

FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION OF UNAIDS

**STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON THE DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT
13 July 2001, CICG, Geneva**

**Proceedings Part I:
Summary of Discussions in the Plenary Sessions**

**Proceedings Part II:
Summary of Discussions of Working Groups**

FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION OF UNAIDS

**Evaluation Supervisory Panel
(ESP)**

**Address: Rooms V212&214
c/o UNAIDS
20 avenue Appia
CH-1211, Geneva 27
Switzerland
Telephone: (+41) 22 791 4671/4555
Facsimile: (+41) 22 791 4768
Email: <mst@unaid.org>**

23 July 2001

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON THE DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT Geneva, 13 July 2001

Proceedings Part I: Summary of Discussions in the Plenary Sessions

Attached to this letter is the first part of the Proceedings for the Stakeholder Workshop on the draft Inception Report for the Five-Year Evaluation of UNAIDS. It summarizes the discussions in the plenary sessions. The second part of the Proceedings, summarizing the discussions in the four working groups at the workshop, will follow shortly.

The reports of the working groups included in the proceedings of the plenary sessions represent only the results of the discussion on the specific theme assigned to the group. Working Groups were asked to present to the plenary session two or three suggested improvements to proposals in the draft Inception Report on that topic. The results of the other items discussed in the working groups will be reflected in Part II of the Proceedings, to be distributed shortly.

We are also attaching the list of participants at the workshop.

The Evaluation Supervisory Panel would like to thank all participants for their interest in the Stakeholder Workshop, and their commitment to the evaluation process. Views from stakeholders from different quarters and perspectives provide valuable insights for the Evaluation Team and will contribute to improve the quality of the evaluation.

The **deadline for written comments** on the draft Inception Report is **31 July**. These comments, as well as those presented to the Workshop, will be taken into consideration by the Evaluation Team in finalizing the Inception Report, and by the ESP in approving it. However, the mandate and budget of the evaluation may not permit accommodation of all suggestions.

The final Inception Report will be posted on the UNAIDS website on 7 September.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Euclides Castilho". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'E'.

Euclides Castilho
Chair

ENCLS.: As stated.

FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION OF UNAIDS

Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP)

Address: Rooms V212&214
c/o UNAIDS
20 avenue Appia
CH-1211, Geneva 27
Switzerland
Telephone: (+41) 22 791 4671/4555
Facsimile: (+41) 22 791 4768
Email: <mst@unaid.org>

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON THE DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT 13 July 2001, CICG, Geneva

Proceedings Part I: Summary of Discussions in the Plenary Sessions

PLENARY SESSION 1:

Chair: Torild Skard, ESP Vice-Chair

1. Opening of the Workshop

1.1 The Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP) Chair, Dr Euclides Castilho, welcomed participants to this consultation on the design of the Five-Year Evaluation of UNAIDS. The objectives of the evaluation are comprehensive and the methodology therefore complex, relating to global, intercountry and national level.

1.2 Dr Castilho noted the extensive process of selecting the Evaluation Team by international competitive bidding. The Team has now presented a draft Inception Report. The mandate of the evaluation requires consultation with stakeholders on the Report, and the ESP has launched a broad consultation process, soliciting comments in writing until July 31st from interested parties.

1.3 The stakeholder workshop is part of this process. The purpose of the consultation is to assess whether the implementation plan proposed in the draft Inception Report will achieve the objectives set out in the evaluation mandate. The workshop is not a forum for decision-making, but it has an important role to play in bringing perspectives from different quarters and views from various stakeholders to the evaluation process. It also provides an opportunity for stakeholders to contribute concrete suggestions on how to strengthen the proposed methodology. The suggestions and proposals from stakeholders will be considered by the Evaluation Team in finalizing the Inception Report and by the Evaluation Supervisory Panel in approving it. However, the mandate for the evaluation and the budget may limit the possibility of accommodating all suggestions.

1.4 In closing, the Chair noted that participants could submit additional written comments until July 31st. He thanked participants for their commitment to the evaluation by participating in the workshop.

2. Presentation of the Draft Inception Report

2.1 The Evaluation Team Leader, Derek Poate (ITAD), presented an overview of the draft Inception Report, and the logic of its structure.

2.2 The Report starts with the fundamental question of “What is UNAIDS” – a programme to achieve an expanded response to the epidemic at the national level and a joint unified programme of the United Nations with seven Cosponsors and a Secretariat. The six ECOSOC objectives governing the creation of UNAIDS are captured in the simplified UNAIDS Mission Statement.

2.3 The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the extent to which goals and core objectives set out in the ECOSOC resolution have been met and are realistic, and the relevance of the objectives and functions for the challenges of the next five years. The evaluation will draw conclusions and make recommendations on governance, management and functions that will promote improved performance, including future objectives and functions of the programme. The central purpose of the evaluation is to determine what difference UNAIDS has made, and this will be done against the counterfactual proposition “In the absence of UNAIDS...”

2.4 Evaluation questions will be structured according to the three functions of UNAIDS (policy advocacy for increased awareness and commitment, information to expand capacity and knowledge, and coordination and better use of resources). A fourth important function, governance, will also be evaluated. For each functional area the counterfactual proposition, issues/hypotheses, questions, indicators and information sources have been proposed.

2.5 For country visits, the draft Inception Report specifies a number of criteria for country selection. The Evaluation Team has drawn a random sample stratified by region and prevalence, but with purposive final selection from a longer list, to ensure countries include representation of institutional factors. This approach provides for balance in geographical regions, HIV/AIDS rates of prevalence, UN presence, economic status, and country efforts. A proposed list of eight countries, with alternatives, is contained in the Report. There would be visits to four countries in Africa, two in Asia, one in Latin America and one in Europe. Sources of information for country visits would include national authorities, Cosponsors, NGOs (including people living with HIV/AIDS), donors, and representatives of the private sector.

2.6 In considering the issue of country selection, Mr Poate asked that the criteria be examined. Alternate country suggestions would need to be substitutions, and not additions. A pilot visit to one country at the beginning of the evaluation is planned to test the methodology at country level. Mr Poate would welcome any suggestions on the idea and the country selected.

2.7 In addition to country visits, the Evaluation Team would visit headquarters of the Cosponsors and conduct a number of thematic studies. The proposed themes are mobilization and application of resources; a comparative assessment of institutional, organizational and financial arrangements for global programmes; and a participatory assessment of determinants of impact at national levels.

2.8 The draft Inception Report contains a comprehensive plan for dissemination of results. The objectives are to ensure preliminary evaluation findings are widely known, and to enable key stakeholders to use information for their ongoing policy development in a timely manner. Global and country level networks involving a wide range of stakeholder interests are identified. The products for dissemination include country visit working papers, Cosponsor visit working papers, and reports from thematic studies. Workshops, electronic mail, and the UNAIDS website are channels for dissemination. For the formal draft and final Report, additional channels such as press releases, oral presentations at relevant meetings, and newspaper articles could be considered.

2.9 Finally, Mr Poate outlined the schedule for the workplan of the evaluation. In September, the Evaluation Team would visit the UNAIDS Secretariat, undertake the pilot country study, and set up arrangements for country visits. Visits to cosponsors would take place in October, while country visits would extend from November 2001 to the end of January 2002. Thematic studies would take place from October 2001 to the end of March 2002. The draft final Report is due on May 31, 2002. Stakeholder consultations would take place from late June to end of July, 2002. The Report would be finalized for presentation to the PCB Chair in October 2002, for discussion at the PCB thematic meeting in December 2002.

3. Introduction and Logistics of the Working Groups

3.1 ESP Member Anita Hardon outlined the objectives and logistical arrangements for the working groups. The aims were to discuss overall strengths/weaknesses of the proposed methodology and the appropriateness of the methodology in relation to the mandate, make specific suggestions for improvement of the methodology, review the evaluation framework given in Table 4 of the draft Inception Report, and discuss the process of future stakeholder participation and dissemination of evaluation results.

3.2 Four working groups were set up on the basis of preferences expressed in pre-registration. The four working groups, each chaired by an ESP member and attended by a member of the Evaluation Team, were: WG1: Evaluation Framework 1 - Overall Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation; WG2: Evaluation Framework 2 - Thematic and Cosponsor Studies; WG3: Country Studies; and WG4: Stakeholder Participation and Dissemination. The composition of each working group represented a cross section of stakeholders (countries, NGOs, Cosponsors, MERG) and would remain the same for the two sessions. Two rapporteurs were selected for each group, the first to write up proceedings of the discussions, the second to present key conclusions to the plenary.

3.3 As a large number of respondents indicated interest in the general theme "Overall Evaluation Framework", it was decided to make this topic the opening discussion item for all working groups. These discussions would be summarized in working group proceedings. Participants would then address the specific topic of their working group. Two or three suggested improvements, with the rationale and associated arguments for and against, would be presented to the plenary session. In the afternoon session, the working group would discuss any additional items arising from the morning meeting, and review one of the functional sections of Table 4 (policy advocacy for increased awareness and commitment, information to expand capacity and knowledge, coordination and better use of resources, governance). Comments on issue

statements, hypotheses and counterfactual propositions would be summarized in working group proceedings. Suggestions for deletions, modifications or additions to the questions would be given directly to the Evaluation Team.

