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Introduction
UNAIDS requested an evaluation of the Regional Data Hubs in order to understand and explore:

- History of the creation and implementation of the Regional Data Hubs.
- The existing programmatic and technical design and implementation of the Data Hubs.
- The implicit theory of change, i.e., how the Data Hubs are intended to support and link to UNAIDS larger Mission and Global Strategy.
- Recommendations for the future of the Data Hubs, especially considering recent strategic changes at UNAIDS.
## Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD DAC criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Relevance and coherence**             | *Who are the intended users of the Data Hubs in different regions and are their information needs fulfilled by the Data Hubs?*  
*What is the extent of the use of the Data Hubs outside UNAIDS?*  
*What are the available data sources for the Data Hubs and what does the ecosystem look like (e.g., co-sponsors Data Hubs)?* |
| **The right things & right players**     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| (design issues)                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| **Effectiveness**                        | *To which extent have the Data Hubs achieved their intended objectives?*  
*What are the key conditions that have made the Data Hub in the Asia Pacific achieve its results – and how they apply to other regions?*                          |
| **The right results**                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| (implementation issues)                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| **Efficiency**                           | *How do the resources and capacity expected post-UNAIDS alignment match the requirements of the Data Hubs?*  
*How should the Data Hub model be adapted in different regions to account for organizational priorities and resources?*                                   |
| **The right way**                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
# Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD DAC criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>• What form and role should the Data Hubs take to make them serve UNAIDS best and secure sustainable organizational investments?  &lt;br&gt;  • How can linkages with other existing data platforms be improved (e.g., Health Situation Rooms, COVID-19 portal and AIDSinfo)?  &lt;br&gt;  Note: sustainability defined as regional autonomy, also considering governance of the initiative (resources, structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td>• Are gender and human rights consistently considered in data collection and the analysis, presentation, and dissemination of information products?  &lt;br&gt;  • How do Data Hubs contribute to or draw on efforts to strengthen monitoring of inequalities and community-led monitoring?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Data and users** | }
Data Sources

- The Data Hubs websites, including review of documents posted
- Key Informant Interviews
- Document review of internal UNAIDS documents related to the Data Hubs
- Google Analytics of the Data Hubs
- Google search and comparative analysis
## Key Findings

### History and Technical Design
History

- AP Data Hub created by UNICEF, Asia Development Bank, WHO, and UNAIDS & local universities, circa 2004
- AIDSInfo created as a way to share & build demand for high quality consistent HIV data globally
- 2014, AP Data Hub used as a model to create Regional Data Hubs, launched circa 2018.
Technical Design

- Mix of different platforms and databases support the Data Hubs
- Outside investment in Asia Pacific of their content management system
- Relies on AIDSinfo data
Implicit Theory of Change

Regional Data Hubs
Implicit Theory of Change

UNAIDS goal: Precision Public Health: improve equity and outcomes for those impacted by HIV by using granular data to identify and address the characteristics that lead to inequalities in HIV programming.

Programme goal: Improve the local use of data for decision-making by customizing information to specific regions, themes, and audiences

Outcomes:
- O1: Increase the number of custom and targeted SI data products in alignment with key decisions, regional priorities, themes, and audience needs
- O2: Improve access for locally generated data, information products, and policy documents that impact HIV programming
- O3: Demonstrate and promote the use of data and information products for specific decisions.
- O4: Overcome language, literacy, and other barriers to needed information by different HIV stakeholders
- O5: Provide technical support to co-sponsors, country teams and regional community networks to create, analyze, and use data in their work.

Outputs:
- 1. Regionally specific SI products created by UNAIDS regional & country offices
- 2. Curated repository of internally & externally sourced content relevant to the region
- 3. Self-service interactive data analytics tools, accessible via a web platform, customized to regional priorities, themes, and audiences
- 4. Technical support to partners, co-sponsors and community networks to create, analyze, & use data for their own decision making

Activities:
- Identify activities of technical support for the improved use of data.
- Provide research and analytical support to partners
- Select & configure software to generate desired functionality (data analytics and visualizations, content management systems, review/approval processes, etc)
- Review/approve for publication & publish (with meta data)
- Promote, monitor, track, and improve
- Determine regional priorities, themes, and audiences, including publishing standards and review process
- Determine information self-service needs by different audiences and users
- Identify needed strategic information products
- Identify existing UNAIDS SI products
- Identify external SI products & data
- Identify / create translations & adaptations

Inputs:
- Data Components
- Application Components
- Technology Components
- Asset / Infrastructure Components
- Human Resources
- Financial Resources
Findings by Key Evaluation Questions

OECD DAC criteria
Relevance and coherence
The right things & right players (design issues)
Effectiveness
The right results (implementation issues)
Efficiency
The right way
Sustainability
Equity
Data and users
Relevance and coherence: The right things & right players (design issues)

Finding 1:
Intended users and their needs are generally well understood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User group</th>
<th>Advocacy for policy/programming approaches</th>
<th>Performance analysis and impact</th>
<th>Design and implementation approaches</th>
<th>Up to date data and status info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS RST</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS Country office</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN regional/country offices</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National governments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs/CBOs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other donors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevance and coherence: The right things & right players
(design issues)

Finding 2: Outside of AP, there is minimal usage of the Regional Hubs by UNAIDS or those outside of UNAIDS. Therefore, user information needs are not being met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Users</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDSinfo</td>
<td>1,239,131</td>
<td>Only for the data dashboards - not including UNAIDS.org or other subsites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>24,110 (data dashboard only) 597,233 (analytics)</td>
<td>Because AP has two sites, there are two sets of statistics - one just for the data dashboard and one for the main Data Hub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EECA</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>0 users up to late 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>0 users up to mid-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>0 users up to late 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>not online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCA</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0 users up to early 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>What measuring?</th>
<th>AIDSInfo</th>
<th>AP (data dashboard)</th>
<th>EECA</th>
<th>ESA</th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>WCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total users</td>
<td>number of users to the site</td>
<td>118,233</td>
<td>5761</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>how many sessions on the site</td>
<td>160,059</td>
<td>7,524</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevance and coherence: The right things & right players (design issues)

Finding 3:
There is automated data as well as labor intensive manual uploads of data and documents. Content creation and sourcing is also labor intensive and a major barrier.

