

## Context

**Mandate:** UNAIDS is comprised of 10 UN organisations (UNICEF, UNFPA, WHO, ILO, UNDP, WB, WFP, UNHCR, UNODC & UNESCO). Its Secretariat seeks to support and make more coherent HIV/AIDS activities of its UN co-sponsoring agencies. UNAIDS supports responses around 5 key goals: **1.** leadership coordination and advocacy; **2.** strategic information; **3.** monitoring and evaluation; **4.** civil society engagement and partnerships; **5.** resource mobilisation.

**Size:** The Secretariat employs 400 staff, a third based overseas. It has 81 country offices. The core Unified Budget and Workplan (UBW) for 06/07 is \$320.5m (\$120.7m, shared among 10 co-sponsors; \$115.4m for the Secretariat; \$84.4m for interagency activities at country level). The Core budget has a Supplemental budget, which provides an additional \$25m for the Secretariat and \$21.2m for interagency activities. The PCB increased the Supplemental interagency budget by \$40m bringing the Core, Supplemental Secretariat and interagency for 06/7 to \$406m. When taken with other PCB allocations approved in 06/7 of \$21m for priority strategic initiatives, investments, and US\$ 12 million carried forward, this amount increased to \$439m.

**Key Issues:** Progress against GTT recommendations for harmonising the UN's response to HIV is slow. UNAIDS ability to create change is dependent on the willingness and capacity of its co-sponsors, leaving them little room to manoeuvre. Current governance mechanisms (PCB/UBW) do not enable UNAIDS to effectively demand accountability from their cosponsors. Reports of UNAIDS country level performance are variable. UNAIDS are instigating more transparent and merit based staff appointment systems to ensure staff postings are based on merit. Its country level impact is difficult to ascertain, as most programme areas such as harmonisation and coordination are not measurable with the current indicators.

**Summary:** **a)** UNAIDS is trying out innovative ways to support national leadership/unified programming/division of labour/harmonisation. It pushes RBM, and through the UBW outlines UNAIDS Secretariat plans for working towards efficiency/strategic planning/improved accountability for results. The country and regional department had success in translating corporate priorities into specific actions that can be taken at country level. However, leverage against cosponsor activity is weak. Staff appointment and management systems are becoming increasingly merit based. **b)** UNAIDS works well with the UN (although constrained by its co-sponsors). The GTT has recommended ways it can work more effectively with partners for a more harmonised approach to the epidemic. Most importantly, it is seen as a credible and critical partner at the highest political levels. **c)** It is achieving its mandate at international level by advocating/leading on response to the HIV/AIDS epidemic, but its effectiveness at country level is less consistent. It is developing mechanisms to monitor its impact at country level.

**\*Disclaimer:** This Effectiveness Summary is a tool designed to simply present the latest available information on UNAIDS's effectiveness. It is one of many prepared by DFID covering a range of multilaterals. The summaries will inform policy but are only one of a range of criteria and sources of evidence considered in recommending future DFID funding allocations. The balanced scorecard format organises what we believe to be the objective sources of information available on four aspects of each organisation's internal effectiveness. It does not measure actual development results on the ground or the merits of the organisation's development objectives. The text within each summary box provides a short analysis of what we believe this information tells us. Any unreferenced text is DFID analysis not in the public domain. It should be noted that the amount of information available and the quality and reliability of information varies considerably across organisations, so there is a limit to which the summaries will be used for comparative purposes.

# Is UNAIDS *BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE?*

**Summary** UNAIDS is seen as a reasonably dynamic and open organisation, not yet set in its ways; often described as UN reform in action. Through its mandate of coordination it is trying out innovative ways to support national leadership, joint programming, division of labour and harmonisation. Valuable lessons learnt from these initiatives must inform the wider UN reform debate. UNAIDS is pushing Results Based Management (RBM) through its organisation and strengthening accountability and review mechanisms through its PCB and UBW. UNAIDS ability to hold their co sponsor to account is still weak. UNAIDS is strong on knowledge management and their dissemination of lessons learnt and policy guidelines have made a significant contribution to national responses. UNAIDS annual Global Epidemic Report is a key knowledge instrument and highly respected and used. Information on UNAIDS staff development is unavailable. UNAIDS strategic leadership can be reported as weak in certain countries, with them being too dependent on UNDP and WHO. This is often attributed to poor staff appointment where talented staff are not always placed in the right positions.

