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## Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFPPD</td>
<td>Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDA</td>
<td>Asian Population and Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRO</td>
<td>Asia and the Pacific Regional Office, UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAid</td>
<td>Australian Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP</td>
<td>Annual work plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPPD</td>
<td>Cambodian Association of Parliamentarians on Population and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOS</td>
<td>Division for Oversight Services, UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECARO</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia Regional Office, UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICPD</td>
<td>International Conference on Population and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IERD</td>
<td>Information and External Relations Division, UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPF</td>
<td>International Planned Parenthood Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTF</td>
<td>Japan Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOU</td>
<td>Letter of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGPD</td>
<td>Parliamentary Group on Population and Development, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLCPD</td>
<td>Philippine Legislators’ Committee on Population and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Results-based management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAW</td>
<td>Violence against Women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development (AFPPD) was established in 1981 with the support of the UN Population Fund (UNFPA) and the Japan Parliamentarians’ Federation for Population. The aim was to raise awareness and involvement of members of national legislatures on issues related to population and development, notably the Programme of Action of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD), and to generate their support for legislative actions and resource mobilization for population programs.

AFPPD’s mission statement notes that it is “a coordinating body of National Committees of Parliamentarians on Population and Development and Parliamentary Committees dealing with population and development issues, working to generate support and perpetuate cooperation among Asian parliamentarians in the area of population and development, and related fields.”

Over a period of thirty years AFPPD has expanded into a coordinating body of twenty-five national committees of parliamentarians on population and development that address issues related to these topics in their countries. Working with these committees, which include full-time NGO offices in several countries, AFPPD seeks to inform, educate, and motivate parliamentarians about the linkages between changes in population and such issues as HIV/AIDS, family planning, reproductive health, and gender equality.

As a nongovernmental organization based and registered in Bangkok, AFPPD receives most of its financial support from UNFPA, both from regular resources and the Japan Trust Fund, which UNFPA manages. Due to the magnitude of UNFPA’s financial support to AFPPD, and reflecting the agency’s commitment to results-based management, UNFPA’s Asia and Pacific Regional Office (APRO) commissioned an independent evaluation of AFPPD in early 2011 to assess what AFPPD has achieved and to make recommendations about the future of UNFPA’s collaboration with, and support to, AFPPD.

The terms of reference for the evaluation require attention to the AFPPD’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and institutional capacity. The evaluation focuses on regional activities for the period 2008 to early 2011, financed through regular and other resources under the Asia and the Pacific Regional Program. Five outcome areas of UNFPA’s current strategic plan were reviewed.

The evaluation, which was conducted by a team of two independent consultants in March, April, and May 2011, has attempted to adhere to international best practices. Accordingly, the evaluation was conducted in full compliance with the UNFPA’s Evaluation Guidelines, the UN Evaluation Group’s Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, its Norms for Evaluation in the UN System, and its Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System. Consistent with UNFPA’s expectations, AFPPD’s stakeholders were provided with multiple opportunities to participate meaningfully in the evaluation process.

The evaluation employed (a) data triangulation by collecting information across a range of countries and individuals with different levels of knowledge of and experience with AFPPD; (b) investigator triangulation through a two-person evaluation team; and, (c) methodological triangulation. The triangulation included a detailed review of documents and
reports at AFPPD’s offices in Bangkok and semistructured interviews or other communications with more than 100 stakeholders and key informants. There were also field visits in Australia, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, and the Philippines.

The evaluation acknowledges AFPPD’s achievements over its thirty-year lifespan. These include its long-term success in building relationships with and among parliamentarians and UNFPA; its recognition as a pioneer in the field of parliamentary action on population matters and as a major parliamentary network that works to advocate for the ICPD mandate in Asia and the Pacific; its successes in securing parliamentary committees on population and development as formal members of AFPPD and the subsequent expansion of its membership to twenty-five national committees, the majority of which are located within their respective parliaments; AFPPD’s encouragement and support for the establishment of new parliamentary committees on population and development, including linking these to more established committees in the region; its ability to access and convene participants that are among the most influential leaders from many countries; AFPPD’s ability to raise ICPD-related issues to prominence on a recurring and regional basis and interregionally through collaboration and knowledge-sharing with other regional forums; and its exemplary attention to gender-related issues and its strong and genuine commitment to gender equality.

In contrast to these achievements, the evaluation also reveals concerns about AFPPD’s performance, as measured against the evaluative criteria. AFPPD’s work is considered to be satisfactorily relevant to the ICPD Programme of Action and the organizational and regional strategies manifested in the UNFPA’s strategic plan and global and regional program. Nonetheless, many key stakeholders expressed concerns that AFPPD’s events-based approach to parliamentary engagement has become marginal in influencing parliamentarians and enhancing their capacity to advocate for issues related to the ICPD Programme of Action.

AFPPD’s effectiveness is assessed as unsatisfactory, in part because of AFPPD’s inadequate attention to results beyond activities and events, coupled with the difficulty of results-based reporting using the UNFPA’s format. AFPPD has expertise and a demonstrated track record in accessing parliamentarians, but the potential of this access to institute meaningful change has been neither strategically addressed nor fully realized. AFPPD’s small grants and policy tracking initiative have the potential to be effective, but there is insufficient indication that AFPPD is exploiting this potential.

While AFPPD’s efficiency is acceptable in terms of organizing conferences and workshops, and keeping the cost of these manageable, it is compromised by its high indirect costs and the disproportionate burden of these on UNFPA, coupled with the costs associated with the high rate of turnover of AFPPD’s staff. AFPPD’s overall efficiency is therefore assessed as unsatisfactory.

With regard to impact, the evaluation was able to identify changes in legislation and increases in funding for family planning and related activities, but the attribution of these changes to AFPPD’s efforts is tenuous. This is largely due to AFPPD’s lack of attention to results-based approaches to its programs, as evidenced by the deficiency in meaningful indicators, baseline information, or targets in annual work plans.

There is little evidence however, that AFPPD has contributed significantly to ongoing parliamentarian activities at the global, regional, and national levels, largely because of
AFPPD’s limited follow up of its activities. Nevertheless, AFPPD’s impact is assessed as satisfactory.

Programmatic and organizational sustainability raises concerns. The evaluation recognizes that a need exists for a regional body to enhance the capacity of parliamentarians in advocacy, to support and coordinate national parliamentary committees, to facilitate dialogue between them, and to facilitate the sharing of lessons learned and best practices in the region. There is also an identified need for UNFPA to partner with an organization to strategize parliamentary advocacy at national and regional levels. Despite these needs, AFPPD’s technical expertise in building the capacity of parliamentarians and parliamentary groups in advocacy is weak. It is acknowledged that AFPPD has good access to parliamentarians and their support mechanisms, as well as significant capacity and experience in events management. Whether these events are an effective means for sharing lessons learned and best practices is questionable.

In addition, weaknesses were identified related to AFPPD’s administrative procedures, governance, leadership continuity, and the management of its finances, human resources, and programs that affect the sustainability of the organization. AFPPD’s sustainability is assessed as unsatisfactory.

In the opinion of the evaluation team, UNFPA does not receive adequate value for its investment in AFPPD. On the part of UNFPA, the value can be increased by strengthening the management of oversight of the Regional Program as it relates to parliamentarians, guided by a clear strategic vision of what it wants from AFPPD.

To address the concerns identified in the evaluation, the following priority recommendations should be considered for future collaboration with AFPPD:

First, UNFPA should develop a strategic approach to working with parliamentarians that specifies how it will collaborate with and support its implementing partners in this area and what the agency expects to achieve in terms of meaningful and measurable results through engagement of parliamentarians. The strategy could build on the agency’s global Terms of Partnership for UNFPA’s Work with Parliamentarians (November 2005; revised February 2010). This strategy should be results-based, cover a multiyear period, and specify the long-term objectives that UNFPA seeks to achieve. Coincident with the development of this strategy, APRO should collaborate with other UNFPA units to devise an indicative multiyear program for its work with parliamentarians. Reliance on multiple, one-off projects based on annual work plans is not conducive to the achievement of UNFPA’s long-term objectives.

Second, UNFPA should apply the concepts and principles of results-based management (RBM) to its support to AFPPD to all annual work plans. At a minimum, this will require UNFPA to ensure that these work plans:

- Identify clear and measurable results to be achieved for all activities or projects;
- Include indicators that can be used to measure progress in achieving the results, including required outputs contribute to agency’s strategic objectives and are linked directly to the indicators that the agency uses in its own reporting of results at the regional and global levels; and,
- Set explicit, time-bound targets for each indicator used to judge progress (compared to baselines) and performance.
Third, UNFPA should ensure AFPPD’s compliance with all of the agency’s reporting and procedural requirements. Many of these requirements have been neglected. As part of this compliance UNFPA should request AFPPD to (a) return to UNFPA all money that has been accumulated from unused funds; (b) prepare a monitoring and evaluation plan; and, (c) submit standard annual progress reports that identify results achieved (versus activities completed).

Fourth, UNFPA should also initiate an external audit of AFPPD’s financial records for at least the past five years, due to many anomalies. This review can be used to (a) assess the extent to which UNFPA’s resources have been used to support activities, and (b) assist AFPPD in correctly calculating, applying, and reporting its indirect costs of UNFPA supported activities.

Last, given AFPPD’s organizational limitations, it will need considerable assistance to restructure its operations to a degree that will deliver results, promote policy change at the national level, and ensure organizational sustainability. UNFPA must consider whether and to what extent it is prepared to support this assistance.

The evaluation team appreciates that UNFPA cannot direct or require AFPPD to change its internal administrative procedures. Nonetheless, if UNFPA chooses to continue its funding of AFPPD, changes in these procedures are essential to enhance the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact of UNFPA-sponsored tasks. UNFPA should use its considerable financial leverage and negotiate support to AFPPD in 2012 and beyond to make sure AFPPD develops, as a high priority: (a) a demand-driven, advocacy and capacity-development strategy that encompasses its UNFPA-sponsored projects and activities; (b) a staff manual; (c) a finance manual; and, (d) a transition strategy in anticipation of the retirement of AFPPD’s executive director in mid-2012. The strategy should be in place and its implementation started as soon as possible and well before 2012.
Introduction

UNFPA’s mission reflects the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) as well as the agency’s desire to support countries to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other internationally agreed objectives. However much support UNFPA provides, the achievement of the ICPD Programme of Action and the MDGs depends largely on national-level political will to fill the gaps in laws, policies, and programs and then to ensure their effective implementation. In recognition of this situation, UNFPA emphasizes strategic engagement in advocacy. An example of this engagement is UNFPA’s long-standing collaboration with the Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development (AFPPD), which the agency helped to establish in 1981 with the support of the UN Population Fund (UNFPA) and the Japan Parliamentarians’ Federation for Population.

AFPPD is a coordinating body of twenty-five national committees of parliamentarians on population and development that address related issues in their countries. Working with these committees, which include full-time offices based in nongovernmental organizations (NGO) in several countries, AFPPD seeks to inform, educate, and motivate parliamentarians about the linkages between changes in population and such issues as family planning, reproductive health, HIV/AIDS, and gender equality.

An NGO based in Bangkok, AFPPD receives financial support from the UNFPA – both from regular resources and the Japan Trust Fund (JTF), which UNFPA manages in a manner similar to its other cofinancing resources (see table 1). Other sources of periodic support to AFPPD include other UN agencies, private foundations, and bilateral donors. AFPPD’s full-time executive director and a staff of about fifteen people are supported by an executive committee, which meets twice a year. An unpaid, part-time secretary general, who is traditionally (and for purposes of compliance with Thai laws) a member of the Thai Senate, oversees the executive director’s day-to-day work on behalf of the executive committee.

Table 1: Sources of AFPPD’s Financial Support, 2008-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Support</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan Trust Fund/UNFPA</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$512,942</td>
<td>$313,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA Regular Funds</td>
<td>$469,000</td>
<td>$692,942</td>
<td>$627,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$122,440</td>
<td>$367,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$854,000</td>
<td>$1,328,324</td>
<td>$1,308,384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AFPPD financial records, including annual audited financial statements.

AFPPD’s has many accomplishments since its creation. It is recognized as a pioneer in the field of parliamentary action on population matters and as a major parliamentary

---

1 AFPPD’s members include Australia, Japan, New Zealand, and Central Asian countries that are not within the geographic area of responsibility of UNFPA’s Asia and the Pacific Regional Office.

2 The Government of Japan created the trust fund, which provides funds to AFPPD each year. UNFPA administers these funds on behalf of the Japanese government and works with AFPPD to propose how these funds will be used. Projects that rely on these funds require the consent of the Japanese Government. In addition to annual support from APRO, the agency’s Information and External Relations Division in New York and its Eastern Europe and Central Asia Regional Office (EECARO) in Istanbul provide occasional support.
network that works to advocate for the ICPD mandate in Asia and the Pacific. AFPPD has been successful in securing parliamentary committees on population and development as formal members of this network, despite the initial reluctance of some parliamentary groups to join an external organization. AFPPD has subsequently expanded its membership to twenty-five national committees, the majority of which are located within their respective parliaments. AFPPD also encourages and supports the establishment of new parliamentary committees on population and development, including linking these to more established committees in the region. The organization is able to engage with parliamentarians who are among the most influential leaders from many countries (as an example, the Mongolian parliamentarian who participated in the first male standing committee meeting became Minister of Foreign Affairs and continues to champion prevention of violence against women). AFPPD is also able to raise ICPD-related issues to prominence on a recurring and regional basis, and interregionally through collaboration and knowledge sharing with other regional forums.

In recognition of these efforts, AFPPD was a recipient of the 27th United Nations Population Award in 2010. The award is given to individuals and institutions for their outstanding contributions to population issues and human welfare. As the UN secretary general’s remarks indicated, AFPPD is “globally recognized as a pioneer in the field of parliamentary action on population matters.”

Notwithstanding AFPPD’s successes and accomplishments, there has never been a comprehensive external evaluation of its activities and, more important, its overall performance. For this reason, and due to the magnitude of UNFPA’s financial support to AFPPD, the agency’s Asia and the Pacific Regional Office (APRO) commissioned this independent evaluation of AFPPD. The evaluation’s purpose is to assess what AFPPD has achieved and to make recommendations about the future of UNFPA’s collaboration with and support to AFPPD. The terms of reference (TOR; see annex 1) for the evaluation require attention to the forum’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and institutional capacity. The evaluation specifically focuses on (a) the period from 2008 through early 2011; (b) all sources of financial support provided by or through UNFPA APRO; and, (c) all five of the UNFPA’s current strategic plan outcomes for which the agency provides support to AFPPD.

Evaluation Methods

The evaluation attempts to adhere to international best practices, including the UN Evaluation Group’s norms and standards for evaluation, as well as UNFPA’s Evaluation Policy and its Evaluation Guidelines. In addition, UNFPA’s Division of Oversight Services (DOS) assesses evaluations completed for the agency using nine quality assessment criteria, covering such issues as the structure and clarity of reporting, design and methodology, and findings and analysis. The evaluation team has attempted to ensure that the evaluation at least

---

3 The definitions of the first five criteria are those found in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.
4 Funding from IERD or EECARO was not included.
5 In contrast, the national parliamentary committees with which AFPPD collaborates are not evaluated in this report, but members of these committees and their staff were interviewed as part of the evaluation.
meets and, whenever possible, exceeds the expectations associated with the quality assessment criteria.

One DOS criterion addresses the methods used in the evaluation. These methods are expected to: (a) be valid and logically linked to the evaluation’s objectives; (b) be consistent with good practice and include, where appropriate, explicit efforts to test counterfactuals and triangulate among methods and data sources; and, (c) control bias and that acknowledge limitations due to uncontrolled bias are implemented and described.

The methods used for the evaluation reflect practices appropriate – and feasible – for consideration of the evaluative criteria. Annex 2 identifies the questions to be addressed for the evaluative criteria (from the TOR) and the proposed performance indicators, data sources, and data-collection methods.

Given the nature of the evaluation and, as described below, the absence of data on AFPPD’s baselines and target indicators, the evaluation team placed special emphasis on several approaches to triangulation. As the Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility (2010) has noted, “In the scarcity and/or absence of a reliable set of quantitative data, triangulation can be a useful substitute for obtaining reasonably solid and reliable evaluation results.” Following Denzin (1970), three approaches to triangulation were used.

**Data triangulation.** The evaluation team collected information across a range of countries and individuals with different levels of knowledge of and experience with AFPPD. Annex 3 provides a list of more than 100 people contacted for the evaluation. Throughout the report the greatest weight has been assigned to the opinions of those with the most familiarity with AFPPD. As might be expected, a range of opinions was expressed, but there was remarkable consistency among respondents on most issues, including nearly all the key ones.

**Investigator triangulation** refers to the use of more than one evaluator to gather and interpret data. The two-person evaluation team shared responsibility for data collection and interviewing of respondents together in Indonesia, and then separately in the remaining countries visited.

**Methodological triangulation** involves the use of mixed methods of data collection. The primary methods included: (a) a thorough review of documents and reports provided by UNFPA and AFPPD and (b) semistructured interviews or other communications with key stakeholders and other informants including but not limited to: (i) AFPPD; (ii) APRO; (iii) the agency’s Information and External Relations Division (IERD); and (iv) respondents in Australia, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, and the Philippines, where field visits occurred in March and April 2011. The countries were selected after consultation with APRO’s regional director, its M&E advisor, and with AFPPD’s executive director.

Cambodia and Indonesia were selected purposively. One member of the evaluation team lives in Phnom Penh, and both team members attended the 8th Regional Women Ministers’ and Parliamentarians’ Conference on Young Women and Girls in Jakarta on

---

6 Annex 4 includes the methodological instruments that guided the interviews (keeping in mind that they were semistructured and that respondents had different levels of familiarity and experience with AFPPD). Accordingly, not all questions were asked of all respondents and some respondents were asked follow-up questions not included in the annex.
March 26-27, 2011. Despite the purposive selection of these two countries, they provide geographic representation and a sample of national committees at different levels of activity and maturity. India and the Philippines were selected because they have notably strong and well-recognized national committees on population and development. Australia was included opportunistically; one team member used the occasion of a personal visit to conduct interviews in Canberra.

Given the universe of potential informants, which included those identified in the TOR but primarily the members of national parliamentary committees, semistructured interviews are well suited to the availability and time constraints of parliamentarians and parliamentary staff. Such an interviewing process ensured that key issues were addressed, but also that issues raised in interviews could be pursued. A formal interview protocol would have limited such opportunities. Furthermore, a semistructured interview process also helped to accommodate the sociocultural differences among countries and their parliamentarians. Again, a single, formal protocol would likely include some or perhaps even many questions that would not be relevant to many respondents.

Although a single survey protocol was not used, the interviews ensured attention to three key questions. Is the right thing being done? Is it being done well? Are there better ways of doing it? The first question addressed the rationale and relevance of what AFPPD does. The second question examined the effectiveness of the results achieved and assessed efficiency, with a view towards optimizing the use of resources, promoting sustainability, and leading to long-term impacts. The third question identified alternatives and suggested recommendations for actions to be taken by AFPPD and UNFPA.

In addition to these approaches, two other mixed methods were used to gather information. The evaluators conducted an extensive document review that included all proposals for small grants and all annual work plans (AWP) for AFPPD’s work from 2008 through 2010 to determine the expected results of its efforts. These AWPs are summarized in annex 5; a list of documents reviewed can be found in annex 6. The TOR also required attention to AFPPD’s financial and administrative procedures to determine whether application of these procedures ensures accountability. These procedures and a sample of AFPPD’s financial records and internal operating procedures were examined to assess how efficiently it uses its resources and whether these procedures and AFPPD’s implementation are consistent with: (a) the UNFPA’s Guidelines for UNFPA Collaboration with Non-Governmental Organizations (1997); (b) the UNFPA’s Guidelines on the Assessment of Potential Executing Agencies (1998); (c) the UNFPA’s Guide for Implementing Partners (2008); (d) the agency’s Global and Regional Programme Guidelines; (e) the letters of understanding (LOU) between AFPPD and UNFPA; and, (f) the agreement between the Government of Japan and the UNFPA that established the Japan Trust Fund.

