

**21<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board  
Geneva, Switzerland,  
17-18 December 2007**

**Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions**

The UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board,

*Recalling* that all aspects of UNAIDS work are directed by the following guiding principles:

- Aligned to national stakeholders' priorities;
- Based on the meaningful and measurable involvement of civil society especially people living with HIV and populations most at risk of HIV infection;
- Based on human rights and gender equality;
- Based on the best available scientific evidence and technical knowledge; and
- Promoting comprehensive responses to AIDS that integrate prevention, treatment, care and support;

**Agenda item 1.1: Opening of the meeting and adoption of the provisional agenda**

1. *Adopts* the provisional agenda;

**Agenda item 1.2: Consideration of the report of the twentieth meeting**

2. *Adopts* the report of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board;

**Agenda item 1.3: Report of the Executive Director**

3. *Takes note with appreciation* of the Report of the Executive Director and the comments from the floor;

**Agenda item 2: Independent Evaluation of UNAIDS**

- 4.1 *Agrees* that the purpose of the evaluation is to assess the efficacy, effectiveness and outcomes of UNAIDS (including UNAIDS Secretariat, the PCB and Cosponsors) at the global, regional and country levels;
- 4.2 *Agrees* that, with respect to the questions to be addressed by the Second Independent Evaluation the following questions will be included, and *further*

agrees that the comments received in plenary (see Annex 1) on this agenda item will be submitted to the Oversight Committee for consideration and incorporation, as appropriate, in the Tender for the Evaluation Team:

**a) The evolving role of UNAIDS within a changing environment**

Given the changing global, regional and country environments, the evolving role and priorities of the Joint Programme needs to be clearly defined, especially concerning working relationships with institutions like the Global Fund, PEPFAR, UNITAID, bilateral donors, private sector, civil society, regional organizations and others, all of which have grown in importance since the Five Year Evaluation. To what extent does UNAIDS generate and take advantage of synergies with its partners including HIV vaccine and other appropriate technologies advocacy and development partners and organizations of vulnerable populations and people living with HIV?

**b) Governance of UNAIDS**

This evaluation should involve a review of the governance and accountability structures of UNAIDS (Program Coordinating Board, Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations and the Unified Budget and Workplan), and its relationships with the Cosponsors and other UN bodies on a wide range of issues, especially given the organization's expansion, the entry of new partners into the field, and the growing range of activities being undertaken. The evaluation should consider the progress on recommendations of the GTT review and the Review of NGO/Civil Society Participation in the Programme Coordinating Board.

**c) The response to the Five Year Evaluation of UNAIDS**

Assessing the extent to which UNAIDS has been able to respond to the recommendations and proposed activities that emerged from the Five Year Evaluation based on the PCB decisions is important. It is also necessary to identify any factors, which may have facilitated or limited UNAIDS' implementation of these recommendations such as national capacities, availability of resources and resource gaps. Implementation will also have to be evaluated at headquarters, regional and country levels to determine the overall effectiveness, efficiency, equity and acceptability of the Programme.

**d) The interaction between Secretariat, Cosponsors, Agencies and Countries**

The components of UNAIDS, and the operational relationships between Secretariat, Cosponsors and other institutions, like the Global Fund, at headquarters, regional and country levels need to be reviewed. This should also involve evaluating the efficiency of UNAIDS in terms of coordination, consistency and compatibility of activities and programmatic strategies and, how the 'Division of Labour' has affected working relationships in country and taking into account the perspective of national governments. Does UNAIDS fulfill its global coordination role on AIDS. The Evaluation should include an assessment of UNAIDS' role in strengthening health systems and determine what improvements could be made to strengthen health systems in ways that support UNAIDS objectives.

**e) The administration of the Joint Programme**

This involves evaluating how the administration and business practice of the UNAIDS Secretariat has evolved since its creation, including its institutional

relationships with WHO and UNDP, and whether it has been flexible and creative enough to keep up with the changing pace and types of demands that have emerged over time, including transfer of resources to countries. Patterns and processes of staff deployment and management will need to be addressed.

**f) Delivering as One**

The impact of UN Reform, GTT and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness on delivering the mandate of UNAIDS especially in countries, how it is viewed by countries, Cosponsors, donors and staff, and how this should influence the future should all be assessed. Also the impact which UNAIDS has had on UN reform and greater coherence at country, regional and global levels.

