

UBRAF Working Group

Note for the record - Seventh Meeting - 3 May 2022

Follow-up points:

- Working Group members to send their feedback on the draft 2022 – 2026 UBRAF indicators by Friday 6 May.
- Secretariat to share the draft Note for Record of the 7th meeting.

1. Welcome and reflections from the Chair

- The Chair welcomed the members of the Unified Budget Results and Accountability Framework (UBRAF) Working Group to the seventh call and appreciated their engagement throughout the past year, leading to the submission of the 2022 – 2026 UBRAF. A few members were excused. The agenda of the meeting was adopted.

2. Draft 2022 – 2026 UBRAF Indicators presentation and discussion

- The Secretariat was invited to present the draft UBRAF 2022 – 2026 indicator matrix. Recalling the relevant decisions from the PCB Special Session in December 2021 ([Agenda Item 4](#)), the Secretariat provided an update on process and summarized the overall approach for the indicators and examples as follows:
 - **Result framework and result chain:** as per the approved results framework and results chain, the indicators will measure the Joint Programme's performance against its 3 outcomes, specific outputs within the 10 results area at output level and the Secretariat's performance against its 5 strategic functions.
 - **Building on past feedback with clear logical approach:** earlier feedback from the PCB and UBRAF Working Group on the draft indicators noted some missing linkages, not fully clear and consistent formulations and level of ambitions of the indicators. To improve them, a clear standardized methodology was used to for ensuring meaningful and SMART indicators across all components. The draft UBRAF indicators were also reviewed against the Global AIDS Monitoring/National Commitments and Policy Instruments indicators ([Global AIDS Monitoring 2021 | UNAIDS](#)) and a 'reality-check' on availability of data and other verification is still ongoing. The process included an in-depth review and consultations by Cosponsors and Secretariat leads.
 - **Snapshot of the indicator matrix:** A summary overview of the draft indicator matrix was shared including, at this stage, selected 19 outcome indicators from the Global AIDS Monitoring (GAM), 27 indicators for the 10 result areas and 18 indicators for the 5 secretariat functions. Noting their complementarity and interconnectedness, together, they form a 'whole' perspective of the added value of and to monitor the performance of the Joint Programme but only measure specific areas of the Joint Programme's work and are not meant to and able to cover its entire scope of work.
 - **Indicator matrix and indicator guidelines:** The indicator matrix including indicators, baselines, milestones by 2023 and 2025, target by 2026, data sources as per usual M&E standards will be submitted to the PCB to take note of. An (internal) complementary guidelines was developed to describe the methodology and additional details to ensure a consistent approach and reporting. It was also

highlighted how the UBRAF indicators evolved over the past frameworks since 2012 and related refinements informed by lessons learned, PCB and external evaluation feedback. The new indicators follow a mixed approach, focusing on measuring Joint Programme's work but with better consistency and linkages to broader impact to capture its catalytic role.