Although the methods chosen were both feasible and practical, several methodological challenges exist. First, triangulation can improve but does not ensure the validity of the information collected. While the uncertainty of interpretation is reduced through triangulation (Webb et al., 1966), some advocates of triangulation assume that data

---

7 Attendance at the conference also provided an opportunity for the evaluation team to interview parliamentarians from the Cook Islands, Iran, Pakistan, Maldives, and Papua New Guinea.
derived from different methods can be compared unambiguously and regarded as equivalent in terms of their capacity to address questions in an evaluation. This may not be a valid assumption.

Second, the sample of people interviewed unavoidably reflects selection bias and is not representative of all people associated with AFPPD or its national parliamentary committees. As noted earlier, AFPPD is a coordinating body of these committees. Neither the time nor the resources were available to meet with a representative sample of parliamentarians from these committees. Moreover, it is not clear that a representative sample even exists. The national committees represent six of the world’s ten most populous nations, as well as several of the smallest, including Fiji, the Maldives, and the Solomon Islands, all of which have less than one million residents. As a result of these differences, the population and development issues that the national committees consider are disparate and dissimilar.

As a result of the selection bias, the views expressed by the informants may not be representative of all parliamentarians associated with AFPPD. To mitigate this concern, the evaluation team met with as many parliamentarians and other people knowledgeable about AFPPD as possible during the evaluation and sought a diversity of views among them.

Third, although AFPPD initiates and engages in many activities, it does not have a results framework of its own.8 As UNFPA’s Evaluation Policy observes:

A prerequisite for evaluation is a coherent results framework. Results frameworks are developed when interventions are planned; they include statements of the expected results and the logical sequence of those results. They indicate how the activities undertaken lead to the expected results, and identify relevant performance indicators, baselines and targets.

As the information in annex 5 illustrates for AFPPD’s activities in 2008-2010, many activities (e.g., organize a meeting; mobilize young parliamentarians; arrange airline tickets for parliamentarians) have imprecise objectives. Although these activities are intended to contribute to UNFPA’s programmatic goals, the linkage between the two is not always clear or easily discernible.

Given the absence of a results framework, and the weakness of the AWP as a tool for RBM, a major concern of the evaluation team was how to make judgments about AFPPD’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.

Furthermore, the information in annex 5 demonstrates that AFPPD has few measurable targets or indicators, which thwarts efforts to determine objectively whether AFPPD has achieved its expected results. To deal with this problem, the evaluation team attempted to relate all of its conclusions and judgments to UNFPA policies or to best practices associated with evaluations. In other instances, clear-cut benchmarks or performance standards may not exist. In such instances, the evaluation team applied a rating scale (see table 2) to make its judgments about each of the evaluative criteria, and due to necessity and on the basis of proxy or indirect indicators, all of which require assumptions about their validity.

---
8 The regional programme has a results framework that contains multiple components, including AFPPD’s AWPs.
### Table 2: Rating scale for evaluative criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>The criterion is fully met. Positive evaluation findings entirely or overwhelmingly outweigh negative ones. Performance relative to the criterion is well above reasonable expectations given the context, circumstances, and resources available. Ratings of highly satisfactory are uncommon. Performance at this level provides exemplars for other organizations. Few, if any, changes in management, administration, and/or implementation are desirable or necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>On balance the criterion has been met. The positive evaluation findings outweigh negative ones. Performance relative to the criterion represents what is both adequate and reasonable given the context, circumstances, and resources available. Nonetheless, opportunities for improvement exist; some changes in management, administration, and/or implementation may be desirable if they will lead to improved or highly satisfactory performance relative to the criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>The criterion is met only partially. Negative findings outweigh positive ones. Performance relative to the criterion is inadequate and below reasonable expectations given the context, circumstances, and resources available. An unsatisfactory rating indicates a need for changes in management, administration, and/or implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>The criterion has not been met. A seriously deficient evaluation result with few or no positive findings. Performance relative to the criterion is highly inadequate and well below reasonable expectations given the context, circumstances, and resources available. Ratings of highly unsatisfactory are uncommon and assigned only when deficiencies are widespread and have a highly negative effect on the criterion. An unsatisfactory rating indicates a need for major changes in management, administration, and/or implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (2010).

Fourth, in the absence of a valid counterfactual, respondents were typically asked to consider what would happen to population and development issues among parliamentarians if AFPPD ceased to exist.

Baseline data were available for few of the issues that receive attention from AFPPD, so the absence of a counterfactual means that any changes observed from the baselines cannot be attributed to the AFPPD’s efforts with confidence or certainty. Indeed, in the absence of a valid counterfactual, the problem with uncertain attribution cannot be mitigated, and establishing a clear cause-and-effect relationship between AFPPD’s activities and results observed is not possible.

A further problem with attribution is that some or even many changes in national policies may be the result of national committees’ efforts rather than of AFPPD’s (or the
changes may be due to the combined efforts of both AFPPD and a national committee, or to neither).

**Ethical Considerations**

The evaluation was conducted in full compliance with the UNFPA’s *Evaluation Guidelines*, the UN Evaluation Group’s *Standards for Evaluation in the UN System*, its *Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*, and its *Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System*. In particular, the evaluation team made its best efforts: (a) to ensure that respondents understood the evaluation’s purpose, the criteria applied, and the intended use of findings; (b) to be sensitive to cultural norms and gender roles in the countries visited during the evaluation and during interactions with all respondents; and, (c) to respect their rights and welfare by ensuring informed consent and rights to confidentiality before interviews. Equally important, in collecting data, the evaluation team attempted to ensure that women were adequately represented among those contacted. The evaluation team exceeded this expectation: a majority of respondents were women.

Attention to these ethical considerations is essential. In response, UNFPA’s Division of Oversight Services (DOS) has provided guidance related to ethical considerations for evaluators. This guidance notes that:

1. Minimum expectations for ethical considerations should include documentation of consent procedures where beneficiaries or members of the public are surveyed;
2. Brief descriptions of confidentiality provisions should be provided where personal information is used in the evaluation or the evaluation report;
3. Institutional review board or research ethics approval as appropriate to the nature of the evaluation and content should also be mentioned. If no such approval was sought or deemed relevant, stating that reduces uncertainty for the reader.

In response to this guidance and to ensure respondents’ informed consent and their awareness of the scope and limits of confidentiality of the information they were asked to provide, respondents were given a written statement (see an example in annex 7) explaining the evaluation process before any substantive discussion occurred. The statement addressed informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality to ensure that sensitive information could not be traced to its source (without the respondent’s approval). When appropriate, the statement was translated into an appropriate local language and provided in advance of interviews. In addition, respondents were given the time and information to decide whether they would be interviewed and to make this decision independently without any pressure.

In the opinion of the evaluation team, the involvement of an institutional review board did not appear necessary. None of the issues or questions raised in any interviews asked about a person’s health or personal behaviors or any issues likely to be deemed sensitive for religious, cultural, or any other reasons.

---

9 Both members of the evaluation team, Richard Tobin and David Wilkinson, are familiar with the Code of Conduct and have agreed, in writing, to abide by it.
Stakeholder Involvement

Consistent with UNFPA’s expectations, AFPPD’s stakeholders were given multiple opportunities to participate meaningfully in the evaluation process. The evaluation team recognizes and appreciates that participation in surveys or interviews is not the same as involvement.

The TOR identifies the evaluation’s stakeholders as AFPPD, APRO, UNFPA’s country offices in the Asia-Pacific region, and the national parliamentary committees on population and development that are members of the forum. Prior to the evaluation, APRO shared the TOR with AFPPD and solicited comments and suggestions about how it could be improved. APRO also involved UNFPA’s Information and External Relations Department in New York. In addition, the evaluation team shared the TOR with the UNFPA country offices in which interviews occurred or in which data for the evaluation would be collected.

Similarly, in the written statement just noted (in annex 7), all respondents were encouraged to (a) offer suggestions about how the evaluation team could best address its tasks and (b) to provide any suggestions or recommendations they might have to improve AFPPD’s performance and UNFPA’s management and oversight of the forum. A similar statement was sent to each of the UNFPA’s country offices in the countries visited. All respondents were also given contact information for members of the evaluation team so that, if desirable, respondents could contact a team member after having met him.

APRO established an Evaluation Management Reference Group, which provided guidance to the evaluation. The group, which provided written comments on the evaluation team’s inception and draft evaluation reports, included representatives from APRO, IERD, and several UNFPA country offices. The draft report was also shared with AFPPD’s executive director. APRO subsequently provided additional comments. The evaluation team considered all comments received. When deemed appropriate the evaluation team amended portions of this report in response to these comments.

The evaluation team believes that these procedures meet or exceed all reasonable expectations for stakeholder involvement in evaluations.

Conflicts of Interest

Neither member of the evaluation team has any known or potential conflicts of interest or any prior or present connection to AFPPD that would affect their judgment or ability to provide a credible and independent evaluation. It should be noted, however, that Richard Tobin, the team leader, had worked as a consultant to APRO beginning in July 2010, and both evaluation team members had been in discussion with UNFPA about possible further consultancy work in the region.

Context: AFPPD’s Tasks and Activities

Before considering the evaluative criteria and how AFPPD fares with respect to each of the items to be assessed, it is useful to summarize what AFPPD does and seeks to achieve. According to AFPPD’s constitution, the organization seeks to:
Encourage and promote parliamentary activities aimed at facilitating population and development policies designed to improve the living standard and welfare of the people of Asia as well as those parliamentary activities aimed at obtaining the support of the government and the people towards this cause.

This statement is not sufficiently precise to settle a recurring issue, namely whether AFPPD is a (a) an advocacy organization created solely to facilitate collaboration between parliamentarians and UNFPA in the support of the ICPD Programme of Action or (b) an organization with substantive, programmatic responsibilities as well. AFPPD’s main role, from one perspective, “is to provide the platform for members of parliament to share lessons learned, gain information about ICPD Programme of Action from UNFPA and others, and to assist parliamentarians in advocating for the program in their national governments. AFPPD is an advocacy and not necessarily a programmatic NGO.” From this perspective, AFPPD should be evaluated only in terms of its effectiveness at advocacy among its target audiences and not through a programmatic lens. More important, this perspective casts AFPPD as being different from other implementing partners with whom UNFPA collaborates and therefore not subject to the same programmatic expectations that UNFPA’s other implementing partners face.

An alternative perspective, and the one reflected in this evaluation, is that AFPPD’s roles and responsibilities have evolved since its creation. In addition to an advocacy role, UNFPA has increasingly tasked AFPPD with substantive, programmatic responsibilities, including capacity development of parliamentarians and their staff. All of UNFPA’s recent AWPs for AFPPD are linked to the agency’s strategic objectives, all of which are programmatic. AWPs operationalize the agency’s Global and Regional Program (2008) and are intended “to ensure a programme approach with an integrated results chain and cohesive planning over the program cycle.” Accordingly, UNFPA’s support to AFPPD is premised on the latter’s contribution to the agency’s programmatic goals. Moreover, AFPPD views itself as having a programmatic role, as the following paragraphs suggest.

AFPPD relies on three primary methods to achieve its objectives, one of which is administrative and the others substantive and programmatic. First, AFPPD organizes workshops and conferences throughout the Asia-Pacific region on topics related to the ICPD Programme of Action. Working with national committees, which select the parliamentarians and others that attend these conferences, AFPPD organizes as many as ten or more meetings each year.

Recent conferences have addressed such topics as gender, eliminating violence against women, maternal and reproductive health, and population and development. The conferences are intended to inform parliamentarians and to increase their awareness of ICPD-related issues, in the expectation that they will increase their willingness and ability to advocate for these issues in their countries. Parliamentarians from as many as twenty Asian

---

10 Due to AFPPD’s recognition as a regional leader in engaging parliamentarians on ICPD, as well as its experience in organizing regional conferences, UNFPA occasionally asks the forum’s assistance in organizing international conferences, such as the 4th International Parliamentarians’ Conference on the Implementation of the ICPD Programme of Action in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in October 2009, and in selecting and arranging the travel of the region’s parliamentarians to conferences outside the region.
and Pacific countries attend AFPPD’s conferences, and their presence thus provides opportunities for parliamentarians and their staff to learn what other countries are doing to advance ICPD-related issues.

At the conclusion of most AFPPD conferences, attendees are usually asked to approve a statement of commitment. As an illustration, at the end of the 8th Regional Women Ministers’ and Parliamentarians’ Conference on Young Women and Girls in March 2011, attendees approved a statement in which they pledged to (a) implement a series of actions related to gender equality, gender-based violence, and gender budgeting and (b) to “systematically and actively monitor the progress we make in doing so.” Other meetings have produced national “action plans” on maternal and reproductive health. AFPPD also publishes summaries of its conferences.

Second, AFPPD plays a substantive and programmatic role and in so doing attempts to develop and enhance the capacity of parliamentarians and their staff to be effective advocates for ICPD-related issues. AFPPD convenes training workshops for the staff members of national committees. An example is the workshop on the creation of a database to summarize and track population policies in the Asia-Pacific region in November 2010. AFPPD’s Policy Tracking and Monitoring Unit issues periodic “roundups” of recent population-related issues.

AFPPD has several websites, including one in Russian for AFPPD’s audiences in central Asia. In addition, AFPPD produces a newsletter several times a year and periodically publishes reports on ICPD-related topics or on AFPPD’s work. Examples include Maternal Health and Rights: Asia and the Pacific Consultation (2009) and Engaging Parliamentarians on Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality: A Report on AFPPD Gender Advocacy (2011). Except for a few publications in Russian, all of AFPPD’s publications are in English.

In addition to these periodic reports of activities, AFPPD occasionally produces more substantive publications that are potentially useful for parliamentarians and parliamentary staff. Two recent examples are Maternal Health: An Advocacy Guide for Parliamentarians (2010) and Parliamentarians’ Perspectives: A Focus on Global Population and Development Issues from a Parliamentary Perspective (2007). The first publication is a guidebook that highlights the challenges in advocating for adequate maternal health at regional, national and community levels and provides practical advice with “take home” messages and examples from several countries on how parliamentarians can improve their approaches to advocacy. The publication includes a checklist to help assess existing resources and gaps at national level together with a compact disk containing a PowerPoint® presentation to guide parliamentarians in making statements about maternal health issues.

The second publication (on parliamentarians’ perspectives) summarizes interviews with 58 parliamentarians from 38 countries on issues related to population and development and contains sound bites that can be used for advocacy purposes. Although these publications are of high quality and have potential value as advocacy tools, there is no indication of how, or if, they are being employed and, if so, by whom.

AFPPD organizes and hosts occasional study tours for parliamentarians. UNFPA’s annual work plans with AFPPD also engage the forum in programmatic tasks, such as assessments of national committees to identify gaps in capacity, advocacy visits to strengthen
links with national committees, the establishment of new regional partnerships, and follow up of the implementation of national action plans.

Third, AFPPD provides small grants to national committees and their support mechanisms in response to proposals from these committees. AFPPD provided grants, all related to male involvement in the elimination of violence against women, to five national committees in 2010. The national committees are all members of the regional network that AFPPD represents, but the forum has no supervisory, management, or financial responsibilities for the national committees. The national committees typically have several sources of funding, usually including the UNFPA’s country offices.

As noted above, AFPPD’s roles have evolved over time. This evolution has led to questions about what it should be doing and with whom. AFPPD is recognized for its access to the region’s parliamentarians, so several UN agencies, including UNAIDS, UNWOMEN, and the UN Development Programme (UNDP), have expressed interest in collaborating with the forum to engage parliamentarians on topics of interest to these agencies, such as governance in the case of the UNDP. Especially in the past two years, AFPPD has also collaborated with non-UN agencies. Not all the activities these organizations support are related to the ICPD Programme of Action or AFPPD’s mandate.

A further issue involves the quantity and quality of AFPPD’s technical capacity to perform its roles successfully. There is no doubt about AFPPD’s ability to organize the logistical and administrative aspects of regional and international conferences. Many respondents, in contrast, questioned AFPPD’s technical and substantive expertise in the programmatic areas in which it works. Among respondents the evaluation team considered most knowledgeable about ICPD-related issues, there was overwhelming agreement that AFPPD’s lack of expertise on ICPD-related issues, including reproductive health, as well as a poor understanding of local contexts is a major weakness.

If this is a valid perception of AFPPD’s technical competence, it raises a fundamental question, namely how effective an advocate can the AFPPD be? How can AFPPD assess and enhance the capacity of parliamentarians on ICPD issues when AFPPD itself does not possess such capacity or adequate knowledge of ICPD-related issues? The pages that follow address these questions, albeit indirectly, and assess whether the results achieved are commensurate with the expectations for AFPPD’s performance.

Findings and Analysis

Relevance

This section examines the extent to which AFPPD’s work under the regional program is relevant to: the ICPD Programme of Action; the organizational and regional strategies manifested in the UNFPA’s strategic plan and global and regional program; the focus and outputs of the country programs that UNFPA supports; and national needs and priorities. The section also examines the extent to which AFPPD’s UNFPA-supported projects are appropriate to responding to the current and future regional and national challenges and trends and the extent to which gender and human rights dimensions have been incorporated in the project design.
AFPPD’s mission statement notes that it is “a coordinating body of National Committees of Parliamentarians on Population and Development and Parliamentary Committees dealing with population and development issues, working to generate support and perpetuate cooperation among Asian parliamentarians in the area of population and development, and related fields.” AFPPD is committed to informing, educating, and motivating parliamentarians on the linkages between increasing population and issues such as reproductive health, family planning, food security, water resources, sustainable development, environment, ageing, urbanization, migration, HIV/AIDS, and gender equality. AFPPD gives emphasis, for the most part, to national and in some cases subnational activities including reviews of legislation, monitoring program implementation, and advocacy at the constituency level on issues related to population and development.

One of AFPPD’s main objectives is to educate, motivate, and involve members of parliament in population, reproductive health, and family planning programs in Asia and the Pacific. AFPPD aims: “to increase awareness and promote the understanding of the interrelationship between population and development issues; to initiate, promote and support exchanges and exchange programs among the parliamentarians of Asia and outside the region in order to encourage new and effective ideas and approaches to population and development issues, and to promote other lawful acts which are appropriate, conducive or necessary to the attainment of the above objectives.”

AFPPD’s work is therefore directly relevant to UNFPA’s global/regional program output 1.1.1, Regional partnerships developed and strengthened to build national capacity to integrate population dynamics into national and subnational planning processes and to global/regional program output, 2.2.1, Enhanced capacities of regional and national parliamentary bodies, health ministries and relevant local governance councils to reduce maternal mortality and morbidity, especially by improving access of poor and excluded communities.

As noted in the introduction, UNFPA’s support to AFPPD is premised on the latter’s contribution to UNFPA’s development results. AFPPD facilitates collaboration between parliamentarians and UNFPA in support of the ICPD Programme of Action. The initial role of AFPPD was to provide a platform for parliamentarians and their staff to access information about this program from UNFPA and others, share lessons learned, and assist the parliamentarians in advocating for the program in their national governments. To this end, many of AFPPD’s activities can serve as a means to help parliamentarians enhance their involvement and motivation in ICPD-related issues. AFPPD’s work under the regional program is therefore directly relevant to the Programme of Action.

In general, and especially in recent years, the conferences and seminars organized by AFPPD have responded to evolving global and regional challenges and trends, as have the calls for proposals for small grants supported by AFPPD. For example, conferences and seminars organized by AFPPD in 2010 focused on population and adaptation to climate change; the role of parliamentarians in advancing maternal health; increasing funding for reproductive health; parliamentarians’ actions and legislations on the elimination of violence against women; and how climate change impacts on indigenous people and rural poverty. The criteria for submission of proposals to AFPPD for small grants now includes current thematic focuses, for example, engaging male parliamentarians in eliminating violence against women.
As noted in its mandate: “AFPPD provides due importance to the participation and involvement of women parliamentarians and gender equality including Elimination of Violence against Women and male involvement in this process” – issues that present regional and national challenges. AFPPD has two standing committees, both of which have a specific gender focus: a standing committee on women and a standing committee on male parliamentarians’ involvement on the prevention of violence against women. AFPPD’s work is therefore relevant to regional program output, 3.1.1, *Strengthened capacity of regional and national counterparts and UNFPA country offices to support adoption and implementation of national legislation to protect the human rights of women and young girls.*

While AFPPD’s work is relevant to UNFPA’s global and regional programs, its relevance to country programs is less clear. UNFPA’s country-level engagement with parliamentarians is almost entirely through national committees or their support mechanisms, and there is limited engagement between UNFPA’s country offices and AFPPD.

