



UNAIDS/PCB(25)/09.17
13 October 2009

25th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board
Geneva, Switzerland
8-10 December 2009

Second Independent Evaluation of UNAIDS
Report of the Oversight Committee

Document prepared by the Chair of the Oversight Committee

Additional documents for this item: *none*

Action required at this meeting – the Programme Coordinating Board is invited to: *take note of the report*

Cost implications for decisions: *none*

OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE PROGRAMME COORDINATING BOARD

FULFILLING THE MANDATE

INTRODUCTION

1. The Oversight Committee (OC) interpreted its mandate from the Programme Coordinating Board as the responsibility to ensure a credible and independent evaluation process, and a high quality, forward-looking report relevant to the future of UNAIDS. This report informs on how the OC has fulfilled this mandate. It covers the process and the product of the Evaluation, and reflects on some lessons learnt.
2. The Committee was created by, and made directly accountable to the Programme Coordinating Board. The ten-member Committee consisted of five women and five men appointed in their individual capacity, and on a voluntary basis. They were nominated by, and drawn from, a cross-section of UNAIDS stakeholders, and together they brought to the Committee a wide range of expertise and experience, and knowledge of all regions. A Cosponsor Liaison Official and UNAIDS Secretariat contact person were appointed to work with the Committee.

KEY PRINCIPLES AND CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

3. The Committee, at its first meeting, specifically established the respective roles and responsibilities of the Committee, Committee Chair and Vice-Chair, Cosponsor Liaison Official, Secretariat contact point, and the Oversight Committee Secretariat.
4. The Committee was guided by international evaluation quality standards¹, and in addition, identified a number of critical success factors – independence, transparency, impartiality, stakeholder involvement, cooperation with UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsors, and the selection of a qualified Evaluation Team (ET).
5. As evidence of their commitment to the task, all members of the OC attended each of the six meetings, with the exception of one absence due to visa problems.

INTERPRETING PCB TERMS OF REFERENCE AND DECISIONS

6. The basis for the work of the OC and the development of a Request for Proposal (RFP) was the document prepared by the PCB Bureau for discussion at the 21st meeting of the Programme Coordinating Board in December 2007, and related Decisions. These documents presented a challenge both to the OC and the ET.
7. There were ambiguities on the extent and nature of involvement of Cosponsors, Secretariat, PCB Bureau, and Programme Coordinating Board, in the process of the evaluation. The OC dealt with the uncertainties by defining roles and responsibilities, and deciding how the Committee would ensure that the relevant bodies were kept informed whilst respecting the evaluation principles of independence and impartiality.

¹ In particular the OECD DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. Guidelines of several bilateral and multilateral organisations were also reviewed.

8. On some levels the instructions in the documents were too detailed, as for example, the instructions on the composition of the Evaluation Team, the Evaluation work plan and reporting arrangements to the OC. Some basic provisions, such as DAC standards for evaluation assessment criteria and process principles were lacking. The eleven questions resulting from sequential Programme Coordinating Board discussions resulted in a wide-ranging list of general, specific, programmatic, thematic, governance and administrative issues for the Evaluation, with no indication of relevant weighting or priority. Nor were the questions easily combined into a clear evaluation framework that could deal with all the issues in depth, or effectively capture the cross-cutting themes. Thus, the OC had to contend with documents that were both prescriptive and incomplete – a difficult task for a newly-formed committee to deal with.
9. In preparing the RFP for selection of the Evaluation Team, the Oversight Committee clarified some of these areas, and elaborated on the Programme Coordinating Board Decisions, in accordance with their remit to incorporate comments from the general discussion at the Programme Coordinating Board². The Committee also added key “guiding principles” for conducting the Evaluation, including DAC standards and involvement of stakeholders. These were to apply both to the way the ET would conduct their research and data gathering, as well as to the overall process managed by the OC. The RFP did not include the detailed management provisions contained in the Programme Coordinating Board documents, but did extend the list of qualifications required of the ET, and the nature and timing of their outputs. The OC also ensured that in the selection of the successful bid considerable weight (30%) was placed on the way in which the bidder structured the Evaluation questions into a conceptual framework that demonstrated an understanding of the complexity of the questions and underlying issues of the Evaluation.

