Official Development Assistance

ODA Volumes (1990-2010)

Source: OECD/DAC CRS Database

All donors includes developed country governments, development banks, development funds, UN agencies and other Development Institutions. DAC members refer to the 24 states who are currently members of the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee.
ODA Efforts (1994-2010)
EU Share of Global ODA

Net disbursements in billion USD (2010)

- **EU Member States**: 84,267 (58%)
  - **Country**: EU-Member States
  - **Amount**: 71,282
  - **Share of Total**: 49%
  - **Share of Total (4.28%)**
  - **Variance in Absolute Disbursements Over Previous Year**

- **Other Europeans**: 7,873 (5%)
  - **Amount**: 5,873
  - **Share of Total (10.30%)**

- **USA**: 30,154 (20%)
  - **Amount**: 30,154
  - **Share of Total (4.59%)**

- **Canada**: 5,132 (3%)
  - **Amount**: 5,132
  - **Share of Total (28.29%)**

- **Australia**: 3,849 (3%)
  - **Amount**: 3,849
  - **Share of Total (39.37%)**

- **Other Donors**: 4,878 (3%)
  - **Amount**: 4,878
  - **Share of Total (-17.43%)**

European Union Institutions denotes funds and instruments administered by the European Commission.

*Other Donors does not include data for Chinese Taipei, Thailand or Israel in 2010

**Other Europeans includes Turkey, Norway, Switzerland, and Iceland.

Top Global ODA Donors

- USA: 30.2 billion USD
- Canada: 5.1 billion USD
- Japan: 11.0 billion USD
- Other Europeans*: 7.9 billion USD
- EU Institutions: 13.0 billion USD
- EU Member States: 71.3 billion USD

*Other Europeans includes Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey. European Union denotes funds and instruments administered by the European Commission.

Top 10 European Donors

ODA per Capita – Most Generous

Total Funding for Population Assistance (1994-2009)


The revised ICPD Costed Package from the UN CPD 2009 report, estimates that the donor share in 2010 should have been at this level.

The ICPD Costed Package is the 1993 estimated total costs for achieving the ICPD Programme of Action.
Breakdown of Population Assistance

Source: UNFPA/NIDI Resource Flows Project Database, Millennium Declaration

Includes all donor institutions, including developed country governments, foundations/NGOs and development banks.
The Funding Gap

The Funding Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP &amp; RH</td>
<td>4,625.50</td>
<td>5,953.16</td>
<td>7,044.83</td>
<td>7,476.16</td>
<td>7,712.16</td>
<td>7,902.16</td>
<td>7,817.50</td>
<td>48,531.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>601.67</td>
<td>3,426.67</td>
<td>3,645.67</td>
<td>3,927.01</td>
<td>4,188.01</td>
<td>4,424.67</td>
<td>4,673.01</td>
<td>24,886.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Research</td>
<td>269.82</td>
<td>1,365.15</td>
<td>1,067.15</td>
<td>499.15</td>
<td>146.49</td>
<td>40.82</td>
<td>50.18</td>
<td>3,338.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Totals</td>
<td>5,496.99</td>
<td>10,744.99</td>
<td>11,757.66</td>
<td>11,902.32</td>
<td>12,046.66</td>
<td>12,367.66</td>
<td>12,440.32</td>
<td>76,756.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Donors of Population Assistance
Global Efforts on Population Assistance
2007-2009, as percentage of ODA

Summary: Population Assistance in 2009
12 donors increased their contributions as % of ODA
11 donors decreased their contributions as % of ODA

Top European Donors

Source: UNFPA/NIDI Resource Flows Project Database
Population Assistance per Capita

Top Donors to Reproductive Health

*Data for 2009 is derived from the OECD DAC, while previous years’ data was received directly from the Source: UNFPA/NIDI Resource Flows Project Database
Top Donors to Family Planning

Source: UNFPA/NIDI Resource Flows Project Database
dsw-online.de
epfweb.org
nidi.knaw.nl
countdown2015europe.org
Tracking European Donor Funding and Policy Changes for RH and FP in ODA
Consortium of 16 European NGOs working in 13 European countries and with European institutions

- Lead partner: IPPF EN
What is...

