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HIP Meeting Notes

Welcome

Martyn Smith gave welcoming remarks on behalf of Beth Schlachter and introduced Heidi Quinn as the facilitator for the day.

Updates

Shawn Malarcher shared with the participants an update on the 2016 evidence reviews:

- **Community Group Engagement** – This was defined as group dialogue and was our very first social and behavior change (SBC) brief. Community Group Engagement (CGE) was classified as a promising practice, meaning that while it includes good quality evidence, more information is needed to fully document implementation experience and potential impact. The TAG recommends that these interventions be promoted widely, provided they are implemented within the context of research and are carefully evaluated in terms of impact and process.
- **Economic Empowerment** – The determination of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) on the economic empowerment brief and improved contraceptive use was that the evidence was insufficient to meet the criteria of a HIP. The evidence summary will be made available on the website, and will include a research agenda that identifies key evidence gaps.

2017 Briefs

- **Health communication** – While this is an existing brief, it is too broad. The TAG recommended focusing the brief on a specific practice within SBC. After examining the evidence base for SBC in general, the authors, in collaboration with the HIP development team, decided to narrow the focus of the brief to mass media. The decision was based on the significant number of studies examining this approach as well as the level of investments in mass media by family planning programs.
- **mHealth** – This was defined as digital applications with an emphasis on mobile technologies. Again the TAG recommended focusing the brief more specifically on either systems applications or client-side approaches. After deliberations, the development team decided to focus on health systems as the evidence base seems stronger for these applications.

2017 New Briefs

- **Immediate Post-Partum Family Planning** – The focus of this brief is on family planning counseling and the provision of a contraception within the first 48 hours after childbirth.
- **Social Franchise** – The focus of this brief is on how to organize health clinics into quality assured networks to increase access to family planning.

As in the past, all briefs will be sent to points of contact (POCs) at endorsing partner organizations. This will begin in early 2017. Partners will be given two weeks to review these new briefs and provide comments. POCs are requested to disseminate the brief to relevant colleagues within their organization or other partners, as appropriate. Remember that useful comments come from individuals with and without specific expertise in these technical area. Please provide the names of reviewers so they may be acknowledged in the brief. After comments have been incorporated, the briefs will be sent for fact checking, followed by the TAG review.
Refining HIP TAG Decision-Making Process

Ellen Eiseman, the TAG meeting facilitator, shared the main points discussed at the TAG meeting:

- Guidance for writers was discussed.
- Standards of practice are to be refined.
- The Theory of Change was reviewed; participants agreed to include it in the briefs.
- The 2017 briefs review process was discussed.
- HIP classification was revisited.
- HIP list is to be revised.
- TAG meetings will continue twice a year, the next is planned for June at the World Health Organization in Geneva.

Review Guidance Notes on Principles

Victoria Jennings led a discussion about the principles statement. The objective of this statement is to explicitly outline the principles that underpin the HIP work and guide our deliberations and work planning. A number of principles were discussed: equity, choice, volunteerism, client-centered practices, quality, country ownership, rights-based approaches, and meeting reproductive intentions throughout a life cycle. There was a great deal of energy around this idea and the group agreed that to be most effective the principles should be integrated into the HIP work, rather than discussed in a stand-alone piece. The decision was made to draft something short that could be included on the landing page of the new HIP website. The text will be sent for review prior to launching the site.

IBP HIPs Task Team

Ados May provided an overview of activities supporting the dissemination and implementation of HIPs in 2016. The most salient activities included the dissemination of HIPs at global and regional meetings such as International Conference for Family Planning (ICFP) 2016, the Adolescent and Youth Sexual and Reproductive Health (AYSRH) consultation, Family Planning (FP)2020 regional focal point meetings, the regional WHO Regional Office for Africa (AFRO) meeting, and the West African Health Organization (WAHO) good practices forum. In addition, the HIPs Task Team coordinates and produces a webinar series on Service Delivery HIPs that, on average, convene 120 participants per event. The webinar series is now supported by FP2020.

Family Planning Goals and Their Potential Use in Countries

Michelle Weinberger shared the Family Planning Goals Model, highlighting that it draws on evidence on what is effective for programming within the specific country context. This includes demographic characteristics such as urbanization, population growth, and age structure. The model is also complementary to existing models, which start with determining a goal, in terms of modern contraceptive use, then determine what programs could help achieve that goal. The Model focuses on three levers of change:

- Policy – works mostly as a “break” (where policy/enabling environment is not strong, growth is slowed)
- Access – has a direct impact on the contraceptive prevalence rate (CPR), includes supply side/service provision
- Demand – direct impact on increasing CPR, but also playing an indirect goal (in countries where demand is low, access interventions will be less impactful and growth will be slowed)
The Family Planning Goals Model does not include other outcomes of interest, such as child marriage or delayed sexual debut. The majority of interventions included in the Model are aligned closely with the HIPs.

However, there are some important differences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HIPs</th>
<th>Family Planning Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Build consensus based on literature and programmatic evidence</td>
<td>Use robust evidence on documented links between interventions and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intended impact</strong></td>
<td>mCPR and broader: e.g., birth spacing, breastfeeding, discontinuation</td>
<td>mCPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Prioritization process and standards for what can qualify as a HIP</td>
<td>Wider selection of interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interventions included in the Family Planning Goals Model that are not currently covered under the HIPs include:

- Social franchising and postpartum family planning (PPFP) – both are upcoming HIPs
- Method-specific revitalization/reintroduction – HIPs focus on how practices or changes in services are required to increase access to methods, they do not focus on a single method, rather, they emphasize the importance of providing the broadest method mix appropriate for each context and delivery channel
- Youth centers – impact appears quite low based on current evidence, but the intervention is included to show countries that investments in youth centers may not be most effective
- Comprehensive youth programming, with added impact for those who incorporate a youth-friendly services component – this remains too broadly defined to be considered as a HIP

### Country Perspectives and Prioritization

The FP2020 Country Support Team presented the work of the initiative related to the HIPs. The FP2020 Secretariat has 38 country commitments within the nine Ouagadougou Partnership countries—Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria, Senegal, and Togo—and the 15 Global Financing Facility (GFF) countries—Bangladesh, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Liberia, **Guinea**, Mozambique, **Myanmar**, Nigeria, Senegal, **Sierra Leone**, Tanzania, Uganda, **Vietnam**). Please note that the countries in bold are part of the third wave of GFF Countries who are in the process of developing an investment case.