OVERSIGHT OF THE AGREED WORKPLAN

10. The Programme Coordinating Board decision provided for four two-day meetings of the OC but the Committee found this insufficient to fulfil its responsibilities. The Committee met six times in all from the period May 2008 to September 2009, and increased the number of days from two to three. Two of the meetings were combined with stakeholder workshops, attended as well by the ET. The ET attended two other OC meetings for discussions on the first progress report, and the draft Evaluation Report.
11. The Committee monitored implementation of the Evaluation workplan against agreed timelines and approved Programme Coordinating Board estimates. The OC reviewed four quarterly reports from the ET reporting on activities completed, any delays or reasons for adjustments to the work programme, necessary measures to redress the situation, and outstanding implementation considerations. A number of internal milestones were adjusted, but the overall evaluation timeline was adhered to as set out by the Programme Coordinating Board.
12. On the financial side, the Committee monitored expenditures against the approved Programme Coordinating Board estimates. Within approved estimates, the Committee funded two additional meetings of the OC, as noted above, two stakeholder workshops, and the attendance of the Chair and Vice-Chair at this 25th meeting of the Programme Coordinating Board. The contract with UNOPS for assisting in the selection of the ET, and subsequently in administering the contract with the Team, was also an additional unanticipated cost that was included within the approved estimates.

² Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions of the 21st Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, 17-18 December 2007, No. 4.1-4.3.

13. The OC is pleased to report that the SIE has been completed on time and well within the Programme Coordinating Board approved Estimates, as indicated in the attached Annexes 1 and 2.

MEASURES FOR A CREDIBLE EVALUATION PROCESS AND PRODUCT: CRITICAL FACTORS

Independence

14. Members of the OC were selected to serve in their individual capacity and the Committee was directly responsible to the Programme Coordinating Board.
15. Committee deliberations were held in private and decisions taken by the Committee alone, although when required advice was sought from the Secretariat, Cosponsors and others. In accordance with its accountability to the Programme Coordinating Board, after every Committee meeting, the OC Chair wrote to the Programme Coordinating Board Chair to inform on progress on the Evaluation, the financial situation, actions taken, and any issues for his attention. In addition, the Chair of the OC presented written and oral reports to the December 2008, and June 2009 Programme Coordinating Board meetings.
16. The Committee was alert to any potential conflict of interest that could jeopardise the Evaluation. Three potential consultancy contracts were reviewed where Evaluation Team Consortium members could be considered for contracts with the Secretariat and Cosponsors. After discussion with the Secretariat, it was agreed that these consultancies should not proceed due to possible conflict of interest that might compromise the independence of the Evaluation. Another case reviewed was judged as not constituting a potential conflict of interest.
17. An important factor in establishing OC independence was the provision of an independent OC Secretariat, consisting of full time Executive and Administrative Assistants, and a part-time Evaluation Specialist, reporting directly to the Chair of the Committee. The experience and knowledge of the Oversight Committee Secretariat contributed greatly to the efficient functioning of the OC as an independent entity.

Transparency

18. Transparency in the evaluation process was another critical factor identified by the OC for a credible evaluation. A number of mechanisms were put in place to keep stakeholders fully informed and provide opportunities for inputs. These included a SIE webpage on the UNAIDS website where key documents for the Evaluation were continuously posted (see Annex 3). A dedicated email address, and telephone and fax lines, were set up to deal with requests, comments, and concerns of stakeholders. UNAIDS mailing lists were used to distribute information, and advise stakeholders of new materials posted on the webpage.
19. Of the required outputs from the Evaluation Team set out in the PCB terms of reference and approved Inception Report, only the Final Report (as a PCB document), and a short summary report for public dissemination, were specified as documents to be made publically available. All other outputs were to be reviewed exclusively by the Oversight Committee. However, the Oversight Committee, for transparency and stakeholder involvement, made available a wide range of documentation through the SIE webpage, as summarized in the attached chart (Annex 3).