**g) Involving and working with civil society**

The extent to which UNAIDS has been able to, support, include, engage and incorporate in a meaningful and measurable way the concerns and capacities of civil society, and what types of functional relationships and partnerships have evolved at different operational levels should be reviewed and should be an integral part of all questions to be addressed by this Independent Evaluation.

**h) Gender dimensions of the epidemic**

The extent to which gender equality has been incorporated as an integral part of the work of UNAIDS at the global and national levels and the extent to which these issues have been incorporated in national strategies and actions. This must include the degree to which UNAIDS has supported countries in their efforts to address the gender dimensions of the epidemic. The measurement of impact on the gender equality must include; an analysis of the development of policy guidance; monitoring of gender-differentiated impact of programmes; systematic disaggregation of data by sex and integration of gender and equality indicators in monitoring and evaluation frameworks; as well as having the necessary internal capacity for gender analysis and policy guidance. Work on gender norms, work with sexual minorities, including men who have sex with men and transgender communities should also be examined.

**i) Technical support to national AIDS responses**

The impact of the technical support rendered by UNAIDS through an examination of activities in, and the needs and priorities of affected countries, and the quantity and quality of support rendered, including transaction costs, accessibility of funding, coordination mechanisms such as Joint UN Teams and others designed to enhance service delivery. To what extent does UNAIDS allow for flexible procedures that are adaptable to different national or regional situations?

**j) Human Rights**

How UNAIDS programmes and policies have contributed to strengthening the rights of vulnerable populations and have addressed issues of gender inequality, stigma and discrimination, the empowerment of vulnerable populations among its priorities and ensures that programme objectives reflect the priorities expressed by vulnerable populations themselves. This should include mechanisms to enable meaningful participation of vulnerable populations in policy and programme development.

**k) The Greater and meaningful involvement of People living with HIV**

The extent to which UNAIDS has enabled the active and meaningful engagement of people living with HIV through inclusive, transparent and democratic selection processes and of the choice, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of UNAIDS programmes from their inception;

- 4.3 *Agrees* that the Second Independent Evaluation should focus on UNAIDS and its performance as a whole. This includes the Secretariat and the HIV-related work of all 10 Cosponsors. In particular it should focus on:
- a. UNAIDS as an organizational and administrative entity in terms of its ability to deliver its agreed upon workplan (Unified Budget and Workplan);
  - b. the Secretariat's roles within UNAIDS; and
  - c. a selection of key areas (e.g. civil society engagement, GIPA, gender, and human rights), and activities of the Secretariat and Cosponsors at headquarters, regional and in particular, country levels;
- 4.4 *Agrees* that:
- a. the Second Independent Evaluation should be contracted by a team or a consortium of teams that demonstrate competence, experience and sensitivity to the complexity of the process, its geographic scope and its many underlying components such as administration, financing, international relations, public health, civil society engagement, gender and human rights;
  - b. the Second Independent Evaluation should be contracted to private or public sector teams, or a mix of both provided they are external to the UN system, have the capacity to work together and share responsibilities according to capacity and expertise. To the extent possible the team should have gender and geographical balance; and
  - c. those involved in the Evaluation should represent organizations from different regions and constituencies, to ensure that all relevant regions and stakeholder groups, including persons living with HIV, are part of the Evaluation;
- 4.5 *Agrees* the Terms of Reference for the Evaluation Team as follows:
- a. The Evaluation Team should be headed by a Team Leader, employed full-time for 18 months who is independent of the UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsors. The remainder of the Evaluation Team would comprise support staff for the Team Leader and a minimum of 10 short-term consultants for 5-7 months each. This choice is dependent upon the agreed scope of the evaluation and the number of country visits undertaken;
  - b. Key responsibilities:  
*Team Leader:* Design the overall evaluation methodology and manage a team of between 10-12 short-term consultants working on various aspects of the Evaluation. Produce quarterly reports for the Oversight Committee, a mid-year progress report for the Programme Coordinating Board and the final report according to timelines established. Direct and manage all interactions with the Oversight Committee and other administrative mechanisms. Liaise

with country and regional offices to organize field visit as needed. The Team Leader will be supported by an administrative assistant as well as other part-time support staff;

