

PD-HBI-067

**TRIP REPORT: BANGLADESH TECHNICAL  
ASSISTANCE IN MIS, CA/NGO PROJECT**

February 6 - 17, 1993

**Hillard Davis & Margaret Watt  
MIS Program, Management Sciences for Health**

**FAMILY PLANNING MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT**

Project No.: 936-3055  
Contract No.: DPE-3055-Q-00-0052-00  
Task Order No.: A1717 BANGO

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS .....	3
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	4
II. BACKGROUND .....	4
III. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF WORK .....	5
IV. ACTIVITIES .....	6
V. OBSERVATIONS AND RESULTS .....	7
A. SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT .....	7
B. SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS .....	9
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS .....	15
A. SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT .....	15
B. SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS .....	16
ANNEX I: SCOPE OF WORK AND WORKPLAN FOR SUBSEQUENT VISITS ...	18
ANNEX IIA: REVISED SEMIANNUAL REPORT .....	20
ANNEX IIB: DEFINITIONS FOR SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT .....	32
ANNEX III: SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS .....	41
ANNEX IV: LIST OF CONTACTS .....	48

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

AVSC	Association for Voluntary Surgical Contraception
CA	Cooperating Agency
CBD	Community Based Distribution
CPR	Contraceptive Prevalence Rate
ELCO	Eligible Couple
FPAB	Family Planning Association of Bangladesh
FPMD	Family Planning Management Development Project
FPSTC	Family Planning Services and Training Centre
IMF	Institutional, Managerial, Financial (Sustainability)
MDA	Management Development Assessment
MIS	Management Information Systems
MSH	Management Sciences for Health
MWRA	Married Women of Reproductive Age
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
PF	Pathfinder International
PIMF	Programmatic, Institutional, Managerial, Financial (Sustainability)
PS	Programmatic Sustainability
QES	Quality, Expansion, Sustainability
SOW	Scope of Work
TAF	The Asia Foundation
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

## **I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In April 1993, the Family Planning Management Development (FPMD) Project of Management Sciences for Health (MSH) designed a project to provide technical assistance to the USAID-funded Cooperating Agencies (CAs) in Bangladesh, with the objective of enabling them to better support their subgrantee non-governmental organizations (NGOs). One of the three components of the CA/NGO Project is to provide technical assistance to the CA management information systems (MIS). The objective of the MIS support is to develop a comparable analytic framework for measuring achievement of the combined CA programs toward their strategy of Quality, Expansion, and Sustainability (QES).

During the FPMD/MIS team's first visit, in November-December 1993, the consultants analyzed the indicators being reported to USAID in the semi-annual report, and initiated a process of revision of the reporting format. As a result of discussions with the CAs and USAID, it was decided to revisit the indicators as well. Pathfinder was to pilot test indicators for Quality and Expansion, and FPMD would develop and test indicators for Sustainability.

During the FPMD/MIS team's second visit, in February 1994, the semi-annual report format was revised and finalized based on approval from all parties. The sustainability indicators to be tested were identified and discussed with the CAs, and plans were made to pilot test the indicators through The Asia Foundation (TAF).

## **II. BACKGROUND**

In April of 1993, an FPMD project design team worked with USAID and the five family planning Collaborating Agencies (CAs) -- the Family Planning Association of Bangladesh (FPAB), Family Planning Services and Training Centre (FPSTC), The Asia Foundation (TAF), the Association for Voluntary Surgical Contraception (AVSC), and Pathfinder (PF) -- responsible for overseeing and providing technical and financial support to the local family planning NGOs. FPMD identified three specific areas in which technical assistance would help the CAs/NGOs meet their strategic goals of improving the quality of services, the expansion of coverage, and the strengthening of their institutional, managerial, and financial sustainability, a strategy known as QES. (See A. Ellis, S. Helfenbein, S. Sacca report: Visit to Bangladesh to Develop a Plan for Technical Assistance to the CA/NGO Project, April 11-28, 1993.)

One of the areas targeted for provision of technical assistance was the management information system (MIS). Developing a system for measuring QES achievements across CA programs would facilitate long-term planning, resource allocation, and evaluation of the overall family planning program. The general objective identified for the MIS technical assistance was therefore to develop a comparable analytic framework for measuring achievement of the combined CA programs on the basis of a set of key QES indicators.

Following the FPMD project design, USAID/Dhaka in collaboration with the CAs initiated the development of indicators for measuring QES and designed a format for semi-annual reporting on these indicators and on the CAs' Cooperative Agreements. The first semi-annual report was submitted by the CAs to USAID in July 1993. Based on this experience, the CAs reported that the report preparation was an arduous process from data collection and processing to analysis and writing. Furthermore, the output did not fully meet the expectations of either the CAs or USAID.

The FPMD/MIS team carried out its first visit to Bangladesh from 21 November - 9 December 1993, reviewing the operationalization of the QES strategy within the CA information systems, in particular looking at CA reporting to USAID on the QES indicators in the first semi-annual report. The team found that there had been considerable difficulty in operationalizing, reporting on, and using the QES indicators. As a result of the team's discussions with the CAs, USAID, and the Pathfinder technical assistance (TA) team which was also present and with whom FPMD/MIS collaborated, the umbrella Scope of Work (SOW) was modified. The revised SOW has four main components:

- revision, pilot testing, and modification of indicators for QES;
- development of a methodology for integrating the outputs of CA information systems into a QES-based MIS and assistance to specified CAs in operationalizing the QES-based MIS;
- strengthening of CA staff capabilities in using the QES-based MIS in planning, budgeting, monitoring, and evaluation, as appropriate; and
- development of a computer-based "executive information tool" for compiling and comparing the outputs of the various CA information systems in order to provide a general report for use by USAID and the CAs.

### **III. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF WORK**

The FPMD/MIS team, consisting of Hillard Davis, MIS Program Associate/Statistics and Margaret Watt, MIS Program Associate -- both of MSH's MIS Program -- carried out its second visit to Bangladesh from February 6 - 17, 1994. The objectives of the visit were to:

- Follow-up on previous discussions with the CAs and with USAID to finalize the semi-annual reporting format;
- Discuss with the CAs appropriate indicators of Sustainability to be tested; and
- Set up and launch the Sustainability pilot test under the auspices of The Asia Foundation.

In addition, it was originally anticipated that the team's visit would coincide with a visit by a member of the Pathfinder TA team, Mr. Luigi Jaramillo, thus allowing coordination between the two teams on the launch of the Quality and Expansion indicators pilot test being carried out by Pathfinder. However, because of a delay in Mr. Jaramillo's travel dates, the FPMD/MIS team was not able to coordinate with Pathfinder in the preparation of their pilot test. The team did meet with Mr. Jaramillo to discuss activities to date and upcoming plans during the last two days of the visit.

#### IV. ACTIVITIES

During the course of the visit, the FPMD/MIS team carried out the following activities, focusing primarily during the first week on finalizing the semi-annual report and refining the framework (definition, elements, and sub-elements) for sustainability indicators, and working more in-depth during the second week on the indicators themselves and methods for pilot-testing them.

The FPMD/MIS team:

- held a briefing meeting with USAID;
- held three separate working sessions with USAID to discuss the improvements to the semi-annual reporting format that had been discussed with CA staff during the previous visit but not finalized with USAID, and to make any modifications needed by USAID;
- held separate meetings with each of the CAs to brief the Executive on the SOW for the trip, discuss with the Executive and appropriate other staff (including MIS counterparts) the suggested framework for identifying sustainability indicators (see Annex III), and discuss the CAs' ideas and experiences related to defining and measuring sustainability;
- held separate meetings with each of the CAs to receive additional feedback on the framework and discuss in more detail the indicators under development;
- held meetings with The Asia Foundation program and MIS staff to discuss the list of indicators in detail and to make plans for the pilot test;
- held a meeting of the CA MIS counterparts and USAID representatives to present the newly revised semi-annual report (see Annex II) and discuss any further issues for final modification;
- held a debriefing with USAID; and
- held a debriefing with the CA Executives and with USAID.