20. Country Summary Reports were also made available to stakeholders. However, background notes, such as evaluation framework tables related to country studies, where sensitive information could be traced to sources, were provided to the OC in confidence to enable them to fulfil their oversight role of ensuring that findings were substantiated by reliable data. In accordance with international standards of evaluation ethics on anonymity and confidentiality, the Committee decided that these documents be left with the Evaluation Team as research notes. An example of how these frameworks were used is provided in Annex 2 (Methodology) of the Final Report.
21. From its opening in July 2008 to October 2009 (prior to the posting of the Final Report) some 22,000 visits were made to the SIE webpage. The Committee suggests that the webpage be left open until at least December 2010 so that stakeholders can continue to access information regarding the SIE.

Impartiality

22. To ensure impartiality and conformity with UN standards for competitive bidding in the selection of the Evaluation Team, and to avoid any bias or perception of bias (from the Programme Coordinating Board, Cosponsors, Secretariat or Oversight Committee) the services of UNOPS were engaged in the selection process. The selection was verified by the UNOPS Project Review Committee for the propriety of its process, the technical aspects of the bid, and the financial competitiveness. A detailed report on the process and selection was prepared by the OC for the Programme Coordinating Board in seeking its endorsement of the recommendation on the winning bid.
23. The statement of services for UNOPS also included the negotiation and administration of the contract with ITAD. This ensured that the provisions of the contract were also in line with standard UN practices, including costs. The contract was based on payment for deliverables, and although UNOPS performed the administrative functions, quality control of the deliverables remained with the Committee, and payments were made by UNOPS only after approval by the OC/OC Chair.
24. One area where impartiality might have been at risk because of stakeholder pressure was in the selection of country studies. There was great interest in the selection, and the ET proposed a list of 12 countries based on criteria outlined in the terms of reference, with additional criteria that the ET felt would help to ensure a good selection. Strong views from stakeholders, including Member States, the Secretariat, the Cosponsors, and the OC, introduced other considerations into the selection process. Increasing the number of country studies would have met these interests, but in discussions with the ET, the OC concluded it was better not to increase the number of countries, but to do more in-depth assessments on twelve countries, and a special consultation of the Pacific region. There were some changes to the original selection proposed by the ET, but the final list still provided a balanced and diverse purposive country selection that provided a basis on which to compare the operation of UNAIDS in different country contexts.

Stakeholder Involvement

25. Stakeholder involvement in the Evaluation process was a priority consideration of the Committee, as a critical factor for a credible evaluation.
26. There was no specific provision for stakeholder consultations in Programme Coordinating Board documents and cost estimates, but the OC ensured that participation was integrated into the evaluation methodology for data gathering at

country and global levels, and was able to identify resources for two workshops: the first on 15-17 September 2008 on the draft Inception Report, and the second on 3-5 June 2009 on Preliminary Evaluation Findings³. The consultations provided for inputs and views at the key points in the process when these would be most useful for influencing the events and progress of the Evaluation.

27. The workshops, held in conjunction with OC meetings, provided a venue for direct discussions and exchange of views between stakeholders, the Committee, and the ET. In order to ensure balanced participation, some 13 Members States and 5 NGO representatives on the Programme Coordinating Board were provided with financial support, according to the Programme Coordinating Board modus operandi. Some 85 participants attended the first workshop, and 120 the second. Each of the workshops was part of a broader consultation soliciting written comments on the documents, thus extending the breadth of input from stakeholders.
28. As follow-up, the OC requested the ET to indicate how stakeholder views and comments were taken into account in revising the documents. This has been documented in Annex 2 on Methodology of the Final Report.

Cooperation with the UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsors

29. The Committee had excellent cooperation from the UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsors, and their engagement has contributed to the quality of the Evaluation process and to the product through provisions of logistical support, data, and practical advice.
30. All ten Cosponsors and multiple representatives from the Secretariat participated actively in the stakeholder consultations on the draft Inception Report and the Preliminary Findings Document, followed up with written comments, and provided additional material as requested by the Evaluation Team.
31. The OC Chair and Vice-Chair met with the former and current Executive Directors, and after OC meetings in Geneva and Montreux, the OC met with representatives of the Secretariat and Cosponsors for an exchange on issues and concerns. The meetings were complemented with individual and group telephone conferences.