*Short-term Consultants:* Under the supervision of the Evaluation Team Leader, undertake various aspects of the Evaluation. This will include reviewing all relevant documents received from the Secretariat, Cosponsors or other organizations; designing the methodology for specific country visits including rationale for choice of country; preparing and carrying out country visits according to agreed methodology; and writing up country reports. Assist in the preparation of any reports and summaries;

- c. Areas of Expertise: one part of the Evaluation relates to assessing the various aspects of UNAIDS, and therefore requires social science and public health expertise. The disciplines considered appropriate for membership in the Evaluation Team include public health, such as epidemiology, behavioral sciences, demography and operations research, specialists in evaluation, program management, management information systems and subject matter specialists in HIV (such as, women, youth, children, Injecting Drug Users, men who have sex with men), and related public health issues. The Team is also expected to have knowledge of existing AIDS programming globally and of the international health and aid architecture in which this programming occurs. Another aspect of the Evaluation may include an administrative evaluation of UNAIDS/WHO and UNDP procedures in support of UNAIDS. The latter would include a summary of yearly audits, a social audit and an information audit and may require the involvement of accounting firms, which have developed expertise in managerial and administrative audits;

#### 4.6 *Agrees that:*

- a. the Second Independent Evaluation comprise a careful mix of site visits and observations, interviews and discussion groups, desk based research and review of existing reports, such as the Unified Budget and Workplan Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. The Evaluation should be performed using proven methods in standardized formats and carried out in such a way that no single methodology eclipses others;
- b. the timing of these different methods be staggered so as to benefit from those activities that can be implemented immediately and promote efficiency regardless of location, i.e. headquarters, regions or countries;
- c. the Second Independent Evaluation should draw on the expertise and experience of partners, member states and civil society and other evaluations like WHO's "3 by 5" Evaluation, Global Fund Evaluation and the Institute of Medicine's Evaluation of PEPFAR;
- d. the results of the Evaluation should be presented as global, regional, and country analyses, including specific country case studies that highlight best practice and lessons learned. The quality of information obtained as part of these exercises also needs to be assessed and commented on; and

e. While the specific input from UNAIDS will be identified, based on the experience of other evaluations e.g. the Global Fund and PEPFAR, the difficulty of attributing specific changes within countries to the work of an individual organization is recognized;

4.7 *Decides* that an Oversight Committee be created to oversee the Evaluation. This would consist of a balanced cross section of representatives of governments, Cosponsors and civil society, ensuring appropriate participation of persons living with HIV and other stakeholders. In order to ensure independence, the Committee Chair should not be a member of the Programme Coordinating Board;

4.8 *Agrees* the Terms of Reference for the Oversight Committee as follows:

a. Membership of the Oversight Committee

*Decides* the Membership of the Oversight Committee should include representatives of donor and recipient countries, UNAIDS stakeholders, including Cosponsors, Member States, civil society, while ensuring appropriate representation of people living with HIV, and relevant independent experts, including representation from the TERG/MERG.

*Further decides* that the Oversight Committee should be constituted according to the following criteria:

- At least one person from each region and two from Africa
- At least two participants who are HIV+
- No more than three members of the Programme Coordinating Board
- Not less than 40 percent of either gender
- Not more than ten members

b. Accountability

The Oversight Committee will report directly to the Programme Coordinating Board via the Oversight Committee Chair. It will inform the Board of any changes in scope, activities, or budget that may be required due to a change in the agreed evaluation procedures.

c. Required Expertise

The members of the Oversight Committee should be characterized by high levels of credibility and relevant experience in the areas of monitoring and evaluation and data collection at the field level. In addition, they must have extensive knowledge of AIDS, including issues related to prevention, treatment, care and support interventions, as well as good knowledge of issues surrounding UNAIDS and the United Nations in general. The disciplines considered appropriate for membership in the Oversight Committee include: quantitative and qualitative disciplines from public health such as epidemiology, biostatistics, behavioral sciences, demography and operations research, specialists in program management, management information systems, management under harsh circumstances and subject matter specialists in AIDS

and related public health issues, gender, human rights and civil society engagement.

d. Membership Selection

Based on nominations received, and taking account of the above criteria, the Programme Coordinating Board Bureau will agree the Chair and composition of the Oversight Committee. The Bureau will send out to the PCB the proposed membership of the Oversight Committee for review and approval on a non-objection basis. A vice chair shall be elected by members of the Committee from among its membership. Individual members should not have any conflict of interest and there should be appropriate gender and geographical representation. Committee members should have the time and commitment to participate in all meetings.