## Commitment to Continual Improvement

### How committed is UNAIDS to UN reform?

✓UNAIDS has called itself a pathfinder for UN reform. (Dr Piot has publicly stated that UNAIDS has a limited shelf life). The Executive Director has stressed “the need for continued reform to ensure harmonised action at the country level overcome bureaucratic bottlenecks, move with more urgency and encourage responsibility and accountability among member states, the UN and other development partners, in support of national ownership and leadership.” He also “encourages development partners to support UN reform at country level by Joint UNAIDS programmes which respect the division of labour.”<sup>2</sup>

### Does the Board require management to act on performance results and the findings of evaluations?

✓ Yes, the PCB has increasingly emphasised, when reviewing and approving the UBW, the need for Results Based Management [CB 12 decision 46, PCB 14 decisions 24&25]. External audits are performed each biennium and submitted to PCB for review. The 5 year evaluation of UNAIDS was taken very seriously and resulted in the identification of a number of key action areas. These have been incorporated into work plans and are reported on at the PCB.<sup>3</sup>

## Building Knowledge and Lesson Learning

### Does UNAIDS have adequate mechanisms for learning and spreading lesson learning?

✓ Yes. UNAIDS has a fairly rigorous programme to collect strategic information and “best practices” identified at country level. Lessons learned are extracted and disseminated widely beyond UNAIDS.<sup>1</sup> UNAIDS Global Epidemic Report produced annually is a key knowledge instrument.<sup>6</sup>

## Results Based Management:

### To what extent does UNAIDS manage by results?

⇔ Even though steps have been taken to improve RBM within UNAIDS, there is still some way to go.<sup>1</sup> The June 2005 PCB requested the streamlining of the UBW to capture country level financing and harmonisation with a strengthened RBM approach. A Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Framework was agreed upon at the June 2006 PCB.<sup>2</sup> Resources are allocated according to level of HIV/AIDS prevalence in a given country, not according to results.<sup>8</sup>

## Staff Development

### What is the average number of days training per staff member?

Information not available.

### What is the level of staff satisfaction?

Information not available

**\*Disclaimer:** This Effectiveness Summary is a tool designed to simply present the latest available information on UNAIDS’s effectiveness. It is one of many prepared by DFID covering a range of multilaterals. The summaries will inform policy but are only one of a range of criteria and sources of evidence considered in recommending future DFID funding allocations. The balanced scorecard format organises what we believe to be the objective sources of information available on four aspects of each organisation’s internal effectiveness. It does not measure actual development results on the ground or the merits of the organisation’s development objectives. The text within each summary box provides a short analysis of what we believe this information tells us. Any unreferenced text is DFID analysis not in the public domain. It should be noted that the amount of information available and the quality and reliability of information varies considerably across organisations, so there is a limit to which the summaries will be used for comparative purposes.

# How well is UNAIDS *MANAGING* its *RESOURCES*?

**Summary** The clear framework provided by the UBW outlines UNAIDS plans for working towards organisational efficiency, strategic planning and improved accountability for results. It is a complex undertaking trying to reflect the Programme and the Secretariat's unique added value. The strategy cascades down effectively and the Country and Regional Department have done a good job in translating corporate priorities into specific actions that can be taken at country level. UNAIDS has a very transparent approach to strategic planning and accountability, which is a key strength. Staff appointment and management systems are becoming increasingly merit based and transparent although quality of staff in countries still varies. The recognised authority of UCC by the co-sponsors to coordinate and lead their activities on HIV/AIDS in country can be problematic.