Selection of a qualified Evaluation Team

32. The selection of a qualified Evaluation Team was of primary importance. In addition to the impartiality of the process through UNOPS, noted above, the Committee prepared a detailed selection criteria grid of some 46 factors against which to assess the tenders. The grid was weighted (50%) towards the experience, expertise and demonstrated leadership of the Evaluation Team and its Leader. In addition, prior to presenting the winning bid to the Programme Coordinating Board for approval, the OC arranged for a lengthy telephone interview with the Team Leader, to assess his personal knowledge and experience with the issues of the Evaluation, and his appreciation of its complexity.

³ The OC transferred resources from the line items of "Support costs", "Unforeseen", and "Publication, translation and dissemination costs" – after review of planned expenditures against these items. The PCB Chair and PCB were informed of these adjustments.

OVERSEEING AND REVIEWING THE PRODUCTS OF THE EVALUATION

33. The Committee established a framework for monitoring progress on evaluation findings. The objective of this aspect of oversight was to identify any issues relating to difficulties or constraints in the proposed methodology, data collection, interpretation of the evaluation terms of reference or questions; and to ensure that the emerging findings would be relevant to the final report. In this respect, each country report and the two progress reports⁴ were assessed against the following criteria: coverage of the terms of reference; any required clarification of terminology, definitions or evaluation questions; clear linkages between evidence, data, and background material; logical links between findings, conclusions and recommendations; adherence to the work plan outlined in the approved Inception Report; and incorporation of stakeholder views.
34. A similar approach was taken in the intensive review of the draft Final Report at the three-day final meeting of the OC on 2-4 September 2009. Specifically the discussions looked at:
- the extent to which the findings are supported by the evidence;
 - whether the findings reflect diverse views and whether issues of attribution are considered;
 - whether there were unintended and/or unexpected findings identified;
 - whether there are issues where the information provided is not strong enough to come to a suitable conclusion;
 - the rationale for the choice of recommendations;
 - clarity and explicitness of the recommendations;
 - whether the recommendations are practical for implementation within a given timeframe, and directed to the correct area of responsibility.
35. The OC also considered the extent to which the draft Evaluation Report fulfilled the purpose and scope of the terms of reference, including the continued relevance of its ECOSOC mandate and core objectives, and whether the recommendations would provide the basis for UNAIDS to create a vision and institutional structure for future challenges within the changing environment.
36. Throughout this process of review of the draft Evaluation Report, the role of the OC was to ask critical questions, test levels of evidence, appraise the relevance of findings, conclusions and recommendations, and to provide guidance in areas where the OC felt the Final Report would be strengthened -- substantively or in its presentational aspects. The OC was careful not to direct the drafting of the Final Report or its recommendations.

THE OC VIEWS ON THE QUALITY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

Fulfilling the terms of reference

37. The framework proposed in the bid and elaborated in the approved Inception Report grouped the Programme Coordinating Board questions around four main themes, and provided an evaluation framework that allowed the OC and stakeholders to track the evaluation questions through the stages of the evaluation process.
38. The framework developed by the ET, allowed them to address the specific questions and themes, and also to address the higher level assessments on the overall

⁴ The second progress report was used as the Consultation Document for Stakeholders on Preliminary Evaluation Findings.

performance of UNAIDS, including in relation to the ECOSOC mandate and objectives, and their continuing relevance for the future UNAIDS. Thus, the OC considers that the Final Report fulfils the purpose, scope and detailed questions of the Evaluation, and is a high quality, forward-looking report that meets expectations of the terms of reference.

Methodology

39. The general methodology, set out in the Programme Coordinating Board decision document, outlined a standard methodology for a programme evaluation of this type. This methodology was further defined by the ET in the Inception Report, as approved by the OC after extensive stakeholder consultations.
40. The methodology outlined in the Introduction in Section A of the Final Report and the accompanying Annex 2 on Methodology, fully documents the use of different methods of enquiry, the rationale for choosing certain methods in specific contexts, weighting of evidence, and what types of conclusions were drawn on the existing evidence.
41. The OC has monitored the way in which the methodology has been elaborated and used in the conduct of the Evaluation. In the view of the Committee the studies were carried out as described in the approved Inception Report. Cases of minor adjustments have been explained by the ET in Annex 2 of the Final Report. The Committee is satisfied that the methods used by the ET were appropriate, within the resources provided, for the nature and scope of the Evaluation and the assessment criteria.