e. Tenure of Membership

The members of the Oversight Committee shall serve for the period of the Evaluation.

f. Logistic Support

The Chair of the Oversight Committee will be supported by dedicated members of the Secretariat. In addition, support will be available from the Secretariat to organize meetings and arrange travel and accommodation for Committee members;

4.9 *Agrees* the process for the establishment of the Oversight Committee presented below:

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
17-18 December 2007	21 <sup>st</sup> PCB meeting approves TOR for the Evaluation
21 December 2007	Email sent from Chair of the PCB to all PCB members, observers, five NGO representatives and ten cosponsoring agencies in the 21 <sup>st</sup> PCB meeting inviting nominations to the Oversight Committee. Nominations must include full CV and names of two referees demonstrating eligibility against the criteria established in the TOR
18 January 2008	Deadline for submission of nominations
18-25 January 2008	Secretariat to collate and verify nominations and establish consolidated matrix of nominations, against criteria, for consideration by PCB Bureau. This will be a purely logistical exercise and will not rank nominations in any way.
28 January 2008	PCB Bureau meeting to agree Chair and composition of the Oversight Committee

1 February 2008	PCB Chair to inform PCB by electronic means of composition of Committee and to invite responses, if any, by 8 February 2008.
8 February 2008	Deadline for comments and silent approval of composition of Oversight Committee
9 February 2008	Oversight Committee is established

4.10 *Agrees* the timeline presented below:

DATE	MILESTONE/DELIVERABLE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
<b>PREPARATION OF THE TENDER</b>		
<b>PCB 21<sup>st</sup> meeting: 17-18 December 2007</b>	Draft Terms of Reference for Second Independent Evaluation is presented for approval by the PCB	PCB Bureau
21 December 2007	Call for nominations, through the PCB Chair, for membership of the Oversight Committee	PCB Chair
11 January 2008	Deadline for submission of nominations for membership of Oversight Committee	PCB Chair
15 January 2008	Draft tender is produced including criteria and methods for evaluating the bids	PCB Bureau with logistics support from the Secretariat
28 January 2008	Chair and members of the Oversight Committee are identified and appointed	PCB Bureau
15 February 2008	Tender for the Evaluation Team presented to the PCB, through the PCB Chair, for finalization by electronic means	Oversight Committee

DATE	MILESTONE/DELIVERABLE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
<b>TENDER PROCESS</b>		
7 March 2008	Tender disseminated: deadline for receipt of bids on 4 April 2008	Oversight Committee
11 April 2008	Summaries of the bids provided to PCB Chair and PCB Bureau for review	Oversight Committee
<b>PCB 22nd meeting: 23-25 April 2008</b>	Recommendation on the bids presented with a view to a decision on the winning bid by the PCB	PCB Chair in conjunction with Oversight Committee

DATE	MILESTONE/DELIVERABLE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
<b>EVALUATION PROCESS</b>		
8 June 2008	Detailed plan of work for the Evaluation delivered to the Oversight Committee	Winning bidder (Evaluation Team)
24 June 2008	Core parts of the evaluation (selection, compilation and content analysis of selected documents) begins	Evaluation Team
23 August 2008	All methodological and logistical aspects of the Evaluation completed and reported to the Oversight Committee	Evaluation Team
From 1 October 2008	Regular bi-weekly reporting to the Oversight Committee on progress, delays and any problems encountered	Evaluation Team
<b>PCB 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting: 15-17 December 2008</b>	Progress report on the Evaluation presented	Evaluation Team
10 April 2009	Draft Evaluation report submitted to the Chair of the Oversight Committee for review and submission to the PCB	Evaluation Team
April 2009	Briefings on draft Evaluation report	Oversight Committee and Evaluation Team
<b>PCB 24<sup>th</sup> meeting: June 2009</b>	Final Report of the Second Independent Evaluation presented to the PCB and presentation of the UNAIDS response to the Evaluation to the PCB with recommendations for decision by the Board	Evaluation Team and Executive Director

4.11 *Agrees* a maximum budget for the Oversight Committee of:

<b>OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE:</b>	<b>Estimated Cost (USD)</b>
Meeting costs – room rental, interpretation, report writing, technical support e.g. microphones	100,000
Travel (10 people for 4 meetings – flights only @ \$3,000 flight per person)	120,000
Per diem (10 people, 4 meetings of 2 days each (plus 2 days travel time) @ \$300 per day)	48,000
Support costs – short term consultant to provide technical assistance	80,000
Unforeseen	40,000
Publication, translation and dissemination costs	100,000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>488,000</b>

4.12 *Agrees* that the budget for the Evaluation team would be within the limit of USD 650,000 including staff travel costs. (see Annex 1 for indicative budget breakdown);

4.13 *Decides* that 12 to 16 country visits should be undertaken according to the following criteria and *agrees* the budget in the range of USD 1,069,200 – 1,425,600:

- Balanced regional representation
- Representatives of generalized and concentrated epidemics
- High and low prevalence countries
- Humanitarian and emergency settings
- Differing economic status;

### **Agenda item 3: Programme Performance Monitoring Framework**

5.1 *Endorses* the Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the 2008-2009 Unified Budget and Workplan;

5.2 *Requests* the PCB Bureau to work with the Secretariat in considering the possible establishment, terms of reference and membership of standing sub-committees of the PCB, including one on monitoring and evaluation, and make proposals to the 22<sup>nd</sup> PCB meeting;

**Agenda item 4: UNAIDS collaboration with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria**

6. *Takes note* of the progress to date in the UNAIDS collaboration with the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria;

**Agenda item 5: Progress report on the Global Implementation Support Team**

- 7.1 *Agrees* to consider and approve the revised mandate and terms of reference, including the membership to support south-south cooperation and geographical representation, of the GIST via electronic means during January 2008;
- 7.2 *Requests* that a review of the GIST be presented to the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Programme Coordinating Board, including an evaluation of its efficacy and value added;

**Agenda item 6: Issues related to future Programme Coordinating Board meetings**

- 8.1 *Takes note* of the paper on issues related to future Programme Coordinating Board meetings presented by UNAIDS [UNAIDS/PCB (21) /07.5];
- 8.2 *Reaffirms* that future PCB meetings may be held from time to time outside of Geneva drawing on the following criteria:
- Regional rotation
  - Overall cost and cost-sharing
  - Local expertise
  - Local facilities
  - No travel restrictions
  - Relevance to the theme
  - Added value
- 8.3 *Agrees* on the following criteria to guide the selection of themes:
- Broad relevance
  - Responsiveness
  - Focus
  - Scope for action

**Agenda item 7: PCB meeting in 2008**

- 9.1 With respect to the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, *decides* that it be held in Thailand on April 23-25, 2008 with the theme of “Diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis (TB) among people living with HIV and how UNAIDS can work with TB communities”;
- 9.2 With respect to the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, *decides* that it be held in Geneva on December 15-17, 2008 with the format to be decided at the 22<sup>nd</sup> Programme Coordinating Board meeting.

**Agenda item 8: Any other business**

10. *Agrees* that Programme Coordinating Board meetings will start with one minute of silence to remember those who have passed away from AIDS since the last meeting.

[Annex 1 follows]

## ANNEX 1

### **COMMENTS AND POTENTIAL INCLUSIONS BY ISSUE:**

#### **4.2 Questions to be addressed**

##### **b) Governance**

- this should include; an assessment of the efficacy of the UBW as a planning tool; the ability of the PCB to monitor follow-up of its decisions; the extent to which stakeholders are accountable for, and hold ownership over, such decisions; prioritization of issues by the Board; and geographical distribution on the PCB. (AFRO)

##### **c) Response to the 5 Year evaluation of UNAIDS**

- Particular focus should be placed on Organizational efforts to secure sustainable funding for UNAIDS and to what extent the Organization has achieved this in the context of global resource requirements (AFRO)

##### **d) Interaction between Secretariat, Cosponsors, Agencies and countries**

- Does it provide an effective leadership role in global policy discussions - What must be done to strengthen the UNAIDS Secretariat and the PCB to increase their status in the United Nations System so as to increase their efficiency and effectiveness to coordinate the war against HIV/AIDS(AFRO)?

##### **e) Administration of the Joint Programme**

- as well as an assessment of the planning, monitoring and evaluation of the financial and administrative systems within the UNAIDS Secretariat..

