

**SESSION A: How UNAIDS is responding to the changing context:**

**Wednesday, 3 June**

**16:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**16:15 – Breakout into Study Groups**

**SGA1: Q(a) The evolving role of UNAIDS in a changing financial environment**

ET Finding (pp 7-9):

*UNAIDS has evolved in response to the changing patterns of global finance and has generally been effective at developing relationships. Some examples of synergy can be found. Evaluations are undertaken but tend not to be planned systematically across the cosponsors.*

Discussion topics:

- 1. UNAIDS has adapted to a new funding environment and developed strong and positive relationships with the Global Fund and PEPFAR**
2. UNAIDS has been effective at developing relationships with partners
3. Synergies have been developed in the field of research and resource tracking.
4. Synergies have been generated among development partners and organizations of vulnerable populations and people living with HIV

**SESSION A: How UNAIDS is responding to the changing context:**

**Wednesday, 3 June**

**16:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**16:15 – Breakout into Study Groups**

**SGA2: Q(a) The evolving role of UNAIDS in configuring response to the national epidemic**

ET Findings (pp 7-9):

*UNAIDS has evolved in response to the changing patterns of global finance and has generally been effective at developing relationships. Some examples of synergy can be found. Evaluations are undertaken but tend not to be planned systematically across the cosponsors.*

Discussion Topics:

- 1. UNAIDS needs to clarify its role as a proactive source of technical support to countries**
2. Synergies have been developed in the field of research and resource tracking.
3. Synergies have been generated among development partners and organizations of vulnerable populations and people living with HIV.
4. Whilst there has been good support to develop national M&E capacity (see findings under Question j), there is little evidence of a systematic and good quality approach to evaluation different interventions, policies and strategies implemented across many partners.

**SESSION A: How UNAIDS is responding to the changing context:**

**Wednesday, 3 June**

**16:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**16:15 – Breakout into Study Groups**

**SGA3: Q (c) Response to the Five-Year Evaluation recommendations**

ET Findings (pp 2-6):

*Most recommendations have been implemented in full or in part. Less progress has been made a) with those dealing with governance and financial management and b) in implementation at country level.*

Discussion Topics:

- 1. Most recommendations dealing with objectives, governance and management were not implemented.**
2. Recommendations that were under the direct control of the Secretariat and for which resources were available have mostly been implemented.
3. Implementation of the recommendations has been less effective at country level.

**SESSION A: How UNAIDS is responding to the changing context:**

**Wednesday, 3 June**

**16:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**16:15 – Breakout into Study Groups**

**SGA4: Q (e) Strengthening health systems**

ET Findings (pp 12-15):

*No significant added value of UNAIDS as a joint programme as yet. Increased funding of health systems strengthening by major HIV donors and inclusion of health systems issues in national AIDS strategies is difficult to attribute to UNAIDS.*

Discussion Topics:

- 1. UNAIDS approach to health systems strengthening and role vis-à-vis global initiatives is not clearly articulated**
2. UNAIDS has not had a substantial influence on HIV and health systems strengthening at country level.
3. Health system issues are, by and large, included in national HIV strategies.
4. Major HIV donors have increased allocation of funds for health systems strengthening.
5. UNAIDS has not had a substantial influence on HIV and health systems strengthening at country level.

**SESSION A: How UNAIDS is responding to the changing context:**

**Wednesday, 3 June**

**16:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**16:15 – Breakout into Study Groups**

**SGA5: Q (g) Delivering as One: The effects of UN Reform at country level on UNAIDS**

ET Findings (pp 16-21):

*Neither UN reform nor commitments made under the Paris Declaration have significantly affected the way UNAIDS works, though some benefits have arisen through joint teams at country level.*

Discussion Topics:

- 1. UN reform has not significantly affected the rules and conventions that dictate how the ten cosponsors and secretariat interact with each other and collectively with external stakeholders at the global level. This is partly because the major focus of reform has been at the country level.**
2. The Regional Directors' Team (RDT) approach did not significantly affect the effectiveness of coordination mechanisms at country level during the evaluation period.
3. Reform at country level has fostered new working methods in joint teams but a lack of institutional incentives has held back progress.
4. There is little evidence to suggest that the implementation of the Paris Declaration has directly affected, or enhanced the effectiveness, of the work of UNAIDS at country level.

