

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol

613.94
AS12a

1. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			2. PROJECT NUMBER		3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE	
A. Final PRO-AG or Evaluation FY <u>71</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>83</u>	C. Final Inflow Delivery FY <u>84</u>	932-0537		DS/POP/R	
4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No., beginning with No. 1 each FY) <u>21-46</u>			5. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR			
			<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION			
6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION			
A. Total \$ <u>33,441,084</u>			From (month/yr.) <u>Sep 1977</u>			
B. U.S. \$ _____			To (month/yr.) <u>Sep 1980</u>			
			Date of Evaluation Review <u>Sep 1980</u>			

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues and those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which involve AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., program, SPAR, PIC, etc. will create detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
<p>This evaluation serves as a basis for initiating a new three-year phase of the project, FY1981-FY1983. Funding beyond the first year will be contingent on an on-site review of IFRP by an evaluation team.</p>	<p>DS/POP/R, M. Mamlook</p>	<p>Comprehensive Evaluation Report to be completed early in 1981.</p>

8. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CFI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change		
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/T	_____	B. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or		
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan		
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/P	_____	C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project		

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Name and Title) (for intensive evaluations only)	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval Signature: <u>J. Speidel</u> 8/21/81 Printed Name: <u>J. Joseph Speidel (Acting)</u> Date: _____
Signature: OAA/DS/HRD	

13. Summary

The International Fertility Research Program (IFRP) was established on July 1, 1971 with the stated primary goals of conducting comparative field trials on new means of fertility regulation in developing countries, disseminating information generated by these trials, and improving developing-country research capabilities. In order to carry out this mandate, IFRP developed an international network of more than 250 collaborating investigators working in over 30 countries. It also established standard methods of gathering and reporting clinical data, documented the short-term safety and effectiveness of a number of fertility regulation methods, and determined the relative appropriateness of the different methods and procedures for people living in a variety of cultural and medical environments.

In September 1977, following a Research Advisory Committee (RAC) review and RAC Subcommittee site visit, IFRP made a number of changes in both staffing and administrative procedures, many of which were along the lines recommended by RAC. As new IFRP interests developed, support for a wider range of objectives was secured in 1977 in the form of an Agency for International Development (AID) grant.

In September 1980, the American Public Health Association (APHA) recruited an Evaluation Team to review the IFRP and its activities. A number of documents were provided to the members of the Team as background information and, from September 29 to October 1, 1980, they site-visited IFRP at Research Triangle, North Carolina. Group and individual interviews were carried out with members of the various divisions and additional staff interviews were held later in New York. The Team also talked with members of the Board of Directors and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Finally, the Team assessed staffing plans and the organization chart against the proposed future program in order to evaluate whether or not the size, composition, relationships, and constellation of talents and backgrounds of the staff were relevant and adequate.

Following extensive review and deliberation, the Team concluded that IFRP was continuing to make progress in dealing with the recommendations of the RAC Subcommittee and AID. In addition to continuing its earlier work evaluating fertility regulation methods, IFRP had developed new areas of interest under the grant mechanism. The Team was particularly supportive of the further testing of the postpartum intrauterine devices (IUDs), the studies on female sterilization, and the new emphasis being placed on mid- to long-term safety studies of contraceptives and surveillance for serious adverse effects. It also reacted positively to the plans for the development of new data processing systems and appropriate software for use in the developing world along with in-country short-term training in research design and in the use of these systems. Finally, the Team felt that many of the moves made recently by IFRP in new directions as exemplified by the RAMOS approach held promise for the future.

While the overall impression of the Team was that IFRP had made a considerable number of improvements when compared with the 1977 RAC review, there were areas in organization, staffing and research which the Team felt could be further strengthened. Therefore, a series of recommendations were made dealing with these areas.