Evidence to support findings

42. The vast amount of information contained in the Final Report and accompanying Annexes, the twelve summary country reports and the Pacific regional study, and the two web-based surveys, give insight into how evidence has been gathered and analysed to draw findings and conclusions against the Evaluation terms of reference. The way in which the Evaluation was designed and the structure established in the evaluation frameworks for information gathering facilitates the links between the data and findings. Details are also provided on the documentation reviewed, persons contacted, meetings held, and survey results, to indicate how sources have been verified and triangulated to substantiate findings. The OC has examined the "evidence trail" in reviewing the documents produced in the course of the Evaluation, in particular the draft Final Report, and is confident that the findings are well-substantiated.

Conclusions and recommendations

43. The evidence available in the Report is extensive, and could lead to a number of relevant conclusions and recommendations. The OC considered whether recommendations were: logical, strategic, forward-looking, clear and explicit, implementable (preferably within a given time frame), and directed to appropriate actors.
44. The OC discussed these principles with the ET during their three-day review of the draft Evaluation Report. The discussions and criteria are reflected in the conclusions and recommendations of the Final Report.
45. The OC believes that the recommendations, although challenging, provide realistic, constructive, and relevant options for the Programme Coordinating Board to consider in their follow-up to the Evaluation.

Presentation and overall quality of the Report

46. The Report reflects the professionalism and quality expected of a highly-competent and experienced Evaluation Team. The extent and complexity of the terms of reference implies a lengthy report to cover all the aspects of the purpose and scope. The Final Report has provided “layered” levels of information suitable to address the needs and depth of review for different audiences. Its lay-out, plus the use of sign-posting, boxes and sub-headings, acronym lists, and glossary also helps the reader. The additional information provided in Annexes, complements the analysis for a substantive and practical report.

REFLECTIONS ON GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

Terms of reference

47. (*Lesson*) The breadth and complexity of the terms of reference resulted in a lengthy report that addressed all issues but none in great depth. Large-scale evaluations could be more effective if there are good programme and project level studies relating to key issues to build on. Thus, consideration should be given to staged evaluations on specific issues within a comprehensive medium-term plan, possibly as a follow-up to the SIE.
48. (*Lesson/Good Practice*). The detailed instructions contained in the terms of reference would have been difficult to implement for both the OC and ET. However, considerable leeway was given in the mandate of the Oversight Committee to interpret the intentions and “spirit” of the terms of reference in overseeing the Evaluation. Thus, for future evaluations, the initial stage of formulating terms of reference could be professionally worked out to focus on a clear statement of purpose, scope, issues, assessment criteria, and principles for managing the evaluation, and be less prescriptive in the detailed management of the evaluation. A second stage, outlining a detailed evaluation workplan, comparable to an Inception Report, could then be developed

Evaluation criteria and principles

49. (*Good practice*) Internationally recognized criteria, definitions, and guidelines should be the reference points for the evaluation process and product. These include the assessment criteria of efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, outcomes, and sustainability, and the principles of independence, impartiality, transparency, participation, and evaluation ethics.

Clarity of terminology

50. (*Good Practice*) Terminology is used and interpreted differently when a wide range of stakeholders is involved. Differences can affect the way questions are addressed in the methodology, responses from informants, and interpretation of results. A clear glossary of basic terminology that provides definitions used, and how differences are taken into account, is essential to understanding findings and conclusions.

Oversight Committee

51. (*Good practice/Lesson*) An independent oversight mechanism with credible representation provides the necessary independence and impartiality for an evaluation that assesses a range of components (e.g. Programme Coordinating Board, Secretariat, Cosponsors, CCO). The composition of the OC represented the geographic regions and disciplines associated with UNAIDS. This was invaluable in ensuring that the various

perspectives were considered in the work of the OC. Its independence is essential, including serving in individual capacity, strict impartiality and disassociation from representative groups within the UNAIDS family.

