

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

## Purpose

Welcome to a short survey regarding the updated 2010 Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in Humanitarian Settings (IAFM).

First developed in 1997 and later finalized in 1999, the Field Manual has served as the authoritative guide on reproductive health programming in humanitarian settings. Used in conjunction with other complementary guides such as the [2010 Inter-agency Standing Committee \(IASC\) Health Cluster Guide](#), these manuals aim to reduce avoidable mortality, morbidity and disability during a humanitarian crisis.

To remain current, the Field Manual has undergone a two and a half year revision process. The newly revised edition has recently been distributed for field testing and contains updated information on the coordination and implementation of reproductive health services in humanitarian settings.

Several important changes have been made to the Field Manual. What was previously one chapter on HIV and Sexually Transmitted Infections (STIs) has been split into two chapters. The chapter on Maternal and Newborn Health has been renamed from the previous version, and the chapter on Comprehensive Abortion Care has been extended from the first edition to cover more than post-abortion care. Further, the chapters on Programme Design, Monitoring and Evaluation and Adolescent Reproductive Health have been placed earlier in the Field Manual, as these are cross-cutting issues, while human rights and legal considerations have been integrated into every chapter.

The goal of the Field Manual review process is to learn about your experiences in using the manual to implement reproductive health services and interventions. In doing so, we intend to provide field workers with a relevant, user-friendly and practical manual that that can be applied to diverse contexts. Your feedback is essential in this regard. Your consent to participate will be presumed if you decide to complete the survey.

We appreciate and thank you for your time and feedback in advance.

Inter-agency Working Group (IAWG) on Reproductive Health in Crises, IAFM Steering Committee

## Background

### 1. Please check the type of organization you work for:

Academic/Research Institution

International NGO

Local/Community-based NGO

Government Agency

Regional NGO

United Nations Agency

Other (please specify)

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

## 2. At what office are you based?

Headquarters

Regional Office

Field Office

Other (please specify)

## 3. What country are you currently based?

## 4. What is your role working with the beneficiary population?

## 5. Which version(s) of the Field Manual have you used in the past? (Please check all that apply.)

1997

1999

2010

None

## 6. Have you used or are you using any of the following complementary guides? (Please check all that apply.)

2010 Inter-agency Standing Committee (IASC) Health Cluster Guide

2004 Sphere Standards in Disaster Response

2005 IASC GBV Guidelines

Other (please specify)

## Field Specific

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

**1. In what type(s) of situation(s) do you currently work? If you do not provide direct services, select which types of situations you address in your work. (Please check all that apply.)**

- Natural disaster
- Active conflict
- Stable protracted setting
- Post-conflict
- Other, please specify

Other (please specify)

**2. Please select the type of setting in which you are currently working. (Please check all that apply.)**

- Urban
- Rural
- Camp
- Not Applicable

**3. Who is your beneficiary population? (Please check all that apply.)**

- Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)
- Refugees
- Host population(s)
- Other crisis-affected communities
- Not Applicable

## Layout

The following questions pertain to the length and user-friendliness of the 2010 Field Manual.

**1. Do you think the document is:**

- Too long
- Too short
- Just right

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

## 2. Please rate how user-friendly you found the following components of the manual

	Very user-friendly	Somewhat user-friendly	Not user-friendly
Overall Layout (how information is arranged, including boxed text, tables, etc.)	jn	jn	jn
Overall Design (how information is visually presented, including use of space)	jn	jn	jn

If not user-friendly, please specify what can be improved.

  

## Clarity

The following questions pertain to the clarity and comprehensibility of the 2010 manual.

### 1. How clear is the LANGUAGE used in this document overall?

- Very clear
- Somewhat clear
- Not clear

### 2. Please rate the overall comprehensibility of the KEY MESSAGES in the revised 2010 Field Manual.

- Very easy to understand
- Somewhat easy to understand
- Not easy to understand

## Applicability

The following questions pertain to the applicability of the 2010 Field Manual in your particular context.

### 1. How applicable is the 2010 Field Manual to your particular context? Applicability can be thought of as the relevance of the guidance to your setting.

- Very applicable
- Somewhat applicable
- Not applicable

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

**2. How practical is the 2010 Field Manual to your particular context? Practicality in this case is defined as usefulness.**

Very practical

Somewhat practical

Not practical

## Applicability

**1. What were the problems and challenges you encountered in using or applying the Field Manual in your particular setting?**

  

**2. How did you address these problems and challenges?**

  

## Content and Structure

The following questions pertain to the content and structure of the 2010 Field Manual overall.

**1. Is the overall chapter order easy to follow?**

Yes

No

Don't Know

**2. Do the headings and sub-sections flow in a logical and clear manner?**

Yes

No

Don't Know

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

3. Each sub-section within a chapter has a numbering system. For instance:

**Chapter 1-Fundamental Principles**

**Section 3-Fundamental Principles of RH Programming in Humanitarian Settings**

**Sub-section 3.1-Coordination**

**Does the numbering system within each chapter make sense?**

Yes

No

Don't Know

If no, please explain.