Based on the above findings, the evaluation team rates AFPPD’s relevance as satisfactory. This means that the positive evaluation findings outweigh negative ones. Performance relative to the criterion represents what is both adequate and reasonable given the context, circumstances, and resources available.

**Effectiveness**

Although AFPPD’s activities are deemed to be broadly relevant to UNFPA’s objectives, an equally important question asks whether these activities have been effective. Effectiveness, as defined in the UNFPA’s *Programme Manager’s Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit*, is a “measure of the extent to which a program achieves its planned results.” Consistent with this definition and coincident with UNFPA’s *Evaluation Policy*, the evaluation team focused its attention on “performance in achieving development results,” which includes outputs, outcomes, and impacts. This definition necessarily diminishes attention to the number or variety of activities performed or completed; completion of activities is not an indication of their effectiveness or impact. As defined in the agency’s *Results Based Management Policy*, outputs “are changes in skills or abilities, or the availability of new products and services” while outcomes “represent institutional and behavioural changes in development conditions that occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of goals.”

Attention to results also has a corollary within UNFPA. The agency has committed itself to mainstreaming RBM into all of its activities. At a minimum, this concept requires that all of the agency’s organizational processes, products, and programs contribute to the achievement of desired results, notably those identified in UNFPA’s current strategic plan. RBM typically includes at least these steps:

1. Identify clear and measurable changes and results to be achieved;
2. Select indicators that can be used to measure progress in achieving the results;

---

11 UNFPA’s *Results Based Management Policy* (May 2011) underscores the agency’s commitment to RBM. The purpose of the policy document “is to foster a culture of measurement and results at UNFPA, creating a demand for and improve usage of credible information and evidence on results to inform decision-making.”
3. Set explicit targets for each indicator used to judge performance;
4. Develop performance monitoring systems to collect data on actual results;
and,
5. Review, analyze, and report actual results vis-à-vis the targets.

All of these steps are reflected in UNFPA’s procedural guidelines for its implementing partners. First, AWPs are required to specify “what is expected to be accomplished by the implementing partner during the year.” Second, AWPs are required to include baselines and annual targets, identify the indicators associated with each output, and indicate the source of each indicator. For indicators without baselines or targets, “there should be clear indication of a deadline by which the missing data will be available. If data for indicators are not available from existing sources, data generation should be built into the AWP” (UNFPA 2008).

Third, implementing partners are required to have a monitoring and evaluation plan and to update it annually (UNFPA 2008; UNFPA 2010). In turn, UNFPA is required to discuss and approve this plan and its revisions. These partners are further expected to monitor progress continuously while UNFPA is expected to link this monitoring to the disbursement of funds. In particular, implementing partners are supposed to use an Annual Work Plan and Monitoring Tool to monitor implementation and then to submit the tool to UNFPA, usually in conjunction with their quarterly financial reporting.

Fourth, implementing partners are required to submit standard annual progress reports for each AWP that provide “a critical assessment of progress made in achieving results, the adequacy of strategies including capacity development strategies, and contributions of the activities” to the UNFPA’s Global and Regional Program. The annual reports are expected to provide information on results as well as challenges encountered and lessons learned.

Finally, although not required, many organizations find it desirable to have a multiyear strategic plan that provides a vision of what the organization seeks to achieve and how it will do so, substantively and financially. Such plans can usefully provide an overarching framework that provides coherence to the organization’s activities and to the four accountability-related requirements just noted. Despite the desirability of a strategic plan, AFPPD does not have a strategic plan that provides any sense of its intended direction or desired accomplishments.12 Many respondents were critical of this absence, commenting on AFPPD’s lack of vision and direction.

As several interviewees noted, the absence of a strategic plan for AFPPD creates a sense of ad hoc activities without a coherent approach either to advocacy or to AFPPD’s programmatic responsibilities. A report from International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF, undated) that summarizes its experiences with advocacy is especially germane here:

…advocacy is more successful when we have a clearly defined desired outcome with realistic actions for specific actors to undertake. Advocacy should therefore always be targeted to a particular group of people asking them to do a concrete action toward a

---

12 An internal evaluation completed for AFPPD (Seetharam 2005) had recommended the “development of a strategy and action plan for a longer period…with clearly defined and time bound goals.” AFPPD has not implemented this recommendation.
desired political change…advocacy is about effecting lasting change. This is achieved by making sure that policy makers and other decision makers are held to account for the needs and rights of their constituents and communities. Some activities may contain elements of advocacy, but they do not by default constitute advocacy….Advocacy goes beyond information, education and communication in that it seeks specific changes in policy and legislation.

Concerns about AFPPD’s lack of a strategic plan and a practical model for advocacy were shared widely, and some people within AFPPD also voiced similar concerns. When UNFPA’s country-based staff were asked whether they knew of AFPPD’s planned activities (or their location) for the remainder of 2011, none had any idea. While APRO has developed some strategies for thematic areas, there was no strategy for advocacy. Without a clear strategy articulating APRO’s focus and priorities in terms of advocacy, including engagement with parliamentarians, it is difficult to provide midterm plans for AFPPD’s work under APRO funding.

Nonetheless, give the requirements for RBM noted above, and assuming AFPPD’s compliance with them and UNFPA’s oversight of AFPPD’s efforts, both AFPPD and UNFPA have been remiss in ensuring compliance with the requirements. AFPPD’s compliance with the four accountability-related requirements is highly unsatisfactory. Few of its AWPs contain baselines or targets, and there was no evidence that deadlines were greed by which the baselines or target would be provided. In 2009, for example, UNFPA provided $165,000 to AFPPD to develop parliamentarians’ leadership on population, reproductive health, and gender as well as other activities and another $50,000 to improve the capacity of national parliamentary committees on population and health through small grants to national committees. The AWPs contain no indicators, no baseline information, no targets, and no deadline by which the required information would be provided. When asked why AFPPD’s AWPs did not include valid indicators, the evaluation team was informed that APRO had not asked for AWP-level indicators. Without valid and meaningful indicators it is not possible to assess AFPPD’s effectiveness, to verify objectively what results were achieved, or to make an impartial judgment about how UNFPA’s support for AFPPD contributed to the outcomes described in the agency’s strategic plan or its global and regional program.

AFPPD received $290,000 in 2009 and 2010 to strengthen its institutional capacity to advocate for ICPD issues, but the evaluation found no evidence of institutional strengthening having occurred. Likewise, the JTF provided support to AFPPD in 2010 to develop parliamentarian and local elected body leadership on gender, population, and reproductive health. AFPPD’s summary of its activities for that year does not mention any activities at the local level (as opposed to national and regional activities).

13 The guidance from APRO at the start of the regional program was that all AWPs should use the indicators in the program’s results and resources framework—not separate indicators, to move toward a programmatic approach from a project approach.
In other instances AWPs identified “improved performance” and “evidence of action at the national and regional level” as indicators, but they were not meaningful indicators of results. These examples are illustrative of the weaknesses of most of AFPPD’s AWPs.

Although AFPPD is aware of the requirement that it have a monitoring and evaluation plan, it does not have one and has made no effort to develop one. Similarly, AFPPD does not systematically monitor the implementation of its programs or report on the progress of this implementation using the Annual Work Plan and Monitoring Tool, as it is required to do. AFPPD did not submit any standard progress reports to APRO in 2008 or 2009, despite APRO’s written request that AFPPD do so.

AFPPD did submit three annual standard progress reports to APRO for 2010. They focused primarily on descriptions of events and activities rather than results achieved and were largely unresponsive to the required contents. One AWP provided $126,000 in 2010 for activities related to the elimination of violence against women and girls. There were three indicators, none with targets or baselines. Two indicators addressed the number of: (a) knowledge resources and policy tools developed; and, (b) government, civil society and UN advocates giving feedback on the use of knowledge resources and policy tools or requesting technical assistance in their use. The related standard progress report did not include any discussion of these indicators, thus diminishing the report’s value in making judgments about AFPPD’s effectiveness or whether the expected outputs had been achieved.

AFPPD has provided oral and informal reports to UNFPA (and UNFPA staff usually attend meetings that AFPPD organizes), so there is some awareness of what occurs at AFPPD-facilitated events. Despite this awareness, UNFPA staff indicated that the information they receive focuses on “low-level monitoring” and is primarily activity based (e.g., the number of meetings and the number participants at these meetings). Overall, AFPPD’s reporting was poor. Several of AFPPD’s publications reinforce this perspective; in recent years AFPPD has published reports that summarize activities completed with little or no discussion of desired results (e.g., *AFPPD Activities Report 2008: Empowering Parliamentarians*). AFPPD explained to the evaluation team that its annual reports are normally activity reports and meeting or conference reports that can be indicative of its achievements.

No less important, many respondents were highly critical of AFPPD’s (and, equally important, APRO’s) failure to identify intended targets and objectives. AFPPD’s lack of accountability and inability to demonstrate its effectiveness were recurring themes among those interviewed.

AFPPD’s publications reinforce a commonly voiced opinion – AFPPD is an event- and activity-based organization, a view shared even within AFPPD and reinforced in its publications. In the absence of direct measures of effectiveness the evaluation team had to
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14 As an illustration, UNFPA’s *Global and Regional Programme Guide* stipulates that indicators should be direct, objective, practical, and adequate. Other commonly used criteria identify indicators that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound.

15 In accordance with the document that established the JTF (as well as the subsequent letters from the government notifying UNFPA of specific commitments of funding to AFPPD), final reports, including a final accounting report, are required upon the completion of each trust-funded activity. A search of UNFPA’s Donor Agreement Report Tracking System did not locate any such reports, but AFPPD submitted workshop reports on JTF-funded activities.
consider alternatives, and these include a review of the perceived effectiveness of: (a) AFPPD’s conferences; (b) its newsletter; (c) its website; (d) its policy-tracking initiative; and, (e) the small grants that it provides.

Conferences

There was near universal agreement among stakeholders consulted about the considerable desirability of convening regional meetings of parliamentarians to discuss issues of mutual concern and to compare their countries’ performance against that of others. AFPPD’s conferences thus introduce some participants to views and perspectives to which they would not otherwise be exposed. There is undoubted value in this process. Moreover, in the face of many competing social, economic, and political concerns in the region, the ability to raise ICPD-related issues to prominence on a recurring and regional basis is admirable. As a consequence, AFPPD’s ability to access and convene participants that are among the most influential leaders from many countries is a well-recognized and much-appreciated strength. AFPPD’s unique access to the region’s parliamentarians provides UNFPA with opportunities to spread its message among key policymakers throughout Asia and the Pacific. A side benefit of such meetings is that they provide opportunities for staff from UN and NGOs to meet with parliamentarians, who are otherwise often difficult to meet. As an illustration, at the Jakarta meeting in March 2011, representatives from the International Labor Organization, UNAIDS, UNWOMEN, and UNFPA had the opportunity to interact with nearly 50 parliamentarians from seventeen countries.

In addition, international meetings that attract participants from as many as twenty countries also raise APRO’s and UNFPA’s profile. The following comment well summarizes AFPPD’s success in convening meetings:

AFPPD is the oldest, most influential and most institutionalized group of all the regional forums that UNFPA has been working with in advocating with parliamentarians. It has an established name and recognition in the region as the only parliamentary network that works to advocate for the ICPD mandate in Asia and the Pacific.

For these reasons, APRO and IERD consider AFPPD to be a valuable partner.

Is AFPPD’s success in organizing conferences matched by its success in achieving desired results? Is AFPPD able to capitalize on its ability to convene the parliamentarians? Do these conferences contribute to the long-term goal, which includes changes in national policies and effective implementation of these policies? In answering these questions the evidence is mixed, as can be seen by considering respondents’ reactions to several facets of every conference: preconference planning, the conference itself, and postconference follow up.

Preconference planning

Four concerns, all of which reduce AFPPD’s effectiveness, were common:

- There are problems in getting the “right” parliamentarians to attend AFPPD’s
conferences. One respondent expressed the opinion that AFPPD appears to bring people together randomly, with little sense of coherence or even continuity. This problem arises, at least partially, because national committees rather than AFPPD invite potential participants. In addition, too many conferences occur toward the end of each calendar year, and some national committees thus are unable to “fill” their quotas for each conference or find that the parliamentarians who should attend are not available. In some cases, parliamentarians learn of the opportunity to attend a conference only a few days before it begins. For the conference in Jakarta mentioned above, one parliamentarian from South Asia said he learned that he would attend the day before he traveled to Jakarta. It was reported that, typically, those parliamentarians who are available are selected, rather than the most suitable ones, with the consequence that “second-line people” often attend. Among those who do attend, most are already sympathetic to ICPD-related issues. Several respondents observed that AFPPD’s conferences change few people’s minds. An AFPPD conference in Bali in 2009 was mentioned by several respondents as a prime example of this. In contrast, APRO believes that the Bali participants were correctly selected based on having prior experience in maternal health.

- Australian parliamentarians and parliamentary staff interviewed during the evaluation felt that the conferences had value in facilitating dialogue and discussion among parliamentarians with a diversity of knowledge and perspectives. They believed that some parliamentarians who had scant knowledge or negative attitudes about family planning, gender, abortion, etc., were able to interact with more knowledgeable (or informed) parliamentarians from other countries in the region.

- Inadequate and insufficient collaboration by AFPPD with UNFPA’s country offices in the planning for conferences was reported from the four country offices visited during the evaluation, as well as from UNFPA staff who had worked in country offices not included in the site visits. Rather than working with country offices to develop and present conferences that contribute to and promote the objectives of the country offices and that reflect the local context, AFPPD seemingly plans its conferences without working closely with country offices. As one UNFPA respondent remarked, AFPPD “tends to bypass country offices” and does not see these offices as a “central part of the equation” when conferences are planned. Along the same lines, another UNFPA staff member believes that AFPPD has not asked country offices what the priorities are in his country. Although the country has hosted several AFPPD meetings over the past decade, the country representative further noted that the country office had no role in organizing or contributing to the conferences. APRO notes that AFPPD relies on national committees as its primary in-country counterpart, not UNFPA country offices. This is clearly a missed opportunity for both AFPPD and the country offices. Similarly, participation of stakeholders in the development process and implementation of AFPPD projects supported by UNFPA is also limited. For many national committees the flow of information appears to be top down from AFPPD rather than bottom up or participatory.

- Some respondents believed that conferences appear to be supply driven or in response to donors’ requests. An emphasis on the number of meetings and a perception that
AFPPD’s role is to organize meetings might explain this situation.

The Value of Conferences

In terms of logistics and administrative arrangements, respondents reported positively on AFPPD. Although there are occasional complaints, they are inevitable when dealing with large numbers of people, some of whom expect preferential treatment. More important, what are the participants’ opinions about the value and effectiveness of the conferences they attend? A number of parliamentarians and parliamentary staff were highly complementary about the conferences they had attended. These opinions were often from those who had attended only a single conference. For example, first-time delegates from Cambodia who attended the March 2011 conference in Jakarta noted that “it was a wonderful experience that highlighted the need to focus on the issues and challenges facing women and girls, and encouraged us to hold a follow-up meeting in Cambodia to tackle this issue.” Some others, who had attended several AFPPD events, were less positive in their comments:

- Several respondents expressed a concern that the purposes and objectives of many meetings are unclear, other than to bring parliamentarians together. In the absence of an understanding of these objectives, concern was also expressed about an observed lack of coherence across presentations, and also that some presentations that were not well related to the themes or title of the relevant sessions.

- There is a lack of continuity from one meeting to another. On the one hand, there is agreement among many respondents, including AFPPD’s executive director, that attendance at a single meeting is not sufficient to enhance parliamentarians’ knowledge about ICPD-related issues or their capacity to advocate effectively on these issues. Despite such agreement, more than 80 percent of all country-based participants at conferences in 2009 and 2010 had attended only one AFPPD meeting in those years. On the other hand, there is little continuity from one meeting to the next, even when they address similar topics. The meeting in Jakarta, noted above, was the eighth meeting in a series, but no mention was made of any of the previous seven meetings, what had happened at them, or what had occurred as a result of the statements of commitment that participants had approved at the prior meetings. As several respondents observed, there is no connection or continuity from one AFPPD conference to another.

- Many AFPPD meetings are too short, filled with too many presentations, and do not provide enough time for discussion after presentations or among participants. Most AFPPD meetings are only two days in length, and some are but a single day (such as a meeting in Australia in December 2010). Not only are these meetings and the associated international airfares expensive, but doubts were frequently expressed about their utility, practical value, and effectiveness.

- AFPPD meetings commonly involve parliamentarians from throughout Asia and the Pacific, thus employing a “one size fits all” approach to topics and issues. Many respondents recommended subregional meetings that would bring together parliamentarians and their staff with similar national issues and levels of progress on ICPD-related issues. The national committees have different levels of experience and capability, but many people commented on AFPPD’s seeming lack of attention to
these differences in capacity. Having subregional meetings would perhaps reduce the diversity of views and opinions found in the large and comprehensive regional meetings that are now the norm, but many respondents nonetheless favored smaller meetings with colleagues from their own subregion.16

- One challenging and potentially intractable problem is the limited proficiency in English of some participants. Parliamentarians who do not speak English are less likely to attend and find useful AFPPD conferences than those who do speak English. Among attendees with limited proficiency in English, their ability to participate is limited severely, as is their ability to follow and benefit from the presentations and to network with other conference participants. In contrast, the reliance on English often means that participants from English-speaking countries dominate the discussions that occur. Subregional meetings may help to address this concern.

- Many respondents questioned the methodology and approach used in AFPPD’s meetings and conferences. This format typically relies on formal PowerPoint presentations by parliamentarians from as many countries as possible plus additional presentations from UNFPA or other UN staff and invited speakers from the country hosting the conference. Finally, and most important, many respondents believe that the conferences are largely ineffective and lack value. The evaluation team recognizes that there is value in the networking opportunities that occur at AFPPD conferences, but there is a sense that AFPPD’s access to the region’s parliamentary leadership is rarely transformed into desired results. The general sentiment of respondents is that “the conferences do not add up to anything.”

Postconference follow-up

While AFPPD successfully organizes high-profile conferences, the evaluation team heard a consistent message among respondents, namely that there is negligible evidence of any meaningful follow up from AFPPD after its conferences end. National committees have some responsibilities in this area, but many respondents were disappointed that the end of a conference also seemed to signal an end to AFPPD’s interest in what occurred at the meeting. As an illustration, each AFPPD conference typically ends with the participants’ adoption of a statement of commitment. There is neither a comprehensive record of these commitments nor any effort to assess their effectiveness or consequences. The value and effectiveness of the commitments are thus unknown.

All of these concerns lead the evaluation team to conclude that AFPPD should revisit its conference-based model to advocacy and capacity development. Fewer but longer conferences and workshops are desirable, as is enhanced attention to the scope, format, agendas, timing, selection of participants, substantive preparation, and intended results of AFPPD’s meetings. Rather than judging success by the number of conferences and participants, AFPPD should consider how its convening authority can best be used to transform opportunity into action and accomplishment. There are surely some desirable results associated with AFPPD’s present conference-based model, but these results are
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16 Four regions were suggested: south Asia, central and east Asia, Southeast Asia, and the Pacific.
uncertain, difficult to verify, and often achieved at high cost. Such a model may no longer be appropriate or effective; rethinking and restructuring is urgently required.

Newsletter and Website

AFPPD publishes an Asian Forum Newsletter about six times per year. Respondents’ reactions to it were mixed. A few people indicated that the newsletter provides useful information for them in the form of parliamentarians’ “sound bites.” In contrast, far more respondents were critical of the newsletter and found it unhelpful.

One explanation of the criticisms is the newsletters’ content, which typically summarizes previous conferences and meetings. To illustrate, the last issue in 2010 was devoted almost entirely to descriptions of AFPPD’s meetings or training programs (and with many pictures accompanying the summaries). Only one article focused on anything other than a meeting. The last issue of 2009 had the same format: it summarized the statements that participants had made at previous conferences. A review of other issues from 2008-2010 found similar results. As a result, there is little in most newsletters that captures or sustains readers’ interest.

Some major changes are noted in the first issue of 2011. The newsletter has an attractive cover and contains interviews with regional parliamentarians, an article on the status of proposed legislation on reproductive health in the Philippines, and a summary of a presentation by UNFPA’s new executive director on the agency’s desire to partner with parliamentarians and civil society. Recipients of the newsletter might find the new format far more appealing than in the past.