## Corporate Governance and Strategy

Is UNAIDS's corporate strategy based on a clear definition of mandate and comparative advantage?

✓ Yes. UNAIDS mandate and corporate strategy is clearly defined in their Future Directions Paper and the UBW with clear financial allocations against each strategic priority. UNAIDS Secretariat has a niche role, which attempts not to duplicate work that should be done by the co-sponsors. There is potential for duplication, but, as yet, there is no evidence that this has happened. This may be because the UBW does not cover country level co-sponsor activities, with all UNAIDS funding for co-sponsors being for global level or regional level activities.<sup>1</sup>

## Resource Management

Is UNAIDS committed to robust efficiency targets?

⇔ UNAIDS do not have efficiency targets - a system for capturing the effectiveness and efficiency of the coordination processes that UNAIDS are involved in needs to be developed.<sup>1</sup> As UNAIDS Secretariat is largely involved in co-ordination and harmonisation it is difficult to measure their level of effectiveness and efficiency. The UBW currently has activity focused indicators. UNAIDS has developed the Country Harmonisation and Alignment Tool (CHAT) to assist national AIDS authorities to assess the participation and degree of engagement of partners in the national response and the degree of harmonisation and alignment among international partners.<sup>10</sup>

What proportion of the budget is spent against the period to which it was allocated?

✓ UNAIDS Total income (including core/extra-budgetary) approximately US\$373m of which total spend against total income for the 2004-05 period was approximately US\$312m. Looking at total income and total spend - approximately **84%** of 2004/05 income received was spent against the 2004-05 biennium period.<sup>5</sup>

✓ Breaking it down to look specifically at the Core budget: The 2004/05 Core budget was US\$270m. UNAIDS received US\$309m in total donor Government contributions to the core budget plus US\$13.9m from other sources including interest accrued. Total spend against the core budget for the biennium 2004/05 was US\$265m leaving a positive fund balance of US\$58m unspent against core income received. Looking at total income against the core budget and total core spend - **82%** of core income received was spent against the 2004/05 biennium.<sup>5</sup>

✓ However if we look at it in terms of the planned core budget in the 2004/05 UBW of US\$270m (and not core income received of \$323m), then total spend of US\$265m equates to approximately **92%** of the core funds spent against the period to which it was allocated.<sup>5</sup>

What proportion of total expenditure is spent on administration?

Information not available. From the 2004/05 financial report and the UBW there is no line for administrative expenditure. It is most likely that to mainly come from the Secretariat budget allocation of US\$91.2m but this is not detectable.<sup>5</sup>

**\*Disclaimer:** This Effectiveness Summary is a tool designed to simply present the latest available information on UNAIDS's effectiveness. It is one of many prepared by DFID covering a range of multilaterals. The summaries will inform policy but are only one of a range of criteria and sources of evidence considered in recommending future DFID funding allocations. The balanced scorecard format organises what we believe to be the objective sources of information available on four aspects of each organisation's internal effectiveness. It does not measure actual development results on the ground or the merits of the organisation's development objectives. The text within each summary box provides a short analysis of what we believe this information tells us. Any unreferenced text is DFID analysis not in the public domain. It should be noted that the amount of information available and the quality and reliability of information varies considerably across organisations, so there is a limit to which the summaries will be used for comparative purposes.

How well is UNAIDS's resource allocation criteria aligned with its corporate strategy and comparative advantage?

✓ It is clearly articulated in the UBW plan and outlined in the Future Directions Paper. The UBW clearly outlines the programme of work to be followed and the relevant financial allocations attached to it. <sup>1,2,3</sup>

How clear and effective are UNAIDS financial and procurement management procedures?

✓ UNAIDS financial management procedures are clearly set out in the UBW, which is reported on annually at the PCB. <sup>1</sup>

### Staff Management

To what extent is staff recruitment, postings and promotions meritocratic and transparent?