## Content and Structure

**1. In general, did you find the chapters to be helpful?**

Yes

No

Don't Know

Please describe what you appreciated or did not appreciate about the 2010 Field Manual.

**2. Is there any new information in the 2010 Field Manual that you feel is more useful compared to the 1999 version?**

Yes

No

Don't Know

Please elaborate if you responded "yes" or "no".

## Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

**3. The Human Rights section has been distributed consistently throughout the 2010 Field Manual instead of having a separate chapter (as in the 1999 Manual). How useful is the integrated format?**

Very useful

Somewhat useful

Not useful

If not useful, please explain why. If you have further feedback, please note.

### Content and Structure

As noted in the introduction, chapters have been reorganized in the the revised Field Manual:

- What was previously one chapter on HIV and Sexually Transmitted Infections (STIs) has been split into two chapters (Chapters 9 and 10).
- The chapter on Maternal and Newborn Health (Chapter 6) has been renamed from the previous version, and the chapter on Comprehensive Abortion Care (Chapter 7) has been extended from the first edition to cover more than post-abortion care.
- The chapters on Program Design, Monitoring and Evaluation (Chapter 3) and Adolescent Reproductive Health (Chapter 4) have been placed earlier in the Field Manual, as these are cross-cutting issues.
- Information on human rights and legal considerations has been integrated into each of the thematic chapters.

Below is the list of all chapters. The following sets of questions are intended to assess how sufficient the information in each chapter is and to identify any gaps. We are also interested in how the manual has assisted you in monitoring and evaluating your programming. Any additional comments would be most helpful and appreciated.

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

## 1. Which chapters have you read (please check all that apply)?

- Chapter 1: Fundamental Principles
- Chapter 2: Minimum Initial Service Package (MISP) for Reproductive Health
- Chapter 3: Programming, Design and Evaluation
- Chapter 4: Adolescent Reproductive Health
- Chapter 5: Family Planning
- Chapter 6: Maternal and Newborn Health
- Chapter 7: Comprehensive Abortion Care
- Chapter 8: Gender-Based Violence
- Chapter 9: Sexually Transmitted Infections
- Chapter 10: HIV
- Annex 1: Glossary
- Annex 2: Acronyms and Abbreviations
- Annex 3: Sample Code of Conduct

## Content and Structure

### 1. Would you like to provide feedback on specific chapters?

We are interested in your experience using each thematic chapter, how the chapters have assisted you in monitoring and evaluating your programs and any gaps in information.

Yes

No

## Content and Structure

Please feel free to provide constructive feedback on any of the chapters in the spaces provided below. If you are noting technical updates or other learned practices, please make sure to cite the relevant source.

### 1. Chapter 1: Fundamental Principles

	5
	6

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

## 2. Chapter 2: Minimum Initial Service Package (MISP) for Reproductive Health

	5
	6

## 3. Chapter 3: Programming, Design and Evaluation

	5
	6

## 4. Chapter 4: Adolescent Reproductive Health

	5
	6

## 5. Chapter 5: Family Planning

	5
	6

## 6. Chapter 6: Maternal and Newborn Health

	5
	6

## 7. Chapter 7: Comprehensive Abortion Care

	5
	6

## 8. Chapter 8: Gender-Based Violence

	5
	6

## 9. Chapter 9: Sexually Transmitted Infections

	5
	6

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

## 10. Chapter 10: HIV

	5
	6

## 11. Annex 1: Glossary

	5
	6

## 12. Annex 2: Acronyms and Abbreviations

	5
	6

## 13. Annex 3: Sample Code of Conduct

	5
	6

## Assessment, Monitoring and Evaluation

The following questions ask you to assess the usefulness of the Field Manual's monitoring and evaluation tools. In addition to the indicators listed in chapter three (p. 68-75), there are also indicators listed at the end of each thematic chapter.

### 1. Adolescent Reproductive Health Indicators

	Are you collecting this indicator?	If yes, how useful do you find the indicator?
1. Incidence of STIs in young people	6	6
2. Proportion of syndromic STIs diagnosed among under 18s	6	6
3. Proportion of births recorded among under 18s	6	6
4. Proportion of sexually active young people reporting condom use at last intercourse (disaggregated by sex and age)	6	6

Please note any additional comments on adolescent reproductive health indicators. Please feel free to list other indicators you are using or explain why you are not using any particular indicators.

	5
	6

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

## 2. Family Planning Indicators

	Are you collecting this indicator?	If yes, how useful do you find the indicator?
1. Proportion of women of reproductive age (15-49) who are using (or whose partner is using) a contraceptive method	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
2. Proportion of sexually active persons able to cite major messages about family planning	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
3. Contraceptive supply	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
4. Proportion of clients attending family planning services who are offered counseling	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
5. Number of family planning service delivery points that maintain a minimum of 3 month supplies of OCPs, injectables, IUDs or implants	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
6. The number and proportion of providers appropriately implementing family planning services	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>

Please note any additional comments on family planning indicators. Please feel free to list other indicators you are using or explain why you are not using any particular indicators.