Using a focal point model, the FP2020 Secretariat works at the country level with colleagues from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the U.K. Department for International Development, and the United National Population Fund (UNFPA) to select an appointee from each country’s Ministry of Health. In tandem with the partners, the Secretariat engages colleagues at the headquarter level of the organizations that make up FP2020’s Core Conveners. These country-level focal points help to identify and address country challenges through the creation of a 12- to 18-month action plan, providing guidance for the implementation at all levels, and through the additional involvement of colleagues at international- and national-level NGOs. In terms of global priorities and the HIPs—and in collaboration with FP2020’s country and donor partners—the Secretariat identified six global priorities
within the 38 commitment-making country action plans, which tie into the focus of the 17 different HIPs:

- **Global Priority I: Financing/Global Commodities Gap**
  - Financing Commodities and Services
  - Vouchers
- **Global Priority II: Supply Chain/Delivery Systems Improvements**
  - Supply Chain Management
  - Drug Shops and Pharmacies
- **Global Priority III: Demand Creation/Social Norms**
  - Community Group Engagement
  - Community Health Workers
  - Health Communication
  - Social Marketing
- **Global Priority IV: Improving Youth Access**
  - Educating Girls
  - Adolescent Friendly Contraceptive Services and Improving Sexual and Reproductive Health of Young People
- **Global Priority V: Expanding Method Mix**
  - mHealth
  - Family Planning and Immunization Integration
  - Leaders and Managers
- **Global Priority VI: Effective Data Utilization**

The FP2020 team highlighted that in the 38 commitment-making countries in all three regions, many countries were working to improve data use and implementation of data a focus of their work plans; however, there is no specific HIP on this.

**Concept Proposals for 2018 Briefs**

Ten proposals for concept notes were discussed at the meeting. Partners putting forward the concepts are responsible for preparing a short one-page document to be submitted for TAG review. The concept notes will be evaluated and discussed, and up to two will be selected for 2018 development. The following topics were proposed:

- Making Family Planning Services Free (Tom Van Boven, FP2020)
- Managing Side Effects (Winnie Mwebesa, Save the Children; Martha Brady, PATH; and Victoria Jennings, Institute for Reproductive Health [IRH])
- Digital Health for SBC, Client-Side (Trinity Zan, FHI 360; and Victoria Jennings, IRH)
- Engaging Men (Tim Shand, IRH)
- Provider Bias (Lisa Nichols, Abt Associates)
- Family Planning in Emergency Settings (Lisa Nichols, Abt Associates; and Janet Meyers, Save the Children)
- Comprehensive Sex Education (Liz Leahy Madsen, Population Reference Bureau)
- Governance (Nandita Thatte, USAID)
- Last Mile Solution for Ensuring Contraceptive Security (Yet Asfaw, EngenderHealth)
- Data for Decision Making (Sarah Fox, Options)
HIP Website Redesign

Caitlin Thistle and Sara Mazursky updated the participants on the HIPs website redesign. The main objective of this effort is to modernize the website and make more visually engaging. New features will include: presenting the evidence base, current and emerging; showing more ways for users to access HIP content, links to FP2020 country pages, and Implementing Best Practices (IBP) pages; better articulating the HIP process; and highlighting collaborative efforts. The timeline for this process includes onboarding the vendor in December, releasing an alpha version in March, followed by a beta version by the end of May 2017. A team, coordinated by Knowledge for Health (K4Health) is working with the website developer to provide input on the new website.

Monitoring and Evaluation of HIPs Implementation

Reshma Trasi, Karen Hardee, and Nandita Thatte updated those present on the ongoing discussion to better monitor the implementation of HIPs. The HIPs Task Team convened meeting about what has been done regarding monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and what type of framework could be used moving forward. Reshma shared a framework that was developed during the HIPs Task Team meeting, pointing to specific elements:

- Create initial framework for members to react to
- Examine the five diverse presentations that preceded this process
- Pull together main themes from these presentations into the framework, if needed
- Bring clarity to why is this important and who the intended audience(s) is/are
- Reconcile the deviation from fidelity and the adaptation in order to guide M&E efforts
- Track the dissemination of the briefs or the outcomes of the implementation
- Track the effectiveness or adaptation, if needed
- Determine what is important to move the HIPs conversation forward?

Two options were presented:

GO WIDE approach – This method answers questions that should be monitored/tracked: Who knows about the HIPs? How are they being used?
  - Desk review of mission health implementation, most downloaded
  - This could be explored in several countries, maybe even regionally.

GO DEEP approach – This method addresses questions about effectiveness and the process agenda: Are these HIPs effective? Being adapted? Which elements can be changed? Need to stay the same?
  - We want to focus on fewer countries where we know multiple HIPs are being applied.

The group discussed various options for this work and, by consensus, decided to reconsider the need for M&E given the new context and framework. This work was begun when the HIPs were nascent and the group need to establish the acceptability, need, and usefulness of the work. The HIPs are now more established and accepted by the community, and new set of questions may need to be posed: What are the key questions to better inform this work? How and who will the monitoring information be used?

Reviewing Non-Brief HIP Work

Shawn Malarcher shared with the group that we have started to expand into developing other types of materials, such as white papers and decision-making tools. There is no process for reviewing, agreeing on, and finalizing the content. She proposed that a small group pulls together a draft; once the draft
ready, it is circulated and reviewed by endorsing partners within a pre-set short comment period; comments are then incorporated; and draft is finalized. The group agreed, if an organization has a particular interest in a topic or a viewpoint that is relevant to one of these products, it is highly encouraged to get reach out to the authors early in the process if it wants to provide input.

Organizational Endorsement of Briefs
Shawn reviewed the existing process for endorsement: Once a brief has been copy edited, it is sent to all of the partners listed as an endorsing organization on that brief. There are organizations that give blanket approval, and others that review each product. It has become a very labor-intensive process, and it is suggested that we do away with this process. This means that if you provide input, you will still be listed in the acknowledgements, etc., but they will not have a listing on each individual brief. It was suggested that moving forward, Shawn will send a message to the POCs who do not have a blanket endorsement, asking if they would want to do a blanket endorsement; if they do not, those organizations will explore how to streamline the endorsement process.