Respondents’ comments about the usefulness of the AFPPD website were mixed, with some people finding the website to be of use (primarily those people with little knowledge of the ICPD Programme of Action), whilst many other respondents repeatedly voiced their dissatisfaction with the website. Few people find it attractive or believe that it has much information of value. Moreover, few people use it as a primary or even a secondary source of relevant information to support or inform their work on ICPD-related issues. Much of the information that does appear is procedural and activity-based rather than substantive, analytic, and policy oriented. A web link to the ICPD Programme of Action would be useful.

The mixed reviews and concerns about the newsletters and the website raise questions about the purpose, utility, and effectiveness of each. A full-color newsletter on high-quality, glossy paper can be expensive to print and distribute throughout the region, and the website seemingly has little appeal or value to many of the people in AFPPD’s target audience. These concerns justify substantial changes to both the newsletter and website. Even though the content of the newsletter was improved in 2011, its purpose and objectives need to be clarified and cost-effectiveness demonstrated convincingly.

Policy Tracking Initiative

One of the AWPs for 2010 tasks AFPPD to establish a “policy tracking and monitoring database,” which is intended to be a “place where all population policies of Asia-Pacific are documented and regularly updated.” To complement this initiative, AFPPD was also given funds to train parliamentary staff on this initiative. The four-day training occurred in Bangkok in November 2010.
The AWP for the policy tracking initiative contains detailed output indicators from which it should be possible to monitor progress with the database. The project started only recently, however, and as a result, it is premature to judge its effectiveness, especially because the database is not yet well known in the region. AFPPD’s policy tracking unit has already placed more than 670 pages of policy documents on AFPPD’s website.

In addition to the web-based data, AFPPD has also completed four “policy trends” that provide information on: (a) debates about population in India; (b) Pakistan’s draft population policy; (c) a proposed reproductive health bill in the Philippines; and, (d) Japan’s global health policy. The major criticism of the briefs is that they lack analysis. In the case of the “policy trend” on the Philippines, as an example, it contains only the proposed legislation – without any discussion of its history, rationale, changes in and implications for reproductive health in the country, sources of support and opposition, or prospects for approval. The issue on Japan’s global health policy is a photocopy of a publication from Japan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs. If the policy trends are to continue, the absence of analysis and commentary should be remedied. Without such analysis, there is little value added and not much that contributes to AFPPD’s effectiveness. Having suggested the need for more than mere summary, AFPPD’s ability to provide meaningful analysis is a challenge in view of its staff’s limited technical capabilities on analysis in general and ICPD-related issues in particular.

Small Grants to National Committees

Since 2007 AFPPD has provided support in the form of small grants of up to $10,000 to national parliamentary groups or committees or their support mechanisms to implement projects related to the ICPD Programme of Action.

The evaluation team reviewed all small grant proposals and products (where available) over the last four years (see annex 8).17 The number of proposals funded annually is steadily increasing, although it is unclear whether this is due to an increase in the number of applications or the quality of the proposals. In 2007 two proposals were funded; in 2008 five were funded; in 2009 six were funded; and in 2010 ten proposals were funded.

AFPPD has improved its application process for small grants since 2009 through the development of guidelines and a standard application form that requires applicants to specify project goals, key outputs, and indicators of achievement. AFPPD has also identified key focal areas for small grants, such as engaging male parliamentarians in eliminating violence against women.

The quality of the small-grant proposals varies considerably, as do the products. Despite the new criteria for submission, few of the proposals provide objectively verifiable indicators or measures of success, and even fewer provide means of verification. It is therefore difficult to assess the effectiveness of the small grants and almost impossible to assess their impact.

Nevertheless, some of the proposals have developed products with the potential to be useful. The Cambodian Association of Parliamentarians on Population and Development (CAPPD) organized a regional seminar for women parliamentarians promoting maternal and
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17 Reports were not available for one small grant provided in 2008 (Philippines) and for two grants provided in 2009 (Philippines and Vietnam)
child health in March 2011. One of the stated goals was increased national budget allocations for priority interventions, although it is too early to assess the impact of this initiative. Nonetheless, the seminar was well attended and two of the stated outputs were achieved: policy issues identified and women’s parliamentary network strengthened. Similarly, in Indonesia a local NGO was supported to produce fact sheets on family planning, and the Indonesian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development will organize hearings with commissions and political factions. The advocacy aim is to increase the national budget on family planning in 2012.

As noted above, some of the outputs of the projects supported by the small grants appear to be potentially useful, although it is sometimes difficult to assess whether this potential is being realized. For example, the Philippines parliamentary committee, PLCPD, developed a comprehensive and detailed document in 2008 that outlines the structures, activities, and achievements of the majority of parliamentary groups in the Asia-Pacific region. This could be a useful resource document for AFPPD among others, but its use has not been evaluated.

Australia’s Parliamentary Group on Population and Development (PGPD) has been a major recipient of AFPPD small grants, and while all the products and outputs of PGPD’s projects are of high quality and appear to have been developed efficiently, the focus is largely if not entirely on Australia. It is acknowledged that the products were intended to contribute to the Australian discussion on foreign aid policy, programming, and the like. Australia being a major donor for UNFPA and ICPD issues, its policy has global and regional implications. In collaboration with the Australian Reproductive Health Association, as an example, PGPD developed a detailed and extensive report highlighting Australian parliamentarians’ actions in support of the ICPD agenda and the MDGs; however, the report appears to target Australian parliamentarians rather than being for regional distribution, and it is unclear how this report has been used.

One example of a small grant with positive effect is the development in 2007 by PGPD of well-produced advocacy briefs and a parliamentary lobbying kit with clear advocacy objectives, largely focused on how the Australian Agency for International Development’s (AusAID) family planning and program guidelines constrained access to safe abortion in countries in the region that AusAID supports. As discussed below, intensive lobbying by PGPD eventually resulted in a cross-party caucus voting to change the guidelines, so that AusAID is now able to support the same range of family planning programs for women in developing countries as are available to women in Australia (subject to the national laws of partner countries). There are indications that the successful change in the family planning guidelines and the subsequent increase in funding by AusAID for safe abortion in the region can be attributed, at least in some part, to the small grant from AFPPD. However, the small-grant proposal contained no indicators of success and no means of verification (other than the development of the advocacy briefs and lobbying kit).

This last example highlights the evaluation team’s concerns with the existing procedures for small grants. While the application form requires applicants to state the proposed project’s goals and key outputs and provide details of the means of assessing whether the goals have been achieved, these sections are rarely completed to an acceptable standard. In some cases it is difficult to understand how AFPPD can justify awarding the
small grant on the basis of the proposal submitted, yet most proposals are funded. AFPPD’s procedures and criteria for assessing small-grant proposals are also unclear, or at least are undocumented, as are the procedures for informing applicants about the success of their proposal. AFPPD also appears to have no mechanism or capacity for following up on whether project outputs and impact were achieved, and how best to further utilize these.

AFPPD’s executive director noted that funds earmarked annually for small grants are invariably underspent, and the small-grants scheme could therefore be expanded. As outlined above, some of the outputs of the projects funded under the scheme are innovative, of high quality, and if well utilized have the potential to deliver an impact. There are indications that the distribution of the small grants is skewed. Twelve of the twenty-three grants awarded between 2007 and 2010 went to the national committees in Australia and the Philippines in contrast to only one each in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam.

Some national committees expressed concerns about the processes for submission and review of proposals of small grants, including the lack of clear criteria and timeframe for decisions on their acceptability. The national committee in India, for example, submitted a proposal to AFPPD in May 2009, but was still awaiting a decision in 2011 on whether the proposal had been accepted for funding.

The evaluation findings on effectiveness are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with the four accountability-related requirements (clear and measurable changes and results; indicators to measure progress; targets for each indicator; and performance monitoring systems to collect data on actual results)</td>
<td>Highly unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference management, as judged by preconference planning, conference implementation and postconference follow-up, coupled with demonstrable results from conferences</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFPPD’s newsletter and website, in terms of reach, coverage and usefulness.</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFPPD’s policy tracking initiative, in terms of current level of analysis and potential.</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFPPD’s provision of small grants to national committees in terms of potentially useful products, AFPPD’s management of the grant process and AFPPD’s follow-up.</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite rating</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarize, the overall evidence on AFPPD’s effectiveness is mixed. On the one hand, AFPPD’s inadequate attention to results and considerable uncertainty about what has been achieved, leads the evaluation team to rate AFPPD’s effectiveness as highly unsatisfactory. On the other hand, AFPPD has an impressive and effective convening authority, although its potential is not fully achieved or strategically addressed. Similarly,
there is evidence of effectiveness with respect to the small grants and, potentially, with the policy tracking initiative. If AFPPD was a recently created organization, still establishing its credibility and technical and substantive competence, the evaluation team would be comfortable in assigning an overall rating of satisfactory for effectiveness. To the contrary, AFPPD is a now mature organization. After thirty years of existence AFPPD should be able to demonstrate its effectiveness in achieving results. AFPPD has not done so convincingly, so the evaluation team’s overall rating for effectiveness is unsatisfactory.

### Efficiency

Efficiency is a measure of how economically resources and inputs, such as funds, expertise, and time, are converted into results. To assess efficiency, it is necessary to link results to expenditures and judge whether results have been achieved as economically as possible. As the discussion of AFPPD’s effectiveness has suggested, identifying and measuring results and attributing them to AFPPD is problematic. Accordingly, this situation creates a challenge in terms of assessing the forum’s efficiency in achieving results.

Among those interviewed for the evaluation, there was widespread and overwhelming agreement that AFPPD efficiently organizes its conferences and workshops. AFPPD provides a seamless operation that generates both recognition and praise from people who have attended its functions. AFPPD has also successfully limited the daily subsistence allowances provided to attendees at these conferences. Through negotiated concessional rates for hotel accommodations and meals, AFPPD has also been able to minimize the costs of each participant’s expenses at the conference venues.

In contrast, there are several ways to improve AFPPD’s efficiency and to lower its costs in organizing conferences without sacrificing quality. One such example is handling of international travel. International airline tickets are one of AFPPD’s single largest expenses and thus may offer opportunities for cost savings and increased efficiency. AFPPD asks prospective conference attendees to identify an economy-class routing and ticket price they would prefer to use. Once this choice is made, the invitee (or his or her national committee) sends the information to AFPPD. In turn, AFPPD staff then review the information to determine whether the price and routing are acceptable. As often happens, however, some parliamentarians would like to extend their trip or to include additional destinations. When this occurs, AFPPD staff must then determine what the air fare would be without the extension or additional stopovers. In either event, AFPPD’s process for arranging international travel is time-consuming, administratively expensive, and assumes that AFPPD staff have as much expertise as do travel specialists, which is unlikely. In addition, the current AFPPD procedure precludes the negotiation of group or discounted fares that many airlines offer.

Once AFPPD approves the price of a ticket, it is purchased locally, often by the national committee. AFPPD then reimburses the national committee via a wire transfer. This transfer process involves substantial fees. In 2010 alone, AFPPD’s bank fees exceeded $7,500, most or all of which could have been avoided if AFPPD had relied on travel agencies with whom the national committees had dealt directly. AFPPD would reimburse one or a few travel agencies rather than all the national committees that had purchased the tickets. Such a
procedure should be used for all forthcoming meetings and conferences. AFPPD should no longer operate as a travel agency.

Another issue is indirect costs. UNFPA limits reimbursement of NGOs’ indirect costs or overhead to 12 percent of actual direct expenses incurred. Staying within the 12-percent limit thus provides a measure of efficiency. UNFPA is understandably interested in ensuring that its resources are used for implementation of activities, rather than for indirect expenses, which reflect an organization’s overhead.

As the UNFPA Letter of Understanding with AFPPD states, this “amount cannot be exceeded” for any AWP. As UNFPA’s Guidance Note on Indirect and Direct Costs (May 2011) indicates, “Contributions from UNFPA to an NGO which require little or no management on behalf of the implementing partner are subject to little or no indirect cost payment.” Furthermore, the Guidance Note stipulates that “indirect costs cannot be included” in advance payments to NGOs because these costs are based on actual expenditures.

Indirect costs are incurred as part of an organization’s regular operating expenses but are not directly allocable or attributable to a specific task or activity. Indirect costs are related to an organization’s day-to-day operations and continue to exist no matter which projects are being implemented at any point in time. UNFPA’s Financial Regulations and Rules define indirect costs to include “the expenses incurred as a result of the management and administration of program activities and funds.” UNFPA elsewhere defines indirect costs to include “the top management of an organization, its corporate costs and statutory bodies not related to service provision.” Among other organizations, indirect costs normally include the salaries and expenses of executive officers, personnel administration, and accounting. In addition, indirect costs usually include the costs of an NGO’s advisory or executive committee, rent, utilities, equipment, maintenance, supplies, office insurance, and the design and maintenance of its website, although UNFPA does accept each of these as direct costs when billed to a specific project.

AFPPD provided the evaluation team with conservative estimates of its indirect cost rate for 2010 to be approximately 19.6 percent (see annex 9), well above the UNFPA’s 12-percent limit. AFPPD does not have a clear understanding of the concept of indirect costs and does not compute them correctly. The review of AFPPD’s audited financial statement for 2010 indicates an indirect cost rate of 6.2 percent, but this number is open to question as some of the indirect costs were categorized as direct costs (e.g., compensation of AFPPD’s accounting and executive staff). Conversely, some expenses that should have been allocated
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18 In assessment of other evaluations, DOS (2011) has considered indirect costs to be a suitable measure of efficiency.
19 As an illustration, UNFPA’s Guidelines for UNFPA Collaboration with NGOs declare that a “lower rate deemed appropriate by the concerned unit of UNFPA applies to projects with activities which do not incur significant amounts of indirect costs such as small-scale meetings and workshops, travel grants, tuition, and publications.” In addition, the provisions of the JTF similarly stipulate that project management “and expenditures will be governed by the regulations, rules and directives of the UNFPA” and in “accordance with UNFPA Financial Rules and Regulations as well as its Policies and Procedures.”
20 UNFPA, Report of the Implementation of the UNFPA Policy on Indirect Cost Recovery, DP/FPA/2010/16, November 17, 2009. To be clear, an organization’s costs for executive oversight are typically indirect costs. In contrast, direct costs, according to UNFPA, “are specifically and entirely attributable” to the activities of a project that an NGO is executing on behalf of UNFPA. UNFPA also accepts the cost of top management as a direct cost when it is allocated to a project activity and recorded in a timesheet. AFPPD does not do so.
to a specific project were categorized as indirect expenses when they were not (e.g., travel insurance, hospitality at conferences).

In addition to concerns about AFPPD’s inefficiency in calculating and limiting its indirect costs, the evaluation team has other concerns about the disparate application of these costs across projects within AFPPD’s portfolio. These concerns are discussed below, in the section of AFPPD’s financial management.

Another efficiency-related issue that merits attention is management of human resources. AFPPD has no formal staffing plan, no staff manual, no written job descriptions, no salary schedules, no human resources policy, no opportunities for promotion, and no career path that promotes professional growth and development among its staff. Likewise, AFPPD has no clear rationale for staff salaries, such as pay grade and range; benefits are neither clearly documented in a policy manual nor equitably applied. AFPPD has no process for regularly assessing staff performance including objective setting, listing of responsibilities, and assessment of performance.

High staff turnover is a recurring, well-recognized, and largely unaddressed problem at AFPPD.\(^{21}\) As in any organization, new employees typically have a learning curve that mitigates their efficiency and effectiveness until they are both comfortable and proficient with their new responsibilities. The reasons for the turnover of AFPPD’s staff vary, but salaries and benefits that are not competitive are part of the explanation. The salaries and benefits provided to AFPPD’s international staff are below those of many other international nongovernmental organizations. High staff turnover has led to low morale, a loss of valuable experience (including English- and Russian-language skills), and high costs for recurring recruitment. The low salaries have also made it difficult for AFPPD to attract and retain staff with experience and technical expertise in the areas in which it works.\(^{22}\) As a consequence, AFPPD’s staffing structure is not conducive to its delivery of outputs or, more important, achievement of desired results. A partial remedy to this problem would be to raise staff salaries to prevailing market rates.

The organization does not conduct exit interviews or gather or retain information on leavers. There is also negligible delegation of authority, which disempowers staff and discourages their creativity and effectiveness. Communication is limited between management and staff; few opportunities exist to exchange ideas or discuss management, program, or technical issues, and staff meetings are infrequent. Staff ideas are not systematically sought in the decision-making process, and decisions affecting AFPPD are not often communicated or explained well.

In sum, AFPPD’s human resource management is therefore categorized as highly unsatisfactory.

The criteria for assessing AFPPD’s efficiency are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(^{21}\) AFPPD sponsored a self-evaluation of its operations (Seetharam 2005) that identified a “high degree of [staff] turnover” as a cause of concern.

\(^{22}\) As Seetharam (2005) noted, “funding…limits AFPPD’s ability to hire experience and technical staff.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization of conferences and workshops, in terms of cost savings and travel management</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs, in terms of calculating and limiting indirect costs</td>
<td>Highly unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource management, in terms of staff retention, staff satisfaction, and career planning</td>
<td>Highly unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite rating</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the reasons outlined above, the evaluation teams rates AFPPD’s overall efficiency as unsatisfactory.

**Impact**

This section addresses two questions in the TOR: how have the parliamentarians been engaged in the advocacy for policies and budget in support of ICPD Programme of Action and MDGs? Were there any unexpected long-term effects, either negative or positive?

An assessment of impact depends critically on the existence of meaningful indicators, targets, and means of verification. As discussed above, AFPPD’s work plans are deficient in indicators, baseline information, targets, or deadlines by which the required information would be provided. More specifically, no indicators are provided in AFPPD’s AWPs that measure how parliamentarians have been engaged in the advocacy for policies and budgets in support of the ICPD Programme of Action and MDGs. It is therefore difficult to form an objective judgement of the impact of AFPPD’s advocacy initiatives or programs.

Given that advocacy initiatives are often long-term, the evaluation team reviewed potential impact for a period longer than the three-year timeframe specified in the TOR. In doing so, the evaluation has drawn on an impact assessment report developed internally by AFPPD in 2007, as well as other more recent reports from national parliamentary groups. It is acknowledged that these are secondary data sources and that the element of bias cannot be discounted. The evaluation has attempted to triangulate these data sources by interviews with parliamentarians and their support staff.

One of AFPPD’s most notable and enduring impacts is its support for the creation of the national committees that are members of its network. In its early years AFPPD worked with individual parliamentarians, but following the ICPD in Cairo in 1994, AFPPD helped to promote the concept of parliamentary committees on population and development. Despite the initial reluctance of some parliamentarians and their committees to become members of an external organization, AFPPD successfully engaged with them, resulting in the newly formed national committees on population and development becoming its members. A key achievement of AFPPD is that its membership has expanded to twenty-five national committees of parliamentarians on population and development. AFPPD continues to promote the formation of new parliamentary committees on population and development and encourage their membership in the forum. These national committees can play a role in advocating for the formulation of policies and programs and mobilizing additional resources to achieve the ICPD goals and the MDGs.
Furthermore, the review of the parliamentary reports from these committees reveals an enormous diversity in how impact is characterized, ranging from the engagement of full-time parliamentary support staff to the construction of a building to house a national committee, as in India. The following indicators of impact have been identified:

- **Australia**: official development assistance has been increased for population and reproductive health as a result of lobbying by PGPD; AusAID increased funding to UNFPA and IPPF; assistance for work on HIV/AIDS increased; legislation removes minister of health’s veto over registration and importation of abortion pill, RU486.
- **Cambodia**: Legislation on prevention and control of HIV/AIDS, which had been proposed by CAPPD, was approved; adoption of law on domestic violence.
- **China**: re-evaluation of the one child policy at village level.
- **India**: Reservation of women as chair in local self-governments.
- **Indonesia**: Amendment of laws on health and population in line with ICPD and MDGs approved by parliament; domestic violence law approved and signed by president.
- **Malaysia**: National plan for the advancement of women adopted; domestic violence act approved.
- **Mongolia**: HIV/AIDS legislation approved; national program for provision of gender equality initiated; law on domestic violence passed.
- **Nepal**: Abortion made legal without restriction within first twelve weeks of pregnancy.
- **New Zealand**: Provided increased funding to UNFPA resulting from advocacy by the New Zealand Parliamentarians on Population and Development.
- **Philippines**: HIV/AIDS stigma and discrimination prevention bill and elimination of violence against women bill sponsored by PLPCD and approved by parliament; bills on population and reproductive health receiving significant advocacy support from the PLCPD.
- **Sri Lanka**: HIV/AIDS legislation approved; population and reproductive health policy adopted.
- **Thailand**: elimination of violence against women bill supported by AFPPD approved by national legislative assembly; draft reproductive health law under preparation; prevention of discrimination and stigma on HIV/AIDS legislation approved.
- **Vietnam**: Population ordinance to relax abortion situation approved; law on protection of people’s health, which legalised abortion, was approved; bill on elimination of domestic violence approved.

