

PNCA AX-145

12-50230

A GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE
ROLE OF INTERCOUNTRY ACTIVITIES
IN THE UNFPA PROGRAM

A Report Prepared By:
LEOPOLD LAUFER

During The Period:
FEBRUARY 4, 1981 - MAY 18, 1981

Supported By The:
U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
(ADSS) AID/DSPE-C-0053

001318
000191
S

AUTHORIZATION:
Ltr. AID/DS/POP: 6/15/81
Assgn. No. 582078

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study could not have been undertaken and completed without the assistance and cooperation of many persons scattered over three continents. I wish to express special appreciation to Dr. Carl Hemmer, liaison officer, UNFPA, AID/Washington; Ms. Judith Simmons, management assistant, APHA/Washington; Mr. Stephen Viederman, chief, Interregional and Global Projects Section, UNFPA/New York; Ms. Marion O'Connor, chief, Program Statistics Branch, UNFPA/New York; Dr. A. Petros-Barvazian, director, Family Health Division, WHO/Geneva; Mr. Kailas C. Doctor, chief, Population and Labor Policy Branch, ILO/Geneva; Mr. Alexander Graham, director, Population Division, UNESCO/Paris; Mr. William Schulte, population coordinator, FAO/Rome; Dr. Richard Moore, country coordinator, UNFPA/Bangkok; Mr. David Oot, population officer, USAID/Bangkok; Dr. Steven Sinding, chief, Office of Population, Health and Nutrition, USAID/Manila; and Ms. Nancy Hopkins, population consultant, USAID/Manila. I also wish to thank Ms. Maureen Doallas, APHA/Washington, who edited this report.

Leopold Laufer
May 13, 1981

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
ACRONYMS	x
I. INTRODUCTION	
Purpose of the Assignment	1
Itinerary and Methodology	1
II. BACKGROUND AND TRENDS	
Definitions	3
Rationale	4
Programming Trends	5
Program Components	8
III. THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES	
UNFPA Allocations	15
Implementing Agency Commitment to Population Activities	18
A. WHO	19
B. ILO	21
C. UNESCO	21
D. FAO	23
E. ESCAP	23
Policy Implications	24
IV. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION	
Recent Decisions Affecting IC Programs	
A. Governing Council Action on IC Programs	25
B. Governing Council Action on Agency Support Costs	27
Program Implications	27
Program and Project Management and Monitoring	29
Program and Project Evaluation and Review	30

A.	UNFPA Evaluation	30
1.	Period 1972-1977	31
a.	ESCAP Population Programs	31
b.	ESCAF Population Clearing House	31
c.	UNESCO Population Education Clearing House	32
d.	International Institute for Population Studies	32
e.	Latin American Demographic Center (CELADE)	32
f.	Cairo Demographic Center	32
g.	Regional Institute for Population Studies	33
h.	Institut de Formation et de Recherche Demographiques	33
i.	World Fertility Survey	33
j.	Population Education Program of World Assembly of Youth	33
k.	International Audio-Visual Resource Service	34
2.	Period 1978-1980	34
a.	ECA Population Programs	34
b.	African Census Program	34
c.	Research and Action Program Concerning Population and Employment (ILO)	35
d.	Assistance to Research Activities	35
B.	Tripartite Project Review	36
C.	Implementing Agency Evaluation and Review	37
	Policy Implications	39
V.	HIGHLIGHTS AND ISSUES OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS	
	Content and Strategies	40
	Policy Implications	44
	Role of UNFPA in Field Operations	45
	Policy Implications	46
	Interagency Coordination and Collaboration	46
	Policy Implications	49
	Innovation	49
A.	Research	49

1. Land Resources for Populations of the Future	49
2. Risk Approach for Maternal and Child Health Care	50
B. Training and Communication	50
C. Regional Cooperation	51
D. Reaching the Poor	52
Policy Implications	53
VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS	
Place of the IC Program Within Entire UNFPA Program	54
UNFPA Management	54
Role of the Implementing Agencies	55
U.S. Interests in IC Programs	55
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: List of Resource Persons	
Appendix B: Intercountry Programs at Various Percentage Levels of Total Program Allocations	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background and Program Trends

The United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) divides its programs into country programs (CPs) and intercountry programs (ICs). The latter are further subdivided into regional, interregional, and global programs. These account now for approximately 30 percent of the UNFPA's total programs, but by 1982 they will have been reduced to approximately 25 percent in compliance with a 1979 decision by the United Nations Development Program's (UNDP) Governing Council. This action accelerates an existing trend and reflects the aspiration of recipient developing countries for greater concentration of UNFPA resources in CPs and greater control over all the resources of the Fund.

IC activities have had an important and necessary role in the evolution of the UNFPA's program, and they continue to be a key component of the UNFPA's current program. They are most useful as links to the development of country activities; instruments for comparative research; vehicles for regional, subregional, and country-level institution building; and umbrellas for innovation and experimentation. In accordance with current policy, links between IC and country program activities are being strengthened steadily. The two kinds of programs should be seen as complementary, and not competitive.

Over time, the geographic focus of IC activities has been shifted somewhat from the heavy concentration in Asia to other parts of the world. Communication and education and population dynamics have been emphasized over other content areas; family planning activities have been accorded a relatively small role (13-20 percent of funds). This is in sharp contrast to country programs; in these programs family planning accounts for nearly two-thirds of total UNFPA funds. However, the actual focus on family planning in IC programs may be somewhat understated, because family planning is a frequent theme in heavily emphasized communication and education programs and in the so-called "multisector" activities (conferences, missions, and program development presumably related to country programs).

Because of the character of the programs, implementing agencies, including, for the purpose of this analysis, the U.N. Secretariat and the regional commissions, are represented more prominently in IC activities than in country programs. Nonetheless, the UNFPA is gradually assuming an increasing share of responsibility for the "direct execution" of IC projects, which reflects the changing character of the UNFPA--from a largely funding and policy agency to an organization that also conducts operations. If it continues, this trend will have important implications for the UNFPA's structure and operations, including, perhaps, the addition of technical staff.

Implementing Agencies

The implementing agencies are, by and large, capable and equipped to carry out their responsibilities for IC programs, many of which involve the supervision and backstopping of country programs. Although the agencies' policy "commitment" to population concerns is, for the most part, clear, none of them, with the exception of the U.N. Secretariat and the regional commissions, has borne more than approximately 10 percent of the cost of the population activities, and few have made any significant efforts to "infuse" population elements into the broad spectrum of their program operations. In some of the implementing agencies, structural rigidities and lack of support from the top make the "infusion" of population concerns difficult, if not impossible.

U.S. policy on this question has not been consistent; sometimes there have been calls for increased commitment, but more often regular budget increases for population activities have been opposed. U.S. policy has also been heavily influenced by the varying perceptions of the domestic agencies with lead responsibilities for particular implementing agencies. There has been no systematic U.S. Government (USG) approach or strategy to deal with the structural impediments or lack of top-level support where these factors constitute obstacles to increased implementing agency commitment to population concerns.

Program Management and Administration

The process of reducing IC activities to 25 percent of the total program has been painful at times and has disrupted orderly operations. The impact of the action has been magnified by the shrinkage of the UNFPA's resources in 1980, and it is further complicated by a system-wide decision by the U.N. that requires the payment of 13 percent of "agency support costs" (overhead) for each project carried out by implementing agencies. Although this was a technical decision, it is likely to lessen the UNFPA's influence with the agencies as direct funding of "infrastructure" posts is discontinued, and it may stimulate the implementing agencies to "sell" new projects which would bring in additional overhead payments. The response of UNFPA management to these new elements has been to cushion, as much as possible, the disruptive effect and at the same time use the opportunity to streamline the IC program. This action is being accomplished primarily through scaled-down program allocations and the so-called "countryfication" policy, under which country components of IC projects must increasingly be funded from country allotments. No longer will countries be able to regard these programs as "freebies" separate from country programs and requiring few or no inputs from the recipients. Similarly, with the elimination of funding for infrastructure posts, the implementing agencies will be expected to commit their own resources (to be sure, augmented by UNFPA overhead payments) to maintain adequate staffing for population activities.

Clearly, the coincidence of the 25 percent quota, the decision on agency support costs, and the resource crunch have major implications for IC programs. They are forcing a rigorous assessment of priorities and cost-conscious programming, but they also may stifle new initiatives, subordinate broader goals to narrow national interests, and reduce the capacity of the implementing agencies to service UNFPA programs. UNFPA management, recipient countries, and the donor community can influence the outcome of the process through their own actions.

The UNFPA and the implementing agencies share the responsibility for IC program monitoring. The quality and frequency of monitoring appear to be uneven. The principal monitoring instrument is a semi-annual progress report by the implementing agency; it is supplemented by ad hoc correspondence and consultations. As presently constituted, UNFPA headquarters and field staff are not adequately equipped for thorough and systematic monitoring. Although the implementing agencies are, by and large, providing the required reports, the quality of those reports varies. UNFPA management is aware of the problem and is developing a new system to improve the quality of implementing agencies' reports and the monitoring outreach of UNFPA staff.

High-quality evaluations of IC programs are conducted by an independent unit at UNFPA headquarters whose capacity is limited. The implementing agencies make few evaluations or other reviews of IC programs. Tripartite reviews and annual country reviews, which are part of a standard operating procedure for country programs, are not considered to be applicable to IC programs, and in fact such programs are not evaluated, although they are subject to so-called "process" evaluation (monitoring).

Evaluations of IC programs by the UNFPA's Evaluation Office appear to be of high quality, and they invariably contain actionable recommendations which are taken seriously by UNFPA management. They show a "to-be-expected" distribution of successes and shortcomings, but they suffer from an exceedingly long gestation period (18 or more months). Improvement of the inadequate monitoring, evaluation, and review process for IC programs will require not only changes in monitoring procedures (these are under way), but also organizational changes to provide capacities that do not now exist and programming policy changes to make evaluation an integral part of the entire programming process.

Program Operations Highlights and Issues

IC programs offer an excellent opportunity to integrate population concerns with the other development activities of implementing agencies, and, through them, with country development programs generally. To achieve this goal, however, a coordinated strategy aimed at both the agencies and the individual countries, and at both operational and policy levels, is needed.

Most implementing agencies seem to concentrate most heavily on communication and education activities in IC programs. This raises not only

the question of possible duplication of effort, but the more important question of whether such heavy emphasis on communication and education is still required, and if so, where. There also appears to be a heavy concentration on migration research in Asia, but the delineation of scope is not always sufficiently clear to prevent duplication. Decisions to support new IC-funded research should take into account not only the intrinsic long-term value of that research, but also the near-term ability and probability of governments to act on the findings. A reassessment of IC priorities for communication and education and research is also indicated by the relatively large professional staff resources allotted to the activities.

The UNFPA's ability to orchestrate the various IC inputs and IC-related operations of the implementing agencies may be somewhat constrained by administrative decentralization of responsibility at UNFPA headquarters and inadequate capacity for supervision in the field. UNFPA country coordinators and their immediate supervisors--the UNDP resident representatives--are, as their titles imply, country-oriented. Sometimes, they appear to lack the authority to become involved in IC activities. In general, UNFPA coordinators appear to have less authority than officials of some other international agencies. Another limiting factor seems to be the tendency of host governments to assign liaison responsibility for the UNFPA to ministries of health, which may militate against intersectorial or non-health initiatives.

Despite these problems, much consultation and coordination take place among UNFPA implementing agencies, with active stimulation by UNFPA management. Joint execution is rare, but, where it has been attempted, it has apparently been successful. The same can also be said for collaboration with the Agency for International Development (AID) and the UNFPA's participation in multi-donor consortia (e.g., the WHO Special Program of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction). This relatively positive picture, however, is no indication of the growing groundswell of coordination and collaboration, and it should not conceal counterindications of competition for funds and recognition, as well as strong feelings of organizational loyalties and protection of turf. Besides UNFPA management, member countries have responsibilities to ensure that their staffs are better informed about UNFPA programs and that, in their own conduct, they set the tone and direction for a sustained climate of cooperation.

This review of UNFPA IC activities would not be complete if it did not touch on innovation, one of the principal justifications for IC programming. In several important program areas--research, training and communication, regional cooperation, reaching the poor--the author found evidence of innovative and imaginative programming. It is the task of UNFPA management to create a climate for innovation without abandoning necessary discipline or shortchanging the mainstream activities of the organization. It is also the responsibility of the implementing agencies to respond to such stimulation.

Concluding Remarks

1. Within the present framework of UNFPA operations, IC programs occupy a key place, but, as the technical and managerial capacities of recipient countries continue to grow, the need for regionally-funded and regionally-staffed technical and managerial services is likely to decline. At the same time, there will continue to be other activities which can best be funded and managed as IC programs.
2. The UNDP Governing Council and UNFPA management should continue to maintain a balance between IC programs and country programs. This effort will require a certain amount of flexibility to enable management to determine what the proportion of IC programs should be within the entire program.
3. At this time, IC programs depend heavily on the implementing agencies, but the agencies are likely to come under increased pressure as countries, individually or in groups, develop the experience and appetite for direct execution. The implementing agencies face the challenge of proving their worth, both as providers of quality services and as organizations committed to population concerns. And they must prove their worth if they wish to maintain a major role in the UNFPA's program.
4. The UNFPA continues to finance a number of major IC programs of prime interest to the USG. Both the UNFPA and its implementing agencies have access where U.S. bilateral programs may not. Although the UNFPA's and AID's mandates are in harmony, they are not identical, and it would be unrealistic to expect either the approach or program priority to be completely identical. It appears that the IC programs serve U.S. interests and priorities reasonably well. Even better results could be achieved if the policies and strategies of U.S. agencies involved in population programs were coordinated more closely with the lead responsibilities for relations with principal implementing agencies.

ACRONYMS

AID	Agency for International Development
APHA	American Public Health Association
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
CELADE	Inter-American Institute for Demographic Studies
CP	Country Program
DTCP	Development Training and Communication Planning (Bangkok)
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECLA	Economic Commission for Latin America
ESCAP	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
FP	Family Planning
IC	Intercountry Program
IEC	Information, Education, Communication
IFORD	Institut de Formation et de Recherche Demographiques (Yaoundé)
IIPS	International Institute for Population Studies
ILO	International Labour Organization
INT/GLO	Interregional/Global
IPPF	International Planned Parenthood Federation
IUD	Intrauterine Device
KAP	Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (of Family Planning)
LA/C	Latin America/Caribbean
MCH	Maternal and Child Health
ME/M/E	Middle East/Mediterranean/Europe

NESDB	National Economic and Social Development Board (Thailand)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PAHO	Pan American Health Organization
PHC	Primary Health Care
RIPS	Regional Institute for Population Studies (Accra)
SEARO	Southeast Asia Region (WHO)
TBA	Traditional Birth Attendant
TCDC	Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries
TFR	Total Fertility Rate
TPR	Tripartite Project Review
UN-DTCD	United Nations Department of Technical Cooperation for Development
UN-OFS	United Nations Office of Financial Services
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Fund for Population Activities
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
WAY	World Assembly of Youth
WFS	World Fertility Survey
WHO	World Health Organization
WPRO	Western Pacific Regional Organization (WHO)

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Assignment

The purpose of this assignment was to contribute to a general assessment of the work of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), which was undertaken by a team of AID officers and consultants provided by the American Public Health Association (APHA). The author's specific task was to examine in depth that part of UNFPA's program generally referred to as intercountry programs (i.e., programs not funded from country allocations). By identifying these programs and examining their role within the general UNFPA program, as well as their relationship to UNFPA country programs and other population programs, the author has been able to prepare a report that complements and forms part of the review team's assessment of UNFPA's entire program.