The team was also able to coordinate efforts with the FPMD Regional Director, Alison Ellis, and Senior Program Officer, Paul Fishstein, Asia/Near East Region, at the beginning of the trip, and with Luigi Jaramillo of Pathfinder/Boston, toward the end of the trip.

## **V. OBSERVATIONS AND RESULTS**

The observations and results are grouped into two sections dealing with (a) the semi-annual report and (b) the sustainability indicators.

### **A. SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT**

The objective with regard to the format of the semi-annual report to USAID was to minimize the data collection and reporting burden on the CAs and NGOs while providing necessary information for both CA and USAID purposes. To this end, the FPMD/MIS team discussed the November/December revision in detail with USAID, revised it further based on USAID feedback, presented the new revision to CA staff, and modified the document slightly to reflect the final feedback (see Annex IIA). In addition, an accompanying glossary of terms was prepared (see Annex IIB).

Although the preparation of the original semi-annual report was an arduous process for the CAs and for USAID, their experience in using that report for two reporting periods was useful in establishing the report's strengths and weaknesses. The revised reporting format represents a strong effort by all parties to improve the original report based on their experiences. As a result, the revision should greatly facilitate the preparation of the report as well as its usefulness to all parties, and all the CAs as well as USAID expressed their satisfaction with the improvements.

#### **1. Purposes of Report and Implications**

The need to compare certain indicators in the semi-annual reports had resulted in an over-emphasis on standardized reporting on indicators that were at times not comparable among CAs or were inappropriate for a specific CA's projects. It was determined that the semi-annual report actually serves several purposes:

Objective 1: To allow USAID and the CAs to assess the overall CA/NGO portfolio's progress, in particular toward Quality, Expansion, and Sustainability.

This objective requires information focused on impact and aggregate information for an overview of the attainments of the various CAs. Relevant information includes the key (QES) indicators and narratives discussing overall achievements, the results of testing and/or implementing innovations, and discussion of constraints and solutions.

Objective 2: To allow USAID and each CA individually to monitor the CA's accomplishment of its Cooperative Agreements.

This objective requires a description of the outputs, a comparison of the outputs to workplan and Cooperative Agreement targets, and updates on the status of personnel and the budget. The outputs information does not need to be presented identically by all CAs, but rather in accordance with each CA's Cooperative Agreement. Additional narratives and any supporting tables will be specific to each CA's functional specialty, program activities outside the Cooperative Agreement, and other activities.

Objective 3: To allow each CA to monitor and manage its NGO (project) portfolio.

This objective implies that CAs need information that provides an overview of all their NGOs/subgrantees, for example on active users. This information can also be used to compare an individual NGO's performance to a CA's overall portfolio.

This information is based on the NGO-specific detail collected by the CAs, which is not necessarily reported in the USAID semi-annual report. NGO-specific information is not required by USAID and is assumed to be available within each CA. If desired, a CA may include this additional information in its semi-annual report -- for instance, if the semi-annual report is the CA's principal summary report, in which case it might be useful to have all information in one place -- but this is not obligatory.

## **2. Summary of Revisions**

As a result of the discussions with the CAs and USAID, the following modifications, described in detail in Annex IIA, were made to the semi-annual report:

- Tables will be integrated more closely into the text and will be fully interpreted in the analysis of performance;
- There will be an emphasis on CA determination of appropriate information to be reported;
- NGO-specific detail will be eliminated;
- The number of required tables will be reduced to five, of which one is annual only:

Table I: Key Achievement Indicators by Targets

Table II: Expenditures in Relation to Budget

Table III: Personnel by Type and Status

Table IV: Active Users by Method and Source

Table V: Annual Summary of Outputs by Time Period and Target; and

- A glossary of the terms used in the report has been developed.

## **B. SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS**

The objective with regard to sustainability was to identify indicators that can be tested in order to determine which are most predictive and can be operationalized for reporting by all CAs. This work is part of the overall effort to test indicators for Quality and Expansion, as well as Sustainability -- an effort agreed upon by the CAs and USAID as addressing their concern that the set of indicators currently in use has not proven to be particularly useful in planning and management.

As the first step, a framework for identifying indicators for testing was developed, based on a broad definition that was designed to encompass other existing definitions of sustainability (local and international). The definition was purposefully broad, in order both to capture previous work and to ensure that other areas that may not have been adequately captured in previous definitions were addressed. The major components (elements) and subcomponents (sub-elements) of the definition were then discussed with members of all the CAs as well as with USAID and indicators were developed for the sub-elements. Plans for the pilot test were made with The Asia Foundation. The framework and pilot test are described below.

### **1. Sustainability Framework**

Indicators are used, as the term implies, to provide an indication of something, rather than to describe it fully. A select number of indicators can be used to provide an overview of an entire program, its results and problem areas, without being buried in the details of day-to-day management issues. This implies that only one or two indicators related to any given area of a program or project are needed. For example, if an indicator related to client re-supply shows that clients are being resupplied regularly, then it can be assumed that the entire logistics cycle, from procurement through distribution, is operating effectively. If this indicator shows that there is a problem related to client re-supply, then it may need to be combined with a logistics indicator in order to determine whether the problem is related to a stockout at the warehouse. However, to determine the exact operational issues involved (is the problem actually logistics, or is it client access or some other factor?), it will be necessary to go back to the service statistics, logistics information system, or other records.

In this example, an indicator of client resupply or of logistics operations would still not address other aspects of the program, such as whether clients are receiving the appropriate supplies, or whether everyone who wishes to use family planning is actually approached to become a client. A crucial part of developing indicators is therefore to identify all the key aspects (elements) to be covered -- in this case, supply, appropriateness, coverage, etc. -- and to make sure they are all measured by at least one appropriate indicator.

To develop sustainability indicators that cover all key aspects, the framework that was used began with a broad definition and broke it down into its elements and sub-elements. Care was taken to ensure compatibility with related work done previously in Bangladesh as well as

the work currently being carried out by the Family Planning Impact Evaluation Project (The EVALUATION Project).

### Definition and Elements of Sustainability

The first step in building the framework for measuring sustainability was to define what is meant by the term "sustainability." According to the definition used by the FPMD/MIS team, a sustainable program or institution is one that has:

THE ABILITY TO PROVIDE ACCORDING TO CLIENTS' NEEDS, NOW AND IN THE FUTURE, WITHIN THE GOALS OF THE PROGRAM OR INSTITUTION.

The above definition implies that the key elements of sustainability are:

- Supply and Demand (*the ability to provide what is needed*)
- Institutional and management structures that work in the present and are flexible to adapt to future needs (*now and in the future*)
- Mission (*within the goals of the program or institution*)

Each of these elements is critical to sustainability: a program or institution cannot market its services and products unless there is demand; where there is demand, solid yet flexible management structures and systems need to be in place to ensure the continuous provision of services and products to meet changes in the future; and finally, the mission must provide a structure so that changes in response to demand and supply still fit the overall project or institutional goals as well as external needs.

### Relationship of Different Definitions

The present definition and its elements, which form the core of the framework used, have an advantage in that they are simple to discuss and understand: the elements are essentially composed of what (supply, demand); how (management structures and systems, adaptability); and why (need, goals). This definition encompasses the elements used in Bangladesh in earlier discussions of sustainability, but adds an important emphasis on need and demand as key programmatic considerations. In fact, demand had been the focal point of sustainability discussions at the time the QES strategy was adopted, but in practice, the concept of measuring program sustainability by looking at demand had been lost. For this reason, it was important to begin by broadening the definition of sustainability so that the element of demand could again be examined.

*The EVALUATION Project Definition:* Internationally, The EVALUATION Project has been working to identify indicators of sustainability, beginning at the national program level. These indicators have been taken into account in developing the present framework, with

adaptation to the local level. The EVALUATION Project indicators cover: demand (both met need as measured by continuing use, and unmet need), targeting of resources, political support (e.g., statement by leadership, quality and stability of leadership), existence of core technical skills within the program, adequate contraceptive procurement and distribution, and program generation of funds. These elements are measured by the proposed indicators.

