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Objectives of the evaluation
To assess how the framework as set out in UNFPA Strategic Plan 2008-2013 and further specified in the Reproductive rights and sexual and reproductive health framework (2008-2011) as well as in the GPRHCS (2007-2012) and the HIV/Unintended Pregnancies framework (2011-2015), has guided the programming and implementation of UNFPA interventions in the field of family planning.

To facilitate learning and capture good practices from UNFPA experience across a range of key programmatic interventions in the field of family planning during the 2008-2013 period.
Evaluation approach
Evaluation criteria

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Sustainability
- Coordination

Evaluation questions
## Evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ1</strong> <strong>Integration</strong> of family planning with PHC programmes</td>
<td>Relevance, effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ2</strong> <strong>Coordination</strong> with other family planning/ SRH stakeholders to raise profile of family planning</td>
<td>Coordination, sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ3</strong> <strong>Brokerage and partnership</strong> to strengthen national leadership of family planning</td>
<td>Effectiveness, sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ4</strong> <strong>Enabling environment</strong> to ensure family planning information and exercise of rights</td>
<td>Relevance, effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ5</strong> <strong>Vulnerable and marginalised groups</strong>; identify needs, resource allocation and promotion of rights</td>
<td>Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ6</strong> <strong>Rights-based approach</strong>; access, quality of care, and support to CO for rights-based approach</td>
<td>Relevance, effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ7</strong> <strong>Modes of engagement</strong> adapted to country needs, using evidence and best practice</td>
<td>Relevance, efficiency, sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ8</strong> <strong>Supply-side activities</strong> improving access to quality voluntary family planning</td>
<td>Relevance, effectiveness, sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ9</strong> <strong>Support to CO</strong> from UNFPA HQ and RO across all evaluation questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main components of the evaluation

- National level
  - CO Survey (64 countries)
  - Focus group discussions (5 countries)
  - Stakeholder Survey (64 countries)
  - 5 Country case studies

- Regional level
  - Document review
  - Stakeholder interviews (462)

- Global level
  - Financial review
  - Desk study
  - 42 Global & Regional interviews

Focus group discussions (5 countries) and Stakeholder Survey (64 countries) are included in the National level.
Countries included in the online survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Number Responded</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage CO survey</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Number of COs that responded to the survey (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage stakeholder survey</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>Number of stakeholders that responded to the survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(response from 52 countries (81%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type of stakeholders and level of analysis

504 people were interviewed

- **UNFPA**: 31%
- **UN agencies and international DPs**: 21%
- **Central Government bodies**: 18%
- **Reg/ District gov'n bodies**: 13%
- **INGOs/NGOs/ CSOs**: 10%
- **Users**: 8%

- **HQ & Regional**: 50%
- **National (UN, IDPs, Gov. bodies)**: 42%
- **National NGOs, CSOs, Users**: 8%
Evaluation process

Preparatory
September 2014

Data collection
September 2014 – July 2015

Dissemination
July – September 2016

Inception
September – December 2014

Analysis and reporting
Financial analysis
Estimated expenditure in support of family planning during the period under evaluation is US$705 million (14.5% of UNFPA total expenditure) from 2008-2013.

Expenditure from 2014 to 2015 during the current strategic plan is estimated at US $431 million (26.53% of UNFPA total expenditure).
GPRHCS: a driving force for UNFPA support to family planning

GPRHCS spending (2008-2013) US$ million
Prior to 2012, family planning expenditure was not explicitly tracked by UNFPA financial system.

As of 2012, family planning expenditure is captured under a dedicated development results framework outcome code (U3).