52. (*Observation*) The broad composition of the Committee meant that at 10 members, its size was a significant factor in the cost and management of the OC. The trade-off between efficiency and breadth should be considered.
53. (*Lesson*) The level of effort of serving as a member of the OC was greatly underestimated. Two meetings additional to those anticipated were required for an effective oversight role, and it was necessary to meet for three days instead of two. In addition, members were required to comment in detail on numerous documents, to take on key roles in stakeholder workshops, and to participate in electronic decision-making. The extra responsibilities of the Chair were considerable.
54. (*Lesson*) The reality of the time required (over and above attendance at OC meetings) should be clearly indicated in approaching potential members for an oversight committee. For those members who cannot take on this role within their existing professional responsibilities, it may be worth considering some form of honorarium as recognition of the efforts involved in substantive, long term committees. The Chair would like specifically to stress that this is a burden that fell disproportionately on Committee members based in developing countries.

Roles and responsibilities

55. (*Good practice*) Clear definition of mandate and roles and responsibilities of the main players – Oversight Committee, Oversight Committee Secretariat, Cosponsors, Secretariat, Programme Coordinating Board, PCB Bureau, Member States, and other stakeholders – need to be clearly understood, and made public early in the evaluation process.

Stakeholder consultations

56. (*Lesson/Good Practice*) The credibility of the evaluation depends on participation and involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation. This is a process that requires time, planning, and resources. The OC discussed at length the objectives, the context, the nature, and the timing of stakeholder consultations, within the financial constraints, to hold consultations when their views would be most useful in shaping the progress of the Evaluation and providing the ET with views and inputs. .
57. (*Lesson/Good Practice*) The first consultation was on the draft Inception Report. The Committee discussed at length the “right” time for the second consultation on evaluation findings, with the options being either at an earlier stage on preliminary findings or on a draft evaluation report. The OC decided on the former, on the basis that consultations at this formative stage would provide a better opportunity to take into account stakeholder expectations and views in the final report.
58. (*Lesson*) For many stakeholders more accustomed to consultations on a draft report, the consultation document used for the second consultation was not fully understood as it was lacking elements such as detailed methodology and recommendations, normally found in a draft report. The OC believes that the consultation on preliminary evaluation findings was the right timing, as it generated good inputs and new evidence, as well as interest in and ownership of the process. However, it is necessary to ensure stakeholders are well-informed on the nature of the consultations and the type of document used, to avoid any misunderstandings.

Transparency

59. *(Good Practice)* The OC took the view that as much information as possible should be in the public domain as soon as possible. The SIE website and the efforts of the OC Secretariat have been important conditions for making this possible.

Independent Oversight Secretariat

60. *(Good practice)* A separate secretariat unit, dedicated to the OC, and staffed with experienced and knowledgeable staff provided a stable base for managing the Evaluation in support of the OC.

FINAL THOUGHTS

61. The Oversight Committee set out to fulfil a mandate to oversee a credible and independent Evaluation process resulting in a high quality, forward-looking Report relevant to the future of UNAIDS. How the Committee has approached this formidable challenge has been outlined in this report. The Committee believes the process was credible, in accordance with international evaluation standards and its own definition of critical factors for success. With extensive cooperation and participation of stakeholders, the process has delivered a high-quality Report that is practical and relevant to the future challenges facing UNAIDS in the changing environment.
62. We are confident that the discussion and appropriate follow-up by the Programme Coordinating Board will mean that this Evaluation is important in developing strategies and the decisive steps necessary to secure a strong future for the continued global response to AIDS. We look forward to following future developments and contributing to them and to seeing UNAIDS meet the challenges ahead. The Oversight Committee feels privileged and proud to have played a role in the evaluation process.

ANNEX 1

Timeline

December 2007	PCB Approval of Terms of Reference for Second Independent Evaluation (SIE)
April 2008	PCB Approval of selection of Oversight Committee (OC).
27-28 May 2008	First OC meeting.
06 June 2008	Dissemination of Request for Proposals for Evaluation contract.
15-16 July 2008	Second OC meeting to select winning bid for Recommendation to the PCB.
29 July 2008	Confirmation by PCB of winning bid.
05 September 2008	Receipt and distribution from Evaluation Team of draft Inception Report
08-26 September 2008	Consultation on Draft Inception Report.
15-17 September 2008	Third OC meeting and Stakeholder Workshop on draft Inception Report.
21 October 2008	Approval of Inception Report.
8-23 October 2008	First country study (Ethiopia) to test country visit methodology
15-17 December 2008	OC Progress Report to the PCB.
2-4 February 2009	Fourth OC meeting to consider First ET Progress Report on evaluation findings.
15 May 2009	ET Report on Preliminary Evaluation Findings to OC and distribution of Report to stakeholders.
25 May – 12 June 2009	Consultations on Preliminary Evaluation Findings
3 – 5 June 2009	Fifth OC meeting. OC/ET meeting and Stakeholder Workshop on Preliminary Evaluation Findings
22-24 June 2009	OC Chair Report to the PCB on Progress and Stakeholder Workshop.
07 August 2009	Draft Evaluation Report received by the OC.
2-4 September 2009	Sixth OC meeting to discuss draft Evaluation Report with ET.