PLENARY SESSION 2:

Chair: Torild Skard, ESP Vice-Chair

4. Reports of the Working Groups

4.1 Report of Working Group 1 (WG1): Evaluation Framework 1 - Overall Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

Chair: Konglai Zhang, ESP Member

Vice-Chair: Bob Grose, MST Member

Rapporteurs: Plenary: Joost Hoppenbrouwer (NGO)

Proceedings: Valerie Young (Canada)

4.1.1 In its report to the plenary, WG1 proposed the following improvements:

- The “readability” of the document could be improved to make it easier to follow for the general reader.
- The “value-added” of UNAIDS needs further clarification. The evaluation should examine the flexibility that UNAIDS has used to respond to its mandate.
- The mechanisms for involvement of civil society, including in industrialized countries, should be increased/made more effective.
- Greater focus at the regional level is required as the epidemic is increasingly seen in a regional perspective and responses are structured accordingly.
- Follow-up to the evaluation needs further clarification, including clear indications on how different actors should follow-up on the results and recommendations.

4.1.2 Comments in the plenary:

- The emphasis on ensuring effective follow-up to the recommendations was supported, as the PCB did not have sufficient authority in itself to implement all of them. The implementation depends on a number of other actors.
- A greater regional focus was emphasized. This may not imply separate regional studies, but the evaluation would be weaker if the regional perspective were not taken into account. There are areas where regional and sub-regional initiatives are the channels to the country level, in particular where the UN presence is weak. Countries draw from these regional structures. The fact that different Cosponsor regional structures are different can be accommodated.
- It was also noted that methodologies to address cross-cutting issues such as gender and human rights were not evident in the proposal.

4.2 Report of Working Group 2 (WG2): Evaluation Framework 2 – Thematic and Cosponsor Studies

Chair: Torild Skard, ESP Vice-Chair

Rapporteurs: Plenary: Ulrich Vogel (Germany)

Proceedings: Joel Rehnstrom (UNAIDS Secretariat)

4.2.1 In the report to the plenary, WG2 presented the following points on *thematic studies*:

- In general, the studies need to be more focussed. It is not evident what the main orientation of the thematic studies are, and how they fit in with the evaluation methodology.
- Regarding the thematic study on resources, the group suggested caution. The focus should be on the allocation of funds and how they are/should be channeled within the UN system. A global analysis of resources would be time-consuming and difficult to do effectively.
- For the study on global programmes, the group also expressed concern. There is a risk of comparing apples and oranges in looking at the experiences of different programs. Further, it may be costly, and there may be little that is applicable to the UNAIDS situation.
- The group expressed strong support for the proposed study on impact. This is an ongoing issue that everyone is struggling with, and it should be addressed by the stakeholders, not delegated. It will help stakeholders to address the issue in a more thoughtful way, and lead to more informed discussion and reasoning on the issue.

4.2.2 On the *cosponsor studies*, WG2 noted that:

- The focus of the studies needs to be clearer.
- The diversity of each Cosponsor needs to be taken into account and respected.
- There are differences between formal mandates and how they are perceived. The analysis should concentrate on this “gap”.
- The studies should look at achievements and processes of change within each Cosponsor, including both institutional and programme aspects.

4.2.3 There were no further comments in the plenary.

4.3 Report of Working Group 3 (WG3): Country Studies

Chair: Andrew Arkutu, ESP Member

Rapporteurs: Plenary: Alice Lamptey (NGO)

Proceedings: Ilona Jürgens Genevois (UNESCO)

4.3.1 In its report to the plenary, WG3 made the following recommendations for change:

- The scope of the evaluation must include more emphasis on the regional dimension and perspectives, and how UNAIDS has assisted regions/institutions and structures to deal with the epidemic.
- The Caribbean should be included in the country visits. The pros are that the Caribbean region has the second highest infection of HIV/AIDS prevalence; there are regional structures, institutions and resources established to fight the epidemic; and there are large numbers of people moving across the region. This has implications for the rate of spread of the epidemic. A study in one island could provide lessons that could be replicated to other island countries. Further, there is a number of scheduled regional meetings where there is an opportunity to meet stakeholders. The cons include the time factor and cost-effectiveness for visits to small countries. The group noted there may be other ways to collect data than country visits.
- China should replace Thailand in the country selection. The pros are that this would enhance the quality of the entire evaluation; it addresses the regional perspective and balance; and there is an opportunity to look at how the UN system positions itself to respond in large countries such as China, where the stage of the epidemic provides an opportunity to influence prevention approaches. The cons are time, i.e. what can be done in 10 days in a country as large as China.

4.3.2 Comments in the plenary

4.3.2.1 WG1 also discussed country selection. They proposed a two-phase approach. The first phase would collect data on a large number of countries with different types of responses to the epidemic and the way in which UNAIDS has worked with stakeholders. The second phase, i.e. final selection of countries, would be purposive, not random. The pros for this are better quality information and inclusion of more countries. The cons are higher costs and fewer “in-depth” country visits. The group also felt that there needed to be an “island state” country, either from the Pacific or from the Caribbean.

4.3.2.2 WG2 also presented views on country selection:

- In selecting countries, the important issue is what does the evaluation want to achieve. The key question is to look at UNAIDS operations, i.e. what is working and what is not working well.
- Country studies are not just visits. There are other approaches to get more data on countries.

- The regional perspective is required to have a critical mass of data.

4.3.2.3 WG2 proposed two additional selection criteria: i) countries which are not popular with donors and do not attract support for programs; and ii) countries where it is difficult to get the issues across, for whatever reason.

4.3.2.4 In the plenary discussion, it was further suggested that country selection should take into account NGO strengths and mechanisms in the country.

4.3.2.5 It was also noted that HIV prevalence should not be the overriding criteria in country selection. The denomination of the evaluation is the UN response and impact of UNAIDS. The question of where the UN reacts and works with the government should be factored in, and this could imply that some political considerations must be taken into account.

4.4 Report of Working Group 4 (WG4): Stakeholder Participation and Dissemination

Chair: Princeton Lyman, ESP Member

Rapporteurs: Plenary: Panakadan Salil (India)

Proceedings: Chika Saito (UNDP)

4.4.1 WG4 divided its report to the plenary into two separate issues, stakeholder participation and dissemination of results.

4.4.2 On *stakeholder participation*, WG4 recommended that:

- Criteria need to be developed for selection of the stakeholder list. The list presented in Table 5 is not satisfactory, and there is no explanation for the rationale. For example, there is no reference to faith-based groups. The list should include “leaders” and “laggards” from different categories. This would provide a rational basis for choice, assure balance, and expand coverage of different situations and facets of the problem. The pros are that it would be a more representative list, it assures transparency, and there is a better “developed/developing” country balance. The cons are that consensus is difficult to obtain on the selection criteria.

4.4.3 The WG4 comments on *dissemination of results*, are:

- Recommendations should be made to the PCB on modes of utilization and dissemination of the final Report. The pros for the suggestion are that the PCB is the client of the evaluation and has the authority to decide on implementing the results of the evaluation. Concrete recommendations for action develop a sense of ownership and responsibility that ensures follow-up. The cons are that awaiting PCB decisions could entail delays.
- Proposals in the draft Inception Report to circulate country visit working papers and Cosponsor working papers to stakeholders on the website should not be implemented. The reason for this is to avoid misinterpretation. The proposals could violate the evaluation mandate as the client is the PCB, which has the authority to decide on the

dissemination of findings. Stand-alone studies lack sufficient methodological rigour and are only an input into a larger whole picture. Working papers may need to be reviewed as more data/analysis becomes available. Publication of papers may further impact on subsequent participation in other countries/Cosponsors. The final report is intended as a synthesis, not a sum of individual parts. The cons in not disseminating the working papers are delays in corrective action, lack of transparency, and a possible watering down of the final report.

4.4.4 Comments in the plenary

In the plenary discussion it was clarified that the proposal from WG4 was not intended to eliminate the process of immediate feed-back to verify findings with stakeholders at the end of each country visit. The proposal was against the dissemination of these papers to a general audience prior to any synthesis of findings from all the visits. The importance of timely feedback to countries in order to respond and take corrective action was noted. The possible use that the media might make of the early release of specific country reports, without understanding that they are not evaluation “findings”, gave reason for concern. In addition it was noted that electronic dissemination was not effective in all geographic areas.

5. Remarks by the Evaluation Team

5.1 In his response to working group reports, the Evaluation Team Leader, Derek Poate, welcomed the debate, which produced many ideas.

- On the country studies, he noted that once country selection moves away from random selection, there could be a bias.
- The Evaluation Team will review the issue of regional focus. While this may not be an area for a substantive study, the Team will explore ways to ensure that the regional perspective is taken more into account.
- On the dissemination of results, he expressed concern that without continuous feedback from working papers, there is a risk that findings will be dated by the time the evaluation report is released next year.