✓ All P5 staff appointments and below are advertised and filled through a competitive process. At the director level more emphasis is accorded to gender and geographic distribution and positions filled either through a competition or executive search process. Competency frameworks have been developed to ensure a best match between needs and skills. UNAIDS sometimes attracts criticism for its staff quality, but the system is in transition and it will be fairer to judge further down the line after new UCC recruitment procedures have bedded in. <sup>6</sup>

Is there an agreed human resources strategy in support of UNAIDS's strategic plan?

This information is unavailable. However there is a UNAIDS Secretariat Staff Association. 2005 saw the transition from UNAIDS Staff Association Steering Committee (USASC) to the UNAIDS Secretariat Staff Association. As was agreed by the WHO Staff Association (WHOSA) General Assembly, the UNAIDS Staff Association Steering Committee became an independent staff association for the UNAIDS Secretariat. <sup>6</sup>

### Operational Management

Is UNAIDS sufficiently decentralised to enable it to respond flexibly to country demand?

⇔ Partially, UNAIDS Secretariat, by its nature, is relatively centralised. UNAIDS country staff, until very recently, have been relatively junior members of the UN country teams. In practise decision making and accountability depended to some extent on the strength of the Resident Coordinator, and the Chair of the UN HIV/AIDS Theme Group. Upgrading of staff in 2003 to UNAIDS Country Coordinators, has achieved their equal status in the UN country team, and guidance from Mark Malloch-Brown (Nov 2003) has helped clarify UNAIDS and co-sponsors responsibilities at country level. A remaining challenge is the transformation of Inter-Country Teams into Regional Support Teams. Resources have been shifted from the centre to country level to facilitate this as well as externally commissioned work to design appropriate delivery models. <sup>1</sup> Some MOPAN country teams assess that responsive is constrained due to insufficient size of and decentralisation of resources and responsibilities to country UNAIDS team. <sup>8</sup>

Does UNAIDS's MIS provide accurate, useful and timely info for programmatic decision-making?

⇔ UNAIDS secretariat work plan is based on the programme's 5 key cross cutting functions, these filter down to departmental level. These work plans helps frame the comparative advantage that UNAIDS plays at a country level. Specific results and indicators are defined, but can be difficult to access in aggregate form. <sup>6</sup> However, there is a new database of UBW indicator data and databases containing UNGASS indicator data.

**\*Disclaimer:** This Effectiveness Summary is a tool designed to simply present the latest available information on UNAIDS's effectiveness. It is one of many prepared by DFID covering a range of multilaterals. The summaries will inform policy but are only one of a range of criteria and sources of evidence considered in recommending future DFID funding allocations. The balanced scorecard format organises what we believe to be the objective sources of information available on four aspects of each organisation's internal effectiveness. It does not measure actual development results on the ground or the merits of the organisation's development objectives. The text within each summary box provides a short analysis of what we believe this information tells us. Any unreferenced text is DFID analysis not in the public domain. It should be noted that the amount of information available and the quality and reliability of information varies considerably across organisations, so there is a limit to which the summaries will be used for comparative purposes.

# How well is UNAIDS managing its *PARTNERSHIPS*?

**Summary** UNAIDS is a model partner in many respects. The secretariat manages an extremely complex set of partnerships very effectively. UNAIDS can be applauded for supporting civil society participation and the inclusion of people living with HIV/AIDS and marginalised groups in the response at global and country level. UNAIDS are strong in supporting governments and country level approach. UNAIDS works well with the UN although they can sometimes appear constrained by their co-sponsors. However, its effectiveness at creating change is limited by its lack of authority over co-sponsors. Establishing clearer lines of authority and accountability of the co sponsors through the PCB/UBW processes needs to be encouraged, as well as working towards greater coherence at country level with a harmonised UNDAF. UNAIDS has good relationships with international donors, philanthropic private sector and multilateral funds. The GTT has recommended ways through which UNAIDS can work more effectively with partners for a more harmonised response to the epidemic, which is being implemented to a varying extent. Most importantly, UNAIDS is seen as credible and critical partner at the highest political levels. There is no doubt that the partnerships that UNAIDS has established have led to major policy changes in how the epidemic is addressed.

