

Measuring Progress: Challenges and Opportunities in Monitoring and Evaluation

Edilberto Loaiza, Ph.D.
UNFPA, New York

Reducing Inequities: Ensuring Universal Access to Family
Planning

30 June – 2 July 2009

New York City



Outline

- The global framework
- Monitoring at the global level
- The programming approach
- Evaluation
- Summary and recommendations

The Global framework

- ICPD and MDG
- MDG5: Improve maternal health
 - MDG5a target: Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio
 - MDG5b target: Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health
- Indicators for MDG5b:
 - Contraceptive Prevalence Rate
 - Unmet need for family planning
 - Adolescent fertility rate
 - Antenatal care

Data sources

- Population census
- Administrative records
- Household surveys
 - Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS)
 - Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS)
 - Reproductive Health Surveys (RCH)
 - PAPFAM/PAPCHILD
 - Other

Unmet need for contraception (UNC)

- UNC refers to fecund women who are not using any method of contraception, but who wish to postpone the next birth or who wish to stop childbearing altogether (spacing or limiting)
- Agreement in the basic concept but not in the operational definition: postpartum amenorrhea; infecundity; whether or when to have another child (e.g. DHS and MICS)
- Other concepts:
 - Contraceptive prevalence rates (CPR)
 - Total demand for contraception (TDC) = $UNC + CPR + CP(\text{failure})$
 - Percent of demand satisfied (PDS) = $100 - UNC/TDC$

Monitoring at the global level

- Where are we in 2009?
- How many countries have available data?
- How many countries have trend data to measure progress?
- How many countries have collected data since 2000?
- Who is collecting the data?

Only 51% of the countries has data on Unmet Need for Family Planning

Regions	Countries		
	Total	With data	Percent
<i>Northern Africa</i>	6	4	67
<i>Sub-Saharan Africa</i>	50	42	84
<i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i>	49	20	41
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	6	3	50
<i>Southern Asia</i>	9	5	56
<i>South-eastern Asia</i>	11	8	73
<i>Western Asia</i>	15	7	47
<i>Oceania</i>	20	0	0
Developed regions	42	10	24
Transition countries of south-eastern Europe	7	7	100
CIS - Europe	4	2	50
CIS - Asia	8	7	88
Total	227	115	51
Percentage		50.7	

It is about inequities, right?

- How can we address inequities in FP when the evidence is not there?
- Or is the evidence there?
- Often is lack of access to data and knowledge sharing:
The MICS3 example...
- No further analysis of existing data

Only 32% of the countries have trend data,
that is to report on progress

Regions	Countries			
	Total	With data	With trend data	Percent
<i>Northern Africa</i>	6	4	3	50
<i>Sub-Saharan Africa</i>	50	42	28	56
<i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i>	49	20	17	35
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	6	3	2	33
<i>Southern Asia</i>	9	5	5	56
<i>South-eastern Asia</i>	11	8	6	55
<i>Western Asia</i>	15	7	3	20
<i>Oceania</i>	20	0	0	0
Developed regions	42	10	1	2
Transition countries of south-eastern Europe	7	7	1	14
CIS - Europe	4	2	2	50
CIS - Asia	8	7	5	63
Total	227	115	73	32
Percentage		50.7	32.2	

Progress?

- New AID environment
- Pressure to produce results
- If we can not produce results at the country, region and global level, then what are the prospects for inequities?
- Even more, for some countries with trend data, reporting on progress may be compromised by sampling and no sampling errors around estimates obtained from household surveys (e.g. sample sizes, definitions, etc.)

Only 38% of the countries have data produced since 2000

Regions	Countries				
	Total	With data	With trend data	Data since 2000	Percent
<i>Northern Africa</i>	6	4	3	4	67
<i>Sub-Saharan Africa</i>	50	42	28	36	72
<i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i>	49	20	17	13	27
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	6	3	2	2	33
<i>Southern Asia</i>	9	5	5	5	56
<i>South-eastern Asia</i>	11	8	6	7	64
<i>Western Asia</i>	15	7	3	7	47
<i>Oceania</i>	20	0	0	0	0
Developed regions	42	10	1	0	0
Transition countries of south-eastern Europe	7	7	1	6	86
CIS - Europe	4	2	2	2	50
CIS - Asia	8	7	5	5	63
Total	227	115	73	87	38
Percentage		50.7	32.2	38.3	

Monitoring?

- Clearly not a comprehensive approach to the need to monitor progress for all women, independently of donors preference for example
- This contrast with the high priority given to HIV/AIDS and more recently to Malaria, both of which include an important component for M&E

57% of the most recent surveys were conducted under the DHS program

Regions	Countries				Data Source		
	Total	With data	With trend data	Data since 2000	DHS	MICS	Other
<i>Northern Africa</i>	6	4	3	4	2	2	--
<i>Sub-Saharan Africa</i>	50	42	28	36	35	5	2
<i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i>	49	20	17	13	10	--	10
<i>Eastern Asia</i>	6	3	2	2	--	1	2
<i>Southern Asia</i>	9	5	5	5	4	1	--
<i>South-eastern Asia</i>	11	8	6	7	5	--	3
<i>Western Asia</i>	15	7	3	7	2	3	2
<i>Oceania</i>	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Developed regions	42	10	1	0	--	--	10
Transition countries of south-eastern Europe	7	7	1	6	--	4	3
CIS - Europe	4	2	2	2	2	--	--
CIS - Asia	8	7	5	5	5	1	1
Total	227	115	73	87	65	17	33
Percentage		50.7	32.2	38.3	57	15	29

Is this enough?

- The reality is that there is a limit on how much DHS can cover in a given year or period
- MICS is now implemented every three years and yet not planning to measure unmet need
- Not a good tradition of good coordination among different data collection systems
- Also a poor system to share and disseminate data, specially for developing countries (the fact is that most of the users of DHS and MICS are in developed countries)

The Programming Approach

- The challenge to go from “project” to “programme” approach.
- The strategic planning does not respond to a proper approach for results and to a clear identification of results chain (e.g. goal-outcomes-outputs-activities-inputs)
- Poor integration of results, management and finance frameworks,
- Monitoring often is equated with reporting.

Evaluation

- Still limited results due to poor planning and monitoring
- Importance of include M&E issues from the beginning
- Importance to deal with the **evaluability** of programmes,
- We can wait for this..

Summary and recommendations

- Research in the definition of clear and agreed indicators
- Coordination and harmonization of data collection, analysis and dissemination
- Establish a MERG for MDG5b
- Develop a data base including disaggregation of data by basic background characteristics (age, place of residence, region, women's education, household wealth, religion, ethnicity, etc.)
- Strengthening the results based programming and management.

Thanks!



Example in UNFPA

- Goal 2 of the 2008-2011 Strategic Plan includes 5 Outcomes to obtain *Universal Access to RH by 2015 and universal access to comprehensive HIV prevention by 2010 for improved quality of life*
- Outcome 3 calls for *Access and utilization*
- Output 2 calls for *Challenges to provision of quality of family planning services analyzed* for which the following indicators were identified:
 - I1 *Tailored strategy to underserved populations based on mapping of underserved needs available in selected countries/regions*
 - Unfortunately no baselines or targets have been defined to guide the development and formulation of activities that will allow the attainment of the desired results

Edilberto Loaiza

Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser
Population and Development Branch

Technical division

loaiza@unfpa.org

212-297 5281