30 September 2009	Final Evaluation Report to PCB Chair, UNAIDS Executive Director and OC.
13 October 2009	OC Report to PCB Chair on the oversight role in the Evaluation.
08-10 December 2009	PCB discussions on Final Report, OC Report, and UNAIDS response.

ANNEX 2

**FINANCIAL REPORT
As of 12 October 2009**

	Item	PCB Indicative Budget	Obligated	Unobligated/shortfall	Estimated PCB attendance	Total shortfall
1 Oversight Committee						
1.1	Meeting costs	100,000	32,045	67,955		
	Travel	120,000	211,656	(91,656)	7,184	
	Per Diem	48,000	89,228	(41,228)	2,972	
	Sub-Total	268,000	332,929	(64,929)	10,156	
1.2	Support costs/Consultants	80,000	44,788	35,212		
1.3	Contingency	40,000		40,000		
1.4	Publication, translation and dissemination costs	100,000	123,456	(23,456)		
	Sub-total	220,000	168,244	51,756		
TOTAL OC		488,000	501,173	(13,173)	10,156	(23,329)
2 Evaluation						
	Item	PCB Indicative budget	Obligated	Current cost of ITAD contract	Current UNOPS cost*	Remaining Balance (B - C = E)
		A	B	C	D	E
2.1	Evaluation Team	650,000	650,000			
2.2	Country Visits	1,425,600	1,425,600			
Total Evaluation		2,075,600	2,075,600	1,786,785	134,022	288,815
Total PCB Approved Indicative Budget (OC + Evaluation)		2,563,600	2,576,773			
SUMMARY: US\$						
A	PCB Approved Indicative Estimates					
	Oversight Committee		488,000			
	Evaluation		2,075,600			
	Total (A)				2,563,600	
	Less Expenditures:					
B	ITAD contract		1,656,539			
	Amendment 1		130,426			
	Total (B)		1,786,965			
C	Oversight Committee					
	Current Expenditures		501,173			
	Planned Expenditures		10,156			
	Total (C)		511,329			
	Shortfall under OC		-23,329			
D	Total Expenditures (B + C = D)			2,298,294		
E	Estimated available balance (A - D = E)					265,306
F	UNOPS contract*		134,022			
G	Final estimated balance (E - F = G)					131,284
*Current UNOPS cost (represents 7.5% of ITAD's contract).						

ANNEX 3

Evaluation Documentation

Evaluation Team Outputs

N.B. * on SIE Webpage

Document	Type	Date	Public Access	Comments
Tender Submission	Bid for ET contract	August 2008	Yes*	Winning bid Proposal from ITAD
Inception Report	Consultation Document on evaluation work plan	Oct 2008	Yes*	Posted with invitation from OC Chair to submit written comments; used as basic document for stakeholder workshop
Quarterly Reports	Progress against work plan	Oct 2008- July 2009	No	Four reports (Oct 2008, Jan, April, and July 2009). Factual events summarized in Chair Update letters. To be archived with Secretariat
First Progress Report	Report to Oversight Committee	Jan 2009	No	OC Internal document. To be archived with Secretariat
Preliminary Findings (Second Progress Report)	Consultation Document on Preliminary Evaluation Findings	May 2009	Yes*	Posted with invitation from OC Chair to submit written comments; document for stakeholder workshop
Country Summary Reports	Summaries of country visits (12)	Oct 2008- April 2009	Yes*	Summaries of findings and visits for country visits
Evaluation Framework Tables	ET research notes from country visits	Oct 2008- April 2009	No	Confidential information where sources could be traced and identified. Representative sample provided in Annex 2 of Final Report
Asia/Pacific Regional Study	Summary of special consultations on the Pacific region	Feb 2009	Yes*	Similar to, but not as extensive as a country study
Table of Contents for the Draft Evaluation Report	ET first draft on structure of Final Report	August 2009	Yes*	Made available for information to stakeholders to indicate progress on Final Report
Draft Evaluation Report	Draft of Final Report	August 2009	No	Reviewed by the OC – based on consultation document on preliminary findings with incorporation of stakeholder and OC views and comments.
Web-based	Questions and	September	Yes*	Related to Final Report but