Family planning is also mainstreamed across other program areas.
UNFPA contribution to raising the profile of family planning

Raised the profile of family planning through effective engagement in global and country efforts, contributing to a reaffirmed global consensus regarding the priority of family planning within the ICPD Programme of Action

- Growing strength of GPRHCS as a UNFPA flagship program contributed to UNFPA engagement in the repositioning of family planning at global and country level

- Noticeable shift in 2011-2012 towards UNFPA’s increased engagement in family planning and re-emergence via the London Summit and FP2020

- Limited success by UNFPA to integrate and align family planning activities across the organization to achieve results at scale

- UNFPA visibility on family planning is hampered by limited capacity in program documentation
An important strategic broker and partner for family planning

Well-placed among development partners and successful at linking global and national initiatives in family planning, relying on long-time country presence and working relationship with governments

A balance between being a privileged partner of government and meeting stakeholder expectations specifically in relation to advocacy for more space for CSIs and NGOs

- UNFPA actively supported government-led coordination forums and committees, including family planning Costed Implementation Plans
- Effective coordination by UNFPA at global level - e.g., SDGs
- In some contexts, caution in brokering partnerships between government and NGOs on sensitive issues, while partners expect UNFPA to lead
Mixed success in promoting and supporting integration

Overall, effective global leadership and technical guidance on integration of family planning in support of the ICPD vision. However, UNFPA has made more limited progress integrating family planning into other aspects of sexual and reproductive health at the level of service delivery.

- Important global leadership from UNFPA HQ on defining SRH/HIV linkages, less so on integration of family planning within maternal health
- Effective support for integration “upstream” (policy and strategy level), but gaps between policy level and operational results
- Thematic funding for family planning comes with a stronger vertical approach, pausing the question as how family planning should be prioritized within the construct of integration
Contribution to national sustainability

Positive contribution to strengthened and improved national policy environments, including renewed commitment of budget allocations for reproductive commodity security and family planning

There has been less progress to strengthen sustainability of health system capacity and demand creation

- A key challenge is to translate renewed national commitments to sustained improvement in capacity for services and demand creation

- Beyond integration at “upstream” level, “downstream” work in capacity building to support service delivery is hampered by inadequate resources (“trying to do too much in too many places”)
Human rights with a focus on vulnerable and marginalized groups

Visible and vocal global leader as advocate for human rights-based approach to programming and for rights and needs of VMGs (mainly youth)

Lack of shared understanding on how the operationalize and implement a HRBA for family planning at country level

- In some contexts, issue of balance between the push for accelerated family planning results and promotion of a human-rights based approach
- Focused programme attention on rights to access/expanded method mix with less attention to quality and voluntary choice in contraceptive service delivery
- Resource constraints hinder systematic situation analyses to support to vulnerable and marginalised groups programmes, despite commitment to meet VMG needs
Greater focus on documentation for promotion than on evidence and learning

Overall, UNFPA lacks a body of systematically organised evidence on strategic aspects of effective programming, limiting capacity to strengthen programmes and to advocate for scale-up of innovations.

- UNFPA results oriented documentation is still insufficiently developed, hampering knowledge about what is working and how to invest.

- Lack of an explicit organisation-wide learning agenda, makes it difficult to promote learning and exchange on key topics; however thematic funds can offer significant resources to advance knowledge.

- Some missed opportunities to influence and realise potential as knowledge broker.
On modes of engagement and UNFPA comparative advantage in family planning

**Strong comparative advantage** to work with national governments and other development partners on **policy engagement for family planning**

**Not as well placed** to support other **modes of engagement** that require long-term and dedicated resources (i.e., **capacity development and service delivery**)

- **Strong grasp** of country context by COs; **well-attuned** to needs of national government and **well-placed to work upstream** on policy advocacy in family planning

- **Resources are spread** across a large number of countries affecting capacity to engage in health systems strengthening and service delivery

- In the Post2015, the changes in **global health architecture** provide both a threat and opportunity to future modes of engagement and partnership as countries develop their RMNCH investment cases for the new Global Financing Facility
UNFPA effectively supported national government to increase emphasis and invest in reproductive health commodity security and strengthen management of the contraceptive supply chain

- **GPRHCS** contributed to reinvigorating UNFPA attention on family planning,

- Through GPRHCS, UNFPA contributed to expanding contraceptive method mix, task-shifting, reducing costs of procurement at global and country levels, and improving access to family planning within humanitarian situations
Recommendations
Recommendations

3 main clusters

Programming Content

Modes of Engagement

Accountability for Results
I. Strengthen alignment of family planning programming with ICPD commitments to integration and a human rights-based approach
Examine previous efforts to strengthen integration and collaboration among technical “silos” to adjust the organisational approach to family planning

- Provide operational guidance to ensure that a family planning perspective and issues are **incorporated at all stages of programme cycle**

- Require COs to present the rationale for taking/not taking action to **address integration** of family planning within other programmes

- Review opportunities to **link support for family planning with other SRHR programming in lieu of new strategy development**

- Ensure that monitoring frameworks include **indicators for the extent of integration** of family planning, and measure the effect of integration on improving service access and quality
Continue to take a strong stance in the promotion of HRBA at global, regional and country levels

- Further clarify organizational **expectations and accountabilities** for ensuring that family planning initiatives at country level embody HRBA principles.

