

UNAIDS Second Independent Evaluation
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

<http://www.unaids.org/en/AboutUNAIDS/IndependentEvaluation/>

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT

Geneva, Switzerland

September 15-16, 2008

ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK

RESULTS

Stakeholder Group (Replies)	
Member State	8
Cosponsor	3
Civil society	5
Secretariat	1
Non-specified	4
Total	21

(All comments received are noted on the attached chart)

		Median (1 to 5)
1	To what extent were the Workshop objectives achieved?	
	(a) Present the IR to a broad range of stakeholders.	4.3
	(b) Review the IR to ensure the foundations are laid to achieve the Evaluation purpose as set out in the terms of reference.	4.0
	(c) Inform the Evaluation Team and provide an opportunity for suggestions to strengthen the methodology of the design and process of the Evaluation.	3.6
	(d) Strengthen stakeholder involvement and support	

	for the process and understanding of the material that will be presented in the Final Report	4.0
2	Were the Workshop Format and Agenda appropriate?	
	Plenary	4.2
	Study Groups	3.7
3	Were the discussions in the Study Groups useful in relation to the objectives?	
	(a) Relevant themes/questions.	3.8
	(b) Clearly defined guides.	3.3
	(c) stimulating for exchange of views	4.1
4	What were the strengths of the Workshop?	Please see attached.
5	What were the weaknesses?	Please see attached.
6	What would you suggest for engagement and consultations with Stakeholders on progress in the Evaluation and the draft Final Report ?	Please see attached.
7	Any other comments	Please see attached.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

ST : Stakeholder
MS : Member State
CO : Cosponsor

CS : Civil Society
SEC : Secretariat
NS : Non-specified

ST	Q1 (Objectives)	Q2 Format/Ag	Q3 SG discussions	Q4 Strengths	Q5 Weaknesses	Q6 Suggestions	Q7 Comments
MS				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • diverse attendance • easy atmosphere to contribute 	Repetition	Mid-evaluation meeting on draft report.	
MS				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SG sessions • General discussions 		Sharing periodically the different phases.	
MS				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SG discussions 	Questionnaires should be precise and well-defined.		
MS				Structured discussion		Information meetings	
MS				Good discussions covered large number of aspects.	Not focused enough, especially to TOR and mandate given ET.	Clearly state what information is required.	
MS		SGs did not cover all issues of the		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participatory discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • too large • gaps already 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • advance planning for 	

		evaluation.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participation of civil society 	<p>known in UN agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • funding not fully addressed 	<p>country visits to inform government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • advice of countries re selection of stakeholders for contacts • advance notice so that CSO participation is representative 	
MS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not much discussion on methodology • mostly about issues/questions and too much focus on the “answers” which do not concern IR 	Again – try to raise evaluation questions for upcoming evaluation.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • broad participation creating ownership • broad spectre of views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGs were of varied quality • could have had evaluation experts to guide the OC? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • put draft report on the web • stakeholder workshop in Draft report 	Thank you for organizing the workshop.
<u>MS</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • doubts about 1 (c) but up to ET to know 	Good to discuss issues in SGs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • do not understand 3(b) • ET got relevant suggestions on how to move forward 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • smaller groups enables more interaction • focus on specific issues • good atmosphere • open 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too broad questions .. dividing SG3 was good idea • sometimes Qs looked more like an evaluation 	At least another SWS before the draft Final Report not long after consultations with CCO members.	Hope for clear recommendation including who has to act

				<p>constructive discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maybe arrange rapporteurs beforehand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (hope comments/discussions on issues of content will be taken into account – not mentioned by ETL in summary) 		
CO	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
CO				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flexibility • study groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • varying levels of knowledge among stakeholders • specifics of the UN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sharing of drafts • good preparations of the country visits 	
CO	Could not question methodology within the structure.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SG3 did not relate to ECOSOC objectives • did not allow for structured review of change drivers in the environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inclusive • structured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • structure closed down discussions prematurely • reluctance to address impact issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take time to listen. 	
CS		Plenary gave time and platforms for comments.	We could speak in all issues openly and were taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • involvement of civil society • group work 	More involvement of civil society.	Should be a meeting before the final draft so that	

			into consideration.			one could comment on it.	
CS	Participants were often evaluating rather than being guided by facilitators to help ET get questions right.	Need more direction from facilitators that the exercise was not part of the Evaluation but to help the right questions get asked.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (as per previous comments) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> right mix of Secretariat, Cosponsors, CS (including NGO and FBO) open discussion was facilitated 	Small group sometimes dominated by facilitators's knowledge of UNAIDS, Secretariat and Cosponsors perhaps from previous evaluation work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> get CS/NGO/FB= involvement early and often at country level site visits required to talk to implementation and those living or affected by the disease ask civil society 	
CS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> efficiently chaired questions in small groups very effective in bringing out issues 		Representation of vulnerable populations was good given time available to set up the meeting	Priority to national country actions could be better next time		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> not sure key concerns raised will find their way into the Evaluation have been listened to but time will tell whether or not suggestions are actually taken on board
CS				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> open to all and inclusive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> not enough civil society 	Much was listed.	Thanks

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • friendly space was created • ability to influence process to some extent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • civil society needs to be better prepared – not all are aware of all UNAIDS activities 		
CS		Not sure the content of the SG is in a form that will be useful for ET.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provided opportunity to learn more about the evaluation • exposed ET to diversity of experiences with and opinions about UNAIDS 	Often seem we were being asked to comment on UNAIDS performance rather than on the scope and methodology of the Evaluation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • most important is to have significant and meaningful engagement with stakeholders and particularly a breadth of CSO's at the country level including outside capitals • some of the SWS felt like orientation of the ET which could have been earlier, differently, e.g. by the ET having a series of informant 	

						interviews with different stakeholders early in the process	
SE C		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • good discussion in SG's but methodology should have been explained • people had expectation of getting into key questions 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • exchange between participants • SWS came early in the process – perceived as a real opportunity to have views heard 	Level of preparation of some participants – perhaps insufficient time to engage with discussion questions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure outreach to key affected populations (go to where they are) • produce monthly one or two page updates (e.g. country visits, outreach etc. 	Facilitation by Paul was perceived as very aggressive and inappropriate at times.
NS				Time for exchange and discussion.		Another workshop with a similar concept.	
NS				Range of stakeholder views from gov't to civil society		Yes	
NS				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • very participatory process • short time for busy agenda 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • civil society/PLWHA and grass roots involvement 	
NS				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • calling partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not enough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • balance should 	

				<p>together before evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trying to accommodate participants view • country selection criteria 	<p>inclusion of civil society</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • broad concepts (MDGs, universal access and joint commitments) were not on board 	<p>be maintained (Govt, NGO, CS and PLHIV)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focus group discussion is needed 	
--	--	--	--	---	---	---	--