Identify Other Areas of Collaboration and Direction

- Develop a communications package, including an overview presentation of the HIPs.
- There has been expressed interest in combining IBP annual meeting with HIPs partners meeting:
  - IBP’s new strategy is heavily linked to HIPs and might benefit from piggybacking the meetings.
  - IBP meeting is usually 1.5 days (plus additional 0.5 day for steering committee).
  - IBP has larger membership than HIPs partnership, if we join, it might mean a larger group.
  - Would we also piggyback HIP TAG? We are unsure, but at most would ask for a two-day meeting.
- Briefs are not implementation guides but from today’s discussion there seems to be a gap between the two types of documents. Can we more strategically link the briefs to the implementation tools that already exist?
  - Only some tools are included in the briefs. Earlier feedback indicated that the inclusion of all tools was too overwhelming.
- World Bank has not been engaged in HIPs but are leading on GFF. How can we engage them on HIPs?
  - GFF secretariat is staffing up, including a soon-to-be-hired family planning advisor; FP2020 will propose that person joins the HIPs partners group.
- When costing costed implementation plans (CIPs), the process takes into account MOH cost estimates but not implementing partners’ costs. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) will send out anonymous survey to implementing partners to get their cost estimates.
  - The Gates Institute and IntraHealth International are working on The Challenge Initiative (TCI) and will be launching the TCI academy, which will use HIPs.

Next Steps and Wrap Up
Heidi Quinn closed the meeting highlighting that a lot of information was shared today, including technical updates from partners. We had an opportunity to suggest topics for new briefs and receive input on additional collaboration areas. We reflected that it is a great time for the HIPs, as brand recognition is strong and there is an additional opportunity to grow with the upcoming hire of a HIPs advisor based at FP2020. Finally, Heidi highlighted the opportunity to integrate HIPs into CIPs, either
in countries that have CIPs coming up for review and/or in countries or states that do not currently have CIPs.

**Key Action Items and Recommendations**

- **Principle paper**
  - Include all rights and draw on existing documents, such as ICPD and SDGs when possible
  - Focus on meeting reproductive intentions throughout the life cycle
  - Incorporate principles on the HIP list and on the website
  - Text should short and not as a stand-alone, but reflected in existing documents

- **Country support for HIP Implementation**
  - Consider ways to strengthen prioritization at the country level
  - Use the Family Planning Goals Model and other tools to better assess if countries have prioritized practices that will lead to the greatest impact and opportunities for further strengthening these investments

- **New concepts for evidence summaries and potential HIPs**
  - Making Family Planning Services Free (Tom Van Boven FP 2020)
  - Managing Side Effects (Winnie Mwebesa, Save the Children; Martha Brady, PATH; and Victoria Jennings, IRH)
  - Digital Health for SBC, Client-Side (Trinity Zan, FHI 360; and Victoria Jennings, IRH)
  - Engaging Men (Tim Shand, IRH)
  - Provider Bias (Lisa Nichols, Abt Associates)
  - Family Planning in Emergency Settings (Lisa Nichols, Abt Associates; and Janet Meyers, Save the Children)
  - Comprehensive Sex Education (Liz Leahy Madsen, PRB; and Victoria Jennings, IRH)
  - Governance (Nandita Thatte, USAID)
  - Last Mile Solution for Ensuring Contraceptive Security (Yeti Asfaw, EngenderHealth; and Leslie Patykewich, JSI)
  - Data for Decision Making (Sarah Fox, Options)

- **Website redesign**
  - Include more accessible links to citations/studies
  - Include a brief overview of the HIPs

- **Monitoring and Evaluation**
  - Reconsider the audience for the M&E and how the information will be used

- **AOB**
  - Review materials developed as part of the HIP partnership that are not evidence briefs
    - The materials will be sent for review to all endorsing partners for review and comment.
    - Comments will be considered and the materials finalized and disseminated under the HIP brand at the discretion of the organizers, USAID, UNFPA, WHO, IPPF, and FP2020.
  - Continue to include names of organizations that agree to “endorse” each brief
    - However, the timeline will be strictly two weeks. Please consider if your organization would be willing to provide a blanket endorsement.
  - Consider combining HIP Partner’s and IBP meetings
    - Clarify if this means having one right after the other (back to back)—the duration of both of these meetings combined should not be more than two full days—or if it is
one meeting that incorporates both subjects.

- Continue to support production of HIP folders (with hard copies of the briefs and any other materials developed) as they are useful, particularly in developing countries
- Support a meeting to examine further integration of Family Planning Goals Model and CIP development.
## Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