6. General Plenary Discussion

6.1 Other points raised by discussants in the plenary included:

- Studies on the UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsors should focus on the quality of the process and products.
- The relative weight of the questions in Table 4 in the draft Inception Report should be reviewed from the perspective of whether they are right under any circumstance, or only during a specific phase. There is heavy emphasis on questions related to the coordination function as compared to advocacy and information. While UNAIDS has had to give priority to what may be called mobilization, the questions should seek to address how UNAIDS moved to this point and how to get to the next stage.

- The section on governance in the draft Inception Report does not indicate that the issue is well understood. It is under-conceptualized and confuses management and governance. The counterfactual statement on governance relates to efficiency rather than relevance, whereas the other counterfactual statements on functions in Table 4 are stated in terms of relevance.
- The consultative process so far has been unbalanced, as few Africans are included in the list of persons consulted in the Draft Inception Report. Also, although names were listed, many had participated in a wide meeting where there was not sufficient time for real discussion. It was suggested that the Evaluation Team should take advantage of regional meetings to meet stakeholders. The Evaluation Team Leader noted that their experience at the PCB suggested that corridor meetings are not very effective. Specific meetings with the Evaluation Team need to be arranged before or after such meetings. The Chair noted the suggestion made in the written comments to the draft Inception Report that Missions in Geneva would be a useful source of information for the Evaluation Team.

6.2 Participants sought information on dissemination and timeframes for the report on the evaluation, noting that it would be worthwhile to have a formal way to give inputs and to meet again in connection with the draft Final Report. The Chair stated that there will be a broad consultation process on the draft Final Report, but as of now the ESP has not decided to organize another stakeholder workshop. This requires a lot of effort and resources, and what is needed at the final stage is above all formal comments from various stakeholders.

7. Closing

The meeting closed with thanks to the participants and the organizers.

ANNEXES

I Workshop Agenda

II Participant List

FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION OF UNAIDS

Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP)

Address: Rooms V212&214
c/o UNAIDS
20 avenue Appia
CH-1211, Geneva 27
Switzerland
Telephone: (+41) 22 791 4671/4555
Facsimile: (+41) 22 791 4768
Email: <mst@unaids.org>

Stakeholder Workshop on the Draft Inception Report Geneva, 13 July 2001

ANNEX I

Place of meeting: *Salle 4*
International Conference Center Geneva (CICG)
Rue de Varembe 15, Geneva

Time of meeting: *08:30 -12:30 and 13:30 – 17:30*

Provisional Agenda

- | | |
|--------|---|
| 08:00 | Registration |
| 08:30 | Opening of the Workshop by ESP Chair |
| 08:45 | Presentation of draft Inception Report by Evaluation Team
General remarks/comments |
| 09:45 | Introduction and logistics of Working Groups |
| 10:00 | Coffee |
| 10:15 | First session of Working Groups |
| 12:30 | Lunch |
| | <i>(Rapporteurs prepare summary of Workshop discussions)</i> |
| 13:30 | Second Session of Working Groups |
| 15:30 | Coffee |
| | <i>(Rapporteurs prepare summary of Workshop discussions)</i> |
| 16:00 | Plenary Session
Report of Working Groups
Remarks by Evaluation Team |
| 17: 30 | Closing of Workshop by ESP Chair |

FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION OF UNAIDS

Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP)

Address: Rooms V212&214
c/o UNAIDS
20 avenue Appia
CH-1211, Geneva 27
Switzerland
Telephone: (+41) 22 791 4671/4555
Facsimile: (+41) 22 791 4768
Email: <mst@unaid.org>

Stakeholder Workshop on the Draft Inception Report
13 July 2001, Salle 4, CIGC

ANNEX II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Member States

I. Members

Brazil

Ms Rosemeire Munhoz
Head of the Prevention Unit
National STD and AIDS Programme
Ministry of Health of Brazil
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco "G" 5º andar
70058-900 Brasilia/DF
Brazil
Tel: 55 61 223 2709/315 2613
Fax: 55 61 223 2709
Email: rosemeire@aids.gov.br

Gabon

Ms Angone Abena
Counsellor
Permanent Mission of the Republic of Gabon
To the United Nations Office and Other
International Organizations in Geneva
Avenue Blanc 47
Case postale No. 12
1211 Geneva 7
Tel: 731 6869
Fax: 731 6847
Email: amb.gabon@geneva.link.ch

List of Participants

India

Dr Panadakan Salil
Joint Director, Blood Safety
National AIDS Control Organization
Ministry of Health & Family Welfare
Government of India
344 "A", Nirman Bhavan
New Delhi 110011
India
Tel: +91 11 301 4252/7706
Fax: +91 11 301 7706/91 11 373 1746
Email: nacodel@vsnl.com

Mr Kumar Tuhin
First Secretary
Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations
Office and other International Organizations
in Switzerland
Rue du Valais 9 (6th floor)
1202 Geneva
Tel: 906 8686
Fax: 906 8696

Japan

Mr Satoshi Hemmi
First Secretary
Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations
Office and other International Organizations at Geneva
3, chemin des Fins
Case postale 337
1211 Geneva
Tel: 717 3107
Fax: 788 3811
Email: satoshi.hemmi@mofa.go.jp

Norway

Mr Ottar T. Christiansen, Counsellor
Permanent Mission of Norway to the United
Nations Office at Geneva
Avenue de Budé 31-35
Case postale 274
1211 Geneva 19
Tel: 918 0400/30

List of Participants

Fax: 918 0410/11

Email: ottar.Christiansen@mfa.no

Philippines

Dr Loreto Roquero, Jr.
Director
Philippine National AIDS Council
3/F Building No. 12
San Lazaro Compound
Sta. Cruz, Manila
Philippines
Tel: +63 2 743 8301
Fax: +63 2 743 0512
Email: naspcp@doh.gov.ph

Portugal

Monsieur Paulo Bárcia, Conseiller
Mission permanente de Portugal auprès
de l'Office des Nations Unies à Genève
33 rue Antoine Carteret
Tel: 918 0200
Fax: 918 0228
Email: mission.portugal@ties.itu.int

Russian Federation

Dr N. Fetisov, Counsellor
Permanent Mission of the Russian
Federation to the United Nations Office at Geneva
Tel: 918 0230
Fax: 740 0711
Email: mission.Russian@ties.itu.int

Senegal

Dr Ibra Ndoye
Directeur du Programme du SIDA
Institut d'Hygièn
BP 3435
Dakar
Senegal
Tel: + 221 822 90 45

List of Participants

Fax: +221 822 15 07
Email: ibndoye@telecomplus.sn

Mr André Basse
First Secretary
Mission permanente de la République du Sénégal
Auprès de l'office des Nations Unies et des
Institutions spécialisées à Genève
Rue de la Servette 93
1202 Genève
Tel: 918 0230
Fax: 740 0711
Email: MABasse@netscape.net

Sweden

Mr Tomas Lundstrom
Programme Officer
Swedish International Development Cooperation
Agency (SIDA)
105-25 Stockholm
Sweden
Tel: +46 8 698 5787
+46 8 698 5646
Email: tomas.lundstrom@sida.se

Tanzania

Dr Roland Swai
Programme Manager
National Aids Control Programme
Lithuli Road
P.O. Box 11857
Dar-es-Salaam
Republic of Tanzania
Tel: 255 22 211 8581/2
Fax: 255 22 213 8282
Email : nacp@raha.com

Tunisia

Dr Maamouri Ahmed
Direction des Soins de Santé de Base
Ministère de la Santé
31, Rue Khartoum

List of Participants

Tunis
Tunisia
Tel: +00216 178 8314
Fax: +00216 178 9679
Email: ahmed.maamouri@planet.tn

U S A

Mr David Hohman
Health Attaché-USA
U.S. Mission – Geneva
Tel: 749 4623
Fax: 749 4717
Email: hohmande@state.gov

Zambia

Ms Annie Kazhingu,
Second Secretary
Permanent Mission of the Republic of Zambia
to the United Nations Office and other International
Organizations at Geneva
Tel: 788 5330
Fax 788 5340
Email: annie.Kazhingu@ties.itu.int

List of Participants

2. Cosponsoring Organizations

UNDP Ms Chika Saito
HIV/AIDS and Development Specialist
UNDP
One UN Plaza
New York, NY 10017, USA
Tel: +212 906 6372
Fax: +212 906 6336
Email: chika.saito@undp.org

Ms Elena Marcelino
Evaluation Specialist
Evaluation Office
One UN Plaza, DC1-458, New York
New York 10017 USA
Tel: +212 906 5845
Fax: +212 906 6008
Email: elena,marcelino@undp.org

UNFPA Ms Nobuko Horibe
Office of Oversight and Evaluation
United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
220 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017
USA
Tel: 1 212 297 5218
Fax: 1 212 297 4938
Email: Horibe@unfpa.org

UNICEF Dr Joseph Foubi
Senior Adviser
3, United Nations Plaza
New York, USA
NY 10017
Tel: 1 212 824 6721
Fax: 1 212 824 6492
Email: jfoubi@hqfaus.unicef.org

