



**UNAIDS**  
UNICEF • UNDP • UNFPA  
UNESCO • WHO • WORLD BANK

UNAIDS/PCB(4)/97.5 Add.1  
4 March 1997

Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS

## **PROGRAMME COORDINATING BOARD**

**Fourth meeting**

**Geneva, 7-9 April 1997**

*Provisional agenda item 6*

### **Report of the PCB Working Group on Indicators and Evaluation**

#### **Status of the UNAIDS Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan**

#### Contents

I	Introduction
II	Progress report on performance monitoring and evaluation
III	Comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan
IV	Other recommendations
Annex 1:	Matrix of Monitoring and Evaluation Tools

**I. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 In its June 1996 report to the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB), the Working Group on Indicators and Evaluation outlined a statement of guiding principles and recommendations for performance monitoring and evaluation. Among the recommendations of the report was that, UNAIDS devote sufficient funds and staff to develop, by January 1997, a Performance Assessment Plan which details the mechanisms to be established to ensure effectiveness across UNAIDS and provides the basis for accountability.
- 1.2 On February 17-18, the PCB Working Group on Indicators and Evaluation held its second meeting in order to review UNAIDS's progress in developing its Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. During this meeting, the Working Group reviewed the Progress Report on Performance Monitoring and Evaluation, related materials, and referred to a draft Programme Budget and Workplan for 1998-1999.
- 1.3 Although a comprehensive performance monitoring and evaluation plan has not yet been completed, the Working Group felt that the progress was impressive and commended UNAIDS on work accomplished to date. The Working Group also supported many of the activities and plans described by the Secretariat as components of a performance monitoring and evaluation effort and recommended further development of a comprehensive plan.
- 1.4 The Group agreed with UNAIDS's recommendation to replace the Working Group with a UNAIDS advisory group that encompassed technical and policy concerns.

**II. PROGRESS REPORT ON PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

- 2.1 Overall, the Working Group was pleased with the progress made to date and the direction the UNAIDS Monitoring and Evaluation strategy is taking. The Working Group found the conceptual framework useful (see UNAIDS/PCB(4)97.5, Annex 1).
- 2.2 The Working Group members felt that the Expanded Response Effort Assessment (EREA) may be an approach for tracking the expanded response. Developing and testing this tool should be given high priority.
- 2.3 The Working Group expressed satisfaction that an adequate HIV/AIDS surveillance system had been established through a network of partnerships with key players (e.g. WHO and the US Census Bureau) and UNAIDS as the focal point for presenting a global picture of the pandemic. The Working Group was less comfortable with the status of surveillance of STDs but noted that this falls outside the UNAIDS mandate.

2.4 The Working Group anticipates that "UNAIDS in Country: 1996 Status Assessment" will give insight into the status of UNAIDS at country level during 1996, its first full year of operations. The Working Group looks forward to the presentation of results at the PCB meeting in April, 1997.

2.5 The Working Group was pleased with the description of the conceptualization of best practices and with UNAIDS's role in promoting best practices. However, members expressed concern that insufficient development has been made on the dissemination, utilization and effectiveness of best practice. More consideration must be given to the contribution of best practice to the overall achievements of UNAIDS's objectives in order to elaborate specific performance indicators in the area of best practice.

### III. COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

3.1 While it is understandable that UNAIDS was not able to complete a comprehensive plan in time for the PCB's April 1997 meeting, the Working Group strongly recommends that such a plan be submitted to the PCB in 1998. The plan should follow the Guiding Principles approved by the PCB at its third meeting in June 1996 (UNAIDS/PCB(3)/96.5).

3.2 In order to give more specific guidance to UNAIDS, the Working Group constructed a matrix, outlining specific monitoring and evaluation components that build on the tools UNAIDS presented to the Working Group and that are described in the Progress Report (Annex 1). However, not all the important features of a comprehensive plan are shown in the matrix. These are discussed below.

3.3 Implications of Partnerships: As with all aspects of UNAIDS's work, a critical assumption is that a successful effort depends, in varying degrees, on collaboration and cooperation with its partners.

3.4 Coverage of Conceptual Model: Currently, UNAIDS does not have a complete set of monitoring and evaluation tools and approaches for each level described in its "Conceptual Framework for Performance Monitoring and Evaluation". The matrix prepared by the Working Group suggests specific activities for each of the framework's four levels.

3.5 User Perspective: The Working Group felt that UNAIDS should determine user satisfaction, quality and effectiveness of its services, goods and information.

3.6 Priority Setting: A comprehensive effort to monitor and evaluate performance needs to be phased and its scope continuously assessed. Monitoring and evaluation activities must be kept at a manageable level over time so as not to overburden the organization and to enable a focused, well-executed process. Special attention should be paid to data management and analysis. Some activities have a more immediate urgency, like an information system for

managers to track UNAIDS's implementation of its Workplan. Other initiatives such as reduced individual and collective vulnerability require a great deal of methodological development, and still others demand a level of effort that dictates restrictions on their scope and frequency. The plan must present a realistic schedule for tasks and products. For instance, the Expanded Response Effort Assessment (EREA) might first be limited to selected countries so that data processing and analysis mechanisms can be perfected. The plan should also reflect staffing and budgetary constraints.

3.7 Comprehensive Assessment of UNAIDS: The Working Group suggests that a comprehensive assessment of UNAIDS be conducted in 2001. This date gives the organization time to establish a track record. Such assessments should be repeated every five years.