**SESSION A: How UNAIDS is responding to the changing context:****Wednesday, June 3****16:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team****16:15 – Breakout into Study Groups****SGA6: Assessment of UNAIDS performance against the ECOSOC mandate****ET Findings:** (web survey results)

About 580 people responded to the web survey question “How effective has the UNAIDS Joint Programme (secretariat and cosponsors) been in meeting its ECOSOC objectives?” Respondents were asked to categories performance as:

- Very effective
- Fairly effective
- Not very effective
- No opinion

There are six objectives, listed here:

- 1. To provide global leadership in response to the epidemic**
- 2. To achieve and promote global consensus on policy and programme approaches**
- 3. To strengthen the capacity to monitor trends and ensure that appropriate and effective policies and strategies are implemented at the country level**
- 4. To strengthen the capacity of national governments to develop comprehensive national strategies and implement effective HIV/AIDS activities**
- 5. To promote broad-based political and social mobilization to prevent and respond to HIV/AIDS**
- 6. To advocate greater political commitment at the global and country levels including the mobilization and allocation of adequate resources**

- Most respondents thought that UNAIDS has been fairly effective or even very effective at making progress towards objectives 2, 3 and 4 with consistent views held by staff of the UNAIDS Secretariat, the cosponsors, NGOs, PLHIV and other groups.
- Objectives 1, 5 and 6 revealed a greater diversity of views, particularly for objective 1. Most respondents from UNAIDS (Secretariat and Cosponsors) staff, the private sector, bilateral donors and charitable foundations all rated the programme as ‘very effective’ at providing global leadership. The majority of other UN staff, national government staff, NGOs, FBOs and PLHIV felt that performance was only ‘fairly effective’.
- Few respondents felt that the programme has not been very effective at objective 1. Around 20% or more of NGO, PLHIV, bilateral donors and researchers rated performance of objective 2 as ‘not very effective’. And a significant minority overall (around 15%) rated performance as ‘not very effective’ for objectives 3, 4, 5 and 6.

## **SESSION B: How UNAIDS Works**

Thursday, June 4

0900 – Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team

0915 – Breakout into Study Groups

### **SGB1: Q(b) Governance of UNAIDS: Effectiveness of the PCB and CCO as a governance mechanism**

ET Findings (pp 22-27):

*Governance of UNAIDS has not improved during the evaluation period.*

Discussion Topics:

1. **The PCB concentrates on policies and priorities for future action rather than reviewing past performance and linking that to future plans.**
2. There is no formal provision to track performance of either the UNAIDS Secretariat or the Executive Director.
3. Members of the PCB believe it is managed efficiently and there is little interest in reforming the process.
4. Influence of the NGO Delegation is not undermined by not having voting rights; voice is undermined more by other arrangements in the PCB.
5. The PCB has tracked implementation of some GTT recommendations but not the degree to which PCB decisions, as opposed to GTT recommendations, have been reflected in the work programmes of the Cosponsors and Secretariat.
6. **The Heads of Agencies of the Cosponsors are increasingly disengaged from the work of UNAIDS and the CCO does not perform the function for which it was created**
- 7 Neither ECOSOC nor the PCB has authority over the Cosponsors.
- 8 The influence by the PCB depends on the extent to which Cosponsor boards act on PCB decisions.

## **SESSION B: How UNAIDS Works**

Thursday, June 4

0900 – Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team

0915 – Breakout into Study Groups

**SGB2: Q(b) Governance of UNAIDS: UBW as a tool for coordination, consistency and compatibility of activities and strategies at the global and regional level**

ET Findings (pp 22-27):

*Governance of UNAIDS has not improved during the evaluation period.*

### Discussion Topics

1. **The UBW process lacks transparency and does not influence the programming intentions of the cosponsors.**
2. The UBW process does not significantly change what cosponsors intend to do but rather the way that they do it.
3. There is some evidence that the UBW has enhanced coordination, consistency and compatibility of activities, but the transaction costs have been high.
4. Resource allocation of UBW funding is not based on a transparent set of criteria, including past performance and results delivered.

## **SESSION B: How UNAIDS Works**

**Thursday, June 4**

**0900 – Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**0915 – Breakout into Study Groups**

**SGB3: Q(d) Division of Labour between the Secretariat, Cosponsors, Agencies and Countries: UBW and the Inter-agency Task Teams as tools for allowing UNAIDS to fulfill its global coordination role.**

ET Findings: (pp28-38):

*There is evidence of some minor reduction in duplication between agencies at the global and country levels, but little evidence that this is due to the Division of Labour. Being a member of UNAIDS doesn't change what UN agencies do so much as how they do things.*

Discussion Topics:

- 1. There is little evidence to suggest that the DoL has had a significant impact on coordination at global level.**
2. Being a Cosponsor has stopped some agencies from downgrading their focus on AIDS and kept it as a policy priority across the cosponsors.
3. The evaluation period has seen a growing prominence of the global coordinators and their role as policy champions within their own organizations.
4. The present approach to performance monitoring and reporting doesn't pick up on the added value of having UNAIDS at a global level.
5. There has been a significant increase in the capacity dedicated to work on AIDS at central and regional country level, which has often depended upon the availability of UBW funding.
6. The role of the Executive Director as an AIDS champion within the UN has been vital.