- Increase European donor commitment
  - to achieve universal access for reproductive health
  - Special attention to raising awareness on the unmet need for family planning
The Challenge of Tracking European Donor Funding for Family Planning

What do international reporting mechanisms on funding for FP tell us about European donors?
Addressing a Challenge: European Donor Data on Family Planning

UNFPA Core Funding by All Countries 2000 (% to RH, % to FP, % to STD/HIV/AIDS)

Countdown 2015 Europe

OECD 50
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B. General Contributions to Intermediate Organisations for Population Activities in 2010

OECD

IPPF EN
Transparent European Donor Data on FP Work with NIDI

- UNFPA/NIDI Resource Flows project: question added on % RH and % FP
- FP tracker tool
- Civil servant Expert Meeting, The Hague
- OECD invitation

### General Contributions to Intermediate Organisations for Population Activities in 2010

Please list any general contributions made by your organisation during 2010 to intermediate organisations involved in population activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of organisation</th>
<th>Total amount for general contribution</th>
<th>% of this total amount for population activities</th>
<th>Amount for STD/HIV/AIDS activities only</th>
<th>% of this amount, % for STD/HIV/AIDS activities only</th>
<th>Amount for Family Planning activities only</th>
<th>% of this amount, % for Family Planning activities only</th>
<th>Amount for Reprod. Health activities only</th>
<th>% of this amount, % for Reprod. Health activities only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. UNFPA</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td>12 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. UNAIDS</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IPPF</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. UNIFEM</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>29 %</td>
<td>29 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. UNICEF</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. UNDP</td>
<td>8 %</td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td>68 %</td>
<td>68 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. WHO</td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>46 %</td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td>81 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. UN Foundation</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td>53 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. GFATM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. World Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transparent European Donor Data on FP Work with OECD WP STAT

- Recommendations to OECD STAT Task Team on MNCH, October 4th 2011, Paris
  - More detailed information needed
    - Use full range of existing purpose codes
    - Breakdown projects by multi-purpose codes
    - Better project descriptions
  - More transparency needed
    - Extending use of standardized keywords in English
    - Harmonization of project descriptions by providing guidelines
    - More adequate training and quality scrutiny of staff reporting
Recommendations on new solutions to OECD STAT Task Team on MNCH, October 4th 2011, Paris

- Ability to choose multiple purpose codes or multipurpose codes
- To whom directed: beneficiary coding
- Databases to capture all aid flows
- Attach original project documentation
- Databases to capture domestic resources
- Tracking international pledges
Web-based tool with
- Real time data, automatically uploaded and translated into graphs
- More recent & detailed figures for monitoring
- Respecting national reporting systems
- ICPD categories & Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness
Most recent trends?
Data available in real time

- Example: All donors to UNFPA 2009 & 2010
Data on funding for multilateral organisations
Detailed Monitoring of National Data
Tracking European Donor Support for RH and FP

Ireland

Country Profile

Ireland is the Government of Ireland’s programme of assistance to developing countries. While there is no single sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) policy, the government has consistently supported family planning in political statements and Irish Aid policy documents.

The current economic crisis has resulted in substantial cuts to Ireland’s overseas development budget. Irish Aid’s annual reported funding to UNFPA has been maintained at 2009 levels. The category of ‘Health, HIV and AIDS’ accounted for 25% of funding through Irish Aid’s bilateral programme and 20% of its civil society programme in 2010. However, current reporting procedures do not otherwise disaggregate family planning and reproductive health expenditure within health spending.

A general election in February 2011 resulted in a coalition of a left and a centre-right party. A new Minister for Development was appointed in March 2011. In April 2011, Ireland readies its first

Recent Ireland Updates

- Development Minister makes strong case for SRH as a key element of Irish Aid’s work.