#### **4.3 Scope**

*Potential additional text to add to the decision*

- its strengths and weaknesses and, in particular an assessment of the comparative advantages of UNAIDS (AFRO)

#### **4.8 Oversight Committee**

All participants in the Oversight Committee should have the following characteristics:

- A demonstrated practical knowledge and experience in national, regional or global HIV programming;
- A strong grounding and understanding of gender, Human Rights, and the role of civil society in the response to HIV.

#### 4.12 Indicative budget for the Evaluation Team

<b>EVALUATION TEAM:</b>	<b>Estimated Cost (USD)</b>
Evaluation Team Leader full time 18 months	180,000 – 250,000
Support staff for Team Leader and Team	200,000 - 300,000
Travel <sup>1</sup> (8 missions – flights only @ \$3,000 flight per person)	24,000
Per diem (8 missions of 2 days each @ \$300 per day)	96,000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>500,000 – 650,000</b>

#### General comments

- Comment that the evaluation will be restricted to the review of the role of UNAIDS in achieving UA by 2010 when Prevention is a priority.
- The evaluation should be a constructive exercise.
- Questions to be addressed – it is important not only to look at management and procedural issues – but also more substantive issues – such as prevention, gender equality and the role of UNAIDS at the country level to support their efforts to fight AIDS – role of UNAIDS in forming strategies and capacity building.
- The importance of independence of the oversight committee was highlighted. And the need for seasoned competent people was emphasized.
- Hope the evaluation sees the role of UNAIDS in a systematic way – system wide.
- Wonder how UNAIDS is really able to address the real drivers of the epidemic – beyond the health system – including gender and others.
- On the budget, there were several comments that the cost of oversight committee should be in better balance with the cost of the actual evaluation.
- It was requested that the TOR should be more concise with clear research questions.
- Question of performance management of the evaluation team.
- Question whether the ECOSOC resolution will be reviewed to see whether still relevant.
- Would like to review the value added of the regional approach of UNAIDS implemented since the last Evaluation.
- Modus operandi of PCB needs to be urgently reviewed and need follow up on PCB decisions and recommendations.
- Recommend looking at structural drivers such as stigma and discrimination in the evaluation.
- Suggest to prioritize the questions to be addressed in view of limited time and funds.

<sup>1</sup> Travel is foreseen for stakeholder interviews, attendance at meetings e.g. the Programme Coordinating Board, and others, as necessary.

- The same metrics of the previous evaluation should be used to ensure comparability over time.
- Need to look at the obstacles to establishing and implementing joint programmes at the country level – ensure participation of civil society and PLHIV – also need to look at the coordination of programmes to see whether improvement can be made in PCB composition, efficiency of decision making and effectiveness of outcomes ( secretariat to PCB need to be evaluated).
- The overriding issue that needs to be addressed, is the ability of UNAIDS and the secretariat to deliver as one – performance at country level needs to be assessed.
- Assessment should be balanced and constructive and highlight successes and challenges – countries concerned need to be engaged.
- Evaluation should also review the contribution of UNAIDS to health system strengthening and provision of sexual and reproductive health services.
- Evaluation needs to include examples of UNAIDS impact at country level – draw on experience from GFATM.
- Lists of populations and themes in the evaluation document may be limiting - need to be open to surprises.
- Issues of human rights and PLHIV needs to be strengthened and integrated throughout the document.
- Regional levels of UNAIDS needs to be evaluated – need to look at the Impact evaluations in 8 countries that are being evaluated by the Global Fund.
- Concerned about the timing – could also gather information from countries via virtual mechanisms.
- Much concern about the timing – want the evaluation to be completed as quickly as possible – by mid- 2009.
- Support for both 12 and 16 country visits- but concern about the timing.
- Feeling that there is a rush in the front end of the evaluation process that needs to be reviewed – perhaps add an extra month in the preparation time.
- Representation at Secretariat level needs to take into account.
- General comment for oversight committee- need to ensure that we don't have a conflict of interest.
- Need to really look at how to better engage civil society – need to assess how to have more and significant inputs of civil society participation and the evaluation should address this as well.