**HIPs Partners’ Meeting**

**November 29th, 2016**

9:00 – 17:30

### Objectives
- Clarify roles and responsibilities of HIPs as part of larger FP context
- Discuss new HIP briefs and finalize process for developing new HIP briefs
- Update on HIP work to date and identify priority work for 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30 – 09:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 09:00 – 09:15 | Welcome
Beth Schlachter, FP2020  
Heidi Quinn, IPPF (Chair) |
| 09:15 – 10:45 | Updates
2017 briefs
Shawn Malarcher, USAID  
Refining HIP TAG decision-making processes
Ellen Eiseman, Chemonics  
Review guidance notes on Principles
Victoria Jennings, IRH and Jay Gribble, Palladium  
**IBP HIP Task Team**
Ados May, IBP Secretariat |
| 10:45 – 11:00 | Break                                                                   |
| 11:00 – 11:45 | FP Goals and its Potential use in Countries
Michelle Weinberger, Track20 |
| 11:45 – 12:30 | Country Perspectives and Prioritization
FP2020 Country Support Team |
| 12:30 – 13:30 | Lunch                                                                   |
| 13:30 – 14:00 | Concept Proposals for 2018 Briefs                                      |
| 14:00 – 14:45 | HIP Website Redesign
Caitlin Thistle, USAID and Sara Mazursky, JHU-CCP |
| 14:45 – 15:30 | Monitoring and Evaluation of HIPs Implementation
Nandita Thatte, USAID, Reshma Trasi, Pathfinder and Karen Hardee, Population Council |
| 15:30 – 15:50 | Break                                                                   |
| 15:50 – 17:20 | Reviewing Non-Brief HIP work
Organizational Endorsement of Briefs
Identify Other Areas of Collaboration and Direction |
<p>| 17:20 – 17:30 | Next Steps and Wrap Up, Heidi Quinn, IPPF (Chair)                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td>Tim Shand</td>
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<td>UNFPA</td>
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<td>Trinity Zan</td>
<td>FHI 360</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tzan@fhi360.org">Tzan@fhi360.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandita Thatte</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nthatte@usaid.gov">nthatte@usaid.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paata Chikvaidze</td>
<td>WHO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Jennings</td>
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<td><a href="mailto:jenningv@georgetown.edu">jenningv@georgetown.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>USAID</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smalarcher@usaid.gov">smalarcher@usaid.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyn Smith</td>
<td>FP2020</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msmith@familyplanning2020.org">msmith@familyplanning2020.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ados May</td>
<td>IBP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ados.may@phi.org">ados.may@phi.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihira Karra</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mkarra@usaid.gov">mkarra@usaid.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika Houghtaling</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ehoughtaling@usaid.gov">ehoughtaling@usaid.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Fox</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.fox@options.co.uk">s.fox@options.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Stratton</td>
<td>Palladium</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sara.Stratton@theppalladiumgroup.com">Sara.Stratton@theppalladiumgroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yetnayet Asfaw</td>
<td>EngenderHealth</td>
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<td>Heidi Quinn</td>
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<tr>
<td>Gwen Morgan</td>
<td>MSH</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gmorgan@e2approject.org">gmorgan@e2approject.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennie Greaney</td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:greaney@unfpa.org">greaney@unfpa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin Thistle</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cthistle@usaid.gov">cthistle@usaid.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Burckhart</td>
<td>PSI</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mburckhart@psi.org">mburckhart@psi.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Leahy Madsen</td>
<td>PRB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emadsen@prb.org">emadsen@prb.org</a></td>
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</tr>
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Appendix C: Guidance for Developing and Evidence Brief

Purpose

HIP briefs are intended to facilitate the use of evidence to inform program investments in developing country contexts. They provide an unbiased synthesis of the evidence and experience on implementing HIPs to date; identify priority research gaps or limitations to the evidence base; and test tools related to the specific HIP of interest.

Audience

The primary audience for the briefs are individuals managing family planning programs or investments in developing countries. The briefs are not intended to include the level of detail needed for implementing programs; however, they are a valuable overview for those tasked with advocating, designing, and overseeing family planning funding.

Length and Layout

Total length of a brief should be no more than eight pages, including graphics.

- 1 inch margins all around
- 16 pt titles
- 14 pt headings
- 11 pt body text, with 9 pt references
- Single spaced text, with double spaces between paragraphs

Evidence

The briefs are intended to translate a wide variety of evidence and experiential learning. Where possible, quantitative data will provide support for the rationale and evidence of impact. Qualitative data can be used to support and strengthen these arguments. Experiential knowledge can be incorporated into the brief in the implementation section. Statements of effect of relationships should be supported by documentation of any type.

When presenting evidence, use citations when possible. Standardize results across settings. Original analysis can also be used. Include systematic reviews when possible.

Language

Briefs should be written in plain language. Avoid using jargon whenever possible, as even words like “integration,” “quality,” and “engagement” can be interpreted in a variety of ways. It is preferable to focus on observable inputs and outcomes that can be measured and reported.

Do not reference branded models or tools; instead, describe the intervention in common terms. Organizations should not be referenced in the text, however they should be cited. Use countries or locations to refer to studies or specific interventions. Specific branded tools can be referenced in the “Tools” section, where appropriate.

Content

The structure and content of the briefs will vary somewhat depending on the type of HIP (enabling environment, service delivery, or social and behavior change) and the level of evidence (proven, promising, or emerging). However, all briefs should follow the following structure:
Title
The focus of the practice (e.g., community health workers, postabortion care), what the practice is intended to accomplish (e.g., bringing family planning services to where people live and work, strengthening the family planning component of postabortion care)

What is the proven (promising/emerging) high impact practice in family planning?
Simple statement referencing the intervention

Background
This section orients the reader to the content, and is similar across briefs (one page max.)

Why is this practice important?
This section provides the rationale or context for the practice. What problems can this practice address? The rationale should be specific to the practice rather than to family planning more generally. Use quantitative data when possible to demonstrate the magnitude of the problem. Consider using graphics.

This section includes a theoretical framework that describes the mechanism of action and key expected outcome of the practice.

What is the impact?
This section focuses on the HIP criteria:
• Breadth and quality of evidence
  o The TAG recognizes that the HIP briefs do not allow for discussion of study design or details on quality of evidence. However, the writing team should consider these aspects when summarizing the evidence base.
• Demonstration and magnitude of impact on contraceptive use and continuation, and potential public health impact
• Potential application in a wide range of settings
• Consistency of result
• Replicability
• Scalability
• Cost-effectiveness

For practices with a limited evidence base, authors should propose the priority research agenda and/or gaps in knowledge specific to the HIP criteria. Consider using graphics.

How to do it: Tips from the implementation experience
This section allows authors to synthesize experiential and tacit knowledge. What lessons have been learned from implementation? Consider the following:
• What did not work? Do not make the same mistake.
• What gender issues should be addressed?
• Should adaptations be made for special populations, such as youth, rural, and poor?
• How sustainable is the intervention, e.g., provider motivation, task sharing?
• Do supply chain issues exist and how should they be addressed?

Tools
Link to a small number of tools. This is not intended to be comprehensive, so the authors and contributors may need to review and prioritize the tools. A short description should be included with the link.
Process for Identifying Topics for New Evidence Briefs

Anyone is welcome to undertake the development of an evidence brief. Each year at the HIP Partners meeting participants are invited to propose new topics. Those proposing new topics should be willing to support the complete development of the evidence brief, which generally takes 15 months from approval to printing.

All members wishing to write about a topic are invited to submit a short concept note to the HIP TAG for consideration. Concept notes should include: the HIP statement (what is the practice?), a brief description of the evidence base, and the author responsible for brief development. The TAG can approve no more than two topics each year for development. Approval by the TAG to develop an evidence brief does not mean the practice is a HIP. That determination is made once the brief is fully developed and reviewed by the TAG.