**SESSION B: How UNAIDS Works****Thursday, June 4****0900 – Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team****0915 – Breakout into Study Groups**

**SGB4A: Q(d) The Division of Labour between the Secretariat, Cosponsors, Agencies and Countries: The impact of the Division of Labour and Joint Team concept as mechanisms for enhancing coordination and coherence at country level.**

ET Findings (pp 28-38):

*There is evidence of some minor reduction in duplication between agencies at the global and country levels, but little evidence that this is due to the Division of Labour. Being a member of UNAIDS doesn't change what UN agencies do so much as how they do things.*

Discussion Topics:

1. **There is little evidence from the case study countries that the DoL is known and understood by stakeholders external to the UN or has been useful to them.**
2. There has been little oversight of the quadrupling the Secretariat's staffing in six years.
3. Evidence from the case study countries is that the DoL is known about by the AIDS Joint Teams and they would claim that it is being applied.
4. There is little evidence from the case study countries that the DoL has significantly impacted on programming intentions of the individual UN Cosponsors.
5. There is no evidence from the case study countries of the joint team approach or the Division of Labour influencing staffing decisions across the agencies.

## **SESSION B: How UNAIDS Works**

Thursday, June 4

0900 – Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team

0915 – Breakout into Study Groups

**SGB4B: Q (d) The Division of Labour Between the Secretariat, Cosponsors, Agencies and Countries: The impact of the Division of Labour and Joint Team concept as mechanisms for enhancing coordination and coherence at country level.**

ET Findings (pp 28-38):

*There is evidence of some minor reduction in duplication between agencies at the global and country levels, but little evidence that this is due to the Division of Labour. Being a member of UNAIDS doesn't change what UN agencies do so much as how they do things.*

Discussion Topics:

- 1. There is little evidence that the expected benefits of the joint team approach have been captured yet.**
2. There is evidence of UN staff working together effectively at country level.
3. There is no evidence from the case study countries of the joint team approach or the Division of Labour influencing staffing decisions across the agencies.
4. Incentive systems across the UN and in the wider environment still do not reward joint working.
5. Case studies suggest variable implementation of GTT recommendations on the operation of the joint teams and little evidence that these recommendations have eased operationalisation, or enhanced effectiveness, of the joint team concept..

## **SESSION B: How UNAIDS Works**

Thursday, June 4

0900 – Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team

0915 – Breakout into Study Groups

**SGB5: Q (f) Administration of the Joint Program: Efficiency and effectiveness of administration and management within the Secretariat**

ET Findings (pp39-44):

*Systems have slowly improved over the period of the evaluation but do not yet meet adequate standards of efficiency*

Discussion Topics:

- 1. In general, both WHO and the Secretariat interviewees agree that the relationship works relatively well, and that a productive *modus operandi* is in place, which has allowed the Secretariat to maintain independence, despite it legally remaining part of the WHO.**
2. Staff working for the Secretariat have to deal with three differing administrative systems.
3. A revised MOU in 2008 has solved most practical problems but there is still no service agreement specifying standards of support to be provided by UNDP.
4. Multiple administrative system bring inefficiencies.
5. Efficiency of administration of PAF funding has improved but it is still weak.
- 6. Expansion of staff numbers, which was recommended in the 5-year evaluation, has taken place with little formal planning, weak human resource management and no oversight by the PCB.**
7. New arrangements should result in improved human resource and financial management system in place by the end of 2010.

**SESSION C: How UNAIDS is fulfilling its Mandate**

**Thursday, June 4**

**11:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**11:15 Breakout into Study Groups**

**SGC1: Q (i) Addressing the gender dimensions of the epidemic**

ET Findings (pp 50-55):

*The evidence only partly supports the hypothesis. Support to countries has been provided by the secretariat and cosponsors, but there is little evidence of a strategic joint programme approach*

Discussion Topics:

1. **UNAIDS global leadership on gender has been weak.**
2. The roles of UNDP, UNIFEM, UNAIDS Secretariat and GCWA are unclear.
3. Engagement with organizations working on gender has been limited.
4. UNAIDS support to countries to address the gender dimensions of the epidemic is not strategic.
5. There is a need to improve UN capacity for gender analysis and policy guidance.
6. Progress has been made in disaggregation of data by sex.
7. Work on gender norms and sexual minorities has received little attention until relatively recently.