*Bangladeshi Definitions:* The definitions of sustainability used by the Bangladesh family planning program had gradually been expanded from financial sustainability (the focus of a Pathfinder-sponsored workshop in 1991); to institutional, managerial, and financial (IMF) sustainability (the aspects measured in the semi-annual report and monitored by the Management Development Assessment (MDA) tools, which were developed by FPMD with the CAs); to programmatic, institutional, managerial, and financial (PIMF) sustainability (Barkat & Khuda paper presented at the May 1993 workshop sponsored by Pathfinder). The elements of the present definition encompass the MDA sub-elements and parallel the elements of the PIMF definition, as discussed below.

*Management Development Assessment Definition:* The sub-elements of the present definition cover all the major sub-elements used in the MDAs (leadership, organizational structure and lines of communication, mission and plans, finance, human resources, and community participation), and as such, the MDAs are expected to serve as an important source of information for the sustainability indicators. However, the MDAs are not themselves appropriate tools for measuring sustainability across CAs since these instruments are agency-specific with regard to collection and aggregation of data. (It may be possible to modify individual items in the various MDAs to standardize their collection in preparation for reporting of sustainability indicators.) The MDAs should not be viewed as serving a parallel purpose to the sustainability indicators: they contain a wealth of NGO-specific management information which is necessary at the CA and NGO level but not for purposes of overall measurement of sustainability across CAs.

*PIMF Definition:* The point was raised that CA and NGO project personnel have all been trained to understand sustainability in terms of the PIMF definition and would need to be re-oriented to understand the proposed definition. The new definition should not be seen as requiring a complete revision of what has preceded it, however. The definition was broadened in order to examine and test all aspects of sustainability, but the indicators that come out of the definition can easily be grouped under the programmatic/institutional/managerial/financial elements -- particularly since most of the pilot indicators that are not oriented toward demand are quite similar to those currently in use.

The indicators that are tested under the current framework can be understood in terms of the PIMF framework as follows: "programmatic sustainability" (PS) can be taken to incorporate supply and demand factors, while IMF sustainability parallels other elements and sub-elements of the proposed framework. The substantive difference is the addition of demand to the programmatic sustainability area.

In fact, the definition of PS proposed in the Barkat & Khuda paper addresses the importance of demand, stating that the aim of PS is "to transform the program from the supply-oriented to demand-driven." Barkat & Khuda also point to the importance of norm-building (a demand indicator) as a factor in sustainability. In practice, however, programmatic sustainability and aspects of demand have not been fully incorporated into the IMF framework: they are not currently measured by the semi-annual report nor contained in project proposals. Attempts at measuring demand have been supplanted by measurements of institutional (leadership), managerial, and financial systems.

### Importance of Demand Element

Logically, demand for services and products is perhaps the critical factor in determining whether a program is sustainable. The EVALUATION Project and the Barkat & Khuda work on sustainability both support this notion. The question remains whether local data on demand is necessary, or whether national information is adequate. Certainly local information can be of great use in setting targets and assessing the effectiveness of outreach efforts, but the costs of collecting this information must also be weighed.

For this reason, it is essential first to pilot-test demand indicators to determine their usefulness. The pilot test should provide a basis for judging the usefulness of these indicators and the difficulty of collecting and analyzing them. If the indicators prove worth collecting (e.g., they show levels of need by type of person more clearly than other available information), then ways of incorporating some of these into the routine data-collection system can be examined. It may be that one or two sustainability indicators need to be collected through special studies, perhaps once a year or even every two years, just as several quality indicators will need to be collected specially.

The testing process will provide a one-time, low-cost method of determining how effective the proposed indicators are and whether special studies are necessary. There will be an opportunity at the indicators workshop, to be held in August by FPMD and Pathfinder, for all parties to decide, based on the test results, which of the routine and non-routine Quality, Expansion, and Sustainability indicators to adopt.

## **2. Sub-elements and Indicators**

The elements listed above were broken down into sub-elements in order to define better the indicators for each area. These sub-elements and indicators are described in Annex III.

### 3. Pilot Test

The above indicators will be pilot tested using several of TAF's client NGOs. The purpose of the pilot test is to:

- Determine which indicators are important measures of sustainability
- Determine the feasibility of using the indicators as routine measures
- Explore the possibility of combining indicators to form a Sustainability Index

The unit of analysis for the test will be the NGO. The indicators will be tested by correlating them with the perceived sustainability, as measured in terms of management capabilities, of the test NGOs. The test sites selected from among TAF's 26 NGOs will therefore include both NGOs thought by TAF program staff to be poorly managed and NGOs thought to be well managed. (The process of selection of test sites is described next.)

TAF program officers will visit each site and collect information necessary to compute the indicators. The FPMD/MIS team will work with TAF staff to process, analyze, and interpret the results; the team will make a visit in May to assist in the data collection process and work with the preliminary data, and will return in August to analyze the remaining data and conduct the workshop. (See Annex I, Scope of Work.)

#### Selection of NGO Testing Sites

So as not to conduct an expensive, time-consuming pilot test, a purposeful sample was taken. Selection of NGOs was based on the following characteristics: management strength (good vs. poor) as perceived by TAF program officers, services offered (FP only/multiple), location (rural/urban setting), and number of sites (single-site NGO/multi-site). The management aspect will help determine whether an NGO's score on various sustainability indicators correlates with the (perceived) reality of its performance. The other characteristics will be used to stratify data based on potential modifying factors.

TAF program and MIS officers grouped their client NGOs as follows: (1) single service/poor management, (2) single service/good management, (3) multiple services/poor management, and (4) multiple services/good management. One NGO was selected to represent each of these four groups, taking into account the NGO's location (rural vs. urban and proximity to Dhaka), number of sites of the NGO, and the quality of the information collected and reported by the NGO. In all cases, NGOs of a similar size (as measured by catchment population) were selected: the populations averaged about 10,000 per NGO, with a range of approximately 7,000-12,000. This process resulted in selection of the following four NGO sites:

SITE	LOCATION	NGO DESCRIPTION
CWFP	Rajashi Branch (Western Bangladesh)	Poor management Multi-service Single site Urban (Branch office of National NGO)
SUPK	Dinajpur District (Northern Bangladesh)	Good management Multi-service Multi-site Rural/Urban
JKK	Sylhet District (Northeastern Bangladesh)	Poor management Single service Multi-site Rural/Tribal
SUP	Narsinji District (Middle Bangladesh)	Good management Single service Single site Rural

### Selection of Households

To obtain the four data items that require special studies (interviews of ELCOs), 80 households will be selected from each NGO site as follows: The interviewer will randomly select the names of five CBD workers from a list of all the NGO's CBD workers, and will then interview a cluster of 16 ELCOs served by each of the five selected CBD workers. Contiguous households served by the selected CBD worker will be interviewed. To obtain a sample with half of the clients practicing birth control and half not, the interviewer should make sure that eight of the 16 ELCOs selected are practicing clients and eight are not. If the interviewer has reached the quota of one type for a particular cluster, then he/she will suspend interviewing that type and only interview the type for which the quota has not been met.

### Data Collection

Information will be obtained from a number of sources. The majority of data items will be obtained from the NGO records and the current MIS. Other information will be obtained from the household survey (described above), the MDA, monitoring visits, minutes of NGO meetings, and other project documents. For the latter, non-routine information, TAF will ensure that the NGO collects the relevant information during the period of the test and makes it available during TAF's visits.

The FPMD/MIS team will develop the questionnaires and data collection forms to capture all the necessary information, as well as protocols to guide the data collection effort. These will be discussed with TAF program and MIS staff and finalized by the beginning of April.

### Timeline

Data will be collected at two points in time for each of the selected NGOs. The first data collection will take place during April-May 1994, followed by a second collection of the same data two months later. (The data will not be analyzed longitudinally. The two data collection points are intended to gather sufficient data for analysis; the comparison will be of high-performing and low-performing NGOs, rather than of changes over time.)

### Roles and Responsibilities

A senior person from TAF will supervise the collection of the pilot test data, using the protocols and instruments designed for this task. TAF program officers will be responsible for selecting the sample of ELCOs and interviewing them. CBD workers will not be used for this work.

The FPMD/MIS team will work with TAF during their May and August visits to process and analyze the information collected during the pilot test. The purpose of the analysis will be to eliminate those indicators that do not measure sustainability or correlate strongly with other measures. Consideration will also be given to dropping those indicators for which difficulty is encountered in collecting the data.

