membership in these groups to provide data and other technical inputs to help in the drafting of maternal health-related strategies and in the planning and management of maternal health services (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Lao PDR and Madagascar). The MHTF has helped increase UNFPA visibility in midwifery/skilled birth attendance and EmONC (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Madagascar and Zambia).
The maternal health situation in a given country is the outcome of complex interactions between a large number of stakeholders, policies and resources that reach beyond the immediate sphere of maternal and reproductive health.

Stakeholders, such as health ministries, local authorities and civil society organizations influence directly the availability of health services for women in need. Numerous other organizations and individuals, such as community and religious leaders, as well as government ministries in sectors other than health (e.g., transport, social affairs) also affect the possibility for women from different population groups to access maternal health services. Likewise, a wide range of policies and other strategic frameworks in a diversity of public policies and sectors influence both the availability of maternal health services and the possibility for women to access and use sexual and reproductive health services.

In fact, the availability and accessibility of quality reproductive health services is also determined by numerous factors relating to issues which are outside of the reproductive health arena (e.g.; transport, social security, gender relations etc.). UNFPA country offices need to play an active role in navigating this complex environment. To this aim, in UNFPA country offices, the staff participates in policy forums and donor coordination meetings with a view to ensuring that maternal health is anchored on the national policy agenda for health as well as for other sectors.

Acknowledging the complex interplay of maternal health determinants, UNFPA staff also builds alliances with relevant partners within, as well as outside of, the sphere of reproductive health.

This evaluation has found that country offices are often struggling to fulfill this important and central role. This is largely the consequence of insufficient human resources in country offices (see Conclusion C4) and gaps with regard to technical support (see Conclusion C5). This shortcoming is further aggravated by UNFPA weaknesses in terms of strategic planning (see Conclusion C1).

A – Facing a complex policy, institutional and stakeholder context with a weak multi-annual strategy

In country offices, short-term and “project-by-project” planning prevails over comprehensive, long-term strategic planning in the area of maternal health. Inadequate templates and procedures for project and strategic planning at country level make it challenging for country offices to develop multi-annual strategies (see Conclusion C1). Neither the templates for country programme action plans (CPAP) nor the formats for annual work plans (AWP) require a detailed multi-annual planning. The CPAP often list the objectives for the country programme period without exploring the details and logical coherence of the strategy to achieve them. As a result, none of the 10 country offices visited over the course of this evaluation had developed a detailed and explicitly documented multi-annual support strategy for maternal health focusing on the needs of the groups most vulnerable to poor maternal health (see Conclusion C2). Instead, planning occurred exclusively on the basis of AWP, whose format and limited scope make it difficult to develop comprehensive, long-term plans to guide maternal health support.176

Confined to the reproductive health sphere. In the absence of appropriate strategic direction, many country offices focus their engagement and support of maternal health on the immediate national policy arena for reproductive health. UNFPA reproductive health

---

176 See evaluation question 8 (evidence orientation).
staff work with ministerial departments for reproductive health, nursing councils, midwifery associations and other directly relevant organizations (fig. 3 – b) to revise reproductive health policies, draft midwifery strategies, develop midwifery training curricula or to finance the training of additional health service providers (fig. 3 – c). Country offices also coordinate this work with development partners working in reproductive health (fig. 3 – d) and seek opportunities for joint programming, albeit to differing degrees.

**Unaddressed factors outside of the immediate reproductive health policy arena prevent sustainable improvements in maternal health.** In many programme countries, weak national systems for deploying and retaining health staff threaten sustained effects from UNFPA-supported training initiatives. In spite of this, many country offices do not link their support for these trainings to the establishment of partnerships with other suitable governmental partners (such as HRH departments, fig. 3 – e) or development partners (fig. 3 – f) with a view to addressing these broader constraints (see Conclusion C6). As a result, UNFPA-supported maternal health policies and programmes are not linked to the policies of counterparts in the wider health sector or in other policy sectors which are indispensable to overcome maternal health barriers and to improve the availability of, and accessibility to maternal health services (fig. 3 - g).

**A silo approach.** The absence of a long-term maternal health strategy also affects the management of UNFPA staff and resources in country offices. Without guidance from at least a tacit strategic vision for maternal health, managers and staff put less focus on establishing linkages between UNFPA sub-programmes in reproductive health, population and development and gender (fig. 3 - h). Different types of activities, such as the implementation of pilot projects, the provision of data and findings from research, technical assistance on maternal health and other issues, as well as policy advocacy are not sufficiently well integrated (see Conclusion C3). Instead, they are treated as individual interventions without strong cross-linkages (fig. 3 – i).
B – A “multi-annual vision” to navigate the complex policy, institutional and stakeholder context

In a number of country offices, a “multi-annual vision” for maternal health support has been developed, albeit in a tacit and unwritten manner. Although such a vision cannot amount to a substitute for a clearly formulated multi-annual strategic plan for maternal health support, it has nonetheless allowed country offices to promote improvements and pursue reforms of the policy frameworks in EmONC, family planning or midwifery in a coherent and systematic manner over a number of years. This effort to adopt a more strategic approach has also led to an improved management of scarce internal resources and staff in country offices (see Conclusion C4) and helps in positioning the country office vis-à-vis its partners in maternal health and beyond.

**Synergies.** Adopting strategic foresight in planning maternal health support allows country offices to exploit synergies between the reproductive health sub-programme, the reproductive health thematic funds and the sub-programmes for gender and population and development (fig.4 – a). For example, having a longer-term perspective has encouraged reproductive health advisers and managers to plan the use of the resources from the population and development sub-programme to generate data on the maternal health situation. Country offices are then able to use this information to advocate for policy changes in EmONC, human resources for health and family planning, amongst other crucial areas. Those country offices also provided technical assistance to partner governments to implement corresponding studies, such as EmONC or midwifery assessments, thus linking these components strategically within a more

---

**Figure 4: Guided by medium- to long-term strategy, country offices navigate the complex policy, institutional and stakeholder context of maternal health support**

---
comprehensive and longer-term set of maternal health interventions (fig.4 – b).\textsuperscript{177}

**Stable partnerships.** The adoption of a “multi-annual” vision for supporting maternal health also leads to the establishment of stable partnerships with strategically important partner organizations. Country offices have built a certain amount of trust and credibility with important stakeholders in maternal health (maternal health centers, nursing councils, etc.) as well as with organizations in the wider health policy arena, both in government (such as HRH departments) and in the development community (fig.4 - c and d). These partnerships eventually proved to be important tools to link UNFPA maternal health support (such as the development of maternal health training policies and frameworks) to corresponding initiatives in the wider health policy arena (fig.4 - e). Those country offices which have developed these partnerships are more successful in affecting changes in policies for health-system-wide concerns, such as the deployment and retention of staff. They are also more effective in achieving the official endorsement of reproductive health policies in the context of a strengthened health system (fig.4 – f),\textsuperscript{178} and, ultimately, can better address key maternal health barriers in the access to, and use of maternal health services (fig.4 - g).

**Higher visibility.** The synergetic use of scarce organizational resources coupled with the capacity to form stable partnerships with a wide range of organizations increases the visibility of UNFPA at country level. In particular, donors, non-governmental organizations and partner governments have acknowledged the contributions of country offices that used their ability to generate data and research to drive advocacy on EmONC or on the issue of pay and incentives for health workers.\textsuperscript{179}

The following sections present the conclusions of the evaluation.

### 4.1 Appropriateness of UNFPA maternal health strategy

**CONCLUSION 1**

UNFPA maternal health support in programme countries has not been sufficiently based on country-specific medium or long-term strategies

- **Origin:** Evaluation questions 1 (relevance); 3 (community & demand), 4 (HRH), 6 (family planning), 7 (EmONC), 8 (evidence), 9 (maternal health frameworks), 11 (headquarters, regional, country coherence)

- **Evaluation criteria:** Effectiveness, Sustainability

UNFPA support to maternal health has been more effective when country offices have based their interventions on a multi-annual strategic vision which served as a common framework for their individual interventions and annual work plans (AWP). However, current templates for strategic planning are not conducive to developing this kind of multi-annual vision. Neither the CPAP (nor the individual AWP) require country offices to develop and articulate a theory of change to achieve the higher level objectives. Furthermore, country offices are not required to elaborate a multi-annual operational plan for any of the interventions based upon the theory of change within the particular context of each programme country. This has weakened the long-term strategic orientation of maternal health support and has also affected the ability of UNFPA to adequately monitor and evaluate medium and long-term results of maternal health support (see Conclusion C7 for details).

Those country offices which have managed to develop their maternal health support within a medium- to long-term strategic vision have made more effective use of the organizational resources of UNFPA. The long-term vision allowed them to logically plan interventions such as data collection in one year, the dissemination of the collected information and associated policy advocacy in the following year and technical assistance for the

---

\textsuperscript{177} See evaluation questions 4 (HRH), 6 (family planning), 7 (EmONC), 9 (policy frameworks).

\textsuperscript{178} See in particular evaluation question 4 (HRH), but also evaluation questions 2 (harmonization) and 9 (policy frameworks).

\textsuperscript{179} See evaluation questions 4 (HRH), 6 (family planning), 7 (EmONC), 9 (policy frameworks).
formulation of national maternal health initiatives in the subsequent years. On the contrary, those country offices which lacked a multi-annual perspective were more likely to manage individual interventions separately from each other. This silo approach provided fewer incentives for staff working on different interventions to coordinate their work and to pool financial and organizational resources from different funding sources, such as the different sub-programmes or the reproductive health thematic funds, such as the MHTF and the GPRHCS.

CONCLUSION 2

In its approach to support maternal health, UNFPA has not sufficiently responded to its mandate to focus on addressing the root causes of poor maternal health of the most vulnerable.

- **Origin:** Evaluation questions 1 (relevance); 3 (community and demand), 4 (human resources for health), 6 (family planning), 7 (EmONC), 8 (evidence), 9 (maternal health frameworks), 11 (headquarters, regional, country coherence)

- **Evaluation criteria:** Relevance

UNFPA headquarters has not sufficiently defined the operational implications of focusing on the maternal health needs of the “most vulnerable”. As a result, country offices have had difficulties developing country-specific and detailed analyses of the important social, political, cultural and economic root causes of poor maternal health of vulnerable groups. Instead, country offices identified a list of vulnerable populations, such as the rural poor, migrant populations, youth. However, they did not sufficiently analyze and identify the particular risks and barriers that kept women and girls from these populations from accessing quality maternal health services.

Country offices commonly targeted geographical ‘pockets’ of high maternal mortality and large groups from the vulnerable populations. The systemic weaknesses of health systems, other social inequities responsible for lack of access, and other risk factors that made particular socio-economic groups in the country more vulnerable to poor maternal health were not adequately addressed. Some country offices supported community empowerment to minimize some of these barriers. However, a more systematic approach requires a better understanding of the country-specific social, cultural and economic barriers faced by vulnerable populations. Studies to identify and examine access barriers were only rarely carried out.

CONCLUSION 3

UNFPA support to the provision of maternal health services at sub-national level has not consistently reflected the relative comparative strengths of UNFPA as a primarily knowledge- and evidence-based organization.

- **Origin:** Evaluation Questions 1 (relevance), 4 (HRH), 7 (EmONC), 8 (evidence), 12 (visibility)

- **Evaluation criteria:** Effectiveness, Efficiency

A significant portion of the relatively small budget of UNFPA for reproductive and maternal health support was allocated to interventions at sub-national level. UNFPA has worked directly with sub-national authorities to financially and technically support the delivery of maternal health services. In many countries, UNFPA established sub-national offices to support operations in provinces. At times, UNFPA was either the only, or one of very few organizations working on maternal health. In these cases, there was no alternative to the engagement of UNFPA in the provinces to secure the provision of maternal health services to beneficiaries.

In other countries, however, UNFPA was one of many organizations that offered support to maternal health. As an organization with a relatively small budget, but with a considerable access to maternal health know-how and technical expertise, UNFPA did not have a clear comparative advantage to engage in resource-intensive support of maternal health services at sub-national level in these situations.

Moreover, country offices have not consistently used their engagement at sub-national level to generate data and lessons to further the maternal health policy agenda at national level. While some country offices implemented
pilot interventions at sub-national level, weaknesses in the monitoring and evaluation system limited their opportunities to learn from these experiences. In other cases, country offices utilized UNFPA presence at sub-national level primarily as a means to support service delivery to beneficiaries without strengthening the capacity of UNFPA to generate and disseminate maternal health-related knowledge and expertise.

### 4.2 Role and capacity of UNFPA country offices

**CONCLUSION 4**

Insufficient staff capacity and gaps in the skills available in country offices have negatively affected the ability of UNFPA to act as brokers of maternal health-related expertise and to be a facilitator of national and international maternal health commitments and strategic partnerships.

**Origin:** Evaluation questions 1 (relevance), 4 (human resources for health), 7 (EmONC), 8 (evidence), 9 (maternal health frameworks), 10 (reproductive health, population and development, gender), 11 (headquarters, regional, country coherence)

**Evaluation criteria:** Efficiency, Effectiveness

The success of UNFPA maternal health interventions at country level depends to a large extent on the capacity of country offices to act as brokers of maternal health-related data and expertise and to mobilize resources from development partners and obtain financial commitments from governments. Managers and staff at country level are responsible for translating global UNFPA strategies into country-specific support strategies (see C1). They are called on to champion maternal health in national policy initiatives and in donor coordination forums. Reproductive health staff needs to be able to introduce novel approaches to support maternal health and also have to oversee the implementation of UNFPA-supported maternal health interventions. Finally, country offices also are required to pull together resources and technical support from a variety of different sources, such as core funds, reproductive health thematic funds and external sources.

Staffing constraints in country offices made it difficult for reproductive health teams to fulfill all the above tasks. Annual planning based on inadequate templates (AWP, CPAP; see C1), combined with limited experience and know-how in strategic planning prevented country offices from developing appropriate multi-annual strategies to support maternal health. The small number of reproductive health staff in country offices made it difficult for UNFPA to be present in relevant technical working group meetings or policy forums. Time constraints prevented reproductive health advisors from preparing technical inputs or from launching and pursuing innovative approaches to support maternal health.

**CONCLUSION 5**

Country offices have not received sufficient technical support from regional offices and headquarters to fulfill their central role delivering maternal health support

**Origin:** Evaluation Questions 2 (harmonization), 8 (evidence), 11 (headquarters, regional, country coherence), 12 (visibility)

**Evaluation criteria:** Effectiveness, Efficiency

For many of the themes and topics associated with maternal health, UNFPA country offices needed to rely on technical support from regional offices or from headquarters, either because the required expertise was not readily available at country level or because it would not have been cost-efficient to permanently employ the respective experts. In the areas of human resource development and training, country offices were faced with the challenge of linking the training of midwives and other health cadres to the resolution of related challenges, such as deficiencies in the deployment and retention of trained staff. As this is a relatively new field for UNFPA, staff at country level has relatively little experience in this regard.

However, for regional offices, the availability of technical support is limited in particular in technical fields like human resources for health, EmONC and midwifery, as well as for operational issues such as strategic planning, results-based management or monitoring and evalua-
tion. These gaps in technical support have affected the capacity of country offices to adequately plan, manage and monitor their own maternal health portfolio. They also negatively impacted on the role of UNFPA as broker of maternal health knowledge and expertise by reducing the opportunities to provide evidenced-based information to development and governmental partners.

In this context, the Maternal Health Thematic Fund has been a valuable instrument to make available additional resources for technical support on EmONC, midwifery and family planning (see C8 below).