Itinerary and Methodology

Following a briefing on February 4, 1981, by Mr. Carl Hemmer, of the AID Population Office, and Messrs. Harry Glazer and John Yates, of the Department of State, the consultant spent six working days reading background material and interviewing AID officials who have a special interest in the UNFPA, and particularly its intercountry programs. The purpose of these preliminary interviews was to identify the views and particular areas of interest of AID officials. The consultant also spent two days in preliminary discussions with UNFPA officials in New York to obtain a general view of UNFPA policies on intercountry programs and to plan the field visits that were considered to be crucial to the assignment. In consultation with the head of the core review team, the consultant agreed to the following schedule of work and itinerary:

- a. Washington, D.C., February 17-19: Administrative preparations for field travel and interviews with Pan American Health Organization (PAHO).
- b. New York City, February 23-27, UNFPA Headquarters: Review of files and interviews with program and policy officers; interviews with staff of U.N. Secretariat, Population Division, Statistical Office, other U.N. agencies, and the U.S. mission to the United Nations.
- c. Geneva, March 2-5, World Health Organization (WHO) and International Labour Organization (ILO) Headquarters: Interviews and review of documents.

- d. Paris, March 5-6, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Headquarters: Interviews and review of documents.
- e. Rome, March 9-10, United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) Headquarters: Interviews and review of documents.
- f. Bangkok, March 16-24, Regional offices for major parts of Asia and the Pacific for FAO, UNESCO, and ILO: Interviews, review of documents, and project visits, as appropriate. U.N. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP): Interviews and review of documents; interviews with officials of the USAID, the Thai Government, the UNFPA, and other U.N. agencies.
- g. Manila, March 25-April 1, Western Pacific Regional Office (WPRO) of WHO: Interviews, reviews of documents; interviews with USAID personnel, officials of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Philippine Government, and non-government officials and experts; project visits, as appropriate.
- h. Washington, D.C., April and May: Analysis of data and preparation of report.

II. BACKGROUND AND TRENDS

Definitions

The UNFPA program is divided into two broad categories: country programs (CPs) and intercountry (IC) programs. The latter, which are the principal subject of this report, are further divided into three sub-categories:

- a. Regional--activities involving several countries or regional bodies within one of the UNFPA's five geographic regions (Latin America and the Caribbean (LA/C), Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Europe, the Middle East, and the Mediterranean (ME/M));
- b. Interregional--activities involving two or more, but not all, regions; and
- c. Global--activities involving all regions.

The dividing line between the different sub-categories is not always clear. Division is complicated further by the differing geographic definitions used by the UNFPA and the various implementing agencies. For example, the Cairo Demographic Center, essentially a regional institution serving the Arab countries, is considered to be an interregional project because it serves countries located in three of the UNFPA's regions: Europe and the Mediterranean, the Middle East, and Africa. UNFPA fellowships for an individual from Thailand may come from a global block allocation through the U.N. Secretariat's Department of Technical Cooperation for Development (UN-DTC/D), the regional FAO/ASEAN population program, or the Thailand country program. The WHO-operated Population Documentation Center, located in New Delhi, is funded by the UNFPA as an Asian regional project, but it serves only that part of Asia included in the WHO's South-east Asia Region (SEARO).

These incongruities are of more than academic interest, for they have practical implications for the programs and their administration. For example, Asian countries outside the WHO SEARO region do not benefit from the Population Documentation Center's project, although, from a programming standpoint, they could and probably should. Administratively, the UNFPA headquarters backstops regional activities through five regional project branches and interregional and global (INT/GLO) activities through the Planning and Interregional Global Projects Branch. A project such as the Cairo Demographic Center requires coordination at UNFPA headquarters between at least three regional branches and the Planning and Interregional/

Global Projects Branch, which, officially, is responsible for the project. It appears that there is little practical distinction between interregional activities and global projects. Thus, one might ask whether the distinction drawn between these two categories is significant.

Rationale

Even more important to an understanding of IC activities than the question of definitions is the rationale for the IC approach. The following reasons are given frequently to explain the approach:

- a. IC activities are the link and bridge to the development of country activities; they provide the technical and institutional backstopping frequently needed to carry out country population projects. By using expertise and institutional resources for more than a single country, this approach is also more cost-effective.
- b. Certain specialized research programs, such as WHO's Special Program of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction, or the World Fertility Survey (WFS) and follow-up, can best be carried out as intercountry projects.
- c. Transnational problems, such as international migration or urbanization, lend themselves to multi-country and comparative approaches.
- d. Innovative, experimental projects require resource inputs and risk-taking which cannot be expected in country programs.
- e. Regional institutions can be developed or strengthened and in turn influence the entire region. They also may be a resource for country programs. Good examples of such institutions are the Inter-American Institute for Demographic Studies (CELADE) and the Population Division of the U.N. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP).

From his observations the author has concluded that the rationale for IC activities is valid and is likely to remain so for some time. Particularly impressive is the link between intercountry and country programs which, for reasons still to be discussed, is likely to become even

closer in the near future. This link can take several different forms. In one form, lessons learned from an IC project may be incorporated into the design of country projects. This is being done in the Philippines, where rural boticas (pharmacies), which had been tested successfully in the IC-funded Bohol Maternal and Child Health-Based Family Planning Project, are being established. The regionally-funded Clearing House and Information Section of ESCAP provides another example. It has promoted for some time the establishment of national population clearinghouses in the region. Such clearinghouses are operating now in Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, South Korea, Sri Lanka, and Thailand. ESCAP has been designated the implementing agency to establish UNFPA-funded population information centers in Viet Nam and China. In yet another form, regional training establishments, such as the Development Training and Communication Planning (DTCP) organization in Bangkok, may work in many countries, with the funding coming from both regional and country programs.

The rationale for experimentation and innovation, which often are linked to country follow-up, is important to considerations of the usefulness of the IC approach. A good example is the FAO regionally-funded action-research project to investigate conditions in fishing villages in Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia, with special reference to demography. The project, initiated in 1978 and terminated in 1980, sought to encourage policymakers to focus on these typically disadvantaged communities and documented the conditions of uncertain income, malnutrition, low levels of literacy, high fertility, and mortality. As a result of the effort, Indonesia has prepared a five-and-one-half-year, \$2.34 million program for which it has requested assistance from Japan. The Philippine Population Commission is carrying out a second-stage pilot project (see Chapter V) and is considering a four-year expanded program. Thailand's Institute of Population Studies is drafting a proposal that will be submitted to the government's planning authorities.

The author does not doubt the validity of the rationale for IC activities, but he would emphasize that national officials are highly competent and desire to focus their attention largely on country projects. Any policy review or modification must clearly take into account the legitimacy of these observations, just as the UNFPA's present programming policy is attempting to do.

Programming Trends

Earlier, IC activities occupied a much more important place in the UNFPA's program than they do at this time. In the early period of UNFPA activity, IC activities comprised as much as two-thirds of the program. Their importance has declined gradually, and they now account for approximately one-third of the program (see Tables 1 and 2). This decline can

Table 1
UNFPA ACTUAL EXPENDITURES, 1968-1979
(U.S.\$000s)

	<u>1968-1972</u>	<u>1973-1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
<u>Country Programs</u>				
Africa	954	24,716	7,687	14,071
Asia	4,738	76,076	29,009	42,430
Latin America/Caribbean (LA/C)	994	43,956	12,855	14,450
Middle East/Mediterranean/ Europe (ME/M/E)	2,261	31,998	9,187	11,547
<u>Country Total</u>	8,947	176,746	58,738	82,498
<u>Intercountry Programs</u>				
Regional Africa	1,420	11,762	2,390	3,669
Regional Asia	2,533	12,208	3,973	4,722
Regional LA/C	1,060	17,462	4,316	5,869
Regional ME/M/E	439	5,355	1,503	1,993
<u>Regional Total</u>	5,442	46,787	12,182	16,253
Interregional	9,940	42,591	7,946	11,694
Global	2,142	30,565	10,213	16,948
<u>Intercountry Total</u>	17,524	119,943	30,341	44,895
 GRAND TOTAL	 <u>26,471</u>	 <u>296,689</u>	 <u>89,079</u>	 <u>127,393</u>

Source: Program Statistics Unit, UNFPA.

Table 2
UNFPA ACTUAL EXPENDITURES, 1968-1979
(In Percentage Shares)

	<u>1968-1972</u>	<u>1973-1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
<u>Country Programs</u>				
Africa	3.6	8.3	8.6	11.1
Asia	17.9	25.7	32.6	33.3
LA/C	3.8	14.8	14.4	11.3
ME/M/E	8.5	10.8	10.3	9.1
<u>Country Total</u>	33.8	59.6	65.9	64.8
<u>Intercountry Programs</u>				
Regional Africa	5.4	4.0	2.7	2.9
Regional Asia	9.6	4.1	4.5	3.7
Regional LA/C	4.0	5.9	4.8	4.6
Regional ME/M/E	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.5
<u>Regional Total</u>	20.6	15.8	13.7	12.7
Interregional	37.5	14.3	8.9	9.2
Global	8.1	10.3	11.5	13.3
<u>Intercountry Total</u>	66.2	40.4	34.1	35.2
GRAND TOTAL	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Source: Program Statistics Unit, UNFPA.

be traced directly to the increased capacity of the developing countries to carry out national programs and their desire for more control over the external population funds available to them. The international community, including the major donors, UNFPA management, and, to a lesser extent, the major implementing agencies, have supported this orientation, although there are fears that this trend, if pushed too far, could impair the effectiveness of the program.

Tables 1 and 2 show the geographic distribution of IC activities. The early dominance of Asian regional programs parallels the geographic trend of country programs. In the middle and late 1970s, however, the trends in regional and country distribution diverged, with regional institutions in Latin America and the Caribbean receiving a larger share of funds than those in Asia. This development reflects two factors: the rapid growth of two principal hemispheric regional institutions, the Population Division of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) and the Inter-American Demographic Institute, which later merged into a single organization, and the relatively smaller role of country programs in Latin America, as compared to activities in Asia. In a broader sense, this trend reflects the more profound differences in the characteristics of the two regions to which the UNFPA has had to adapt.

In examining the relative weight of the three categories of IC activities, regional, interregional, and global, it is evident that here, too, significant changes have occurred over time. Whereas interregional programs were the strongest component of IC activities in the early period, they now occupy third place, after global and regional projects. This trend can be expected to continue. In fact, with the steady growth of country activities in the overall program, one can anticipate a gradual phaseout of interregional activities, with regional projects playing primarily a supporting role for country projects and global activities picking up all the non-country concerns of the organization.

Program Components

The UNFPA classifies program activities under eight basic categories or program components: (a) basic data collection; (b) population dynamics; (c) formulation and evaluation of population policies and programs; (d) implementation of policies; (e) family planning programs; (f) communication and education; (g) special programs; and (h) multisector activities. Without going into a detailed analysis of these categories, the author must point out that, as a guide to the substance of the UNFPA's IC activities, these categories are seriously deficient. The "multisector," "special programs," and "policy implementation" categories tell us nothing about the actual substance of the programs, and even the other categories may disguise more than they reveal. The "communication and education" and "multisector" categories, for instance, may include much "family

planning"-oriented activity, whereas the "family planning" category may include health activities that are linked only remotely to family planning. With these caveats in mind, it is useful to examine the sectorial content of the UNFPA's IC activities, especially as it relates to family planning activities.

If we look at regional activities (see Tables 3 and 4), it is evident that the greatest emphasis has been on communication and education, followed closely by population dynamics. Family planning activities accounted for about one-fifth of all regional projects until 1977, when they began to decline, and ultimately reached a level of 13.3 percent in 1979. Although the focus on family planning may have been greater throughout because it was "infused" into other sectors, there seems to have been some net slackening in the family planning effort at the regional level. The sectors which apparently gained during the 1969-1979 period were population dynamics and multisector activities (i.e., projects related to demographic research and training, and to missions, conferences, program development, etc., that are, presumably, linked to country programs).

Looking at interregional and global activities for the same period (see Tables 5 and 6), we note that family planning programs declined from nearly one-third in the 1969-1975 period to about one-fifth in 1976, the level that has been maintained consistently since then. The principal sectors that gained during the period 1969-1979 were basic data collection, which would include such activities as the World Fertility Survey, censuses, vital registration, etc.; communication and education; and formulation and evaluation of population policies and programs.

Before proceeding to comments on these trends, it should be noted that, in country programs, family planning accounted for 65.2 percent of the resources in 1976. This figure declined to 56.8 percent in 1979.¹

Several comments are appropriate, given the analysis of the data for the period 1969-1979:

- a. There appears to have been an overall decline in the percentage share (though not total funds) going to the family planning sector in both inter-country and country programs.
- b. Family planning, nevertheless, remains the major sector in country programs, accounting for well over half of the funds designated for country activities.

¹ Program Statistics Unit, UNFPA.

Table 3
ACTUAL EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM SECTOR, 1969-1979
(U.S.\$000s)

	<u>1969-1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
<u>Regional Projects</u>					
Basic Data Collection	\$ 2,481	\$ 845	\$ 877	\$ 812	\$ 1,284
Population Dynamics	4,447	2,855	2,664	2,500	3,757
Formulation and Evaluation of Population Policies and Programs	5,502	862	914	1,364	1,909
Implementation of Policies	---	---	53	12	---
Family Planning Programs	6,934	2,304	2,416	2,163	2,158
Communication and Education	10,947	2,930	3,003	3,686	4,684
Special Programs	276	155	228	20	278
Multisector Activities	<u>2,522</u>	<u>1,072</u>	<u>1,131</u>	<u>1,624</u>	<u>2,157</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$33,108</u>	<u>\$11,022</u>	<u>\$11,286</u>	<u>\$12,180</u>	<u>\$16,226</u>

Source: Program Statistics Unit, UNFPA.

Table 4
 ACTUAL EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM SECTOR, 1969-1979
 (In Percentage Shares)

	<u>1969-1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
<u>Regional Projects</u>					
Basic Data Collection	7.4	7.7	7.8	6.6	7.9
Population Dynamics	13.4	25.9	23.6	20.5	23.2
Formulation and Evaluation of Population Policies and Programs	16.7	7.8	8.0	11.2	11.7
Implementation of Policies	---	---	0.5	0.1	---
Family Planning Programs	21.0	20.9	21.4	17.8	13.3
Communication and Education	33.0	26.6	26.6	30.3	28.9
Special Programs	1.0	1.4	2.1	0.2	1.7
Multisector Activities	<u>7.6</u>	<u>9.7</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>13.3</u>
TOTAL	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Source: Author's calculation based on UNFPA Program Statistics.