Document	Type	Date	Public Access	Comments
surveys	responses to PCB and General surveys	2009		published separately in advance
SIE Final Report	Final Report for the PCB	Sept 30, 2009	Yes*	Sent directly to the PCB Chair with copies to OC and EXD – PCB document for discussion in Dec. 2009
Annexes to Final Report	Additional information and additional supporting data and analysis for the Final Report	Sept 30, 2009	Yes*	10 Annexes: Terms of Reference, Methodology, List of people consulted, List of documents reviewed, Response to Recommendations from the Five-year Evaluation, UN Reform, Health systems strengthening, Governance of UNAIDS, Division of Labour, Administration of the joint programme
Country Reports	Separate volume	October 2009	Yes*	Consolidated volume of 12 country reports and Pacific regional consultation
Short Summary of SIE	Public interest	Oct 2009	Yes*	Sent to EXD for action. Available as conference room paper at the PCB.

Oversight Committee Documents

Document	Type	Date	Public Access	Comment
Request for Proposal	Tender	July 2009	Yes*	On SIE and Cosponsor websites
Biographies of OC members	Information	July 2008	Yes*	Overview of OC and Members
PCB Chair letter of selection of the ET	Letter from OC outlining process of selection and recommended winning bid for endorsement by the PCB	July 2008	Yes*	Details of selection process and OC steps to ensure impartiality and independence of process.
Chair Update Letters	Information on Evaluation events	June, July, October (2008); March, June (2009).	Yes*	Posted on SIE webpage with message to stakeholders through UNAIDS mailing lists
Letters to PCB Chair	Inform on meetings of the OC	After each OC	No	Private letter for PCB Chair – similar

Document	Type	Date	Public Access	Comment
		meeting		information in Chair Update letters
Evaluation Progress	Milestones for evaluation	Oct 2008, updated March 2009	Yes*	For use at International AIDS Conference in Mexico – posted on website in four languages
Roles, responsibilities and relationships	Defines terms of reference for key players	October 2008	Yes*	OC, OC Chair/Vice-Chair, Cosponsor Liaison Official, Secretariat contact person, OC Secretariat
OC Chair Reports to the PCB	Summary of events and issues	December 2008, June 2009	Yes*	PCB document
Stakeholder Workshops Proceedings and Working Group Reports	Summary of general and detailed discussions	September 2008, June 2009	Yes*	Results of consultations on the draft Inception Report, and on the Preliminary Evaluation Findings
FAQ's	Frequently asked questions on stakeholder consultations and workshops, evaluation reports, and OC monitoring procedures	May 2009	Yes*	Information presented in response to queries
Written Summaries	Comments from stakeholders on consultation documents	Sept 2008, June 2009	Yes*	Written comments received made available at stakeholder workshops. Those received on Preliminary Evaluation Findings document posted on SIE website
Minutes, Agendas, background documents of OC Meetings	Record of discussions	After each OC meeting	No	Internal documents for the OC to be archived with the Secretariat
Internal correspondence	Various subjects	Periodic	No	Internal documents for the OC to be archived with the Secretariat
OC Report to the PCB	Report on oversight role and assessment of the Final Report	October 2009	Yes*	For PCB discussion in December 2009

General Background Documents

Document	Type	Date	Public Access	Comment
PCB discussions and Decisions on the Evaluation	Purpose of SIE and terms of reference	December 2007, April 2008	Yes*	PCB documents
Unified Budget and workplan (UBW)	UNAIDS budget and workplan	2008-2009	Yes*	PCB document
Report of the First Five-Year Evaluation	Reference for follow-up in SIE	October 2002	Yes*	PCB document
Future Directions for UNAIDS	UNAIDS response to the First Five-Year Evaluation	December 2002	Yes*	PCB document