ISN 13498

PD-AAL-961

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) PART I

Report Control Symbol U-

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA)	932-0662	S&T/POP

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) 82-17 08/02/82

☐ REGULAR EVALUATION ☒ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 68	A. Total $	From (month/yr.) 10/77
B. Final Obligation Expected FY Continuing	B. U.S. $	To (month/yr.) 01/81
C. Final Input Delivery FY –		Date of Evaluation Review 02/01/82

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
The review of UNFPA which was completed in January 1982 was not an AID evaluation in the strict sense because the program with UNFPA was not established according to AID's project design system. Nevertheless, we are submitting the Executive Summary of the review report under cover of the PES face sheet in order to get the report into the information system.		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Carl J. Hemmer, S&T/POP

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: J. J. Speidel

Typed Name: J. J. Speidel

Date: 08/02/82

AID 1330-18 (3-78)

February 1, 1982

MEMORANDUM

TO : Distribution

FROM : Richard E. Benedick REB
Coordinator of Population Affairs

Gordon L. Streeb
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, Bureau for International Organizations

J. Jarrett Clinton
Agency Director for Population and Health

SUBJECT : Final Report on 1981 State-AID Review of UNFPA

Attached is the final report on the 1981 review of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) that was carried out by a State-AID review team. A separate distribution to Embassies and Missions will follow. Comments on this report will be welcome.

Distribution:

SAA/S&T, N.C. Brady
AA/AFR, F. Ruddy
AA/ASIA (Acting), R. Halligan
AA/LAC-Designate, O. Reich
AA/NE, A. Ford
AA/PPC-Designate, J. Bolton
S&T, C. Fabrar
S&T, L. Yeager
S&T/POP, J.J. Speidel
S&T/H, C. Pease
AFR/DR, W. Trayfors
ASIA/TR, M. Jordan
LAC/DR, M. Brackett
NE/TECH, L. Kangas
PPC/PDPR, R. VanDusen
IDCA, F. Li
S&T/POP/DEMO, J. Brackett
S&T/POP/PDD, S. Clark
S&T/POP/R, D. Gillespie
S&T/POP/FPS, D. Newman
S&T/POP/FPS, D. Voran

T - James L. Buckley
S/P - Michael Feldstein
OES - James L. Malone
AF/EPS - R. Pringle
ARA/ECP - C. Aller
EA - A.C. Abrecht
EB - A. Basora
NEA - V. Dickey
INR/EC - L. Giffler
IO/D - E. Parsons
IO/D - A. Gayoso
IO/D - H. Glazer
IO/D - L. Polik
T - W. Salmon
USUN/NY - W. Clark
USUN/NY - R. Zimmerman
EB/IFD/CDF - L Peters
Treasury - T.C. Dawson
Defense - S. Rana
Agriculture - Q.M. West
Commerce - M. Zitter

S&T/POP/IEC, A. Aarnes
S&T/POP/TI, B. Kennedy

HHS - E.G. Peterson
NICHD - N. Kretchmer
OMB - P.A. DuSault
ICA - R.L. Roth
CEA - W. Niskanen
JCS - G.L. Gile
CIA - K.W. Layton
CEQ - K. Plowman
NSF - H. Averch
OST - D.J. Prager
NSC - M. Guhin

FINAL REPORT

1981 State-AID Review

of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities

January 1982

Table of Contents

part		page
I	Executive Summary	1
II	Introduction: Origin and Design of Review; Available Reports	7
III	Survey of Embassies and Missions: Final Report	10
IV	Executive Summary of Consultant Report on UNFPA Intercountry Programs: Dr. Leopold Laufer	24
V	Executive Summary of Consultant Report on UNFPA Assistance to Family Planning Programs: Dr. Lincoln Chen and Mr. David Parker	29

PART I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: FY 1981 STATE-AID REVIEW OF UNFPA ACTIVITIES

During 1981, State and AID jointly conducted the first comprehensive review of activities supported by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). This Executive Summary indicates the background, purposes, major findings, and recommended actions related to this review.

Background and Purpose of Review

On November 12, 1980, the Assistant Administrator of AID's Development Support Bureau determined that a comprehensive review of the activities of UNFPA should be carried out. From 1968 through FY 1980, the U.S. Government had contributed some $236 million to UNFPA which, with the resources contributed by other donors, had made UNFPA the second largest source of population assistance to developing countries. In view of the major U.S. role in supporting UNFPA and recognizing the growing gap between overall requests for population assistance and available resources, the review was intended to assess the purposes and effectiveness of UNFPA programs and to provide guidance for a more productive AID-UNFPA relationship in the decade of the 80's.

The State-AID review team represented the following offices: State - the Coordinator of Population Affairs, and the Bureau for International Organizations; AID - the Office of the Assistant Administrator, DSB, and the Office of Population. This team, directed to work in close coordination with AID's regional bureaus (which had formally requested such a review), with the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, and with UNFPA, was charged with developing an overall plan for the review.

The review plan was completed in January, 1981. This plan, for which UNFPA offered its complete cooperation, consisted of four main parts:

(1) a review of UNFPA's country program assistance - representing about 70 per cent of all UNFPA expenditures;

(2) a review of UNFPA's inter-country assistance programs - the remaining 30 per cent of UNFPA expenditures;

(3) a review of UNFPA's support for family planning programs - the largest single category (about 45 per cent) of country and inter-country expenditures;

(4) a review of UNFPA's program management system.

The review was focussed on UNFPA activity mainly during the period of 1978-80. The review set out to assess UNFPA's performance principally in terms of its own mandate; it did not attempt to compare UNFPA assistance with other assistance to population programs, including that provided by AID.

The second and third elements of the review plan were undertaken by consultants. Shortages of travel funds curtailed the review of country

program activity (element 1 above) to a survey questionnaire which was sent to 68 Embassies and Missions in countries that accounted for more than one-half of all countries that received UNFPA assistance during the period of 1978-1980, and nearly three-quarters of all UNFPA assistance dollars for country assistance programs.

Major Review Findings

1. A continuing UNFPA role is important to the achievement of USG foreign policy objectives.

In their response to the survey questionnaire, 47 of 48 Embassies and Missions responded positively to the question, "Is a continuing UNFPA role important to the achievement of USG population assistance and foreign policy objectives?" Narrative comments specified the U.S. interests that are advanced by UNFPA activity.

Mission and Embassy responses indicated various ways of improving the effectiveness of UNFPA activities and of directing a larger portion of UNFPA assistance to what the U.S. perceives as country priority needs. Overall, more than 90 per cent of the Embassies and Missions that responded to the questionnaire considered UNFPA "effective (to some degree) in providing requested assistance" and judged "UNFPA program activity consistent with the USG country population strategy". UNFPA assistance is considered much more effective in the field of assistance for basic data collection than for family planning programs.

UNFPA assistance serves more than 100 countries and provides a variety of assistance needs that are not always met by AID bilateral population assistance programs and which often are vital to the successful implementation of AID activities. The UNFPA's priority country guidelines and program mandates derive from a set of UN decisions in which the U.S. concurred. UNFPA assistance is allocated differently than AIL population assistance because the Governing Council has given UNFPA program guidance that differs from the mandate that directs AID programs. However, it should be noted that UNFPA's program and country priorities are currently changing under the guidance issued by the Governing Council in June, 1981 and, as a result, UNFPA is moving in program directions that should assure greater future coincidence of its priorities and programs with U.S. population program policy objectives - particularly with respect to greater emphasis on family planning assistance.