It is difficult to assign attribution of change to advocacy efforts in general, and nigh impossible to attribute changes in laws or policies to advocacy efforts by a particular parliamentarian or parliamentary committee. However, UNFPA supports evaluations assessing the extent of an organization’s “contribution” to change, especially where “attribution” is difficult to assess. While AFPPD works with national parliamentary committees, its major role is in facilitating dialogue and exposure to best practices and lessons learned related to the ICPD’s Programme of Action.

The absence of a definitive cause-and-effect relation between AFPPD’s activities and changes at the national level compromises efforts to specify AFPPD’s impacts. This is especially important to note because AFPPD judges its own success by what happens at the national level. In an effort to judge AFPPD’s relative contribution to such changes at this
level, the evaluation team asked key respondents in Indonesia and the Philippines to assess the relative importance of AFPPD in supporting and approving key policy and legislative proposals in the two countries. Indonesia’s House of Representatives approved major legislation in 2009 related to health (Law 36) and population and family development (Law 52). In the Philippines, a major restructuring of the country’s laws on reproductive health has been proposed and debated in the House of Representatives for nearly fifteen years. Respondents indicated that AFPPD’s impact on the passage of these laws was, or would be, marginal or, at best, limited, as AFPPD is not directly involved in associated national processes.

If one of AFPPD’s objectives is to support and promote the success of the various national committees, there is not much evidence that this is occurring. Members of national committees had many ideas about the kind of support that they would welcome, but such support was reportedly not usually provided, and AFPPD had not asked the committees’ representatives what help they might need. Support that would be welcomed involves technical capacity and expertise, although all the national committees mentioned the limited capacity of AFPPD to provide these. Respondents also mentioned their perception that AFPPD is insufficiently familiar with the national context in which the national committees operate. Nonetheless, one example of AFPPD’s direct contribution to both policy change and increased funding is noteworthy. This is briefly outlined in the section on small grants, above, which notes that there are indications that the successful change in the family planning guidelines and the subsequent increase in funding by AusAID for safe abortion in the region can be attributed, at least in some part, to the AFPPD small grant.

AFPPD’s mandate under the regional program has recently expanded beyond advocacy to building the capacity of parliamentarians for advocacy although, as discussed elsewhere in this report, baseline data, targets, and indicators of success in this area are weak or lacking. An approach to addressing this deficiency is currently under development, initiated by the IPPF’s subregional office in India in collaboration with AFPPD. The approach is to identify up to fifty parliamentarians from nine countries in the Asia-Pacific region and conduct a baseline survey on their knowledge and attitudes related to the ICPD Programme of Action, together with an assessment of their skills in advocacy on ICPD-related issues. IPPF, in collaboration with AFPPD, will then hold a series of regional workshops to build the knowledge and advocacy capacity of the parliamentarians. This process will include exposure of the parliamentarians to midmedia (local TV, community radio, etc.) and an assessment of parliamentarians’ performance in discussions of gender issues, reproductive health and rights, etc. The process will be repeated periodically and progress will be monitored over time. The cost of the initiative is estimated at $5 million over five years. Seed funding of $150,000 has apparently been secured from the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development to work with the BBC and Johns Hopkins University for the initial activities, and funding is currently being sought from other donors, including the European Union, to expand the initiative.

The evaluators believe that this is an innovative approach to both build capacity of parliamentarians and assess the impact of this capacity building, as it will develop baseline data, targets, and measurable indicators of success over time, with clear means of
verification. UNFPA may wish to consider supporting this initiative, which is currently funded by other donors.

The criteria for assessing impact are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of parliamentarians in advocacy for policies and budget in support of ICPD Programme of Action and MDGs</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of national committees</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to national committees</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building of parliamentarians for advocacy</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite rating</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the constraints in measuring impact, in part due to the lack of a results-based framework, but based on the limited evidence available, the evaluation team has provided a rating of impact as satisfactory.

**Sustainability and Institutional Capacity**

This section addresses two questions: (a) how has AFPPD contributed to ongoing parliamentarian activities at the global, regional, and national levels; and (b) how much of AFPPD’s institutional capacity is institutionalized for sustainability?

The first question has been largely addressed in other sections of the report, and in particular in the sections on effectiveness and impact. The key word here is “ongoing,” and there is little evidence to suggest that current parliamentarian activities around ICPD issues will continue as is without UNFPA’s support at the regional level, but sustainability at the country level seems to be higher due to the mechanism of national committees of parliamentarians that can operate with or without AFPPD. The contribution AFPPD makes at the global level is through the unique combination of its members from donor (Australia, Japan, and New Zealand) and program countries that links issues and needs with increased or sustained funding availability globally, as evidenced in the case of Australia.

As outlined earlier, AFPPD devotes significant time and resources to organizing conferences and seminars, but a major criticism from a range of stakeholders is the lack of continuity and follow-up from these conferences. UNFPA staff and parliamentarians have emphasized that what happens in between the conferences is the critical issue, but AFPPD seemingly plays little or no role in this, nor does it have any mechanism in place to track progress from one conference to the next. The recent conference in Jakarta was the eighth in a series, but there was no review of the outcomes of the previous seven meetings or to what extent the declarations made by participants at these prior meetings had progressed. A simple approach to facilitate continuity and follow-up would be to begin each conference with such a review, take stock of progress, identify obstacles to success, and discuss lessons learned.
Similarly, the lack of follow up of the small grants provided by AFPPD to national parliamentary committees compromises the sustainability of their projects and misses opportunities to capitalize on potentially useful outputs and to enhance South-South cooperation.

To assess AFPPD’s sustainability as an organization, the evaluation team used seven criteria: (i) administrative procedures; (ii) governance; (iii) financial management; (iv) human resource management; (v) organizational management; (vi) program management; (vii) technical capacity. These criteria are derived from an Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool23 currently being employed by UNFPA’s country office in Nepal to explore ways to sustain NGO activities as UNFPA begins to phase-out direct program support.

Administrative Procedures

Several APRO and AFPPD staff members have expressed concern about AFPPD’s lack of written internal administrative procedures. AFPPD does not have a written policy on travel or travel-related expenses, which account for as much as 50 percent of its budget each year. As explained to the evaluation team, in the absence of a written policy on travel, there are no clear criteria that are applied transparently to parliamentarians and other participants including AFPPD staff as to who are permitted to fly in business class.

According to AFPPD’s executive director, an increasing number of parliamentarians expect AFPPD to pay for business class travel on international flights. AFPPD has resisted doing so, but the absence of a written policy on class of travel means that declinations of requests for such travel may appear subjective and amenable to exceptions depending on who makes the request.

There are also multiple instances in which AFPPD has not complied with UNFPA’s requirements, as already noted. The LOU requires AFPPD to (a) “submit a completed AWP monitoring tool” at the end of each year and (b) mark “all items financed by UNFPA…with UNFPA insignia.” AFPPD has not submitted the monitoring tools, and the evaluation team did not observe any UNFPA insignia on equipment, notably computers, purchased with UNFPA’s funds.

The evaluation team therefore rates AFPPD’s administrative procedures as unsatisfactory.

Governance

The evaluation rates AFPPD’s governance as unsatisfactory. Through 2010, the executive committee had met 68 times but still lacked rules or procedures pertaining to AFPPD’s governance and management processes. The absence of written rules and responsibilities for members of the executive committee prompted one member at the committee’s meeting in April 2010 to request specification of the members’ roles, functions, benefits, and financial liabilities. Not surprisingly, several members of the committee expressed uncertainty about their roles and responsibilities as AFPPD’s office bearers.

23 The tool was developed by Initiatives Inc., with contributions by John Snow Incorporated under the USAID-funded New Partner’s Initiatives Technical Assistance, Contract No. GHS-I-00-07-00002-00 and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s New Partner’s Initiatives Technical Assistance Contract No. 200-204-05316. http://www.ngoconnect.net/c/document_library/get_file?p_l_id=31308&folderId=218756&name=DLFE-9974.pdf
AFPPD’s executive director was instructed to prepare “a detailed manual” covering roles and responsibilities and submit a proposed draft to the committee in late 2010, but it has been delayed and the written rules and procedures were not yet in place as of May 2011.

The evaluation team is also concerned about the transient nature of the executive committee. A review of members’ attendance at eight meetings from 2007 through 2010 found that more than half of all attendees had been to only a single meeting. Thirteen people attended the two meetings in 2010; among these, only two people had attended both. In other words, many attendees have little familiarity with AFPPD or what occurred at previous meetings. This situation was compounded by a related problem. Some members complained that the materials that they received prior to the meetings were insufficient and not received in time to allow suitable review or preparation. As one attendee of the meetings of the executive committee observed:

“The AFPPD Secretariat is very engaged with implementing activities one after another and though this ambition is good, the consequences are that there is not enough information-sharing or rigorous decision-making processes. Last‐last minute, yet essential, requests are made to national committees and parliamentarians presumably because there is not enough time or sufficient capacity to deal with the workload. Even members of the executive committee, therefore, are not well‐ and fully informed of AFPPD’s activities since it is permanently occupied with executing conferences.”

The evaluation team and several people interviewed are concerned about the potential for and appearance of conflicts of interest. NGOs typically have boards or executive committees composed of members independent of the organization they oversee; these members thus are not potential beneficiaries of the decisions they make. In the case of AFPPD’s executive committee, in contrast, all of its members are affiliated with the forum and are potential beneficiaries of the decisions they make. The evaluation team is not aware of any actual conflicts of interest within the executive committee, but well‐managed NGOs conscientiously avoid even the appearance of possible conflicts of interest. The evaluation team recommends that AFPPD does the same by adding several independent members.

Financial Management

AFPPD does not have an effective, accurate, or well‐functioning accounting system or an internal manual that specifies how its finances will be managed in accordance with generally accepted accounting procedures. Despite the long‐standing partnership with UNFPA, AFPPD does not have a financial manual that specifies “what is required in all financial transactions, detailing all processes and procedures, including samples of forms and other instruments required in financial transactions,” as required as an Implementing Partner, according to the UNFPA’s Guidelines on the Assessment of Potential Executing Agencies. The review of considerable financial information by the evaluation team revealed multiple discrepancies between the Annual Disbursement Report and the quarterly Certificate of Expenditures forms and between the Annual Status of Funds report and the audited financial statement, all of which APRO should have detected. The evaluation team also found that several audited financial statements certified total expenditures that were exactly
the total budget allocations, although the breakdowns were different. As noted earlier, the determination of indirect costs and their apportionment to different funders (AFPPD received funds from other organizations than UNFPA) were not consistent or proper. As a result, much of the financial information that AFPPD has submitted to UNFPA is incorrect and misleading. No less important, the financial reports reviewed provide indisputable evidence that AFPPD’s erroneous reporting has been routine and deliberate over an extended period rather than sporadic and inadvertent. This has compromised UNFPA’s ability to make accurate financial reporting to donors on the use of money provided through general contributions and the cofinancing arrangement.

AFPPD spends more than 12 percent of the funds received as indirect costs. The possibility of AFPPD reducing its overhead costs or increasing its income is limited. To keep the current indirect costs within the 12-percent limit, AFPPD would need an annual budget of just over $1.9 million (i.e., slightly less than $1.7 million in direct costs plus 12 percent of that amount for indirect costs). UNFPA alone is unlikely to provide this amount, and there is a mixed view as to whether AFPPD should receive funds from others to cover areas not directly related to ICPD. In the absence of substantial funding from other sources, UNFPA and AFPPD should assume that the latter’s actual indirect cost rate will continue to exceed 12 percent for the foreseeable future. Twelve percent is not an unreasonable limit and is well within the range that other donors permit, but it does not now and cannot accommodate AFPPD’s cost structure or how it operates.

Members of AFPPD’s executive committee also expressed concern about the amount of money in AFPPD’s Saving Fund and how it has been accumulated and used. The Letter of Understanding between UNFPA and AFPPD requires that any funds unused at the end of each calendar year must be reported and returned to UNFPA. Despite this requirement and based on information that AFPPD provided to the evaluation team, AFPPD had more than $1 million in this fund by the end of 2010. According to the minutes of an executive committee meeting in November 2010, the “savings had been accumulated from the unused budget provided by UNFPA.” Although AFPPD had reported and certified to UNFPA that the agency’s funds had been fully spent in the year in which they had been provided, this was often incorrect. Unspent funds that should have been returned to UNFPA have been placed in AFPPD’s Savings Fund without the agency’s knowledge or approval.

AFPPD does not have a capacity to sustain its operations without UNFPA funding or to sustain its core existence within the 12 percent limit of indirect support costs. More important, AFPPD does not have a capacity to manage its finances in a credible, accountable, and transparent way. While UNFPA does not normally work with organizations that are completely reliant on its funding for their existence, this principle does not apply to AFPPD, as UNFPA was providing as much as 70-95 percent of AFPPD’s funding between 2008 and 2010. If UNFPA’s funding ends, it would be difficult for AFPPD to sustain its business.

24 In several instances in 2009 and 2010, costs related to staff health insurance and overhead, including rent, electricity, supplies, equipment and repair, were charged to UNFPA, rather than apportioned to other organizations. Also, AFPPD tended to adjust the allocation of its indirect costs to ensure that the budgeted amounts are not exceeded but almost always spent in their entirety. The evaluation team estimates that UNFPA provided 70 percent of AFPPD’s direct costs but paid over 97 percent of its indirect costs in 2010.
The examples and comments above lead the evaluation team to rate AFPPD’s financial procedures as highly unsatisfactory and, in turn, its accountability and transparency as equally unsatisfactory.

Organizational Management

AFPPD has no formal organizational structure and no long-term strategic plan. The organization does not appear to have a documented process to respond to internal changes, for example in staffing, leadership, budgets, or to external changes. Key functions and responsibilities of staff, members of the executive committee, and office bearers are not well defined.

There is an extraordinary concentration of decision-making authority in the executive director. He makes all decisions, including minor ones, even when he is away from the office. Moreover, there is no deputy director, no midlevel staff, and no succession plan. If something happens to the executive director, no one else in AFPPD is capable of managing its staff or activities or even authorized to do so in the executive director’s absence. This is a high-risk approach to leadership with no commensurate benefits. To the contrary, the approach jeopardizes AFPPD’s viability and sustainability. For all these reasons, widespread concern exists on the future of AFPPD after the retirement of the current executive director in 2012.

The organization has annual plans but these do not contain goals, strategies, measurable outputs, timelines, responsibilities and indicators. Those that are indicated are not adequate. Furthermore, the annual plans do not appear to be developed with the participation of staff. There appears to be no resource mobilization strategy. There is little indication that AFPPD has estimated its future resource needs or has taken steps to identify additional local, national, or international resources or opportunities to support its programs and activities, either directly or through potential partnerships.

AFPPD’s organizational management is therefore assessed as highly unsatisfactory.

Program Management

AFPPD appears to be knowledgeable about UNFPA regulations and standard provisions but has weak systems in place to ensure compliance with them. In terms of reporting, AFPPD provides reports on its work plans but these do not include a review of its objectives and strategies, facilitating factors and barriers, identification of lessons learned or best practices. AFPPD does not satisfactorily report on program indicators or use information to review or revise strategy with staff and stakeholders. While most technical and financial reports are available and are submitted on time, AFPPD does not have an internal system for monitoring and evaluation; it has not identified outcome indicators and has limited tools, data collection system, or processes to analyze and report on program outcomes and impact as defined in its AWPs.

AFPPD’s program management is therefore assessed as unsatisfactory.

Technical Capacity

AFPPD has demonstrated significant capacity and experience in organizing regional and international conferences. Many respondents, however, questioned AFPPD’s technical and substantive expertise in the thematic areas in which it works. Some view that AFPPD’s
lack of expertise on ICPD-related issues as well as limited understanding of local contexts as a major weakness. AFPPD’s technical expertise in building the capacity of parliamentarians and parliamentary groups is seen to be weak, as is its technical capacity in advocacy.

AFPPD’s technical capacity is therefore assessed as unsatisfactory.

Overview of sustainability and institutional capacity.

The table below summarizes the assessments of the six components of sustainability and institutional capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative procedures</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>Highly unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational management</td>
<td>Highly unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program management</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical capacity</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite rating</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A consideration of the above criteria leads to the sustainability of AFPPD being rated as unsatisfactory overall, and in need of urgent attention.

AFPPD’s Comparative Advantage

The TOR required the evaluation team to address two additional questions: Are there any other organizations with a mandate similar to AFPPD’s? If so, what is the comparative advantage of AFPPD?

There is an identified niche for an organization such as AFPPD. UNFPA is committed to working with parliamentarians, and UN procedures highlight the need to work through partner organization(s). To a large extent, this is fulfilled at the country level by the national parliamentary committees and their support mechanisms. Nevertheless, there is an identified need for a regional body to support and coordinate these national committees, to facilitate dialogue among them, and to facilitate the sharing of lessons learned and best practice in the region. Given UNFPA’s limited capacity in advocacy with parliamentarians, there is also a need for an organization to provide technical assistance at national and regional levels.

The Asian Population and Development Association (APDA) has a mandate that is similar to AFPPD’s. APDA’s mission mirrors AFPPD’s. In particular, APDA organizes regional and international meetings of parliamentarians and engages in advocacy activities through public seminars and publication and dissemination of knowledge to address population and development issues. APDA also serves as the secretariat of the Japan Parliamentarians’ Federation for Population and is a member of AFPPD’s network of national parliamentary committees.

In comparison with APDA, AFPPD has three comparative advantages. First, AFPPD has a larger staff and more resources than does APDA. Second, AFPPD is based in a
developing country in the region (albeit one with upper middle-income status). Third, AFPPD has greater regional and international visibility than does APDA.

**Attention to Gender and Human Rights**

AFPPD’s attention to key gender-related issues is exemplary. All of the forum’s activities and programs are inculcated with sustained and meaningful attention to gender and gender sensitivity. Indeed, rather than treating gender as an afterthought or as an obligatory appendage to other issues, AFPPD has placed gender at the forefront of its activities. There are many examples to illustrate the comprehensive commitment to gender, especially to women’s rights.

As noted above, AFPPD has two standing committees devoted to women, one on the status of women, which an Australian senator chairs, and a second, on male parliamentarians’ involvement on the prevention of violence against women, which an Indonesian parliamentarian chairs. Both committees are highly active and have worked with AFPPD to advance attention to gender through a series of workshops and conferences. Some recent examples include:

- A regional conference of ministers and parliamentarians in Indonesia in October 2010 to share best practices on actions and legislations to eliminate violence against women.
- A meeting of the committee on prevention of violence against women in Australia in December 2010 organized in collaboration with UNFPA, the Australia Reproductive Health Alliance, and that country’s Parliamentarian Group on Population and Development. At the close of the meeting, committee members made personal commitments for actions they would take to address the issue of violence against women in the next twelve months and signed a collective statement of commitment specifically recognizing the need for their work to address prevention of violence against women and children, not just women and girls.
- The 8th Regional Women Ministers’ and Parliamentarians’ Conference on Young Women and Girls: Enhancing Parliamentary Support for and Monitoring of Gender Equality in Jakarta in March 2011.
- Two activities funded through AusAid, a “Review of Asia-Pacific Parliamentarians’ Actions on Eliminating Violence against Women” and open parliamentary hearings on eliminating violence against women in the Philippines (in March 2011) and in Pakistan (in April 2011).