List of Participants

UNESCO M. Reshov
Director, Central Programme Evaluation Unit
7, pl de Fontenoy
B.P. 3.07 Paris
Paris 07 SP 75352
Tel: 33 1 4568 1354
Fax: 33 1 4568 5522
Email: m.reshov@unesco.org

Ms Ilona Jurgens Genevois
Programme Specialist
7-9, rue Eugene Delacroix
75116 Paris
Tel: 33 1 45 03 77 45
Fax: 33 1 40 72 83 66
Email: i.jurgens.genevois@iiep.unesco.org

WHO Ms C. Abou-Zahr
FCH/RHR
20 avenue Appia
Geneva 27
Tel: 41 22 791 13367
Fax: 41 22 791 3111
Email: abouzahr@who.ch

List of Participants

3. UNAIDS Secretariat

Kathleen Cravero
Deputy Executive Director
20 Avenue Appia
Geneva 27
Tel: 791 4716
Fax: 791 4179
Email: craverok@unaids.org

Michel Carael
Chief, Evaluation
Programme Development and Coordination
Tel: 41 22 791 4611
Fax: 41 22 791 4768
Email: caraelm@unaids.org

James Sherry
Director
Programme Development and Coordination Group
Tel: 791 4505
Fax: 791 4768
Email: sherryj@unaids.org

Joel Rehnstrom
Chief, Planning and Performance Monitoring
Programme Development and Coordination Group
Tel: 791 4640
Fax: 791 4768
Email: rehnstromj@unaids.org

Clement Chan Kam
Chief, Theme Group Support
Department of Country & Regional Support
Tel: 791 4556
Fax: 791 4880
Email: chankamc@unaids.org

List of Participants

4. Representatives of Non-Governmental Organizations/People Living with HIV/AIDS

Africa

Ms Alice Lamptey
GHANET
P.O. Box LG 760
Legon
Accra
Ghana
Telefax: +233 21 500851/233 21 778185
Email: tvolamp@ghana.com

Asia & Pacific

Ms O.C. Lin
5/F Shaukeiwan Jockey Club Clinic
8 Chai Wan Road
Shaukeiwan
Hong Kong
Tel: +852 2560 8528 (office)
Fax: +852 2560 4154
Email: oclin@asiaonline.net

Latin America & Caribbean

Dr Ezio Santos-Filho
Vice-President
Grupo Pela Vidda/RJ
Av. Rio Branco, 135-7 andar – Sala 709
20.040-006 Rio de Janeiro
Brazil
Tel: 552 12 513 09 27/552 12 518 3993
Fax: 552 12 518 1997
Email: etfilho@attglobal.net
gpvrj@pelavidda.org.br

North America

Mr Jairo Pedraza
Global Network of PLHIV/AIDS, GNP+
2-12 Seaman Avenue 3H
New York, N.Y. 10034
U.S.A.
Tel: +1 212 569 6023
Fax: +1 212 942 8530 or 212 629 3321
Email: Babaluaye@aol.com

List of Participants

Observers

I. Member States

Australia

Mr Kerry Kutch
Counsellor (Development)
Permanent Mission of Australia to the
United Nations Office at Geneva
2, Chemin des Fins (CP 172)
CH -1211 Geneva 19
Tel: 799 9100
Fax: 799 9109
Email: kerry.kutch@dfat.gov.au

Austria

Ms Elke Atzler
Permanent Mission of Austria
Deputy Permanent Representative
Tel: 748 2048
Fax: 748 2040
Email: elke.atzler@bmaa.gv.at

Canada

Ms Valerie Young
Senior Programme Review Specialist
Canadian International Development Agency
200, Promenade du Portage
Hull, Quebec K1A 0G4
Tel: +1 819 994 6137
Fax: + 1 819 953 9130
Email: Valerie_young@acdi-cida.gc.ca

Dorothy Blake
Consultant, International Public Health
Portland, Jamaica
Tel/Fax: 876 993 7208/7391
Email: blaked@cwjamaica.com
Port Antonio, Portland
P.O. Box 210 (if FEDEX: Gremlin Hill, Drapers
P.A., Portland, Jamaica)

List of Participants

People's Republic of China

Mr Zhenyi Hou
Counsellor
Permanent Mission of the People's Republic
of China to the United Nations Office
Chemin de Surville 11
Case postale 85
1213 Petit-Lancy 2
Tel: 879 5638
Fax: 793 7014
Email: mission.china@itu.ch

Finland

Dr Maarit Kokki
Senior Medical Officer
Ministry of Social Affairs and Health
P.O: Box 33,
Fin 00023 Government
Tel: 358 9 160 4030
Fax: 358 9 160 4144
Email: mmarit.kokki@stm.m.fi

Germany

Dr Ulrich Vogel
Team leader
AIDS Control in Developing Countries
GTZ
P.O. Box 5180
65726 Eschborn
Germany
Tel: 49 6196 79 4102/3
Fax: 49 6196 79 7418
Email: Ulrich.vogel@gtz.de

List of Participants

Romania

Mr Adrian Ciubreag
Second Secretary
Mission permanente de la Roumanie auprès
de l'Office des Nations Unies et des
Institutions spécialisées à Genève
Chemin de la Perrière 6
Route de Coligny
1223 Coligny
Tel: 752 1090
Fax: 752 2976
Email: mission.romania@ties.itu.int

2. *Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)*

Mr Joos Hoppenbrouwer
AIDS Coordination Bureau
C/o Royal Tropical Institute
P.O. Box 95001
NL-1090 HA Amsterdam
Tel: +31 20 5688.428
Fax: +31 20 6654.423
Email: acb@kit.nl

Ms Marie Therese' Bellamy
Permanent Representative to the United Nations
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)
46, Av Blanc
CH1202 Geneva
Tel: 738 4202
Fax: 738 1082
Email: icftu-ge@geneva.icftu.org

List of Participants

3. *MERG Members*

Françoise Dubois Arber
University Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine
17 rue du Bugnon
CH 1005 Lausanne
Tel: 41 21 314 7292/90
Fax: 41 21 314 7244
Email: fdubois@inst.hospvd.ch

John Novak
United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
G/PHN/HN/HIV/AIDS 03.06.093
3rd floor RRB
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20523-3700
Tel: 1 202 712 4814
Fax: 1 202 216 3046
Email: jnovak@usaid.gov

Fred Paccaud
Director
University Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine
17 rue du Bugnon
CH 1005 Lausanne
Tel: 41 21 314 7272
Fax: 41 21 314 7373
Email: Fred.Paccaud@inst.hospvd.ch

4. *Five-Year Evaluation of UNAIDS*

Evaluation Supervisory Panel

Dr Euclides Castilho
Chair, ESP
Faculdade de Medicina da USP
Departamento de Medicina Preventiva
Av Dr Arnaldo 455
01246 903 Sao Paulo SP
Brazil
Tel: +5511 3062 6822 (ext. 41)

List of Participants

Tel: +55 11 3062 6822
Email: Euclides@aims.gov.br
or: castil@usp.br

Ms Torild Skard
Vice-Chair, ESP
Senior Advisor, Multilateral Dept.
Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Oslo, Norway
Tel: +47 2224 3701
Fax: +47 2224 2734
Email: Torild.skard@mfa.no
and: Toriskar@online.no

Dr Anita Hardon
Associate Professor and Director
Medical Anthropology Unit
Dept. of Anthropology
Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences
Univ. of Amsterdam
Oudezijds Achterburgwal 185
1012 DK Amsterdam
Tel: 3120 525 2670
Fax: 3120 525 3010
Email: hardon@psecw.uva.nl

Dr Andrew Arkutu
40, Forest Avenue
Dzorwulu, Accra
Ghana
Tel: 233 21 506030
Fax: 233 21 505995
Email: aarkutu@africaonline.com.gh

Mr Princeton N. Lyman
Executive Director
Global Independence Initiative
The Aspen Institute
One Dupont Circle, 7th floor
Washington, DC 20036-1193
USA
Tel: 1 202 736 1085

List of Participants

Fax: 1 202 775 2622
Email: plyman@aspeninst.org
or phlyman@erols.com

Dr Konglai Zhang
Professor, Department of Epidemiology
Peking Union Medical College
5 Dong Dan San Tiao
Beijing 100005
China
Tel: 8610 652 96973
Fax: 8610 652 88170
Email: klzhang@public2.east.cn.net

Management Support Team

Mrs Jean Perlin
Team Leader
Evaluation Supervisory Panel
UNAIDS
20, Avenue Appia
1211 Genève 27
Tel: 791 4671
Tel: 791 4768
Email: perlinj@unaids.org

Mr R.N. Grose
Member, MST/ESP
Chapple Farm
Brownston, Ivybridge, PL21, OSQ
United Kingdom
Tel: 44 1548 821017
Fax: 44 1548821017
Email: Bobgrose@hotmail.com

Ms Gunnvor Berge
Evaluation Section
Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Oslo
Norway

List of Participants

Tel: +47 2224 3836
Fax: +47 2224 2734
Email: gunnvor.berge@mfa.no

Evaluation Team

Mr Derek Poate
ITAD, Ltd. Ditchling Common
Ditchling HASSOCKS
West Sussex, BN6 8SG
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 1444 248088
Fax: +44 1444 248763
Email: derek.poate@itad.com