2. Inadequate resources are becoming a severe restraint in UNFPA programming.

The result is a reduction in some planned activities, a stretching out of other assistance programs, and a slowing of the previously planned expansion of others. Resource adequacy was not specifically addressed

in the survey questionnaire, but there was frequent allusion to this as a problem by Embassies and Missions. Responses from non-priority UNFPA countries were somewhat more likely to stress resource scarcity, with a concomitant recommendation of changes in UNFPA's selection criteria for priority country status. These recommendations for revision of priority country criteria are largely identical with the guidelines that the UNDP Governing Council developed at its session in June, 1981.

3. AID and UNFPA have working relationships that represent generally effective program coordination; certain organizational differences have produced communication gaps which can and should be overcome.

In nearly 90 per cent of the countries with AID bilateral missions, AID and UNFPA field staffs meet at monthly intervals and a similar percentage of all Embassies and Missions exchange program documentation. AID/W backstop staffs for bilateral assistance are in frequent contact with their counterparts at UNFPA headquarters. Communication and program coordination, however, need improvement in the following cases:

- Some countries lack a clearly designated person within the resident U.S. staff with responsibility for coordinating AID centrally-funded population assistance with UNFPA programs. In these cases, UNFPA field staff have no U.S. counterpart for program coordination;

- UNFPA program decisions on country assistance packages are made principally at New York headquarters - rather than in the field as is the case with AID. Understandings of agreements reached by AID field staffs with resident or visiting UNFPA representatives have not always been transmitted to AID/W and to UNFPA/NY, resulting in subsequent misunderstandings between UNFPA and AID headquarters staffs;

- Nearly two-thirds of the countries that receive AID population assistance are provided support only through centrally-funded projects, managed in AID/W; UNFPA staff, both in New York and in the field, are frequently unfamiliar with the country assistance provided by these projects and the relationship of this assistance to UNFPA initiatives; a lack of information on these assistance flows has prevented some potentially useful program coordination, both in New York and in the field.

4. The allocation of UNFPA assistance differs sharply between AID regions in kind and in magnitude: these differences, however, are generally consistent with U.S. interests.

Overall, UNFPA allocates nearly one-half of all country assistance to Asia, and the remainder is divided in roughly equal shares between the

remaining three regions. In Africa and the Near East, however, UNFPA's program provides two to three times more resources for basic data collection assistance than it does in Asia and Latin America and, conversely, Asia and Latin America receive two to five times more resources for family planning assistance than Africa or the Near East.

Despite these differences, 80 per cent or more of the Embassies and Missions that responded to the survey questionnaire, across AID regions, tend to regard UNFPA support for basic data collection as "effective" and two-thirds or more consider UNFPA support for family planning programs "effective" as well.

Nonetheless, in view of the increasing demand for funds the June, 1981, session of the Governing Council called for a "substantial" reduction in UNFPA support for basic data collection and policy development assistance and for a "substantial" increase in support for family planning assistance (taken in its narrower sense).

5. UNFPA's support for inter-country programs will be sharply reduced; further reductions can jeopardize UNFPA's capacity to meet priority assistance needs.

Under the direction of the Governing Council, UNFPA has been reducing the share of its total resources allocated to inter-country programs from close to 50 per cent in the mid-1970's to a target level of 25 per cent (at the end of 1982). The U.S. has generally supported this process. Selected further reductions, particularly in non-project support for the population offices of the U.N. regional economic commissions, may improve the effective use of scarce UNFPA resources. UNFPA inter-country programs have supported useful activities, such as the World Fertility Survey during the 1970's, and they represent a cost-effective way of providing (1) consultant and training services that are useful for some country programs, (2) support for international meetings, and (3) a capacity for various regional and inter-regional initiatives that cannot be funded within individual country programs. The 25 per cent target level for resources allocated to UNFPA's inter-country programs by the end of 1982 is less important than the objective of continuing to provide adequate support for those selected activities that should continue as inter-country programs.

6. UNFPA support for family planning programs is shaped by host country policies, resulting in the provision of considerable assistance for health activities unrelated to family planning. The health-oriented mandates of UNFPA's principal executing agencies also contribute to this mix of activities.

"Family planning" is defined broadly in UNFPA's mandate to include a wide array of assistance for improved maternal and child health. In

requesting UNFPA assistance, many countries give priority to support for health, rather than family planning, activities. This is particularly true in Africa and the Near East where half or more of all respondents reported that host countries give "low priority" to the provision of family planning services. Almost all countries surveyed "favor or require the integration of family planning assistance with maternal-child health or other health programs". In these circumstances about half of UNFPA's family planning assistance represents support for health activities unrelated to family planning.

Moreover, WHO, PAHO, and UNICEF, which frequently serve as executing agencies for UNFPA programs, are oriented to health program support, broadly defined. UNFPA assistance for family planning, in its narrower sense, has grown in recent years with UNFPA's introduction of direct Fund support for country programs and with its use of NGO's that are specialized in family planning assistance, such as the Population Council, as its executing agencies.

USG support for UNFPA derives entirely from funds appropriated for population program assistance. UNFPA's interpretation of "family planning" assistance to include considerable support for health programs has been a concern within AID which was a major consideration in undertaking the current review of UNFPA activity.

Recommended Actions

1. The U.S. should continue financial support for UNFPA.

While no specific support level can be derived from the review findings, the support level adopted should be sufficient to reflect the demonstrated importance of UNFPA activity to the achievement of overall U.S. foreign policy and development assistance interests. The overall level of AID support should take into account the U.S. government's perception of differing regional needs and UNFPA's relative capacity to meet those needs; the likely support for UNFPA from other national donors is also an important consideration. It is possible that any diminution in USG support might be interpreted by other donors and by LDC's as a negative signal with regard to the Fund and international population assistance.

2. The U.S. should encourage and support AID-UNFPA program coordination at all levels.

Where gaps currently exist, members of Embassy or USAID staffs should be assigned responsibility for the coordination of U.S. population

assistance with UNFPA; communications gaps should be bridged, particularly between UNFPA/NY and USAID field staffs, and between AID/W managers of centrally-funded activities and UNFPA staff. Meetings between AID/W regional population offices and UNFPA program support staffs, focussed on regional needs, should be a regularly scheduled occurrence.

3. The U.S. position at the next session of the Governing Council should emphasize

   - that UNFPA should channel a larger proportion of its resources into support for family planning programs - as contrasted with other health programs, particularly by directing requests for health assistance to other UN agencies and by utilizing the most effective executing agencies for UNFPA-funded projects - with particular emphasis on NGO's;

   - the necessity for clear guidance with regard to future funding decisions should take into account the differences between the assistance needs of different geographic regions and the importance of providing policy development assistance that encourages governments to recognize and to address their population problems; and

   - judicious selection of the inter-country programs for which UNFPA support is to be reduced so that assistance needed by country programs and best organized at an inter-country level are not weakened or eliminated.

4. Establishment of a process for the continuing U.S. review of UNFPA activities should be a condition for the continued U.S. support of UNFPA.

   A comprehensive review, covering all major aspects of the UNFPA program, should be undertaken every five years. On a continuing basis, specific problem and country-oriented reviews should be carried out, including intensive, on-site reviews of UNFPA country projects where these activities closely relate to U.S. population assistance objectives.