### **THESE AND OTHER COMMENTS BY DELEGATION:**

#### **Belgium**

- importance of independence of the oversight committee
- need to try to complete the evaluation as soon as possible ideally by mid 2009

#### **Brazil**

- important to address role and mandate of WHO and UNDP in AIDS
- need for emphasis on human rights strengthening
- need for more emphasis on PLHIV

### **Djibouti**

- evaluation should give better understanding of what has and has not worked at country level

### **DR Congo**

- country level focus important, including focus on obstacles to successful implementation
- need for civil society participation
- need for a review of PCB
- need for an evaluation of Secretariat

### **Germany**

- two years time frame is too long – prefer to have it completed by mid 2009
- the budget of the oversight committee should be reviewed

### **India**

- need for several country visits to cover diversity of AIDS epidemics worldwide
- need to keep countries' role in perspective

### **Italy**

- recommended shorter TOR and clearly defined research questions
- it is important to build on 5-year evaluation
- there is need for a process to ensure the quality of the evaluation team's work
- Italy looks forward to the rationalization of the budget
- there is need to ask whether the goals of the ECOSOC resolution establishing UNAIDS are still relevant today
- there is need to consider the context on UN reform and AID effectiveness
- UNAIDS' size, levels of work (country, regional, global), role in advocacy, resource mobilization, partnership building, strategic information, M&E, regional approach through Technical Support Facilities are all elements to be evaluated
- structures and relationships within Joint Programme to be examined to recommend how governance, accountability and budgetary mechanisms could be strengthened
- need to review PCB responsibilities and modus operandi, including more systematic follow up or reporting to PCB and Cosponsor Boards on PCB decisions
- need to assess UNAIDS institutional effectiveness
- Italy supports focus on gender dimension and recommends attention to other structural drivers e.g. stigma and discrimination and poverty

### **Japan**

- need to clarify what are the general and what the specific objectives of evaluation
- all questions should be addressed seriously but there is also a need to prioritize them

### **Kenya**

- all levels of UNAIDS' operations (country, regional, global) should be covered by this exercise
- proposal for a new decision on technical support
- support to inclusive, transparent process involving key stakeholders
- need to ensure sustainable financing

## **Myanmar**

- country level to be reflected in evaluation questions taking into account governments' perspective
- need to assess impact of operational harmonization within the UN system
- need to assess whether active dialogue and consultation with national government has occurred
- support to including professional from both private and public sectors in the evaluation team based on capacity and expertise
- administrative assessment should include also cosponsors

## **New Zealand**

- need for more emphasis on Health Systems Strengthening
- no need for formal impact evaluation, but important to highlight country stories
- country visits should reflect the diversity of AIDS epidemics worldwide

## **Switzerland**

- need for prioritization of evaluation questions
- important to conduct a system wide review including all key drivers of epidemic
- no preference re: oversight committee, but need for clear ToR and independence. Budget too high
- budget of oversight committee appears to be not in balance with the rest of the evaluation costs

## **Thailand**

- overriding question of evaluation should be performance of UNAIDS
- approach should be constructive and empowering (highlighting successes and challenges)
- need to engage concerned countries
- importance of prevention should be highlighted
- the evaluation analysis should be linked to development goals
- preference for option b) re: oversight committee. Oversight. Committee to interact closely with Evaluation Team
- there is need to shorten time frame

## **USA**

- as much as possible this evaluation should use the same methodology as the 5-year evaluation to ensure comparability of results
- three key issues are to be addressed: 1) how well UNAIDS is fulfilling its mandate; 2) UNAIDS' strengths and weaknesses; 3) UNAIDS' value added
- recently revised structures and mandates should not be a focus for the evaluation – e.g. GTT assessment
- evaluation should consider technical support provision, including progress and challenges
- evaluation should consider benefit to be derived by UNAIDS from participation in broad aid effectiveness agenda (e.g. Paris Declaration)
- the gender-related question should be broadened through reference to the phrase “know your epidemic”

- the evaluation should provide not only analysis but actionable recommendations to be considered and endorsed by PCB
- regarding the oversight committee the USA supports the concept of an “evaluation task force”
- while there needs to be an appropriate separation, there should be a supportive role for the Secretariat in the management of this exercise
- timelines for the evaluation should be shortened
- costs appear to be rather high, the USA welcomes a discussion on budget but could live with the current proposal in the spirit of consensus

**NGO delegation**

- need to strengthen the question gender  
need for better reflection of human rights and GIPA.