Finding 4:
There is a clear need and interest in addressing the HIV pandemic through knowledge management, where UNAIDS has a clear potential role.
Effectiveness: The right results (implementation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Outcome</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1: Create and publish custom and targeted SI data products in alignment with regional priorities, themes, and audience needs.</td>
<td>Other than AP, none of the regional Data Hubs routinely created and/or published SI data products to the Data Hub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2: Concretely demonstrate and promote the use of data and information products for specific decisions.</td>
<td>Other than AP, the Data Hubs are not routinely used by UNAIDS staff or other partners to inform decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3: Improve access for locally generated data, information products, policy documents that impact HIV programming.</td>
<td>Other than AP, the Data Hubs do not contain nor support the usage of this type of content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4: Overcome language, literacy, and other barriers to needed information by different HIV stakeholders.</td>
<td>One success point of the Data Hubs has been hosting of non-English documents (such as Russian, Spanish, or French) on the sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 5: Provide technical support to co-sponsors, country teams and regional community networks to create, analyze, and use data in their work (AP only)</td>
<td>AP was able to provide evidence, including hosting government data, of providing technical support to local stakeholders and improve the use of data for decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finding 5:**
Other than AP, the Data Hubs have not achieved their objectives.

**Finding 6:**
AP success came from determine needs first, then proposing solutions.

**Finding 7:**
Imposing a technology solution without understanding users’ needs and a lack of resourcing to implement will fail.
Efficiency: The right way

Finding 8:
Implementation outside the Asia Pacific region was focused on technology and not on the non-technical aspects (leadership, staffing, etc.).

- Insufficient staffing & leadership.
- Undervaluing the role of the Data Hub staff in AP success (esp. capacity building).

Finding 9:
Evidence of the success and challenges from the regional Data Hubs provides good insight for the Data for Impact initiatives envisioned by UNAIDS.

- Used the AP Hub to build cultures of evidence.
- Made it easier to share existing knowledge products and create new ones.
- Provides targeted, granular information.
- Provide a one stop shop for stakeholders.
- **UNAIDS understands the knowledge needs of the user ecosystem.**
## Sustainability

### Finding 10:
Regional Data Hubs, other than AP, are not sustainable, based on the metrics of ownership, leadership, investment, delivery and performance monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability metric</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>EECA</th>
<th>ESA</th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>MENA</th>
<th>WCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership: the Hub is seen as a regional product that is core to the mandate of the RST</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: the Hub is prioritized by RST leadership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment: the Hub has generated investment and resource mobilization from UNAIDS staff and/or co-sponsors</td>
<td>Yes – co-sponsorship plus investment in technology</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Somewhat – an attempt to invest in external technology</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery: the Hub routinely meets content and data management requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance monitoring: the Hub routinely reviews its performance to improve its delivery of services</td>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equity: Data and users

Finding 11:
The design of the Data Hubs supports gender and human rights; however, the content uploaded is at the discretion of the regional Hub team.

Finding 12:
The design of the Data Hubs supports monitoring of inequalities and community-led monitoring; but minimal or none is occurring.
Conclusions

Conclusion 1:
Other than AP, the Regional Data Hubs have not met their objectives, and are not serving intended users.

Conclusion 2:
The key factor in the lack of success in the non-AP Data Hubs has been the lack of connection of the Data Hubs to the mission of the RST.

Conclusion 3:
The AP regional Hub was defined by Global Centre as primarily a technology solution, ignoring the non-technology elements crucial in its success.

Conclusion 4:
The regional Hub programme has identified good lessons for UNAIDS future Strategic Information programming through both the successes of the AP Hub and the challenges in the other regional Hubs.
Recommendations

- **Rec 1.** Decommission the Regional Data Hub websites.
- **Rec 2.** Improve Data Usage Skills within Data for Impact and UNAIDS as a whole.
- **Rec 3.** Build in Theories of Change and Metrics into Data for Impact Hubs.
- **Rec 4.** Make strategic investments in UNAIDS information management systems.
Rec 2. Improve Data Usage Skills within Data for Impact and UNAIDS as a whole.

Rec 2.1 Build internal capacity within Data for Impact team on behaviour change analysis mixed with human-centred design skills.

Rec 2.2 Build frameworks within UNAIDS on Human-Centred Design.

Rec 2.3 Build capacity within UNAID countries and regions on Human-Centred Design.
Rec 3: Build in Theories of Change and Metrics into Data for Impact Hubs.

Rec 3.1 Data for Impact activities must include a resourced local capacity building and collaboration component for all aspects of data management (from collection to application/usage).

Rec 3.2 Data for Impact products must be able to be more granularly focused with customized theories of change.

Rec 3.3 Establish standard performance metrics for engagement with information products.
Rec 4. Make strategic investments in UNAIDS information management systems.

Rec 4.1 Review existing UNAIDS information management systems for targeted improvements for reuse.

Rec 4.2 Invest in a data mesh technology.

Rec 4.3 Invest in a central data cataloguing system.

Rec 4.4 Invest in technology that allows different presentations to different audiences.
Discussion