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) PART I

Report Control Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA)	932-0662	S&T/POP

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) 82-17 08/02/82

☐ REGULAR EVALUATION ☒ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 68	A. Total $	From (month/yr.) 10/77
B. Final Obligation Expected FY Continuing	B. U.S. $	To (month/yr.) 01/81
C. Final Input Delivery FY –		Date of Evaluation Review 02/01/82

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
The review of UNFPA which was completed in January 1982 was not an AID evaluation in the strict sense because the program with UNFPA was not established according to AID's project design system. Nevertheless, we are submitting the Executive Summary of the review report under cover of the PES face sheet in order to get the report into the information system.		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Carl J. Hemmer, S&T/POP

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: J. J. Speidel

Typed Name: J. J. Speidel

Date: 08/02/82

AID 1330-18 (3-78)

February 1, 1982

MEMORANDUM

TO : Distribution

FROM : Richard E. Benedick REB
Coordinator of Population Affairs

Gordon L. Streeb GL
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, Bureau for International Organizations

J. Jarrett Clinton
Agency Director for Population and Health

SUBJECT : Final Report on 1981 State-AID Review of UNFPA

Attached is the final report on the 1981 review of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) that was carried out by a State-AID review team. A separate distribution to Embassies and Missions will follow. Comments on this report will be welcome.

Distribution:

SAA/S&T, N.C. Brady
AA/AFR, F. Ruddy
AA/ASIA (Acting), R. Halligan
AA/LAC-Designate, O. Reich
AA/NE, A. Ford
AA/PPC-Designate, J. Bolton
S&T, C. Farrar
S&T, L. Yeager
S&T/POP, J.J. Speidel
S&T/H, C. Pease
AFR/DR, W. Trayfors
ASIA/TR, M. Jordan
LAC/DR, M. Brackett
NE/TECH, L. Kangas
PPC/PDPR, R. VanDusen
IDCA, F. Li
S&T/POP/DEMO, J. Brackett
S&T/POP/PDD, S. Clark
S&T/POP/R, D. Gillespie
S&T/POP/FPS, D. Newman
S&T/POP/FPS, D. Voran

T - James L. Buckley
S/P - Michael Feldstein
OES - James L. Malone
AF/EPS - R. Pringle
ARA/ECP - C. Allen
EA - A.C. Abrecht
EB - A. Basora
NEA - V. Dickey
INR/EC - L. Giffler
IO/D - E. Parsons
IO/D - A. Gayoso
IO/D - H. Glazer
IO/D - L. Polik
T - W. Salmon
USUN/NY - W. Clark
USUN/NY - R. Zimmerman
EB/IFD/CDF - L Peters
Treasury - T.C. Dawson
Defense - S. Rana
Agriculture - Q.M. West
Commerce - M. Zitter

S&T/POP/IEC, A. Aarnes
S&T/POP/TI, B. Kennedy

HHS - E.G. Peterson
NICHD - N. Kretchmer
OMB - P.A. DuSault
ICA - R.L. Roth
CEA - W. Niskanen
JCS - G.L. Gile
CIA - K.W. Layton
CEQ - K. Plowman
NSF - H. Averch
OST - D.J. Prager
NSC - M. Guhin

FINAL REPORT

1981 State AID Review

of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities

January 1982

Table of Contents

part		page
I	Executive Summary	1
II	Introduction: Origin and Design of Review; Available Reports	7
III	Survey of Embassies and Missions: Final Report	10
IV	Executive Summary of Consultant Report on UNFPA Intercountry Programs: Dr. Leopold Laufer	24
V	Executive Summary of Consultant Report on UNFPA Assistance to Family Planning Programs: Dr. Lincoln Chen and Mr. David Parker	29

PART I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: FY 1981 STATE-AID REVIEW OF UNFPA ACTIVITIES

During 1981, State and AID jointly conducted the first comprehensive review of activities supported by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). This Executive Summary indicates the background, purposes, major findings, and recommended actions related to this review.

Background and Purpose of Review

On November 12, 1980, the Assistant Administrator of AID's Development Support Bureau determined that a comprehensive review of the activities of UNFPA should be carried out. From 1968 through FY 1980, the U.S. Government had contributed some $236 million to UNFPA which, with the resources contributed by other donors, had made UNFPA the second largest source of population assistance to developing countries. In view of the major U.S. role in supporting UNFPA and recognizing the growing gap between overall requests for population assistance and available resources, the review was intended to assess the purposes and effectiveness of UNFPA programs and to provide guidance for a more productive AID-UNFPA relationship in the decade of the 80's.

The State-AID review team represented the following offices: State - the Coordinator of Population Affairs, and the Bureau for International Organizations; AID - the Office of the Assistant Administrator, DSB, and the Office of Population. This team, directed to work in close coordination with AID's regional bureaus (which had formally requested such a review), with the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, and with UNFPA, was charged with developing an overall plan for the review.

The review plan was completed in January, 1981. This plan, for which UNFPA offered its complete cooperation, consisted of four main parts:

(1) a review of UNFPA's country program assistance - representing about 70 per cent of all UNFPA expenditures;

(2) a review of UNFPA's inter-country assistance programs - the remaining 30 per cent of UNFPA expenditures;

(3) a review of UNFPA's support for family planning programs - the largest single category (about 45 per cent) of country and inter-country expenditures;

(4) a review of UNFPA's program management system.

The review was focussed on UNFPA activity mainly during the period of 1978-80. The review set out to assess UNFPA's performance principally in terms of its own mandate; it did not attempt to compare UNFPA assistance with other assistance to population programs, including that provided by AID.

The second and third elements of the review plan were undertaken by consultants. Shortages of travel funds curtailed the review of country

program activity (element 1 above) to a survey questionnaire which was sent to 68 Embassies and Missions in countries that accounted for more than one-half of all countries that received UNFPA assistance during the period of 1978-1980, and nearly three-quarters of all UNFPA assistance dollars for country assistance programs.

Major Review Findings

1. A continuing UNFPA role is important to the achievement of USG foreign policy objectives.

In their response to the survey questionnaire, 47 of 48 Embassies and Missions responded positively to the question, "Is a continuing UNFPA role important to the achievement of USG population assistance and foreign policy objectives?" Narrative comments specified the U.S. interests that are advanced by UNFPA activity.

Mission and Embassy responses indicated various ways of improving the effectiveness of UNFPA activities and of directing a larger portion of UNFPA assistance to what the U.S. perceives as country priority needs. Overall, more than 90 per cent of the Embassies and Missions that responded to the questionnaire considered UNFPA "effective (to some degree) in providing requested assistance" and judged "UNFPA program activity consistent with the USG country population strategy". UNFPA assistance is considered much more effective in the field of assistance for basic data collection than for family planning programs.

UNFPA assistance serves more than 100 countries and provides a variety of assistance needs that are not always met by AID bilateral population assistance programs and which often are vital to the successful implementation of AID activities. The UNFPA's priority country guidelines and program mandates derive from a set of UN decisions in which the U.S. concurred. UNFPA assistance is allocated differently than AID population assistance because the Governing Council has given UNFPA program guidance that differs from the mandate that directs AID programs. However, it should be noted that UNFPA's program and country priorities are currently changing under the guidance issued by the Governing Council in June, 1981 and, as a result, UNFPA is moving in program directions that should assure greater future coincidence of its priorities and programs with U.S. population program policy objectives - particularly with respect to greater emphasis on family planning assistance.