### 4.3 Partnerships with donors, governments and other stakeholders

**CONCLUSION 6**

The varying capacity of country offices to establish and maintain partnerships with governmental organizations, donors and civil society in and outside of the reproductive health arena has influenced the ability of UNFPA to address service access barriers and other root causes of poor maternal health and to help strengthen the maternal health system in programme countries.

- **Origin:** Evaluation questions 1 (relevance), 4 (human resources for health), 7 (EmONC), 8 (evidence), 9 (maternal health frameworks), 10 (reproductive health, population and development, gender), 11 (headquarters, regional, country coherence)

- **Evaluation criteria:** Effectiveness, Sustainability

Well-established and long-term working partnerships at country, regional and global levels are an important asset for UNFPA. They allow the organization to extend its reach beyond the area of maternal health and to ensure the sustained improvement of maternal health outcomes. Such partnerships (e.g. with parliamentary associations and various departments in health ministries) have improved the capacity of country offices to advocate for policy initiatives (e.g., EmONC subsidies) with a view to removing or diminishing key access barriers preventing women from utilizing quality maternal health services. Long-term partnerships with government organizations and donors also enable country offices to tie their support for developing national human resource capacity for maternal health to larger governmental efforts with a view to strengthening the national health systems. In particular, good relationships with HRH departments helped UNFPA to convince health ministries to address deficits in the deployment and retention of health staff.

Country offices have utilized the influence of their partners to solicit financial commitments for maternal health and to lobby for increases in the salaries of health and maternal health staff. Long-term partnerships have also allowed UNFPA to place specific maternal health-related topics (such as EmONC and midwifery) on the agenda of donor coordination meetings and other government-led policy forums. Finally, partnerships also enabled UNFPA to ensure that initiatives that had been spearheaded by UNFPA were subsequently implemented by government agencies, thus increasing the chances for their sustainability.

However, not all country offices were able to engage in the long-term process of forging and maintaining partnerships. To build strong partnerships, country offices need to repeatedly prove themselves over a number of years as reliable and valuable partners to gain the trust and collaboration of donors and government agencies. Successful partnerships also required the lead and consistent drive of country office representatives.
4.4 Use of Evidence and Monitoring and Evaluation

CONCLUSION 7
A lack of appropriate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms has affected the capacity of UNFPA to assess the results of maternal health support. The absence of a results-oriented monitoring, also negatively impact on the optimization of the corporate and country-level maternal health strategies over time.

- **Origin:** Evaluation questions 1 (relevance); 3 (community and demand), 4 (human resources for health), 6 (family planning), 7 (EmONC), 8 (evidence), 9 (maternal health frameworks), 11 (headquarters, regional, country coherence)

- **Also see Mid-term Evaluation of the MHTF Conclusion 9**

- **Evaluation criteria:** Efficiency, Effectiveness

UNFPA monitoring and evaluation system has not been effective at generating data on the results of maternal health support. Monitoring indicators focus primarily on UNFPA activities or outputs contained in country programme documents (CPD). However, these CPD outputs were typically formulated as outcomes and relate to higher level societal changes in the maternal health situation (such as “improve access to maternal health care”). This renders it impossible to draw a direct link from the CPD output indicators to the interventions supported by UNFPA.

As a result, country offices are largely unable to collect monitoring data on the progress of UNFPA-supported interventions. The information on the chain of effects linking UNFPA-supported activities to higher-level societal changes is therefore incomplete. As a result, monitoring data cannot provide information on the contribution of individual interventions (along the intended chain of effects) to improvements in maternal health in programme countries.

The weaknesses in the monitoring system mirror deficiencies in the system and procedures for strategic planning in country offices and in UNFPA overall (see Conclusion C1). As mentioned above, UNFPA annual work plans (AWP) merely present targets for individual activities which furthermore are loosely related to high level outputs from CPD. Indeed, neither the AWP, nor the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) and the CPD define a comprehensive *theory of change* for individual interventions (or groups of interventions) with a view to describing how these interventions are intended to affect change in the maternal health situation of the programme country. This leaves UNFPA staff without the necessary reference framework to develop a monitoring system that tracks changes along the presumed results chain. Consequently, UNFPA country offices lack the data to optimize and refine their approach to support maternal health over time. This shortcoming affected the work of UNFPA in EmONC, human resources for health, community empowerment, behaviour change communication, policy advocacy and family planning.

Finally, UNFPA implementing partners often do not have the required technical capacity and know-how to fulfill their monitoring-related responsibilities. Consequently, country offices have not been able to consistently support the development of M&E capacity among implementing partners.

4.5 Added value of UNFPA Maternal Health Thematic Fund

CONCLUSION 8
The Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) has helped to provide much needed financial and staff resources to UNFPA country offices and headquarters in the short and medium-term.

- **Origin:** Evaluation question 4 (human resources for health), 7 (EmONC), 11 (headquarters, regional, country coherence)

- **Also see Mid-term Evaluation of the MHTF Conclusions 1, 2, 3 and 7**

- **Evaluation criteria:** Efficiency and Sustainability

In important technical areas, such as EmONC, midwifery or obstetric fistula, the MHTF has provided
much needed funds, staff resources and technical guidance to country offices. The staff positions financed by the MHTF bolstered staff capacity in country offices and allowed them to intensify their engagement in areas like EmONC and midwifery. In addition, the MHTF partnerships with Averting Maternal Death and Disability (AMDD) and also with the International Confederation of Midwives (ICM) gave country offices access to additional technical support in key areas of the UNFPA maternal health portfolio. Overall, these additional resources have helped country offices and headquarters to launch a number of new initiatives in EmONC and midwifery and overall have contributed to reinforce interventions in maternal health. Finally, the MHTF has also helped raise the profile of UNFPA at country level and in global maternal health forums.

CONCLUSION 9

The MHTF has not been sufficiently integrated into the organizational structure of UNFPA and the overall planning process at country level to ensure sustainability of its interventions

Origin: Evaluation Questions 1 (relevance), 2 (harmonization), 4 (HRH), 7 (EmONC), 11 (headquarters, regional, country coherence)

Also see Mid-term Evaluation of the MHTF Conclusions 1, 2, 10, 11 and 12

Evaluation criteria: Efficiency, Sustainability

However, to date, the MHTF has not been sufficiently integrated into planning processes to ensure that country offices and regional offices mobilize the resources required to continue the initiatives that the MHTF has contributed to launching. For instance, the EmONC assessments are meant to trigger the development and implementation of national EmONC scale-up plans by governments. However, as MHTF support was provided outside of UNFPA technical support structures, regional offices have not yet provided the technical resources needed by country offices. Country offices also did not yet systematically plan for the mobilization of resources necessary for the continuation of MHTF initiatives.
The following sections present recommendations based on the conclusions developed above.

5.1 Reviewing UNFPA maternal health strategy and approach

**RECOMMENDATION 1**
UNFPA should revise its internal procedures, tools and templates for strategic planning. The new process should require country offices to develop maternal health support strategies for the medium to long-term, and to detail how resources from the different sub-programmes will be used to implement these strategies.

- **Priority:** Very High
- **Target level:** Programme Division
- **Based on conclusions:** C1, C7

**OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

- Revise country programme document (CPD) and country programme action plan (CPAP) templates to allow for the presentation of detailed analyses of the specific political, administrative, cultural and socio-economic challenges related to maternal health that need to be addressed in the four to five years covered by the programme.

- Require country offices to present in the CPAP a detailed description of the medium-term strategy and the human resources required to implement that strategy (see Recommendation R5)

- Replace intervention planning based on *annual work plans* with a system that requires multi-annual planning.

- The overall rational and theory of change should be described in a comprehensive planning document that details the entire results chain for the intervention, following the results framework (inputs, activities, outputs, expected outcomes, and development results).

- In addition, the document will have to explain the risks and assumptions on which the intervention is based. The assumptions need to include a description of the support or cooperation the intervention will require from UNFPA partners.

- The planning document also needs to include a set of monitoring indicators for the different results levels that will become the basis for the monitoring system of the intervention. This information should be presented in a results framework.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**
UNFPA needs to better define the operational implications of the objective to target the needs of the “most vulnerable”. This concept is a relevant part of the UNFPA maternal health strategy, yet it is too vague in its current form to guide maternal health programming at country level.

- **Priority:** Very High
- **Target level:** Technical Division
- **Based on conclusions:** C2
OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

- Conduct an internal assessment to analyze the concrete ways in which characteristics of health systems, social support structures, and socio-economic conditions determine and shape the vulnerability of specific population groups to maternal health threats and risks. The assessment needs to result in a concretely defined typology of barriers for different types of context and services that are common in UNFPA programme countries.

- Based on this assessment, prepare an operational and programming guide that explains how country offices need to translate the UNFPA mandate for working with the most vulnerable into specific country programmes and interventions. The guide needs to:
  
  - Offer a clear definition of maternal health vulnerability that explains: (a) what vulnerability is; (b) what types of risk factors create vulnerability to poor maternal health for different population groups; (c) what social, political and economic variables determine the level of risks these populations are exposed to and their ability to manage these risks;
  
  - Identify the policy sectors that are relevant to influencing the social, political and economic variables that determine the risk levels and risk management options of vulnerable populations (health policy, social policy, transport and infrastructure policy, economic policy);
  
  - Explain: (a) the main options for donors to influence the social, political and economic variables at the policy level and at community level; (b) the main options for UNFPA to contribute to a common response of development partners, based on its organizational comparative advantage (see Recommendation R3);
  
  - Discuss the use of partnerships with different organizations in the various policy sectors to address maternal health vulnerabilities.

RECOMMENDATION 3

When supporting maternal health service delivery at the national and sub-national levels, UNFPA needs to increase the focus on knowledge generation and learning, to ensure that the organization can make use of lessons from these interventions to inform evidence-based policy advocacy and other knowledge-based activities that are at the core of the UNFPA mandate.

- Priority: High
- Target level: Technical Division, Programme Division
- Based on conclusions: C3, C7

OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

- Require country offices to specifically justify their intention to support maternal health service delivery at the sub-national level in country programme action plans (CPAP) and in the respective programme documents.
  
  - Country offices should be required to justify in both CPAP and planning documents why UNFPA should engage in the support of service delivery at sub-national level in each particular situation;
  
  - Country offices should demonstrate that no other development partners are able and/or available to provide the support of service delivery; or that UNFPA will use the experiences of work at sub-national level to generate lessons that can be used to shape the maternal health policy agenda at national level.

- Require country offices to present in planning documents (see above, Recommendation R1) on interventions implemented at sub-national level: (a) how these interventions will contribute to the body of knowledge and experience on maternal health in the programme country; (b) what activities the country office has foreseen to formulate and disseminate lessons learned on the basis of these interventions.
Strengthen the UNFPA provisions for monitoring (see Recommendation R8 below) to ensure that country offices track progress, identify successes and failures and promote lessons from the interventions they support at sub-national level.

Ensure that country offices collect, analyze and disseminate information from interventions, and notably pilot interventions, in support of maternal health service delivery on the ground. Responsibilities for ensuring appropriate knowledge management and utilization of lessons-learned from UNFPA activities should be reflected in the job descriptions of the relevant country office staff (including country representatives).

5.2 Improving the capacity of UNFPA country offices

RECOMMENDATION 4

UNFPA needs to better align the capacity and skill mix of staff and managers to ensure that country offices can fulfill their role as knowledge brokers and facilitators of evidence-based approaches to improve maternal health.

- **Priority:** Very High
- **Target level:** Division for Human Resources
- **Based on conclusions:** C1, C4, C7

**OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

- Require country offices to develop a resource plan as part of the country programme action plan (CPAP) (see Recommendation R1 above) to explain how staff time will be allocated to the different components of the strategy. The resource plans also should state which additional resources will be required to implement the strategy, and how these will be mobilized.

- Increase the focus of staff in country offices on health care issues related to policy and management. Emphasize professional development of staff in sexual and reproductive health in disciplines like project management, strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation, public health, policy development, and policy advocacy.

- Ensure that job descriptions for country representatives appropriately emphasize their accountability for the strategic orientation and performance of country offices. In particular, the following responsibilities need to be stressed:
  - The development of multi-annual strategies in CPD and CPAP that reflect the organizational comparative advantages of UNFPA as a knowledge-based organization;
  - Positioning country offices to develop strategic partnerships with governments, development partners and civil society organizations to ensure sustainability of results.
  - Offer seminars for professional exchanges between advisors in sexual and reproductive health.

RECOMMENDATION 5

The planning process for technical support elaborated at regional level needs to be better aligned with the long-term strategic and operational planning for maternal health support at country level (see Recommendation R1). Regional offices’ planning processes need to address the current country-level programming needs and to anticipate the future support requirements of country offices.

- **Priority:** High
- **Target level:** Regional offices
- **Based on conclusions:** C4, C5

**OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

- As country offices develop more comprehensive and coherent long-term maternal health strategies (see
Recommendation R1), UNFPA needs to ensure that the corresponding requirements for technical support are well addressed by regional offices and become the basis for long-term strategic planning at regional level.

- Regional programme documents (RPD) and regional programme action plans (RPAP) need to be developed in joint planning sessions that bring together participants from country offices, headquarters (including from the reproductive health thematic funds, such as MHTF, GPRHCS) and regional office staff.

- In addition to the RPAP, regional offices need to develop a plan in coordination with UNFPA thematic funds and headquarters (Technical Division, Programme Division) to estimate the resources required to deliver the needed technical support, identify likely resource gaps and develop strategies (such as partnerships, raising of external funds) to close these gaps.

- Technical support priorities and related resource allocations as well as resource mobilization strategies should be reassessed annually (or bi-annually) as part of the periodic review of the RPAP. This assessment should be jointly conducted by the Technical Division (including MHTF, GPRHCS and other reproductive health thematic funds), the Programme Division, and selected country offices and regional offices.

5.3 Improving the guidance on UNFPA partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA needs to anchor the concept of partnerships more firmly in strategic documents, operational guidelines and terms of references/job descriptions of management staff. Strategic documents need to explain why partnerships are an important operational and strategic component to ensure sustainable results for UNFPA maternal health support. Operational guidelines need to explain how country offices can foster different types of partnerships. UNFPA managers need to be responsible for setting up the required partnerships at country, regional and global levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Priority:** High
- **Target level:** Technical Division, Programme Division
- **Based on conclusions:** C1, C6

**OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

- Identify the significance of partnerships for implementing UNFPA programmes at country, regional and global levels, and how partnerships can help make programme effects sustainable.

- Prepare an assessment for the different technical areas (EmONC, human resources for health, midwifery) to analyze the inter-dependencies of poor maternal health outcomes and systemic weaknesses in national health systems and deficiencies in social support structures.

- Use the assessment to develop a typology of stakeholders who can help UNFPA address the identified deficits and root causes of poor maternal health in the context of the wider health system (e.g., human resources for health systems, local governance system, resource allocation systems, etc.).

- Strengthen the capacity of regional offices to support country offices in establishing partnerships.

- Encourage regional offices to produce short-lists of organizations at regional level that are good candidates for UNFPA partnerships in different technical areas.

- Develop training resources that regional offices can use to train staff in country offices in developing partnerships for EmONC, human resources for health and midwifery

- Ensure that the job descriptions of UNFPA country representatives, directors of regional offices and managers at headquarters emphasize their responsibility for developing partnerships. Consider “development of partnerships” as a criterion for staff performance assessment.
5.4 Improving UNFPA provisions for monitoring

**RECOMMENDATION 7**

UNFPA needs to strengthen result-oriented monitoring for country offices to measure results and not only activities and inputs. UNFPA also needs to assign greater responsibilities and offer more guidance to country offices for supporting the set-up of appropriate monitoring mechanisms with implementing partners.