These and other AFPPD-sponsored activities typically have a large number of female participants, despite their underrepresentation in many of the region’s parliaments. To illustrate, AFPPD disaggregates data on attendance at its conferences by gender. A total of 209 parliamentarians attended AFPPD conferences in 2010; of this number, 48 percent were female. Among all conference participants in that year, including staff of national committees and resource persons, 51 percent were female. Females represented 53 percent of all participants in 2009. Furthermore, female participants from Afghanistan, Australia, Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, and Vietnam outnumbered their male counterparts at AFPPD’s conferences in 2009. This is a remarkable
accomplishment; in only one of these countries do women comprise more than 30 percent of the countries’ parliamentarians.25

There are many more examples, but the ones cited above provide ample evidence of AFPPD’s strong and genuine commitment to gender equality. In short, this commitment is not only highly satisfactory but also to be applauded and encouraged.

In contrast to AFPPD’s strong commitment to gender equality, the evidence for AFPPD’s attention to human rights is mixed. While a human rights-based approach is implicit in promoting ICPD issues, the forum’s executive director noted that the issue of human rights is sensitive among some Asian governments, so it is an issue that he is not comfortable raising in terms of conference agendas or AFPPD’s publications. For this reason, the evaluation team did not actively pursue discussion of the topic during interviews.

Conclusions and Lessons Learned

The evaluation team believes that a fundamental restructuring of AFPPD and revitalization of approaches are necessary to improve UNFPA’s partnership with parliamentarians through AFPPD. Small, incremental adjustments at the margins will not be sufficient.

AFPPD is recognized for its ability to reach and convene parliamentarians, but this ability is not often translated into desired results. AFPPD’s activity- and event-based approach and lack of attention to outcomes and impacts needs to change. Evidence from this evaluation suggests that UNFPA does not now receive adequate value for its investment in AFPPD.

The reason for this can be attributed, at least in part, to UNFPA’s weak management and oversight of AFPPD, coupled with the absence of strategic vision of what UNFPA wants, or can reasonably expect, from its long-term investment in AFPPD. Two examples well illustrate this point. As one key stakeholder noted:

I think it is important to be realistic about what reasonable outcomes/outputs are for advocacy. Policy change isn’t a reasonable expectation of parliamentarian work at the national level, let alone at the regional level.

One of AFPPD’s AWPs for 2009 adopted just the opposite perspective and reflects a belief that policy change is a reasonable expectation. One of the AWP’s indicators is the number of “new reproductive rights related national laws in place or improvements in current laws.”

UNFPA has not articulated clearly or unambiguously what it wants from a parliamentary program, so the agency gets what it intends. This highlights a significant lesson learned from UNFPA’s support to its parliamentary program, namely the need for a strategic approach to parliamentary engagement as part of an advocacy strategy that embraces UNFPA’s global, regional, and national programs.

The evaluation team notes that UNFPA has a proposed division of labor within UNFPA, and between UNFPA and its partner parliamentary groups, that identifies

---

25 Data on parliamentary representation are from the Inter-Parliamentary Union and are current as of April 30, 2011. See http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm
responsibilities and key partners of IERD, regional offices, technical division, country offices, regional parliamentary groups and parliamentarians for global action. Despite this division of labor, there is no overarching strategy that guides the activities of the various entities, and the degree of communication and coordination among them leaves much to be desired. A member of the Evaluation Management Reference Group noted that UNFPA has a Terms of Partnership for UNFPA’s Work with Parliamentarians, but the document is not part of the agency’s Policy and Procedures Manual and is not accessible through UNFPA’s webpage that describes its work with parliamentarians. The Terms of Partnership contain the genesis of a strategy and can be used as a basis for a more substantial and meaningful strategy. Furthermore, the evaluation notes that while parliamentary engagement is deemed important at the country level, this is not well reflected in Country Program Action Plans or funding for advocacy activities at the country level.

A second and related lesson is that UNFPA’s reliance on annual work plans compromises the likely achievement of its long-term objectives for advocacy among parliamentarians. The policy and social changes that UNFPA seeks to change require long-term commitment and strategic approaches. AWPs, in contrast, represent short-term, tactical approaches with uncertain commitments to long-term objectives. These plans require that funded activities be completed in the calendar year for which the work plan is approved. Although AWPs are supposedly agreed upon prior to their year of implementation, they are often not approved (or funding provided to implementing partners), until many months into each calendar year. The result is that implementing partners have only a few months to implement what are often intended to be full-year activities. The perpetually late funding and short duration of AWPs discourage strategic planning and multiyear activities among implementing partners, promote financial uncertainty among these partners, and risk disruption of initiatives already started.

A third lesson learned is the need for consistent and effective management and oversight by UNFPA of implementing partners engaged in parliamentary advocacy. AFPPD should be held accountable for full compliance with the same standards and requirements that UNFPA’s other implementing partners are obliged to follow. This has not been the case, and UNFPA has been indulgent of AFPPD, to the detriment of both AFPPD and achievement of the agency’s objectives.

Following from this, a fourth lesson learned is the need for UNFPA to embrace fully the principles and practice of RBM, both for itself and for its implementing partners in a meaningful way. The agency professes commitment to RBM, but this commitment is an evolutionary process. In the opinion of the evaluation team, the pace of this evolution has been too slow. Continually pointing out the challenges of assessing the results of advocacy is not productive and makes no contribution to RBM.

There is a considerable literature on advocacy and its measurement and evaluation. Without attention to RBM and the lessons that can be learned from its application, there will be “uncertainty about where and how [sponsors of advocacy] might make effective investments in advocacy and policy work, what kinds of outcomes are possible or realistic,
and what kinds of strategic adjustments in programmatic approaches or funding allocations might be needed.”26 This is exactly the situation in which UNFPA finds itself.

A fifth lesson is that there is much that can be learned about advocacy and capacity building among parliamentarians. While the obvious purpose of AFPPD is to inform and influence these parliamentarians’ actions in desirable ways, there is now thirty years of experience that should be but has not yet been adequately captured and documented. Many opportunities for learning within UNFPA may have been missed. For example, what are the most effective ways to inform parliamentarians about ICPD-related issues? How can UNFPA best use its resources and work most effectively with these key policymakers? What are the strengths and weaknesses of various approaches to advocacy among parliamentarians and their staff? What are the capacity needs of newly elected parliamentarians, and how can these needs best be addressed? What are the most effective strategies for advocating to parliamentarians who need to be converted or who lack basic knowledge and understanding about the ICPD Programme of Action? What are the best strategies for addressing the needs of parliamentarians with limited skills in English? What are the most effective means of promoting effective South-South cooperation among parliamentarians? These are just a few of the questions for which answers should already be available and spread widely throughout UNFPA. To the contrary however, the evaluation team believes that many relevant lessons about advocacy among parliamentarians have not yet been well captured or documented – to UNFPA’s considerable disadvantage.

Key Recommendations

1. UNFPA should develop, as part of a broader advocacy strategy, a strategic approach to working with parliamentarians that specifies how it will collaborate with and support its implementing partners and what the agency expects to achieve in terms of meaningful and measurable results through engagement with parliamentarians. This strategy, which should be a high priority, should encompass and be relevant to all of the regional parliamentary forums that UNFPA supports and be developed collectively by all of the UNFPA units that fund these forums. The strategy could build on the outline developed by UNFPA in its Terms of Partnership for UNFPA’s Work with Parliamentarians, noted above.

   As part of this strategy, APRO should collaborate with other UNFPA units to devise an indicative approach to multiyear funding for its work with parliamentarians (i.e., with AFPPD or another organization selected in response to a request for proposals). Reliance on multiple, one-off projects based on AWPs is not conducive to strategic planning by either UNFPA or AFPPD or the achievement of results that are unlikely to be reached within the time covered by a single AWP.

2. When considering the form of UNFPA’s new relationship with AFPPD, it is important to separate (a) the function of working with parliamentarians from (b) the organization that performs the function. The function is essential and of considerable potential value to UNFPA; the function should undoubtedly continue, as should the

26 Reisman, Gienapp, and Stachowiak (2007a and b) provide a framework for evaluating advocacy and a handbook of data-collection tools for measuring the effects of advocacy.
enhancement of parliamentarians’ skills in advocacy for ICPD-related issues. As highlighted in the evaluation, however, AFPPD’s effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability are assessed as unsatisfactory. Accordingly, UNFPA should carefully consider the value for money of continuing to provide support to AFPPD as it is presently functioning. Given its substantive and organizational limitations, AFPPD will need considerable technical and financial support to restructure its operations to a degree that will ensure its sustainability, build its substantive capacity, deliver results, and promote policy change at the national level.

An alternative would be for APRO to develop a request for proposals from organizations that can demonstrate the requisite technical and institutional capacity that AFPPD now lacks. The organization selected could then house a reconstituted AFPPD secretariat, which would benefit from the organization’s existing capabilities in ICPD-related issues. In other words, AFPPD could continue to exist but would do so under the auspices of another organization. The selected organization would then work with UNFPA and the national parliamentary committees to network with parliamentarians and advocate effectively for issues of concern and interest to UNFPA and the ICPD Programme of Action. The evaluation team urges APRO not to dismiss this option without thorough consideration of its feasibility, desirability, and the extent to which an alternative to AFPPD would provide suitable value for money.

3. APRO, EECARO, and IERD should apply the concepts and principles of RBM to their support to AFPPD. The evaluation team appreciates that RBM concepts are difficult to apply to the area of advocacy – especially in the formulation of targets and attribution of results. UNFPA should be able to demonstrate progress over time in applying these concepts. Despite this expectation, such improvement is difficult to discern in AFPPD’s AWPs from 2008-2010. At a minimum, the application of RBM will require UNFPA to ensure that all of AFPPD’s AWPs:

- Identify clear and measurable results to be achieved for all activities or projects;
- Specify indicators to be used to measure progress in achieving the results, including required outputs that (a) contribute to agency’s strategic objectives and (b) are linked directly to the indicators that the agency uses in its own reporting of results at the regional and global levels; and,
- Set explicit, time-bound targets for each indicator used to judge progress (compared to baselines) and performance.

4. UNFPA should ensure AFPPD’s compliance with the terms of their Letters of Understanding and all of the agency’s reporting and procedural requirements. In particular,

A. UNFPA should request AFPPD to return all money in the forum’s “Savings Fund” that have been accumulated from unused funds provided by the agency.
B. UNFPA should request AFPPD to return the accumulated interest.
C. AFPPD should (a) develop a monitoring and evaluation plan that can be used to monitor progress and that UNFPA can use to link the disbursement of funds to results achieved and (b) submit standard annual progress reports that provide “a critical assessment of progress made in achieving results,” as these reports are required to do. The reports should focus on results identified in AWPs and then achieved rather than on activities initiated or completed.
5. **UNFPA should initiate an external audit of AFPPD’s financial records for at least the past five years.** AFPPD’s poor management of its UNFPA-provided finances justify a comprehensive review, so such an audit is a high priority and should be initiated as soon as possible.

This audit can be used to assist AFPPD in correctly calculating, applying, and reporting its indirect cost rate. Based on the findings, indirect costs charged to UNFPA should be adjusted and properly apportioned among different funders. UNFPA should settle any differences and provide guidance for future application of indirect costs.

6. If UNFPA chooses to continue the funding for small grants, currently managed by AFPPD, then several procedures should be improved or established. These include: a transparent, documented, and well-publicized process for soliciting proposals; the development of transparent and publicized criteria for assessing the quality and acceptability of proposals; a documented mechanism for reviewing the proposals and making decisions on whether to accept or reject proposals, including the option to resubmit an improved proposal based on feedback provided by the reviewers; and a mechanism for assessing the extent to which the project’s intended results were achieved and how best to utilize them. Consideration should also be given to a process that encourages and assists less-skilled national committees to complete viable proposals.

No less important, UNFPA should decide whether the small grants are best administered at the country level through APRO, or through the agency’s country offices, or retained within AFPPD. Other than “off loading” an administrative burden from UNFPA, the evaluation team sees little merit in AFPPD’s continued management of the small grants.

UNFPA should also decide what proportion of the grants should be awarded to the most and least developed countries in the region. The evaluation team recommends that small grants, should they be continued, should be given to the countries most in need and the farthest from achieving the relevant MDGs.

7. The evaluation team appreciates that UNFPA cannot direct or require AFPPD to change its internal administrative procedures. If UNFPA chooses to continue its funding of AFPPD, however, changes in these procedures are essential to enhance the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact of UNFPA-sponsored tasks. UNFPA should use its considerable financial leverage and decline or defer support to AFPPD in 2012 and beyond unless AFPPD develops, as a high priority:

   A. a **demand-driven, advocacy and capacity-development strategy that encompasses its UNFPA-sponsored projects and activities**, including those funded through the JTF. The strategy should incorporate a meaningful results framework, and should reflect UNFPA’s technical guidance on capacity assessments, strategies, and the measurement and monitoring of outcomes and impacts associated with capacity development.\(^2^7\) The strategy should also discuss AFPPD’s plans to achieve sustainability independent of UNFPA’s continued support.

   The strategy should begin with an acknowledgment that existing capacity among the national parliamentary committees varies widely. This recognition requires an

---

assessment of existing capacities (including AFPPD’s), identification and measurement of appropriate baseline data on these capabilities, and acknowledgment that some countries need more assistance than others. AFPPD will likely need technical assistance to develop a viable strategy, and UNFPA should consider supporting this assistance.

B. a **staff manual** that addresses the terms of employment, job descriptions, fringe benefits, accrual and use of sick and vacation leave, compensatory time, opportunities and eligibility for professional development, criteria for promotions, delegation of authority in the absence of the executive director, procedures for consideration and redress of grievances, and other issues deemed appropriate for inclusion.

C. in accordance with UNFPA’s *Guidelines on the Assessment of Potential Executing Agencies*, a **finance manual** that explains in clear terms what is required in all financial transactions, detailing all processes and procedures, including samples of forms and other instruments required in financial transactions. The manual should include an explicit policy on international travel and staff use of AFPPD’s automobile. UNFPA is AFPPD’s major source of funding, so the evaluation team recommends that AFPPD’s travel policy should match or be similar to the UNFPA’s.

D. due to the anticipated retirement of AFPPD’s executive director in 2012, a **transition strategy** that articulates how and when the transition to a new executive director will occur and how potential challenges associated with the transition will be addressed. The strategy should be in place and its implementation started as soon as possible and well before 2012.

E. to improve efficiency, AFPPD should consider outsourcing international travel to a travel agency, with whom workshop or conference participants would deal directly.

---

28 InProgress, a German-based organization, has published a *Financial Handbook* (available at [http://www.inprogressweb.com/resources](http://www.inprogressweb.com/resources)) that provides a thorough and comprehensible introduction to financial management for NGOs, highlighting the importance of a strong financial system and management.
Annex 1: TOR for the Evaluation of UNFPA Support to AFPPD

**Background**

The mission of UNFPA is to support countries in using population data for policies and programs to reduce poverty and to ensure that every pregnancy is wanted, every birth is safe, every young person is free of HIV/AIDS and every girl and woman is treated with dignity and respect. This mission is a reflection of the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development and as such it fully offers a basis to support countries to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other internationally agreed goals.

The achievement of ICPD Programme of Action and MDGs depends largely on the political will to fill the gaps in laws, policies and programs, and budgets. Therefore, UNFPA continues its emphasis on strategic engagement in advocacy globally, regionally and at the country level.

In Asia and the Pacific, UNFPA has a long-standing collaboration with the Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development (AFPPD), through which UNFPA has been a key strategic partner for delivery of the Regional Program in relation to advocacy/policy dialogue. Because parliamentarians act as the bridge between the people and their government, they are instrumental in advocating for the rights and needs of the people. Partnership with parliamentarians is vital to build support for the ICPD Programme of Action and the MDGs.

AFPPD is a coordinating body of National Committees of Parliamentarians on Population and Development and Parliamentary Committees dealing with population and development issues working to generate support and perpetuate cooperation among Asian and the Pacific parliamentarians in the area of population and development, and related fields.

AFPPD’s main focus is on developing the capacity of parliamentarians to advocate for population, reproductive health, and gender issues. AFPPD’s work under the current Asia and the Pacific Regional Program (2008-2013) is being treated as a cross-cutting issue integrated into the thematic areas of the program, so that advocacy is one aspect of interventions.

**Evaluation Purpose**

The purpose of the evaluation is to take stock of what AFPPD with UNFPA support has achieved, assess its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and institutional capacity, and make recommendations about the future of UNFPA’s collaboration with AFPPD.

Stakeholders in the evaluation include: AFPPD, National Committees of Parliamentarians on Population and Development, UNFPA Country Offices, and the Asia and the Pacific Regional Office.
Scope of Evaluation

The evaluation will look at AFPPD’s contribution to the UNFPA Strategic Plan Outcome 1.1:29

Population dynamics and its inter-linkages with gender equality, sexual and reproductive health and HIV/AIDS incorporated in public policies, poverty reduction plans and expenditure frameworks

as well as the contribution to UNFPA Regional Program output 1.1.1.:

Regional partnerships developed/strengthened to build national capacity to integrate population dynamics into national and sub-national planning processes.

Specific questions to be addressed by the evaluation include:

Relevance:

- How relevant was the AFPPD’s work under the Regional Program to a) national needs and priorities; b) focus and outputs of the CPs supported by UNFPA; c) the organizational and regional strategies manifested in the Strategic Plan and Global and Regional Program?
- Are AFPPD projects supported by UNFPA appropriate to responding to the current and future regional/national challenges and trends?
- Have gender and human rights dimensions been incorporated in the project design?

Effectiveness

- Were the 2008 to 2010 outputs achieved as planned? How were they complementary to UNFPA’s support through the country program and other UNFPA support at the regional level? Were the linkages clearly established with country programs, regional programs, and the global program for coherent UNFPA support?
- How participatory among stakeholders was development process and implementation of AFPPD projects supported by UNFPA?
- Did AFPPD projects supported by UNFPA offer an effective way of engaging national governments and regional forums in ICPD issues?
- Did the AFPPD projects supported by UNFPA take into account feedback and suggestions by stakeholders/participants?

Efficiency

- To what extent have the program inputs (human, technical, and financial) been used efficiently?
- How and where could improvements have been made to improve efficiency without compromising quality?

29 By agreement with APRO, the evaluation will assess AFPPD’s contribution to all the strategic objectives associated with UNFPA’s support for the forum.
Impact

- How have the parliamentarians been engaged in the advocacy for policies and budget in support of the ICPD Programme of Action and MDGs? Was there any unexpected impact, both negative and positive?

Sustainability

- Has the project contributed to ongoing parliamentarian activities at the global, regional, and national levels?

Institutional Capacity

- Are there administrative and financial procedures and policies in place and applied to ensure accountability?
- How much of the organizational capacity is institutionalized for sustainability?
- Is the staffing structure conducive to AFPPD’s delivery of outputs?
- Are there any other organizations with similar mandate? If so, what is the comparative advantage of AFPPD?

Methodology

The evaluation will be based on:

a) the review of documents including strategic plans/Multi-year Funding Frameworks, Inter-Country Programs, Global and Regional Programs, relevant strategy papers, AFPPD project document and annual reports, AFPPD website and publications, including newsletters; b) site visits to AFPPD and selected members of selected National Committees of Parliamentarians on Population and Development (APRO countries), and UNFPA Country Offices; c) interviews with selected parliamentarians, including representatives from the Executive Committee and Standing Committees relevant to UNFPA; and d) interviews with other NGOs working at the regional level on ICPD issues; and interviews with IERD and representatives of parliamentary forums on population and development in other regions. It is expected that four countries will be selected, in consultation with the stakeholders and based on the agreed criteria. If timely and appropriate, the evaluation team should also consider attendance at one or more of the regional or national meetings that AFPPD sponsors or to which it contributes.

The evaluation methodology will be further refined by the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Management Reference Group.

APRO and AFPPD will be responsible for providing background documents.

The evaluation will follow the principles of UN Evaluation Group’s norms and standards (especially independence, objectiveness, impartiality, and inclusiveness) and will be guided by the UN ethics guidelines for evaluators.

Use and Users

The key users of this evaluation will be AFPPD and the UNFPA’s Asia and the Pacific Regional Office. The findings and recommendations will be used to guide the development of future programming and partnership between AFPPD and UNFPA.

