

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

ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK

Stakeholder Group	Number of respondents
Member State	14
Cosponsor	4
Civil Society	1
International Organization	0
UNAIDS Secretariat	7
Not indicated	3
Overall total	29

Approximately 30% of the participants responded to the questionnaire, with representation from a cross-section of stakeholder groups.

1. To what extent were the Workshop Objectives Achieved?

- presentation of evaluation findings for discussion with Stakeholders
- express agreement/disagreement with findings; direct the ET to new evidence
- identify areas for further clarification of issues or prioritization
- foster discussions on fruitful areas for formulating recommendations

Rating (Low to High)	Q1(a)	Q1(b)	Q1(c)	Q1(d)
1	1	0	0	0
2	2	2	5	6
3	6	8	5	10
4	7	14	13	6
5	12	5	6	7
Total number of responses	28	29	29	29
Percentage median (rating 3) and above	86%	93%	83%	79%

Comments:

Respondents felt the Consultation Document was a good, well-written overview covering a wide-range of topics. Limitations were due to time constraints leaving insufficient time to review and discuss. Also participants could only attend one study group for each Session.

2. Was the Workshop Format and Agenda appropriate?

- (a) Opening Plenary
- (b) Working Group Sessions
- (c) Closing Plenary

Rating (Low to High)	Q2(a)	Q2(b)	Q2(c)
1	2	1	1
2	1	3	1
3	9	5	8
4	8	13	8
5	7	7	8
Total number of responses	27	29	26
Percentage median (rating 3) and above	83%	86%	83%

Comments:

Most comments noted that there was too little time for discussions, including in both study groups sessions and the plenary. A few noted the need for better facilitation and reporting to the plenary.

3. Were the Study Groups useful in relation to the objectives?

- a) Relevant themes/questions
- b) Clearly defined focus topics
- c) Reference material provided
- d) Clearly defined, useful discussion aids and documentation
- e) Interactive discussion within groups
- f) Available reference information

Rating (Low to High)	Q3(a)	Q3(b)	Q3(c)	Q3(d)	Q3(e)	Q3(f)
1	0	0	2	1	0	1
2	0	2	3	3	1	4
3	4	8	8	9	4	9
4	14	10	8	8	11	8
5	6	5	3	4	9	0
Total number of responses	24	25	24	25	25	22
Percentage median (rating 3) and above	83%	79%	66%	72%	83%	59%

Comments:

Respondents noted shortcomings in information on methodology, reference information and documentation, as well as imbalance of stakeholder representation in some study groups.

4. What were the strengths of the Workshop?

Respondents noted the benefits of bringing together a diverse and appropriate range of stakeholders for an open, frank, interactive dialogue. The points for discussion were clear, and there was the occasion to discuss a range of topics in some depth. The timing and structure of the Workshop provided an opportunity to look at results at an early stage to allow the ET time to respond to stakeholder concerns.

5. What were the weaknesses?

Time constraints were identified as the main weakness, but participants differed in where the balance should be, with some suggesting longer plenary sessions to allow more time for discussion of general issues, while others preferred longer study group sessions, to allow for greater in-depth review. Some felt that the meeting was fragmented, with too many overlapping and unclear discussion items in study groups, resulting in lack of an overall appreciation of findings. Some felt findings were phrased in global terms with insufficient attention to critical details underlying the issues. Some commented on unbalanced participation in study group sessions, both in numbers and in representation, in part due to the number of groups, and inability of Member States and civil society to cover them all.

6. Other Comments

Participants were appreciative of the professionalism of the Evaluation Team and Oversight Committee, and their open attitude to stakeholder views. Some participants felt that sensitive issues could not/were not addressed, such as gender issues, and participation of key vulnerable populations. Views on balanced participation varied in that some felt more Member State participation was needed to bring in experience at country level, others felt that more civil society participation was desirable, and still others were concerned of bias due to large participation of the UNAIDS Secretariat. Finally, respondents noted their expectations that the suggestions/recommendations from the study groups would be incorporated into the Evaluation Report.