- **Priority:** Very High
- **Target level:** Programme Division
- **Based on conclusions:** C1, C4, C5, C7

**OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

- Provide operational guidance for result-oriented monitoring to clarify that monitoring at output level is primarily tasked to collect data that can gauge the contribution of UNFPA support to higher level health outcomes (those outcomes identified in the CPD/CPAP).

- Develop a set of guidelines on result-oriented monitoring and related training resources that country offices can access and use in the development of monitoring mechanisms for their maternal health portfolio.

- Strengthen the responsibilities and capacities of country offices to support the set-up of appropriate monitoring mechanisms with implementing partners.

  - Ensure that monitoring staff at country offices receive formal training in monitoring;

  - Develop guidelines for M&E officers in country offices to communicate UNFPA monitoring requirements to implementing partners and to offer some technical guidance on monitoring.

5.5 Revise role and integration of the Maternal Health Thematic Fund in UNFPA

**RECOMMENDATION 8**

Strengthen the capacity of the MHTF as a catalytic tool to facilitate the implementation of evidence-based maternal health interventions in programme countries. Clarify in the MHTF Business Plan that the MHTF is not only responsible for launching initiatives (like those in EmONC and midwifery), but also for mobilizing required technical and financial resources (UNFPA-internal and from external sources) to support country offices and programme countries in following-through with these initiatives until their completion.

- **Priority:** Very High
- **Target level:** Technical Division
- **Based on conclusions:** C8, C9 of the MHTF mid-term evaluation

**OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

- Clarify the purpose of the MHTF (e.g., as described in the Business Plan). Stress that the MHTF is a tool that:

  - Helps the organization to launch and support evidence-based maternal health interventions in selected thematic areas (currently EmONC, midwifery);

  - Helps country offices to mobilize the technical support needed to assist partner governments to implement these initiatives at national level;

  - Is responsible for assessing the technical support needs of UNFPA to implement these initiatives.
Update the guidance to country offices on the purpose and role of the MHTF to clarify:

- What type of resources and support country offices can expect from the MHTF if they access MHTF funds and what type of support they cannot expect;

- What are the responsibilities of country offices when working with MHTF funds, in particular: stress the catalytic nature of the MHTF and spell out the resulting responsibilities of the country office. Also highlight the shared responsibilities to mobilize resources with a view to ensuring that MHTF-funded initiatives (such as EmONC up-scaling) are pursued until completion.

- Harmonize MHTF planning with the (proposed) multi-annual planning approach for core funds (see Recommendation R1 above).

- MHTF-financed interventions need to be reflected in the CPAP and also need to be based on multi-annual planning documents detailing: results chains, risks, assumptions.

- Planning documents for MHTF interventions should also include a resource plan explaining what staff resources and technical support will be required to implement the MHTF-funded interventions.

---

**RECOMMENDATION 9**

UNFPA should use MHTF funds to carry out pilot interventions in programme countries on selected core maternal health issues, such as the development of appropriate support strategies to better target populations with high vulnerability to poor maternal health (also see Recommendation 2 above)

- Priority: Medium
- Target level: Technical Division
- Based on conclusions: C3, C8, C9

---

**OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

- Conduct an inventory of maternal health issues and topics that require pilot-testing (including in particular EmONC and midwifery);

- Prioritize issues and topics and invite country offices to submit proposals for pilot interventions;

- Ensure that country offices have access to the required resources and skills to appropriately monitor and evaluate the pilot interventions throughout their lifetime;

- Prepare activities to analyze and disseminate results from the pilot interventions.
1. About UNFPA

UNFPA, the United Nations Population Fund,180 is one of the world’s largest international sources of funding for population and reproductive health programmes. Since the Fund began operations in 1969, it has provided nearly USD 6 billion in assistance to developing countries. UNFPA is an international development agency that promotes the right of every woman, man and child to enjoy a life of health and equal opportunity. UNFPA supports countries in using population data for policies and programmes to reduce poverty and to ensure that every pregnancy is wanted, every birth is safe, every young person is free of HIV, and every girl and woman is treated with dignity and respect.

UNFPA works in partnership with governments, as well as with other agencies and civil society broadly, to advance its mission. Two frameworks serve to focus its efforts: The Programme of Action adopted at the International Conference on Population (ICPD) and Development and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) which the international development community committed itself to six years later. Since the dates for achievement of these interconnected sets of goals and related targets are fast approaching, considerable work is being undertaken to analyze what has worked, as well as to galvanize support and a redoubling of efforts.

Under its second Goal (“Universal access to reproductive health by 2015 and universal access to comprehensive HIV prevention by 2010 for improved quality of life”), the Strategic Plan (2008-11) aims at strengthening partner countries’ health systems to meet sexual and reproductive health goals, especially with respect to lowering maternal mortality and morbidity rates. In 2008, UNFPA adopted the Sexual and Reproductive Health Framework which serves as the Fund’s framework of action for the Strategic Plan. The SRH Framework advocates for the support of an integrated package of interventions in the area of reproductive health which includes maternal health. Acknowledging the inter-related needs that women experience throughout their life cycle, the Framework promotes the support of reproductive health services as a way to foster empowerment of women, gender equality, protection of human rights, health and well-being. This includes reduction of maternal mortality and morbidities, prevention of HIV and other sexually-transmitted diseases and the promotion of adolescent reproductive health.

The three core areas of work of UNFPA are reproductive health, gender equality and population and development strategies. These are inextricably related. Population dynamics, including growth rates, age structure, fertility and mortality, migration etc. influence every aspect of human, social and economic development. Reproductive health and women’s empowerment powerfully affect, and are, in turn, affected by, population trends.

UNFPA supports programmes aiming at helping women, men and young people to:

- promote their reproductive rights
- plan their families and avoid unwanted pregnancies

180 See http://www.unfpa.org/public/home/about
* The complete set of annexes to this reports are available in Volume 2.
• undergo pregnancy and childbirth safely

• avoid sexually transmitted infections - including HIV/AIDS

• combat violence against women.

Together, these elements protect reproductive rights understood as the right of all couples and individuals to decide freely about the number, spacing and timing of their children and to have the information and the means to do so. Reproductive health designates a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being in all matters related to the reproductive system. It is recognized as a human right, as part of the right to health.

UNFPA also provides support to governments in the world’s poorest countries, and in other countries in need, to formulate population policies and strategies in support of sustainable development. All UNFPA-funded programmes promote gender equality and the empowerment of women.

2. Mandate

Systematic and timely evaluation of expenditure programmes is a comprehensive function which incorporates accountability for, and oversight of the management of allocated funds. It is also an important tool to promote a lesson-learning culture throughout the organization.

The 2009 Evaluation Policy of UNFPA supports the organization’s efforts to strengthen results-based management, as reinforced by the Strategic Plan (2008-2011). In this context, an evaluation to appraise the support of UNFPA and interventions in maternal health comes as an independent assessment of an area of crucial importance to UNFPA.

This evaluation was included in the 2010 Business Plan approved by the Executive Director on 22 January 2010. The planning of annual activities at the Division for Oversight Services (DOS) is based upon an internal risk assessment aiming at to identifying high risk areas/opera-

Concurrently, a mid-term evaluation of the Maternal Health Thematic Fund had also been planned by the Technical Division of UNFPA in view of assessing the design and implementation of the Fund. Given the potential complementarities and positive interconnections as well as risks of possible overlaps between the Maternal Health Thematic Fund mid-term evaluation and the thematic evaluation of the support of UNFPA in the area of maternal health, the Technical Division (TD) and the Division for Oversight Services have agreed to put in place single process in order to build upon the synergies of both exercises and make an optimal use of available resources. However, in order to reflect the evaluations’ specificities (notably in terms of audience) the evaluations have clearly delineated scopes and shall lead to separate final reports (see sections 4 and 9 below).

3. Background

Maternal mortality represents the greatest health inequity in the world. No other health indicator as starkly illustrates global disparities in human development. Each year more than 350,000 women die during pregnancy or childbirth.181 Half of the maternal deaths that occur each year are in Africa – a continent which represents 11 per cent of the world’s population and six countries (India, Nigeria,

181 The most recent assessment of maternal mortality, which was jointly sponsored by WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, and the World Bank, reported 573,300 maternal deaths globally in 1990, and 535000 in 2005 (a 0.48% yearly rate of decline).
Pakistan, Afghanistan, Ethiopia and the Democratic Republic of Congo) account for over half of maternal deaths.

The reduction of maternal mortality is a key feature in human, social and economic development. It is linked to improvements in health – including of the newborns, to the reduction of the gender divide and it also contributes towards poverty reduction. The improvement of maternal health was adopted as one of the eight Millennium Development Goals back in 2000.

To this date, the two MDG 5 targets of: reducing maternal mortality by 75% and achieving universal access to reproductive health by 2015 have shown limited progress and have been unequal. Between 1990 and 2005, Asia experienced a 20 per cent reduction in MMR. During the same time period, MMR in sub-Saharan Africa decreased by a mere two per cent. Globally, the rate of death from pregnancy and childbirth declined between 1990 and 2005 by only 1% per year. In order to get back on track toward achieving MDG 5, it is estimated that a 5.5% annual rate of decline is needed from 2005 to 2015. Increase in proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel has been slow. Globally, the proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel has increased from 62% during the 1990s to 66% during 2000–2008, with virtually no progress over the last decade in Africa (WHO); caesarean section rates have also remained low. Furthermore, access to and utilization of family planning services have remained insufficient as illustrated by the high adolescent birth rate and low contraceptive prevalence rates (CPR) in many countries of the continent especially West and Central Africa. The adolescent fertility rate is highest in the Africa (118 per 1000) and particularly in low-income countries (110 per 1000) as compared with a global average of 47 per 1000 over the period 2000–2008. Furthermore, it must be noted that the average CPR is less than 24% in Africa over 2000-2008.

In 2008, UNFPA also launched the Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF). This new initiative was meant to provide support to countries with a high burden of maternal mortality in order to scale up the proven interventions needed to save women and newborns as well as promoting reproductive health. In synergy with the Global Programme on Reproductive Health Commodity Security (GPRHCS), MHTF provides support to strengthen national health systems through technical expertise and financial resources to address bottlenecks of progress in maternal health.

Though maternal mortality and morbidity continue to be a major health problem in many parts of the world, notable progress has been achieved in over 100 countries. Furthermore, recent analyses provide new and encouraging estimates indicating that in 2008 maternal deaths had fallen to 358,900. The vast majority of maternal and newborn deaths can be prevented with proven and highly cost-effective interventions. Progress in the countries that have managed to reduce maternal mortality by half in less than 10 years has led indeed to a growing consensus in the global health community on three sets of interventions most effective in reducing maternal mortality and morbidity: (1) universal access to family planning; (2) a skilled health professional present at every delivery; and (3) access to emergency obstetric and newborn care, when needed; recent research also shows the connection with HIV and maternal deaths. Reducing maternal mortality also calls on interventions in other areas than the health sector, in particular in view of eliminating child marriage, retaining girls in school and providing comprehensive sexuality education.

Goal 5: Improve maternal health:

Target 5a: Reduce by three quarters the maternal mortality ratio
- 5.1 Maternal mortality ratio
- 5.2 Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel

Target 5b: Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health
- 5.3 Contraceptive prevalence rate
- 5.4 Adolescent birth rate
- 5.5 Antenatal care coverage (at least one visit and at least four visits)
- 5.6 Unmet need for family planning

182 Maternal mortality is defined as the death of women during pregnancy, childbirth, or in the 42 days after the end of pregnancy.
183 Indicating that in the absence of HIV, there would have been 281,000 maternal deaths worldwide in 2008, ibidem.
184 Births per 1000 women aged 15-19 years.
185 Given the numerous indicators associated with the improvement of maternal health, it will be an important task for the evaluation team to collect and analyze process indicators that can be used directly to answer the evaluation questions; in particular the process of data collection (Desk and Field phases – see section 5 below) shall be focused on the evaluation questions retained for the evaluation (see section 6 below).
The MHTF is intended to:

1) Be strategic in the sense that it should address priority bottlenecks that are hampering progress in maternal health and health systems strengthening at the country level;

2) Be catalytic in the sense of boosting ongoing country office efforts aimed at strengthening national capacity to advance towards universal access to adequate and quality maternal health care in the context of reproductive health and the integrated package of services;

3) Be catalytic in the sense of leveraging global, regional and national awareness/ focus/resources on the subject and foster further commitment and action;

4) Make additional financial resources available to priority countries, (i.e., those showing the least progress on Millennium Development Goal 5) to facilitate and accelerate points 1 and 2.

The priority areas of the Maternal Health Thematic Fund are:

• **Family Planning**
  Ensuring that all pregnancies are wanted: complementarily with the GPRHCS, to address policies for access and uptake of family planning (service delivery), supply-side interventions (commodities), capacity building related to logistics and procurement, and demand generation interventions.

• **Human resources for maternal and newborn health**
  Skilled care during pregnancy, at delivery, and in the post-partum period—particularly through strengthening of midwifery (including family planning and HIV prevention).

• **Access and uptake of Emergency Obstetric and Newborn Care**
  In partnership with UNICEF and AMDD, support through the emergency obstetric and newborn care needs assessments the availability of strategic information to governments and partners for advocacy, planning, scaling up of EmONC services, and monitoring of progress.

• **Addressing Maternal Morbidity – The Campaign to End Fistula**
  Scale up of prevention, treatment and social reintegration of fistula patients

4. **Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation**

The purpose of the evaluation is twofold:

A. The maternal health thematic evaluation will assess to what extent the overall assistance of UNFPA—i.e.; the support of UNFPA from all sources: core resources, co-financing and all thematic funds — has been relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable in contributing to the improvement of maternal health *in the last 10 years*.

Improving of maternal health is at the confluence of many determinants belonging to both national health systems as well as the overall demographic, socio-cultural as well as economic environment (population and economic growth, girls and women status, literacy and education, good governance etc.)

The scope of the maternal health thematic evaluation covers all programmatic interventions directly relevant to mortality and morbidity within the mandate of UNFPA, and covers all relevant activities financed from core and non-core resources as well as resources provided through the reproductive health thematic funds of UNFPA (Maternal Health Thematic Fund, the Global Programme to enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security, the joint UNFPA-UNICEF FGM Programme) as well as other funds provided by the Global and Regional Programme - GRP). As a result, the maternal health thematic evaluation shall be inclusive of the following initiatives and instruments of UNFPA:

• The core funding and other co-financing mechanisms contribute to all 3 pillars to reduce maternal mortality and morbidity. In the 145 UNFPA programme countries, the core resources represent the large majority of country programme funding.

• The Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security (GPRHCS) which (i) provides RH commodities (procurements, product
and technologies for family planning, condom programming and obstetric care); (ii) strengthens health information management system (HIMS for forecasting and logistics); and (iii) builds governments’ capacities. Therefore, the GPRHCS improves access and uptake of family planning (considered as the first pillar of reducing maternal mortality and morbidity). It must be noted that a mid-term evaluation of the *Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security* is currently on-going. The present evaluation will foster synergies with the GPRHCS evaluation so as not to duplicate effort.

- The MHTF addresses mainly EmONC, fistula and human resources for health – in particular: midwifery (as the other two pillars for reducing maternal mortality and morbidity).

- The Joint UNICEF-UNFPA Programme on Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) addresses mainly social change, legal aspects and community mobilization.

- The core funding and other co-financing mechanisms contribute to all 3 pillars to reduce maternal mortality and morbidity.