2. Inadequate resources are becoming a severe restraint in UNFPA programming.

The result is a reduction in some planned activities, a stretching out of other assistance programs, and a slowing of the previously planned expansion of others. Resource adequacy was not specifically addressed

in the survey questionnaire, but there was frequent allusion to this as a problem by Embassies and Missions. Responses from non-priority UNFPA countries were somewhat more likely to stress resource scarcity, with a concomitant recommendation of changes in UNFPA's selection criteria for priority country status. These recommendations for revision of priority country criteria are largely identical with the guidelines that the UNDP Governing Council developed at its session in June, 1981.

3. AID and UNFPA have working relationships that represent generally effective program coordination; certain organizational differences have produced communication gaps which can and should be overcome.

In nearly 90 per cent of the countries with AID bilateral missions, AID and UNFPA field staffs meet at monthly intervals and a similar percentage of all Embassies and Missions exchange program documentation. AID/W backstop staffs for bilateral assistance are in frequent contact with their counterparts at UNFPA headquarters. Communication and program coordination, however, need improvement in the following cases:

- Some countries lack a clearly designated person within the resident U.S. staff with responsibility for coordinating AID centrally-funded population assistance with UNFPA programs. In these cases, UNFPA field staff have no U.S. counterpart for program coordination;

- UNFPA program decisions on country assistance packages are made principally at New York headquarters - rather than in the field as is the case with AID. Understandings of agreements reached by AID field staffs with resident or visiting UNFPA representatives have not always been transmitted to AID/W and to UNFPA/NY, resulting in subsequent misunderstandings between UNFPA and AID headquarters staffs;

- Nearly two-thirds of the countries that receive AID population assistance are provided support only through centrally-funded projects, managed in AID/W; UNFPA staff, both in New York and in the field, are frequently unfamiliar with the country assistance provided by these projects and the relationship of this assistance to UNFPA initiatives; a lack of information on these assistance flows has prevented some potentially useful program coordination, both in New York and in the field.

4. The allocation of UNFPA assistance differs sharply between AID regions in kind and in magnitude: these differences, however, are generally consistent with U.S. interests.

Overall, UNFPA allocates nearly one-half of all country assistance to Asia, and the remainder is divided in roughly equal shares between the

remaining three regions. In Africa and the Near East, however, UNFPA's program provides two to three times more resources for basic data collection assistance than it does in Asia and Latin America and, conversely, Asia and Latin America receive two to five times more resources for family planning assistance than Africa or the Near East.

Despite these differences, 80 per cent or more of the Embassies and Missions that responded to the survey questionnaire, across AID regions, tend to regard UNFPA support for basic data collection as "effective" and two-thirds or more consider UNFPA support for family planning programs "effective" as well.

Nonetheless, in view of the increasing demand for funds the June, 1981, session of the Governing Council called for a "substantial" reduction in UNFPA support for basic data collection and policy development assistance and for a "substantial" increase in support for family planning assistance (taken in its narrower sense).

5. <u>UNFPA's support for inter-country programs will be sharply reduced; further reductions can jeopardize UNFPA's capacity to meet priority assistance needs.</u>

Under the direction of the Governing Council, UNFPA has been reducing the share of its total resources allocated to inter-country programs from close to 50 per cent in the mid-1970's to a target level of 25 per cent (at the end of 1982). The U.S. has generally supported this process. Selected further reductions, particularly in non-project support for the population offices of the U.N. regional economic commissions, may improve the effective use of scarce UNFPA resources. UNFPA inter-country programs have supported useful activities, such as the World Fertility Survey during the 1970's, and they represent a cost-effective way of providing (1) consultant and training services that are useful for some country programs, (2) support for international meetings, and (3) a capacity for various regional and inter-regional initiatives that cannot be funded within individual country programs. The 25 per cent target level for resources allocated to UNFPA's inter-country programs by the end of 1982 is less important than the objective of continuing to provide adequate support for those selected activities that should continue as inter-country programs.

6. <u>UNFPA support for family planning programs is shaped by host country policies, resulting in the provision of considerable assistance for health activities unrelated to family planning. The health-oriented mandates of UNFPA's principal executing agencies also contribute to this mix of activities.</u>

"Family planning" is defined broadly in UNFPA's mandate to include a wide array of assistance for improved maternal and child health. In

requesting UNFPA assistance, many countries give priority to support for health, rather than family planning, activities. This is particularly true in Africa and the Near East where half or more of all respondents reported that host countries give "low priority" to the provision of family planning services. Almost all countries surveyed "favor or require the integration of family planning assistance with maternal-child health or other health programs". In these circumstances about half of UNFPA's family planning assistance represents support for health activities unrelated to family planning.

Moreover, WHO, PAHO, and UNICEF, which frequently serve as executing agencies for UNFPA programs, are oriented to health program support, broadly defined. UNFPA assistance for family planning, in its narrower sense, has grown in recent years with UNFPA's introduction of direct Fund support for country programs and with its use of NGO's that are specialized in family planning assistance, such as the Population Council, as its executing agencies.

USG support for UNFPA derives entirely from funds appropriated for population program assistance. UNFPA's interpretation of "family planning" assistance to include considerable support for health programs has been a concern within AID which was a major consideration in undertaking the current review of UNFPA activity.

Recommended Actions

1. The U.S. should continue financial support for UNFPA.

While no specific support level can be derived from the review findings, the support level adopted should be sufficient to reflect the demonstrated importance of UNFPA activity to the achievement of overall U.S. foreign policy and development assistance interests. The overall level of AID support should take into account the U.S. government's perception of differing regional needs and UNFPA's relative capacity to meet those needs; the likely support for UNFPA from other national donors is also an important consideration. It is possible that any diminution in USG support might be interpreted by other donors and by LDC's as a negative signal with regard to the Fund and international population assistance.

2. The U.S. should encourage and support AID-UNFPA program coordination at all levels.

Where gaps currently exist, members of Embassy or USAID staffs should be assigned responsibility for the coordination of U.S. population

assistance with UNFPA; communications gaps should be bridged, particularly between UNFPA/NY and USAID field staffs, and between AID/W managers of centrally-funded activities and UNFPA staff. Meetings between AID/W regional population offices and UNFPA program support staffs, focussed on regional needs, should be a regularly scheduled occurrence.

3. The U.S. position at the next session of the Governing Council should emphasize

   - that UNFPA should channel a larger proportion of its resources into support for family planning programs - as contrasted with other health programs, particularly by directing requests for health assistance to other UN agencies and by utilizing the most effective executing agencies for UNFPA-funded projects - with particular emphasis on NGO's;

   - the necessity for clear guidance with regard to future funding decisions should take into account the differences between the assistance needs of different geographic regions and the importance of providing policy development assistance that encourages governments to recognize and to address their population problems; and

   - judicious selection of the inter-country programs for which UNFPA support is to be reduced so that assistance needed by country programs and best organized at an inter-country level are not weakened or eliminated.

4. Establishment of a process for the continuing U.S. review of UNFPA activities should be a condition for the continued U.S. support of UNFPA.

   A comprehensive review, covering all major aspects of the UNFPA program, should be undertaken every five years. On a continuing basis, specific problem and country-oriented reviews should be carried out, including intensive, on-site reviews of UNFPA country projects where these activities closely relate to U.S. population assistance objectives.