- **Approaches and principles for UBRAF indicator formulation:** It was explained that indicators are formulated in different ways: a) Joint Programme's focused formulation focusing on measuring its work and performance more directly and through self-reporting; b) Impact-focused formulation focusing on measuring broader changes in the response that it will contribute to using then GAM/NCPI reported data; or c) a combination of both. Clear principles and a logical and time flow approach are also followed for consistency over time and between indicator, baseline, milestones, and targets, to ensure the use of existing sources of information, and minimizing the reporting burden. Examples of this logical flow were shared.
- **UBRAF outcome indicators:** Indicators for the UBRAF outcomes are selected from the GAM with baseline being the latest available data (noting that 2021 GAM data will likely not be available by June 2022 hence 2020 data may be used). This will also be the case for upcoming reporting rounds, where data from the previous year may only be available after the June PCB.
- **Key considerations and challenges:** Summarizing key issues regarding the indicators, it was noted that clear accountability was aimed for, while considering the complex structure of the Joint Programme and the balanced between its wide scope of work but need for specific indicators. Furthermore, this exercise is highly technical, with new programmatic changes UNAIDS aims to shape but with limited past reference data and/or evolving guidance to translate new scientific development into timely action and accelerate progress. This and past UBRAF experience underline the need to allow for flexibility of such a framework. Hence, as earlier explained to the PCB, the 2025 milestones and 2026 targets will be updated as needed as part of the 2024-2025 Workplan and Budget. Other main challenges include the uncertain environment regarding the continued impact of COVID and available resources for UNAIDS, and the diversity of expectations regarding granularity of indicators.
- **Feedback from the Working Group on 2022-2026 UBRAF indicators:** The Chair invited the Working Group to provide their comments while more specific and detailed comments would be shared by email with the Secretariat.
 - **Strongly appreciated the quality of work.** Members thanked the Joint Programme for the submission of a strong and informative indicator framework that had a clear logical flow and rationale, clear linkages between outcomes and outputs, good level of detail and helped concretize 'what will be measured and how'. It was also acknowledged that the draft indicators have significantly improved and showed evidence that an in-depth review and consultation process took place by Cosponsors and the Secretariat.
 - **Good focus on robustness and reliability of indicators:** The mix approach was appreciated, and it was recommended to use 'hard' data (such as PrEP initiation, uptake or coverage), which is easier and clearer to measure and thus avoid using composite indicators which are harder to define and interpret. The difficulty to measure for example HIV incidence was stressed as it can be done through different ways.

- **Usefulness of indicators beyond UNAIDS:** It was noted that this information might be helpful for other evidence-informed work beyond the Joint Programme and it was recommended to include a short paragraph that would highlight this.
- **Baseline data point and actual contribution of the Joint Programme to countries:** Members suggested consideration of adding a year of data point where not already done so. Taking the example of Result Area 8, it was suggested to include more concrete measuring of the Joint Programme's work to support countries with reporting on financial data and it was clarified that indicator focusing on Joint Programme's support for GAM reporting were included. However, it was stressed that GAM reporting is a commitment of and falls under the responsibility of member states. The submission and level of completeness of the country reports, which has been decreasing in recent year, especially since the COVID-19 pandemic, and will affect further reporting, is beyond the control of the Joint Programme.
- **Using short clarifications where needed:** Finally, members noted challenges with some indicators that are non-binary, such as for some of the Secretariat's functions. While striking a balance between meaningful and yet measurable indicator and data availability, it was recommended to tweak or more clearly define some terms.
- **Impact beyond UBRAF indicators:** Cosponsors stressed how their capacities on HIV are decreasing as shown by a recently conducted capacity assessment and the importance of HIV strategic positioning globally. The impact of a not fully funded UBRAF has been high in recent years and unless resources are available as per the approved US\$210m/year, expected UBRAF results are at high risk of not being achieved. On another note, it was also shared that the smarter approach of using existing reporting mechanisms and data, the elaboration of UBRAF indicators had positive impact on Cosponsor work on indicators/descriptors, helping to improve/update those.

3. Next steps – Recap and Outlook

- Feedback from the UBRAF Working Group will be integrated as much as possible and further verification and review including from an ongoing survey with country office will help finalize the draft. It was acknowledged that there may be a challenge of receiving certain data sets, especially at the GAM 2021 data will not be fully available/validated by the time of submission to the PCB. Part of the UBRAF indicator guidelines may still be finalized after PCB
- The Chair thanked the Group for their constructive feedback and reminded of the deadline for written comments of Friday 6 May.
- Key dates are:
 - Submission of final UBRFA indicator matrix to the PCB by 23 May.
 - Pre-PCB meetings (13-17 June, UBRAF indicators on 16 June 2022, 1-4pm Geneva time)
 - PCB itself (21-24 June, UBRAF indicators on 22 June, 3:45-4:30pm Geneva time)
- The Group also agreed that no other meeting will be needed.
- A short statement by the Chair of the Working Group will be presented to the PCB and the UBRAF Working Group report will be updated.

4. Closing remarks

- The Secretariat mentioned that an updated report of the Working Group will be shared for their review and finalization. The Chair extended his sincere thanks to the group again for all the valuable feedback over the course of the UBRAF development and closed the meeting.