Once a HIP is identified for the development of an evidence brief, it should follow a process similar to the one described below. Adaptations of this process may be required and are at the discretion of the Co-Sponsors (USAID, UNFPA, WHO, IPPF, and FP2020).

HIP Brief Development

*Step 1:* Identify a group to facilitate the development of the brief. This usually includes one or more of the following: a technical expert or champion, an implementation partner, and a HIP coordinator to facilitate the review process and ensure consistency across materials being developed.

*Step 2:* Identify a primary author. It is helpful to have one person develop a first draft, which is then reviewed by a larger group, usually four or five individuals. The author should understand the research and present information in a clear unbiased manner. Avoid research that disregards information or presents a biased point of view. The author should be well respected in the field. The organizing group should identify any additional individuals or organizations that will participate in early stages of the brief development.

*Step 3:* Once a first draft is developed, it is distributed to HIP partner organizations. This group should include representatives from outside family planning, if appropriate, and technical experts in the field.

*Step 4:* Once the larger group has incorporated comments, the brief is sent for third-party fact checking and any lingering issues are addressed.

*Step 5:* The brief is ready for review by the TAG. This usually takes place in the context of a TAG meeting. The TAG makes recommendations regarding the inclusion of the HIP on the HIP list, reviews any substantial adjustments or changes to the wording of the HIP, and provides guidance on the strength of the evidence base. The TAG also reviews the research agenda proposed in the brief.

*Step 6:* After comments from the TAG are incorporated, K4Health provides copy editing and layout for the briefs. Final versions are available in hard copy and through the K4Health website.
Appendix D: Guidance for HIP Brief Discussants

Two TAG members serve as the discussant for each HIP brief. All TAG members are expected to have read and reviewed each brief prior to the meeting. The role of the discussants is to open discussion and to help identify any critical issues for the group to discuss.

Each discussant will have three minutes to reflect on the HIP brief. Comments should be concise to allow for group discussion. In reviewing the HIP brief, the TAG is asked to consider the following:

- **Breadth and quality of evidence**
  - Study design is not discussed in detail within the briefs. All references are available in Dropbox for more detailed review.
- Demonstration and magnitude of impact on contraceptive use and continuation, and potential public health impact
- Potential application in a wide range of settings
- Consistency of result
- Replicability
- Scalability
- Cost-effectiveness

The discussant may reflect on any relevant issues or observations from their review. At the end of this period, the TAG is asked to make recommendations on the following:

1. **Does the evidence as reflected in the brief meet the HIP criteria?**

   The **enabling environment** HIPs are identified based on expert opinion and demonstrate correlation with improved health behaviors and/or outcomes. These outcomes include improvements in unintended pregnancy, fertility, or one of the primary proximate determinants of fertility—increased modern contraceptive use, delay of marriage, birth spacing, and breastfeeding.

   HIPs in **service delivery** are identified based on demonstration and magnitude of impact on service utilization, including contraceptive use and continuation; and potential application in a wide range of settings. Consideration is also given to the evidence on replicability, scalability, sustainability, and cost-effectiveness.

   Briefs can also be classified as an “enhancement”. An example of this is the mHealth brief, which is not a stand-alone practice, but rather a technology that could be added to a practice for additional impact or cost-effectiveness.

2. **Categorize service delivery practices based on the strength and consistency of the evidence base (Proven, Promising, Emerging).**

   **Proven:** Sufficient evidence exists to recommend widespread implementation, provided that there is careful monitoring of coverage, quality and cost, and operations research to help understand how to improve implementation.

   **Promising:** Good evidence exists that these interventions can lead to impact; more information is needed to fully document implementation experience and impact. These interventions should be promoted widely, provided that they are being carefully evaluated both in terms of impact and process.
**Emerging:** Some initial experiences with developing interventions exist, but there is a need for more intense intervention development and research.

3. **What additional evidence, if any is needed?**

When developing the brief, contributors are asked to reflect on this question and develop a research agenda, if appropriate. This is included toward the end of each brief. The agenda should focus on evidence that addresses key gaps related to the HIP criteria. The research questions should be clear as to what type of evidence is needed, and the TAG is asked to give specific guidance on appropriate counterfactuals where possible.
Appendix E: Presentation Slides
FOUR CROSS-CUTTING INITIATIVES

- DRIVING COUNTRY-LEVEL SUPPORT
- PROMOTING DATA USE & PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
- SHARPENING THE FOCUS ON GLOBAL ADVOCACY, RIGHTS & YOUTH
- FACILITATING DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE & EVIDENCE

CONVENING DONOR AND COUNTRY FOCAL POINTS

Common priorities have surfaced across countries and regions:
- Building high-level political support for family planning in-country
- Expanding data use
- Mapping resource mobilization
- Scaling up LARC
- Improving supply chain and delivery systems
- Investing in demand-side efforts and social and behavior change communications
- Increasing private sector involvement

NEW FAMILY PLANNING
HIGH IMPACT PRACTICES ADVISOR

New position underscores growing collaboration with HIPs/USAID:
- Developing overarching strategy to promote and disseminate HIPs (integrated with FP2020 country action plans)
- Identify new areas of collaboration around HIPs
- Coordinating with WHO/IPB a comms and dissemination strategy to inform and engage the broader family planning community
- Identify and engage new stakeholders

F2020

@FP2020Global
FP2020FPGLOBAL
VIEW OUR FULL REPORT
www.familyplanning2020.org/progress
CONTACT US
info@familyplanning2020.org

Core Partners
HIP Brief update 2016

- Community Group Engagement – "Engage and mobilize communities in group dialogue and action to promote healthy sexual relationships."
- First Social and Behavior Change HIP Brief, promising practice
- Economic Empowerment – "Invest in activities that contribute to economic empowerment of women and girls in support of reproductive health."
- Evidence on the relationship between economic empowerment interventions and improved contraceptive use or fertility behaviors is insufficient to meet the standards of a high-impact practice in family planning.