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) PART I

Report Control Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA)	932-0662	S&T/POP

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) 82-17 08/02/82

☐ REGULAR EVALUATION ☒ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 68	B. Final Obligation Expected FY Continuing	C. Final Input Delivery FY –	A. Total $ ____ B. U.S. $ ____	From (month/yr.) 10/77 To (month/yr.) 01/81 Date of Evaluation Review 02/01/82

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
The review of UNFPA which was completed in January 1982 was not an AID evaluation in the strict sense because the program with UNFPA was not established according to AID's project design system. Nevertheless, we are submitting the Executive Summary of the review report under cover of the PES face sheet in order to get the report into the information system.		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify) ____
- ☐ Other (Specify) ____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Carl J. Hemmer, S&T/POP

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: J. J. Speidel

Typed Name: J. J. Speidel

Date: 08/02/82

AID 1330-15 (3-76)

February 1, 1982

MEMORANDUM

TO : Distribution

FROM : Richard E. Benedick REB
Coordinator of Population Affairs

Gordon L. Streeb GLS
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, Bureau for International Organizations

J. Jarrett Clinton
Agency Director for Population and Health

SUBJECT : Final Report on 1981 State-AID Review of UNFPA

Attached is the final report on the 1981 review of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) that was carried out by a State-AID review team. A separate distribution to Embassies and Missions will follow. Comments on this report will be welcome.

Distribution:

SAA/S&T, N.C. Brady
AA/AFR, F. Ruddy
AA/ASIA (Acting), R. Halligan
AA/LAC-Designate, O. Reich
AA/NE, A. Ford
AA/PPC-Designate, J. Bolton
S&T, C. Farrar
S&T, L. Yeager
S&T/POP, J.J. Speidel
S&T/E, C. Pease
AFR/DR, W. Trayfors
ASIA/TR, M. Jordan
LAC/DR, M. Brackett
NE/TECH, L. Kangas
PPC/PDPR, R. VanDusen
IDCA, F. Li
S&T/POP/DEMO, J. Brackett
S&T/POP/PDD, S. Clark
S&T/POP/R, D. Gillespie
S&T/POP/FPS, D. Newman
S&T/POP/FPS, D. Voran
T - James L. Buckley
S/P - Michael Feldstein
OES - James L. Malone
AF/EPS - R. Pringle
ARA/ECP - C. Allen
EA - A.C. Abrecht
EB - A. Basora
NEA - V. Dickey
INR/EC - L. Giffler
IO/D - E. Parsons
IO/D - A. Gayoso
IO/D - H. Glazer
IO/D - L. Polik
T - W. Salmon
USUN/NY - W. Clark
USUN/NY - R. Zimmerman
EB/IFD/CDF - L Peters
Treasury - T.C. Dawson
Defense - S. Rana
Agriculture - Q.M. West
Commerce - M. Zitter

S&T/POP/IEC, A. Aarnes
S&T/POP/TI, B. Kennedy

HHS - E.G. Peterson
NICHD - N. Kretchmer
OMB - P.A. DuSault
ICA - R.L. Roth
CEA - W. Niskanen
JCS - G.L. Gile
CIA - K.W. Layton
CEQ - K. Plowman
NSF - H. Averch
OST - D.J. Prager
NSC - M. Guhin

FINAL REPORT

1981 State-AID Review

of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities

January 1982

Table of Contents

part		page
I	Executive Summary	1
II	Introduction: Origin and Design of Review; Available Reports	7
III	Survey of Embassies and Missions: Final Report	10
IV	Executive Summary of Consultant Report on UNFPA Intercountry Programs: Dr. Leopold Laufer	24
V	Executive Summary of Consultant Report on UNFPA Assistance to Family Planning Programs: Dr. Lincoln Chen and Mr. David Parker	29

PART I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
FY 1981 STATE-AID REVIEW OF UNFPA ACTIVITIES

During 1981, State and AID jointly conducted the first comprehensive review of activities supported by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). This Executive Summary indicates the background, purposes, major findings, and recommended actions related to this review.

Background and Purpose of Review

On November 12, 1980, the Assistant Administrator of AID's Development Support Bureau determined that a comprehensive review of the activities of UNFPA should be carried out. From 1968 through FY 1980, the U.S. Government had contributed some $236 million to UNFPA which, with the resources contributed by other donors, had made UNFPA the second largest source of population assistance to developing countries. In view of the major U.S. role in supporting UNFPA and recognizing the growing gap between overall requests for population assistance and available resources, the review was intended to assess the purposes and effectiveness of UNFPA programs and to provide guidance for a more productive AID-UNFPA relationship in the decade of the 80's.

The State-AID review team represented the following offices: State - the Coordinator of Population Affairs, and the Bureau for International Organizations; AID - the Office of the Assistant Administrator, DSB, and the Office of Population. This team, directed to work in close coordination with AID's regional bureaus (which had formally requested such a review), with the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, and with UNFPA, was charged with developing an overall plan for the review.

The review plan was completed in January, 1981. This plan, for which UNFPA offered its complete cooperation, consisted of four main parts:

(1) a review of UNFPA's country program assistance - representing about 70 per cent of all UNFPA expenditures;

(2) a review of UNFPA's inter-country assistance programs - the remaining 30 per cent of UNFPA expenditures;

(3) a review of UNFPA's support for family planning programs - the largest single category (about 45 per cent) of country and inter-country expenditures;

(4) a review of UNFPA's program management system.

The review was focussed on UNFPA activity mainly during the period of 1978-80. The review set out to assess UNFPA's performance principally in terms of its own mandate; it did not attempt to compare UNFPA assistance with other assistance to population programs, including that provided by AID.

The second and third elements of the review plan were undertaken by consultants. Shortages of travel funds curtailed the review of country

program activity (element 1 above) to a survey questionnaire which was sent to 68 Embassies and Missions in countries that accounted for more than one-half of all countries that received UNFPA assistance during the period of 1978-1980, and nearly three-quarters of all UNFPA assistance dollars for country assistance programs.

Major Review Findings

1. A continuing UNFPA role is important to the achievement of USG foreign policy objectives.

In their response to the survey questionnaire, 47 of 48 Embassies and Missions responded positively to the question, "Is a continuing UNFPA role important to the achievement of USG population assistance and foreign policy objectives?" Narrative comments specified the U.S. interests that are advanced by UNFPA activity.

Mission and Embassy responses indicated various ways of improving the effectiveness of UNFPA activities and of directing a larger portion of UNFPA assistance to what the U.S. perceives as country priority needs. Overall, more than 90 per cent of the Embassies and Missions that responded to the questionnaire considered UNFPA "effective (to some degree) in providing requested assistance" and judged "UNFPA program activity consistent with the USG country population strategy". UNFPA assistance is considered much more effective in the field of assistance for basic data collection than for family planning programs.

UNFPA assistance serves more than 100 countries and provides a variety of assistance needs that are not always met by AID bilateral population assistance programs and which often are vital to the successful implementation of AID activities. The UNFPA's priority country guidelines and program mandates derive from a set of UN decisions in which the U.S. concurred. UNFPA assistance is allocated differently than AID population assistance because the Governing Council has given UNFPA program guidance that differs from the mandate that directs AID programs. However, it should be noted that UNFPA's program and country priorities are currently changing under the guidance issued by the Governing Council in June, 1981 and, as a result, UNFPA is moving in program directions that should assure greater future coincidence of its priorities and programs with U.S. population program policy objectives - particularly with respect to greater emphasis on family planning assistance.