3.8 Ad Hoc Evaluations: The Working Group noted that no plan can anticipate or cover all needs. Therefore, UNAIDS should have contingency funds for ad hoc evaluations.

3.9 Required Resources: Human and financial requirements need to be described.

#### IV. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1a Budget: The Working Group members expressed serious concern at the lack of specific attention to Monitoring and Evaluation in the 1998-1999 Proposed Programme Budget and Workplan, noting the lack of a Monitoring and Evaluation chapter in the text and the fact that the Workplan does not explicitly identify funding which may be earmarked for monitoring and evaluation activities in other areas such as surveillance. Although, in principle, it is accepted that everyone has responsibilities toward monitoring and evaluation, experience has shown that when all are responsible, no one is responsible and necessary actions fall through the cracks. Dedicated staff and resources are inevitably necessary to ensure that monitoring and evaluation is carried out thoroughly and should be fully identified in the Workplan and Budget.

4.1b The lack of specific details in the monitoring and evaluation budget for 1998-1999 made it difficult for the Working Group to assess the adequacy of the funds allocated for that period, but discussions during the meeting indicated that current resources are inadequate to meet current needs. The Working Group recommends that every attempt be made to ensure that the next budget will be sufficient to fully implement the Monitoring and Evaluation Workplan and that the budget be formatted so that all funds used for monitoring and evaluation can be identified.

4.2 Human Resources: The Working Group recommends that the PCB approve the full-time staff position proposed along with the proposed reallocation of an existing post (the 1998-1999 Workplan allows for one post in the general service category as well). Members note

with concern that additional human resources will be needed to develop and implement a comprehensive performance assessment effort. Other mechanisms for staffing this area are encouraged, such as out-sourcing, secondments from Cosponsoring Organizations or bilaterals, and use of existing UN capabilities like the Joint Inspection Unit.

4.3a **Future of the Working Group:** The Working Group members concur with the UNAIDS recommendation that the PCB disband the Working Group and establish an advisory group that will meet both the evolving performance assessment needs of UNAIDS and maintain some of the benefits of the Working Group. UNAIDS representatives agreed that the current Working Group was especially suited to strategic planning and practical oversight and provided a supportive forum for UNAIDS to explore ideas and concerns.

4.3b The Working Group recommends that the new group include:

- i. continuing involvement of selected Working Group members to ensure continuity and capture the knowledge of UNAIDS performance monitoring and evaluation to date;
- ii. technical experts from academia and from Cosponsoring Organizations;
- iii. representation from a cross-section of stakeholders including:
  - UNAIDS staff
  - donor organizations
  - bilaterals
  - non-governmental organizations, and
  - providers.





<b>Conceptual Framework Levels (Priority)</b>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation Tools</b>	<b>Resource Implications</b>	<b>UNAIDS Operational Considerations ~</b>	<b>Partners External to UNAIDS</b>	<b>Target Audience/Users</b>	<b>Timeline for Evaluation Deliverables and Frequency</b>
PRIORITY II						
Level 1 Reduced Individual and collective vulnerability	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	PCB 1999*
PRIORITY II						
Level 1 Reduced adverse impact of HIV/AIDS on individuals and communities	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	PCB 2000*
PRIORITY II						
Level 2 Expanded National Response  PRIORITY I	<i>EREA Country Report</i>	<i>EREA Budget</i>	Proposed outsourcing	To Be Determined	UN Theme Groups CCO/COs NAP Bilaterals PCB	PCB 1999 Every 7 years

~ These are things of special note that must happen in order for the tool to be operational

\* Tentative dates only



Conceptual Framework Levels (Priority)	Monitoring and Evaluation Tools	Resource Implications	UNAIDS Operational Considerations~	Partners External to UNAIDS	Target Audience/Users	Timeline for Evaluation Deliverables and Frequency
Level 3 Intermediate Outcomes - Effective and Expanded UN System Response	UN Theme Group Status Assessment  <i>User Satisfaction Surveys (e.g., MOH, NAP)</i>	Baseline database development and maintenance	UN Theme Group to collect and collate data and report back  UN Theme Group to collect and collate data and report back	Commitment of Cosponsors to joint planning and funding  Harvard School of Public Health	UN Theme Groups NAP UNAIDS - PCB	2000 Bi-annual
PRIORITY II	Study of the Financing of National HIV/AIDS Programmes					1997 Bi-annual
PRIORITY II	<i>Cosponsoring Organization Working Group Performance Assessments</i>	To Be Determined		COs	CCO PCB	Annual

Conceptual Framework Levels (Priority)	Monitoring and Evaluation Tools	Resource Implications	UNAIDS Operational Considerations~	Partners External to UNAIDS	Target Audience/Users	Timeline for Evaluation Deliverables and Frequency
Level 4  Monitoring the Execution of the UNAIDS Workplan  PRIORITY I	<i>System for Performance Information for Programme Managers to be developed</i>	An increase in resources may be required	Internal Secretariat Concerns		UNAIDS Management and PCB	Annual
Quality Assessment and Strategic Relevance of UNAIDS Outputs (both qualitative and quantitative performance aspects)  PRIORITY II	<i>Selected Performance Indicators and Criteria</i>  <i>User's Satisfaction Survey, e.g., UN Theme Groups</i>	An increase in resources may be required	Timing critical; assessment must be completed in time to inform development of the 1998-1999 budget		PCB UN Theme Groups  PCB UN Theme Groups	Bi-annual  Nov. 1998 Every 4 yrs.

**NOTE:** Items in *italics* indicate suggested evaluation tools.