HIP Brief Update 2017

**Update**
- Health Communication - Use one or more mass media channels (radio, TV) to stress increased knowledge, improve attitudes and skills, and encourage social change to support family planning.
- Jean Krull
- eHealth - Digital applications (including mobile, eHealth, and Information Communication Technology) that support the delivery of family planning services, supplies, and counseling.
- Temi Zim

**New**
- Immediate post-partum FP - Counseling and provision of contraception within the first 48 hours after childbirth.
- Lora Kenny
- Social Franchise - Organize health clinics into quality assured networks to increase access to FP.
- Sarah Thorton
The Technical Advisory Group

- Experts in family planning research, program implementation, policy makers and representatives from donor agencies. Meets at least once a year to review evidence and make recommendations on updating and implementing HIPs.
- Members selected based on the following criteria: recognized expertise in international family planning, good understanding of research methods and methodologies, good understanding of program implementation, ability to consider and review evidence from a wide range of subjects, ability to prioritize, and ability to provide an unbiased viewpoint.

The TAG is responsible for:

- Reviewing all finalized HIP briefs to ensure the “practice” meets the criteria for HIP as set out by the HIP Partnership (see HIP list);
- Reviewing HIP concept notes in order to prioritize no more than 2 per year for development into briefs;
- Reviewing updated HIP briefs to ensure they continue to meet HIP criteria and standards of evidence; and
- Refining and improving standards of evidence relevant to family planning programming.
Objectives of the November 28 meeting

- Refine HIP TAG decision-making processes
- Provide interim feedback on 2017 briefs

Highlights

- Discussed guidance for writers; updates to be made
- Standards of evidence/practice to be refined
- Theory of Change reviewed; agreed to include in Briefs

Highlights

- Revisited HIP Classification – discussion around “Emerging”; Standards of evidence/practice work group will develop a proposition
- HIP List (Fact Sheet) to be revised
- Agreed to continue with 2 TAG meetings/year. Next meeting planned for June at WHO

If you have any questions see Shawn Malarcher or members of the TAG
IBP HIPS Task Team

HIPS Partners' Meeting
November 29, 2016

Background

- Purpose is to support dissemination and implementation of HIPS
- IBP is neutral and has access to over 45+ implementing partner organizations and 8000 individual members
- Current representation from: UNFPA, USAID, WHO, Save the Children, PSI, MSI, MSH, Pathfinder, FHI 360, EngenderHealth, USAID, JHU-CCP, others

HIPS and IBP

- HIPS dissemination and implementation are central to the 2016-2020 IBP Strategic Plan
- Most active Task Team in the consortium
- Task Team and Secretariat lead activities:
  - Dissemination
  - Implementation
  - Scale up
  - Monitoring and Evaluation of the HIPS

Illustrative Activities 2016

- Dissemination of HIPS to global and regional meetings
  - International Conference on Family Planning, Nusa Dua (January)
  - AYSRH Consultation, Geneva (April)
  - FP2020 Focal Point Meeting, Kampala (April)
  - FP2020 Focal Point Meeting, Abidjan (May)
  - IBP LAC Regional Meeting, Lima (June)
  - WHO AFRO Regional Meeting, Harare (July)
  - LAC Conference, Cartagena, (September)
  - WAHO Good Practices Forum, Grand Bassam, (October)
2016 HIPs Webinar Series

- CHWs: 85 participants and 26 views
- PAFP: 55 participants and 71 views
- Mobile Outreach: 127 participants and 25 views

Illustrative Activities — Country Level

- Follow up and dissemination to IBP partners in Ethiopia (February 2016)
  - Member of HIP Task Team met with a number of partners in Addis to follow up on HIPs and present in more detail the map, new briefs and learn about current use
- Dissemination to WAHO countries as part of IBP Follow up to Good Practice Forum
  - Cabo Verde (Portuguese HIPs) May, 2016
  - WAHO HIP briefs as part of the packet of information provided to countries on current TA visits (mostly Francophone members)
- Dissemination of HIPs at country level in LAC
  - Colombia, July 2016
  - Mexico, October 2016
- Case Studies
  - Mozambique, to be published in December 2016

Moving Forward...

- Continue to support dissemination
- Facilitate use of HIPs
- Link HIP Partners meeting and IBP annual meeting
- Continue to strengthen link between IBP, HIPs, FP2020
- More documentation of HIPs at country level
- Support update of the HIPs website
- Plan and deliver next webinar in the series (Social Marketing)
- Strengthen M&E around dissemination and implementation

THANK YOU
Outline

- Overview: what is FP Goals?
- HIPs and FP Goals
- Experience from countries
- Lessons learned and next steps

Using evidence to drive our decisions

- What is already happening in the country?
- How is the population changing? – urbanization, growth, age
- What interventions are effective in increasing use?
- Who can these interventions reach?

FP Goals takes all of this into consideration

What is FP Goals?

FP Goals: Potential use in Countries
Using FP Goals with existing models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FP Goals</th>
<th>Plan/Invest</th>
<th>Impact 2</th>
<th>RealityCheck</th>
<th>Impact/Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate mCPR in future-based on scale up of specific FP interventions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculate relative contribution of each intervention to mCPR growth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter CPR goal (or goal to reduce unmet need)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculate commodities needed to reach goal</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculate near-term impact of reaching goal (e.g., maternal deaths averted)</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How it works

What FP Goals does not do

- Does not account for other important investments beyond mCPR growth- but these are still important! For example:
  - Quality of services
  - Equity
  - Changing norms related to sexual debut, marriage, future contraceptive use
- Not an optimization tool—must enter different scale up plans and compare results
- Does not adjust for unrealistic scale up—must sense check plans (e.g., is it feasible to train XXX new CHWs?)

HIPs and FP Goals
FP Goals Interventions

- Post-partum and post-abortion family planning
- Improve public sector provision
- Community Health Workers
- Mobile clinical outreach
- Social franchising
- Pharmacies and drug shops
- Reduce stock outs
- Introduce a new method/revitalize an underused method

Note: model includes more details for each intervention- summary list only

HIPs and FP Goals: meeting different needs

**High Impact Practices**

- Build consensus on what the evidence-base and experiential learning tells us about program effectiveness
- Outcomes of interest are broad - mCPR, fertility, breastfeeding, child marriage
- Global focus, generalizability

**FP Goals**

- Use global evidence-base to look at documented links between interventions and outcomes
- Outcomes focused on mCPR growth
- Country/program focus - link evidence to country specific context

But: ensuring consistency of language between both, and, where possible, consistency of evidence used.