2. Inadequate resources are becoming a severe restraint in UNFPA programming.

The result is a reduction in some planned activities, a stretching out of other assistance programs, and a slowing of the previously planned expansion of others. Resource adequacy was not specifically addressed

in the survey questionnaire, but there was frequent allusion to this as a problem by Embassies and Missions. Responses from non-priority UNFPA countries were somewhat more likely to stress resource scarcity, with a concomitant recommendation of changes in UNFPA's selection criteria for priority country status. These recommendations for revision of priority country criteria are largely identical with the guidelines that the UNDP Governing Council developed at its session in June, 1981.

3. AID and UNFPA have working relationships that represent generally effective program coordination; certain organizational differences have produced communication gaps which can and should be overcome.

In nearly 90 per cent of the countries with AID bilateral missions, AID and UNFPA field staffs meet at monthly intervals and a similar percentage of all Embassies and Missions exchange program documentation. AID/W backstop staffs for bilateral assistance are in frequent contact with their counterparts at UNFPA headquarters. Communication and program coordination, however, need improvement in the following cases:

- Some countries lack a clearly designated person within the resident U.S. staff with responsibility for coordinating AID centrally-funded population assistance with UNFPA programs. In these cases, UNFPA field staff have no U.S. counterpart for program coordination;

- UNFPA program decisions on country assistance packages are made principally at New York headquarters - rather than in the field as is the case with AID. Understandings of agreements reached by AID field staffs with resident or visiting UNFPA representatives have not always been transmitted to AID/W and to UNFPA/NY, resulting in subsequent misunderstandings between UNFPA and AID headquarters staffs;

- Nearly two-thirds of the countries that receive AID population assistance are provided support only through centrally-funded projects, managed in AID/W; UNFPA staff, both in New York and in the field, are frequently unfamiliar with the country assistance provided by these projects and the relationship of this assistance to UNFPA initiatives; a lack of information on these assistance flows has prevented some potentially useful program coordination, both in New York and in the field.

4. The allocation of UNFPA assistance differs sharply between AID regions in kind and in magnitude; these differences, however, are generally consistent with U.S. interests.

Overall, UNFPA allocates nearly one-half of all country assistance to Asia, and the remainder is divided in roughly equal shares between the

remaining three regions. In Africa and the Near East, however, UNFPA's program provides two to three times more resources for basic data collection assistance than it does in Asia and Latin America and, conversely, Asia and Latin America receive two to five times more resources for family planning assistance than Africa or the Near East.

Despite these differences, 80 per cent or more of the Embassies and Missions that responded to the survey questionnaire, across AID regions, tend to regard UNFPA support for basic data collection as "effective" and two-thirds or more consider UNFPA support for family planning programs "effective" as well.

Nonetheless, in view of the increasing demand for funds the June, 1981, session of the Governing Council called for a "substantial" reduction in UNFPA support for basic data collection and policy development assistance and for a "substantial" increase in support for family planning assistance (taken in its narrower sense).

5. UNFPA's support for inter-country programs will be sharply reduced; further reductions can jeopardize UNFPA's capacity to meet priority assistance needs.

Under the direction of the Governing Council, UNFPA has been reducing the share of its total resources allocated to inter-country programs from close to 50 per cent in the mid-1970's to a target level of 25 per cent (at the end of 1982). The U.S. has generally supported this process. Selected further reductions, particularly in non-project support for the population offices of the U.N. regional economic commissions, may improve the effective use of scarce UNFPA resources. UNFPA inter-country programs have supported useful activities, such as the World Fertility Survey during the 1970's, and they represent a cost-effective way of providing (1) consultant and training services that are useful for some country programs, (2) support for international meetings, and (3) a capacity for various regional and inter-regional initiatives that cannot be funded within individual country programs. The 25 per cent target level for resources allocated to UNFPA's inter-country programs by the end of 1982 is less important than the objective of continuing to provide adequate support for those selected activities that should continue as inter-country programs.

6. UNFPA support for family planning programs is shaped by host country policies, resulting in the provision of considerable assistance for health activities unrelated to family planning. The health-oriented mandates of UNFPA's principal executing agencies also contribute to this mix of activities.

"Family planning" is defined broadly in UNFPA's mandate to include a wide array of assistance for improved maternal and child health. In

requesting UNFPA assistance, many countries give priority to support for health, rather than family planning, activities. This is particularly true in Africa and the Near East where half or more of all respondents reported that host countries give "low priority" to the provision of family planning services. Almost all countries surveyed "favor or require the integration of family planning assistance with maternal-child health or other health programs". In these circumstances about half of UNFPA's family planning assistance represents support for health activities unrelated to family planning.

Moreover, WHO, PAHO, and UNICEF, which frequently serve as executing agencies for UNFPA programs, are oriented to health program support, broadly defined. UNFPA assistance for family planning, in its narrower sense, has grown in recent years with UNFPA's introduction of direct Fund support for country programs and with its use of NGO's that are specialized in family planning assistance, such as the Population Council, as its executing agencies.

USG support for UNFPA derives entirely from funds appropriated for population program assistance. UNFPA's interpretation of "family planning" assistance to include considerable support for health programs has been a concern within AID which was a major consideration in undertaking the current review of UNFPA activity.

Recommended Actions

1. The U.S. should continue financial support for UNFPA.

While no specific support level can be derived from the review findings, the support level adopted should be sufficient to reflect the demonstrated importance of UNFPA activity to the achievement of overall U.S. foreign policy and development assistance interests. The overall level of AID support should take into account the U.S. government's perception of differing regional needs and UNFPA's relative capacity to meet those needs; the likely support for UNFPA from other national donors is also an important consideration. It is possible that any diminution in USG support might be interpreted by other donors and by LDC's as a negative signal with regard to the Fund and international population assistance.

2. The U.S. should encourage and support AID-UNFPA program coordination at all levels.

Where gaps currently exist, members of Embassy or USAID staffs should be assigned responsibility for the coordination of U.S. population

assistance with UNFPA; communications gaps should be bridged, particularly between UNFPA/NY and USAID field staffs, and between AID/W managers of centrally-funded activities and UNFPA staff. Meetings between AID/W regional population offices and UNFPA program support staffs, focussed on regional needs, should be a regularly scheduled occurrence.

3. The U.S. position at the next session of the Governing Council should emphasize

   - that UNFPA should channel a larger proportion of its resources into support for family planning programs - as contrasted with other health programs, particularly by directing requests for health assistance to other UN agencies and by utilizing the most effective executing agencies for UNFPA-funded projects - with particular emphasis on NGO's;

   - the necessity for clear guidance with regard to future funding decisions should take into account the differences between the assistance needs of different geographic regions and the importance of providing policy development assistance that encourages governments to recognize and to address their population problems; and

   - judicious selection of the inter-country programs for which UNFPA support is to be reduced so that assistance needed by country programs and best organized at an inter-country level are not weakened or eliminated.

4. Establishment of a process for the continuing U.S. review of UNFPA activities should be a condition for the continued U.S. support of UNFPA.

   A comprehensive review, covering all major aspects of the UNFPA program, should be undertaken every five years. On a continuing basis, specific problem and country-oriented reviews should be carried out, including intensive, on-site reviews of UNFPA country projects where these activities closely relate to U.S. population assistance objectives.