B. The evaluation will also review the design, coordination, and added value of the Maternal Health Thematic Fund as a targeted effort to improve maternal health since the start of its country support in the fall of 2008.

The scope of the MHTF mid-term evaluation covers the programmatic directions including the assumptions, design and early choices (as per the MHTF Business Plan) at national, regional and global levels. The scope also covers the internal coordination and management mechanisms (including technical capacities at the three above-mentioned levels), the effectiveness (performance of the contribution), efficiency and sustainability of the technical and financial support. The evaluation will assess the complementarities internally with the other reproductive health thematic fund (the Global Programme to Enhance Reproductive Health Commodity Security within UNFPA) as well as externally in the context of H4+ (UNFPA, UNICEF, WHO, the World Bank and UNAIDS) support to priority countries. The evaluation will thus help improve the management of the thematic fund at the Technical Division, Internal and External Relations Division (IERD) levels, and UNFPA country and regional offices levels.

More specifically, the objectives of the mid-term evaluation of the MHTF are:

- to assess the strategic, synergistic and catalytic nature of the interventions supported by the fund, specifically...
how effectively countries and regions integrate the MHTF-supported programmes within regular country and regional programmes;

✓ to assess the programmatic and geographic focus (priority countries);

✓ to assess the effectiveness (performance) of MHTF contributions and achievements towards maternal health in supported countries;

✓ to assess the effectiveness in increasing UNFPA and country capacity to effectively support the delivery of interventions in the area of maternal health;

✓ to assess the efficiency and sustainability of the support;

✓ to assess the internal coordination and management mechanisms (identify strengths and weaknesses in the structure, coordination mechanisms and the management of the MHTF);

✓ to suggest evidence-based informed amendments to the MHTF outputs and results framework that can be implemented for the remaining duration of the MHTF.

The evaluation should also assess the coordination and complementarity of interventions with other donors and agencies, notably in view of the 2008 Joint Statement on Accelerating Efforts to save the life of women and Newborns and Joint Country Support for accelerated implementation of maternal and newborn continuum of care (WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, World Bank and, since 2010, UNAIDS). The five agencies (referred to as “the Health 4+”) aim at enhancing their support to the 25 countries with the highest maternal mortality rates.186

The contribution of UNFPA to the Campaign to End Fistula having been recently the subject of an in-depth evaluation187, the obstetric fistula components of the MHTF will not be studied in details in the course of the present evaluation.

The evaluation's findings and recommendations should inform policy decision-making and project management purposes as well as how to strengthen existing partnerships. The main users of the evaluation should be UNFPA country and regional offices, UNFPA Programme and Technical Divisions, including the Maternal Health Thematic Fund staff. The evaluation should also generate results of interest to a broader audience, including governments of partner countries, UNFPA member states including donors, civil society and others.

The evaluation will include a comprehensive desk phase followed by country case studies to be carried out in a maximum of 12 different partner countries. Country case studies will be identified during the desk phase. The evaluators shall identify and formulate in-depth questions and test hypotheses for country case studies, allowing addressing the issues of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability of UNFPA support to maternal health.

The evaluation shall cover aid implementation during the Period 2006-2010. The specific mid-term evaluation of the Maternal Health Thematic Trust Fund (MHTF) will cover the period 2008-2010.

The evaluation should come to country-specific as well as to general overall judgments of the extent to which the strategies of UNFPA as programmed by and implemented under the management of country offices, have contributed towards the achievements of the objectives and intended impacts in terms of improving maternal health, based on the answers to the agreed evaluation questions.

The evaluation shall lead to conclusions based on objectives, credible, reliable and valid findings and provide UNFPA with a set of operational and useful recommendations.

186 The evaluators shall take note of the fact that in September 2010, the UN Secretary General launched an Initiative on women’s and children’s health.
**5. Methodology and Approach**

**Sampling Approach**

The Thematic evaluation will focus on a sample of 12 (maximum) countries. The criteria for the selection of the countries will be proposed by evaluators, presented to and validated by the Reference Group.

The sample should include both countries that substantially reduced their MMR as well as countries that have not significantly progressed on their MMR (>300 per 100,000 is considered high MMR) in the course of the past 20 years and are recipients of core and thematic funds. This combination could provide interesting insights into bottlenecks and main constraints as well as the identification of lessons learned and evidences to improve maternal health. The selection of countries should also be based on their comparability in terms of population size, poverty level, education level, economy, political stability, other funding mechanism (and in particular that of GPRHCS) and other relevant drivers in terms of maternal health/mortality. The sample should also be inclusive of countries that have benefited from the MHTF and some that have not. Finally, the countries retained should also be reflective of the geographical distribution of the support of UNFPA and the relative acuity of maternal health in those regions (ARO, APRO, ASRO, LACRO).

The evaluation approach should encompass the following fundamental tasks:

(i) Identify and explain the selected CO objectives in the field of maternal health, their logic and coherence, their *relevance* both to UNFPA objectives (in particular as formulated in the SRH Framework and MHTF’s Business Plan) and to the needs of recipient countries, the intended results corresponding to each objective, and finally how these intended results fit within the overall objective of improving maternal health.

(ii) Assess *effectiveness* in terms of how far the intended results were achieved and also - to the extent that the interventions were effective - their efficiency in terms of how far funding, staff, regulatory, administrative, time and other resource considerations contributed to, or hindered the achievement of results.

(iii) Consider the *sustainability* of maternal health related activities in the context of sexual and reproductive health; that is an assessment taking into account, in particular, the institutional capacity required to maintain results.

(iv) Keeping in mind that MHTF is only one additional source of resources (financial and technical expertise) for “priority country offices” to improve maternal health, the evaluators should adopt a comparative approach between recipient and non-recipient countries of MHTF funds so as to identify MHTF’s potential added value.

**Evaluation Phases**

The Evaluation shall consist of 5 phases, subdivided in subsequent methodological stages (phases for which consultants’ contribution is requested are marked in grey) and related deliverables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Phases</th>
<th>Methodological Stages</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Preparation Phase (DOS/TD) | - preparation of ToR  
- Constitution of the reference Group | - Final ToR  
- Interoffice memorandum |
| 2. Desk Phase 3. Field Phase 4. Reporting Phase | - Structuring of the evaluation  
- Data collection, verification of hypotheses  
- Analysis  
- Judgments on findings  
- recommendations | - One Inception report  
- One Desk Phase report  
- Two Final reports |
| 5. Feedback and Dissemination | - management response  
- Dissemination activities | |

**5.1. Preparation Phase**

Following their finalization by the evaluation managers (Evaluation Branch/DOS and MHTF/SRHB/TD), the present *Terms of References* (ToR) will be sent by DOS to PSB. PSB will prepare the standard International Competitive Bidding (ICB) document based upon the present ToR. The ICB will be posted in UNGM website and will also be circulated among recommended consultants identified by DOS. The ICB will keep open 21 days for prospective bidders.
The bidder should come with two kinds of proposals: technical and financial.

√ the technical part of the bid: should contain at least: (i) the bidder’s understanding of the ToR, (ii) the proposed composition of the core evaluation team with individuals’ curriculum vitae and (iii) the proposed work plan. This proposal will be evaluated by the Evaluation Branch/DOS based on technical evaluation criteria.

√ the financial proposal: the evaluation of the financial proposal will be performed by PSB.

The evaluation managers identify the persons to be invited to participate in the Reference Group (RG), which will ensure that the expertise of UNFPA on maternal health is fully utilized and all the relevant information is provided to the evaluators. The Reference Group shall consist of a maximum of 8 members and will provide balance expertise in maternal health/reproductive health as well as in evaluation.

5.2. Desk Phase

5.2.1 One Inception report

Following the selection of consultants, the work will proceed to the structuring stage which shall lead to the production of an Inception Report.

The Inception report will:

√ Contain an analysis of all relevant key documents;

√ Propose a set of criteria for selection of country studies. Based on these criteria, the evaluators should justify the choice of several representative country case studies to be examined in detail during the desk phase. The specific aspects of the situation as regards MMR and CO programmes for each selected country are to be highlighted;

√ Specify the methodological tools that will be used;

√ Present two preliminary sets of evaluation questions (see section 6 below);

√ Present a detailed work plan, specifying the organization and time schedule for the evaluation process.

The Contractor will present the Inception Report which shall be formally approved by the Evaluation Branch/DOS. The Reference Group will comment on the Inception Report and validate the evaluation questions and the proposed country case studies.

5.2.2 One Desk report

Upon approval of the Inception Report, the team of consultants will proceed to the Desk Phase of the evaluation. The desk phase shall be the moment when relevant information (in Headquarters as well as from country offices and regional offices – based upon the identified country case studies) is gathered and analyzed.

The desk phase reports take up the points dealt with in the Inception Report and goes into as much detail as necessary. In this stage, consultants are asked to:

√ Present 2 final sets of evaluation questions along with appropriate judgment criteria and relevant quantitative and qualitative indicators;

√ Present a set of selected case studies, the selection criteria applied and the relevant identified questions, judgment criteria and indicators;

√ Present the methodology for data and information collection and validation, both for the desk phase and for the forthcoming field phase.

√ Present the methods of analysis of the information and data collected in order to draw findings that would enable to draw general conclusions; due to the difficulty of this exercise any limitation should be made explicit;

√ Present the preliminary findings responding to the evaluation questions and the first hypotheses to be tested in the field based.

At the completion of this work, the evaluation team will present one Desk Phase Report setting out the results of this first phase of the evaluation including all the above
listed tasks (the core part of the Inception Report will be annexed to the Desk Phase Report).

The RG will comment on the Desk Phase Report based on which the necessary amendments will be specified. The Evaluation Branch/DOS formally approves this report.

The country offices in countries selected for the field mission will be informed through a formal announcement letter from DOS.

5.3. Field Phase

Following satisfactory completion of the desk phase, the evaluation team will proceed to the field missions.

Prior to completion of each country visit the evaluation team shall prepare for the CO a debriefing presentation of the field mission results, seeking to validate the data and the gathered information.

For each country case study and following completion of the field mission, the team will proceed to prepare case study notes to be submitted to the Evaluation Branch at DOS within ten working days after returning from the field (see Annex 1 for an outline structure of the country reports). DOS will share the case study notes with the evaluation manager at MHTF/TD.

These notes will be annexed to the two Final Reports. When all field missions are conducted, and before the start of the reporting phase, the evaluation team shall present results of the field phase in a form of detailed debriefing for the Reference Group.

5.4. Reporting phase

Following the formal approval of the Desk Phase Report by the Evaluation Branch/DOS and SRHB/TD, the evaluators will submit two Draft Final Reports corresponding to (1) the maternal health thematic evaluation and (2) the MHTF mid-term evaluation.

Each Draft Final Report for the (1) maternal health thematic evaluation and (2) the MHTF mid-term evaluation shall include the answers to the evaluation questions identified (inception report) and agreed upon (desk phase report) for each exercise. The Draft Final Reports shall also present a synthesis of the main conclusions of the evaluations.

The evaluation managers will verify the quality of the submitted draft reports. If the quality of the draft reports is acceptable, the managers circulate it to the Reference Group members for comments. The reports will then be discussed in the last RG meeting with the evaluation team.

On the basis of the comments expressed by UNFPA services (Evaluation Branch/DOS, RG members, country offices, regional offices) the evaluation team shall make appropriate amendments and submit the Final Report. If comments are rejected by the evaluation team, evaluators shall explain reasons in writing.

The Final Reports should clearly account for the observations and evidences on which findings are made so as to support the reliability and validity of the evaluation. The reports should reflect a rigorous, methodical and thoughtful approach. Conclusions and recommendations shall build upon findings.

Recommendations must be:

- Linked to the conclusions
- Clustered, prioritized and targeted at specific addressees
- Accompanied by a timing for implementation
- Useful and operational
- If possible, presented as options associated with benefits and risks.

The final version of the Final Reports shall be presented in a way that enables publication without need for any further editing. The Final Reports (like previous Inception and Draft Reports) shall be written in English and submitted to DOS in a timely manner (see calendar below).
The Final Reports will be formally approved by the Directors of DOS and TD.

5.5. Dissemination and follow-up

Following the approval of the Final Reports, reception of the management response, the evaluation managers will proceed to dissemination of the results (conclusions and recommendations) of the evaluation reports.

The evaluators may be required to assist in dissemination and follow-up activities. For instance, in coordination with Evaluation Branch/DOS and MHTF/SRHB/TD, they may be invited to present the conclusions and recommendations during a seminar.

6. Identification of the Evaluation Question/Issues

The evaluation will be based on 2 sets of key evaluation questions which are intended to give a more precise and accessible form to the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and to articulate the key areas of interest of UNFPA services, thus optimizing the focus and utility of the evaluation.

Evaluators will identify the evaluation questions building upon the purpose and scope of the evaluation as specified under Section 3 above. The evaluation questions should also reflect particular interests from UNFPA services represented in the Reference Group.

The evaluators will propose 2 distinct sets of evaluation questions each being specifically tailored for (1) the MHTF mid-term evaluation and (2) the maternal health thematic evaluation. It is however expected that the questions proposed for the thematic evaluation (broader in scope) will build on, as well as include a number of questions formulated for the MHTF mid-term evaluation.

The following main topics/issues are of interest to DOS/TD:

(1) The CO portfolio of maternal health activities (as part of RH) and the extent to which these are the result of an evidence-based programming and build upon proven interventions (SBA, EmONC, FP) to effectively reduce maternal death.

(2) The status of demographic and maternal health information (incl. SBA, EmONC and FP) in Country and the role of CO to increase availability and reliability of data.

(3) The role of UNFPA in ensuring that maternal health related interventions are given priority in national health plans.

(4) The alignment of the national priorities/commitment – e.g.; as expressed by budget allocations for maternal health – with the above-mentioned triptych of proven interventions.

(5) The synergies and coherence between CO activities developed under the RH component and activities programmed within the other mandate areas of UNFPA, notably data for development, gender equality (incl. violence against women), and the activities in the adolescent and youth sector.

(6) The contribution of regional offices (and prior to ROs, the country support teams in regions) and regional programmes to country programmes in maternal health.

(7) The contribution of the Global Programme (beyond the thematic fund) to maternal health.

(8) The global leadership of UNFPA on maternal health (integ rally and in specific areas).

(9) Co-ordination, complementarity and synergies with other UN Agencies as well as bilateral and multilateral donors to effectively contribute to improve maternal health in the context of H4+.

(10) CO monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to assess progress on results achieved and inform an evidence-based approach to programming in the area of maternal health.

More specifically, for the Maternal Health Thematic Fund mid-term evaluation it is expected that the following topics will be addressed:
(11) The contribution of the MHTF to strengthening country office capacity for positioning maternal health and related interventions in policies and strategies at country level.

(12) The contribution of the MHTF to enhance human resources for maternal and newborn health and particularly midwifery – e.g.;

- Upgraded midwifery education and training programs with curricula based on the ICM essential competencies for basic midwifery practice.
- Increased number of midwifery associations with capacity to advocate for and implement the scaling up of midwifery services in country.
- In country policies, regulatory standards and monitoring systems that maintain quality of midwifery services in place.
- Increased support at global and regional levels for midwifery as a key health workforce for the achievement of MDGs 4 and 5, and advocacy to this end.

(13) The contribution of the MHTF to the availability of strategic information to governments and partners for advocacy, planning, scaling up of EmONC services, and monitoring of progress.

(14) The contribution of the MHTF to advancing the monitoring and evaluation for maternal and newborn health programmes in priority countries.

(15) Synergies and cooperation of the MHTF with the GPRHCS, HIV/AIDS as well as FMG/C programmes.

