

FIVE-YEAR EVALUATION OF UNAIDS

Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP)

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

Progress Report from the Evaluation Supervisory Panel (ESP) Chair to the Twelfth Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) 29 – 31 May 2002

1. This Progress Report provides information on completed milestones and planned activities from my report to the PCB in May 2001 to discussion of the Evaluation Report at the December 2002 PCB. It also notes several items where guidance is required.

Progress in Implementing the Evaluation Work Programme

2. The draft Inception Report, prepared by the Evaluation Team (ET), was circulated to a wide range of stakeholders at the end of June 2001, through the UNAIDS Secretariat mailing lists and website. Stakeholders were asked to comment on the draft Report by the end of July 2001. In addition, a workshop held in Geneva on 13 July 2001 brought together 45 representative stakeholders from PCB members and observers and the Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group (MERG) to discuss the draft Report with the ESP and the ET. All written comments, Proceedings from the Workshop, and Reports from four Workshop Working Groups were taken into account by the ET in finalizing the Inception Report, and by the ESP in approving it on 9 September. The documents from the consultation, including the response of the Evaluation Team to stakeholder comments, are on the website. The approved Inception Report was circulated to participants in the Workshop, those who submitted written comments, Cosponsor focal points and evaluation units, Theme Group Chairs in the nine countries proposed for studies, and posted on the website. In addition, a general message was sent to stakeholders, advising them how to obtain a copy of the final Inception Report, if they do not have access to the website.
3. The stakeholder consultations brought forth issues, concerns and constructive comments that influenced the final definition of the Evaluation methodology and implementation activities. For example, the work programme now provides for greater attention to the differences in Cosponsor realities at global, regional and national levels; more emphasis on the regional dimension; enhancement of country studies through three additional visits and a self-evaluation questionnaire; more emphasis on policies and programmes of industrialized countries, including mobilization and channelling of resources; contacts

with a wider range of civil society organizations, in particular in countries in the South; and a revised approach to the study on governance.

4. In early September 2001, the Evaluation Team began their site visits to the UNAIDS Secretariat, Cosponsors, nine countries, and government capitals. There was some disruption to the schedule due to the events of 11 September 2001 in the United States and particular country situations, but the ET completed their site visits by the end of March 2002.
5. The Third Meeting of the ESP, hosted by the Brazilian Government, was held on 16-19 December 2001 in Rio de Janeiro. In the context of an approved Inception Report, a progress report from the ET on implementation, and ESP experience in working with a complex Mandate and unique management structure (UNAIDS/PCB(10)/00.4, Annex I), the ESP took a number of decisions on key items for the Evaluation work programme. These include the schedule, written outputs, stakeholder consultations on the draft Final Report, distribution of reports and dissemination of findings, and final budget estimates.

Specific Items

Revised Milestones

6. The Evaluation is on schedule. However, based on the experience of the initial site visits and the need to ensure integration and synthesis of findings and results from the separate studies, the ESP and Evaluation Team agreed that it would be beneficial to allow more time to complete the analytical work on the country studies, the three functional areas, and governance. Thus, the delivery date of the draft Final Report to the ESP, originally targeted for 31 May 2002, has been extended by two weeks to 14 June 2002.
7. In addition, experience and feedback from the stakeholders on the consultation process on the draft Inception Report indicate that July is not an optimal month to hold consultations due to holiday periods in many countries. Thus, the ESP has decided to provide a longer period for consultations on the draft Final Report, and to hold a workshop in mid-September 2002.
8. The revisions do not affect the timeframe for delivery of the Final Report from the Evaluation Team to the PCB Chair and Executive Director of UNAIDS, which remains early October 2002. The new milestones are:

2002

- 14 June: Delivery of the draft Final Report to the ESP
- 15-18 July: Meeting of ESP/ET to review the draft Final Report
- 2 August: Circulation of draft Final Report to Stakeholders
- 12-13 September: Stakeholder Workshop and ESP/ET Meeting
- 20 September: Deadline for written comments
- 8 October: Submission of the Final Report by the ET to the PCB Chair and Executive Director of UNAIDS

- 31 October: ESP Comments to PCB Chair on Final Report
- December: PCB Discussion of Evaluation Report

Written Outputs

9. The Final Evaluation Report will consist of a summary document with supplementary volumes of supporting analysis and information. Comments from stakeholders will be incorporated into the Final Report and/or summarized in an addendum. In addition, a short summary written for a general audience will be prepared.

