



Second Independent Evaluation of UNAIDS
Oversight Committee

Address: Room V25

c/o UNAIDS

20 avenue Appia

CH-1211, Geneva 27

Switzerland

Telephone: (+41) 22 791 5528/4555

Facsimile: (+41) 22 791 4187

Email: <IndependentEval2@unaids.org>

Stakeholder Workshop on Preliminary Evaluation Findings
3-4 June 2009
Geneva Switzerland

Proceedings: Opening Plenary Session

Participants:

Member States (46), Cosponsoring Organizations (14), Other International Organizations (1), Civil Society Organizations (9), UNAIDS Secretariat (27), Oversight Committee/OC Secretariat (13), Evaluation Team (6).

Introductions:

The Oversight Committee Chair reminded the participants that the Workshop was part of a broader consultation that included solicitation of written comments, and that participants were also welcome to submit comments at any time up to June 12th. She noted that the Oversight Committee had deliberately chosen a stakeholder consultation on preliminary evaluation findings rather than, at a later stage, on a draft report as part of a process to produce a Final Evaluation Report that contains meaningful recommendations for the future of UNAIDS.

She noted that there were 87 findings presented in the Consultation Document. The consultations are intended to solicit views, comments and ideas for the Evaluation Team and Oversight Committee. Participants in the Study Group Sessions were asked to consider three questions: i) if the findings resonated with their own perceptions; ii) and, if not, if there was evidence could they direct the ET to; and iii) what areas were the most fruitful for developing recommendations.

Paul De Lay, Director, Evidence, Monitoring and Policy Department and Acting Deputy Executive Director, Programme, on behalf of UNAIDS Secretariat, extended a warm welcome to participants and noted it was heartening to see such a good turnout for the Workshop. The SIE is timely and an important product for the Executive Director (EXD), who is in the process of extensive consultations on a number of structural issues. The EXD sees the SIE as a core for guidance on the next phase of UNAIDS. Dr De Lay noted that the Recommendations needed to be actionable, and the Stakeholder Workshop

was taking place at a critical point in the evaluation process, in helping to shape recommendations for improving UNAIDS.

Steve Kraus, Cosponsor Liaison Official, noted that all Cosponsors were present, despite competing priorities during a busy period of meetings. He noted that the Cosponsors were made to feel welcome and engaged by the Oversight Committee, and that the Evaluation Team had made an effort to reach out to all Cosponsors – jointly, one on one, follow-up meetings, group encounters, and web-based surveys, and that the Cosponsors also had opportunities to contribute during the country studies. He noted that the process demonstrated a genuine effort to ensure robust dialogue with the Evaluation Team. He thanked the Oversight Committee for the relationship that they had also encouraged with Cosponsors. Finally, he noted the importance of the discussions at an important time in the life of UNAIDS.

A [presentation by the Evaluation Team Leader](#), Derek Poate, summarized the evaluation framework, questions to be addressed, and the findings to date against the hypotheses posed in the framework. He noted it was difficult to give an overall sense of the evaluation at this point, but emerging conclusions suggested that five of the hypotheses had largely been confirmed, that four had been partially confirmed and that there was little evidence to date to support the other three hypotheses. He noted that the Stakeholder consultations were part of the information gathering process of the evaluation and that the finding statements are preliminary and may still change. The Evaluation Team are looking for clear feedback on three questions: how the statements resonate with stakeholders' own perceptions; and where the findings do not resonate what additional evidence should the ET review to challenge/change their findings; and what areas offer scope for strategic recommendations.

Discussion:

An intervention from Kenya noted the disturbing nature of the findings that suggested a collective failure by the international community in the fight against HIV/AIDS; the reasons for lack of progress on recommendations from the Five-Year Evaluation, in particular with regard to governance, financial management and country level reforms; the political and religious impact of AIDS on peace and security, an important aspect of the changing environment and consideration of a stronger mandate for UNAIDS; and finally what definition of health systems was used.

The delegate from the International Civil Society Support familiar with the Global Fund evaluation underway note the number of overlapping issues between the two evaluations and the need to take into account the respective findings and their relationship.

The representative from Denmark read a statement on behalf of Norway, Finland, Switzerland, Sweden, Austria and Iceland. She noted the complexity of the evaluation and the preliminary nature of the findings. However, there were some methodological weaknesses, including lack of transparency on how stakeholder input and web surveys are used, limited access to background information, lack of systematic analysis of

evidence derived from country case studies for assessment of performance at country level, information largely presented in a qualitative way, lack of findings on prevention, and use of budgets for resource allocation and management. She noted the overall assessment of outcomes -- while positive on civil society, human rights, and PLHIV, there was no progress on strengthening health systems, Division of Labour, administration of the joint programme, and follow-up to recommendations from the five-year evaluation. Serious questions are raised on the functioning of the PCB and of UNAIDS as a joint programme. The Evaluation must provide a deep and thorough analysis of why progress has not occurred and whether the problems can be solved through the current existing structure. She noted that the consultation document contained limited or no information about the analytical methods and data used, nor information on the background and context. However it does provide interesting and important findings. The final document needs to address the methodological shortcomings, and present well-founded, clear conclusions and recommendations.

The Canadian delegate noted the importance of the evaluation to his government as well as the PCB response to it, which will be a factor in decisions on future support to UNAIDS. He was satisfied with the format and content of the *Consultation Document*, which dealt with strategic issues, and indicated their linkages. It contributed to better understanding of the issues.

The Netherlands delegation was satisfied by the work done and with the decision to discuss findings at this earlier stage. The document will serve to move forward. It shows the weaknesses with governance. The final report will need to deal with the issue of whether the current architecture of UNAIDS is fit for the future.

The Ethiopian delegate noted the need to address impact at country level. UNAIDS can have influence to harmonize with national plans. National authorities need road maps to guide on how best to go forward on such issues as health system strengthening, why and how Global Fund money is used, and to address bottlenecks.

The Oversight Committee Chair and Evaluation Team Leader emphasized that the Consultation Document is not and should not be seen as a draft Evaluation Report. It is a working document for discussions with stakeholders on preliminary findings. The Final Report will provide more information on context, methodology, evidence and findings.

The Oversight Committee Chair noted that the Oversight Committee had reviewed more than a thousand pages of background material as part of its oversight role and stressed the need to maintain the independence of the Evaluation. She also stressed that the OC very much welcomed the interest in the Evaluation and the OC and were open at any time to dialogue with Stakeholders. The Evaluation Team Leader noted the Evaluation Report will highlight issues from the Global Fund evaluation where they are linked. On governance, the ET noted that the issue of governance structure is related to the decisions on the future role of UNAIDS.

The Evaluation Team Leader presented an overview of the first of the three Study Group Sessions: “How UNAIDS is responding to the changing environment”.

The discussion topics and results of the Study Group discussions are provided in the report for the Closing Plenary Session.