(16) The role of MHTF in humanitarian settings.

(17) Partnership Building: effectiveness of the coordination among partners at the global and regional level; role played by MHTF to enhance the leadership of UNFPA in the H4+.

(18) The internal coordination and management of the MHTF: its effectiveness; analysis of current bottlenecks and ways to overcome these.

7. Management and Supervision of the Evaluation

The responsibility for the management and supervision of the evaluation will rest with the Evaluation Branch at the Division for Oversight Services in collaboration with MHTF/TD.

The progress of the evaluation will be followed closely by the Reference Group (RG) consisting of members of UNFPA services who are directly interested in the results of this thematic evaluation.

The principal function of the Reference Group is to follow the evaluation process and more specifically:

- to act as the interface between the consultants and the UNFPA services (in headquarters, regional and country offices) in particular to facilitate access to information and documentation;
- to advise on the quality of the work of the consultants;
- to facilitate and assist in feedback of the findings and recommendations from the evaluation.

Several Reference Group meetings (about 4/5) will take place during the process of the evaluation, as indicated below in the time schedule (see section 8)

8. Evaluation Team

This evaluation is to be carried out by a team with advanced knowledge and experience in development co-operation. Special expertise will be required concerning support in reproductive health and maternal health, particularly expertise in country health systems, midwifery, as well as UN process indicators assessment will be required.

Previous experience of conducting evaluations for international organizations (notably with the UN) will be considered as an asset.

The team leader must have a proven experience in evaluation methodology. Consultants should possess an appropriate training and documented experience in conducting evaluations as well as applying evaluation methods in field situations.
The team should comprise a reasonable mix of consultants familiar with the different regions of interest to UNFPA. The team must be prepared to work in English and possess excellent drafting skills. Knowledge of French and Spanish, in particular for the field phase, is required. The Evaluation Branch at DOS recommends strongly that consultants from beneficiary countries will be employed (particularly, but not only, during the field phase).

The team-leader shall have considerable experience in managing evaluations of a similar size and character. In addition, each country team should be led by an experienced member of the team (or directly by the team leader).

The agreed team composition may be subsequently adjusted if necessary in the light of the final evaluation questions and selected countries for the field phase once they have been validated by the Reference Group.

A declaration of absence of conflict of interest should be signed by each consultant and annexed to the offer.

9. Time Schedule

The evaluation should start in September 2010, the completion of the Final Report is scheduled for July 2011 and the dissemination activities will take place as of September 2011.

An indicative schedule appears below188

10. Cost of the Evaluation and Payment Modalities

The overall cost of the evaluation should not exceed 800,000 USD. The contract will be awarded to the institute who will provide UNFPA with the most competitive technical and financial proposals.

### Indicative Time Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Phases and Stages</th>
<th>Notes and Reports</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal (UNFPA) arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendering Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations/Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Technical Evaluation to PSB</td>
<td></td>
<td>February 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Award</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESK PHASE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staging Phase</th>
<th>Inter Office Memo</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structuring Stage</td>
<td>Inception Report (draft)</td>
<td>May 2011 (first half)</td>
<td>RG Meeting (mid-May)</td>
<td>Payment of 30% of Total budget upon approval (DOS) of Inception Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report (final)</td>
<td>May 2011 (second half)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk Study</td>
<td>Draft Desk Report</td>
<td>End of June 2011</td>
<td>RG Meeting (early July)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Desk Report</td>
<td>End of July 2011</td>
<td>Payment of 30% of Total budget upon approval (DOS) of Final Desk Phase Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

188 The dates mentioned in the table may only be changed in view of optimizing the evaluation performance, and with the agreement of all concerned.
Payments modalities shall be as follow: 30% at the acceptance of the Inception Report; 30% at acceptance of Draft Final Report; 40% at acceptance of Final Report.

The invoices shall be sent to the Division for Oversight Services only after the Evaluation Branch/DOS confirms in writing the acceptance of the reports.

**Guidance on the country reports for the country case studies**

**Length:** Each country report should be of a maximum 15-page length (excluding annexes).

The *Thematic Evaluation of the support of UNFPA in the area of maternal health* is partly based on a number of country case studies. These case studies allow the evaluation team to gather information on the interventions of UNFPA aiming at lowering maternal mortality ratio at the country level, which together with the desk phase findings should feed the global assessment reported in the Final Report.

The country reports are needed for transparency reasons, i.e.; to clearly account for the basis of the evaluation, and also to be able to have a factual check with the concerned country and regional offices and other stakeholders.

At the end of the evaluation the country reports will be published as part of the overall evaluation exercise in annexes to the final report. These reports should be prepared after the missions, they should respect the agreed structure and they should go further than the oral presentations (exit meeting debriefings) conducted at the end of the missions in the premises of the country offices.

Note that the evaluation questions are formulated to be answered on the global level using the sum of the information collected from the different case studies and the desk study, and should hence not be answered at the country case study level.

**Indicative structure for country reports:**

1. Introduction (including: purpose of the evaluation; purpose of the country report; reasons for selecting this country as a case study country).

2. Data collection methods used (its limits and possible constraints)
3. Short description of the reproductive health sector in the country

4. Findings on the theme under evaluation (focused on facts and not going into analysis)

5. Conclusions at two levels: (1) covering the main issues on country office intervention to lower MMR in the context of the country and (2) covering the elements confirming or not confirming the desk phase hypothesis.

6. Annexes (including: list of people interviewed; list of documents consulted; list of the interventions, projects and programmes specifically considered; all project assessment fiches; all questionnaires; acronyms and abbreviation).

**Outline structure of the final evaluation reports**

**Length:** The overall length of the final evaluation reports should not be greater than 60 pages (including the executive summary). Additional information on overall context, programme or aspects of methodology and analysis should be confined to the annexes (which however should be restricted to the important information).

1. **Executive summary**

   **Length:** 5 pages maximum

   This executive summary must produce the following information:

   1.1 Purpose of the evaluation;
   
   1.2 Background to the evaluation;
   
   1.3 Methodology;
   
   1.4 Analysis and main findings for each Evaluative Question and short overall assessment;
   
   1.5 Main conclusions;*
   
   1.6 Main recommendations.*

   * Conclusions and recommendations must be ranked and prioritized according to their relevance to the evaluation and their importance, and they should also be cross-referenced back to the key findings. Length-wise, the parts dedicated to the conclusions and recommendations should represent about 40% of the executive summary.

2. **Introduction**

   **Length:** 5 pages

   2.1. Synthesis of UNFPA’s mandate and strategy in the field of maternal health/reduction of MMR: the objectives, how they are prioritized and ordered, their logic both internally (i.e.; the existence – or not – of a logical link between the UNFPA’s approach and expected impacts) and externally (i.e.; within the context of the needs of the country, government policies, and the programmes of other donors); the implicit assumptions and risk factors; the intended impacts of UNFPA’s interventions.*

   2.2. Context: brief analysis of the political, economic, social and cultural dimensions, as well as the needs, potential for and main constraints.*

   2.3. Purpose of the Evaluation: presentation of the evaluative questions

   * Only the main points of these sections should be developed within the report. More detailed treatment should be confined to annexes.

3. **Methodology**

   **Length:** 10 pages maximum

   In order to answer the evaluative questions a number of methodological instruments must be presented by the consultants – these include in particular:

   3.1. Data and Information Collection: Scope and methods for data collection. The consultants will indicate any limitations and will describe how the data should be cross-checked to validate the analysis.
3.2. Methods of Analysis of the data and information obtained for each evaluation question (indicating any eventual limitations);

3.3. Methods of judgment (incl. judgment criteria and indicators for each evaluation question)

4. Main findings and analysis

**Length:** 20 to 30 pages

4.1. Answers to each Evaluation Question, indicating findings and conclusions for each;

4.2. Overall assessment of the support of UNFPA in the area of maternal health with the aim of lowering the MMR. This assessment should cover:

- Relevance to needs and overall context, including development priorities and co-ordination with other donors;

- Effectiveness in terms of how far the intended results were achieved:

- Efficiency: in terms of how far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time and other resource considerations contributed or hindered the achievement of results;

- Sustainability: whether the results can be maintained over time.

5. A full set of conclusions and recommendations

**Length:** 10 pages

A full set of conclusions* and recommendations* (i) for each evaluation question; (ii) as well as an overall judgment.

*All conclusions should be cross-referenced back by paragraph to the appropriate findings.

Recommendations must be ranked and prioritized according to their relevance and importance to the purpose of the evaluation (also they shall be cross-referenced back by paragraph to the appropriate conclusions).

6. Annexes

Annexes should include the list of interventions/programs specifically considered; the country reports, list of people interviewed, list of documentation, terms of reference; any other information which contains factual basis used in the evaluation, etc.
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UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: Mission Conjointe UNFPA; Région de l’Est ........................................... 2009
UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: Plan de Travail 2009 du Fonds Thématique pour la Santé Maternelle ........ 2009
UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: Politique et Normes en Matière De Santé De La Reproduction .................. 2006
UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: Projet Composant « Appui à la Lutte contre la Mortalité Maternelle » ........ 2004
UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: PTA 2008 SR ...................................................................................... 2008
UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: PTA 2009; Composante SR, produit 2: Appui à la Prévention du SIDA et les IST ......................................................................................... 2009
UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: Rapport Conjoint 2009 pour le Fonds Thématique Santé Maternelle, Programme Global, Projet Sage-femme, Programme Fistule ...................................................... 2010
UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: Rapport Conjoint pour le Fonds Thématique santé Maternelle, Programme Global, Projet Sage Femme, Programme Fistule, 2009 .............................................................. 2010
UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: Rapport Conjoint pour le Fonds Thématique santé Maternelle, Programme Global, Projet Sage-femme, Programme Fistule ...................................................... 2010
UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: Rapport d’Analyse des Études Menées dans le Cadre de Programmes/Projets en Santé Sexuelle et Reproductive des Adolescent(e)s au Burkina Faso ...................... 2005
UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: Rapport du Plan de Travail Annuel 2009 du Produit 1, Composante santé de la Reproduction .................................................................................................. 2009
UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: Rapport Synthèse des Différentes Rencontres Réalisées dans le Cadre de la Mission Conjointe dans la Région du Centre Est 2009


UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: SMTF 2010, Résumé 2010


UNFPA/Ministère de la Santé: Template for Country Annual Joint Reporting for the Thematic Funds 2009

UNFPA/Ministère des Finances et du Budget: Revue Annuelle à Mi-parcours du Programme de Coopération Burkina Faso – UNFPA 2003

UNFPA/OMS/UNICEF/IRSS: Rapport Conjoint pour le Fonds Thématique santé Maternelle, Programme Global, Projet Sage-femme, Programme Fistule 2010


UNFPA/Revue à Mi-parcours du Programme de Coopération 2001-2005; Rapport de Synthèse 2003

UNFPA/SP/CONAPO: Rapports Sectoriels Populations et Stratégie de Développement et SR 2003

UNFPA/UNICEF Joint Programme on FGM/C: Accelerating Change – Annual Monitoring and Reporting Tool 2009


UNFPA/GOS: Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2009-2012

UNFPA/GOS: Country Programme Documents (CPD) 2009-2012


UNFPA/GOS: Review/Assessment and Realignment of GOS/UNFPA-Funded Component Projects 2003


UNFPA/White Nile State: A Situation Analysis of Reproductive Health Services and Utilization Patterns in White Nile State, Sudan ........................................................................................................ NA

UNFPA: “Am here to stay because I want to help my people” - Report on the Assessment of the UNFPA-funded enrolled Nurse Training Programme in North-Western Province ........................................... 2010

UNFPA: 2009 Expenditures Report for Activities Against Thematic Trust Funds .................................................. 2009

UNFPA: 6ème Programme de Coopération UNFPA BF: Lettre d’accord des PTA, Composante SR; produit 2 .... 2006

UNFPA: 6ème Programme de Coopération UNFPA BF: Lettre d’accord des PTA, Composante SR; produits 1 et 3 ................................................................. 2006

UNFPA: Acceptabilité de la Vasectomie Antsirabe ......................................................... 2006

UNFPA: Africa regional office work plan ........................................................................ 2011 & 2010

UNFPA: Analysis of Targeting UNFPA Assistance ........................................................................ 2007

UNFPA: Annex C: Expenditures report for funds allocated by TD under MHTTF funds ......... 2010

UNFPA: Annual Joint Reporting for GP: RHCS & MHTF including Midwifery Programme ........... 2009

UNFPA: Annual Report 2010 .......................................................................................... 2010

UNFPA: Annual Review Meeting -2009, Gender Component Achievements ............. 2009


UNFPA: Annual Work Plan Approved 2008 for the UNFPA Midwifery Programme ........ 2008

UNFPA: Annual Work Plan for IPs in the reproductive health Component ...................... 2010

UNFPA: Annual Work Plan for Midwifery and Fistula Programs .................................. 2010

UNFPA: Annual Work Plans with Implementing Partners .......................................................... 2006-2011

UNFPA: Assessment of Development Results Supported by UNFPA CP4 for Lao PDR: Report and Recommendations ................................................................. 2011

UNFPA: Barriers to family planning in Sudan: The Case of White Nile, Kassala and Al Gadarif States 2008 .. 2008

UNFPA: Business Case for the Decentralization of UNFPA Offices in the RDC ............. 2010

UNFPA: Capacity Building of Master Trainers under the Project “Incorporating Gender Considerations in Reproductive Health and Communication” .................................................. 2006


UNFPA: Concept Note – Early Marriages and Childbearing in Ghana ............................... 2006

UNFPA: Condom Destination Audit ............................................................................. 2009

UNFPA: Country Annual Joint Reporting for the Reproductive Health Thematic Funds .......... 2010

UNFPA: Country Annual Joint Reporting for the Thematic Funds ..................................... 2009, 2010

UNFPA: Country Annual Joint Reporting for the Thematic Funds, North Sudan ............. 2009