Country Profiles

- Belgium
- Denmark
- European Institutions
- Finland
- France
- Germany

UNFPA Core Funding by All Countries 2014 (% to RH, % to FP, % to STD/HIV/AIDS)

- Belgium
- Denmark
- European Institutions
- Finland
- France
- Germany
New Countdown 2015 Europe website:
- Country profiles of 13 European donors
- Real time updates on new RH and FP policy commitments through news section and twitter

www.countdown2015europe.org

Key Documents
- Health portfolio review 2009 (released November 2010)
- Working paper on FP/RH research agenda: Reproductive Health (ISFM-94-948)
- Choices for Women: Planned pregnancies, safe births and healthy newborns (December 2010)
- Target Zero Infections: The UK's position paper on HIV in the developing world (May 2011)
- ODF Evidence Paper: Interventions to reduce unintended pregnancies (December 2010)
Increasing transparency in data for FP: an ongoing exercise

Initial results
- Better quality data
- More awareness on need to invest in FP
- Real time RH/FP tracking on policy and funding
- Graphs available to assist Countdown 2015 Europe partners’ national advocacy efforts

In the future
- More data on funding to be made public
- Match policy and funding commitments
- Need willingness of various actors involved
Thank you!

For more detailed information visit:
www.countdown2015europe.org

or email us:
countdown2015europe@ippfen.org
SUPPORTING CSO OVERSIGHT:
Lessons from Tracking Global Fund Grants for RH/HIV Integration

Suzanne Ehlers, President & CEO
NOVEMBER 29, 2011
PHASE I: MOBILIZING FOR REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH (RH) / HIV INTEGRATION 2008-2009

- First of its kind effort
- Partners in 10 African countries
- Leveraged $200 million for integrated funding in 7 countries receiving Global Fund Grants
- Unique and replicated project model
PHASE II: THE INTEGRATION PARTNERSHIP 2010-2012

- **OBJECTIVE 1:** Increase priority of RH/HIV and Maternal, Newborn and Child Health/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria integration within The Global Fund

- **OBJECTIVE 2:** Increase priority of RH/HIV and Maternal, Newborn and Child Health/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria integration within PEPFAR & Global Health Initiative

- **OBJECTIVE 3:** Promote civil society involvement and informed decision making about integration in six countries in sub-Saharan Africa
  
  ✓ **Activity:** Promoting greater civil society oversight over grants in implementation phase
Assess whether successful proposals to the Global Fund for integrated RH/HIV services resulted in the provision of services and supplies

Strengthen accountability and CSO oversight over Global Fund grant implementation
PAI is working with a local partner Women and Law in Southern Africa (WLSA)

WLSA and partners in Zambia’s sexual and reproductive health coalition will review documents and hold interviews with key stakeholders
SRH/HIV INTEGRATION IN ZAMBIA’S ROUND 8 PROPOSAL FOR HIV PREVENTION

“Supporting districts and provinces to integrate Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission and infant and young child feeding, counseling in antenatal care, reproductive health and family planning services.” —Proposal page 46

- Procurement and supply of family planning commodities
- Research on best practices
- Training workshops for planners and health workers
ROUND 8 IMPLEMENTATION

- Disbursement delays
- Changes in Primary Recipients (PRs)
- New Administration
- Grant consolidation
Round 8 largely reprogrammed from HIV prevention to treatment. But, RH/HIV Integrated components remain.

Procurement order using Round 8 funds scheduled for 2012:

- Over $500,000 worth of injectable contraceptives
- Female condoms
CHALLENGING CONTEXT

- Transparency fatigue
- Role of civil society oversight
PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- SRH/HIV Integrated components of Round 8 Global Fund grants are being implemented

- Need for CSOs to stay engaged at all grant phases

- Re-programming of funds and grant consolidation may lead to deviation from original proposals

*Research findings are preliminary—WLSA investigation will reveal more*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCM</td>
<td>Country Coordinating Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFA</td>
<td>Local Funding Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>Office of the Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Primary Recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Reproductive Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Sub Recipient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLSA</td>
<td>Women and Law in Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>