The following Table summarizes the written outputs for the Evaluation:

Title	Category	No. of Pages	Comments
Draft Final Report for the 5-Year Evaluation of UNAIDS	Report	30	
Final Report for the 5-Year Evaluation of UNAIDS	Report	30	
Analysis of the Functional Areas and Governance of UNAIDS	Annexes	15-30 for each section	Provisionally as 4 separate documents, each of 15-30 pages – Total 60-120 pages
Country Working Papers	Annexes	15-25 for each	Nine papers
Stakeholder Comments on Draft Final Report	Addendum	unknown	If required
Short Summary for General Audience	Separate Report	5	

Distribution of Reports/Dissemination of Findings

10. At its December 2001 meeting, the ESP discussed the process for distributing Evaluation documents and dissemination of findings. For the period from ESP receipt of the draft Final Report (14 June 2002) to the transmittal of the Final Report by the Evaluation Team to the PCB Chair and the Executive Director of UNAIDS (8 October 2002), the ESP has responsibility for ensuring that the distribution and consultation process on the draft Final Report is consistent with the provisions of the Evaluation Mandate. Distribution and handling of the Final Report is under the authority of the PCB.
11. In taking its decisions on distribution of the draft Final Report, the ESP took into account several factors, i.e. the need for access to draft reports and supporting documentation for a meaningful consultation process; practical considerations of distributing multivolume documents amounting to some 300 pages; and implications of dissemination of draft findings to a general public prior to consultations with key stakeholders.
12. The draft Final Report (30 pages) will be widely distributed to key stakeholders at global, regional and field level. Due to volume, the supporting documentation (analyses on the

three functional areas and governance, and nine country working papers) will have more limited distribution, but could be made available upon request to interested stakeholders.

13. I will be seeking PCB guidance on the most appropriate ways of dissemination of the draft Final Report.
14. The distribution modalities for the Final Report, including any revised supporting documents, the short summary prepared for a general audience, and the Addendum (if any) on stakeholder comments are the prerogative of the PCB.
15. The Mandate document makes several references to disseminating, sharing and promoting results and key recommendations to derive maximum benefit from the Evaluation. The PCB, following its discussions on the Evaluation Report in December 2002, is the primary vehicle for determining follow-up actions. However, the Mandate document indicates that fostering dialogue and mutual sharing of experiences at all levels should be taken into account in planning the participatory approach of the Evaluation work programme.
16. Participatory methodology has been used by the Evaluation Team in country studies. They have also put forward dissemination proposals in the Inception Report. In addition they will propose ways of following up on recommendations and findings in the Final Report. The ESP has conducted its stakeholder consultations with these considerations in mind, including stakeholder workshops. The Stakeholder Workshop on the draft Final Report will specifically seek stakeholder views on follow-up to the Evaluation findings. The ESP in its independent report for the PCB Chair on the Evaluation, will also propose follow-up action as requested in the PCB Decision (UNAIDS/PCB(E)/00.5 RECS, paragraph 8d).

Consultations on the draft Final Report

17. In assessing the results of the consultation process on the draft Inception Report, including feedback from stakeholders, ESP concluded that the consultation process met both substantive and participatory objectives of the Evaluation. Stakeholder comments had an impact on the final design of the Evaluation methodology. Participants noted that the Workshop provided an interactive environment where stakeholders could seek clarification, share ideas, network, and develop consensus. It also provided an opportunity for the ESP and ET to hear stakeholder comments first hand. Written comments supplemented the workshop discussions in clarifying issues. The circulation via mailing lists and the website of Workshop Proceedings and written comments contributed to wider distribution of stakeholder comments and ideas.
18. Consultations on the draft Final Report will be based on a similar approach, i.e. a combination of written comments and a stakeholder workshop, but the objectives, questions for comments, and workshop format will be adjusted. The general objectives for the consultations will be to review and clarify results of the Evaluation, and to seek views on how to follow-up on the findings and recommendations. The period for

consultations will be a full seven weeks, with a Workshop scheduled in mid-September, a more convenient time for many stakeholders. Invited participants to the Workshop will be PCB members and observers, and representatives from the Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group (MERG).

Financial Matters

19. The PCB decision on the Evaluation Mandate requests the PCB Chair “to review and approve the total budget submitted to him/her by the ESP, if possible not exceeding US\$ 850,000, subject to availability of funds. The detailed budget will be subject to approval by the ESP, which will be responsible for ensuring that the resources available are sufficient for the activities planned” (UNAIDS/PCB(E)/00.5 RECS, 3 November 2000, Decision 9).

20. I have kept successive PCB Chairs and Vice-Chairs apprised of the budgetary estimates after each ESP meeting, having first verified with the Secretariat that funds would be made available. I also wrote to the PCB Chair (Minister Soininvaara) in March 2001, prior to selection of the winning bid for the Evaluation contract, to seek authority for a negotiating limit. In my report to PCB Chair Dr Thakur on the second meeting of the ESP in July 2001, I undertook to apprise him of the financial situation following the third meeting of the ESP in December 2001, when the Evaluation contract amendment and full programme of activities for the remainder of the Evaluation period would be finalized. On 18 January 2002, I wrote to Dr Thakur to report on the outcome of the third ESP meeting, and requested his approval for the revised budget estimates based on decisions taken at the ESP December meeting. The budgetary estimates were also provided to the UNAIDS Secretariat to confirm that funds would be made available. The ESP estimates are higher than the provisional estimate of US\$ 850,000 noted in the Decision referred to above, due to several factors, e.g. extension of the evaluation timeframe by six months, a more intensive evaluation work programme, and activities cited in the Mandate that were not costed for the provisional estimates.

21. If the PCB Chair so wishes, I will be pleased to elaborate on financial matters at the PCB meeting at the end of May.

22. At that time, I will also make a brief statement highlighting any new information on the Evaluation.

Euclides Castilho
Chair, Evaluation Supervisory Panel
(12 April 2002)