UNFPA: Country Annual Joint Reporting for the Thematic Funds: Midwifery ......................... 2010
UNFPA: Country Annual Joint Reporting for the Thematic Funds: RHCS ............................ 2010
UNFPA: Country Annual Joint Reporting for the Thematic Funds: RHCS and MHTF; Obstetric Fistula and Midwifery Interventions .................................................. 2009
UNFPA: Country Annual Joint Reporting for the Thematic Funds: RHCS, Midwifery and Fistula ......... 2010
UNFPA: Country Annual Report for Thematic Funds – Fistula. ........................................ 2010
UNFPA: Country Programme Performance Summary ................................................ 2008
UNFPA: Darfur MTR: Darfur Humanitarian Program .................................................. 2011
UNFPA: Desk Review And Baseline Study Of Midwifery Pre-Service and In-Service Education For Planning Interventions Towards MDGs four, five & six ....................... 2009
UNFPA: Detailed Midwifery Work plans for 18 Midwifery Training Institutions and Ethiopia Midwifery Association. ................................................................. 2011
UNFPA, Division of Oversight Services: Country Programme Evaluation Cameroon, 2008-2011. ........................................ 2011
UNFPA, Division of Oversight Services: Evaluación del Programa de País Bolivia, 2008-2011. ................. 2011
UNFPA: Enquête MICS .................................................................................. 2011
UNFPA: Ethiopia Gender Survey. A Study in seven Regions ........................................ 2010
UNFPA: Étude Socio Anthropologique des Fistules Obstétricales dans les Régions Sanitaires de l’Est du Centre Est et du Sahel au Burkina Faso .................................................. 2004
UNFPA: Évaluation des Besoins en Matière de Soins Obstétricaux et Néonatals d’Urgence à Madagascar … 2010
UNFPA: Évaluation des Capacités Nationales Susceptibles d’être les partenaires de mise en œuvre du 5e programme ........................................................................ 2004
UNFPA: Évaluation Finale du Programme de Coopération Burkina Faso-UNFPA 2006-2010 – Composante Population et Développement .............................................. N/A
UNFPA: Evaluation of GOG/UN System Programme for Promoting Gender Equality in Ghana ............. 2004
UNFPA: Evaluation of Northern And Southern Sector Projects ............................................................ 2005
UNFPA: Expenditure Details Report for Funds Allocated by Commodity Security Branch for RHCS Activities Implementation ................................................................. 2009
UNFPA: Expenditure Report for funds allocated by TD under MHTF, UBW and GPRHCS funds: Fistula… 2010
UNFPA: Expenditure Report for funds allocated by TD under MHTF, UBW and GPRHCS funds: Midwifery ................................................................ 2010
UNFPA: Expenditure Report GPRHCS & MHTF ........................................................................ 2009-2010
UNFPA: Expenditures Report for Activities Against Thematic Trust Funds ............................................ 2009
UNFPA: Field Monitoring Reports ...................................................................................................... 2010
UNFPA: Final Report on the Safe Motherhood Community-Based Survey, Ethiopia ............................. N/A
UNFPA: GBV Prevention and Response Training Feedback Report ....................................................... 2011
UNFPA: GoK/UNFPA 7th Country Programme Recommendations Tracking Tool – living document. … 2011
UNFPA: GPRHCS Mid-Year Progress Report ......................................................................................... 2010
UNFPA: Health Sector Information required for .................................................................................. 2010
UNFPA: Idea Catalogue 2010: It Pays to Invest in Women Getting MDG 5 and maternal health on the media agenda in the lead-up to the global Women Deliver conference in June and the UN MDG High Level Summit in September 2010 ................................................................. 2010
UNFPA: Interim Report on Midwifery in Republic of Sudan .................................................................. 2009
UNFPA: Investing in Midwives and Others with Midwifery Skills to Accelerate Progress towards MDG5: A Proposal for Three Years ........................................................................... 2007
UNFPA: Joint Programme Results Framework with financial information .............................................. 2011
UNFPA: Joint Reporting for the Thematic Funds Ethiopia ................................................................. 2009
UNFPA: Knowledge, attitudes and practices of Sudanese health care providers towards HIV/AIDS patients in health settings ................................................................. 2008
UNFPA: La Profession de Sage-femme à Madagascar ................................................................. 2009
UNFPA: Lao PDR Annual Report ........................................................................................................ 2001-2002
UNFPA: Lao PDR Application to the MHTF ...................................................................................... 2010
UNFPA: Lao PDR Proposal for GPRHCS and MHTF ........................................................................ 2010
UNFPA: Luapula Province Maternal Death Review (MDR) Orientation and Training of Trainers ......... 2008
UNFPA: Maternal Health: the National Situation ............................................................................ 2011
UNFPA: Media plan 2010: It Pays to Invest in Women - Getting MDG 5 and maternal health on the media agenda in the lead-up to the global Women Deliver conference in June and the UN MDG High Level Summit in September ................................................................. 2010
UNFPA: MHTF Annual Report 2010 ............................................................................................... 2011
UNFPA: MHTF Review Annual Reports 2009/AWP 2010 .............................................................. 2009-2010
UNFPA: Mid-Term Reporting for the Thematic Funds ....................................................................... 2011
UNFPA: Mission de Suivi des Activités des PTA sur le Terrain ........................................................ 2007
UNFPA: Monitoring And Evaluation Report of UNFPA Project Gha/03/POL: Strengthening Community-Based Reproductive Health Services In The Central Region 2008
UNFPA: Multi-Sector, Multi-Partner, Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Gender-Based Violence Prevention and Response in Darfur. An Overview 2006
UNFPA: Office Management Plan Ethiopia 2006
UNFPA: Operational Challenges in Designing and Managing Country Programmes in the Context of the New Aid Environment and UN Reform: Experience in Ethiopia 2006
UNFPA: Plan Annuel de Travail 2010: Renforcement de la Disponibilité et de l’Utilisation des Services SR de Qualité 2010
UNFPA: Plan général MMR 2005 2005
UNFPA: Policies and Procedures Manual -Thematic Trust Funds Guidelines
UNFPA: Programme Coordination and Assistance Component Project Document 2007
UNFPA: Project Budget Balance Ethiopia 2010
UNFPA: Project Evaluation GHA/01/P07 Analysis & Utilization of Population Data for Policy Formulation and Implementation 2005
UNFPA: Project Evaluation Strengthening the Implementation of an Innovative and Culturally Sensitive Integrated Community Based Reproductive Health Service Delivery in the Upper East Region of Ghana 2004
UNFPA: Rapport Annuel Conjoint des Fonds Thématiques à Madagascar 2009
UNFPA: Rapport Annuel des Activités: Initiative Conjointe de Lutte contre les Violences Sexuelles 2005
UNFPA: Rapport Annuel du Projet Conjoint SGBV 2006
UNFPA: Rapport Conjoint pour le Fonds Thématique Santé Maternelle, Programme Global, Projet Sage-femme, Programme Fistule 2010
UNFPA: Rapport d’Étape Type: Genre 2009
UNFPA: Rapport d’Étape Type: Santé de la Reproduction 2008-2009
UNFPA: Rapport de Mission d’Évaluation Projet de Réinsertion des Ex-Fistuleuses Mandritsara 2009
UNFPA: Rapport National de Suivi (+10) des OMD 3 et OMD 5 2010
UNFPA: Rapport Semestriel des Incidents de Violences Sexuelles 2006
UNFPA: Rapport Semestriel du Projet Conjoint SGBV 2006
UNFPA: Report – Global Programme on Reproductive Health Commodities & Maternal Health Thematic Fund. 2010
UNFPA: Report of the Evaluation of Project GHA/01/P08 Strengthening the Integration of Reproductive Health Services into Private Medical Practice. 2005
UNFPA: Report of UNFPA Western Cluster Meeting. 2007
UNFPA: Report on the Inter-divisional Mission of UNFPA to the RDC. 2009
UNFPA: Reports on costing of Reproductive Health Roadmap for Blue Nile, Gadaref, Kassala, South Kordofan, White Nile. 2011
UNFPA: Reproductive Health at the Margins. Results from PEER Studies in Southern Lao PDR. 2008
UNFPA: Reproductive Health- HIV/AIDS Programme SDN5R43A – Progress Report. 2010
UNFPA: Reproductive Health Performance and Key Results of Reproductive Health. 2010
UNFPA: Reproductive Health Progress Report. 2009
UNFPA: Review Annual Reports 2009/AWP 2010. 2010
UNFPA: Review of the Country Annual Joint Reporting for Thematic Trust Funds. 2009-2010
UNFPA: Revised MTR for UNFPA Country Programme Sudan. 2011
UNFPA: Sécurité Contraceptive à Madagascar. 2008
UNFPA: Situation des Refoules Congolais de l’Angola. 2009
UNFPA: SMTF 2010 (Joint planning). 2010
UNFPA: Southern Sudan Integrated MHTF Report for 2010. 2010
UNFPA: Southern Sudan Midwifery Report. 2010
UNFPA: Standard Progress Report. Empowering Communities to Improve Reproductive Health. 2010
UNFPA: Sudan: New Context, Old Problems – A quick look at the programming environment for UNFPA 2011
UNFPA: Summary of all Expenditures in Components reproductive health, population and development and Gender 2009-2011
UNFPA: Synthèse des projets et programmes santé de la reproduction/santé maternelle et néonatale de UNFPA Burkina Faso 2010
UNFPA: Template for Country Annual Joint Reporting for the Thematic Funds (South Sudan) 2009
UNFPA: The Effects of Conflict on the Health and Well-being of Women and Girls in Darfur 2006
UNFPA: The Maternal Health Thematic Fund (MHTF) – Sudan Proposal 2010
UNFPA: The Maternal Health Thematic Fund, 2011 Guidance Note. Accelerating Progress towards Millennium Development Goal 5 - Focus, Partnerships, Results 2011
UNFPA: The Policy and Legal Framework Protecting the Rights of Women and Girls in Ethiopia N/A
UNFPA: Thematic Evaluation of National Programmes and UNFPA Experience in the Campaign to End Fistula. Kenya Desk Review (draft) 2009
UNFPA: UN Workplan Life-saving, comprehensive, and multi-sectoral prevention and response to GBV survivors in Darfur 2010
UNFPA: UNFPA en Action 2010
UNFPA: UNFPA in Darfur: 2011 health priorities and needs for Reproductive Health support 2011
UNFPA: UNFPA Sudan Strategic Planning Meeting 2011 – Presentation of Financial Performance and Operational Issues 2011
UNFPA: UNFPA-HRU Sudan CO Reproductive Health/GBV Consultancy Report 2011
UNFPA: Unified Budget and Work plan UNFPA Broad Activities, Key Outputs with Indicators and targets related to MHTF and GPRHCS 2010-2011
UNFPA: Utilisation du Téléphone Portable pour la Surveillance des Décès Maternels et Néonatals et des Intrants de Sante de la Reproduction 2011
UNFPA: Work Plan and Monitoring Tool 2010
UNFPA: Zambia Mid-Year RHCS Report for the Reproductive Health Thematic Funds 2011
UNFPA-Cambodia: Briefing Kit 2009
UNFPA-Cambodia: Second Health Sector Support Programme II/UNFPA 2010 AWP Budget Revision .... 2010
UNFPA-Cambodia: UNFPA and the 2008 Population Census of Cambodia” .................................. 2008
UNICEF: Assessment of Village Midwives, in five states ............................................................... 2006
United Nations in Cambodia: Cambodia Common Country Assessment 2009 .................................. 2010
United Nations: Country programme document for Cambodia ...................................................... 2005
United Nations: Final Country programme document for Cambodia .............................................. 2010
United Nations: Situation Analysis of Youth in Cambodia ......................................................... 2009
University of Health Sciences - Faculty of Post-Graduate Studies and National Institute of Public Health - Emergency Obstetric and Newborn Care Needs Assessment in 12 Selected Provinces, Final Report. ........ 2011
USAID: Zambia: Reproductive Health Commodity Security Assessment ....................................... 2010
WHO, UNFPA, UNICEF, The World Bank: A country level communications project supporting joint UN action to improve maternal and newborn health in priority countries ........................................ 2010
WHO/UNFPA: Enquête Confidentielle des Décès Maternels ........................................................ 2010
WHO: Global Health Observatory Data Repository ........................................................................ 2011
## List of People Interviewed