- Provide CO staff with **skills-building** and technical assistance to support taking strong, organizationally consistent stands on human rights in family planning.

- Define the operational implications of the objective to “**target the needs of the most vulnerable**,” including how to manage trade-offs between allocating resources to reach VMGs and contributing to FP2020 targets.

- Ensure **human rights elements are monitored** and reported on by incorporating appropriate indicators into country programme monitoring frameworks.

- Develop a family planning-specific communication tool to ensure that **advocacy efforts** include consistent messages on the importance and content of support to family planning emphasising human rights.
II. Further refine and tap into the potential of UNFPA comparative advantage as the key partner with national governments
Work at country programme level to focus on modes of engagement in family planning where there is a comparative advantage

- Examine the current UNFPA **business model** to determine whether and how it is being used for family planning interventions, if it is serving the purpose envisioned, and how it might be improved.

- Require COs to specify in CPAPs how UNFPA activities in family planning relate to/complement what is being done by other **development partners**.

- Require COs to justify their intention to support service delivery and other **downstream activities**.

- Develop indicators to track UNFPA **policy/advocacy** results in terms of how they have influenced others to take action at global and country levels.
Optimize comparative advantages of close technical and strategic relationship with governments to address important challenges to advancing Family Planning

- At the country level advocate for greater cooperation between governments and NGOs and private sector actors -- including: greater engagement of civil society; promotion of a total market approach (TMA)

- Ensure that job expectations of UNFPA country representatives and senior country and regional programme/technical leaders emphasize skills related to high-level advocacy, including on sensitive issues, and managing partnerships

- Provide support to build capacity for the development and implementation of transparent systems of reporting by governments to enhance their accountability for results in family planning and for a human rights-based approach
III. Strengthen documentation of and accountability for results, and organizational learning
Strengthen capacity of COs to document and report on results of UNFPA support to family planning

- Further strengthen the **results-oriented monitoring** capacity of COs
- Hold managers accountable for reinforcing and communicating expectations with staff about the importance of and responsibility for effectively **documenting programme practices**
- Develop an **organisation-wide learning agenda** to support and foster exchange related to emergent “promising” practices in family planning
Clarify the roles and responsibilities

- **Improve coordination** across branches and divisions to ensure realignment. Develop **clear accountabilities** to address lack of cohesiveness and hold leaders of branches and divisions accountable for implementation.

- Ensure that **HQ and RO technical input** on support to family planning is available to CO staff early in the programme design process.

- Ensure that **knowledge management is a priority** component of technical support to COs by staff at HQs and ROs and within job descriptions.
Dissemination
Deliverables

- Evaluation Report
- Evaluation Brief (English, French and Spanish)
Deliverables

5 Country Reports

- Evaluation of UNFPA Support to Family Planning 2008-2013
  - Country Study: Bolivia
  - Evaluation Office: August 2015

- Evaluation of UNFPA Support to Family Planning 2008-2013
  - Country Study: Burkina Faso
  - Evaluation Office: August 2015

- Evaluation of UNFPA Support to Family Planning 2008-2013
  - Country Study: Cambodia
  - Evaluation Office: July 2015

- Evaluation of UNFPA Support to Family Planning 2008-2013
  - Country Study: Ethiopia
  - Evaluation Office: August 2015

- Evaluation of UNFPA Support to Family Planning 2008-2013
  - Country Study: Zimbabwe
  - Evaluation Office: August 2015
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- Evaluation Office/Reference Group – March 2016
- Executive Committee – September 2016
- Executive Board – August 2016; September 2016
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