## **SESSION C: How UNAIDS is fulfilling its Mandate**

**Thursday, June 4**

**11:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**11:15 Breakout into Study Groups**

### **SGC2: Q (h) Involving and Working with Civil Society**

ET Findings (pp 45-48):

*Civil society involvement in policy, programming and M&E has increased and UNAIDS, in particular the secretariat, has played an important role in support for this. Limited evidence makes it difficult to assess systematically the impact of civil society inclusion on national responses.*

Discussion Topics:

- 1. UNAIDS Secretariat leads on civil society engagement.**
2. There is no common UNAIDS vision or strategy for civil society involvement.
3. Advocacy for civil society representation has been very effective.
4. UNAIDS has facilitated resource mobilization for civil society.
5. UNAIDS has provided important support for civil society capacity building.
6. Impact of involvement on national responses is difficult to determine.
7. Representation and accountability is a challenge.
8. Some civil society organizations have received less attention.
9. Resources do not reflect the rhetoric about civil society.

**SESSION C: How UNAIDS is fulfilling its Mandate**

**Thursday, June 4**

**11:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**11:15 Breakout into Study Groups**

**SGC3: Q (I) (Supporting the meaningful involvement of PLHIV**

**ET Findings (pp 67-70):**

*UNAIDS, in particular the secretariat, has championed PLHIV involvement and contributed to increased global and national involvement in policy, implementation and M&E. There is less evidence that UNAIDS has created an efficient process for engagement or transparent and democratic representation*

- 1. UNAIDS Secretariat has advocated effectively for PLHIV involvement.**
2. The Secretariat has been most active in engaging with PLHIV organizations.
3. UNAIDS Secretariat has provided important support for national PLHIV networks and organizations.
4. Despite progress, involvement is still often tokenistic and representation is a challenge.
5. The impact of PLHIV involvement is difficult to determine.

**SESSION C: How UNAIDS is fulfilling its Mandate**

**Thursday, June 4**

**11:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**11:15 Breakout into Study Groups**

**SGC4: Q (k) Promoting and Strengthening Human Rights**

ET Findings (pp62 -66):

*UNAIDS, in particular the secretariat, has provided strong global leadership on HIV and human rights issues. Evidence of UNAIDS action to reflect the priorities of and empower vulnerable populations and to support their meaningful participation is mixed*

Discussion Topics

- 1. Globally, the Secretariat has played a critical role in highlighting HIV and human rights issues.**
2. There are concerns about the respective roles of UNDP and the Secretariat.
3. UNAIDS has been inconsistent in addressing human rights at country level.
4. Leadership concerning key populations could have been stronger.
5. Support for involvement and networks and organizations of key populations has been mixed.

## **SESSION C: How UNAIDS is fulfilling its Mandate**

**Thursday, June 4**

**11:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**11:15 Breakout into Study Groups**

### **SGC5: Monitoring and Evaluation: Q (a) The evolving role of UNAIDs in a changing environment**

#### **Q (j) Technical Support to National AIDS response**

ET Findings (pp 10,-11; pp 60-61):

*Q(a) Evaluations are undertaken but tend not to be planned systematically across the cosponsors.*

*Q (j) UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsors have provided appropriate, timely and valued technical support. There is limited evidence of the added value of the joint programme. joint teams have improved information sharing, but have not functioned as an entry point for, or noticeably strengthened coordination of, technical support*

#### Discussion Topics

- 1. UNAIDS has provided important support to strengthen the Three Ones and technical support for M&E.**
2. Whilst there has been good support to develop national M&E capacity, there is little evidence of a systematic and good quality approach to evaluation of different interventions, policies and strategies implemented across many partners.
3. Progress has been made in disaggregation of data by sex.

#### **Additional points from the text are:**

4. UNAIDS has provided important support for national AIDS coordinating authorities, national strategic plan development and national M&E frameworks.
5. Secretariat M&E Advisors have played a critical role in developing national HIV and AIDS M&E systems in many of the countries visited for the evaluation.
6. M&E capacity across cosponsors and the calibre of M&E Advisors appears to be variable.
7. UNAIDS has been less successful in addressing challenges related to the existence of parallel M&E frameworks and indicators and the interface between health management information systems and HIV and AIDS M&E systems, and in assisting countries to reconcile different advice from different sources, for example, from UNAIDS, World Bank GAMET and PEPFAR.

## **SESSION C: How UNAIDS is fulfilling its Mandate**

**Thursday, June 4**

**11:00 Plenary Presentation by Evaluation Team**

**11:15 Breakout into Study Groups**

**SGC6:** Q (j) Providing technical support for national AIDS responses

ET Findings (pp 56-61):

*UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsors have provided appropriate, timely and valued technical support. There is limited evidence of the added value of the joint programme. joint teams have improved information sharing, but have not functioned as an entry point for, or noticeably strengthened coordination of, technical support*

Discussion topics

- 1. UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsors individually have provided a wide range of technical support.**
2. Capacity to respond to requests for technical support has expended.
3. There is scope to improve planning and coordination of technical support.
4. Technical support is valued but is not systematically evaluated.