### List of persons met in New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Attina, Teresa</td>
<td>Programme Associate for the Maternal Health Thematic Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Bergevin, Yves</td>
<td>Co-ordinator, Maternal Health Thematic Fund, Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Brasseur, Olivier</td>
<td>Director, Division for Oversight Services (DOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Carou-Jones, Valeria</td>
<td>Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Branch, Division of Oversight Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Charpentier, Louis</td>
<td>Chief, Evaluation Branch, Division of Oversight Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Collins, Lynn</td>
<td>Technical Adviser, HIV and Women, HIV AIDS Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>De Bernis, Luc</td>
<td>Maternal Health Advisor, secondment from WHO, Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Fauveau, Vincent</td>
<td>Senior Maternal Health Advisor, TD, Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Franca, Etienne</td>
<td>Media Specialist, Campaign to End Fistula, Media and Communication Branch, Information and External Relations Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Guzman, Jose Miguel</td>
<td>Chief, Population and Development Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Hounton, Sennen</td>
<td>Technical Specialist, Maternal Health Thematic Fund, Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Iversen, Katja</td>
<td>Media Specialist, Media and Communication Branch, Information and External Relations Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Kadibey, Monica</td>
<td>Deputy Director, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Laski, Laura</td>
<td>Chief, Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Lin, Yanming</td>
<td>Regional Desk Advisor, Asia and the Pacific, Programme Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Loaiza, Edilberto</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser, Population and Development. Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Martinelli-Heckkadon, Sonia</td>
<td>Regional Desk Advisor, Latin America and Caribbean, Programme Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Melo Luz, Angela</td>
<td>Human Rights Adviser, Gender, Human Rights and Culture Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Nelson, Gayle</td>
<td>Technical Adviser, Gender, Gender, Human Rights and Culture Branch TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Ogbuagu, Kechi F.</td>
<td>Technical Advisor/Coordinators Global Programme on RHCS, Commodity security Branch, Technical Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Roberts, Olivia</td>
<td>Evaluation Analyst, Evaluation Branch, Division for Oversight Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Pedersen Simoni, Klaus</td>
<td>Resource Mobilisation Advisor, Resource Mobilisation Branch, Information and External Relations Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Usmani, Farah</td>
<td>Planning Adviser, Environmental Scanning and Planning Branch, Programme Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of persons interviewed by phone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICM</td>
<td>Bridges, Agneta</td>
<td>Secretary General, International Confederation of Midwives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The World Bank</td>
<td>Mills, Samuel, Dr.</td>
<td>Senior Health Specialist, Health, Nutrition, &amp; Population Human Development Network, The World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Addico, Gifty</td>
<td>Technical Adviser, Reproductive Health Commodity Security, SRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Azandegbe, Nestor, Dr.</td>
<td>Reproductive Health/Maternal Health Technical Advisor - UNFPA sub-regional office Dakar SRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Dairo, Akinyele Eric, Dr.</td>
<td>Senior Programme and Technical Advisor - UNFPA Africa regional office ARO - Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Kongnyuy, Eugene</td>
<td>MHTF Technical Specialist, Madagascar country office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>Mathai, Saramma Thomas, Dr.</td>
<td>Regional Team Coordinator and Maternal Health Advisor – UNFPA Asia Pacific regional office APRO - Bangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Bathija, Heli, Dr.</td>
<td>Area Manager for the African and Eastern Mediterranean Regions, Department of Reproductive Health and Research (RHR) - Cluster of Family, Women and Children Health (FWC) - World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>Mason, Elisabeth, Dr.</td>
<td>Director Department of Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health, World Health Organisation, WHO, Geneva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### List of persons from UNFPA who attended the RG meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addico, Gifty</td>
<td>Technical Adviser, Reproductive Health Commodity Security, SRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergevin, Yves</td>
<td>Co-ordinator, Maternal Health Thematic Fund, Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carou-Jones, Valeria</td>
<td>Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Branch, Division of Oversight Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambel Alexandra</td>
<td>Evaluation Advisor, Evaluation Branch, Division of Oversight Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charpentier, Louis</td>
<td>Chief, Evaluation Branch, Division of Oversight Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Lynn</td>
<td>Technical Adviser, HIV and Women, HIV AIDS Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daoudi, Hicham</td>
<td>Senior Evaluation Advisor, Evaluation Branch, Division of Oversight Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug, Werner</td>
<td>Director of Technical Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounton, Sennen</td>
<td>Technical Specialist, Maternal Health Thematic Fund, Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iversen, Katya</td>
<td>Media Specialist, Media and Communication Branch, Information and External Relations Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaidbey, Mona</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Technical Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongnyuy, Eugene</td>
<td>MHTF Technical Specialist, Madagascar country office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lal, Geeta</td>
<td>Midwifery Programme Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaiza, Edilberto</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser, Population and Development. Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machefsky, Rachel</td>
<td>Programme Associate/Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mars-Mompoint, Magalye</td>
<td>Evaluation Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, Gayle</td>
<td>Technical Adviser, Gender, Gender, Human Rights and Culture Branch Technical Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
List of persons from UNFPA who attended the RG meetings (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ortayali, Nuriye</td>
<td>Technical adviser, family planning, sexual and reproductive health Branch, TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedersen, Klaus Simoni</td>
<td>Resource Mobilisation Advisor, Resource Mobilisation Branch, Information and External Relations Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Olivia</td>
<td>Evaluation Analyst, Evaluation Branch, Division for Oversight Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usmani, Farah</td>
<td>Planning Adviser, Environmental Scanning and Planning Branch, Programme Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderree, Marleen</td>
<td>Programme Associate/Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abakrampa Health Clinic Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sophia Forson</td>
<td>Midwife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Health Sciences, Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Abd Al Rahman</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Health Sciences, Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Daffalla Alam Elhuda</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Health Sciences, Gadaref</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Laila Tanions Gergis</td>
<td>Supervisor and Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Phoxay Xayavong</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Barbara Lochmann</td>
<td>Sr. Social Sector Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Juliana Tunguzi</td>
<td>Midwifery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArLaeng Village, Chrey Bak commune, Kampong Chhnang District, Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Pao Chuom</td>
<td>Women in the community (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAFF (OBC)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Gouem Moumouni</td>
<td>President ASAFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAFF (OBC)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Palé Marguerite</td>
<td>Comptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAFF (OBC)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Bancé Safiatou</td>
<td>Suivi Évaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAFF (OBC) Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Yamba Askandar</td>
<td>Coordonnateur PADS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblée Nationale Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Deputé Ouédraogo Jacob</td>
<td>Membre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Chrétienne pour le Développement de la Femme et de l’Enfant DRC</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mr. Julien</td>
<td>Directeur Exécutif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breastfeeding Association of Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ruth Muzumara</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Tuléar. Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Équipe de la maternité du Chu</td>
<td>CHU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Health Access Initiative Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Tracy Rudne Hawry</td>
<td>Programme Manager, HRH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Health Access Initiative Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Chikusela Sikazwe</td>
<td>Programme Manager, Male Circumcision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNOSFM/ABSF</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Zerbo Georgette</td>
<td>Membre de l'Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Science, of Champasack, Champasack Province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Vilaysack Bougnarith</td>
<td>Deputy Director, College of Health Science of Champasack (Gynecologist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMOG</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Abdul Manan</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conseil national de l'ordre des sages femmes maïeuticiens(CNOSFM)/ABSF</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ouedraogo Karidja</td>
<td>Membre de l'Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Ministers, National Committee for Population and Development (NCPD) Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>HE. Katika Chamroeun</td>
<td>Under Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Ministers, National Committee for Population and Development (NCPD) Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Maneth Nhém</td>
<td>Head of Training Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPS 2 Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Zabré Drissa</td>
<td>Infirmier Chef de Poste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPS 2 Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Minoungou Rasolgwédé</td>
<td>Accoucheuse Auxiliaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious Minds Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Emmanuel Ashong</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Health Access Initiative Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Tracy Rudne Hawry</td>
<td>Programme Manager, HRH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Ministers, National Committee for Population and Development (NCPD) Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>HE. Katika Chamroeun</td>
<td>Under Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Ministers, National Committee for Population and Development (NCPD) Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Maneth Nhém</td>
<td>Head of Training Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPS 2 Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Zabré Drissa</td>
<td>Infirmier Chef de Poste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPS 2 Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Minoungou Rasolgwédé</td>
<td>Accoucheuse Auxiliaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious Minds Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Emmanuel Ashong</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doka Hospital Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Abd Al Aziem</td>
<td>Medical Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ganou Marc</td>
<td>Point Focal de la DRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRS du Sahel (organisation de la collecte des données)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Yanou Saidou</td>
<td>Directeur Régional de la Santé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSME Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Naré</td>
<td>Directeur de la Santé des Adolescents, des Jeunes et des Personnes Âgés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSME Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Serges Sary</td>
<td>Service de Planification Familiale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSME Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Nobila Sawadogo</td>
<td>Responsable Service de Maternité à Moindre Risque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSME Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sanou Ouedraogon Djénéba</td>
<td>Directrice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>École Nationale de Santé Publique (ENSP) Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mathieu Ouéréssé</td>
<td>Directeur Régional d’École Nationale de Santé Publique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfants du Monde Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sankara T. Tene</td>
<td>Représentant de l'ONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Midwives Association</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Hiwot Wubeshest</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Dawit Desalegn</td>
<td>ESOG Board Member and Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Selamawit Kifle</td>
<td>ESOG Board Member and Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Care international Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Bassané</td>
<td>Responsable Pays FCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Guidance Association of Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Haregewoin Kiflom</td>
<td>Technical Assistant Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Guidance Association of Ethiopia, South Western Area Office</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dessalegn Workineh</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Guidance Association of Ethiopia, South Western Area Office</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Zewdie Mulissa</td>
<td>Clinical Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ministry of Health Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Miheret Hiluf</td>
<td>Rural Directorate Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Ministry of Health, Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Department Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Mengistu H/mariam</td>
<td>Disease Prevention and Health Promotion General Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fédération des sages-femmes Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Jeannine Amélie</td>
<td>Secrétaire général de la Fédération des sages-femmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHOK Youth Friendly Center at Eastleigh</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Angela Tatua</td>
<td>Centre Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fistula Center Kassala</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Amira Okod</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondation pour le développement Communautaire (FDC)/IFC Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Bargo Aminata</td>
<td>Représentante de l'ONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadaref Midwifery School</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Zeinab Mohamed Ahmed</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Director State MoH, North Darfur, Officer in Charge</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Muneer Mohammed Matar</td>
<td>Emergency Humanitarian Action/NGOs Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Health Service</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Peace Akormedie</td>
<td>Family Health Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Health Service</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Yaa Osei Asante</td>
<td>Family Health Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Health Service</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Gloria Quansah Asare</td>
<td>Director of Family Health Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Health Service</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Claudette Diogo</td>
<td>Family Health Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Health Service</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Rejoice Nutakor</td>
<td>Family Health Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Health Service (GHS)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Patrick Aboagye</td>
<td>Family Health Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Health Service Central Region</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Esther Oyinka</td>
<td>Director, Public Education Unit (UNFPA Desk Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Health Service Central Region</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Matthew Ahwireng</td>
<td>Regional Health Promotion Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Health Service Central Region</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mr. Kyeremateng</td>
<td>Deputy Regional Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Nursing and Midwifery School (Korle Bu, Accra)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Netta Ackon</td>
<td>Programme Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Nursing and Midwifery School (Korle Bu, Accra)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Gloria Tetteh</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Registered Midwives Association (GRMA)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Joyce Jetuah</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Registered Midwives Association (GRMA)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Gifty Mantey</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Statistical Service</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sylvester Gyamfi</td>
<td>Head of Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Statistical Service</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Philomena Nyako</td>
<td>Deputy Government Statistician in charge of Operations and Demography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Statistical Service</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Anthony Pharinn</td>
<td>Head of Survey Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Statistical Service (GSS)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Magnus Ebo Duncan</td>
<td>Head of Economics Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kofi Osea Addo</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Oheneba Adjei</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Peter Kofi Amoah</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>S. K. Amposah</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mark Appiah</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Francis Bentum</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Adjei Boakye</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Issah Bukari</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Matthias Coffie</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Anthony Ekow Daatse</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Amos Dadzie</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Isaac Kow Eduf</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>K. A. Gyasi</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>William A. Kporvie</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kofi Menu</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Matthew Quansah</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRTU Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Francis Sam</td>
<td>GPRTU Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center Chrey Bak, Chrey Bak commune, Kampong Chhnang District, Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sokun Meas</td>
<td>Head of health centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center Chrey Bak, Chrey Bak commune, Kampong Chhnang District, Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sothea Rath</td>
<td>Vice head of health centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center Chrey Bak, Chrey Bak commune, Kampong Chhnang District, Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sothea Rath Kong</td>
<td>Health centre staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center Chrey Bak, Chrey Bak commune, Kampong Chhnang District, Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Leng Channe</td>
<td>Commune Chief, and health staff of health centre Health Centre Management team and Women and children’s focal point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center Chrey Bak, Chrey Bak commune, Kampong Chhnang District, Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Chhum Pao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center Chrey Bak, Chrey Bak commune, Kampong Chhnang District, Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Yoeum Keo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center Chrey Bak, Chrey Bak commune, Kampong Chhnang District, Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Im Koeun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center Chrey Bak, Chrey Bak commune, Kampong Chhnang District, Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Piny Phuok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center Chrey Bak, Chrey Bak commune, Kampong Chhnang District, Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sao Sambor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Poverty Action Lao PDR (Former HU)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ketsadasak Kiettisack</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital of National Maternal and Child Health Center (NMCHC) Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Thavy Heing</td>
<td>Chief of OPD and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital of National Maternal and Child Health Center (NMCHC) Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sophornary Say</td>
<td>Midwives of NMCHC hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital of National Maternal and Child Health Center (NMCHC) Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Bou Rum Bun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Jemimah Dennis-Antwi</td>
<td>Regional Midwives Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFP Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Amélie Tatavy</td>
<td>Directeur des Instituts de formation paramédicale, IFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPF Field Office Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Ketkeo Soudachan</td>
<td>National Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRSS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Kouanda</td>
<td>Épidémiologiste, responsable de la Section Santé Publique, Chef d’Équipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRSS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Thieba Millogo</td>
<td>Assistant de Recherche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasempa District Health Office</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mr. Shikelenge</td>
<td>Public Health Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasempa District Health Office</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Joyce Kamwana</td>
<td>Reproductive health focal point person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayayei Youth Association Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mohammed Salifu</td>
<td>Founder Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayayei Youth Association Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Fati Alhassan</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayayei Youth Association Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ayisha Zakaria</td>
<td>First Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayayei Youth Association Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Laraba Ibrahim</td>
<td>Branch Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayayei Youth Association Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Jemilah Fuseini</td>
<td>Group Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayayei Youth Association Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Asana Alhassan</td>
<td>Organizer and Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayayei Youth Association Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ayishetu Alhassan</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayayei Youth Association Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Amatu Issakah</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayayei Youth Association Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sumaiya Mohammed</td>
<td>Savings Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer Youth Association (KYA)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Chansen Sun</td>
<td>President of KYA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kralanh Operation District, Siem Reap Province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Siravuth Long</td>
<td>Director of Operational District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kralanh Operation District, Siem Reap Province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Neary Reak Duong</td>
<td>Director of MCH of Operational District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYA</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kosal Phan Pheab</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao Women Union</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kaysamy Latvilayvong</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux-Development Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Frank Haggerman</td>
<td>Health System Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Stops Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Baholisoa Randrianasalom</td>
<td>Médecin Chef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Stops Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Thierry Ramananantsoa</td>
<td>Project manager Misoprostol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Stops Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sylvie Ramandrosa</td>
<td>Directeur financier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternité de Kitambo</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Katoba</td>
<td>Médecin Directeur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries  (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministère de la Jeunesse et des loisirs Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Marie Ange Tifana</td>
<td>Coordonnateur du programme de la santé des jeunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministère de la Santé Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Claude Congo</td>
<td>Chef de Service Recrutement et Formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MoFEP) Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Stella Williams</td>
<td>Assistant Director, UN Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MoFEP) Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Nana Yaw Yankah</td>
<td>Desk Officer for UNFPA Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mainga Lowabelwa</td>
<td>Chief Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Francis Mpampi</td>
<td>Principle Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Pamela Kauseni</td>
<td>Principle Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Belinda Lumbula</td>
<td>Principle Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health - Gadaref State</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Ali Abd Al Rahman</td>
<td>Director General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health – Gadaref State</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Amira Mohammed</td>
<td>Reproductive Health Statistician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health – Gadaref State</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Aziza Abd Alrahim</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health – Gadaref State</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Abd Allh Al Bashier</td>
<td>PHC Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health – Gadaref State</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ekhlas Hassan</td>
<td>Inspector Health Visitor, MW teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health – Gadaref State</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Gebriel Mohammed Ali</td>
<td>Health Information System Officer, Reproductive Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health – Kassala State</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Moataz Abd Allah Abd Al Hadi</td>
<td>Director General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health (MoH) Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Afisa Zakaria</td>
<td>Director, Programmes, Projects, Monitoring and Evaluation (PPME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health/UNFPA</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Abraham Cingalika</td>
<td>RHCS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health/Department of Human Resource and Development (HRD)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Sam Song Phom</td>
<td>Deputy Director of HRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Prof. Huot Eng</td>
<td>Secretary of State, Director of Health Sector Support Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Sokhan Chhoung</td>
<td>Vice Rector of department of Drug and Food (DDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Anan Sacdpaseuth</td>
<td>Chair of Obstetric Society, Mahosoth Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Bounfeng Phoummalaysith</td>
<td>Deputy Director General of the Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Kaisone Choulramany</td>
<td>Director of Mother and Child Health Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Khamphithoun Somsamouth</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Centre of Information Education for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Phouthone Vangkonevilay</td>
<td>Deputy Director General Department of Organization &amp; Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Somchit Ackhavong</td>
<td>Deputy Director General Department of Hygiene &amp; Diseases Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Chanheme Somnavong</td>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Nursing Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Thanome Insane</td>
<td>Director of Medical Drugs Supply Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Phengdy Inthaphanith</td>
<td>Chief of Nursing and Midwifery Division, Department of Health Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Elizabeth Chazema Kawesha</td>
<td>Director Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Max Bweupe</td>