HIPs and FP Goals: areas of alignment

Where possible draw from same evidence base - but not all HIP references are used in FP Goals, and FP Goals uses reference not included in HIPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIPs</th>
<th>FP Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family planning</td>
<td>CHC education, counseling and referral in family planning services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-abortion</td>
<td>FP interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family planning services</td>
<td>Twoorrowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile technology</td>
<td>Mobile app included in demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-based family planning</td>
<td>Twoorrowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-level FP interventions</td>
<td>Family planning services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile technology</td>
<td>Mobile app included in demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family planning</td>
<td>Twoorrowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-level FP interventions</td>
<td>Family planning services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile technology</td>
<td>Mobile app included in demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family planning</td>
<td>Twoorrowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-level FP interventions</td>
<td>Family planning services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile technology</td>
<td>Mobile app included in demonstration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional interventions in FP Goals not covered in current HIPs:

- Social Franchising (note: HIPs under development)
- Post-partum FP (note: HIP under development for immediate PFP, model reduces community and facility based interventions and not just unmet need)
- Introduction of new methods/revitalize methods
- Youth Care (note: impact listed based on evidence)
- Comprehensive youth programming (beyond just services)
How FP Goals can be used

- Develop a new CIP or strategy
  - Identify priority interventions to be included
  - Create tailored sub-national plans that account for differences in demographics and existing FP programming

- Prioritize within an existing CIP or strategy
  - Calculate impact expected from each intervention included
  - Use to focus on priority areas that will yield greatest impact, especially if not possible to implement full strategy

- Used to answer targeted questions outside of strategy development
  - Look from perspective of specific donors investments
  - Answer related questions about feasibility of goals

More about the process than the model itself; enables evidence-informed discussions to take place with key partners and provide 'a sense check' to what is being planned and discussed

Country work to date: very different contexts and experiences (1)

- **Senegal**
  - Requested by Dr. Diop
  - Government's stated goal of 45% eCPR by 2010
  - National family planning Action plan ended in 2015, in the process of developing the new follow on plan
  - Happened before release of 2015 eCPR; results have not yet been updated
  - National application, follow up by regional application (14 regions)

- **Kenya**
  - Concluded implementation Plan ends in 2015; not yet developing revised plan
  - Country goal of eCPR (uHN) of 50% in 2015, 55% in 2020, and 70% in 2030
  - Kenya has achieved its 2015 goal; discussions underway if a new (higher) goal is needed for 2020
  - Initial FP Goals application to contribute to discussions- not full application, results evaluated for 5 illustrative countries
Country work to date: very different contexts and experiences (2)

- Laos
  - Requested by Government as part of developing CIP
  - Wider RMNCH strategy exists that includes FP- but, very ambitious
  - Model used to create focused alternatives- using RMNCH interventions, but with different levels of scale up by provinces
  - Each scenario then costed to allow discussions about what is feasible
  - Process still being finalized in country

- Nigeria (Lagos, Kaduna)
  - Process still underway- no results to share yet
  - State level CIP already exists
  - Model being used to look at impact of existing CIP and help prioritize within CIP interventions

Sharing high level results- but lots of detailed discussions in country sit behind this

- Involvement of many partners:
  - Government- Ministry of Health, and other relevant departments
  - Donor partners
  - Implementing partners
  - Academics

- Detailed discussions of intervention components

- Links to wider discussions/other initiatives already happening in country (e.g. social health insurance, maternal health strategies)

- Process still ongoing in some countries, so in some cases only sharing illustrative results

FP Goals: the process

Baseline data sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Information</th>
<th>Illustrative Indicators</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>Population, % births, % married, % young (15-29)</td>
<td>Statistics Bureau, Census Data, UN Projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use of FP</td>
<td>mCIP by method, MPP uptake, mCIP for youth</td>
<td>DHS or other population based surveys, FPET modelled estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current provision of FP</td>
<td>% facilities offering FP, % women using each method, accept friendly services, demand generation activities</td>
<td>DHIS2, partner reports, UNFPA facility survey, SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health infrastructure</td>
<td># health facilities by type, # pharmacies, # CBUs</td>
<td>DHIS2, Statistics Bureau, Census Data, Food and Drug Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data often collected by sub-national area (State, Region, Province)
Additional analysis: key contextual factors

- Examining levels of demand
- Examining country placement on the s-curve (of mCPR growth)
- Time trends: where has progress been seen, and, where has there not been (expected) changes
- Identify barriers/challenges within existing FP program
- Quantifying population segments: generalized vs focused programs?

Review of context and baseline data

Meeting with partners—allows discussion:

1. Are we missing any data? → Opportunity to contribute more information
2. What does the data tell us? → Start discussion on what might go into scenarios based on what we learn from the baseline

Senegal example: assessing demand

Looking at time trends (Senegal example)

What has not changed?

- Post-partum FP uptake (low, unchanged)
- Ideal number of children (no change)
- Level of FP information to non-users (low, unchanged)
- Low utilization of Case de santé for FP (1% of users)
- Very little increase in utilization of FP from private sector (15% to 18% of users)

Source: DHS 2010 and 2014

Discussed implications for potential scale up of interventions
Considering population segments

Considering sub-national variation

Focus efforts on areas where stock-outs are worse?
What can we learn from provinces with low levels of stock-outs?