Dr Joanne Harnmeijer
Monitoring and Evaluation Research
and Impact Studies
ETC CRYSTAL
Kastanjelaan 5
P.O. Box 64, 3830 AB
Leusden
The Netherlands
Tel: +3133 432 6030
Fax: +3133 4940791
Email: crystal@etcnl.nl

Mr Ralf Maurer
Consultant
UNAIDS Evaluation
315 E 51st St.
New York, N.Y. 10022
USA
Tel: +1 212 751 7357
Fax: +1 202 478 1825 or 1 212 898 903
Email : rmaurer@hotmail.com
rmaurer@resultsatwork.com

List of Participants

Dr Georges Tiendrebeogo
Médecine Tropical Appliquée
Pédiatrie Sociale et Préventive
KIT Royal Tropic Institute
Mauriskade 63
P.O. Box 95001
10090 HA Amsterdam
The Netherlands
Tel: 3110 418 8426
Fax: 31 20 568 8444
Email: G.Tiendrebeogo@kit.nl

FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION OF UNAIDS

Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP)

Address: Rooms V212&214
c/o UNAIDS
20 avenue Appia
CH-1211, Geneva 27
Switzerland
Telephone: (+41) 22 791 4671/4555
Facsimile: (+41) 22 791 4768
Email: <mst@unaids.org>

2 August 2001

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON THE DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT Geneva, 13 July 2001

Proceedings Part II: Summary of Discussions of Working Groups

Attached to this letter is Part II of the Proceedings for the Stakeholder Workshop on the Draft Inception Report for the Five-Year Evaluation of UNAIDS. It summarizes the discussions in the four Working Groups. Part I of Proceedings summarizing the plenary sessions has been distributed earlier. The two Parts are interrelated and form an integrated whole.

The four Working Groups at the Stakeholder Workshop each had the following agenda items for discussion: general comments on the proposed methodology, a specific topic assigned to each group, a topic proposed by the participants in the Working Group, and review of one of the functional areas from Table 4 (pages 16-26) of the draft Inception Report. The Working Groups were composed of a balanced representation from Cosponsors, Governments, NGOs, the UNAIDS Secretariat and the Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group (MERG). Each Working Group was chaired by a member of the Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP) and attended by a member of the Evaluation Team. Each group selected two Rapporteurs, one to deliver a report to the plenary on the results of the discussion of the specific theme assigned to the group, and another to record the results of the other items discussed in the group.

The Working Groups were established on the basis of preferences expressed in pre-registration. According to the specific topic assigned to each group, the groups were structured as follows:

WG1: Evaluation Framework 1: Overall Objectives and Scope

WG2: Evaluation Framework 2: Thematic and Cosponsor Studies

WG3: Country Studies


WG4: Stakeholder Participation and Dissemination of Evaluation Results

The Working Groups reported to the plenary session on two or three recommendations for change related to the specific topic assigned to the group. These reports are summarized in Part I of the Workshop Proceedings (Plenary Sessions) distributed earlier.

The general comments of the Working Groups on the proposed methodology, possible additional comments related to the specific topic assigned to the group, the discussion of the additional topic selected by the working group itself, and comments on the counterfactual proposition, hypotheses and questions for the assigned functional area of Table 4, are summarized in the attached Part II of the Proceedings. Specific suggestions for deleting, adding or substituting questions in Table 4, also discussed in each Working Group, were submitted directly to the Evaluation Team.

May I thank you again for your participation and contribution to the Stakeholder Workshop. After finalization and approval of the Inception Report in early September, I will provide you with an overview of ESP considerations related to the suggestions from the stakeholder consultations, including the Stakeholder Workshop and written comments received by 31 July 2001. The suggestions will strengthen the proposed methodology of the evaluation, although the mandate for the evaluation and the budget may limit the possibility of accommodating all suggestions.

Yours sincerely,



Euclides Castilho
Chair

ENCLS.: As stated.

FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION OF UNAIDS

Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP)

Address: Rooms V212&214
c/o UNAIDS
20 avenue Appia
CH-1211, Geneva 27
Switzerland
Telephone: (+41) 22 791 4671/4555
Facsimile: (+41) 22 791 4768
Email: <mst@unaids.org>

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON THE DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT 13 July 2001, CICG, Geneva

Proceedings Part II: Summary of Discussions

Working Group 1 – Evaluation Framework 1: Overall Objectives and Scope

Chair: K. Zhang, ESP Member
Vice-Chair: B. Grose, MST Member

Rapporteurs: Plenary Report: J. Hoppenbrouwer (NGO)
Proceedings: V. Young (Canada)

Members: A. Kazhingu (Zambia), K. Kutch (Australia), O.C. Lin (NGO/Asia),
J. Novak (MERG), A. Basse (Senegal), M. Carael (UNAIDS Secretariat),
M. Reshov (UNESCO), J. Pedraza (NGO/North America),
A. Abena (Gabon) and D. Poate (Evaluation Team)

1 Agenda Item 1: General Comments on Proposed Methodology

- 1.1 Lay readers (non-specialists in evaluation) who had not been previously exposed to the documents for this evaluation found the report hard to read. The message for subsequent reports is to make sure the language and structure are easier to read for lay audiences. A 3-4 page executive summary would assist both the final Inception Report and the final Report.
- 1.2 The group took into account the written comments that had been provided by stakeholders in advance of the workshop. These included the need for the Evaluation Team (ET) to take into account the political nature of the evaluation, and to ensure that members of the main part of the Team met a greater proportion of people from developing countries than they had in the inception stage.
- 1.3 Country selection: a significant proportion of the group felt strongly that a small island state should be included. The balance of their views was that a Caribbean state was preferable to one from the Pacific or elsewhere. The rationale appeared to be mainly related to epidemiology (some Caribbean countries having mid-range HIV prevalence), to regional representation, and to links to regional anti-AIDS initiatives. In addition, the group felt that Thailand had reversed its epidemic before the creation

- of UNAIDS and should not therefore be examined as a UNAIDS success story. One member proposed that it be replaced by China.
- 1.4 The participant from UNESCO described evolving approaches to evaluation in his organisation, varying somewhat from the standard five DAC criteria. The UNESCO representative will spell this out in more detail in his written comments, to be submitted by 31 July.
 - 1.5 The group agreed that the involvement of civil society should be spelt out more comprehensively in the Inception Report, to show how Civil Service Organizations (CSOs) would be fully involved. The group agreed that this should be explored in more detail under agenda item 3.
 - 1.6 The UNAIDS Secretariat representative and others made clear that there were regional activities in which UNAIDS was engaged, and that these were an important part of UNAIDS' performance. As such they needed to be included in the evaluation. Examples include the Baltic States Initiative. Pre-existing regional structures, and regional events such as conferences, were also vehicles for AIDS-related advocacy, especially by the Secretariat. These also needed to be examined, e.g. from the perspectives of effectiveness and efficiency.
 - 1.7 The group agreed that there needed to be continuity after the evaluation and that the Inception Report should address this. For example, the Report should propose follow-up mechanisms, including indicators, for implementing the evaluation's recommendations and for monitoring that implementation.
 - 1.8 A number of participants felt strongly that care and support of people affected by HIV/AIDS should be a more prominent subject matter of the assessment of UNAIDS' impact. The references to impact (e.g. in Table 2) currently have little or no explicitness about improvements in care and support. The topic also arose in the context of the way that UNAIDS (especially the Secretariat) had succeeded in putting care and support on the agenda of countries and organisations. The evaluation needed to take this into account.
 - 1.9 Several group members noted that the client audience for the evaluation should be more explicit in the Inception Report. The group accepted that the "legal" audience was the Programme Coordinating Board (PCB), but referred also to the wider audience of stakeholders listed in the Secretariat's stakeholder analysis (this analysis had been distributed with the Mandate document).
 - 1.10 On a related point, the group discussed the options for members of the PCB (or other stakeholders) pursuing the implementation of evaluation findings and recommendations beyond the PCB itself – e.g. by taking them up with ECOSOC or the governing bodies of UNAIDS Cosponsors. The group agreed that the ET should express their findings in such a way as to facilitate stakeholders taking them beyond the PCB where this would be useful.
 - 1.11 On the second part of agenda item 1, whether or not the proposed implementation plan would achieve the objectives as set out in the Mandate document, the groups raised no concerns that it would not, subject to the refinements in the methodology suggested above.