Table 5
ACTUAL EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM SECTOR, 1969-1979
(U.S. \$000s)

	<u>1969-1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
<u>Interregional and Global Projects</u>					
Basic Data Collection	\$ 3,293	\$ 1,536	\$ 1,916	\$ 2,987	\$ 3,162
Population Dynamics	7,133	2,350	2,113	2,519	4,068
Formulation and Evaluation of Population Policies and Programs	1,662	697	861	1,384	2,463
Implementation of Policies	---	3	---	---	4
Family Planning Programs	18,366	2,582	2,990	3,590	5,183
Communication and Education	3,423	1,478	2,096	2,791	3,967
Special Programs	3,502	615	381	932	1,206
Multisector Activities	<u>20,201</u>	<u>3,280</u>	<u>3,092</u>	<u>3,956</u>	<u>4,998</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$57,580</u>	<u>\$12,546</u>	<u>\$13,449</u>	<u>\$18,159</u>	<u>\$25,051</u>

Source: Program Statistics Unit, UNFPA.

Table 6
 ACTUAL EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM SECTOR, 1969-1979
 (In Percentage Shares)

	<u>1969-1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>
<u>Interregional and Global Projects</u>					
Basic Data Collection	5.7	12.2	14.3	16.4	12.6
Population Dynamics	12.4	18.7	15.7	13.9	16.3
Formulation and Evaluation of Population Policies and Programs	2.9	5.6	6.4	7.6	9.8
Implementation of Policies	---	0.0	---	---	0.0
Family Planning Programs	31.9	20.6	22.2	19.8	20.7
Communication and Education	5.9	11.8	15.6	15.4	15.8
Special Programs	6.1	4.9	2.8	5.1	4.8
Multisector Activities	<u>35.1</u>	<u>26.2</u>	<u>23.0</u>	<u>21.8</u>	<u>20.0</u>
TOTAL	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Source: Program Statistics Unit, UNFPA.

- c. Compared to its prominence in country programs, family planning occupies a much more modest place in IC programs, accounting for a maximum of one-fifth of the funds.
- d. To the extent that "family planning," designated directly or indirectly through other sectors, is present in IC activities, it helps prepare the ground and strengthens associated country programs. Its relatively modest role in IC programs understates its importance to the entire effort of the UNFPA in family planning.

III. THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES

UNFPA Allocations

The UNFPA was conceived originally to be primarily a funding and policy agency; major responsibility for the execution of programs was to rest largely with the operational arms of the U.N. family, notably, the U.N. Secretariat, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the U.N. specialized agencies. This concept has been considerably modified over time, with the UNFPA itself, recipient countries, and non-governmental organizations assuming a more significant role in the formulation and execution of programs and projects. This trend, however, seems to have affected country programs more than intercountry programs, where the U.N. agencies continue to dominate.

Looking at regional projects (see Tables 7 and 8), the prominence of the U.N. Secretariat is apparent immediately. The Secretariat accounted for nearly half of the regional funds in the early period. This trend has continued. Since 1979, however, the U.N. regional commissions have been separated, for funding purposes, from the U.N. Secretariat allocation. This change reflects, perhaps, the somewhat greater autonomy of the U.N. regional commissions, but it does not alter the fact that the U.N. Secretariat as a whole (for the regional commissions are part of the Secretariat) continues to play a very large role in UNFPA regional programs.

The next most important organization in the early period was the World Health Organization, although its share seems to have declined over time. The Food and Agricultural Organization has received the smallest share of UNFPA regional funds, an indication, perhaps, of the order of priorities as perceived by the UNFPA and the FAO itself. One other trend is worth noting: the increase in direct execution by the UNFPA, which rose from an insignificant share in the early period to almost 9 percent by 1979.

An examination of interregional and global allocations reveals that at the beginning the U.N. Secretariat had a rather small role, and that this role diminished between 1976 and 1979. WHO, as the largest recipient agency, accounted for almost a quarter of the funds in the early period, but its share declined to approximately 15 percent in 1979. Modest increases in the allotments to the FAO brought that agency to a level comparable to that of other U.N. specialized agencies. More significant perhaps are the increase in UNFPA-executed projects, which rose from 4.4 percent in the early period to 13.9 percent in 1979, and the growing use of non-governmental organizations, which by 1979 were the largest recipients in the interregional and global category, accounting for more than one-third of the funds.

Table 7

ACTUAL EXPENDITURES BY IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES, 1969-1979
(In U.S.\$000s and Percentage Shares)

	1969-1975		1976		1977		1978		1979	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
<u>Regional Projects</u>										
UN-OFS	4,595	13.8	1,386	12.5	1,518	13.5	1,506	12.4	2,045	12.6
UN-TCO	11,037	33.3	4,292	38.9	4,220	37.4	4,270	35.0	2,476	15.2
ILO	3,409	10.2	847	7.6	1,132	10.0	942	7.7	1,152	7.1
FAO	792	2.3	259	2.3	390	3.5	301	2.5	601	3.7
UNESCO	4,150	12.5	1,422	12.9	1,304	11.6	1,734	14.2	2,337	14.4
WHO	5,368	16.2	1,779	16.1	1,763	15.6	1,678	13.8	1,848	11.3
UNFPA	561	1.6	419	3.8	310	2.8	578	4.7	1,414	8.7
NGO	3,191	9.6	615	5.5	644	5.7	1,169	9.6	928	5.7
UNICEF									7	0.04
ECLA									2,733	16.8
ESCAP									678	4.1
TOTAL	<u>33,107</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>11,022</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>11,285</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>12,180</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>16,225</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 8

ACTUAL EXPENDITURES BY IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES, 1969-1979
(In U.S.\$000s and Percentage Shares)

	<u>1969-1975</u>		<u>1976</u>		<u>1977</u>		<u>1978</u>		<u>1979</u>	
	<u>\$</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Interregional Projects</u>										
UN-OFS	6,881	11.9	1,180	9.4	1,264	9.4	1,386	7.6	1,679	6.7
UN-TCD	4,763	8.2	1,305	10.4	729	5.4	1,258	6.9	1,090	4.3
ILO	5,529	9.6	1,617	12.8	1,737	12.9	2,068	11.4	2,509	10.0
FAO	3,051	5.3	1,164	9.2	1,546	11.5	1,481	8.2	2,262	9.0
UNESCO	5,114	8.8	1,311	10.4	1,019	7.6	1,373	7.6	1,549	6.1
WHO	13,567	23.5	2,278	18.1	2,065	15.4	2,592	14.3	3,755	14.9
UNFPA	2,587	4.4	807	6.4	1,133	8.4	2,287	12.6	3,499	13.9
NGO	12,112	21.0	2,611	20.8	3,189	23.7	5,637	31.0	8,590	34.2
UNIDO	67	0.1								
UNICEF	<u>3,905</u>	<u>6.7</u>	<u>269</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>762</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>0.4</u>
TOTAL	<u>57,580</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>12,546</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>12,448</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>18,158</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>25,050</u>	<u>100.0</u>

The following conclusions may be drawn from the foregoing analysis of the role of implementing agencies in IC programs:

- a. In both regional and interregional and global programs, the UNFPA is assuming an increasing share of responsibility for the execution of programs. Although this share comes nowhere near the figure of approximately 50 percent found in the 1979 country programs, it is additional evidence of the changing character of the UNFPA (i.e., from a funding and policy agency to an organization that combines these functions with the execution of programs and projects). These changes have significant implications for the internal structure and operation of the UNFPA, and they may require the addition of technical staff at headquarters and in the field.
- b. Since 1979, the U.N. regional commissions have been receiving their own funding allocations, which are separate from those of the U.N. Secretariat. More recently, ESCAP has been designated an implementing agency for country programs. There is other evidence of the enhanced prominence of the U.N. regional commissions. In 1979, the joint ECLA/CELADE program was the single largest recipient of regional funds (16.8 percent). Increased prominence and control of funds should receive more attention from donors and the UNFPA.
- c. Conspicuous because of its relatively small role in relation to all implementing agencies is UNICEF, which, traditionally, has been a principal procurement agency for the U.N. system, particularly for contraceptives, medical supplies, and transportation equipment. UNICEF's role in IC programs never was significant and has virtually disappeared, although in country programs it accounted for 11.6 percent of funds in 1979, virtually all of which were for commodities. UNICEF's mandate coincides, in part, with that of the UNFPA ("responsible parenthood"); one might expect, therefore, that UNICEF would play a more substantive role in the UNFPA program.

Implementing Agency Commitment to Population Activities

The UNFPA clearly has primary responsibility in the U.N. system to finance and encourage population activities, but its mandate is not, nor

was it meant to be, exclusive. In fact, as a result of the decision of the U.N. General Assembly to endorse the 1974 World Population Plan of Action, all U.N. agencies are committed to give support to population activities. Most of these agencies had announced their support of population activities before the General Assembly's decision.

How committed are the UNFPA implementing agencies that belong to the U.N. family? The question is relevant to this discussion, for it involves directly the functioning of population units at the headquarters of U.N. specialized agencies, and at the regional outposts funded from UNFPA IC allotments, and the influence those units have on their respective agencies. The author sought to determine the total "involvement" of executing agencies in population activities, apart from and in addition to UNFPA funding, by examining (a) Regular Budget allocations and (b) the infusion of population elements into other agency programs. He found that precise figures were not always available and that it was particularly difficult to measure "infusion." Nevertheless, the author did find that it is possible to shed some light on this general question.

A. WHO

The WHO includes most population activities in the component known as "Family Health," which, in the 1980-1981 biennial budget, amounted to \$144 million, or 16 percent of the total budget. As is evident from Table 9, 9 percent of this component is financed from Regular Budget resources. However, only two sub-components of the Family Health Program--maternal and child health (MCH) and the Special Program of Research Development and Training in Human Reproduction--are predominantly population-related. For these, the percentage share of funds from the Regular Budget is 6.4 percent and 1.9 percent, respectively. These are the lowest shares in the family health budget. WHO officials point out that some population-related activities listed under "Health Services" and "Health Information" also receive support from the Regular Budget and, more important, that family planning is now an accepted element of primary health care (PHC), which is considered to be the principal means to achieving WHO's overall goal of "health for all by the year 2000."* "For WHO it is no longer a question of 'Why Family Planning?' but how best to do it," said one senior WHO official. The same official also said that WHO's Seventh General Program for 1984-1989 would include as one objective an increase in the number of family planning practitioners from 30 percent to 60 percent by 1989. To achieve this objective, many more resources would be required than are now available to WHO from the UNFPA and its own Regular Budget. Moreover, it would be necessary to more completely integrate population activities into the operational program components, particularly those related to primary health care.

* This was the slogan adopted at the Alma Ata Conference.

Table 9

POPULATION ACTIVITIES IN THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION, 1980-1981
(In U.S.\$000s, By Source of Funding)

	Regular Budget		Other Sources		Total
	\$	%	\$	%	\$
<u>Family Health</u>					
1. Program Planning and General Activities	850	12.4	6,011	87.6	6,861
2. Maternal and Child Health	4,947	6.4	72,747	93.6	77,693
3. Nutrition	4,344	26.0	12,391	74.0	16,736
4. Special Program of Research, Development, and Training in Human Reproduction	697	1.9	36,806	98.1	37,503
5. Health Education	<u>2,152</u>	<u>39.8</u>	<u>3,252</u>	<u>60.2</u>	<u>5,404</u>
TOTAL	<u>12,990</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>131,207</u>	<u>91.0</u>	<u>144,197</u>

Source: Author's calculation based on WHO Summary Tables for
Program Analysis (WHO PB/82-83).

B. ILO

Population concerns in this organization are largely concentrated in the Population and Labor Policies Branch, whose staff and activities have, until now, been funded almost entirely by the UNFPA. The proposed 1982-1983 Program and Budget provides for the first time full funding from the Regular Budget for the director of the program. This amounts to approximately 0.7 percent of the anticipated resources of \$17.5 million. The population program has been endorsed by the Governing Body, but it does not appear to have much priority in the ILO's total program, and it seems to be removed from the mainstream of the organization's work. The program was last discussed by the Governing Body in 1979, and it is not expected to be discussed again until 1983. The director-general does not appear to have endorsed the program, or to have given it his attention in some time. Nevertheless, the Population and Labor Policies Branch has had fruitful contacts with the Training Department, the Office of Women Workers, and the Cooperatives Branch, and it participates in the briefings of outgoing field personnel.

C. UNESCO

Population-related programs in UNESCO are divided between the Population Division, in the so-called Social Science Sector, and the Equality of Educational Opportunity and Special Programs Division, located in the Education Sector. As Table 10 shows, UNESCO funds between 11 percent and 12 percent of its population program from Regular Budget resources, but it has no plans to increase its funding. Moreover, virtually all Regular Budget funds go for headquarters expenses, a policy criticized last year by the Advisory Committee of Ministers of Education.

Because UNESCO's structure is strictly compartmentalized, the integration of population activities with other agency activities runs counter to the agency's basic orientation, despite exhortations to the contrary and the existence of a number of intersectorial or interdepartmental groups. Population program officers have taken part in some ad hoc training and briefing sessions for experts, other headquarters staff, and UNESCO national commissions. Relations between the two divisions that are responsible for the bulk of the population program seem to be good, but there does not appear to be any significant sharing of responsibilities, even in closely related areas such as population communication and non-formal population education.

Table 10
POPULATION ACTIVITIES IN UNESCO, 1979-1983
(By Source of Funding)

<u>Period</u>	Total UNESCO Population Program		Financed Under			
			UNESCO Regular Program		UNFPA	
	<u>\$</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>%</u>
1979-1980	11,505,000	100	1,405,000	12.2	10,100,000	87.8
1981-1983	<u>20,590,000</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>2,390,000</u>	<u>11.6</u>	<u>18,200,000</u>	<u>88.4</u>
TOTAL, 1979-1983	<u>32,095,000</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>3,795,000</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>28,300,000</u>	<u>88.2</u>

Source: Bureau of the Budget, UNESCO.

D. FAO

The organization of population programs at FAO differs significantly from that in the other specialized agencies. The focal point of population concerns in the FAO is the "FAO Population Program Coordinator," located in the Office of the Assistant Director-General for Economic and Social Development, one of seven major departments of the organization. This person's mandate is to ensure the inclusion of a population component in the FAO's program. The Regular Budget finances between \$400,000 and \$500,000 of population activities per year, or approximately 10 percent of the total FAO population budget. No increase in this level of support is anticipated, although, in the aftermath of the World Population Conference, the 1974 FAO Council went on record as strongly favoring population programs. The director-general, who is known to be particularly conscious of the relationship between food and population, has recently shown himself to be flexible in this regard by agreeing to absorb the costs of part of the second phase of a UNFPA-financed soil and population capacity survey into the FAO's regular 1982-1983 budget.

At least 10 divisions, or units, at FAO headquarters are involved in population activities. The coordinator seeks to raise consciousness, particularly of field staff, through personal briefings of FAO country representatives and program officers, and by including pertinent information in the briefing guide for FAO representatives. Although the structure and the orientation of the personnel favor the integration of population concerns, the relatively low level of total funding (approximately \$5.2 million in 1980) limits the extent of infusion within the organization.