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) PART I

Report Control Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA)	932-0662	S&T/POP

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) 82-17 08/02/82

☐ REGULAR EVALUATION ☒ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 68 B. Final Obligation Expected FY Continuing C. Final Input Delivery FY –	A. Total $ _____ B. U.S. $ _____	From (month/yr.) 10/77 To (month/yr.) 01/81 Date of Evaluation Review 02/01/82

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
The review of UNFPA which was completed in January 1982 was not an AID evaluation in the strict sense because the program with UNFPA was not established according to AID's project design system. Nevertheless, we are submitting the Executive Summary of the review report under cover of the PES face sheet in order to get the report into the information system.		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Carl J. Hemmer, S&T/POP

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: J. J. Speidel

Typed Name: J. J. Speidel

Date: 08/02/82

AID 1330-18 (3-78)

February 1, 1982

MEMORANDUM

TO : Distribution

FROM : Richard E. Benedick REB
Coordinator of Population Affairs

Gordon L. Streeb
Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, Bureau for International Organizations

J. Jarrett Clinton
Agency Director for Population and Health

SUBJECT : Final Report on 1981 State-AID Review of UNFPA

Attached is the final report on the 1981 review of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) that was carried out by a State-AID review team. A separate distribution to Embassies and Missions will follow. Comments on this report will be welcome.

Distribution:

SAA/S&T, N.C. Brady
AA/AFR, F. Ruddy
AA/ASIA (Acting), R. Halligan
AA/LAC-Designate, O. Reich
AA/NE, A. Ford
AA/PPC-Designate, J. Bolton
S&T, C. Farrar
S&T, L. Yeager
S&T/POP, J.J. Speidel
S&T/H, C. Pease
AFR/DR, W. Trayfors
ASIA/TR, M. Jordan
LAC/DR, M. Brackett
NE/TECH, L. Kangas
PPC/PDPR, R. VanDusen
IDCA, F. Li
S&T/POP/DEMO, J. Brackett
S&T/POP/PDD, S. Clark
S&T/POP/R, D. Gillespie
S&T/POP/FPS, D. Newman
S&T/POP/FPS, D. Voran

T - James L. Buckley
S/P - Michael Feldstein
OES - James L. Malone
AF/EPS - R. Pringle
ARA/ECP - C. Allen
EA - A.C. Abrecht
EB - A. Basora
NEA - V. Dickey
INR/EC - L. Giffler
IO/D - E. Parsons
IO/D - A. Gayoso
IO/D - H. Glazer
IO/D - L. Polik
T - W. Salmon
USUN/NY - W. Clark
USUN/NY - R. Zimmerman
EB/IFD/CDF - L Peters
Treasury - T.C. Dawson
Defense - S. Rana
Agriculture - Q.M. West
Commerce - M. Zitter

S&T/POP/IEC, A. Aarnes
S&T/POP/TI, B. Kennedy

HHS - E.G. Peterson
NICHD - N. Kretchmer
OMB - P.A. DuSault
ICA - R.L. Roth
CEA - W. Niskanen
JCS - G.L. Gile
CIA - K.W. Layton
CEQ - K. Plowman
NSF - H. Averch
OST - D.J. Prager
NSC - M. Guhin

FINAL REPORT

1981 State-AID Review

of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities

January 1982

Table of Contents

part		page
I	Executive Summary	1
II	Introduction: Origin and Design of Review; Available Reports	7
III	Survey of Embassies and Missions: Final Report	10
IV	Executive Summary of Consultant Report on UNFPA Intercountry Programs: Dr. Leopold Laufer	24
V	Executive Summary of Consultant Report on UNFPA Assistance to Family Planning Programs: Dr. Lincoln Chen and Mr. David Parker	29

PART I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
FY 1981 STATE-AID REVIEW OF UNFPA ACTIVITIES

During 1981, State and AID jointly conducted the first comprehensive review of activities supported by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). This Executive Summary indicates the background, purposes, major findings, and recommended actions related to this review.

Background and Purpose of Review

On November 12, 1980, the Assistant Administrator of AID's Development Support Bureau determined that a comprehensive review of the activities of UNFPA should be carried out. From 1968 through FY 1980, the U.S. Government had contributed some $236 million to UNFPA which, with the resources contributed by other donors, had made UNFPA the second largest source of population assistance to developing countries. In view of the major U.S. role in supporting UNFPA and recognizing the growing gap between overall requests for population assistance and available resources, the review was intended to assess the purposes and effectiveness of UNFPA programs and to provide guidance for a more productive AID-UNFPA relationship in the decade of the 80's.

The State-AID review team represented the following offices: State - the Coordinator of Population Affairs, and the Bureau for International Organizations; AID - the Office of the Assistant Administrator, DSB, and the Office of Population. This team, directed to work in close coordination with AID's regional bureaus (which had formally requested such a review), with the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, and with UNFPA, was charged with developing an overall plan for the review.

The review plan was completed in January, 1981. This plan, for which UNFPA offered its complete cooperation, consisted of four main parts:

(1) a review of UNFPA's country program assistance - representing about 70 per cent of all UNFPA expenditures;

(2) a review of UNFPA's inter-country assistance programs - the remaining 30 per cent of UNFPA expenditures;

(3) a review of UNFPA's support for family planning programs - the largest single category (about 45 per cent) of country and inter-country expenditures;

(4) a review of UNFPA's program management system.

The review was focussed on UNFPA activity mainly during the period of 1978-80. The review set out to assess UNFPA's performance principally in terms of its own mandate; it did not attempt to compare UNFPA assistance with other assistance to population programs, including that provided by AID.

The second and third elements of the review plan were undertaken by consultants. Shortages of travel funds curtailed the review of country

program activity (element 1 above) to a survey questionnaire which was sent to 68 Embassies and Missions in countries that accounted for more than one-half of all countries that received UNFPA assistance during the period of 1978-1980, and nearly three-quarters of all UNFPA assistance dollars for country assistance programs.

Major Review Findings

1. A continuing UNFPA role is important to the achievement of USG foreign policy objectives.

In their response to the survey questionnaire, 47 of 48 Embassies and Missions responded positively to the question, "Is a continuing UNFPA role important to the achievement of USG population assistance and foreign policy objectives?" Narrative comments specified the U.S. interests that are advanced by UNFPA activity.

Mission and Embassy responses indicated various ways of improving the effectiveness of UNFPA activities and of directing a larger portion of UNFPA assistance to what the U.S. perceives as country priority needs. Overall, more than 90 per cent of the Embassies and Missions that responded to the questionnaire considered UNFPA "effective (to some degree) in providing requested assistance" and judged "UNFPA program activity consistent with the USG country population strategy". UNFPA assistance is considered much more effective in the field of assistance for basic data collection than for family planning programs.

UNFPA assistance serves more than 100 countries and provides a variety of assistance needs that are not always met by AID bilateral population assistance programs and which often are vital to the successful implementation of AID activities. The UNFPA's priority country guidelines and program mandates derive from a set of UN decisions in which the U.S. concurred. UNFPA assistance is allocated differently than AID population assistance because the Governing Council has given UNFPA program guidance that differs from the mandate that directs AID programs. However, it should be noted that UNFPA's program and country priorities are currently changing under the guidance issued by the Governing Council in June, 1981 and, as a result, UNFPA is moving in program directions that should assure greater future coincidence of its priorities and programs with U.S. population program policy objectives - particularly with respect to greater emphasis on family planning assistance.