2. Agenda Item 2: Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

- 2.1 The group recognised that the Mandate gave no scope for *changing* the purpose and scope in the Mandate. However, there was ambiguity in some of the language, e.g. in the use of the word “expectations” in the purpose statement (what and whose expectations) and in what the ET was required to do, e.g. in terms of defining how it would deal with the work of Cosponsors, the definition of added value, and impact. The group therefore recognised that the ET had scope for interpreting the objectives and scope, and that the approach set out in the Inception Report, subject to the comments of this consultation exercise, was a satisfactory way of doing so.
- 2.2 On the issue of impact, the ET Leader pointed out that assessing impact, as technically defined, would be impossible. However, it would be possible to assess “evaluability” and to make recommendations about approaching the assessment of impact. The Inception Report set out how the ET proposed to go about this, especially in section 5. The group agreed that it might be possible to obtain useful information about this from Cosponsors’ own evaluations, so long as care were taken to avoid being unduly influenced by the Cosponsors.
- 2.3 Further, the group agreed that the apparent polarisation of views at the expanded MERG meeting at Lausanne (in which the draft Mandate had been refined), in September 2000, was in fact based on different understanding of evaluation terminology. This meeting recognised the differences between the technical uses of the terms “impact” and “effectiveness” as set out in the DAC criteria. The group agreed that the main focus of the evaluation was effectiveness, meaning principally the influence of UNAIDS on the work of the Cosponsors. The group also agreed that impact, in terms of benefits to individuals, was a crucially important outcome of UNAIDS work, but that it was virtually impossible to evaluate because of the difficulties of attributing benefit to the existence or work of UNAIDS.
- 2.4 With regard to the logical framework approach in Table 2 of the Inception Report, the group was content with the approach, subject to the point made above about the need to incorporate indicators related to care and support at the impact level.

3 Agenda item 3: Topics Proposed by the Group

- 3.1 The group decided to discuss four issues in more depth: the involvement of CSOs; the inclusion of care issues in the evaluation; the approach to assessing added value; and the selection of countries to visit.
- 3.2 Involvement of CSOs. The UNGASS process for involving CSOs, while sometimes controversial, had successfully obtained CSO inputs. It had proved possible to collect and to coordinate the contributions from NGOs around the world, in part through a series of regional events.
- 3.3 The NGOs listed in Table 5 were not thought to be the best choice. The ET Leader indicated that Table 5 was a preliminary list and needed more work. The group endorsed this. It was pointed out that groups such as the International Community of Women Living with HIV/AIDS (ICW+) would be an essential interlocutor.
- 3.4 The question was raised about whether CSOs were a part of the evaluation’s client. (See the point under agenda item 1.) As part of the wider group of stakeholders they may be

- considered to be, as they both contribute to and benefit from the work of UNAIDS and they have formal observer status at the PCB.
- 3.5 It was proposed that the final Inception Report could indicate more clearly how CSOs would be involved during the country visits. It would be necessary, for example, for the ET to make sure that NGOs proposed as interlocutors by the Theme Group or Country Programme Adviser (CPA) really was representative of civil society. This was because some NGOs were reported to be active and effective but excluded from the UNAIDS process in some countries. The ET Leader said that he would improve both Table 5 (on examples of stakeholders to be met) and Table 7 (an indicative programme for the country visits), and that a day would be set aside for meeting NGOs.
- 3.6 In order to give NGOs advance information about the evaluation and the country visit programme, the ET will consider the idea of putting information on the world-wide web, as was done for the UNGASS preparatory process. This could prompt NGOs to prepare their contribution to the evaluation.
- 3.7 Care and support for people affected by HIV/AIDS. The group re-emphasised the points made earlier – that the ET should ensure that they examine ways that UNAIDS has managed to put care and support issues onto the agenda of governments and organisations, and that it should be reflected in the impact-level investigations as set out at the top of Table 2.
- 3.8 Added value. The ET Leader explained that the language in Box 5 was straight from the Mandate and that he, as an evaluator, had found it somewhat unclear. The group suggested that the methodology section could be more explicit about how the ET would assess added value, and agreed that it meant, in essence, the difference that the UNAIDS “arrangement” made to the ways that the Cosponsors and others worked together. The group suggested that the ET be creative in the way that it interpreted the Mandate in relation to added value, not least because the Mandate itself was not particularly helpful.
- 3.9 Country selection. The ET Leader explained the mix of random and purposive methods used to prepare the list of candidate countries, including the reserves. The group tended towards the view that the selection should be more purposive than random, not least because there were so many variables and the number of countries was so small that randomness became almost meaningless.
- 3.10 The group considered a range of options for increasing the amount of useful country-level information. These included
- quick assessments of a larger number of countries, with or without reducing the number of countries visited;
 - quick assessments of more countries, reducing the time spent in country;
 - collaboration (with appropriate cautions about conflict of interest) with Cosponsors, where the Cosponsors would gather information on the ET’s behalf.
- 3.11 A number of participants suggested that the ET could obtain useful information from events such as regional conferences that were scheduled for the evaluation period. These included the forthcoming Ouagadougou meeting and the International Conference on

AIDS in Asia and the Pacific. The ET Leader noted this but pointed out that obtaining substantive inputs from people on the fringes of such meetings could be difficult.

3.12 Regional consultation could, however, produce additional information about country situations. Again, the UNGASS process for involvement of civil society was cited, in which NGOs met regionally and their input was fed into the New York deliberations.

3.13 The group produced two propositions, with their pros and cons.

- A two-stage process for gathering country information, in which the ET would obtain information by contacting a larger number of countries before visiting a group of about the size proposed in the Inception Report. The benefits of this would be that the ET would have information from a broader representation of countries. The disadvantages would be that it would take more time and therefore be more costly. Depending on how costs were managed, it might mean fewer countries being visited in depth.
- Regional activities in which the objective would be to examine UNAIDS performance in activities such as support for regional initiatives (e.g. the Baltic Sea Initiative or CARICOM's AIDS-control work) and its use of regional conferences for advocating greater national responses. Other benefits could be more information to help with country selection, more information about country situations, and the ability to investigate ways in which UNAIDS had pushed back the boundaries of its original mandate. The disbenefits, as above, would be increased costs. The ET would need to look at the propositions in some depth before being able to estimate the time and cost implications.

4 Agenda item 4: Review of Functional Area D: Governance

4.1 General Comments on Counterfactual Proposition, Hypotheses and Questions: Comments were reflected in the general discussions noted above and proposed deletions, additions and changes to specific questions.

4.2 Proposed changes to questions were sent direct to the ET.

FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION OF UNAIDS

Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP)

Address: Rooms V212&214
c/o UNAIDS
20 avenue Appia
CH-1211, Geneva 27
Switzerland
Telephone: (+41) 22 791 4671/4555
Facsimile: (+41) 22 791 4768
Email: <mst@unaids.org>

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON THE DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT 13 July 2001, CICG, Geneva

Proceedings Part II: Summary of Discussions Working Group 2 – Evaluation Framework 2: Thematic and Cosponsor Studies

Chair: T. Skard, ESP Vice-Chair

Rapporteurs: Plenary Report: U.Vogel (Germany)

Proceedings: J. Rehnstrom (UNAIDS Secretariat)

Members: C. Abou-Zahr (WHO), F. Dubois-Arber (MERC), E. Atzler (Austria),
P. Barcia (Portugal), J. Foubi (UNICEF), N. Horibe (UNFPA);
M. Kokki (Finland), A. Maamouri (Tunisia), E. Marcelino (UNDP),
E. Santos-Filho (NGO/Latin America & Caribbean) and
R. Maurer (Evaluation Team)

1 Agenda Item 1: General Comments on Proposed Methodology

1.1 Overall a very good report, in line with the mandate, forward looking with institutional aspects of the programme well covered.

1.2 A challenge for the evaluation will be to reconcile and articulate the relationship between the activities of a global programme and the results (and impact) at country level.

1.3 Other challenges to the evaluation include bringing together country, Cosponsor and other studies in a clear and coherent way, and communicating and disseminating the findings of the evaluation in a way which promotes ownership and constructive change.

1.4 Particular attention should be given to the definition and use of “UNAIDS” and its components – Cosponsors and Secretariat. UNAIDS is not used consistently as a term in the report. A clear distinction when UNAIDS is referred to, whether it is the Secretariat, the Cosponsors or the Theme Group, is necessary. The “value added” by UNAIDS – to countries and Cosponsors and other partners – needs to be clarified and spelled out.

1.5 The definition of an “expanded response” is not limited to the inclusion of new partners, or doing more. Qualitative aspects need to be included. The treatment of the concept in the report does not capture the multisectoral nature of the response.

- 1.6 Defining what “success” means would be useful.
- 1.7 The global level is not identical with the UN.
- 1.8 There is a risk that the evaluation will only confirm what is already known.
- 1.9 The possibility that UNAIDS in fact is preventing further progress in the fight against the epidemic instead of promoting it, should be considered.

2 Agenda Item 2: Thematic and Cosponsor Studies

2.1 Cosponsor Studies

Some points are presented in the report of the Working Group to the plenary. In addition, the following was noted:

- 2.1.1 A vertical analysis of the activities of Cosponsors would be desirable. Cosponsors’ country level work should be included in headquarter visits. Indicators and data sources should include all aspects and levels of Cosponsor work and distinguish between different Cosponsors.
- 2.1.2 A gap analysis could be a way to clarify differences between Cosponsors.
- 2.1.3 A clear distinction of the Cosponsors’ programme and Cosponsors’ work under the umbrella of UNAIDS is very difficult to draw. Nevertheless, the proper role of Cosponsors should be analysed. The willingness or interest of Cosponsors to participate in UNAIDS is not equal among all Cosponsors and should be taken into account.
- 2.1.4 The Cosponsor visits should be more comprehensive and, in general, the input of the Cosponsors to the evaluation – not only through the Cosponsor visits – is very important.

