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Evaluations completed in 2020

i. Evaluations of the Joint Programme
   • Independent Evaluation of UN System Response to AIDS
   • Viet Nam and Mozambique Country Evaluations

ii. Evaluations of UNAIDS Secretariat
    • Collaboration with US CDC
    • Technical Support Mechanism
    • Health Situation Rooms
    • Fast-Track Cities Initiative
Key take-aways from evaluations

1. Provided the basis for **reflection** on ways to enhance relevance, coherence and achievement of results

2. Delivered useful **analyses** for the institutional review of UNAIDS Secretariat, e.g., on strategic information

3. Helped energise key **partnerships** and enhanced **collaboration** and understanding of the work of UNAIDS
Impact of COVID-19 on evaluation

- Approaches and methods were adapted, and evaluations were conducted remotely and using national consultants.

- Activities to strengthen evaluation capacity and opportunities for the Expert Advisory Committee to take forward its agenda were most affected.

- Several evaluations of country, intercountry and regional work could not be initiated and were postponed until next year.
Looking ahead

1. Until 2019 an effective and independent evaluation function missing in efforts to strengthen **accountability, transparency and organizational learning**

2. Considerable progress made in establishing an **independent evaluation office** as a structurally and functionally separate unit reporting to the PCB

3. To maintain the momentum, the UNAIDS evaluation function needs to remain **adequately staffed and resourced**
Priorities for 2021

i. Joint Programme evaluations
   • Violence against women and girls
   • Efficiency and sustainability
   • Key populations

ii. UNAIDS Secretariat evaluations
   • Collaboration with the Global Fund
   • Gender action plan

iii. Development of the next biennial evaluation plan
   • Joint Programme evaluations
   • Secretariat evaluations
Role of evaluation

➢ Contribute to learning and evidence-based decisions

➢ Enhance transparency and accountability

➢ Enable improved governance and oversight by the Board

Role of the PCB

➢ Approve the biennial evaluation plan and ensure a robust evaluation function

➢ Consider annual reports and adopt decisions to convey expectations and guidance

➢ Draw on evaluations for the purpose of governing the Joint Programme
A coordinated UN response to HIV remains relevant and the work at country level shows the advantages of a joint and co-sponsored programme.

Decreases in resource availability have resulted in growing tensions within the Joint Programme.

New and more effective ways of working together and demonstrating results need to be established.
A comprehensive assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents reviewed</th>
<th>Key informant interviews</th>
<th>Web based survey</th>
<th>Country case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600+</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 190 background documents</td>
<td>- 26 Cosponsors</td>
<td>- 1,102 responses</td>
<td>- Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Over 330 supporting documents for country visits</td>
<td>- 9 UNAIDS Secretariat</td>
<td>- 358 UN organisation</td>
<td>- Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 22 External partners</td>
<td>- 87 UNAIDS Secretariat</td>
<td>- South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 412 Country key informants</td>
<td>- 197 government</td>
<td>- Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 180 local NGO or CBO</td>
<td>- Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 89 international NGO</td>
<td>- Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 91 development partner or donor</td>
<td>- Papua New Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 100 other</td>
<td>- Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Madagascar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Morocco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conclusions (1/2)

The work of the Joint Programme is rights- and needs-based, inclusive and participatory.

The Joint Programme has been most successful in engaging with civil society and other sectors.

In general, collaboration works well at country level, but is under stress at the global level.

Mobilisation and allocation of resources is recognised to be weak across the Joint Programme.
Conclusions (2/2)

A theory of change with indicators attributable to the UN system is needed to better measure and document contributions.

Despite shortcomings, results are being achieved with support from the Joint Programme, although with wide variation among countries.

The Cosponsors and Secretariat clearly contribute to country level outcomes, although their relative performance is difficult to establish.

The sustainability of results will depend on continued and increased
  a) core funding of UNAIDS
  b) Cosponsor engagement
  c) alignment with national priorities
Recommendations

1. Prioritise programming in a more **strategic and pragmatic** way

2. Revise the **theory of change** and associated M&E system

3. Address head-on the **future architecture** of the Joint Programme

4. Invest more in **working better together** across the Joint Programme

5. Develop and implement a Joint Programme **resource mobilization** strategy

6. Sharpen – and possibly overhaul – the **resource allocation** processes

7. Develop a concise and clear joint UN ‘**HIV and gender**’ plan

8. Act now to maintain HIV **technical expertise** in the Joint Programme
Implications and reflections

i. The **model of the Joint Programme** which is already under strain could be jeopardized by **the impact of COVID-19**, compounding existing challenges.

ii. The **mobilisation and allocation of resources** and the extent to which Cosponsors can leverage their own **organisational resources** will be key.

iii. The **responsibilities, resourcing** and **architecture** of the Joint Programme will need to be re-examined at the level of the **Executive Heads** of the CCO.