## **VI. RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

### **A. SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT**

#### **1. Reporting**

It was agreed by all parties that the semi-annual report format contained in the present trip report would provide the model for future reporting. CAs will complete the required tables as fully as possible, noting any exceptions (i.e., indicators that are not applicable) and clarifying the number of units reporting overall and the number reporting on indicators that are not applicable to all NGOs or projects. The tables will be fully analyzed and interpreted in the text of the report.

#### **2. Modifications**

The only modifications anticipated in the future will be to the content of the Key Achievement Indicators table. These will be based on the results of the Quality, Expansion, Sustainability indicators pilot tests and workshop.

### **3. Relationship of Annual Workplan to Cooperative Agreement**

Although there is no set format for the workplan submitted by the CAs to USAID, it is essential that all Cooperative Agreement activities and outputs be included in the workplan. The preparation of the workplan each year should be seen as an opportunity to examine the progress made toward specified outputs and to communicate with USAID on any needed modifications. For instance, the annual and five-year targets set in 1992 may now appear unrealistic based on experience and new information. If this is the case, the targets should be modified, and a rationale for the modifications provided, in the annual workplan. The modified targets should then be used in the Annual Summary of Outputs table in the semi-annual report.

### **4. Cost per User**

Cost-per-user is no longer included in the required set of indicators. Methodologically, cost-per-user is difficult to calculate, and it is even more difficult to interpret, especially across organizations. (For a discussion of the methodological and interpretation issues related to this indicator, refer to the annex of the February-March 1992 FPMD report, "Development of Strategic Initiatives for Family Planning NGOs in Bangladesh," by Saul Helfenbein, Peg Hume, and Sara Seims.) Because of the difficulties in comparison, it is not recommended that CAs report this indicator. However, it may be more appropriate for NGOs to use this indicator for the purposes of internal management.

### **5. Feedback**

It will be important for the CAs to provide written feedback based on the overall report to their NGOs or projects, as well as for them to receive feedback, again in writing, from USAID. The quantitative information contained in the report can be used to compare a CA's performance against its targets or against the aggregate performance of all the CAs, or to compare an NGO's performance against the performance of all NGOs. The information contained in the narrative can be used to provide an overview of successes, constraints, solutions, and innovative strategies and methods, which can be useful to the CAs, NGOs, and USAID. One means of sharing information among the CAs may be to distribute the executive summaries from each semi-annual report to all the CAs, a suggestion which was discussed briefly with USAID.

## **B. SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS**

### **1. Pilot Test**

All the suggested indicators should be pilot tested in the coming months by The Asia Foundation. The FPMD/MIS team will provide assistance part-way through the data collection and in the final analysis and interpretation of the data. The results will be presented in a workshop to be sponsored jointly by FPMD and Pathfinder.

## **2. Operationalization**

After the workshop, the selected indicators will be operationalized with assistance from FPMD. At that time, consideration will be given to minimizing the data collection burden (i.e., emphasis on routine collection where possible, rather than use of special studies). The selected indicators will be incorporated as fully as possible into the existing framework (programmatic, institutional/managerial/financial sustainability). Training will be provided.

## ANNEX I: SCOPE OF WORK AND WORKPLAN FOR SUBSEQUENT VISITS

DATE	TASK	CA	COUNTERPART
May 1-12, 1994 2 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure Sustainability pilot test is on track</li> <li>• Collaborate with TAF in analyzing preliminary test results</li> <li>• Coordinate with MDA team</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAF</li> <li>• TAF</li> <li>• All</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MIS staff</li> <li>• MIS staff</li> <li>• MIS staff</li> </ul>
August 6-25, 1994 3 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present and finalize indicators in workshop with Pathfinder</li> <li>• Assess CAs data needs related to selected indicators</li> <li>• Discuss training implications for data collection and data processing personnel</li> <li>• Assist CAs in defining processes and tools for collecting non-routine QES information</li> <li>• Identify follow-up tasks for CAs to begin operationalizing routine QES</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All</li> <li>• All</li> <li>• All</li> <li>• All</li> <li>• FPAB, TAF, AVSC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MIS staff, PF TA staff</li> <li>• MIS staff</li> <li>• MIS and training staff</li> <li>• MIS staff</li> <li>• MIS staff</li> </ul>

DATE	TASK	CA	COUNTERPART
Oct. 30-Nov. 17, 1994  3 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide TA in operationalization of routine QES indicators</li> <li>• Review CA efforts to date to operationalize QES indicators</li> <li>• Oversee development of Executive Information System</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPAB, TAF, AVSC</li> <li>• All</li> <li>• MSH, perhaps with a local programmer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MIS and program staff</li> <li>• Mgmt, program, MIS staff from various levels</li> </ul>
Jan. 8-26, 1995  3 weeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate CAs' processing, analysis and use of QES indicators during initial preparation of semi-annual report</li> <li>• Review use of Exec. Info. Sys.</li> <li>• Hold training workshop for CA staff</li> <li>• Train additional staff at various levels</li> <li>• Seminar for FPAB Board members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TAF, FPAB, AVSC</li> <li>• All</li> <li>• TAF, FPAB, AVSC</li> <li>• FPAB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program and MIS staff</li> <li>• Mgmt, MIS, program, staff</li> <li>• TBA (both CA &amp; NGO staff)</li> <li>• Board, MIS counterparts</li> </ul>

## **ANNEX IIA: REVISED SEMIANNUAL REPORT**

The modifications to the semi-annual report are discussed below. They are followed by the revised table of contents and tables. Annex IIB provides a glossary of the terms used.

### **1. Minimum Required Tables**

By clarifying the different purposes of the report, it was possible to separate the needs for output-related information, specific to each CA, from the overall achievement information. As a result, the number of required tables was reduced to five, of which one is annual only. The five tables are described below.

Note: It is important to the interpretation of the tables, as well as that of the narrative, that the CAs specify the reporting units: for instance, number and percent of total NGOs/projects/clinics/etc. being reported on.

#### Table I: Key Achievement Indicators by Targets

This table provides an overview of progress toward Quality, Expansion, and Sustainability. The indicators to be reported are those contained in the recent amendment of each CA's Cooperative Agreement; they will be changed based on the results of the pilot test. They will be reported against the annual and 1997 targets that are to have been set by the CAs since the amendment. The narrative section of the semi-annual report (Section I, Overview) should include an interpretation of the results in this table and should provide any explanations deemed important (for instance, explaining that a decline in CPR may be due to a changing baseline population, and discussing the change in CPR in the continuing population). The column headings in this table have not been changed; the contents represent a subset of the original list of indicators.

Within the current set of indicators, there are a few that cannot be reported on by all CAs for all NGOs or projects. In these cases, CAs should report to the extent possible, using footnotes to explain which indicators they are unable to report at all and which indicators can only be reported on for certain NGOs or projects (and in this case, listing the reporting units). For instance, it may not be feasible or appropriate to report on NGO-generated funds for a certain hospital but it may be possible to report on the funds generated by the CA-supported project within that hospital.

#### Table II: Expenditures in Relation to Budget

This table provides a financial status report for each CA. The budget categories are drawn from the CAs' Cooperative Agreements. Expenditures should be provided for the first and second semesters of the calendar year (January-June and July-December), rather than for the fiscal year. Relevant aspects of the financial status of the CA should be discussed in the

narrative as they relate to the description of Program Activities per Cooperative Agreement (Section II) of the report. This table is almost identical to the original table.

Table III: Personnel by Type and Status

This table provides an overview of personnel for each CA. The specific categories of personnel within the groupings by salary may be added to or deleted as appropriate for each CA (based on project proposals). The table covers the present period only, since staffing patterns are set in the project proposals and are assumed not to vary widely from one period to the next. If there is great variation or any other noteworthy information, it should be discussed in the narrative as it relates to the cluster review. This table has been simplified based on the recommendations of the CA MIS staff and discussions with USAID.