E. ESCAP

ESCAP is not an "operational" agency in the same sense as the U.N. specialized agencies, but its activities in population can, to some extent, be compared to those of other UNFPA implementing agencies. It is worth noting that of the estimated \$3 million budgeted for ESCAP's Population Division in 1980, 25 percent came from ESCAP's Regular Budget, 70 percent from the UNFPA, and 5 percent from other external donors. The likelihood that additional funds will become available from the Regular Budget may depend on the action of the recently-appointed executive secretary of ESCAP. The Commission recently recommended (March 1981) that population be designated a "priority" area within ESCAP. Responsibility for ESCAP's population program rests with the Population Division and is not shared with any other part of the organization. Cooperation from other divisions is limited. There appears to be competition among the divisions, which may bar the infusion of population concerns into other elements of the ESCAP program.

Policy Implications

In this brief survey of the "involvement" of UNFPA implementing agencies in population activities, the author has highlighted both differences and similarities, and he has raised some important questions as well.

The budgetary contribution of most implementing agencies to UNFPA-funded activities is minimal, and it is not likely to increase unless the donor countries which are contributors to both organizations make special efforts. The USG has not had a consistent policy on this question. The U.S. delegations that are concerned with the programs and policies of these agencies have sometimes called for increased commitments to population activities, whereas those concerned with budgeting have resisted program growth. U.S. support for population activities varies also with the interest and commitment of the particular U.S. domestic agencies with lead responsibility for U.S. participation.

The infusion of population concerns into the broader programs of the implementing agencies seems to depend primarily on the structural framework within which population activities are carried out and, to a lesser extent, on the actions of senior officials and executive bodies. The USG has not identified either the structural changes that are needed to increase the outreach of population programs within the particular agency, or the strategies that are required to ensure the sustained support of the senior official governing body for population activities.

IV.. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Recent Decisions Affecting IC Programs

A. Governing Council Action on IC Programs

In 1979, the UNDP Governing Council decided that IC activities in the future should be "within the level of approximately 25 percent of total program resources" (DP/L/328/Add.5, para. 4). By its decision, the Council indirectly reaffirmed the principles which UNFPA management intended to apply to bring IC activities to the desired level. The principles, enunciated by the U.N. General Assembly (31/170) are:

- preference for regional and subregional projects, as opposed to interregional and global projects;
- concentration of support on the major programs identified as not only useful but necessary;
- projects required for technical backstopping of country programs;
- support for directly executed projects which will enhance self-reliance; and
- projects that have a multiplier effect, especially those leading to collaboration in several disciplines and supporting technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC).

The Council's decision was a response to years of persistent pressure to place the UNFPA's resources at the disposal of national governments to execute national projects. This orientation, although reflecting the wishes of the developing countries in particular, was endorsed also by the donor community, including the United States.

The application of the new rule, as outlined by the executive director in his report to the Council (DP/406), was to result in a number of across-the-board reductions in program activities, including advisory staffs and training, and research and promotional activities. New activities also were to be limited. For example, there would be:

- a. Reductions in the basic data sector for in-depth and comparative analyses of World Fertility Survey data, regional inputs to develop survey capability in countries, and research to improve the methodology for data collection.
- b. Reductions in the population dynamics sector for studies on mortality differentials and their effects on development efforts, regional advisers on labor and population dynamics and on data analysis and utilization, the demographic aspects of agricultural growth and rural development, and demographic modeling.
- c. Reductions in the population policy sector for advisory services, mortality effects on health and development, links between internal migration and development strategies, and the exchange of information on the impact of socioeconomic policies on fertility.
- d. Reductions in the family planning sector for technical backstopping of country activities, epidemiological research on the health aspects of family planning, and regional advisers for the development of services for special groups and for the use of various health systems for integrated MCH and family planning services.
- e. Reductions in the communication and education sector for communications support of family planning programs, advisory services and training in population education, training in management of information exchange systems, and the activities of regional population education and communication clearinghouses.

These and other cuts in programs are being made to reduce the level of IC activities to 25 percent by 1982. The impact of the Governing Council's decision has been magnified further by two events which were not foreseen at the time the decision was taken: the shrinkage of resources available to the UNFPA and the administrative decision for a uniform system of support cost payments within the U.N. family of agencies.

At the time the Council made its decision, the UNFPA's total resources had been growing steadily. In 1979 they totaled \$123 million, and the expectations were for continued real growth in the 1980s. Under

these circumstances, it was thought that the impact of the decision on the volume of IC programs, although significant, would be absorbed relatively painlessly and gradually. However, when the situation changed in 1980 and it became clear that prospects for real growth in resources were slim, significant and sometimes painful program reductions became inevitable.

B. Governing Council Action on Agency Support Costs

To complicate the situation further, the UNDP Governing Council, after years of discussion within the U.N. system, decided in 1980 to require that a 13 percent "agency support cost" fee (overhead) be added to each project executed by the U.N. implementing agencies. Heretofore, the UNFPA had not paid overhead charges for project execution, but had funded a certain number of so-called "infrastructure" positions on the staffs of the major implementing agencies. In 1979, 44 such infrastructure positions were distributed among 10 U.N. implementing agencies. Defined as "posts of an administrative and/or financial support nature" (DP/367, para. 5), they were paid from IC allocations, and amounted to slightly more than \$6 million in 1979 (DP/367, p. 4), or approximately 13 percent of total IC funds.

The UNFPA plans to phase out funding for these posts as it begins paying the 13 percent support costs on the assumption that the agencies will use the payments to continue funding the infrastructure posts from the Regular Budget. Whether this will in fact occur remains to be seen, for the implementing agencies are not obligated to use support payments for specific purposes. Some persons fear that the UNFPA's influence on the implementing agencies will be weakened as it gives up direct funding of identifiable agency positions. They also fear that the agencies may choose not to continue funding the infrastructure positions, thereby weakening the presence and implementation of population programs. Given the slight commitment of some implementing agencies to population projects, these apprehensions cannot be ignored.

Program Implications

Each factor by itself has significant implications for the volume and effectiveness of IC activities. Taken together and occurring almost simultaneously, these events are likely to have a major effect on the IC component of the UNFPA program. Some manifestations of the impact are apparent at this time.

Beginning late in 1980, UNFPA management stepped up its so-called "countryfication" policy to transform IC activities into country projects.

In this approach, the implementing agencies are urged to turn the country components of IC programs into separate country projects which can be funded with UNFPA country allotments or national resources, or both. In those instances where national population officials have looked for new approaches or where the implementing agencies have made a good case, this technique has worked. For example, in Asia national programs in population education are operating in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, and Thailand; in part they are a consequence of training and promotional activities undertaken by UNESCO with UNFPA regional funds. In other areas, however, where circumstances are less favorable, "countryfication" has curtailed a promising project or stifled new initiative. For example, the population unit of the Philippine Ministry of Labor, established in 1975 with UNFPA/ILO regional assistance and funded since 1980 almost entirely out of national funds, experienced a 75 percent drop in output during the first year of its "independent" operation. An FAO proposal to introduce population education into the curriculum of 36 Asian agricultural colleges and universities through the Asian Association of Agricultural Colleges and Universities may founder because of the sheer difficulty of breaking the activity into 14 national components and promoting their funding with UNFPA country allocations.

In the latter part of 1980, in response to the new situation, and especially because of the tightening of resources, UNFPA management ordered a reprogramming exercise through 1984 based on a 15-20 percent overall reduction in planned IC programming levels. The implementing agencies have complied with the order, but often at the expense of new or innovative program proposals. The UNFPA also began to scrutinize more closely those IC projects coming up for renewed or multiple-phase funding. It terminated some projects on short notice and directed the phaseout of others. The funding cutoff for the second round of the World Fertility Survey and the unexpected reduction in the budget of CELADE are two examples of across-the-board belt-tightening in the last year.

It is too early to observe the effects of a phaseout of infrastructure posts. None of the posts have in fact been eliminated. UNFPA management is approaching the issue carefully to minimize the likelihood of disruption in programs which have already been severely tested by the events of the last two years. It is likely that the phaseout process will be gradual, spread over several years, and that a number of infrastructure posts will be assigned to specific projects to justify continued funding. The UNFPA and member countries will have to weigh the tradeoffs between de facto modification of the decision and a concerted drive to persuade the implementing agencies to absorb the infrastructure posts into their Regular Budgets, which are now enhanced by "support cost" payments.

How will these developments affect program effectiveness and management efficiency? Almost inevitably, they will disrupt operations and

create morale problems among those who are adversely affected by the changes. They also are likely to encourage maneuvering to protect projects and staff and to "sell" new national projects that would not be affected by the 25 percent quota but which would earn "support costs" for the implementing agency.

The decisions of the Council and the resource crunch are a powerful incentive to phase out marginal activities and to compel recipient countries to pay more attention to IC programs. In the past, many countries tended to regard these programs as "freebies"--that is, resources over and above their country allocations which required little or no inputs from them. The "countryfication" policy and constraints on resources are forcing a more rigorous assessment of priorities and more cost-conscious programming. It is too soon to tell what the net effect of the often contradictory action will be, but it is clear that both the recipient countries and the donor community have an opportunity to influence the outcome.

Program and Project Management and Monitoring

The responsibility for monitoring IC programs is shared by the UNFPA and the implementing agencies. The UNFPA retains overall oversight responsibility; detailed technical monitoring and project management is in the hands of the implementing agencies. Where the UNFPA is the implementing agency ("direct execution"), the responsibility for both functions devolves upon the UNFPA country coordinator. The primary formal monitoring instrument is the semiannual progress report to UNFPA headquarters; it is mandatory for all projects. In addition, project files include correspondence and basic project documents.

A spot-check of files at UNFPA headquarters showed that most implementing agencies submit the required progress reports, but some do not. The reports and project files are of mixed quality and utility; some contain little information on the projects or their progress. Others are high-quality reports containing evidence of ample correspondence between UNFPA headquarters and the implementing agency. These reports indicate the UNFPA headquarters' intimate involvement in project oversight.

UNFPA management is keenly conscious of the spottiness of its monitoring operation and is trying to improve the quality of its monitoring. It is intending to require annual project reports and to improve the quality and intensify the role of headquarters personnel by increasing contacts with the implementing agencies.

Given the strong orientation to country programs of headquarters personnel and implementing agencies, it may be more difficult to adequately monitor IC activities than other projects. The "direct execution"

of IC projects requiring technical backstopping and monitoring by the UNFPA may pose a special problem. UNFPA field staffs, which are small and not expected to have technical expertise, seem to be ill-equipped for such tasks.

Project monitoring by the implementing agencies is generally more detailed than monitoring at UNFPA headquarters, but the primary activity seems to be the preparation of the semiannual progress report, which is based on site visits or, if the activity is carried out at agency or regional team headquarters, on a summary of the activities of those who conducted the project (e.g., a research effort). Typically, many country and IC projects are monitored by a single team from the implementing agency's headquarters or by a regional team. The quality of monitoring may thus depend on the frequency of site visits and the quality of internal communications with on-site project managers. Where projects are widely scattered and the local infrastructure is weak, as in the South Pacific, the implementing agencies can be expected to increase their regional monitoring efforts correspondingly. But as the author observed, this does not always occur.

Program and Project Evaluation and Review

Several kinds of evaluation-and-review approaches are used in the UNFPA program. Some evaluations are made by the UNFPA headquarters as part of its continuing oversight responsibilities. Tripartite project reviews and project assessments and evaluations by the implementing agencies also are performed.

A. UNFPA Evaluation

UNFPA headquarters has a separate Office of Evaluation. Independent of the headquarters, staff of this office report directly to the executive director or his deputy. The staff concentrate on major program components; they have evaluated a number of important IC programs and projects, including the population programs of the U.N. regional commissions (except for Europe), UNFPA-supported research activities, the African Census Program, population components of the ILO's World Employment Program, regional population clearinghouses in Asia, regional and subregional population research institutes, the headquarters operations of the World Fertility Survey, and the population programs of the World Assembly of Youth and the International Audio-Visual Resource Service.

UNFPA evaluations are concerned with the design, performance, effects, and impact of projects. Because of the methodological difficulty of establishing reliable causal relationships, the last aspect is handled

cautiously in the evaluation reports. UNFPA evaluators have tried to determine why inputs have not led to expected results, and they have recommended ways to deal with the obstacles. To safeguard the objectivity and independence of the analyses, persons who are in any way involved in the planning, appraisal, or implementation are excluded from the evaluation team. Evaluation missions are prepared carefully, and all relevant documentary material is assembled and made available to members of the mission. For example, a background paper prepared for an evaluation of UNFPA assistance to the Pan American Health Organization's regional program contains several hundred pages of background data and documentation.

Some of the more important findings and recommendations from the evaluation reports for 1972-1977 and 1978-1980 are summarized below (see DP/331 and DP/493 for full texts); wherever possible, follow-up actions are indicated.

1. Period 1972-1977

a. ESCAP Population Programs

The quality of the programs varied. The UNFPA had limited opportunities to influence content, which was largely drawn up by ESCAP's Population Division and endorsed pro forma by ESCAP's Population Commission. Countries felt that the regional population programs were often peripheral to their own major concerns. The mission recommended that future regional projects be endorsed by at least three countries in the region. Follow-up: Project proposals are now scrutinized more closely at headquarters. UNFPA country coordinators have become involved in efforts to seek countries' informal views on proposed regional projects; formal approval by the country is not required.

b. ESCAP Population Clearing House

The projects generated a real awareness of the importance of population information; not all activities were implemented according to the prescribed methodology, and objectives were partly modified without notifying the UNFPA. Project funding until 1978 was recommended, the decision for continued funding to be based on a review. Follow-up: No formal review was held, and funding continues.

c. UNESCO Population Education Clearing House (Bangkok)

The achievement of the objectives was more than satisfactory. The clearinghouse is more than a library and documentation center. It was recommended that funding be continued to mid-1979, at which time the project might be reviewed again. Follow-up: No formal review was held; funding continues.

d. International Institute for Population Studies (IIPS, Bombay)

Training activities were rated favorably, although there were some problems with language instruction (English), lack of equipment, and opportunity for fieldwork. The institute is seen as primarily an Indian rather than a regional institution. It was recommended that support be limited to non-Indian students for several years and then phased out. Follow-up: Funding continues.

e. Latin American Demographic Center (CELADE) (Santiago, San Jose)

This is the only center to combine training, research, and technical advisory and information services; its outstanding contribution is to demography. The quality of training is uneven. Technical assistance and research are well received, but the introduction of demographic training and research in national institutions to promote self-sufficiency has not been entirely successful. It was recommended that funding be continued. Follow-up: Funding continues, but the decentralization of basic training courses to the country level is encouraged.

f. Cairo Demographic Center

Training curricula are well balanced, but further improvements are needed to meet international standards. Continued support at prevailing funding levels was recommended. Follow-up: The recommendations were accepted with the understanding that basic training courses would be decentralized eventually to the country level.

g. Regional Institute for Population Studies (RIPS) (Accra)

The mission endorsed the emphasis on training, but thought it unwise that RIPS become a clearinghouse of population information. Too few staff are available for activities. Continuing support was recommended. Follow-up: The recommendations were accepted and funding was increased.

h. Institut de Formation et de Recherche Demographiques (IFORD) (Yaoundé)

The quality of training is good, but insufficient attention is given to socioeconomic factors related to the population problem. Staff and facilities are insufficient. Increased support was recommended. Follow-up: The recommendations were accepted.

i. World Fertility Survey (Headquarters)

The program met all the major objectives of the development phase and was beginning to meet the objectives of country participation. All the participants did not agree on the priorities for objectives. The program is likely to last ten years, instead of the five originally anticipated; corresponding increases in costs can be expected. A detailed workplan is needed for implementation. Follow-up: The recommendations were accepted.

j. Population Education Program of World Assembly of Youth (WAY)

The program gave a favorable impression, but its objectives were unclear and the activities were not linked to the operational activities of the UNFPA and other donor agencies. A major study to develop a joint strategy on youth and the continuation of some funding were recommended. Follow-up: The recommendations were accepted, but no strategy was developed; selective, small-scale funding was provided. On the basis of the evaluation, the USAID reduced its funding of the program, and Sweden discontinued funding altogether.

k. International Audio-Visual Resource Service

The mission concluded that the achievement of objectives was unsatisfactory in most respects, and that project activity was of little value to the countries concerned. It recommended termination of UNFPA support. Follow-up: The implementing agencies, UNESCO, and the IPPF objected, but the recommendation was accepted.