<td>Deputy Director PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Reuben Kamoto Mbewe</td>
<td>Director Technical Services and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Ruth Bweupe</td>
<td>Family Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health, Health Sector Support Programme 2009-13 (HSSP2)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Veasan Kiri Lo</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator of HSSP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health, Personnel Department (PD)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sambor May</td>
<td>Director/Deputy Director of PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health, Personnel Department (PD)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Sary Vannark Oeng</td>
<td>Head of staff management unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health, Personnel Department (PD)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Sony Lay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health/Department of International Cooperation (DIC)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Or Vandine</td>
<td>Director of DIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health/Cambodia Midwives Council (CMC)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Radalng</td>
<td>President of CMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health/Cambodia Midwives Council (CMC)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Pros Nguon</td>
<td>President of CMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Interior Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Malyna Yin</td>
<td>Director, deputy director, and officer of Department of local administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Interior Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Meng Sean Yam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Interior Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sopheak Say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Planning and Investment Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Phonevanh Outhavong</td>
<td>Deputy Director General, Department of Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Planning Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>HE. Sy Than San</td>
<td>Director general of National Institute of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Planning Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Nirmita Hou</td>
<td>Director of women and health department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Planning Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Danane Sengphal</td>
<td>HIV technical officer of women and health department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Planning Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Hak Chhun The</td>
<td>Deputy director of women and health department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Sports Youth and child development Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Toddy Mulonga</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Sports Youth and child development Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Collins A. Mulonda</td>
<td>Director Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Sports Youth and child development Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Abigail Malikutila</td>
<td>Senior Youth Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Sports Youth and child development Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Muma K. Mukupa</td>
<td>Chief Youth Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Sports Youth and child development Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ivy Mbangu</td>
<td>Chief Youth Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Women and Children’s Affairs Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Efua Anyanful</td>
<td>Director of Research and Economics Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Women and Children’s Affairs Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>G.K. Kumor</td>
<td>Director 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moree Health Centre Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Juliana Abban</td>
<td>Midwife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwansa Young Women’s Action Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Loindsay</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi City Council</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Robert Ayisi</td>
<td>City Hall Director of Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi City Council, Urban Slums Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mary Kimani</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Aids Council Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Ben Chirwa</td>
<td>Director General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assembly Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Somphou Douangsavanh</td>
<td>Deputy Director General of Commission for Socio-Culture of the LAPDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Assembly Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Bounlert Louandouangchanh</td>
<td>Secretary of LAPDD, Deputy Director General of Socio-Culture Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Center for Health Promotion, Ministry of Health</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sokun Ouk</td>
<td>Deputy Chief of Technical Bureau of National Center for Health Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Coordinating Agency for Population and Development, NCAPD</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Boniface Omuga K’Oyugi</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Maternal and Child Health Center (NMCHC) Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Prof. Rathavy Tung</td>
<td>Deputy Director of NMCHC and National Reproductive Health Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National MCH Center, JICA Project</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Yasuyo Osanai</td>
<td>Chief Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Ministry of Health Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Sawsan Eltahir Suleiman</td>
<td>Director of National Reproductive Health Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Youth Authority (NYA) Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Henry Adu</td>
<td>Regional Officer, Central Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOCC Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Nalucha Nganga Ziba</td>
<td>Communication &amp; Advocacy Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Marian Kpapka</td>
<td>Director, Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Stephen Kwankye</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBYGN Hospital Gadaref</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Abd Al Gader Mohammed Osman</td>
<td>Medical Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBYGN Hospital Gadaref</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Hussien Ameen</td>
<td>MDR Resident Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBYGN Hospital Gadaref</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Sami Al Safi</td>
<td>MDR Resident Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ouanga Jean Gabriel</td>
<td>Administrateur de Programme et Promotion de la Santé Familiale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONUSIDA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Jean Baptiste Gatali</td>
<td>Chargé de suivi évaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordre national des sages-femmes Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Omega Ranoromalala</td>
<td>Présidente Ordre national des sages-femmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordre national des sages-femmes Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Amélie Tatavy</td>
<td>Vice Présidente Ordre national des sages-femmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordre national des sages-femmes Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Bernadette Raharisoa</td>
<td>Secrétaire général Ordre national des sages-femmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Guira Matilibou</td>
<td>Suivi Évaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sanou Salamata</td>
<td>SE PADS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Baticio Rodrigue</td>
<td>FDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Berehoudougou Diane</td>
<td>Suivi Évaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ouedraogo Olivia</td>
<td>AES/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ouedraogo Lucien</td>
<td>ADRK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sawadogo Alice</td>
<td>ABBEF Bobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Belem Boukari</td>
<td>Projet Bobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>ONADJA Geneieve</td>
<td>IPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sawadogo Emmanuel</td>
<td>ABBEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kaboré Adama</td>
<td>SOS Sahel International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Koné Ablasse</td>
<td>SOS Jeunesse et Défis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Wend Yam</td>
<td>SOS Jeunesse et Défis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADS Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kaboré Celestin</td>
<td>SOS Jeunesse et Défis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Commission Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>H.E. Damry Ouk</td>
<td>Secretary-general and 6th Commission National Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Commission Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Vannak Heng</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel du District de Koupela</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Guigemde Armand</td>
<td>Médecin chef de district (MCD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel du District de Koupela</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Namoano Mamoussa</td>
<td>Responsable Programme Élargi de Vaccination (PEV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel du District de Koupela</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Diasso Abdramane</td>
<td>Responsable SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel du District de Koupela</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kaboré Madi</td>
<td>Centre d’Information Sanitaire et de Surveillance Épidémiologique (CISSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel du District Sanitaire de Tenkodogo</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Yanogo Mathieu</td>
<td>Service de Planification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel du District Sanitaire de Tenkodogo</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Diallo Adama</td>
<td>Médecin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel du District Sanitaire de Tenkodogo</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Traoré Bakary</td>
<td>Médecin, MCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel du District Sanitaire de Tenkodogo</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Yameogo Nadia</td>
<td>Médecin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel du District Sanitaire de Tenkodogo</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Zongo Pascal</td>
<td>Régisseur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel du District Sanitaire de Tenkodogo</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ouandago Hermann</td>
<td>Régisseur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel du District Sanitaire de Tenkodogo</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Swadogo Siméon</td>
<td>CISSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood Association of Zambia (PPAZ)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Henry Kaimba</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood Association of Zambia (PPAZ)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Edford Mutuna</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNUD Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Cyimana Ingrid</td>
<td>Directrice PNUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNUD Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dieudonne Kini</td>
<td>Administrateur de Programme et Gouvernance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNUD Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Zoungrana Salif</td>
<td>Coordonnateur de la Campagne de Plaidoyer pour les OMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPAG</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Albert Odamey</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestataire Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Équipe du Centre ami des jeunes Tanambao</td>
<td>Structure publique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestataire Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Equipe de la Maternité Marie Stops</td>
<td>Marie Stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestataire Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Angeline</td>
<td>Responsable de la pharmacie de gros de district. Manipulatrice du logiciel CHANEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestataire Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Trois (03) femmes ayant bénéficié du projet FO</td>
<td>Communauté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme d’Appui au Développement Sanitaire (PADS)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Harouna Diarra</td>
<td>Gestionnaire, Intérimaire du Directeur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme de santé sexuelle Droits Humains (PROSAD) (GIZ Burkina Faso)</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Guy Zoungrana</td>
<td>Chargé de la Composante SR et Lutte contre le VIH SIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projet de Lutte contre les Fistules Obstétricales dans la Région du Sahel</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Béré Yolande</td>
<td>Conseillère Technique Nationale en SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Health Department (PHD) of Siem Reap</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Kheng Darasy</td>
<td>Deputy of maternal and child health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial health department of Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sam Maly</td>
<td>Chief of MCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial hospital of Kampong Chhnang province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Tirathany Sorin</td>
<td>Director of provincial hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Training Center (RTC) (for Midwifery training), Battambang Province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Chhor Vaeng Ouk</td>
<td>Deputy of RTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Training Center (RTC) (for Midwifery training), Battambang Province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sophea Meak</td>
<td>Head of administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Training Center (RTC) (for Midwifery training), Battambang Province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Channary Moeung</td>
<td>Head of training unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Training Center (RTC) (for Midwifery training), Battambang Province</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ladar Kiev</td>
<td>Teacher and Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief International, North Darfur</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Head of Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réseau des Associations Islamiques en Population et Développement Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Cisse Ahmad Nassour</td>
<td>Président</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solwezi Provincial Health Office</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr George Llabwa</td>
<td>Provincial Health Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solwezi Provincial Health Office</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Winard Mumba</td>
<td>Clinical Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solwezi School of Nursing</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ngambo Mushikula</td>
<td>Principal Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solwezi School of Nursing</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Martha Mushi</td>
<td>THET (Tropical Health Education Trust)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solwezi Urban Clinic</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mulomba M.M. Chilumbu</td>
<td>Clinical Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solwezi Urban Clinic</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Doris Mpatisina</td>
<td>Nurse/Midwife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solwezi Urban Clinic</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Charity M.N. Libwa</td>
<td>Nurse/Midwife MCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solwezi Urban Clinic</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mable Muyupi</td>
<td>Nurse/Midwife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solwezi Urban Clinic</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Makwala Sandra</td>
<td>2nd Year student nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solwezi Urban Clinic</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mercy Mataliro</td>
<td>2nd Year student nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The World Bank, Cambodia country office</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Timothy A. Johnston</td>
<td>Senior Health Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time With Grandma/Grandpa Project (GHS, CR) Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Margaret Awotwie</td>
<td>Grandma/Adviser in Abresea Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time With Grandma/Grandpa Project (GHS, CR) Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Janet Sakyi</td>
<td>Grandma/Adviser in Abresea Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time With Grandma/Grandpa Project (GHS, CR) Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Victor Ocran</td>
<td>Teacher/Project Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time With Grandma/Grandpa Project (GHS, CR) Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Group of Youth/Pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Minh H. Pham</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator United Nations Resident Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Eiko Narita</td>
<td>Head of office of the UN Resident Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kongnyuy, Eugene</td>
<td>MHTF Technical Specialist, Madagascar country office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kante, Mamadou</td>
<td>UNFPA Représentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Compaore Zoungrana, Cecile</td>
<td>Assistant Représentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Zafiryadis, Christelle</td>
<td>JPO Genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Zerbo, Lacina</td>
<td>Programme Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kabore, Saidou</td>
<td>National Programme Officer (NPO) Pop. and Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kone, Andre</td>
<td>NPO Monitoring and Évaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kone, Ali</td>
<td>Programme Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Belemvire, Seydou</td>
<td>NPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sankara, Olga</td>
<td>NPO SR MMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dah, Judith</td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Zerbo Awa</td>
<td>Chargée de la Formation des Sages Femmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Siaka Traoré</td>
<td>NPO CCC Plaidoyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Marc Derveeuw</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sarah Knibbs</td>
<td>Deputy Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Turn May</td>
<td>Assistant Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Pon Rieng</td>
<td>Finance Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Muong Sopha</td>
<td>Programme Associate-EmONC, UNFPA Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Vandara Chong</td>
<td>National Programme Officer, Youth SRH and HIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sophanara Pen</td>
<td>Communications Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sochea Sam</td>
<td>National Officer of MCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Yi Soktha</td>
<td>National Officer of Population and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Marc Derveeuw</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Sathiarany Vong</td>
<td>RH Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Helen Amdemikael</td>
<td>Assistant Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Bethlehem Solomon</td>
<td>National Programme Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Michael Tekie</td>
<td>NPO reproductive health NOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dorothy Lazaro</td>
<td>International Midwifery Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Beza Nardo</td>
<td>Programme Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ayehualem Tameru</td>
<td>NPO HIV NOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dursit Abdishekur</td>
<td>NORAD NPO (Programme Coordinator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Berhanu Legesse</td>
<td>NPO NOC GENDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Behailu Gebremedhin</td>
<td>NPO NOB M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Tsigereda Tiruneh</td>
<td>National Midwifery Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Wondimagegn Fanta</td>
<td>Humanitarian Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Bernard Coquelin</td>
<td>Country Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Bawa Amadu</td>
<td>Assistant Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Esther Abaka</td>
<td>Personal Assistant to the CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Esi Awotwe</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Doris Mawuse Aglobitse</td>
<td>NPO Adviser RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mercy Osei-Konadu</td>
<td>NPO Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Fredrica Hanson</td>
<td>NPP Midwife Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Robert Mensah</td>
<td>Reproductive Health Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Ghana, Northern Region, Tamale Office</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mammah Tenei</td>
<td>Project Officer, Fistula Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Bouathip Phongsavath</td>
<td>MNCH/SBA Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Douangchanch Xaymounvong</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Sengsay Siphakanlaya</td>
<td>Programme Officer IEC/BCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Latsamy Sengvongdeuan</td>
<td>Finance Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Della Sherratt</td>
<td>SBA International Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Meiko Yabuta</td>
<td>Representative of CP4 (Interviewed by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Natasha Bolhman, Midwife</td>
<td>SSA-Midwife/Nurse Clinical Training Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Pafoualee Leechefoung</td>
<td>Assistant Representative - Gender (Interviewed by Skype)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sally Sakulku</td>
<td>MNCH Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>T.A Garagghan</td>
<td>SSA-ASRH/HIV Programme Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Cheikh Tidiane Cissé</td>
<td>Représentant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Eugène Kognyuy</td>
<td>Conseiller Technique, Santé Maternelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Edwige Ravaomanana</td>
<td>Chargée de programme santé de la reproduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dotiane Wanogo Ali</td>
<td>Conseiller Technique Principal - SPSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Nohisoa Rabenampoizina</td>
<td>Chargée de programme suivi et évaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Ratsarazaka Solomandresy</td>
<td>Chargée de programme humanitaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Lordfred Achu</td>
<td>Conseiller Technique Principal - SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Philemon Ndremana</td>
<td>Chargé de programme Santé Reproductive des Adolescents et VIH/SIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Onja Ramiliarijaona</td>
<td>Spécialiste en Genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Aline Bizimana</td>
<td>Interim Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Anas Jabir</td>
<td>Assistant Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dorothy Temu-Usin</td>
<td>Program Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Elqurashi Musa</td>
<td>Reproductive Health Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Hibat Abbas</td>
<td>Program Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Lamya Badri</td>
<td>Gender Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Omer Gtayeb</td>
<td>Programme Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Pam Delargy</td>
<td>Acting Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sally Ahmed</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Sudan, Sub-office, North Darfur</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Moamar Eltalib</td>
<td>Reproductive Health Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Duah Owusu-Sarfo</td>
<td>Country Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Sarai Malumo</td>
<td>National Programme Officer - Reproductive Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Charles Banda</td>
<td>National Programme Officer - Population and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Elizabeth Kalunga</td>
<td>Country Midwifery Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Jenipher Mijere</td>
<td>Country Fistula Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Andrew Kumwenda</td>
<td>National Programme Officer - HIV &amp; AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Precious Zandonda</td>
<td>National Programme Officer - Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Carnet Mulenga</td>
<td>Safe Motherhood Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Clara Mwala</td>
<td>ASRH/Team Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Wilson Mumba</td>
<td>Officer Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mercy Kazungula-Ngandu</td>
<td>Finance/Admin Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mary Kate Bwalya</td>
<td>Reproductive Health Officer/Acting PNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA/DSME Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Coulibaly, Norbert</td>
<td>Admin. de Planification et SPSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR Office East Sudan, Kassala</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Kriston Antonson</td>
<td>Health and Nutrition Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Maurice Hours</td>
<td>Chef de Section Santé Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Burkina Faso</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Bandayé Yemdame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Viorica Berdaz</td>
<td>Chief of Health and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Ataur Rahman</td>
<td>Officer of Health and Nutrition Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Paul Ngklakum</td>
<td>Chargée de santé et nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Denis Mahuza</td>
<td>Spécialiste en santé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Paul Richard Ralairinina</td>
<td>Spécialiste en santé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Zambia - School of Population studies</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Namuunda Mutombo</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Zambia - School of Population studies</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Vesper H. Chisumpa</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Teaching Hospital Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Lackson Kasonka</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Teaching Hospital Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sr Masopela</td>
<td>Sister in Charge – Fistula Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPFA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mohammed Abdalaziz</td>
<td>National Project Professional Personnel – Kassala State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPFA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mohammed Abdulkareem</td>
<td>Reproductive Health Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPFA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mohammed Ahmed</td>
<td>NPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPFA Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Mohiadin Abubaka</td>
<td>DDR Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Cambodia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Sophe Narith Sek</td>
<td>Development Assistance Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Jocelyne Andriamiadana</td>
<td>Chargée de programme, bureau santé, population et nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Susan Brems</td>
<td>USAID Zambia - Mission Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. George Sinyangwe</td>
<td>Senior Health Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Musuka Mussunali</td>
<td>Health Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visite de terrain à Tuléar Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Raymond Daniel</td>
<td>Directeur régional de la santé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wad Sharefi Refugee Camp – Hospital</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Asha Ahmed</td>
<td>Assistant Health Visitor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of persons met in country offices of MHTF countries (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wad Sharefi Refugee Camp – Hospital</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Hassina Mohammed Adam</td>
<td>Midwife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wad Sharefi Refugee Camp – Hospital</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Jehan Hassan</td>
<td>PMTCT Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wad Sharefi Refugee Camp – Hospital</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Khadija Siraj</td>
<td>Midwife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Atnafu Getachew</td>
<td>Maternal and Newborn Health Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Liu Yungo</td>
<td>WHO representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Madagascar</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Masy Harisoa</td>
<td>Administrateur de programme de Sante Familiale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Nada Yahya Hamza</td>
<td>National Program Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr Shah Waliullah Siddiqi</td>
<td>Health Cluster Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Sudan</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Hanan Abdo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO Zambia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Patricia Kananga</td>
<td>Safe Motherhood Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Ethiopia</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Miraf Tadesse</td>
<td>Project Coordinator: Ethiopia and Diaspora Health and Education Professional Mobilization Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Lao PDR</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Dr. Phetdara Chanthala</td>
<td>Health Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Assembly Elmina, CR Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Salamatu Halidu</td>
<td>Presiding Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Assembly Elmina, CR Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Owura Essel</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Assembly Elmina, CR Ghana</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>Sophia Mensah</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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