FP Goals: the process

How it works (general process)

- Define multiple scenarios to be compared
  - Different levels of scale up of key interventions
  - Different combinations of demand vs access interventions
  - Different levels of scale up in different sub-national areas
- Model estimates of mCPR growth + share of growth from each intervention
- Review, discuss, and refine
- Costing → discussions of cost-effectiveness
- Decide on final scenario to be basis of strategy
**Comparing impact vs. effort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>No priority</th>
<th>1 priority</th>
<th>10 priority</th>
<th>Full implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stock out reductions</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMR in public sector</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMR in private sector</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated outreach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-focused</td>
<td>134,149</td>
<td>181,517</td>
<td>181,517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand generation</td>
<td>35,853</td>
<td>141,380</td>
<td>135,215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FP Goals: the process**

1. Establish a baseline
2. Define scale up
3. Project mcOPR growth
4. Based on strategies and plans
5. Based on global evidence
6. Rapidly test multiple scenarios of future scale up

**Lessons learned**

- **Process** is important - allows discussions, brings together partners
- Creates opportunity to reflect on data
  - Background context and baseline data informative on their own, even before the model
  - Results from model create space for discussion - what mix of interventions could lead to high impact?
- High demand to do sub-national applications - data requirements high
- Countries with recent DHS and SPA surveys make application easier - access to large amount of baseline data

**Next steps: when to use FP Goals**

- Developing a new strategic plan
- Mid-term review of an existing plan
- Prioritize funding and focus within a larger plan
- Developing GFF application

**FP Goals is a strategic decision making tool. Applications must be linked to opportunities for strategic policy decisions in country.**
High-Impact Practices Partners’ Meeting
Washington, D.C.
Nov. 29, 2010

FP2020 COUNTRY COMMITMENTS…38 AND COUNTING!

13 Francophone Africa countries
- Benin
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cameroon
- Côte d’Ivoire
- DR Congo
- Gabon
- Madagascar
- Mali
- Mauritania
- Niger
- Senegal
- Togo

14 Anglophone Africa countries
- Ethiopia
- Ghana
- Liberia
- Kenya
- Malawi
- Mozambique
- Nigeria
- Rwanda
- Sierra Leone
- Somalia
- Tanzania
- Uganda
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

11 Asia countries
- Afghanistan
- Bangladesh
- India
- Indonesia
- Laos PDR
- Myanmar
- Nepal
- Pakistan
- Philippines
- Solomon Islands
- Vietnam

N.B. 9 DAGs/attributable Partnership countries in line, 15 Global Financing Facility (GFF) countries in bold

CONVENCING DONOR AND COUNTRY FOCAL POINTS

Common priorities have surfaced across countries and regions:
- Addressing global commodities gap
- Improving supply chain and delivery systems
- Investing in demand-side efforts and behavior change communications
- Improving access for youth
- Expanding method mix
- Effective data utilization

WHICH HIPS FOCUS ON THESE GLOBAL PRIORITIES?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing/Global Commodities Gap</th>
<th>Demand Creation/Social Norms re: RH</th>
<th>Improving Youth Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing Commodity Shortages</td>
<td>Community Group Engagement</td>
<td>Educating Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vouchers</td>
<td>Community Health Workers</td>
<td>Adolescents’ Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply/Chain Management</td>
<td>Health Commodity</td>
<td>Youth-friendly Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Shops and Pharmacies</td>
<td>Social Marketing</td>
<td>Protecting the Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Young People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expanding Method Mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>M&amp;E and Needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets and Managers</td>
<td>FP &amp; Public Health Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy

*This document is not a HIP and is a strategic planning guide.*
**Mapping HIPS in Francophone Africa Action Plans**

- **Reproductive Health of Young People**: 1
- **Outreach Services**: 2
- **Leadership**: 1
- **Policy**: 5
- **Post-Abortion**: 4
- **Supplies Chain Management**: 5

**Mapping HIPS in Anglophone Africa Action Plans**

- **Reproductive Health of Young People**: 0
- **Outreach Services**: 4
- **Leadership**: 1
- **Policy**: 9
- **Post-Abortion**: 0
- **Supplies Chain Management**: 5

**Mapping HIPS in Asia Action Plans**

- **Reproductive Health of Young People**: 1
- **Outreach Services**: 0
- **Leadership**: 1
- **Policy**: 9
- **Supplies Chain Management**: 5

**FP2020 Country Pages: Resources at Your Fingertips**

Features of redesigned pages include:

- Key documents, including government strategies and plans, GFF materials, and self-reported commitment updates
- 2016 Core Indicator data
- Country-specific research and news
- Enhanced shareability – easily share data and information by email or social media
The HIP Website: A New Face and New Features
Sara Mazursky, KaHealth/JHU-CCP
Caitlin Thistle, USAID/PRH
November 29, 2016

We’re Working on a New Website!

Why are we doing this?
- HIPs play a key role in advancing towards FP2020 goals
- Modernize the website and make more visually-engaging
- Highlight the consensus building that surrounds the HIPs

What Will Remain
- Overarching goal
- Audience
- Most Content

What Will Change
- Presentation of the evidence base – current and emerging
- More ways for user to access HIP content
- Better articulation of HIP process
- Highlight collaborative effort

www.FPHighImpactPractices.org
Timeline

- Vendor on-boarded in December
- Alpha version by end of March
- Beta version by end of May

Questions?

We Need Your Help!
Icons for Each HIP

Elevating Stakeholder Use and Promotion of HIPs

- Let's brainstorm!
- Name three things you would need from us to better promote HIPs
- How can the new site be a way to promote your organization's involvement in HIPs
Draft framework for tracking HIPs: dissemination, uptake, application, and outcomes

“GO WIDE”
- Draft Indicators
- Desk Review of Mission Health Implementation Plans, RFA/Ps, Proposals, Work Plans of Bilaterals
- Web Analytics

“GO DEEP”
- Focus on few countries
- Define Implementation Science questions
- Develop Process Documentation and Learnin Agenda

Do people know about the HIP Briefs? Which ones? Are these being used?

Are the HIPs effective? What are the core elements? How are these being adapted? What are the key drivers, factors for HIPs to be effective?

Dissemination → Uptake → Application → Replication → Reach → Institutionalization → Scale → Health Outcomes

Push-pull mechanisms
Social engagement
Referrals

Influenced by perceived benefit of HIP
Usefulness
Reach

(Why) does Fidelity matter?
(Why/how) does Complexity matter?
(How) does Context matter?

Feedback Loops
Program design

Course Correction

Are the HIPs working? For whom?

Bigger Questions:
- Why are we monitoring the HIPs? For whom?
- How will the data be used? By whom?
- How do we reconcile 'deviation from fidelity' and 'adaptation as reality'?
- Do we want to track the dissemination of the HIPs briefs or the outcome of the application of HIPs?
- Do we want to track or evaluate effectiveness or document adaptation?

Pos and Dons:
- Think of Rapid, low-cost, reliable, practical methods
- Consider data collection burden, utility value
- Use existing data sources