2. Period 1978-1980

a. ECA Population Programs

These programs have had little impact, except for the African Census Program, which was considered to be the "only reasonably successful" ECA population activity since 1973. The Population Division's work program needs clearly defined priorities. The evaluators recommended the sharp curtailment of research and increased attention to population information services, demographic advisory services, and assistance to governments in organizing meetings and workshops and training demographic staff. Closer cooperation between the Population Division and the Statistics Division was recommended. Closer attention to the countries' needs is essential. IC activities in the region are likely to be crucial for some years to come. Detailed recommendations to restructure the Population Division were proposed. Follow-up: All substantive recommendations were accepted (except for the recommendation on the Population Division's role in research) and implemented.

b. African Census Program

An evaluation made in 1978 and briefly referred to in the last report on evaluation activities (DP/493) has not been published. Based on an analysis in eight of 22 countries included in the program, it is known to conclude that, on balance, the program achieved its objectives of building a data base, training local staff, and increasing demographic awareness. Serious problems affected the implementation of the censuses, analysis of the data, and publication of the results. Follow-up: Unknown.

c. Research and Action Program Concerning Population and Employment (ILO)

An evaluation was made early in 1980, but it remains in draft and is unpublished. Based on examination of the ILO's research output funded by the UNFPA, the evaluation is known to conclude that the quality of the output was high but that dissemination was lagging. The evaluators recommended that future research programs be less ambitious in scope and more specific in ways to make an impact. Follow-up: The recommendations are being implemented informally.

d. Assistance to Research Activities

A file-by-file study of research projects funded between 1969 and 1976 showed that most research proposals lacked documentation on the availability of information, similar research in progress, need for information, the design of the project, the methodology for collecting and analyzing data, and the expenditure of UNFPA funds. Of completed research projects, 28 percent were followed by a written report. There is little evidence of wider dissemination of research results. Monitoring to ensure reasonable time to complete projects appeared to be insufficient. Follow-up: Most of the recommendations for strengthening formulation, appraisal, implementation, and dissemination were accepted and are being incorporated into operations.

The UNFPA's evaluation efforts are impressive. The quality of the output appears to be high, and UNFPA management seems to take the recommendations seriously. Often, it acts upon those recommendations, both formally and informally. The major weakness in the effort appears to be the exceedingly long gestation period, from conception to dissemination and action, which, apparently, is due to lengthy preparations and a complex approval process. The gestation period of one to one-and-a-half years that was mentioned in the UNFPA's last report on evaluation (DP/493) seems to be conservative. The African Census Program was carried out in 1978, but the evaluation has not been published; other reports have also exceeded the one-and-a-half-year period. One must seriously consider the tradeoffs between the exhaustiveness of the effort and the perfectibility of the process, and the ability to affect program operations in reasonable time.

B. Tripartite Project Review (TPR)

This procedure brings together, approximately midway through the life of a project, the three parties most directly concerned with a project--the UNFPA, the implementing agency, and the government of the country where the project is being executed. Because IC activities are conducted outside the framework of country programs and involve national governments only indirectly, if at all, the TPR procedure has, with few exceptions, not been applied to IC projects.

It was brought to the author's attention that in two places where the TPR procedure was used, the UNFPA-funded population program of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, which is backstopped in the field by the FAO, was involved. The projects in question are "Multi-media Support for Population Programs in the Context of Rural Development" and "Migration in Relation to Rural Development." A brief summary of the "multi-media" TPR held in July 1980 in the Philippines will suffice to explain the approach.

The review was conducted at a five-day workshop. It was found that, of five objectives, the first two had been met fully and the third in part. The objectives were to (1) develop guidelines for the design, production, use, and evaluation of information and educational material on population; (2) adopt or adapt existing material in accordance with the guidelines; (3) develop new materials and mutually supportive multi-media mixes and approaches through the agriculture service, and traditional, folk, and other channels; and (5) evaluate effectiveness in terms of changes in the knowledge, attitude, and practice (KAP) of family planning. Specific plans to achieve the last two objectives were discussed and adopted. Each of the participating countries also reported revisions and refinements in their population information and education programs as a result of the project. The review team noted problems in the execution of the project (e.g., delays in the release of funds, problems with management and coordination, cultural problems, and structural differences between the countries), but they concluded that most of the obstacles to project execution had been or could be minimized and overcome.

Although the process described above may lack the objectivity of evaluations by the UNFPA Office of Evaluation, it has the great advantage of timeliness and directly involves persons who are participating in the execution of the project. Problems undetected and policies that are wanting can be corrected immediately.

Lacking a TPR procedure for IC projects, and given the weakness of the monitoring process, the UNFPA lacks an effective management tool for the mid-course appraisal of IC activities. This situation is aggravated by the fact that, unlike country projects, IC activities are not subject to annual review. Thus, dependence on the implementing agencies to ensure high-quality performance is very high.

C. Implementing Agency Evaluation and Review

The concept of program and project evaluation and review is by no means foreign to the implementing agencies. In discussions with the author, officials of the agencies endorsed the need for evaluations and often pointed out that evaluation concepts and procedures are contained in guidance materials prepared for their personnel or target groups. For example, the "Guide for Programming the Family Health and Population Aspects of Health Development," recently completed by the Family Health Division of the WHO as an interregional project (INT/79/P 30), describes the various steps in evaluating the programming process itself and designing a "retrospective evaluation strategy" and system. The new "Policies and Procedures Handbook," published by the U.N. Department of Technical Cooperation for Development (DTCD), a major recipient of UNFPA IC funds, contains a chapter entitled "Evaluation" which is divided into the following sections: monitoring; project reviews; internal audit functions; audit reports and follow-up; project and program outputs; and impact evaluation. Similarly, the manual for field workers, "Population Education in Non-formal Education and Development Programs," recently issued by the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia and the Pacific, contains a 40-page chapter entitled "Program Evaluation" in which it is stated (p. 164):

Without the benefit of evaluation, a field worker is unable to determine how well the program has fared in the achievement of its goals.

Evaluation also serves as the basis for the improvement of the way field activities are carried out. Regular reviews of program activities to determine progress in the field makes possible the revision or adjustment of teaching-learning strategies and field operations to suit the ever-changing situation.

In the face of such formidable endorsements of the evaluation process, it is surprising that the approach to evaluation is so unclear and unformed. Neither the concept nor the procedure is uniform. The UNFPA itself seems to define "evaluation" as primarily an examination of performance or outcome in relation to stated objectives. The WHO distinguishes between process and impact or retrospective evaluation; the DTCD includes both concepts, as well as monitoring and auditing functions, in its definition of "evaluation." UNESCO adds the concepts of input, potency effectiveness, and realized effectiveness.

If we accept the basic distinctions of the concepts of process, performance (broadly speaking, the observation and description of the use of

inputs in relation to the stated work plan and strategy), and impact or outcome evaluation (what impact is or has been achieved in terms of stated objectives), the following picture will emerge.

The principal regular instrument which the UNFPA uses in a process or performance evaluation is the semiannual progress report. If this report is not available or is of poor quality, little information on implementation is available to the UNFPA or to senior personnel in the implementing agencies. Few impact or outcome evaluations have been conducted by the implementing agencies. Those that are performed are conducted under special conditions.

The most thorough evaluation available is the Final Report of the Bohol Maternal and Child Health-Based Family Planning Project in the Philippines (March 1980), which is to be supplemented by a more comprehensive analysis of the "lessons of Bohol." This five-year project, which was supervised by the WHO and the Population Council, was one of four IC-funded projects (the others were in Indonesia, Turkey, and Nigeria) to determine and demonstrate the effectiveness of family planning service delivery through maternal and child health programs in a rural setting. It received \$1.6 million from the UNFPA. The project appears to have achieved its primary long-range objective, in addition to several more immediate objectives, including (a) the provision of better quality health services for mothers and children; (b) the introduction and improvement of family planning services as part of MCH and within the general health services; (c) the improvement of MCH and family planning training and supervision of health personnel; and (d) the initiation of operational and other studies in support of the immediate objectives, including optimum resources within available funding.

The total fertility rate (TFR) in the project area declined more than the TFR in the non-project control area and in the country as a whole, but project officials were reluctant to draw definitive conclusions about the causal relationship. However, the report showed that midwives, traditional birth attendants, and village paramedical volunteers could be used with increasing efficacy to deliver MCH and family planning services (including IUD insertions by midwives), and that local communities could be persuaded to establish community-financed mini drug stores (boticas), which could greatly improve access to basic drugs. Because the project was experimental, it contained a substantial research and evaluation component which produced a wealth of information leading to mid-course adjustments. The findings were useful in the Philippines and elsewhere. The Bohol project cannot be considered a model for the use of research and evaluation in UNFPA projects generally, but it does demonstrate the utility and feasibility of such built-in components in operational UNFPA-funded projects.

The author had the opportunity to review an evaluation report on the population publications and training program which is conducted with UNFPA funding by the Press Foundation of Asia, a non-governmental organization, and two evaluations of country projects by Development Training and Communication Planning, a Bangkok-based organization financed in part with UNFPA IC funds. Not one of the reports is as comprehensive as the Bohol report, but all the reports contain useful data and recommendations relevant to ongoing operations.

The author also had access to an "assessment" of UNESCO's population education program and its prospects after eight years of operation in Asia and Oceania. The document contains much useful factual material on the operations of the UNESCO program; the summary table (Annex L) shows that in the eight-year period eight evaluations were made of country projects (four in Bangladesh, one in Indonesia, three in the Philippines). The "assessment" itself is more of a summary and promotional document than an evaluation.

Policy Implications

Considering the volume of resources devoted to IC activities and their role in the entire program, the monitoring, evaluation, and review structure of the UNFPA and the implementing agencies appears to be inadequate. This assessment is valid, despite the high quality of the evaluations of the Office of Evaluation and the occasional evaluations or reviews of the implementing agencies. To remedy the situation, organizational changes would be needed to provide a capacity that does not exist at this time. Changes in the programming policy and conceptual clarifications also would be needed. For best results, systematic monitoring and systematic reviews and evaluations should be made an integral part of the programming process.

V. HIGHLIGHTS AND ISSUES OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS

Content and Strategies

In discussing the content and strategies of the UNFPA program, one must recognize that, despite the appearance of uniformity, IC activities bear very much the imprint of the implementing agencies. The WHO, for example, focuses its approach and attention on "family health" and "reproductive health," and not on demographic aspects; the FAO stresses the population-food relationship; UNESCO consciously avoids "family planning" in favor of "population education"; and the ILO stresses an approach to "family welfare." No matter what the accepted doctrine of the agency may be, the agency's commitment, the bureaucratic structure, and the program initiatives that are vying for attention and prominence determine how the doctrine is applied. The trick is to relate population concerns and activities to prevailing priorities, and to ensure that the administrative structure enhances, rather than restricts, the outreach of population programs. It often happens in institutional development that the old structure and doctrine survive. Before population concerns were accepted as legitimate aspects of development, it was necessary to establish structural and programmatic footholds through which the goals of the UNFPA program could be channeled. Because countries and implementing agencies now accept the need for population-related components, this no longer seems to be so important. Today, it is more important to ensure that population considerations are treated as integral elements of a development planning strategy and program.

The UNFPA's executive director recognized this when he wrote, in his draft report to the 1981 UNDP Governing Council, "UNFPA in the 1980's" (p. 13):

The full integration of population into all development efforts constitutes a major goal for UNFPA in the 1980s. Continued efforts will be made to establish firmly recognition of population as an underlying factor which, to a larger or smaller extent, determines everything related to human welfare National efforts to provide adequate food, shelter, health care, employment, education, etc., all have population as one of their main denominators. In the course of this decade, the Fund intends to support strongly the implantation of population in all development thinking as the first and foremost "given" in formulae and schemes, and not merely an extraneous afterthought.

The integration of UNFPA programs into the broad spectrum of development work and the integration of UNFPA-funded personnel into the broader structure of the implementing agencies should begin, logically, with IC activities. In this approach, one could use the administrative structures that are financed largely with UNFPA resources. IC programs are the model, and central and regional IC-funded staffs the supervisors, for country programs. The central headquarters staffs in particular are, or could be, in a strategic position to influence the policy of their agencies. But action along these lines alone would not suffice, given the inherently slow-moving pace of programmatic and structural changes within most implementing agencies. To accomplish the goal of integration, a strategy aimed at the governing body and the top management of the agencies would be required also.

The prominence of communication and education activities has been mentioned. Several of the major implementing agencies, including UNESCO, the FAO, and ILO, give this activity first priority; the WHO lists "health education" second after "family planning" among the components of maternal and child health, its principal vehicle for population programs. Even the ESCAP Population Division, primarily a research organization, spends approximately 40 percent of its annual budget on "clearinghouse and information" activities. Are there enough common elements in these many information-related projects to allow economies of output? Is there a surfeit of information directed at the same target groups?

In Bangkok, the ESCAP Population Division's Clearing House and Information Section operates with a staff of 11 professionals. Support from the UNFPA in 1980 totaled nearly \$500,000 (approximately 25 percent of total UNFPA support to ESCAP's Population Division). UNESCO's Regional Office for Education in Asia and the Pacific, also located in Bangkok, maintains a Population Education Clearing House, staffed by three professionals; in 1980 support from the UNFPA totaled approximately \$120,000. Both institutions appear to have similar or identical objectives (i.e., to encourage and assist population information services at national levels; provide technical assistance, training, selected translations, and audiovisual materials; and distribute continually serial publications or special materials produced by the clearinghouses). UNESCO's main products are the semiannual Population Education Newsletter in Asia and the Pacific, a semiannual series of abstracts and bibliographies, and accessions lists. ESCAP produces, inter alia, Adopt, a monthly compilation of abstracts arranged by subject matter, the quarterly Asian-Pacific Population Program News, the news-type Population Headliners, and Population Research Leads, a capsule, semi-technical series designed to bridge the gap between researchers and program personnel. ESCAP's clearinghouse has a mailing list of approximately 5,000, while UNESCO's has approximately 2,000. Neither institution has undertaken a systematic evaluation of its activities, although both make an effort to determine user interest through periodic surveys. Although there are contacts between the two clearinghouses, no apparent effort has been made to coordinate their work more closely.