Table IV: Active Users by Method and Source

This table provides an overview of active users by CA; the NGO-specific details are no longer required, although the CAs may provide this information if they wish. In the narrative discussion of this table (under the description of program activities and/or cluster review), CAs can provide additional information on referrals or other details as appropriate, while highlighting important findings from the table itself.

Table V: Annual Summary of Outputs by Time Period and Target

This table is intended to track the specific activities and outputs of each CA against the Cooperative Agreements. For each activity or output listed in the CA's Cooperative Agreement, this table should show progress against the annual and five-year targets listed in the CA's workplan (see recommendation regarding relationship of Cooperative Agreement and Workplan). This table will be prepared at the end of each year only (after the July-December period), and discussed in Section II of the narrative section of the report as appropriate. It replaces the previous Summary of NGO Project Activities and Outputs.

This table will cover training for CAs that have training outputs specified in their Cooperative Agreements. CAs with significant training activities are free to provide an additional table with details as appropriate (for example, required resources, outputs in terms of numbers, results in terms of training impact).

## **2. Integration and Interpretation of Tables**

The main focus of the semi-annual report should be informed discussion and analysis, supported by appropriate data (tables). It is therefore essential that the minimum required information (i.e., the five tables) be integrated into the narrative report (whether physically or by appropriate references) and be fully discussed and interpreted in light of project activities, inputs, constraints, or other mitigating factors. For instance, if the CPR declines from the previous period because of the addition of several low-prevalence catchment areas,

there should be a footnote to the appropriate table as well as a discussion of the actual prevalence in different areas. Similarly, if the CPR increases from one period to the next or does not change, there should be explanation and discussion of the programmatic or other reasons as well as of the implications.

### **3. Additional Tables**

Additional tables may be added at the CA's discretion, for the purposes of showing trends, explaining changes, or describing achievements in the area of the CA's functional specialty, other program activities, etc. For instance, a CA may wish to present information on its clinical training activities (numbers of professionals trained, number of procedures carried out during and after training, etc.).

### **4. Innovations**

It is important to note that the section on innovations does not necessarily refer to the 12 "innovative techniques" laid out in the previous format. Instead, this section is aimed at discussing any innovations in approach or mode of delivery that may have been developed by a CA or NGO. The objective is to share information about the successes, obstacles, and inadequacies of different strategies or techniques, so that all NGOs or projects may benefit from one another's experiences.

As such, the section is not oriented at numbers in a table, but should be presented in a context of discussion. The minimum quantitative information that should be provided is the number of subgrantees that had planned to test and/or implement innovative techniques and the number that accomplished the testing and/or implementation during the period. (Techniques being tested are those that are new and have not been fully reviewed; techniques being implemented are those that have been tested, found useful, and adopted as an ongoing strategy by a subgrantee, as well as possibly being replicated throughout a CA's NGOs or projects.)

This quantitative information should be presented under Constraints, Solutions and Innovations (Section VI) along with a narrative that highlights what each innovation is, what its results to date have been, and what the implications are. The narrative should also make recommendations for further testing, implementation, or replication of innovations. (Note: If no innovations have taken place during a reporting period, CAs should simply include a note to that effect under Section VI.)

### **5. Audits and Evaluations**

Information on audits and evaluations should be included as appropriate under Sections II or IV and may be presented in a narrative rather than a table. The minimum information provided must include the number planned for a period in comparison to the number carried

out, by type of audit or evaluation. Information on audits and evaluations planned in the next period is no longer required.

A table is required only for any completed audit or evaluation for which there are recommendations outstanding (i.e., unfulfilled). In this case, the table to be used is a simplified version of the table in the original report format.

## **6. Waivers**

Information on waivers of purchasing regulations is no longer required to be reported in the semi-annual report. However, it is important that CAs continue to anticipate waivers and request them as early as possible, to ensure that they can be processed in a timely fashion. During annual workplanning, it should be possible to plan for major commodities purchases or overseas training courses that may require a waiver.

## **7. Revised Table of Contents of Semi-annual Report**

- I. Executive Summary (Brief Overview of Organizational Changes and Accomplishments)
- II. Program Activities per Cooperative Agreement
  - A. CA
  - B. NGOs
- III. Functional Specialty
- IV. Required Actions per Cluster Review and Approval Letter
- V. Program Activities outside Cooperative Agreement
  - A. CA
  - B. NGOs
- VI. Constraints, Solutions, and Innovations
  - A. CA
  - B. NGOs

**Note:** The five required tables may be either integrated into the actual report or annexed to the report and referred to in the text. The notes above indicate appropriate sections of the report for discussion of the tables. Audits and evaluations should be discussed in Section IV of the report, and innovations should be incorporated into Section VI.

**TABLE I  
KEY ACHIEVEMENT INDICATORS BY TARGETS**

INDICATORS (A)	LAST 6 MONTHS (B)	THIS 6 MONTHS (C)	PERCENT CHANGE (D)	THIS YEAR'S TARGET (E)	PERCENT OF YEAR'S TARGET ACHIEVED (F)	1997 TARGET (G)	PERCENT OF 1997 TARGET ACHIEVED (H)
			$(C-B)/B*100$		$(\text{year's total}) / (E)*100$		$(\text{Total Since Beginning of Project}) / (G)*100$
Contraceptive Prevalence Rate (CPR)							
Total Number of Eligible Couples (ELCOs)							
Total Number Of Active Users							
Total Active Users (Project Source)							
Total Active Users (Other Source)							
Total Clinical Users							
Percent Clinical Users							
Total Low-parity Eligible Couples							
Percent Low-parity Couples using Family Planning							
Number NGOs Scoring $\geq 75\%$ On Institutional/Managerial Scale							
Percent NGOs Scoring $\geq 75\%$ On Institutional/Managerial Scale							
Total funds generated by NGOs, including donations							
Total NGO-generated funds expended on NGO							
Total NGO-generated funds saved + invested							
Total estimated value of non-cash donations to NGOs							

**TABLE II  
EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO BUDGET**

BUDGET CATEGORY (A)	EXPENDED PREVIOUS 6 MONTHS (B)	EXPENDED THIS 6 MONTHS (C)	EXPENDED YEAR-TO- DATE (D)	YEARLY BUDGET (This Calendar Year) (E)	PERCENT YEARLY BUDGET REACHED (F)	CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURE (Total Since Beginning of Project) (G)	TOTAL FIVE-YEAR BUDGET (H)	PERCENT FIVE- YEAR BUDGET EXPENDED (I)	FIVE-YEAR BALANCE UNEXPENDED (J)
					D/E*100			G/H*100	H-G
Subproject Support									
Functional Specialty									
Program Support									
Training (International)**									
Training (Local)**									
Procurement									
Evaluation									
Audit									
Indirect Costs									
TOTAL									

\*In the mid-year report covering January-June, columns (3) and (4) will contain the same data.

\*\*Training should be broken down for international vs. local where applicable.

TABLE III  
PERSONNEL BY TYPE AND STATUS

CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL (A)	FULL-TIME				PART TIME			
	PLANNED THIS 6 MONTHS (B)	ACTUAL THIS 6 MONTHS (C)	NUMBER OF WOMEN (D)	PERCENT WOMEN OF ACTUAL (E)	PLANNED THIS 6 MONTHS (F)	ACTUAL THIS 6 MONTHS (G)	NUMBER OF WOMEN (H)	PERCENT WOMEN OF ACTUAL (I)
				(D-C)/100				G/H*100
<b>I. SALARIED PERSONNEL</b>								
Field Staff: Field Workers/Health Workers Supervisors/Field Officers Village Organizers Team Leaders								
Medical: Physicians Nurses Nurses Aides Paramedics FWs Aya Counselors								
Management:								
Support:								
TOTAL								
<b>II. PARTIALLY FUNDED</b>								
Volunteers/Community Volunteers								
Group Leaders								
Part-time Field Workers								
TOTAL								
<b>III. UNPAID WORKERS</b>								
Board Members								
Organization (club) Members								
Depot Holders								
TOTAL								