Evaluation Management
The Director of UNFPA APRO will have overall supervision of the evaluation. Day-to-day management of the evaluation will be done by the Regional Program Specialist. UNFPA APRO will provide relevant documents and information and will be responsible for logistical arrangements.

The Evaluation Management Reference Group will supervise all aspects of the evaluation. The Group will be made up of representatives from UNFPA APRO, representatives from four UNFPA Country Offices, and UNFPA Information and External Relations Division.

The Reference Group will be responsible for overseeing all technical matters including approval of TOR, methodology and reports.

### Work Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 7</td>
<td>Initial orientation of the team by APRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8-10</td>
<td>Interviews with AFPPD, review of documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12</td>
<td>Submission of the inception report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14 - April 22</td>
<td>Field Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6</td>
<td>Submit first draft report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>Presentation of the first draft report to evaluation reference group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>Evaluation Management Reference Group Feedback provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19</td>
<td>Submission of the final report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Team Composition

It is expected that the evaluation team has no conflict of interest or any connection to the project planning or implementation.

The **team leader** will be an international expert in evaluation with:
- At least 15 years of experience in evaluation, including UNEG standards for evaluation;
- Experience in leading multicountry evaluations;
- Familiarity with the UNFPA’s work and mandate, and A-P region;
- Experience in assessing one or more of the following: advocacy in support of the ICPD Programme of Action, population and development; organizational development and / or capacity development;
- Good management skills and ability to work with a multidisciplinary team of experts from different countries;
- Excellent writing skills.

The **team member** will be an international expert with background in population:
- At least 10 years of experience in evaluation including UNEG standards for evaluation;
- Familiarity with the UNFPA’s work and mandate, and A-P region;
- Experience in assessing one or more of the following: advocacy in support of the ICPD Programme of Action, population and development; organizational development and / or capacity development;
- Good management skills and ability to work with a multidisciplinary team of experts from different countries;
• Excellent writing skills.

**Expected deliverables:**

The evaluation team leader shall deliver electronic versions of the following to Director, UNFPA APRO with copy to the Regional Program Specialist:

1. Inception Report including detailed methodology, dissemination plan, and schedule of activities
2. Draft report including Executive Summary, main body of report, and annexes
3. A final report - edited and ready to print. (main body of report 30 page maximum, plus Executive Summary 5 page maximum, and plus annexes. The final report needs to follow the UNFPA Evaluation Guidelines for evaluation reports, and the Evaluation Checklist)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Effort</th>
<th>Team Leader</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Report</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2: Evaluation Methodology Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Data-collection methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>How relevant was the AFPPD’s work under the Regional Program to national needs and priorities?</td>
<td>Level of concurrence between AFPPD program and national needs and priorities</td>
<td>Country program documents; key informants</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; participation at 8th Women Ministers’ and Parliamentarians’ Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How relevant was the AFPPD’s work under the Regional Program to the focus and outputs of the country programs supported by UNFPA?</td>
<td>Level of concurrence between AFPPD program and UNFPA country programs</td>
<td>Country program documents; annual reports from UNFPA country offices (where available); Regional Program document; key informants</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How relevant was the AFPPD’s work under the Regional Program to the organizational and regional strategies manifested in the Strategic Plan and Global and Regional Program?</td>
<td>Level of concurrence between AFPPD program and UNFPA strategic plan and regional program</td>
<td>Regional Strategic Plan and Global and Regional Program documents; key informants</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are AFPPD projects supported by UNFPA appropriate to responding to the current and future regional/national challenges and trends?</td>
<td>Level of concurrence between AFPPD program and UNFPA’s Global Mandate and UNFPA Asia Regional Strategy</td>
<td>UNFPA’s Global Mandate; APRO Regional Strategy; National Development Plans; ICPD document; MDG declarations; key informants</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; Participation at 8th Women Ministers’ and Parliamentarians’ Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have gender and human rights dimensions been incorporated in the project design?</td>
<td>Documented evidence of gender and human rights included in project documents</td>
<td>Project document; key informants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>To what extent were the 2008 to 2010 outputs achieved as planned?</td>
<td>Achievements against targets (where available and measurable)</td>
<td>AFPPD’s AWPs, 2008-2010; key informants</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How were the outputs complementary to UNFPA’s support through the country</td>
<td>Documented evidence of links between</td>
<td>AFPPD’s AWPs, 2008-2010; key informants</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluation questions</td>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
<td>Data-collection methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>program and other UNFPA support at the regional level? Were the linkages clearly established with country programs, regional programs, and the global program for coherent UNFPA support?</td>
<td>AFPDP program and UNFPA country program and regional program</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How participatory among stakeholders was development process and implementation of AFPPD projects supported by UNFPA?</td>
<td>Degree of stakeholder participation in AFPPD program development and implementation</td>
<td>Document review; key informants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did AFPPD projects supported by UNFPA offer an effective way of engaging national governments and regional forums in ICPD issues?</td>
<td>AFPPD’s AWPs, 2008-2010; key informants</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the AFPPD projects supported by UNFPA take into account feedback/suggestions by stakeholders/participants?</td>
<td>Evidence of stakeholder feedback being incorporated into AFPPD planning and implementation</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>To what extent have the program inputs (human, technical, and financial) been used efficiently?</td>
<td>Documentation and analysis of stakeholder opinions on program design in regard to efficiency; funds used for indirect costs are 12 percent or less of direct costs</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How and where could improvements have been made to improve efficiency without compromising quality?</td>
<td>Documentation and analysis of stakeholder opinions on program design in regard to efficiency; funds used for indirect costs are 12 percent or less of direct costs</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluation questions</td>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
<td>Data-collection methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>To what extent have the parliamentarians been engaged in the advocacy for policies and budget in support of ICPD Programme of Action and MDGs?</td>
<td>Documented evidence of parliamentarian engagement in advocacy for policies and budgets in support of ICPD and MDGs</td>
<td>AFPPD’s AWP, 2008-2010; key informants; conference documents; reports from AFPPD and national committees</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; Participation at 8th Women Ministers’ and Parliamentarians’ Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Was there any unexpected impact, both negative and positive?</td>
<td>Documentation and analysis of stakeholder opinions on program achievements, shortcomings, intended and unintended outcomes</td>
<td>Reports from AFPPD and national committees</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>To what extent has the project contributed to ongoing parliamentarian activities at the global, regional, and national levels?</td>
<td>Documented evidence and analysis of stakeholder opinions about ongoing parliamentarian activities at global, regional, and national levels</td>
<td>AFPPD’s AWP, 2008-2010; key informants</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>How sustainable is AFPPD as an organization? What is needed to ensure its sustainability?</td>
<td>Nine indicators of sustainability: (i) administrative procedures; (ii) governance; (iii) financial management; (iv) human resource management; (v) organizational management; (vi) program management; (vii) leadership and AFPPD program documentation; long-term strategic plan and financial records; key stakeholders including members of executive committee</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluation questions</td>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
<td>Data-collection methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>team dynamics; (viii) identified demand for products and services related to AFPPD’s mandate; and, (ix) technical capacity to meet this demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional capacity</td>
<td>Are there administrative and financial procedures and policies in place and applied to ensure accountability?</td>
<td>Documented administrative and financial procedures in line with good practice</td>
<td>Sample of AFPPD’s financial records and internal operating procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much of the organizational capacity is institutionalized for sustainability?</td>
<td>Nine indicators of sustainability: (i) administrative procedures; (ii) governance; (iii) financial management; (iv) human resource management; (v) organizational management; (vi) program management; (vii) leadership and team dynamics; (viii) identified demand for products and services related to AFPPD’s mandate; and, (ix) technical capacity to meet this demand</td>
<td>Key stakeholders; AFPPD documentation</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the staffing structure conducive to AFPPD’s delivery of outputs?</td>
<td>Documented evidence of appropriate staff job descriptions</td>
<td>Organogram; staff job descriptions; key stakeholders</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Evaluation questions</td>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
<td>Data-collection methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there any other organizations with similar mandate? If so, what is the comparative advantage of AFPPD?</td>
<td>AFPPD compares favorably with other organizations with similar mandates in terms of OECD/DAC criteria</td>
<td>Mandates of other similar organizations; key stakeholders</td>
<td>Document review; key informant interviews; data and interviewer triangulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: People Contacted for the Evaluation

**AFPPD**
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Nyo Min Ko, Program Associate  
Pariyaporn Sappapan, Administrative Associate  
Phermsak Lilakul, Program Associate  
Shiv Khare, Executive Director  
Sirisaranya Pakninrat, Program Associate  
Tammavit Tasnavites, Program Associate

**Australia**

Claire Moore, Senator  
Helen McFarlane, Counselor, Health, Gender and Disaster Management Unit, AusAid, Jakarta  
Joanne Greenfield, Health Advisor, AusAID  
John Hyde, MLA Shadow Minister for Culture and the Arts; Planning; Heritage; Multicultural Interests and Citizenship in the Western Australian Government  
Louise Pratt, Senator  
Mary Merlin-Ryan, Chief Executive Officer, Australian Reproductive Health Alliance

**Cambodia**

Eng Vannak, Coordinator, CAPPD  
Lork Kheng, Member of Parliament  
Krouch Sam An, Member of Parliament and Secretary of Commission on Legislation and Justice  
Pum Sichan, Senator and Vice-chairperson of Commission on Public Health, Social welfare and Labor, War Veterans, Job Training and Women’s Affairs  
Pen Prakath, Project Manager and Deputy Director of International Relations Department, Technical Coordination Secretariat of Cambodian Parliament

**Cook Islands**

Teinakore Bishop, Member of Parliament, and Minister of Tourism, Marine Resources, Pearl Authority, and Human Resources

**India**

Avinash Rai Kharma, Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha)  
B.B.L. Sharma, Assistant Commissioner (Retired), National Institute of Health and Family Welfare  
Francesca Borolo, Program Officer, Restricted Project Management, IPPF, India  
J.J. Yadav, Director (Retired), Institute of Mass Communication
Mabel Rebello, Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha) and Secretary of All India Congress Committee
Manmohan Sharma, Executive Secretary, Indian Association of Parliamentarians on Population and Development
P.J. Kurien, Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha) and Vice-chairperson of AFPPD
P.P. Talwar, Director (Retired), National Institute of Health and Family Welfare
Pradeep Patro, Chief Executive Officer, Depth of Field, and former Country Director, IPPF India
R.N. Singh, Assistant Commissioner (Retired), Ministry of Health and Family Welfare
Sudesh Nangia, Head (Retired), Centre for Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University
Viplove Thakur, Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha)

Indonesia

Ahmad Nizar Shihab, Member of House of Representatives and Chair, Indonesian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development
Aida Mokhtar, Kontrak (an Indonesian NGO), Pontianak, West Kalimantan
Asmaniar, Former Member of House of Representatives, Pontianak, West Kalimantan
Atte Sugandi, Member of House of Representatives
Dewi Aripurnawati, Member, NGO working on child protection, Pontianak, West Kalimantan
Eddy Hasmi, Head of Center for International Training and Collaboration, National Population and Family Planning Board
Hadlir Noor, Golkar Party, Pontianak, West Kalimantan
H.U. Husna Asmara, Provincial Chairman of the Board, Indonesian Planned Parenthood Association, Pontianak, West Kalimantan
Inne Silvane, Executive Director, Indonesian Planned Parenthood Association
Ledia Hanifa Amaliah, Member of House of Representatives
H.D.J. Mulyadi, Provincial Executive Director, Indonesian Planned Parenthood Association, Pontianak, West Kalimantan
Ninuk Widiyantoro, Chair, Women’s Health Foundation
Okky Asokawati, Member of House of Representatives
Padmi Chendramidi, Secretary, Indonesian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development, Pontianak, West Kalimantan
Siti Fathonah, Chairperson, National Population and Family Planning Board, Provincial Office in Pontianak, West Kalimantan
Sri Utari Setywawati, Executive Director, Indonesian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development
Surya Chandra Surapathy, Member of House of Representatives
Urri Husma, Asmara, Pontianak, West Kalimantan
Yayuk Rahayu, Forum Stakeholder, Pontianak, West Kalimantan
Zainuddin, Lecturer, Pontianak, West Kalimantan

Iran

Hosein Nejabat, Member of Parliament

Pakistan

Jan Mehboob Ullah, Member of Parliament
Maldives
Ibrahim Muththalib, Member of Parliament
Rugiyya Mohamed, Member of Parliament

Papua New Guinea
Carol A. Kidu, Member of Parliament, and Minister for Community Development

Philippines
Antonio L. Tinio, Member of House of Representatives
Edcel Lagman, Member of House of Representatives, and Deputy Secretary General, AFPPD
Eden R. Divinagracia, Executive Director, Philippine NGO Council on Population, Health & Welfare
Elizabeth C. Angsioco, National Chairperson, Democratic Socialist Women of the Philippines
Jose Zubiri III, Member of House of Representatives
Junice Lirza Demeterio-Melgar, Executive Director, Likhaan Center for Women’s Health, Inc.
Nelson Culili, Finance Officer, PLCPD
Ramon San Pascual, Executive Director, PLCPD
Roberto M. Ador, Executive Director, Family Planning Organization of the Philippines, Inc.

UNFPA
Anna Marie Leal, National Program Associate, APRO
Ariyanti Rianom, National Program Officer, Monitoring and Evaluation, Jakarta
Ena Singh, Assistant Representative, India
Galanne Deressa, Program Specialist, APRO
Iva Goricnik, Chief, Budget Section, Management Services, Finance Branch, New York
Jose Ferrarís, Country Representative, Indonesia
Nicole Kim, Program Specialist, New York
Kae Ishikawa, Resource Mobilization Specialist, Resource Mobilization Branch, New York
Kiran Bhatia, Regional Gender Advisor, APRO
Marc Derveeuv, Deputy Representative, India
Marta Diavolova, Strategic Partnerships, EECARO
Melania Hidayat, National Program Officer on Reproductive Health, Jakarta
Mona Khurdok, New York
Najib Assifi, UNFPA Representative in Thailand and Deputy Regional Director, APRO
Nesim Tumkaya, Officer in Charge, Cambodia
Nobuko Horibe, Regional Director, APRO
Patnarin Sutthirak, Program Associate, APRO
Pen Sophanara, Communications Associate, Cambodia
Ragaa Said, Parliamentary Affairs Analyst, IERD
Rajat Ray, Senior Advocacy and Communication Officer, Delhi
Rena Dona, Assistant Representative, Philippines
Richard H. Columbia, Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor, APRO
Safiye Çağar, Director, IERD
Samidjo, Advocacy Program Officer, Indonesia
Sarah Knibbs, Deputy Representative, Cambodia
Saramma Mathai, Program Coordinator, APRO
Thin Thin Win, Administrative/Finance Associate, National Execution, New York
Ugochi Daniels, Country Representative, Philippines
Vic Jurlano, National Program Officer, Philippines
Yerkezhan Tabyldiyeva, Operations Manager, EECARO

Others

Anna Klinken Whelan, Regional Director, IPPF, East and South East Asia and Oceania Region, Kuala Lumpur
Fatimata Dème, Executive Director, Forum of African and Arab Parliamentarians on Population and Development, Dakar
Geeta Sethi, APLF Manager, Regional Support Team, Asia and the Pacific, UNAIDS, Bangkok
Janet Wong, Program Specialist/Acting Country Manager, UNWOMEN Indonesia, Jakarta
Nancy Fee, Country Coordinator, Indonesia, UNAIDS, Jakarta
Napaporn Karkamol, Partner/Auditor, MAP Auditing, Bangkok
Osamu Kusumoto, Secretary-General/Executive Director, Asian Population and Development Association, Tokyo
Radikha Kaul Batra, UN Coordination Advisor, UN Resident Coordinator’s Office, Delhi
Rajiv Chandran, National Information Officer, United Nations Information Services, Delhi
Sok Vanna, Program Manager for Cambodia, UN Habitat (former Manager for Population and Development for UNFPA Cambodia), Phnom Penh
Steven J. Kraus, Director, Regional Support Team, Asia and the Pacific, UNAIDS, Bangkok
Annex 4: Semistructured Interview Guide

**Illustrative Questions for Parliamentarians**

Have you attended any of AFPPD’s meetings or conferences in the past? If so, which ones?

Has AFPPD provided any capacity building to you or your colleagues? If yes, how have you/they used this capacity building?

What do you consider to be AFPPD’s strengths and weaknesses in its efforts to (a) develop capacity among parliamentarians; and, (b) produce results (i.e., outputs, outcomes, and impacts)?

Can you please provide any thoughts you might have about AFPPD’s impact in your country or on what you might be doing differently as a result of your experience with AFPPD?

Do you have any suggestions about how UNFPA can best work with parliamentarians such as yourself?

Finally, I would welcome any suggested recommendations you might have to improve or strengthen (a) AFPPD’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, or sustainability

**Illustrative Questions for UNFPA staff and staff of national committees**

How well do you know AFPPD? How engaged have you been with AFPPD at country and/or regional levels?

**Relevance:**

How relevant is AFPPD’s work to national needs and priorities?

How relevant is AFPPD’s work to the focus and outputs of the UNFPA country program?

Are AFPPD projects appropriate to responding to the current and future regional /national challenges and trends?

Do you have any recommendations to improve or strengthen AFPPD’s relevance?

**Effectiveness:**

What do you consider to be AFPPD’s strengths and weaknesses in its efforts to:

(a) promote UNFPA’s agenda;
(b) develop capacity among parliamentarians to advocate for population, reproductive health and gender issues; and,
(c) produce results (i.e., outputs, outcomes, and impact)?

What technical and financial support has the country office provided to AFPPD in the last two years? How well has this support been utilized by AFPPD?

Has AFPPD provided any capacity building to you or your colleagues? If yes, how have you/they utilized this capacity building?

Do you have any recommendations to improve or strengthen AFPPD’s effectiveness?
Efficiency:
To what extent have AFPPD’s human, technical, and financial resources been used efficiently?

Do you have any recommendations to improve or strengthen AFPPD’s efficiency?

UNFPA management and oversight:
How well do you think UNFPA has managed and provided oversight to AFPPD?

Do you have any recommendations to improve or strengthen UNFPA’s management and oversight of its support to AFPPD?

Impact:
What are your views about AFPPD’s impact at regional, national and sub-national levels? Are there any measurable indicators or verifiable evidence to support your views?

What do you think is the value added by AFPPD? What would have happened to population and development issues if AFPPD did not exist?