It was not possible to survey systematically the content and comparability of population education materials produced by implementing agencies in IC programs. The volume, however, is more than impressive--it is overwhelming. It raises not only the question of possible duplication of effort, but, more important, the issue of need. Is this emphasis on population education necessary? Clearly, population education had to be given priority in the 1960s and early 1970s, when population concerns were either ignored or suspect, and when opportunities for more action-directed activities were severely limited. It still may be appropriate in certain parts of Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East, but in most of the developing world, a shift in emphasis toward action-oriented programs in family planning, or second-stage population education aimed more specifically at the institutionalization of the subject in curricula, information systems, legal frameworks, and health and welfare structures, may be desirable. No doubt, such activities are more difficult to design and to implement than broad population education programs, but their impact also may be greater.

Research is another area where emphasis and strategy should be reconsidered. The largest consumers of UNFPA IC resources in the U.N. Population Division and in the population divisions of the U.N. regional commissions are research, or research-related, activities. If one adds to these the considerable research and research-related components in the IC portfolios of the other major implementing agencies, the importance of research, particularly in IC activities, becomes clear. The UNFPA internal evaluation of research called attention to two important problems: project justification and dissemination of results. Both need to be improved. Other important considerations were highlighted at a five-country seminar, "Utilization of Research Findings in Population Policy Formulation and Program Management in the ASEAN Countries," which was organized in August 1980 by the FAO and the Singapore Family Planning and Population Board under the UNFPA-funded ASEAN population program. In the summary report on the seminar, it is noted that:

Research itself may be undertaken for purposes of enlightenment and may be justified on the grounds of creating new knowledge and establishing scientific certainty. But application and utilization is governed by different criteria and justified on different grounds The policymaker makes his judgment in the face of weighty bureaucratic constraints The research utilization process . . . requires constant dialogue between researcher and policymaker (p. 4).

The following factors, which can hinder or enhance the use of research results, were identified at the seminar:

- the attributes of policymakers, administrators, and researchers, and the interactions of these persons;
- the qualities of the research product and of findings and data;
- access, retrieval, dissemination, and the information network system; and
- constraints in resources, bureaucratic procedures, and lack of official support (p. 5).

These are sound reasons for evolving a more rigorous approach to the selection, design, and funding (by the UNFPA) of research projects and staffs primarily concerned with research (e.g., the ESCAP Population Division has a staff of 63 professionals).

The current migration studies undertaken with UNFPA funding illustrate some of the problems identified at the ASEAN seminar. The UNFPA currently supports research at all levels on the trends, causes, and consequences of international and internal migration, with particular reference to employment and spatial distribution. In Asia, the following migration studies are being carried out with UNFPA funding:

- a. ILO: Studies in Population, Labor Force, and Migration in Pakistan; Labor Migration and Employment in Sri Lanka; Migration, Employment, and Development in the South Pacific
- b. FAO: ASEAN Population and Rural Development Program: Migration in Relation to Rural Development (projects in Thailand, Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore)
- c. ESCAP: Comparative Study on Migration, Urbanization, and Development in the ESCAP Region (national migration surveys in Malaysia, Pakistan, Philippines, Indonesia, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and South Pacific).

The ESCAP surveys, the most comprehensive projects under way, are expected to yield data on (a) the volume of migration streams between metropolitan areas, cities, towns, and rural localities; (b) the causal factors underlying different types and directions of movements; (c) interrelations between socioeconomic development projects in urban and rural localities; (d) interrelations between population movements and changes in

fertility levels; (e) the impact of rural development on settlement patterns; (f) the impact of agricultural systems on seasonal movements; (g) assessment of links established by migrants with the place of origin, including remittances and the impact of rural-to-urban migration as a stimulus for social change and rural development; (h) the role of migration in changes in the volume of the urban and rural labor force; and (i) the implications of international migration from and to the country. To prepare for the surveys, ESCAP, in collaboration with the U.S. Bureau of the Census produced seven manuals on the technical and organizational aspects. This effort was funded with a \$250,000 grant from the AID.

Many of the elements and objectives of the ILO and FAO studies overlap those of the ESCAP project, although, generally, they are being carried out on a smaller scale. In no case examined by the author did the effort appear to be coordinated, nor were priorities defined carefully within the general framework of migration research. The closest the ASEAN project came to coordination with ESCAP was to invite the director of the Population Division to the first project seminar. At least one of the five national agencies responsible for the ASEAN study wanted to use the ESCAP-developed survey instrument, but in the end a new instrument was developed. The scope of the ASEAN project, if limited to rural resettlement in connection with land reform, has also been criticized as too narrow and specialized. In the case of the ILO projects, no consultation on project design with the other two agencies seems to have taken place. The Sri Lanka project had not received government approval at the end of 1980, although by that time the first phase of the ESCAP study had been published. This study includes detailed information on patterns of migration and urbanization, as well as data on the labor force, unemployment, health and housing, and income and educational levels in the rural and urban sectors. Both ESCAP and the ILO seem to believe they have the mandate to include the subject of international migration in their various studies.

Policy Implications

The foregoing analysis of problems related to the content and strategies of UNFPA IC programs was focused on information and research. In these areas, a reassessment of priorities and a clearer definition of scope appear to be particularly necessary. Such reassessments must not only be concerned with the intrinsic value of the research over the long term, but also with the near-term ability and probability of governments to act on the findings. Much of what has been said may be applied also to country programs. It is particularly important to remember that IC programs and personnel play a key role in the operation of the program as a whole. It can be taken for granted that the strengths and weaknesses in IC programs will be reflected manifold in country programs.

Role of UNFPA in Field Operations

UNFPA staff, both at headquarters and in the field, are the principal orchestrator of the UNFPA program. This is self-evident and requires no elaboration. This function should be evident particularly in IC programs because UNFPA staff have a special role in those programs. Yet, the organization's administrative structure and practice seem to run counter to this objective.

Administrative authority over IC programs at headquarters is divided. In the geographic divisions, country programs are, understandably, the chief concern. In the field, country coordinators view their primary responsibility in terms of country projects. The country coordinator in Manila had the authority to release funds only for four of the seven regional projects in the Philippines. Control of the funds for the remaining three projects rested with the FAO regional office in Bangkok. The country coordinator in Bangkok, an exceptionally competent official, had little contact with the ILO, the FAO, and the UNESCO regional offices in Bangkok and was responsible for a wide array of IC activities in Asia and the Pacific. Although charged with oversight responsibility for these programs, he was heavily engaged in the country programs for Thailand, Laos, and Hong Kong. Recognizing that this presented a management problem, the UNFPA appointed in 1978 a regional coordinator for Asia positioned in Bangkok; it established, but did not fill, similar positions in Latin America and Africa. Although the new position had its merits, it also suffered from lack of clearly defined authority and the competing interests of implementing agencies and country coordinators. When the constraint on funds became acute in 1980, the new system was scrapped, leaving the basic problem unresolved.

As a result, there have been gaps in oversight and disagreements over strategy which may affect the quality and execution of the program. The programs that appear to be affected most directly are those in the South Pacific which were executed by WHO's Western Pacific Regional Organization. This area would be difficult to handle under the best of circumstances because it is vast, the small populations are scattered widely, and economic development is slow. The single UNFPA "country" coordinator for the area, located in Fiji, evidently was critical of WPRO's strategy, which for the past 10 years was alleged to have been largely oriented to general health. A standoff resulted which may or may not have been resolved by the combined Assessment and Programming Mission (from which both the WPRO and the coordinator were excluded) and the recent replacement of the coordinator. In some WPRO documents questions have been raised about the appropriateness of certain kinds of program activities (e.g., the supply of communications equipment which is used for non-health purposes; the inclusion in the program of islands that have no significant population problems). A more rigorous process of monitoring and program development appears to be needed to resolve such inherently difficult questions.

The UNFPA's unique relationship to the UNDP adds another dimension to the operation of UNFPA field programs, and particularly IC programs. Because the UNFPA began as a fledgling agency under the tutelage of the UNDP, and because the UNDP's field operations are managed by UNDP resident representatives, the resident representatives were designated UNFPA representatives and given authority over UNFPA country coordinators. This action raises policy issues which go beyond the scope of this report. IC programs could be especially disadvantaged in the existing structure, given this country-specific orientation and the authority of UNDP resident representatives.

On a more general level, UNFPA coordinators appear to have less authority than representatives of some other multilateral agencies. This may discourage the initiative and creativity that are crucial to the integration of population with development. Another limiting factor seems to be the tendency of host governments to assign principal responsibility for liaison with UNFPA programs to ministries of health. This may be done because population concerns are considered to be primarily health concerns. Such action tends to limit access for non-health related agencies, sometimes militates against intersectorial or non-health approaches, and may complicate the approval and execution of projects.

Policy Implications

The problems elucidated above are only partly within the UNFPA's power to correct. Other problems (e.g., the relationship to the UNDP and to the health ministries) would require action by both the UNDP Governing Council and host governments. The various actions could be harmonized to be mutually supporting, and they would require the support of UNFPA management and key donor nations.

Interagency Coordination and Collaboration

Coordination and collaboration can take several forms: consultation, planning, and execution. Although there is evidence that research efforts are not coordinated, many other program elements appear to be reasonably well coordinated, thanks in part to the efforts of UNFPA management, which is keenly aware of the problem.

Several major instruments are used by the UNFPA to promote coordination and collaboration: country assessment missions, country programming missions, and periodic consultations with major implementing agencies. Some implementing agency personnel are usually included, in a personal capacity, in UNFPA assessment and programming missions. Participation in the process is not only important from a programming standpoint; it also

broadens the vision of the participants and improves contacts among the various agencies, ultimately leading to better coordination during consultation and planning.

On rare occasions, consultation among the implementing agencies has led to joint execution. One example is a WHO-U.N. Population Division interregional program in mortality studies aimed at improving methodologies to measure and analyze determinants, differentials, and implications of mortality changes. In Malaysia, the Family-Life-Through-Family-Development Program is supervised and executed jointly by UNESCO and FAO regional teams in Bangkok. An FAO project, Population Education in the Agricultural Sector, at Kasetsart University in Thailand, also receives technical assistance from the UNESCO regional team. The more common forms of interagency collaboration include joint participation in workshops (e.g., the Interagency Near East Workshop on Rural Life Education through Cooperatives, in which the FAO, the ILO, the IPPF, and UNESCO participated last year in Damascus); participation in the working groups (e.g., the Inter-Agency Working Group on Population Education); and involvement in subregional training courses in population education (e.g., the course which was organized last year by the UNESCO regional office in Bangkok in which ESCAP, the FAO, the ILO, the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), and the WHO participated).

Coordination and collaboration may involve multilateral and bilateral agencies that have an interest in UNFPA population programs, but not necessarily as implementing agencies. Again, joint project execution seems to be rare, but consultation and planning and coordination of funding appear to be more frequent. AID and the UNFPA came close to joint execution of the ESCAP migration surveys when AID supplied the Bureau of Census team which was needed to complete the first phase of the project. In another kind of arrangement in the Philippines, AID and the ILO (the latter under its UNFPA regional project) are jointly funding an evaluation study of the Labor Ministry's population program, which originally was initiated and supervised by the ILO's regional population team. Depending on the outcome of the evaluation, AID will decide whether to provide funds for the continuation of the project. In both instances, the arrangements appear to have been mutually rewarding.

There may be few of these arrangements because agencies are reluctant to accept the constraints which are the inevitable price of collaboration. At UNFPA headquarters, frequent, informal consultation and coordination take place with the World Bank and AID. In the field, contact depends very much on the persons involved, and especially on those giving directions and setting the tone of the field operations. Generally, although all agencies and organizations are on record as favoring maximum consultation and coordination, more could be done to improve the process.

Multi-donor consortia have provided formal funding and policy guidance to major global population projects. An outstanding example is the

World Fertility Survey, in which both the UNFPA and AID have had a major interest as financiers and sources of policy guidance. The UNFPA has expended nearly \$11 million on this, its largest global project initiation in 1973. It continues to provide approximately \$1 million each year. AID itself has spent approximately \$20 million, and it is providing approximately \$3.5 million in FY 1981. Inevitably, given the involvement of both organizations and the importance of the project as a source for policy and program decisions, disagreements about advanced stages in the project's implementation have arisen from time to time.

A multi-donor approach is being taken in the WHO Special Program of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction, to which the UNFPA contributed \$1.5 million out of a total \$17.5 million budget in 1980. The program, which began in 1972, is the largest coordinated worldwide effort to promote research on the safety and effectiveness of current methods of birth control, the development of new techniques, psychosocial and service aspects of family planning and infertility, and the strengthening of research capabilities of developing countries in these areas. It has an elaborate structure for coordination, policy guidance, and dissemination of research results. The U.S., although it is not a donor, has participated in the technical aspects of the program. It also supported the special decision of the UNDP Governing Council in 1979 that the UNFPA would allocate to this program \$1.5 million per year in 1980 and 1981 and \$2 million in 1982.

Perhaps more than the World Fertility Survey, the WHO program has given rise to controversy about program orientation and policy guidance. However, there seems to be widespread recognition of the importance and many positive accomplishments of this collaborative effort. Despite the conflicts, fruitful coordination and collaboration have occurred among the many countries and agencies involved in the WHO program. This is, perhaps, the most remarkable aspect of the effort.

It would be a mistake to conclude from these examples that there is a growing groundswell of coordination and collaboration among UNFPA implementing agencies and other organizations concerned with population programs. As is evident from the earlier discussion on content and strategy, this is not the case. One would suspect that it is the "implementers," and not the organizations, who, in their zest and enthusiasm, are oblivious to opportunities for fruitful collaboration. Undoubtedly, there is competition for funds and recognition, and there are strong organizational loyalties and desires to protect turf. In view of these "facts of life," it is likely that coordination and collaboration in international projects will continue to be ambivalent.

Policy Implications

UNFPA management has a crucial role: to encourage coordination and, to the extent possible, active interagency collaboration. It is management's responsibility to insist on consultation and coordination of planning, and to identify opportunities to collaborate more closely. Various techniques, including the involvement of personnel from AID, UNICEF, and other non-implementing agencies in UNFPA assessment and programming missions, could be considered.

Member countries, too, have the responsibility to ensure that their staffs are better informed about the UNFPA program. Through the UNDP Governing Council or in their own capacities, they can set the tone and the direction for sustained coordination and collaboration.

Innovation

One of the principal reasons for continuing IC programs is that they permit innovation and experimentation that are not normally possible or which are not likely to be found in national programs. Some examples of innovative approaches are given below.

A. Research

1. Land Resources for Populations of the Future

In the project, staff are studying the relationship of food-production and, hence, the population-supporting capacity of agro-ecological zones in the developing world, to data on existing and projected populations. Making use of a soil map of the world which was completed by the FAO in 1978, staff are now in the second, country-specific stage of the project. They are expected to obtain data to identify critical areas where land resources will be insufficient to meet the food needs of the projected population. The interregional stage of the program is being phased out; it will be followed by country-specific investigations funded in part from country programs.