TABLE IV  
ACTIVE USERS BY METHOD AND SOURCE

METHOD (A)	NUMBER OF ACTIVE USERS LAST 6 MONTHS				NUMBER OF ACTIVE USERS THIS 6 MONTHS				PERCENT CHANGE			PERCENT CURRENT ACTIVE USERS BY METHOD (M)
	PROJECT SOURCE (B)	OTHER SOURCE (C)	TOTAL (D)	PERCENT PROJECT SOURCE (E)	PROJECT SOURCE (F)	OTHER SOURCE (G)	TOTAL (H)	PERCENT PROJECT SOURCE (I)	PROJECT SOURCE (J)	OTHER SOURCE (K)	TOTAL (L)	
			B+C	B/D*100			F+G	F/H*100	(F-B)/B *100	(G-C)/C *100	(H-D)/D *100	H/ [sum(H)] *100
Pill												
Condom												
IUD												
Injectables												
Norplant												
Ligation												
Vasectomy												
Other (name)												
Other (name)												
Other (name)												
Other (name)												
TOTAL												100.0







## ANNEX IIB: DEFINITIONS FOR SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

**TABLE 1**

### **Column A INDICATORS**

This column contains the indicators to be reported, defined below. If an indicator is not applicable to a particular CA's NGOs or projects, N.A. (not applicable) should be written in the appropriate cell of the table. If an indicator is only applicable to some of a CA's NGOs or projects, the available information should be reported with a footnote indicating which reporting units are covered by the information.

► **Contraceptive Prevalence Rate**=Divide the total number of active users by the total number of eligible couples and multiply by 100 to obtain a percentage. (Note: This is actually the Contraceptive Acceptance Rate.)

► **Total Number of Eligible Couples (ELCOs)**=For the purpose of couple registration, defined as a woman who is married and between the ages of 15 and 49. If either the wife or husband is sterilized, the couple will be recorded as an ELCO using the contraceptive method of sterilization. Pregnant women are considered ELCOs, as they may conceive children after their current pregnancy.

► **Active User**=A person who lives in the project area, is a registered ELCO who regularly uses a contraceptive method, and is followed up by the field worker every two months.

► **Active User (project source)**=An active user receiving contraceptive supplies from the Project field workers.

► **Active User (other source)**=An active user receiving contraceptive supplies from a source other than the Project (open market, etc.).

► **Total Clinical Users**=Family planning acceptors of sterilization (vasectomy or tubal ligation) or long-term clinical methods: IUD, injectables, or NORPLANT.

► **Percent Clinical Users**=Total clinical users divided by total active users, multiplied by 100.

► **Total Low-Parity Eligible Couples**=Eligible couples with two or fewer children.

► **Percent Low-Parity Couples Using Family Planning**=Total low-parity eligible couples using family planning divided by total low-parity eligible couples, multiplied by 100.

► **NGO Scores on IMS Scale**=Refers to the Institutional and Managerial Sustainability Scale, used in the previous semi-annual report; this scale is no longer applied to NGOs.

► **Total funds generated by NGOs, including donations**=The amount generated from NGO/project sales of condoms, pill service charge, and clinical service charge (give in Taka).

► **Total NGO-generated funds expended on NGO (project)**=The total amount of the NGO- or project-generated funds mentioned above that were expended on NGO activities (give in Taka).

► **Total NGO-generated funds saved + invested**=The total amount of the NGO- or project-generated funds mentioned above that were either saved in a bank or savings institution or invested.

► **Total estimated value of non-cash donations given to NGOs**=Include donations of medicines, land, materials, time, labor, etc.

#### **Column B LAST 6 MONTHS**

This column contains the appropriate data from the last semi-annual report. For example, if the current report is for January-June 1994, then this column contains information from the July-December 1993 report.

#### **Column C THIS 6 MONTHS**

This column contains the appropriate data for the period covered by the current report.

#### **Column D PERCENT CHANGE**

This refers to the percent change in the data for the current six-month period over the previous six months. To obtain this number, subtract the data in column B from that in column C and divide the results by the number in column B, and multiply this number by 100 to obtain a percentage.

#### **Column E THIS YEAR'S TARGET**

The number in this column refers to the most recent target set by the CA. This number can either be taken from the Cooperative Agreement or the Annual Workplan, whichever is most up-to-date.

**Column F PERCENT OF THIS YEAR'S TARGET ACHIEVED**

This column refers to the percent of this year's target achieved to date. If the report is for the first six months of the calendar year, then divide column C by column E and multiply the result by 100. If the report is for the last six months of the calendar year, add columns B & C, divide this number by column E, and multiply the resulting number by 100.

**Column G 1997 TARGET**

This column should contain the 1997 target for each indicator set in the Cooperative Agreement or in the workplan, if the target has been modified. If the target comes from another source, the source should be referenced in a footnote.

**Column H PERCENT OF 1997 TARGET ACHIEVED**

To obtain this number, accumulate the results from the beginning of the project (after the Cooperative Agreement went into effect) through the end date of the report being prepared, and divide this number by the data in column G, then multiply by 100.

**TABLE II**

**Column A BUDGET CATEGORY**

This column lists the budget categories set in the Cooperative Agreement.

**Column B EXPENDED PREVIOUS 6 MONTHS**

This column contains the information reported in Column C of the previous semi-annual report and refers to monies expended during the six months prior to this reporting period.

**Column C EXPENDED THIS 6 MONTHS**

This refers to monies expended during the six months covered by the report currently being prepared.

**Column D EXPENDED YEAR-TO-DATE**

This column refers to the total expenditures during the calendar year. If the report being prepared covers the first six month of the calendar year, then this column is equal to Column C; if the reporting period covers the second six months in the calendar year, this column is equal to the sum of columns B and C.

**Column E CURRENT YEAR'S BUDGET**

This column contains the amount budgeted for each line item for the entire year.

**Column F PERCENT YEARLY BUDGET REACHED**

To obtain this figure, divide Column D by Column E and multiply the results by 100.

**Column G CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURE FROM BEGINNING OF PROJECT**

This refers to the sum of the monies expended from the beginning of the project (after the signing of the Cooperative Agreement) through the end of the current reporting period.

**Column H TOTAL FIVE-YEAR BUDGET**

This column contains the total five-year budget given in the Cooperative Agreement.

**Column I PERCENT FIVE-YEAR BUDGET EXPENDED**

To obtain this number, divide column G by column H and multiply the results by 100.

**Column J FIVE-YEAR BALANCE UNEXPENDED**

To obtain this number, subtract column G from column H.

**TABLE III**

**Column A CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL**

This column lists NGO personnel, grouped by salaried, partially funded, and unpaid workers: examples of each of these categories are given in the table. Within these categories, the types of workers should be presented according to the break-down in the project proposals.

Full-time and part-time refers to a classification given by the NGO.

**Columns B,F PLANNED THIS 6 MONTHS**

This column contains the total number of each type of worker that was planned in the staffing proposal, including any adjustments that may have been planned to occur during the current period.

**Columns C,G      ACTUAL THIS 6 MONTHS**

This refers to the actual number of each type of worker on staff by the end of the report period.

**Columns D,H      NUMBER OF WOMEN**

This column should give the actual number of female members on staff for each type of personnel.

**Columns E,I PERCENT WOMEN OF ACTUAL**

The percentage of the total full-time staff that are female is obtained by dividing column D by column C and multiplying the result by 100. For part-time staff, divide column H by column G and multiply by 100.

**TABLE IV**

**Column A      METHOD**

This column lists the family planning methods provided by the program. There is space to specify methods not included on this list.

**Columns B,F      PROJECT SOURCE**

This column contains the total number of active users of each method who received supplies or clinical procedures from the project.

**Columns C,G      OTHER SOURCE**

This column contains the total number of active users of each method who received supplies or clinical procedures from a source other than the project.

**Column D,H TOTAL**

This column contains the total of all active users. It is the sum of columns B and C.

**Column E,I PERCENT PROJECT SOURCE**

The percentage of all active users whose supplies were provided by the project during the last six months is obtained by dividing the number of project source users in column B by the total in column D and multiplying the result by 100. For the current six-month period, divide column F by column H and multiply by 100.

**Column J PERCENT CHANGE (PROJECT SOURCE)**

This column shows the percent change since the previous period in active users receiving supplies or clinical procedures from project sources. The number is obtained by subtracting column B from column F, dividing the result by column B, and multiplying by 100.