2. Inadequate resources are becoming a severe restraint in UNFPA programming.

The result is a reduction in some planned activities, a stretching out of other assistance programs, and a slowing of the previously planned expansion of others. Resource adequacy was not specifically addressed

in the survey questionnaire, but there was frequent allusion to this as a problem by Embassies and Missions. Responses from non-priority UNFPA countries were somewhat more likely to stress resource scarcity, with a concomitant recommendation of changes in UNFPA's selection criteria for priority country status. These recommendations for revision of priority country criteria are largely identical with the guidelines that the UNDP Governing Council developed at its session in June, 1981.

3. AID and UNFPA have working relationships that represent generally effective program coordination; certain organizational differences have produced communication gaps which can and should be overcome.

In nearly 90 per cent of the countries with AID bilateral missions, AID and UNFPA field staffs meet at monthly intervals and a similar percentage of all Embassies and Missions exchange program documentation. AID/W backstop staffs for bilateral assistance are in frequent contact with their counterparts at UNFPA headquarters. Communication and program coordination, however, need improvement in the following cases:

- Some countries lack a clearly designated person within the resident U.S. staff with responsibility for coordinating AID centrally-funded population assistance with UNFPA programs. In these cases, UNFPA field staff have no U.S. counterpart for program coordination;

- UNFPA program decisions on country assistance packages are made principally at New York headquarters - rather than in the field as is the case with AID. Understandings of agreements reached by AID field staffs with resident or visiting UNFPA representatives have not always been transmitted to AID/W and to UNFPA/NY, resulting in subsequent misunderstandings between UNFPA and AID headquarters staffs;

- Nearly two-thirds of the countries that receive AID population assistance are provided support only through centrally-funded projects, managed in AID/W; UNFPA staff, both in New York and in the field, are frequently unfamiliar with the country assistance provided by these projects and the relationship of this assistance to UNFPA initiatives; a lack of information on these assistance flows has prevented some potentially useful program coordination, both in New York and in the field.

4. The allocation of UNFPA assistance differs sharply between AID regions in kind and in magnitude; these differences, however, are generally consistent with U.S. interests.

Overall, UNFPA allocates nearly one-half of all country assistance to Asia, and the remainder is divided in roughly equal shares between the

remaining three regions. In Africa and the Near East, however, UNFPA's program provides two to three times more resources for basic data collection assistance than it does in Asia and Latin America and, conversely, Asia and Latin America receive two to five times more resources for family planning assistance than Africa or the Near East.

Despite these differences, 80 per cent or more of the Embassies and Missions that responded to the survey questionnaire, across AID regions, tend to regard UNFPA support for basic data collection as "effective" and two-thirds or more consider UNFPA support for family planning programs "effective" as well.

Nonetheless, in view of the increasing demand for funds the June, 1981, session of the Governing Council called for a "substantial" reduction in UNFPA support for basic data collection and policy development assistance and for a "substantial" increase in support for family planning assistance (taken in its narrower sense).

5. <u>UNFPA's support for inter-country programs will be sharply reduced: further reductions can jeopardize UNFPA's capacity to meet priority assistance needs.</u>

Under the direction of the Governing Council, UNFPA has been reducing the share of its total resources allocated to inter-country programs from close to 50 per cent in the mid-1970's to a target level of 25 per cent (at the end of 1982). The U.S. has generally supported this process. Selected further reductions, particularly in non-project support for the population offices of the U.N. regional economic commissions, may improve the effective use of scarce UNFPA resources. UNFPA inter-country programs have supported useful activities, such as the World Fertility Survey during the 1970's, and they represent a cost-effective way of providing (1) consultant and training services that are useful for some country programs, (2) support for international meetings, and (3) a capacity for various regional and inter-regional initiatives that cannot be funded within individual country programs. The 25 per cent target level for resources allocated to UNFPA's inter-country programs by the end of 1982 is less important than the objective of continuing to provide adequate support for those selected activities that should continue as inter-country programs.

6. <u>UNFPA support for family planning programs is shaped by host country policies, resulting in the provision of considerable assistance for health activities unrelated to family planning. The health-oriented mandates of UNFPA's principal executing agencies also contribute to this mix of activities.</u>

"Family planning" is defined broadly in UNFPA's mandate to include a wide array of assistance for improved maternal and child health. In

requesting UNFPA assistance, many countries give priority to support for health, rather than family planning, activities. This is particularly true in Africa and the Near East where half or more of all respondents reported that host countries give "low priority" to the provision of family planning services. Almost all countries surveyed "favor or require the integration of family planning assistance with maternal-child health or other health programs". In these circumstances about half of UNFPA's family planning assistance represents support for health activities unrelated to family planning.

Moreover, WHO, PAHO, and UNICEF, which frequently serve as executing agencies for UNFPA programs, are oriented to health program support, broadly defined. UNFPA assistance for family planning, in its narrower sense, has grown in recent years with UNFPA's introduction of direct Fund support for country programs and with its use of NGO's that are specialized in family planning assistance, such as the Population Council, as its executing agencies.

USG support for UNFPA derives entirely from funds appropriated for population program assistance. UNFPA's interpretation of "family planning" assistance to include considerable support for health programs has been a concern within AID which was a major consideration in undertaking the current review of UNFPA activity.

Recommended Actions

1. The U.S. should continue financial support for UNFPA.

While no specific support level can be derived from the review findings, the support level adopted should be sufficient to reflect the demonstrated importance of UNFPA activity to the achievement of overall U.S. foreign policy and development assistance interests. The overall level of AID support should take into account the U.S. government's perception of differing regional needs and UNFPA's relative capacity to meet those needs; the likely support for UNFPA from other national donors is also an important consideration. It is possible that any diminution in USG support might be interpreted by other donors and by LDC's as a negative signal with regard to the Fund and international population assistance.

2. The U.S. should encourage and support AID-UNFPA program coordination at all levels.

Where gaps currently exist, members of Embassy or USAID staffs should be assigned responsibility for the coordination of U.S. population

assistance with UNFPA; communications gaps should be bridged, particularly between UNFPA/NY and USAID field staffs, and between AID/W managers of centrally-funded activities and UNFPA staff. Meetings between AID/W regional population offices and UNFPA program support staffs, focussed on regional needs, should be a regularly scheduled occurrence.

3. The U.S. position at the next session of the Governing Council should emphasize

   - that UNFPA should channel a larger proportion of its resources into support for family planning programs - as contrasted with other health programs, particularly by directing requests for health assistance to other UN agencies and by utilizing the most effective executing agencies for UNFPA-funded projects - with particular emphasis on NGO's;

   - the necessity for clear guidance with regard to future funding decisions should take into account the differences between the assistance needs of different geographic regions and the importance of providing policy development assistance that encourages governments to recognize and to address their population problems; and

   - judicious selection of the inter-country programs for which UNFPA support is to be reduced so that assistance needed by country programs and best organized at an inter-country level are not weakened or eliminated.

4. Establishment of a process for the continuing U.S. review of UNFPA activities should be a condition for the continued U.S. support of UNFPA.

   A comprehensive review, covering all major aspects of the UNFPA program, should be undertaken every five years. On a continuing basis, specific problem and country-oriented reviews should be carried out, including intensive, on-site reviews of UNFPA country projects where these activities closely relate to U.S. population assistance objectives.