2. Risk Approach for Maternal and Child Health Care

This is a managerial tool to distribute resources based on measurements of community and individual health risks and to plan local MCH and family planning strategies based on these risks and using all available resources, including, for example, traditional birth attendants, teachers, women's groups, and agricultural service workers. The conceptual and methodological model was developed by a WHO Task Force. Since 1975, national studies have been made in Turkey, Malaysia, Cuba, Burma, and Thailand; other projects are being developed in India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, and Gaza. It is expected that by 1982-1983 approximately 15 countries will be systematically using the risk-approach to MCH management. In Malaysia, information from the partially completed study has already led to important action at the national level. For example:

- the register of traditional birth attendants was reopened as a first step in resuming a TBA training program which was halted six years ago;
- a training program for trainers of TBAs is being conducted; and
- the risk approach is being included as a basic strategy in the fifth Five-Year Malaysian Development Plan.

B. Training and Communication

Bangkok is the headquarters of Development Training and Communication Planning. Nominally a UNDP regional project, it is an autonomous organization jointly funded by the UNDP and the UNFPA. The DTCP believes that there has been excessive reliance on mass media in family planning projects. Its objective is to provide technical assistance related to the "human factor" (i.e., training, communication support, and management for UNFPA and UNDP projects in Asia). There is nothing unique about the provision of such services, although the modus operandi does appear to be unusual.

In 1980, the DTCP generated approximately \$2.5 million in services; more than \$2 million were charged to 26 country projects which the DTCP was assisting. Generally, regional funds pay for pre-project development

services, information and referral services for ongoing projects, and special services, such as workshops for government officials in project formulation, orientation of new UNDP and UNFPA field staff, or new but tested techniques in the use of national consultants, preparation of work plans, etc. Other services are charged to respective country projects. Staff members turn in weekly reports that show how they spent their time; this information is used to apportion charges. Because staff time normally is spread over a number of projects, the cost to each project is reduced. Moreover, because a large proportion of the DTCP's costs are paid from country projects, there is likely to be greater accountability to, and consideration of, the country and its needs. The DTCP must provide services for which countries are willing to pay from their country allocations.

The DTCP receives more requests for services than it can handle; consequently, its policy is to phase out involvement as soon as a project can continue without its help. In Thailand, for example, it phased out the supervision of training for the National Family Planning Program, but not before it was assured that the principle of maximum outreach had been accepted. Now completely under Thai leadership, the Training Supervision and Education Section in the Ministry of Health trains 4,000-5,000 persons a year in family planning. It receives funding from AID. In addition to health personnel, military medical units, border police, factory staffs, assistant teachers for hill tribes, regional agricultural and education staffs, TBAs and traditional doctors are involved in the effort. Auxiliary midwives and nurse midwives are trained to insert IUDs.

The DTCP is respected throughout the world. Frequently, it is a subcontractor for established UNFPA implementing agencies. Its approach and mode of operation may be models for other regions.

C. Regional Cooperation

In February 1976, the heads of the governments of the five countries in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations issued the Bali Declaration, which called for "intensification of the existing cooperation in meeting the problems of population growth in the ASEAN region and, where possible, formulation of new strategies in collaboration with appropriate international agencies."

This declaration led to the creation of the ASEAN Population and Rural Development Program, which was assisted by the FAO and financed in its first phase with UNFPA regional funds. Following discussion, the participating countries agreed on four priority areas for work: integration of population and rural development policies and programs; migration in relation to rural development; multi-media support for population

programs in the context of rural development; and use of research findings in population policy formulation and program management. In each case, one of the countries assumed lead responsibility for guiding the project, including organization of a workshop and publication of the results. The projects are nearing completion, and countries are preparing for the second phase, which will be funded by a \$3 million grant from Australia. Project execution was almost entirely in the hands of country institutions. Despite problems, the process of intensive regional consultation and collaboration seems to be appreciated by the participants. For UNFPA and assisting international agencies, this approach offers another opportunity to extend outreach and strengthen regional and country institutions.

D. Reaching the Poor

In 1978, in an effort to reach a largely neglected segment of poor people in rural areas, the FAO, assisted by the UNFPA, initiated a pilot program directed at fishing communities in Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia. The approach, developed in a series of workshop meetings attended by representatives from the participating countries, was to couple income-producing economic development activities with health and family planning education and services.

The Philippine project, for which data were available to the author, is located in Dulao Village, La Union Province. After considerable preparatory activity in the village which involved numerous Philippine government agencies, a 35-member Fishermen's Association was formed and given a loan to purchase two motorized fishing boats and other equipment. The village was included in the territory of two full-time family planning outreach workers, who were to visit the area twice a week. Three pumps were supplied for a community self-help installation-and-maintenance project.

The returns on this project have not come in. Income has risen for the members of the association, but not all of them participate in productive work. Underemployment remains a problem because fishing, it seems, is possible only between October and May, and then only when there is not a full moon. Contraceptive prevalence seems to have risen from approximately 30 percent to 46 percent. An active women's club is planning various income-producing activities, as well as mothers' classes. The three pump wells are producing only brackish water. With better planning and guidance from the FAO some of these problems might have been avoidable.

Policy Implications

These few examples of innovative approaches and procedures reinforce the conviction that innovation is vital to any dynamic population program. The problem and responsibility of UNFPA management are to stimulate experimentation and to provide a propitious climate for innovation, without abandoning the necessary discipline or shortchanging the mainstream activities that are the bread and butter of the program. Clearly, innovation requires risk-taking, but even more is at risk if one stands still. It appears that UNFPA management is conscious of these problems, and is trying to maintain a balance between flexibility and excessive experimentation. The potential role of the country coordinator in stimulating innovation should not be ignored. Some implementing agencies appear to prefer the tried and tested patterns to the risks of experimentation. Structural rigidities tend to discourage innovation.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The review and analysis of the UNFPA's IC program would not be complete if one did not attempt to answer certain fundamental questions about the place of IC programs within the entire UNFPA program, the quality of UNFPA management, the role of the implementing agencies, and U.S. interests in the IC program.

Place of the IC Program Within Entire UNFPA Program

Within the present framework of UNFPA operations, IC programs occupy a key place. They provide the umbrella for activities of global or regional dimensions, make possible experimentation and innovation, and pave the way for country-level projects. They also provide the instrument for supervision of and technical assistance to country projects, the majority of which operate without resident foreign experts. As the technical competence and managerial capacity of recipient countries continue to grow, the need for technical and managerial backstopping of country activities by regionally-funded teams of experts and infrastructure officials can be expected to decline. This trend can be observed now in Asia, where national governments are particularly eager to take full responsibility for the execution of projects. There will also continue to be activities which can most effectively be funded and managed as IC programs.

UNFPA Management

It is the difficult task of UNFPA management to respond responsibly and creatively to the changing needs and objectives of member countries and, at the same time, to maintain the necessary balance between IC programs and national programs. To meet its responsibilities, UNFPA management needs a certain amount of flexibility from its Governing Council to determine the proportion and geographic distribution of IC programs. It also must make a concerted effort to explain and justify to its constituency the rationale for IC programs, and it must find ways to involve its constituency more intimately in the IC programming process. The UNDP, which faced similar problems, recently held a special meeting in New Delhi for the express purpose of briefing its members on IC programs.

The current challenge to UNFPA management is to improve the quality of IC monitoring, develop evaluation as a more effective programming tool, and ensure the integrity and quality of IC programs. And this it must do in the face of increased financial and managerial constraints and changing priorities for IC programming.

Role of the Implementing Agencies

As presently constituted, the UNFPA's IC program depends heavily on the inputs of the implementing agencies. This dependence extends not only to the supervision and technical backstopping of projects, but also to initiation and follow-up. The increasing trend toward direct execution is likely to reduce the implementing agencies' role. However, direct execution is not necessarily either a complete or altogether desirable substitute for assistance from implementing agencies that have the capacity to mobilize a wide range of resources and experiences and to provide access to a wide spectrum of society. The implementing agencies face the challenge of proving their worth in the face of increasing funding constraints and the desires of recipient countries for greater self-reliance. Their ability to meet this challenge will depend not only on the quality of service they can provide, but also on their commitment to population concerns.

U.S. Interests in IC Programs

The UNFPA continues to finance a number of major IC programs which are of prime interest to the U.S.; these include certain follow-up studies to the World Fertility Survey and the Special Program of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction. In addition, through its global and regional programs, the UNFPA supports research and training institutions (e.g., U.N. Secretariat and U.N. Regional Commission population programs; demographic training and research centers at Yaoundé and Accra; the development training and communication planning organization in Bangkok; the regional population center in Bogotá; the Cairo demographic center) which supplement or support programs of importance to the U.S. Many UNFPA country programs that are supported with regionally-funded teams are also closely coordinated with U.S.-supported country efforts. In some countries and in certain circumstances, the UNFPA, working through its implementing agencies, has access where U.S. bilateral programs would not be welcome. However, although the mandates of the UNFPA and the AID are in harmony, they are not identical. It would be unrealistic to expect the programs and approaches of the two organizations to be identical in all respects but, in general, it appears that UNFPA IC programs do serve U.S. interests and priorities reasonably well.

Even better results could be achieved if population personnel in the USG improved their knowledge of UNFPA programs and problems and if U.S. population concerns were brought to bear fully in U.S. relations with UNFPA implementing agencies. To reach these goals, a vigorous information and education effort must be undertaken by the USG agencies responsible for relations with the UNFPA implementing agencies, and the policies and

strategies of the U.S. agencies involved in population policy must be coordinated closely with the lead responsibilities for relations with the principal implementing agencies.

Appendix A
LIST OF RESOURCE PERSONS

Appendix A
LIST OF RESOURCE PERSONS

AID/Washington

Joseph Speidel, Acting Director, Office of Population
Lenni Kangas, Bureau for Near East
Richard Cornelius, Office of Population
Maura Brackett, Bureau for Latin America and Caribbean
James Brackett, Office of Population
Edward Muniak, Bureau for Asia
Jerald Bailey, Office of Population
Carole Tyson, Office of Population
William Johnson, Office of Population
Carl Hemmer, Office of Population

Department of State/Washington

Harry Glazer, Bureau for International Organization Affairs
John Yates, Bureau of Oceans and Environmental and Scientific Affairs

UNFPA/New York

Halvor Gille, Deputy Executive Director
Nafis Sadik, Assistant Executive Director, Program Division
Roushdi El-Heneidi, Mediterranean and Middle East Branch
Walter Franco, Latin America/Caribbean Branch

Jurgen Sacklowski, Office of Evaluation
Liliana Frieiro, Office of Evaluation
Lloyd Emerson, Adviser
Joseph Van Arendonk, Asia and Pacific Branch
Satish Mehra, Asia and Pacific Branch
Victor Anant, Information and Public Affairs Division
Lamine N'Diaye, Africa Branch
Elin Ranneberg-Nilsen, Africa Branch
Stafford Mousky, Office of Executive Director
Paul Micou, Planning, Interregional and Global Projects Branch
Steven Viederman, Interregional and Global Projects Branch
Marion O'Connor, Program Statistics Branch

U.N. Secretariat/New York

Leon Tabah, Director, Population Division
Simon Goldberg, Consultant, Office of Statistics
Zdenko Rajakovic, Office of Statistics

U.S. Mission to the United Nations/New York

Frank Brecher, Economic and Social Affairs
William Zimmerman, Economic and Social Affairs

WHO/Geneva

A. Petros-Barvazian, Director, Family Health Division
A. Kessler, Director, Special Program of Research, Development and
Research Training in Human Reproduction

S. Brogger, Health Systems
G. Sterky, Maternal and Child Health Section
K. Uemura, Health Statistics Division
H. Hansluwka, Health Statistics Division
A. Williams, Maternal and Child Health Section
N. Dahlquist, Coordination Division

ILO/Geneva

Kailas C. Doctor, Chief, Population and Labor Policies Branch
J. Hamish Richards, Operations
Rene Wery, Research
Ghazi M. Farooq, Economics/Demography

UNESCO/Paris

Alexander Graham, Director, Population Division, Social Science Sector
David Burleson, Population Division
P. Mathur, Population Division
S. Timor, Population Division
Jane King, Population Division
Yvette Abrahamson, Population Division
T. C. Young, Director, Bureau of Budget
M. Andres Besson and Staff, Population Education and Education Sector
H. Ben Amor and Staff, Director, Office of Statistics

OECD/Paris

Margaret Wolfson, Development Center, Population Project

FAO/Rome

W. Schulte, Population Program Coordinator, Economic and Social
Policy Department

R. Moreno, Director, Human Resources, Institutions and Agrarian
Reform Division

H. Quaix, Development Policy Studies and Training Service

J. Delaney, Human Resources, Institutions and Agrarian Reform Division

A. Arndt, Budget Officer

G. M. Higgins, Land and Water Development Division

E. Kennedy, Human Resources, Institutions and Agrarian Reform Division

R. Calderoni, Population Program Office

M. J. Snell, Consultant, Agricultural Education, Training and
Extension Institutions

USAID/Bangkok

David Oot, Population Officer

Thailand Government and Academic Institutions

Vira Osatononda, Deputy Secretary General, National Economic and
Social Development Board (NESDB)

Visit Boonyakesanond, Director, Population and Manpower Planning,
NESDB

Arb Nakajud, Vice Rector for Development, Kasetsart University

Banpot Boonsiri, Director, WHO Collaborating Center for Clinical
Research, Chulalongkorn University

Pramuan Virutamasen, Chief, Human Reproduction Division,
Chulalongkorn University

Nibhon Debavalya, Director, Institute of Population Studies,
Chulalongkorn University

UNFPA/Bangkok

Richard Moore, Country Coordinator

W. Frizen, Consultant

UNDP/Bangkok

Winston R. Prattley, Resident Representative

Roy Morey, Deputy Resident Representative

ILO Regional Office/Bangkok

Douglas H. Greve, Chief, Asian Labor and Population Team

Lionel Demery, Population and Employment Research

Karta Singh Bawa, Cooperatives and Rural Development Institutions

Joo-Hyun Lee, Education

FAO Regional Office/Bangkok

Dioscoro L. Umali, Assistant Director General and Regional
Representative, FAO

Juan Mercado, Development Support Communications

Fathi Z. Botros, Population Program

Herfried Herzog, Population Program

UNESCO Regional Office for Education/Bangkok

Raja Roy Singh, Assistant Director General
Akihiro Chiba, Deputy Director, Regional Office
Leonardo de la Cruz, Regional Adviser on Population Education
Ansar Ali Kahn, Adult and Out-of-School Education
R. C. Sharma, Curriculum Development
Lois Villanueva, Clearing House

ESCAP/Bangkok

Boonlert Leoprapai, Chief, Population Division
Laura Olson, Clearing House
Aminur Rohman Khan, Fertility and Family Planning
D.V.R. Murty, Regional Adviser
G. R. Amritmahal, Training
S. Selvaratnam, Country Monographs
Badr Hanna, Migration and Urbanization