**Column K PERCENT CHANGE (OTHER SOURCE)**

This column shows the percent change since the previous period in active users receiving supplies or clinical procedures from non-project sources. The number is obtained by subtracting column C from column G, dividing the result by column C, and multiplying by 100.

**Column L PERCENT CHANGE (TOTAL)**

This column refers to the percent change in total number of active users since the previous period. Subtracting column D from column H, divide the result by column D, and multiply by 100.

**Column M PERCENT CURRENT ACTIVE USERS BY METHOD**

This column breaks down all active FP users by method, providing the percentage of all active users using each method. The percentages are obtained by dividing the column total for column H into the row entry for each method in column H and multiplying the result by 100. The sum of the cells in column M should then add to 100.0 percent.

**TABLE V (annual only)**

**Column A OUTPUTS**

This column contains a listing of the agreed-upon outputs from each CA's Cooperative Agreement. Use as many rows as necessary to list all outputs listed in the Cooperative Agreement.

**Column B LAST YEAR**

This column reports the data from the previous year-end report, for purposes of comparison to this year's data. Use the data from column C of last year's Table V. For example, if the current report is for 1994, then the "LAST YEAR's" report was for 1993. (Remember, this table is annual only).

**Column C THIS YEAR**

This column contains the summary data for each output for the one-year period which the current report covers.

**Column D PERCENT CHANGE**

This column shows the percent change in the data for the current report compared to the previous year's report. To obtain this number, subtract the data in column B from that in column C, divide the results by the number in column B, and multiply this number by 100.

**Column E THIS YEAR'S TARGET**

The number in this column refers to the most recent target set by the CA. This number can either be taken from the Cooperative Agreement or the Annual Workplan, whichever is most up-to-date.

**Column F PERCENT OF THIS YEAR'S TARGET ACHIEVED**

This column shows the percentage of this year's target that has been achieved to date. To obtain this result, divide column C by column E and multiply the result by 100.

**Column G 1997 TARGET**

The 1997 target should be taken from the Cooperative Agreement or from the workplan, if the target has been modified in that document. If the data comes from a different source, reference its source in a footnote.

**Column H PERCENT OF 1997 TARGET ACHIEVED**

To obtain the percentage of the five-year target that has been achieved to date, accumulate the results from the beginning of the project (after the Cooperative Agreement went into effect) through the end date of the reporting period currently being reported, and divide this number by the data in column G, then multiply by 100.

**TABLE VI (Optional)**

**Column A NAME OF CA OR NGO**

This column is used to list the Cooperating Agencies or Non-Governmental Organizations for which an audit's recommendations have not all been fulfilled.

Audits completed during the reporting period need not be reported unless outstanding recommendations exist.

**Column B A-133 OR NFA**

This column describes the type of audit conducted (A-133 or NFA) for each audit listed.

**Column C PERIOD COVERED**

This column documents the period covered by each audit listed.

**Column D DATE COMPLETED**

This column provides the date each audit listed was completed.

**Column E NUMBER OUTSTANDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

This column provides the number of outstanding recommendations for each audit listed; the recommendations themselves should not actually be listed. (Note: If there are no outstanding recommendations, the CA or NGO audit should not be listed in this table.)

**TABLE VII (Optional)**

**Column A NAME OF CA OR NGO**

This Column is used to list the Cooperating Agencies or Non-Governmental Organizations for which recommendations from evaluations and/or management assessments have not all been fulfilled. Evaluations and/or management assessments completed during the reporting period need not be reported unless outstanding recommendations exist.

**Column B TYPE OF EVALUATION OR ASSESSMENT**

This column describes the type of each evaluation or management assessment. The different types are: internal or external; baseline, mid-term, or final; and MDA. (For instance, the evaluation could be a final evaluation conducted by an external team.)

**Column C PERIOD COVERED**

This column documents the period covered by each evaluation or assessment listed.

**Column D    START DATE**

This column provides the date each evaluation or assessment listed was begun.

**Column E    DATE COMPLETED**

This column provides the date each evaluation or assessment listed was completed.

**Column F    NUMBER OUTSTANDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

This column provides the number of outstanding recommendations for each evaluation or management assessment listed; the recommendations themselves should not actually be listed. (Note: If there are no outstanding recommendations, the CA or NGO evaluation or assessment should not be listed in this table.)

## **ANNEX III: SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS**

This section describes briefly the sub-elements of each element and, within each sub-element, the indicators chosen to be tested, along with their source of data. (The sources of data listed include: special study, MIS, and monitoring visit/project documents (MV/PD). A + symbol indicates that a minor modification to the existing source will need to be made to capture the data.)

### **A. ELEMENT: SUPPLY AND DEMAND**

Within the element of Supply and Demand, four sub-elements were identified: for supply, Availability and Accessibility, and for demand, Attitudes and Stimulation of Demand. While quality is also related to this element, in that it may help determine utilization, indicators of quality were not addressed here since Pathfinder is conducting a separate test of quality indicators.

#### **1. Availability of Products**

Availability can be measured at all levels in the logistics system. The first indicator to be tested will measure whether the client has a continuous supply (for methods requiring frequent resupply), since this is the endpoint of the contraceptive distribution system. The second will measure the availability of inventory at delivery sites, since stockouts at this level will necessarily affect client resupply.

#### **2. Accessibility of Services**

Geographic, temporal, and financial factors can all influence accessibility. Temporal access is not assumed to be a good indicator because of difficulties in collecting the information. Financial access is not indicative since service fees are just being introduced in many cases. With regard to geographic access, measurement of the distance a fieldworker must travel to visit ELCOs varies greatly and depends on the route, but measures of distance to standing service delivery sites may be useful. Similarly, attendance at satellite clinics should indicate access.

#### **3. Attitudes**

Demand for a product or service is based on potential clients' knowledge and attitudes. In population groups where the levels of knowledge and practice of family planning are low, the existence of positive attitudes toward spacing or delaying of childbearing should indicate potential demand for family planning. (Attitudinal indicators may also be useful in identifying programmatic issues related to community outreach and IEC if they measure a high level of potential demand in areas where prevalence is low.)

In populations that have already accepted family planning, an indicator of the sustainability of demand is willingness to pay. This indicator will become more important as fee-for-service is implemented more widely, related to different services and methods, in the Bangladesh family planning program.

#### 4. Stimulation of Demand

Demand is related not only to attitudes among current and potential clients, but also to project efforts to generate demand. Expansion of services to new acceptors should indicate success in creating demand.

SUB-ELEMENT	INDICATOR	SOURCE OF DATA
Availability of products	1. Break in resupply to ELCOs (client out of stock)	Special study
	2. Avg. % on hand of Desired Inventory Level, by method (and brand), over period	MIS
Accessibility of services	3. Avg. distance between ELCO and clinic	Monitoring Visit/Project Documents (MV/PD)
	4. % population in catchment area attending satellite or mini clinics	MIS+
Attitudes	5. % MWRA who want to delay or space childbearing	Special study
	6. % MWRA who want to stop childbearing	Special study
	7. % clients that pay for service, by method	MIS
Stimulation of demand	8. % of FP users that are new acceptors, by target group (newlyweds, low-parity, high-parity)	MIS+
	9. % new acceptors by method	MIS

## **B. ELEMENT: INSTITUTIONAL/MANAGERIAL STRUCTURES AND SYSTEMS**

Institutional and Managerial Structures and Systems (which include financial systems) are important to present-day management, but for true sustainability over the long term they must be adaptable. Many tools are already in place to measure the quality and stage of development of current management practices, but these cannot measure how these practices will fare in the future. For this reason, the indicators for each of the sub-elements below attempt to measure the flexibility of the management structures: does staff plan ahead, are staff provided regular training and development, is innovation encouraged, is the Board active, etc. Many of these can be drawn from or incorporated into the Management Development Assessment tools.

The major sub-elements identified are: Leadership and Levels of Authority, Use of Information, Innovation, Human Resources, Finances, and Community Participation.