Do you have any recommendations to improve or strengthen AFPPD’s impact?
### UNFPA Strategic Plan Outcome: 1.1
Population dynamics and its interlinkages with gender equality, sexual and reproductive health and HIV/AIDS incorporated in public policies, poverty reduction plans, and expenditure frameworks

### Global/Regional Program Output: 1.1.1
Regional partnerships developed and strengthened to build national capacity to integrate population dynamics into national and subnational planning processes

### Global/Regional Program Output Indicators: 1.1.1.1
Number of new regional partnerships developed, 1.1.1.2. Number of capacity-building workshops initiated by UNFPA regional partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFPPD Outputs and Activities for 2008</th>
<th>AFPPD Activities for 2009</th>
<th>AFPPD Activities for 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1:</strong> Developed leadership of parliamentarians on key population and development issues aimed at strengthening legislation and creating public awareness of these issues at the constituency level.</td>
<td>Developing parliamentarian leadership on population, RH, gender, including networking and awareness raising.</td>
<td>Developing parliamentarian and local elected body leadership on population, RH, gender, including networking and awareness raising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Preparation and dissemination of the AFPPD Newsletter</td>
<td>Preparation and dissemination of the AFPPD Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Prepare advocacy materials for parliamentarians on related issues in order to develop their understanding at the legislative and community level ($35,000)</td>
<td>SAARC Conference on RHCS and Maternal Health in Kathmandu, Nepal ($165,000)</td>
<td>SAARC Conference on RHCS and Maternal Health in Kathmandu, Nepal ($165,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Identify and initiate engagement of champion parliamentarians from across the region ($30,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicators: (1) increased commitment of parliamentarians on specific issues; (2) enhanced understanding of various population structures and their implications, resulting in appropriate programming.
### Output 2: Capacity of parliamentary committees further strengthened on population and development issues

**Activities**
- 2.1 Capacity assessment of selected parliamentarian committees identifying capacity gaps and providing recommendations on how these gaps can be addressed ($15,000)
- 2.2 and 2.3 Invite, process, and distribute up to five small grants in response to proposals from national committees for improving evidence-based parliamentary advocacy ($75,000)

**Indicators:**
1. Improved performance
2. Enhance parliamentarians’ capacity and local elected officials at the national level

### Output 3: Enhancing parliamentarian networking with NGOs and promoting population and development issues

**Activities**
- 3.1 Organization of parliamentarian panels and meetings at international and regional events ($20,000)
- 3.2 Advocacy visits to strengthen links with national committees ($20,000)

**Indicators:**
1. Enhanced participation of parliamentarians inside and outside of parliament
2. Evidence of action at the national and regional level

---

* Excludes AWPs originated in EECARO due to the small amounts involved (e.g., $39,925 in 2009 and $33,040 in 2010).
**UNFPA Strategic Plan Outcome**, 1.1, Population dynamics and its interlinkages with gender equality, sexual and reproductive health and HIV/AIDS incorporated in public policies, poverty reduction plans, and expenditure frameworks

**Global/Regional Program Output**, 1.1.1, Regional partnerships developed and strengthened to build national capacity to integrate population dynamics into national and subnational planning processes

**Global/Regional Program Output Indicators**, 1.1.1.1. Number of new regional partnerships developed, 1.1.1.2. Number of capacity-building workshops initiated by UNFPA regional partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AFPPD Outputs and Activities for 2008</strong></th>
<th><strong>AFPPD Activities for 2010</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 4: Increased capacity of AFPPD in generating parliamentarian advocacy and awareness</td>
<td>Establishment of a policy tracking and monitoring database (i.e., “a place where all population policies of Asia-Pacific are documented and regularly updated…”) (40,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Parliamentary staff training on policy tracking and monitoring of parliamentarians’ participation in regional and international fora ($61,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Consultant fees ($105,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Publication of six AFPPD newsletters and twelve issues of E-News per annum ($45,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 and 4.4 Two meetings of the executive board ($55,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators: (1) create awareness among parliamentarians through dissemination of information; (2) various stakeholders informed about pressing issues; (3) decisions made at the executive board meetings and subsequent follow up actions taken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ninth General Assembly of AFPPD on ICPD and MDGs ($100,000), which focused on climate change and population, as well as gender perspective of population issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Convening Sixth Asia-Pacific Conference of Women Parliamentarians and Women Ministers ($100,000). The 6th Asian Women Parliamentarians’ and Ministers’ Conference was held during 23-24 September 2008 in Ulan Bator, Mongolia under the theme “Financing the MDGs: with Focus on Health and Gender”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Training workshop on ICPD and the MDGs ($70,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subcontract(s) to national parliamentary committees for national level programs ($80,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators: (1) number of new regional partnerships established; (2) number of regional partners with increased commitment to promote ICPD Program of Action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**UNFPA Strategic Plan Outcome**, 1.1, Population dynamics and its interlinkages with gender equality, sexual and reproductive health and HIV/AIDS incorporated in public policies, poverty reduction plans, and expenditure frameworks

**Global/Regional Program Output**, 1.1.1, SRH, gender equality, young people’s issues and HIV/AIDS from a population dynamics perspective increasingly included within UN interagency mechanisms and intergovernmental processes

**Global/Regional Program Output Indicators**, 1.1.1.1. Number of new regional partnerships developed, 1.1.1.2. Number of capacity-building workshops initiated by UNFPA regional partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFPPD Activities for 2009</th>
<th>AFPPD Activities for 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arranging air tickets for parliamentarians and AFPPD staff for ICPD at 15 review in Addis Ababa ($145,500)</td>
<td>1. Organization of workshop with parliamentarians, UNFPA focal points, and parliamentary forums ($125,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Per diem and visas ($11,340)</td>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong> (1) improved advocacy techniques and methodologies of working with parliamentarians; (2) review of fundraising and resource mobilization approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Arranging the participation of ten parliamentarians from countries who will be attending high-level meeting on ICPD at 15 ($65,400)</td>
<td>2. Participation of Asia-Pacific parliamentarians at Women Deliver (Washington, DC) ($94,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Arranging the participation of parliamentarians from Japan, Republic of Korea, Australia, and New Zealand at IPCI/ICPD ($86,240)</td>
<td><strong>Indicator:</strong> working to enhance parliamentarian advocacy on women and gender issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Miscellaneous items for the conference ($32,183)</td>
<td>Note: an additional $38,516 was provided for indirect costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicators: (1) promotion of dialogue among parliamentarians from around the world on ICPD at 15 review and future plan for furthering the implementation at country level; (2) statement of commitment and plans of action that will spell out concrete actions to be taken by parliamentarians to further mobilize resources and create an enabling environment for the implementation of the ICPD Programme of Action
**Strategic Plan Outcome, 2.1.** Strengthened capacity of regional and national counterparts and UNFPA country offices to promote the incorporation of an essential package of SRH in policy and expenditure frameworks

**Regional Program Output, 2.1.1.** Strengthened capacity of regional and national counterparts and UNFPA country offices to promote the incorporation of an essential package of SRH in policy and expenditure frameworks

**Global/Regional Program Output Indicators, 2.1.1.1.** Number of governments supporting universal access to the essential SRH package in national development plan, 2.1.1.2. Number of governments increasing budget allocations for various elements of SRH components (FP, MH, contraceptives)

**AFPPD Activities for 2009**

Organize the Asian medical parliamentarians’ conference on focusing on Emerging Health Issues ($63,000), to engage parliamentarians with a medical background.

Indicator: Number of health, finance, and planning ministries supporting universal access to essential SRH package in regional fora.

**UNFPA Strategic Plan Outcome, 2.2.** Access and utilization of quality maternal health services increased in order to reduce maternal mortality, including the prevention of unsafe abortion and management of its complications

**Regional Program Output, 2.2.1.** Enhanced capacities of regional and national parliamentary bodies, health ministries and relevant local governance councils to reduce maternal mortality and morbidity, especially by improving access of poor and excluded communities

**Global/Regional Program Output Indicators, 2.2.1.1.** Number of national parliamentary committees and sub-regional bodies with action plans and/or targeted strategies to address maternal mortality and morbidity, 2.2.1.2. Number of countries where evidence-based consultations have taken place advocating for increased allocations for MH, 2.2.1.3. Number of government with specific policies to address inequalities/inequities in access to maternal health services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFPPD Activities for 2009</th>
<th>AFPPD Activities for 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional meeting of parliamentarians and media to develop a regional action plan (A regional action plan will be developed and then followed up at country level) ($100,000). Regional analysis was presented on Maternal Health and Rights, with each of the 11 countries developing action plans, out of which a regional action plan emerged. Indicator: Number of national parliamentary committees and subregional bodies with action plans and/or targeted strategies to address maternal mortality and morbidity.</td>
<td>Follow-up at country level of Maternal Health and Rights parliamentarian meeting in Bali and adopted national action plans ($50,000) Indicator: Number of national parliamentary committees and subregional bodies with action plans and/or targeted strategies to address maternal mortality and morbidity. Mobilization of young parliamentarians to ensure continued leadership on ICPD: Young Parliamentarians Meeting on ICPD: ($30,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UNFPA Strategic Plan Outcome, 3.1, Gender equality and the human rights of women and adolescent girls, particularly their reproductive rights, integrated in national policies, development frameworks and laws

RAS6G11B

Regional Program Output, 3.1.1, Strengthened capacity of regional and national counterparts and UNFPA country offices to support adoption and implementation of national legislation to protect the human rights of women and young girls

Global/Regional Program Output Indicators, 3.1.1.1. Number of countries that where reproductive rights are reflected in national strategies and plans, 3.1.1.2.: Number of CCAs/UNDAFs where reproductive rights are addressed.

AFPPD Activities for 2009

1. Organize the 7th Asia-Pacific Women’s Parliamentarians’ and Ministers’ Conference Parliamentarian action on ICPD +15 with a focus on gender issues ($119,000)
2. Parliament staff training on results based management($56,050)

Indicators: Number of: (1) new reproductive rights related national laws in place or improvements in current laws; (2) senior government officials from government branches making public commitments to strengthen the implementation and enforcement of existing policies and laws protecting the human rights of women and young girls; and; (3) proportion of countries that request and receive support for gender budgeting

UNFPA Strategic Plan Outcome, 3.2, Gender equality, reproductive rights and the empowerment of women and adolescent girls promoted through an enabling socio-cultural environment that is conducive to male participation and the elimination of harmful practices.

RAS6G21A

Regional Program Output, 3.2.1 Government, civil society and UN advocates gain access to cutting edge knowledge resources and policy tools on gender-based violence prevention

Global/Regional Program Output Indicators, 3.2.1.1. Number of knowledge resources and policy tools developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFPPD Activities for 2009</th>
<th>AFPPD Activities for 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Establishment of a standing committee on male involvement in prevention of violence against women and girls ($27,480), chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister of PNG, to work in support of the Women’s Standing Committee.  
2. Organize a regional meeting of parliamentarians, in collaboration with Partners for Prevention, the UN Joint Program on Male Involvement in GBV prevention ($71,750) | 1. Meeting of Standing Committee of Male Parliamentarians on the Elimination of Violence against Women and Girls (Bangladesh) ($53,000)  
2. Small-grant program to support orientation of male parliamentarians at national level on the elimination of violence against women as follow-up to the Male Standing Committee, and to take the Male Standing Committee Blueprint for Action forward ($73,000) |

Indicators: (1) number of knowledge resources and policy tools developed; (2) number of government, civil society and UN advocates receiving knowledge resources and policy tools along with offer of TA or training in use; (3) government, civil society and UN advocates giving feedback on use of knowledge resources and policy tools or requesting TA in their use.
References


Documents Reviewed

**AFPPD**

**Reports**

*Mobilizing Parliamentarians from Global to Local: AFPPD Activities Report of 2006*

*Outreaching Parliamentarians: AFPPD Activities Report 2007*

*AFPPD Activities Report 2008: Empowering Parliamentarians*

*AFPPD 2009 – A Review*


*Engaging Parliamentarians on Women’s Empowerment and Gender Equality*

*Enhancing Political Commitment for the Prevention, Care, and Treatment of HIV/AIDS*

*Expanding Parliamentarian Outreach 2007-2008*

*Maternal Health: An Advocacy Guide for Parliamentarians*

*Parliamentarians’ Perspectives: A Focus on Global Population and Development Issues from a Parliamentary Perspective*

*Self Impact Assessment Report*
Annual standard progress reports submitted to APRO for 2010

Conference Reports
Maternal Health and Rights: Asia and the Pacific Consultation
7th Asia-Pacific Women Parliamentarians’ and Ministers’ Conference on Parliamentarians’
Actions for Gender Issues
Report of the Fourth International Parliamentarians’ Conference on the Implementation of
the ICPD Programme of Action
Young Parliamentarians’ Consultation on ICPD Issues

Policy Trends
1. Population Stabilisation Debate at the Parliament of India
3. Philippines Reproductive Health Bill

Financial information
All financial forms submitted to APRO, 2008-2010, including FACE, Annual Status of Funds
Report (Form D), and Annual Disbursement Reports (Form E)
Cumulative audited financial statements, 2008-2010
Profit & Loss by Class, January through December 2010

Other
“Agenda X: AFPPD Management (Programme and Administration)” (2010).
AFPPD at a glance in 2010
Constitution of AFPPD.
Country action plans on maternal health and rights from Bangladesh, Cambodia, East Timor,
India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Pacific Islands, Pakistan, Philippines.
Minutes of AFPPD’s executive committee meetings, 2007-2010.
Proposals from national committees for small grants from AFPPD, 2007-2010, plus reports
on funded grants from national committees (Note: not all national committees
submitted reports summarizing the results of their small grants.)

UN Development Group
Capacity Assessment Methodology

UN General Assembly
Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the
United Nations System, 2005

UN Evaluation Group
Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN
Norms for Evaluation in the UN System
Standards for Evaluation in the UN System

UNFPA
Accountability Framework
Evaluation Guidelines
Evaluation Policy
Financial Regulations and Rules
Global and Regional Programme Guide
Guidance Note on Indirect and Direct Costs
Guide for Implementing Partners
Guidelines for UNFPA Collaboration with Non-Governmental Organizations
Guidelines on the Assessment of Potential Executing Agencies
Policies and Procedures Manual
Programme Manager’s Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit
Report of the Executive Director, Review of the System for the Allocation of UNFPA
Resources to Country Programmes, 2007
Report of the Executive Director, Strategic Plan, 2008-2011: Accelerating Progress and
National Ownership of the ICPD Programme of Action
Review of the Implementation of the UNFPA Policy on Indirect Cost Recovery
Letters of Understanding between UNFPA and AFPPD

Other Sources

Funding Agreement Deed between Commonwealth of Australia and AFPPD for its work with
parliamentarians eliminate violence against women. AusAid Agreement 54641
International Fund for Agricultural Development. 2003. IFAD Policy for Grant Financing.
Letter from the Government of Japan to UNFPA establishing the Japan Trust Fund (2000)
Annex 7: Illustrative Statement on Ethics and Confidentiality

I appreciate your willingness to assist in the UN Population Fund’s evaluation of the Asian Forum of Parliamentarians on Population and Development (AFPPD). As part of the team that is evaluating the AFPPD, I am obligated – and pleased – to comply with the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

These norms and standards require that I respect your right to provide information in confidence and to ensure that any sensitive information you provide cannot be traced to its source. The information you provide will not be shared with anyone outside of the evaluation team, except in instances of fraud or wrongdoing. For nonsensitive information, in contrast, it may be desirable to include some of your statements in the evaluation report and to attribute these statements to you. Should the evaluation team wish to include these statements, the team will do so only after allowing you to examine the statement(s) attributed to you and with your approval.

I would like to assume that our discussion will proceed with your informed consent but with your understanding as well that you can stop the discussion at any time without any undesirable consequences. I encourage you to offer suggestions about how the evaluation team can best address its tasks, which include attention to AFPPD’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. In particular, the team welcomes any suggestions or recommendations you might have to improve AFPPD’s performance. I can be contacted at ……

Evaluations for the UN Population Fund typically include a list of people interviewed. Unless you object, the evaluation report will include your name and position or title, but no other personal information.

The Population Fund is interested in an evaluation that fairly and objectively discusses AFPPD’s strengths as well as any weaknesses it might have. For this reason I appreciate your assistance, which will contribute to the team’s responsibility to complete an evaluation that is independent, impartial, and accurate.

Sincerely,
### Annex 8: Small Grants Funded by AFPPD, 2007-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Male parliamentarians opposed to violence against women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Interview with parliamentarians and increase their roles in gender equality and in eliminating violence against women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>A one-day seminar for the involvement of male parliamentarians in eliminating violence against women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Expert panel on gender-based violence and maternal health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>National/subregional seminar of NGOs with male parliamentarians as speakers on the elimination of violence against women as hidden pandemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Parliamentarians forum in the Women Deliver conference in the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Accelerating the achievement of MDG4-5 through the role of women parliamentarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Engaging male parliamentarians to eliminate violence against</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy forum, press conferences, and planning sessions related to reducing violence against women (VAW)</td>
<td>$4,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian parliamentarians committee conducted six interviews with three parliamentarians on gender equality. Developed two articles that were published in the newsletter, national press and distributed to MPs and NGOs</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-day seminar to improve awareness of male parliamentarians on VAW.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening of an expert panel and the production of a document summarizing the presentations circulated to Parliamentarians Group on Population and Development and placed on websites. Goal is to brief PGPD members on linkages between maternal health and gender-based violence.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify eight male and eight female parliamentary ‘champions’ for elimination of VAW and support them as resource persons regional seminars and in capacity building of other parliamentarians in areas where VAW is high through development of fact sheets and a book of parliamentary advocacy on the elimination of VAW</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-day conference to inform national and local legislators about rates of maternal mortality, discuss best practice in other countries, highlight policy gaps and develop national advocacy strategies to increase legislative commitment and actions</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAPD organized a regional seminar for women parliamentarians promoting maternal and child health in March 2011. Goal is increased budget allocation for priority interventions</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of training and support to improve advocacy skills of male parliamentarians on eliminating</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Budgetary advocacy on family planning (MDG5B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Advocacy book on maternal health for parliamentarians and village chiefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>The legal status of pregnancy termination in the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Mobilizing young parliamentarians for population, health and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Person to person advocacy with parliamentarians training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Monitoring and research for actions of Kyrgyz parliamentary questions connected with population and development; presentations on the theme ICPD including problems of women, HIV/AIDS and MDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Mobilizing young parliamentarians for population, health and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>An evaluation study on HIV laws of selected countries in Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Highlighting Australian parliamentarians’ actions in support of the ICPD agenda and the MDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Population and development issues: content analysis of questions raised in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>The role of the house of representatives of the Republic of Indonesia in achieving MDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Highlighting the performance of PLCPD champion parliamentarians in population and reproductive health policymaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Advancing ICPD in the Asia-Pacific region – the role of parliamentarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Parliamentary lobbying kit, largely focused on how AusAID guidelines on family planning constrain access to safe abortion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Promoting the interrelationships of culture, spirituality, gender and reproductive health issues through the production of a digital film and the conduct of a policy forum series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 9: AFPPD’s Indirect Costs by Source of Funding, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Non-UNFPA Indirect Costs</th>
<th>Total Indirect Costs</th>
<th>% of indirect costs paid by UNFPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>$79,890</td>
<td>$79,890</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to Exec. Director</td>
<td>$11,034</td>
<td>$11,034</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Associate</td>
<td>$23,079</td>
<td>$25,140</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>$37,986</td>
<td>$37,986</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$13,109</td>
<td>$14,238</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and supplies</td>
<td>$8,402</td>
<td>$9,232</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>$10,298</td>
<td>$10,332</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$9,370</td>
<td>$10,410</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning service</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>$5,679</td>
<td>$5,679</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office insurance</td>
<td>$670</td>
<td>$670</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website design</td>
<td>$3,297</td>
<td>$3,297</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$202,982</strong></td>
<td><strong>$208,076</strong></td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$731,949</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,059,113</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Cost Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes funds provided by JTF.

Source: Computed from Baht-denominated information in “AFPPD, Profit & Loss by Class, January through December 2010.” Thai Baht converted to US$ at rate of 31.54 Baht to $1. This is the same exchange rate that AFPPD’s auditor used.
Annex 10: DOS Evaluation Quality Assessment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the report clearly describe the evaluation, how it was conducted, the findings of the evaluation, and their analysis and subsequent recommendations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the structure logical? Is the report comprehensive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the information provided be easily understood?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Executive Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does it read as a stand-alone section, and is a useful resource in its own right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it brief yet sufficiently detailed, presenting the main results of the evaluation, and including key elements such as methodology and conclusions and recommendations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Design and Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and is the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth and gender equality) been paid specific attention (when relevant) in the design of the evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are key processes (tools used, triangulation, consultation with stakeholders) discussed in sufficient detail? Are constraints and limitations made explicit (including limitations applying to interpretations and extrapolations; robustness of data sources, etc.) and discussed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Reliability of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are sources of data clearly stated for both primary and secondary data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it clear why case studies were selected and what purpose they serve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are all relevant materials related to case studies, interviews (list of interviewees, questionnaires) etc. annexed to the report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the limitations, and methods to address them, discussed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other data gaps are there and how have these been addressed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Findings and Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a clear pathway from data to findings, so that all findings are evidence-based?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are biases stated and discussed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are unintended findings reported and discussed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are interpretations of the findings understandable? Are assumptions clearly stated and extrapolations well explained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are their limitations (or drawbacks) discussed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the analysis respond to all evaluation questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, are omissions (of both evaluation criteria and questions) recognized and explained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the analysis examined cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are contextual factors identified and their influence discussed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the conclusions organized in priority order?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the conclusions amount to a reasonable judgment of the findings and are their links to evidence made clear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they present an unbiased judgment by the evaluators of the intervention or have they been influenced by preconceptions or assumptions that have not been discussed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a logical flow from the conclusions to recommendations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they strategic and clearly presented in a priority order which is consistent with the prioritization of conclusions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they useful — sufficiently detailed, targeted and likely to be implemented and lead to further action?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have the recommendations incorporated stakeholders' views and has this affected their impartiality?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Meeting Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the report adequately address the information needs and responds to the requirements stated in the ToRs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In particular does the report respond to the evaluation questions, issues or criteria identified in ToR?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>