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What is the NCIFP?

- Builds on the National Family Planning Effort (FPE) Index, adding items related to rights, quality and accountability
- Initial questionnaire developed with inputs from FP2020 Working Groups (PME and R&E), analysis led by Track20
- Based on Family Planning Effort (FPE) methodology, using key informant interviews
- Conducted in 89 countries in 2014 and 84 countries in 2017
  - NCIFP was conducted in both rounds in 71 countries
- NCIFP includes 35 individual scores across 5 dimensions
  - Strategy (6 individual items)
  - Data (7 individual items)
  - Quality (12 individual items)
  - Equity (5 individual items)
  - Accountability (5 individual items)
Why the NCIFP is important

- Covers areas that are acknowledged as important but have lacked data in the past
- Clear link between data + decision making— e.g. “how does our country score, and what does that tell us”
- Can be linked to National Strategies and FP2030 Pledges, looking beyond just mCPR
What is new in 2017?

- 2014 round of NCIFP was comprised of mostly yes/no questions with some 1-10 scale questions

- Challenges related to yes/no questions:
  - Scores represented percent of respondents who said “yes”
  - Yes/No answer not always clear/feasible

- 1-10 scale responses were added after every yes/no question to allow finer nuances in responses while still allowing results to be comparable
2017 Results Compared to 2014 Results
Global results: 2014 compared to 2017

- Improvement in every dimension
- Total score in 2014 was 53; Total score in 2017 was 64
- Largest increase in Accountability, smallest increase in Equity

*weighted by women of reproductive age (WRA)
Strategy was the highest scoring dimension for all regions, but the lowest scoring dimension varied across regions.

- SSAF-A scored highest in Total score, and EECA the lowest
Regional results: 2014 compared to 2017

Median Point Difference in NCIFP Domain Scores from 2014 to 2017, by region

- Largest median point differences in Accountability, lowest in Equity
- SSAF-F improved the most in Total score
Regional results: what did we learn?

- Highest scores for “Strategy” in both 2014 and 2017
  - Reflects work in this area: Costed Implementation Plans, etc.

- Lowest scores for “Accountability” in both years
  - Less socialized concepts: ‘non-discriminatory’, reporting on coercion and denial of services, etc.
  - Some of low scores could reflect less familiarity with the concepts, rather than actual issues on the ground
  - HOWEVER, Accountability saw largest improvements
    - This is due to both improved response rates and improved scores from 2014 to 2017
Variation by question: 2017

**Does the national FP action plan include defined objectives over a 5 to 10-year period, including quantitative targets?**

**Are FP Standard Operating Procedures in line with WHO and used for determining areas of need for quality FP improvement?**

**Extent to which areas of the country not easily serviced by clinics or other service points are covered by CBD programs for distribution of contraceptives?**

**Are violations reviewed on a regular basis?**

---

**Individual NCIFP Scores by region (unweighted)**

- **Strategy**
- **Data**
- **Quality**
- **Equity**
- **Accountability**
Variation by question: 2017 compared to 2014

Median difference in NCIFP item scores for countries with an NCIFP conducted in 2014 and 2017

Does the National FP Action Plan include a mechanism and funding to support meaningful participation of diverse stakeholders?

Extent to which areas of the country not easily serviced by clinics or other service points are covered by CBD programs for distribution of contraceptives.
Large variation across countries within each region
2017 Special Analyses
How does the NCIFP track with mCPR?

Positive (but weak) relationship between NCIFP and mCPR (UNDP 2020).
- Non-SSA: $r = 0.11$
- SSA: $r = 0.53$

SSA shows steeper slope, but with lower mCPR achievement.
## Correlations between mCPR and Dimension scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mCPR: SSA Countries</th>
<th>mCPR: Non-SSA Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
<td>r =0.50</td>
<td>r =0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data</strong></td>
<td>r =0.55</td>
<td>r =0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td>r =0.41</td>
<td>r =0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td>r =0.47</td>
<td>r =0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td>r =0.50</td>
<td>r =0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mCPR estimates are from UN World Population Prospects: Estimates and Projections of Family Planning Indicators 2020.
How does the NCIFP track with youth equity?

Youth Equity Score:
“Extent to which service providers do not discriminate against youth,” “Are there policies in place to prevent discrimination towards youth?”

A ten-point increase in Youth Equity Score is accompanied by a 4-point increase in youth mCPR ($r = 0.23$)

mCPR among sexually active youth were drawn from DHS Surveys from 2015-2018. Data were only available for 17 countries.
How does the NCIFP track with youth equity?

A ten-point increase in Youth Equity Score is accompanied by a 12-point increase in mCPR among youth in high sexual activity countries ($r = 0.46$).
Comparison of 1-10 score vs. yes/no responses

- 20 items had a 1-10 scale and yes/no response

- Scores are lower when based on the 1-10 scale responses – the total score was lower by about 23 points.

- Strategy was the highest scoring dimension and accountability was the lowest scoring dimension according to both response types.
Comparison of 1-10 score vs. yes/no responses
Using results in country
Using results in country

- Compare 2014 scores to 2017 scores

- Compare a country to the region, or other similar countries

- Benchmark performance, highlight areas for further investigation

- Starting point for discussions with policy makers and advocates
Country Briefs

- Overview of NCIFP
- 2014 and 2017 dimension scores benchmarked to region
- 2014 and 2017 individual item scores
- Implications
Focusing discussion on key areas

For example: Togo has improved in all dimensions except Equity, where it has fallen behind the region.
Zooming in to highlight potential issues

For example: In Togo, most individual scores have improved since 2014. However, in the Equity dimension, scores have fallen for 3 items, especially “Are there policies in place to prevent discrimination towards special subgroups?”
Conclusions

- Covers important under-measured concepts—such as quality, equity, accountability.

- Country briefs support in-country use of the data.

- Still a work in progress. Discussions on how to improve questionnaire underway.

- Overtime, we will develop a time series and be able to understand how changes in NCIFP relate to changes in family planning indicators.
Access NCIFP data, reports, and country briefs on the Track20 website