### **1. Leadership and Levels of Authority**

Leadership exists not only at the executive level, but throughout an institution and arises also from within the community. While the quality of leadership at the individual level is important for sustainability but difficult to measure, the active participation of the Board can serve as an indication of community leadership. Participation of staff members in activities related to the overall project or institution should indicate shared decision-making, another important aspect of leadership as well as staff ownership. An additional indicator of leadership and sustainability is the willingness to consider and make institutional-level changes, such as reviewing the institution's structure.

### **2. Use of Information**

Information is of utmost importance when used not simply for reporting or day-to-day monitoring, but in order to evaluate a program's achievements and needs. Appropriate use of information can be vital to long-term sustainability, as it can facilitate projection of future needs, targeting of resources, and modeling of alternate strategies.

At the most basic level, the institution should set its own targets, based on past experience and on objectives. As the institution acquires the ability to set appropriate targets, the majority of targets should be fulfilled. (If many targets are not met or are surpassed, this may be an indication that they are not set based on an accurate assessment of resources, obstacles, etc.) As the institution's management capability becomes stronger, it should be possible to plan ahead for a three- to five-year period. If the long-term planning exercise is useful and fully understood by staff, operational (annual) planning should be based on the long-term plan. Indicators of each of these stages will be tested.

### **3. Innovation**

Adaptability is essential for an institution's functioning over the long term. Such flexibility requires a willingness to identify and test new measures, which can occur at any level in the institution. It may be easier to measure smaller innovations, such as use of a new supervision technique, revenue generation strategy, or data storage procedure, since these are likely to occur more frequently than large-scale innovations in service delivery. Small changes throughout the institution are also a measure of how favorable the institutional climate is toward staff suggestions for improvements.

### **4. Human Resources**

The staff of an institution is its greatest resource. Three aspects of human resources are important for sustainability: the capabilities of the current staff, the ongoing provision of development opportunities that will help staff grow to meet future challenges, and supervisory systems.

### **5. Finances**

It is important to consider several aspects of financing that are related to sustainability: a diversified funding base, the institution's ability to raise its own funds, and institutional savings and/or assets.

### **6. Community Participation**

The support of the community should be a strong indicator of sustainability. Community support can be measured through financial contribution -- not only in value but also in terms of the number of persons contributing -- and through participation in meetings.

SUB-ELEMENT	INDICATOR	SOURCE
Leadership and levels of authority	10. # recommendations made (Board and/or Project)	MV/PD
	11. % Board and/or Project recommendations implemented	"
	12. % Board members that are local opinion leaders <sup>1</sup>	"
	13. # staff involved in developing annual workplan	MV/PD
	14. Project organigram exists and has been reviewed or modified since its inception	"
Use of information	15. Workplan service targets are based on service statistics	"
	16. % of all annual targets that are fully achieved	"
	17. Long-term plan exists for current period	"
	18. Long-term plan is basis for operational planning	"
Innovations	19. Unit heads <sup>2</sup> can identify measure developed and implemented within unit	"
	20. One or more new initiatives developed by institution	"

<sup>1</sup> Opinion leaders include local elected officials, posted administrative officials, religious leaders (imams, etc.), and teachers.

<sup>2</sup> "Unit heads" describes any individual responsible for a functional area, such as service delivery, finance, logistics, management, training, etc.

SUB-ELEMENT	INDICATOR	SOURCE
Human resources	21. Staff responsible for the following areas have received job-related training: service delivery, MIS, finance, training, management, IEC, logistics	"
	22. Staff development/training plan exists (for management and field staff)	"
	23. Supervisory checklist is used	MV/PD
Finances	24. # funding sources	"
	25. # revenue generation activities	"
	26. % annual population budget generated by population project	"
	27. Financial reserves exist (amount)	"
	28. Land and/or office is owned	"
Community participation	29. % annual population budget from contributions	"
	30. # non-cash donations during period	"
	31. Value of non-cash donations during period	"
	32. # group meetings	"
	33. Total # people attending all group meetings	"
	34. # coordination meetings with other projects within NGO (where applicable)	"

### C. ELEMENT: MISSION (PURPOSE)

For a family planning institution to be sustainable, its mission should be appropriate (based on local need) and operational (as demonstrated by a clear statement of purpose). These sub-elements (Need and Purpose) are closely related.

#### 1. Need

The "need" indicators are impact-oriented, since they should help in measuring success at achieving the institution's population goals.

#### 2. Purpose

Although it is important for the institution's goals to be clearly stated, it is critical for staff to understand the larger purpose of the institution.

SUB-ELEMENT	INDICATOR	SOURCE
Need	35. Desired family size by target group (newlywed, low-parity)	Special study
	36. Current family size	Special study
Goals	37. % management staff sampled who can summarize purpose of project or institution	Monitoring visit

## **ANNEX IV: LIST OF CONTACTS**

### **USAID/Dhaka, Office of Health and Population**

Mr. Alan Foose, Population Officer  
Mr. Quasem Bhuyan, Project Management Specialist  
Ms. Louisa Gomes, Project Management Specialist

### **AVSC**

Dr. Abu Jamil Faisal, Country Representative  
Dr. Sukanta Sarker, Senior Program Officer

### **FPAB**

Mr. Mizanur Rahman, Acting Director General  
Ms. Shamima Hasam, Deputy Director, USAID Project  
Mr. Ershad-ul Huq, Program Officer/MIS  
Mr. Habibur Rahman, Program Officer/MIS

### **FPSTC**

Mr. Abder Rouf, Chief Executive  
Mr. Milon Bikash Paul, Deputy Chief Executive  
Mr. Rafique Ahmed, Program Officer/MIS  
Ms. Lulu Bilkis, MIS

### **PF**

Dr. M. Alauddin, Country Representative  
Mr. Saiful Islam, Program Manager  
Mr. Ahmed Sultanur Reza, Program Officer/MIS  
Mr. Kamrul Hossain, Program Officer/MIS  
Mr. Luigi Jaramillo, Evaluation Unit, Pathfinder/Watertown

## **TAF**

Ms. Kirsten Lundeen, Program Manager  
Mr. Shaheed Mahbub Hossain, Program Officer/MIS  
Mr. Golam Faruque, Asst. Program Officer/MIS  
Mr. Wahiduzzaman Chowdhury Swapon, Program Officer  
Ms. Jacinta Gonsalves, Program Officer  
Ms. Tushar Quader Haq, Program Officer  
Dr. Najmus Sahar Sadiq, Program Officer  
Ms. Fazilatun Nessa Bably, Program Officer  
Mr. Farid Uddin, Program Officer  
Mr. Nasiruzzaman, Program Officer  
Ms. Rosy Hossain, Program Officer  
Dr. Khairul, Program Officer

**FAMILY  
PLANNING  
MANAGEMENT  
DEVELOPMENT**

FPMD  
Management Sciences for Health  
400 Centre Street  
Newton, MA 02158, U.S.A.

**MEMORANDUM**

April 8, 1994

TO:

Kristen Lundeen  
Mahbub Hossain Shaheed  
Dr. A. Jamil Faisel

Nancy Piet-Pelon  
Jane Wickstrom  
Mizanur Rahman  
Shamima Hasan

Abdur Rouf  
M. Alauddin  
Robert Timmons

Alan Foose  
Louisa Gomes  
Quasem Bhuyan

Maria Busquets-Moura/Charlotte Ureksoy

Keys McManus  
Adrienne Allison

Nate Wooley  
Zynia Rionda

The Asia Foundation/Dhaka  
The Asia Foundation/Dhaka  
Association for Voluntary Surgical  
Contraception/Dhaka  
AVSC/Dhaka  
AVSC/New York  
Family Planning Association of Bangladesh  
FPAB  
Family Planning Services and Training Centre  
Pathfinder International/Dhaka  
Pathfinder International/Istanbul  
USAID/Dhaka  
USAID/Dhaka  
USAID/Dhaka  
AID/Washington  
AID/Washington  
CEDPA  
POL/CDIE/DI, AID  
AID/Washington

FROM:

Alison Ellis, Regional Director, Asia/Near East, FPMD

Enclosed for your information and review is a copy of the trip report covering the visit to Bangladesh of Margaret Watt and Hillard Davis during February 6 - 17, 1994.

Please contact me if you have any questions or comments.