2.2 Thematic Studies

Some points are presented in the report of the Working Group to the plenary. In addition, the following was emphasized:

- 2.2.1 The focus of the evaluation is important, keeping it sufficiently narrow, not diverting energy or resources. A possibility could be to drop one or more of the thematic studies and redirect resources to country studies.
- 2.2.2 Potentially, the proposed studies can be very comprehensive and difficult to complete within the given framework of the evaluation. It may therefore not be realistic to complete all three. If a choice has to be made, priority should be given to the impact study.
- 2.2.3 It might be difficult to get a total overview of financial resource flows for HIV/AIDS. Definitions and delimitations may be unclear and vary, and many donors do not elaborate appropriate statistics. The focus of the study could therefore usefully be narrowed down.

2.2.4 The selection of global programmes could be narrowed down, using similarity for example in terms of multisectorality. A limited number with a very different setup from UNAIDS could also be selected. The aim should be to get innovative ideas which could be useful for the organisation of the future work of UNAIDS.

3 Agenda Item 3: Topics Proposed by the Group

The Group chose to discuss country selection as an additional topic.

Some points are presented in the plenary in connection with the report of Working Group 3. In addition the following points were made:

3.1 Country studies are key to the evaluation. Comparisons between countries or regions will not be possible. Diversity, variation and differences among the countries selected for study should be the determining criteria.

3.2 Country studies should serve the evaluation as a whole. Therefore more breadth (at the expense of depth) may be desirable. Complementing in-depth country studies by lighter assessments of other countries could be considered.

3.3 Case studies could be provided to give examples of UNAIDS work in different countries – in different regions – without trying to draw conclusions. Some countries should be included where things are not working well.

3.4 The criteria for selection of countries are not clear. They need to be made more explicit. The criteria are more important than the actual choice of countries.

3.5 Prevalence alone – even within a regional breakdown - is not a sufficient criterion. A more deliberate comparison and contrasting of countries might be an alternative.

3.6 The choice only of Argentina in Latin America is not good. Arab countries could also be included along with small island states, possibly represented by a Caribbean country.

3.7 Including high income/developed countries in the evaluation should be considered.

3.8 The selection of respondents in the countries is also important.

4 Agenda Item 4: Review of Functional Area C: Coordination and Better Use of Resources

4.1 General Discussion on Counterfactual Proposition, Hypotheses and Questions

4.1.1 There is a need to ensure that the evaluation is focused. Some tightening is needed of the framework laid out in table 4.

4.1.2 Coordination, better use of resources and capacity to support national planning are not necessarily linked. It might be better to separate the two functional areas and rethink the counterfactual proposition. The use of resources and the thematic study on resource analysis might be combined.

4.1.3 The role of the Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations (CCO) in coordination should be included – which is not entirely captured by the governance function.

4.1.4 The number of questions related to coordination should be reduced, but different questions will be perceived as important or irrelevant by different respondents.

4.1.5 At global, regional and local levels coordination efforts might vary according to thematic areas or tasks. It might therefore be useful to structure coordination questions around specific thematic areas, like mother-to-child transmission or youth.

4.2 Concrete suggestions for deletions, modifications or additions to the question were given directly to the Evaluation Team.

FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION OF UNAIDS

Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP)

Address: Rooms V212&214
c/o UNAIDS
20 avenue Appia
CH-1211, Geneva 27
Switzerland
Telephone: (+41) 22 791 4671/4555
Facsimile: (+41) 22 791 4768
Email: <mst@unaids.org>

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON THE DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT 13 July 2001, CICG, Geneva

Proceedings Part II: Summary of Discussions Working Group 3 – Country Studies

Chair: Dr A. Arkutu, ESP Member

Rapporteurs: Plenary Report: A. Lamptey (NGO/Africa)

Proceedings: I. Jürgens-Genevois (UNESCO)

Members: M. Fetisov (Russia), D. Blake (Canada), Z. Hou (China), T. Lundstrom (Sweden),
C. Chan Kam (UNAIDS Secretariat), J. Pedraza (NGO/North America) and
J. Harnmeijer (Evaluation Team)

1 Agenda Item 1: General Comments on Proposed Methodology

1.1 Within the framework of the methodology proposed, the concept of expanded response risk is stated in terms of vulnerability and impact. The Group felt it should integrate such factors as human rights, gender, poverty, migration and economics.

1.2 The general impression was that the approach should be either top down or bottom up.

1.3 It was proposed that Community Based Organizations (CBOs) should be included in stakeholder consultations.

1.4 The importance of having local and regional consultants, for country visits, was underlined, as well as criteria for their selection.

1.5 It is important to take regional dynamics into consideration. UNAIDS role is to respond to the local and regional level of the epidemic.

1.6 In order to increase the scope of the evaluation, data should be taken from other sources, as well as country visits.

2 Agenda Item 2: Country Selection

- 2.1 In the selection criteria – there is not enough emphasis on the forward looking aspect of the evaluation, and therefore the need to look more closely at countries where the prevalence is currently low but where there is potential for explosion.
- 2.2 The selection should include success and failure of different countries.
- 2.3 Some participants proposed to be less random in country selection and not only use prevalence rate as a main criteria. Other criteria such as strength of CBOs should be included.
- 2.4 The cost element appeared to be the reason not to include a Caribbean country. This should be reviewed.
- 2.5 Looking at countries should not diminish the focus on the regional perspective and dimensions. It is necessary to select countries where UNAIDS has assisted countries through regional institutions and structures.
- 2.6 There is a need to develop a set of issues/questions and the types of key informants that would be required to address the issues identified.
- 2.7 There is an assumption that the UNAIDS evaluation is welcome everywhere, but this may not be so.
- 2.8 Consideration should be given on who should attend wrap-up meetings after country visits. Wrap-up meetings should still be part of the information gathering process.
- 2.9 The Evaluation Team should consider visits outside the capital.
- 2.10 Secondary data sources from government documents, research institutions, NGO networks and donors should be used.
- 2.11 Research institutions, where they exist, and NGO networks are cost effective ways to get data. If the preparatory work is done carefully it will elicit substantial information.
- 2.12 Countries should also have a say in who should be contacted by the Evaluation Team.
- 2.13 Any assessment of the country response should include an assessment of the role of the media. Media representation should not be left until the last moment.
- 2.14 What can the UN do in terms of maximum support, in a country like China where so many dimensions come into play.
- 2.15 Thailand seems to be very well evaluated on issues of HIV/AIDS but not necessarily with respect to UNAIDS.

2.16 The Caribbean should be included in country visits. The region has the second highest HIV/AIDS prevalence. Large numbers of people pass through the islands and this has implications for spread of the disease. Lessons learned from the study of one island country could be replicated for others.

2.17 China should replace Thailand for a country visit. This would enhance the quality of the evaluation. It would provide an opportunity to look at what the UN can do to provide maximum support to a country where many factors come into play.

2.18 There were pros and cons for the proposal to include the Caribbean and China.

The pros were (a) to get a regional perspective; and (b) the possibility to visit one place in order to get a regional overview.

The cons were (a) the cost/budget; and (b) whether the situation and lessons could be replicated in other countries.

Different participants raised the point that other ways exist to collect information from Caribbean countries.

3 Agenda Item 3: Topics Proposed by the Group

The Working Group did not add an additional item to its agenda.

4 Agenda Item 4: Review of Functional Area B: Information to Expand Capacity and Knowledge

4.1 General discussions on counterfactual proposition, hypotheses and questions:

4.1.1 The evaluation should look at the kind of information required and for whom, including at global, regional and country levels.

4.1.2 It should examine what UNAIDS has informed about, the quality and relevance of the information and how it has been used.

4.1.3 The evaluation should also address the efficiency, effectiveness and results from the distribution and use of the information.

4.1.4 The assumptions underlying the information should be examined, i.e. on what basis was the information chosen for dissemination.

4.1.5 The question of responsiveness to needs and the relevance of what was provided should also be reviewed.

4.1.6 The issues of how the information completed, duplicated or filled gaps in relation to other available information should be considered.

4.2 Suggestions for deletion, addition and modification of specific questions were submitted directly to the Evaluation Team.

FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION OF UNAIDS

Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP)

Address: Rooms V212&214
c/o UNAIDS
20 avenue Appia
CH-1211, Geneva 27
Switzerland
Telephone: (+41) 22 791 4671/4555
Facsimile: (+41) 22 791 4768
Email: <mst@unaids.org>

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ON THE DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT 13 July 2001, CICG, Geneva

Proceedings Part II: Summary of Discussions Working Group 4 – Stakeholder Participation and Dissemination of Evaluation Results

Chair: P.Lyman, ESP Member

Rapporteurs: Plenary Report: P. Salil (India)

Proceedings: C. Saito (UNDP)

Members: R. Munhoz (Brazil), S. Hemmi (Japan),
O. Christiansen (Norway), L. Roquero (Philippines),
I. Ndoye (Senegal), R. Swai (Tanzania),
M. Bellamy (NGO/Global), J. Sherry (UNAIDS Secretariat)
and G. Tiendrebeogo (Evaluation Team)

1 Agenda Item 1: General Comments on Proposed Methodology

1.1 There was general agreement that the Draft Inception Report was very good and the evaluation was on the right track.

1.2 There was considerable discussion of the country level:

- country level should be the main focus because this is where the impact matters (but see other views below);
- the ECOSOC resolution provides the mandate for UNAIDS;
- the coordination system overall needs to be examined, not just Theme Groups, which are a part of the UN Resident Coordinator system. Coordination is a process, not an outcome;
- Theme groups are only part of the coordination system, and not seen as the mechanism for the way forward. UNAIDS is now looking at options for adapting the concept as part of building the framework for the future, including the role of the Country Programme Adviser (CPA);
- other sectoral departments than health should also be consulted, and in some countries federal, state and municipal levels of government need to be reviewed.

- 1.3 Use of prevalence as a primary selection criteria for country visits is misplaced. The evaluation is on institutional impact and the effort to move a system. Selection should be related to looking at where and how the machinery operates. Political dimensions, including the relationship between the UN and governments need to be considered.
- 1.4 High-income countries have had an impact at country level, and should not be excluded from the studies.
- 1.5 The regional dimension is absent in the report. It is an important dimension, in particular where UN or UNAIDS has a low presence at country level, as there are many sub-regional structures that provide countries with support.
- 1.6 The evaluation must deal with the static versus the dynamic, i.e. what snapshot does it attempt to capture. The program is continually moving on, and wrestling with obsolescence. The functions in the report need to capture the temporal dimension, as the emphasis on functions is related to timing and sequencing. The relative weight given to the questions for each function does not reflect this dimension, i.e. at what stage is emphasis put on coordination and when on mobilization. The evaluation needs to recognize that gears are shifting.
- 1.7 Different people have different perceptions on UNAIDS and what it means. Their reaction depends on how they see it. This will need to be taken into account in the interview process and in evaluating the responses. The ET should make it clear to respondents that UNAIDS means “Cosponsors and the Secretariat”.
- 1.8 The current global context needs to be considered, e.g. the renewed commitment from UNGASS, the Global Fund.
- 1.9 The questions are weak on the governance function. There is too much emphasis on coordination in comparison. For UNAIDS the most significant aspect is governance, and if it is being fully utilised. Governance is not confined to the Programme Coordinating Board (PCB). Governance of Cosponsoring agencies also needs to be examined to see if they have fulfilled their roles.
- 1.10 Country selection needs revision. A Caribbean country should be included. Argentina is not representative nor a good choice in Latin America.
- 1.11 The evaluation should look at why things are/are not working and both the UN and country have to be examined, including partnerships and relationships, opportunities to impact, and relationships among groups in countries.
- 1.12 The evaluation will need to address UNAIDS at the global, regional and country levels, and the interaction of the various levels.

2 Agenda Item 2: Stakeholder Participation and Dissemination of Evaluation Results

- 2.1 Review of Proposed Mechanisms for Stakeholder Participation
 - 2.1.1 It is not clear what the selection criteria is for the proposed lists of stakeholders to be consulted (Table 5). The lists should have greater balance between leaders and laggards in various categories.
 - 2.1.2 The Evaluation Team (ET) should consult with the International Labour Organization (ILO). There is a tripartite structure with workers and employers organizations that represent civil society. The ILO has just developed a code of practice for HIV/AIDS in the workplace.
 - 2.1.3 There are not enough southern NGOs on the list. Also, the private sector firms listed are all Northern.
 - 2.1.4 The ET should not only consult health departments, as the mission of UNAIDS is much broader than the health aspects of the epidemic.
 - 2.1.5 The list of donors needs to be reviewed. There is too strong an emphasis on Northern donors.
 - 2.1.6 Donor perspectives differ according to whether representatives are in the field or in headquarters, and also where they are in the overall government structure. The same applies to Cosponsors. The ET should distinguish the responses at these different levels as appropriate.
 - 2.1.7 More information is needed on the mechanisms for consultation, not just the lists of names.
 - 2.1.8 Faith and spiritual groups should be included in the lists.
 - 2.1.9 Networks of scientific groups at country and regional level are good sources of information as they are often engaged in research on HIV/AIDS and have relevant data.
 - 2.1.10 There are several women's networks in Africa that should be included.
 - 2.1.11 The rationale for including the private sector is not clear. The names suggested will provide stock responses, and time might be better spent with other stakeholders.
 - 2.1.12 The time-relevance issue applies to stakeholders as well. In certain functional phases donors are more important than in other phases.

- 2.1.13 One issue is whether or not it is more important to expand the range of stakeholders or to expand the interaction with stakeholders
- 2.2 Review of Proposed Mechanisms for Dissemination of Evaluation Results
- 2.2.1 There should be a stakeholder workshop on the draft Final Report well before the release of the Final Report.
- 2.2.2 The mechanisms and processes through which results should be fed need to be considered, e.g. Cosponsors should consider the report in their governing bodies. The MERG could be involved in follow-up. These processes should be identified and factored into the thinking on dissemination.
- 2.2.3 A workshop on implementing the results could be considered
- 2.2.4 Specific guidance notes on follow-up of results, with provisions for monitoring and reporting, could be distributed to various parties, including Resident Coordinators and county teams in the field.
- 2.2.5 The PCB has the mandate to decide on what to do with results, but the evaluation Report should provide specific recommendations on the matter.

On the issue of releasing working papers as they become available, the group was against the proposal for release to the general public of working papers (e.g. on the web), though not against sharing the results with relevant stakeholders involved in the visits. The reasons for and against general release were:

- There are issues of confidentiality.
- A steady release of reports can lead to potential misunderstandings if they are viewed as conclusions.
- Country programs are not being evaluated, and release of country reports may lead to confusion on the issue.
- The process may be outside the mandate of the ET. The client is the PCB and they have the authority to decide what to do with results. They could be the last to know if results are released prior to the Final Report.
- Country visits are only inputs into the main evaluation report, not stand-alone documents. They should never be released publicly. The evaluation is a synthesis report, not a series of numerous different evaluations. Release of separate studies undermines this concept.

- Reports of country/Cosponsor visits are not stand-alone studies. The most important document is the synthesis. Draft conclusion from one study may change because of results of subsequent ones. Moreover, publication of bits and pieces prior to the synthesis may influence subsequent studies as others move to avoid perceived traps or negative findings.
- In favor of general dissemination, the ET and ESP Chair noted that the rationale behind the proposal to disseminate working documents more widely than to participating stakeholders is that the evaluation has a long timeframe and some of the findings in the country visits might be more valuable if made immediately known to the stakeholders for timely corrective action. Release of the studies could increase transparency and limit “gloss-over” of final conclusions.
- However, those opposed argued that it is not a question of transparency but of synthesis. Releasing pieces of the report is comparable to allowing doctors to start practicing medicine after one year of studying a certain subject. Full qualification requires graduation from the full course.
- Release of Cosponsor studies would have the same problems, but thematic studies might be released early.
- What is most important is to keep the dynamics of the process going for mutual lesson-learning. The dynamics of process should be emphasized rather than divulging information at an early time.

2.3 Chair Summary of Main points from the overall discussion:

- The PCB needs to determine the utilization of the evaluation report, but specific recommendations for utilization should be made in the Final Report.
- With regard to stakeholder participation, the criteria needs to be clarified prior to establishing the lists.
- The main issue for dissemination is how to handle the raw data, i.e., the working papers, especially the country studies but also some of the others such as Cosponsor studies.

3 Agenda Item 3: Topic Proposed by the Group

The Group discussed the issue of Governance as an additional item.

- It was noted that UNAIDS is unique. It governs across lines of the seven Cosponsors, and has a common budget. UNAIDS Secretariat is not part of Governance, but a support function. There are no comparable models in the UN system, but the structure might be looked at as a business model.
- The concept of the governance structure should be examined by the ET, including the governing bodies of the Cosponsoring organizations and how they deal with UNAIDS. The PCB is a special body, and should also be reviewed as a governance mechanism.
- The counterfactual statement in Table 4, Section D, should reflect what was intended and what was achieved, i.e. a “more effective UN system response”. This statement is the only counterfactual statement that is in terms of efficiency and not effectiveness.
- The group agreed to raise the issues in the plenary session.

4 Agenda Item 4: Review of Functional Area A: Policy Advocacy for Increased Awareness and Commitment

- 4.1 On the general discussion on the counterfactual proposition, issues/hypotheses, and questions, the following points were made:
- It is difficult to attribute outcomes to UNAIDS efforts.
 - With regard to question 1, the contribution will vary with different stakeholders
 - Hypothesis b) needs clarification.
 - The questions have captured the temporal aspect of the function, which is positive.
- 4.2 Suggestions for deleting, adding and changing specific questions were given directly to the ET.