UNICEF/Bangkok

Titi Memet-Tanumidjaja, Regional Director

DTCP/Bangkok

John Woods, Director
Lertlak Burusphat, Health/Population Planning/Programming

WHO/Bangkok

Rosa Cosico, Adviser, Ministry of Health

USAID/Manila

Steven Sinding, Chief, Office of Population, Health and Nutrition

William Goldman, Family Planning and Health Development

Nancy Hopkins, Population Consultant

UNFPA/Manila

Stirling Scruggs, Country Coordinator

Pat Shima, Program

Philippine Government and Non-Governmental Institutions

Susan de Del, Director, Population and Family Planning Program,
Ministry of Labor and Employment

Conrado Lorenzo, Vice President, Population Commission, and
Executive Director, Population Center Foundation

Donny Encendia, Population Center Foundation

Malou Baybay, Population Center Foundation

Gloria Feliciano, Dean, University of the Philippines,
Institute of Mass Communications

Ben de Leon, Coordinator, ASEAN Population Program

Romy Abundo, Press Foundations of Asia, Editor-in-Chief, Depthnews

Ditas Concepcion, Dean, University of the Philippines, Population
Institute

Aurora Perez, Population Institute

Fishermen's Cooperative (members and families, family planning and agricultural extension workers), Dulao Village, La Union

WHO-WPRO/Manila

- S. T. Han, Director, Program Management
- T. C. Hsu, Acting Director, Promotion and Prevention
- E. Goon, Health Manpower Development
- L. Nair, Nutrition
- Hu-Ching-Li, Maternal and Child Health
- F. Kaliczinski, Maternal and Child Health/Family Planning
- M. Bolton, Adviser, Philippine Ministry of Health

Appendix B

INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMS AT VARIOUS PERCENTAGE LEVELS
OF TOTAL PROGRAM ALLOCATIONS

Appendix B*

INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMS AT VARIOUS PERCENTAGE LEVELS OF TOTAL PROGRAM ALLOCATIONS

I. BASIC POPULATION DATA	<u>New</u>	<u>30 Percent</u>	<u>25 Percent</u>	<u>20 Percent</u>
Development of software for small computers to process population census data		At interregional/global level (INT/GLO)	Reduction in level of support	Further reduction in level of support
World Fertility Survey		At INT/GLO level; in-depth and comparative analysis in all regions	Reduction in level of support at INT/GLO level; in-depth and comparative analysis in some regions	At INT/GLO level; in-depth analysis in Latin America only
Development of household survey capability on population topics	x	Advisory services at INT/GLO level and in all regions	Reduced support in regions	At INT/GLO level only
Improvement of civil and vital registration systems	x	Training and advisory services at INT/GLO level and in all regions	As at 30 percent	Reduction in training programs and advisory services in regions
		Methodological research at INT/GLO level and in some regions	At INT/GLO level only	
Planning and taking of population censuses		Advisory services and training at INT/GLO level in all regions and at sub-regional level in Africa	As at 30 percent	As at 30 percent
		Preparation of training materials for support communication activities in all regions	In some regions	In Latin America only
		Advisory services and training in census cartography in all regions	In some regions	In Africa only
Development of data processing and analysis capacity		Advisory services and training at INT/GLO level and in all regions	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
Improvement in data collection methodology	x	Research in all regions	Research in Africa, Middle East only	
		Exchange of experience among regions	As at 30 percent	As at 30 percent

* Source: DP/406, May 1979.

	<u>New</u>	<u>30 Percent</u>	<u>25 Percent</u>	<u>20 Percent</u>
Use of existing demographic data and projections	x	Training and promotional activities in all regions	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
Population data storage and retrieval systems	(x)	In all regions	Reduced level of support in all regions	In Africa and Latin America only
II. POPULATION DYNAMICS				
Interregional and regional demographic research and training programs:				
RIPS (Ghana)		Above current support	As at 30 percent	
IFORD (U.R. of Cameroon)		Above current support		
CEDOR (Romania)		Some reduction compared with 1978		
CELADE (Latin America)		Below current level		Further reduction in support
IIFS (India)		At current level		Reduced support
Interregional Program (Moscow)		At current level		Reduced support
Cairo Demographic Centre		At current level		Reduced support
Trends, causes, and consequences of international and internal migration, with particular reference to employment and spatial distribution	x	Research at all levels on impact of large-scale labor migration in developing countries	As at 30 percent	
		Training and advisory services on determinants and consequences of migration in all regions	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
		Regional research in Latin America and Asia on relationship between resources and human settlements		
		INT/GLO studies on demographic aspects of agricultural growth, rural development, and land use	Reduced level of support	Further reduction

Appendix B*

INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMS AT VARIOUS PERCENTAGE LEVELS OF TOTAL PROGRAM ALLOCATIONS

I. BASIC POPULATION DATA	<u>New</u>	<u>30 Percent</u>	<u>25 Percent</u>	<u>20 Percent</u>
Development of software for small computers to process population census data		At interregional/global level (INT/GLO)	Reduction in level of support	Further reduction in level of support
World Fertility Survey		At INT/GLO level; in-depth and comparative analysis in all regions	Reduction in level of support at INT/GLO level; in-depth and comparative analysis in some regions	At INT/GLO level; in-depth analysis in Latin America only
Development of household survey capability on population topics	x	Advisory services at INT/GLO level and in all regions	Reduced support in regions	At INT/GLO level only
Improvement of civil and vital registration systems	x	Training and advisory services at INT/GLO level and in all regions	As at 30 percent	Reduction in training programs and advisory services in regions
		Methodological research at INT/GLO level and in some regions	At INT/GLO level only	
Planning and taking of population censuses		Advisory services and training at INT/GLO level in all regions and at sub-regional level in Africa	As at 30 percent	As at 30 percent
		Preparation of training materials for support communication activities in all regions	In some regions	In Latin America only
		Advisory services and training in census cartography in all regions	In some regions	In Africa only
Development of data processing and analysis capacity		Advisory services and training at INT/GLO level and in all regions	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
Improvement in data collection methodology	x	Research in all regions	Research in Africa, Middle East only	
		Exchange of experience among regions	As at 30 percent	As at 30 percent

* Source: DP/406, May 1979.

	<u>New</u>	<u>30 Percent</u>	<u>25 Percent</u>	<u>20 Percent</u>
Use of existing demographic data and projections	x	Training and promotional activities in all regions	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
Population data storage and retrieval systems	(x)	In all regions	Reduced level of support in all regions	In Africa and Latin America only
II. POPULATION DYNAMICS				
Interregional and regional demographic research and training programs:				
RIPS (Ghana)		Above current support	As at 30 percent	
IFORD (U.R. of Cameroon)		Above current support		
CEDOR (Romania)		Some reduction compared with 1978		
CELADE (Latin America)		Below current level		Further reduction in support
IIPS (India)		At current level		Reduced support
Interregional Program (Moscow)		At current level		Reduced support
Cairo Demographic Centre		At current level		Reduced support.
Trends, causes, and consequences of international and internal migration, with particular reference to employment and spatial distribution	x	Research at all levels on impact of large-scale labor migration in developing countries	As at 30 percent	
		Training and advisory services on determinants and consequences of migration in all regions	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
		Regional research in Latin America and Asia on relationship between resources and human settlements		
		INT/GLO studies on demographic aspects of agricultural growth, rural development, and land use	Reduced level of support	Further reduction

	<u>New</u>	<u>30 Percent</u>	<u>25 Percent</u>	<u>20 Percent</u>
Mortality, particularly causes of mortality differentials, effects on development efforts, and relationship with poverty, low productivity, etc.	x	Research at INT/GLO level and in Asia and Africa	Only some of proposed studies	
Socioeconomic factors and fertility change	(x)	INT/GLO studies based on WFS data Research in determinants of fertility in all regions	INT/GLO studies on smaller scale As at 30 percent	Further reduction In selected areas only
	x	INT/GLO micro- and macro-level case studies with particular reference to income distribution	As at 30 percent	
	x	INT/GLO study on consequences of alternative patterns and trends in fertility	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
Demographic trends and developmental planning	(x)	INT/GLO studies on impact of social and economic change on demographic trends Research on consequences of population trends in all regions	As at 30 percent In Asia and Africa only	As at 30 percent In Africa only
	(x)	Advisory services, training, and research support in regions	Some reduction in level of activities in all regions	In selected regions only
Demographic modeling	x	INT/GLO research Regional research and promotional activities in all regions	Reduced level of support As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support As at 30 percent
		INT/GLO conceptual design, technical backstopping, and related training for field programs Regional team of advisers on labor and population dynamics in all four developing regions	As at 30 percent Some reduction in number of advisers	As at 30 percent Further reduction in number of advisers
Population, employment, and socioeconomic planning		INT/GLO study on population, labor, and poverty at family and community levels	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support

	<u>New</u>	<u>30 Percent</u>	<u>25 Percent</u>	<u>20 Percent</u>
Interrelationship of role of women, population change, and development	(x)	INT/GLO studies and dissemination of findings	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
	x	INT/GLO development of methodologies and guidelines for determining progress made in integration of women in development, and demographic impact and application in all regions	As at 30 percent	As at 30 percent
Demographic aspects of aging		INT/GLO studies required to prepare for 1982 World Conference on the Aged; regional study in Latin America	Reduced level of support	
Studies on relationships among population, resources, and environment		INT/GLO studies and promotional activities	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
III. POPULATION POLICIES				
National population development planning units	x	Regional technical backstopping and training of personnel of such units in all regions	As at 30 percent	As at 30 percent
Demographic aspects of development of Sahelian region	x	Support for demographic unit to take into account population aspects of development programs and monitoring of demographic impact	Some reduction	Further reduction
Sociocultural aspects of population and development planning	(x)	INT/GLO study	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
Integration of population and development	(x)	Research at INT/GLO level on inter-relationships between population processes and development approaches	As at 30 percent	As at 30 percent
		INT/GLO development of manual to assist integration	As at 30 percent	As at 30 percent

	<u>New</u>	<u>30 Percent</u>	<u>25 Percent</u>	<u>20 Percent</u>
Integration of population and development (cont.)		Exchange of information among and within regions	Some reduction	Further reduction
		Training in all regions for development planners, preparation of training materials at INT/GLO level	As at 30 percent	As at 30 percent
Policy formulation	(x)	Advisory services and training in use of demographic data at INT/GLO level and in some regions	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
	x	Research and promotional activities on methodological and conceptual aspects of population policy development in all regions	In some regions	In Africa only
		Research at INT/GLO level of conceptual, methodological, and policy issues of internal migration	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support
Implementation and evaluation of population policies	x	Advisory services and training in all regions	As at 30 percent	Advisory services in all regions; training in all regions at reduced levels
		Promotional activities in all regions	Promotional activities at reduced level	
Mortality effects of health and development interventions	x	INT/GLO research	Reduced level of support	Advisory services in all regions
Effects of socioeconomic policies on demographic processes, and vice versa	(x)	Global analysis	At reduced level of support	At reduced level of support
	x	Information exchange among regions	At reduced level of support	
Internal migration patterns and overall development strategies	x	Research in all regions	Global research with case studies on selected countries in each region	Global research with case studies on countries in selected regions only
Migration and population distribution in development plans	x	INT/GLO assessment and dissemination of findings to all regions	As at 30 percent	Reduced level of support

IV. FAMILY PLANNING

	<u>New</u>	<u>30 Percent</u>	<u>25 Percent</u>	<u>20 Percent</u>
Delivery of integrated maternal and child health and family planning services (MCH/FP)	(x)	INT/GLO and regional technical advisory services and backstopping of utilization of various health systems	Support only at regional level	
	(x)	INT/GLO and regional technical advisory services and backstopping of development of services for special groups (primary health care and community-level approaches for rural populations, services for adolescents, etc.)	Reduction in support at regional level	Further reduction in level of support
Manpower development	(x)	Training of health personnel, in particular, in primary health care and community approaches; development of curricula and training materials at INT/GLO and regional levels	Reduced support at INT/GLO level	At regional level only
		Training of health personnel (medical and paramedical) and community agents at INT/GLO levels and in all regions	Reduced support at INT/GLO level	At regional level only
Research in MCH/FP	(x)	Operational research on the risk approach, primary health care, and other community participation approaches to service delivery; attitudes toward and use of services at INT/GLO levels and in all regions	Reduced level of support particularly for new programs and limitation of expansion of ongoing programs; major research operations at INT/GLO level	Support to ongoing programs only, research at INT/GLO level only
	(x)	Epidemiological research on health aspects of family planning (i.e., abortion, infertility, breastfeeding, adolescent fertility), primarily at INT/GLO level	Reduced level of support to regional operations	Reduced support to research limited to INT/GLO level only
	(x)	Development of research methodologies for and studies on the relationships between general infant and childhood mortality, morbidity, and fertility at INT/GLO level	Reduced level of support	Support to ongoing programs only

	<u>New</u>	<u>30 Percent</u>	<u>25 Percent</u>	<u>20 Percent</u>
Research in MCH/FP (cont.)	(x)	Development of statistical information and evaluation systems at INT/GLO level and adaptation at regional level	Reduced level of support to INT/GLO operations	Support to regional operations only
	(x)	Evaluation of current modes of integration of MCH/FP programs at INT/GLO level		
Synthesis of knowledge and information exchange	(x)	Technical meetings, study groups, publications at INT/GLO and regional levels	Reduced level of support	Further reduction in level of support
Contraceptive development research	(x)	Training in research and research operations organized primarily at INT/GLO level; development or regional mechanisms	Reduced support at INT/GLO level and support to Latin America only	Further reduction to level of support to INT/GLO programs; no support to regional operations
		Introduction and adaptation of of current contraceptive technology	Reduced support	Reduced support
V. COMMUNICATION AND EDUCATION				
Planning, management, and evaluation of information, education, and communication (IEC) strategies		Training and advisory services in all regions	Reduced level of activities in all regions	Further reduction in number of advisers and training activities
Research and IEC strategy development in relatively new areas, including adolescent fertility, migration, redistribution, including community-level communication	x	Regional advisory services, including supervision of in-country research in all regions; INT/GLO mechanisms for exchange of research findings and pilot experiences	Reduction in the number of activities and personnel, particularly pilot projects	Elimination of pilot activities; further reduction in coverage
Communication support for population programs		Advisory services and in-country training in all regions	Reduction in personnel and coverage	Further reduction in personnel and in-country training
Population information network(s)		Global and in all regions	Global only	Further reduction in coverage
Integration of population elements into development programs in other sectors		Advisory services and training in all regions; limited global involvement for coordination of sectorial activities	Reduced training activities	

	<u>New</u>	<u>30 Percent</u>	<u>25 Percent</u>	<u>20 Percent</u>
Innovative uses of media, including videotape, educational radio, self-teaching materials	x	Training and advisory services in all regions	Reduced level of support	
Population education in schools and out of schools	-	Advisory services, training, development of prototype materials in all regions	Reduction in advisers and activities	Further reduction
Population education and communication clearinghouses	-	In all regions, including training and advisory services for national clearinghouse activities and translation and exchange of materials	In all regions at reduced levels	Further reduction
Innovative approaches to family welfare education and sex education	x	In all regions, as appropriate, with advisory services, training, research, and INT/GLO involvement for information exchange and comparative studies	Reduced support for personnel and training	Reduced research and pilot activities; elimination of activities in Asia