	<input type="text" value="5"/>
	<input type="text" value="6"/>

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

## 3. Maternal and Newborn Health Indicators

	Are you collecting this indicator?	If yes, how useful do you find the indicator?
1. Rate of deaths among newborns within first 28 days of life	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
2. Proportion of live births that were less than 2500g	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
3. Rate of still births in proportion to number of births	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
4. Proportion of reported maternal deaths which are investigated	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
5. Percentage of pregnant women who made at least 4 antenatal visits during pregnancy	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
6. Proportion of pregnant women who were screened for syphilis during pregnancy	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
7. Proportion of pregnant women who received at least 2 doses of the TT vaccine during pregnancy	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
8. Rate of distribution of clean delivery kits among pregnant women in their third trimester	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
9. Number of health facilities with basic and/or comprehensive obstetric care/500,000 population, by admin unit	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
10. Proportion of all births in emergency obstetric care facilities	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
11. Proportion of women with major direct obstetric complications who are treated in EmOC facilities	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
12. Proportion of births attended by a skilled health worker	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
13. Proportion of women who received 3 postnatal visits within 6 weeks of delivery	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
14. Cesarean sections as a proportion of all births	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
15. The case fatality rate among women with direct obstetric complications in EmOC facilities	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>

Please note additional comments on maternal and newborn health indicators. Please feel free to list other indicators you are using or explain why you are not using any particular indicators.

	5
	6

## 4. Comprehensive Abortion Care Indicators

	Are you collecting this indicator?	If yes, how useful do you find the indicator?
1. Proportion of services performed with appropriate technology (vacuum aspiration or medical methods)	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
2. Proportion of women accessing abortion services who receive contraception prior to discharge from facility	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
3. Percentage of providers who are aware of the legal indications for a termination of pregnancy in the host country and country of origin	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
4. Proportion of women who receive induced abortion procedures	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>

Please note additional comments on comprehensive abortion care indicators. Please feel free to list other indicators you are using or explain why you are not using any particular indicators.

	5
	6

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

## 5. Gender-based Violence Indicators

	Are you collecting this indicator?	If yes, how useful do you find the indicator?
1. Proportion of eligible rape survivors who receive PEP within 72 hours of incident occurring	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
2. Proportion of eligible rape survivors who receive EC within 120 hours of incident occurring	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
3. Proportion of rape survivors who receive presumptive STI treatment within 2 weeks of incident occurring	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
4. Number of cases of sexual violence reported to health facility within a time period	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
5. Number of health workers trained in clinical management of rape survivors	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>

Please note additional comments on gender-based violence indicators. Please feel free to list other indicators you are using or explain why you are not using any particular indicators.

	<input type="text" value="5"/>
	<input type="text" value="6"/>

## 6. Sexually Transmitted Infections Indicators

	Are you collecting this indicator?	If yes, how useful do you find this indicator?
1. Percentage of service providers trained (or retrained) to manage STI/RTI cases according to protocol	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
2. Percentage of patients with STI/RTI assessed, treated and counseled according to protocol (disaggregated by sex and age)	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
3. Incidence of genital ulcer disease among total population	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
4. Incidence of male urethral discharge among male population	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>

Please note additional comments on sexually transmitted infections indicators. Please feel free to list other indicators you are using or explain why you are not using any particular indicators.

	<input type="text" value="5"/>
	<input type="text" value="6"/>

# Field Review of Inter-agency Field Manual on Reproductive Health in

## 7. HIV/AIDS Indicators

	Are you collecting this indicator?	If yes, how useful do you find the indicator?
1. Percentage of referral hospitals that have sufficient HIV rapid tests to ensure all blood destined for transfusion is screened	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
2. Percentage of donated blood units screened for HIV in a quality assured manner	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
3. Proportion of VCT clients tested for HIV, who received post-test results and counseling	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
4. Proportion of first time ANC visit clients who were pre-test counseled	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
5. Proportion of first time ANC visit clients tested for HIV, who receive post-test results and counseling	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
6. Ratio of mother-newborn pairs that swallowed ARV on time	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
7. Rate of condom distribution among the population	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>
8. Proportion of sexually active people reporting condom use at last intercourse	<input type="text" value="6"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>

Please note additional comments on HIV/AIDS indicators. Please feel free to list other indicators you are using or explain why you are not using any particular indicators.

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="5"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>

## Further Suggestions

**1. Please note any other suggestions on structure, content and applicability that would make the Field Manual more practical and user-friendly.**

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="5"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="6"/>

## Thank You

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this survey. Your feedback is greatly appreciated. The information you provided will help the Inter-agency Working Group (IAWG) on Reproductive Health in Crises better ensure that practitioners are able to use the Field Manual easily and effectively around the world.

The Inter-agency Working Group on Reproductive Health in Crises, IAFM Steering Committee