## Voice

**What mechanisms exist for developing countries to influence the strategy of UNAIDS?**

✓ The membership of the PCB includes 22 Member States, the majority of which are Low Income countries, as well as 5 NGOs (3 of which are from developing countries). All of these participate in the functions of the PCB which include establishing broad policies and priorities for the Joint Programme.<sup>6</sup> UNAIDS is currently exploring the NGO members into voting members.

**How actively is UNAIDS promoting the participation of civil society in policy-making, planning and programming?**

✓ UNAIDS is particularly strong and well respected in its ability to bring civil society groups into major policy debates. It has been especially effective at involving people living with HIV and with advocating for the inclusion of marginalised and vulnerable groups.<sup>1</sup> UNAIDS encourages active participation on its governance processes by developing country based CS. Yet country reports reveal no clear picture with regard to UNAIDS support to NGOs and private sector actors.<sup>8</sup>

## Partnership Behaviour

**What mechanisms are in place to seek feedback from partners and what do the results show?**

✓ The Board consistently makes recommendations on inter-agency coordination amongst the programme's co-sponsors and monitors progress of UN system harmonisation through reviews and updates of the UN System Strategic Plan. The Committee of Co-sponsoring Organisations are conducting a review on how different co-sponsoring organisations have used the UBW funds to respond to the AIDS epidemic. An independent review of the Global Task Team is also being commissioned to assess the level that recommendations have been implemented by national governments, development partners and UN agencies at country level.<sup>2</sup>

**Is UNAIDS willing to challenge and assist governments on difficult/controversial issues?**

⇔ UNAIDS has been effective at global level in raising the profile of the HIV/AIDS commitment and maintaining momentum on the response. UNAIDS can be good at challenging government and supporting the voice of civil society and marginalised groups. However, anecdotal evidence shows there are also reports of UNAIDS being constrained by its co-sponsors who do not want to challenge government on certain issues.<sup>7</sup> Partners saw UNAIDS as having potential to play a key role in opening space for policy dialogue.<sup>8</sup>

**\*Disclaimer:** This Effectiveness Summary is a tool designed to simply present the latest available information on UNAIDS's effectiveness. It is one of many prepared by DFID covering a range of multilaterals. The summaries will inform policy but are only one of a range of criteria and sources of evidence considered in recommending future DFID funding allocations. The balanced scorecard format organises what we believe to be the objective sources of information available on four aspects of each organisation's internal effectiveness. It does not measure actual development results on the ground or the merits of the organisation's development objectives. The text within each summary box provides a short analysis of what we believe this information tells us. Any unreferenced text is DFID analysis not in the public domain. It should be noted that the amount of information available and the quality and reliability of information varies considerably across organisations, so there is a limit to which the summaries will be used for comparative purposes.

## Alignment

To what extent does this organisation foster government ownership through the project/programme cycle?

✓ UNAIDS has become more responsive to government requests in recent years and has made progress in aligning its programmes. 8. UNAIDS's promotion of the Three Ones principles firmly puts government in the driving seat of the national response. This has been followed through with intensive UNAIDS support to building capacity within National AIDS Councils to coordinate, plan, monitor and evaluate the national response. UNAIDS should also be able to work through its co-sponsor to ensure that HIV/AIDS is integrating into all relevant country development frameworks, including PRSPs and MTEFs. But their effectiveness at doing this is however still poor. 7 6

What % aid flows to government sector is reported on national partner budgets?

Information not available

What % of TC flows are provided through coordinated programmes consistent with partners' national strategies?

Information not available

Does UNAIDS use countries' own public financial management and procurement systems?

⇔ This is only relevant for the provision of technical assistance as the Secretariat is not involved in implementing projects or programmes. UNAIDS does participate in pooled mechanisms for joint UN programming on HIV/AIDS, insofar as it helps coordinate the activities of co-sponsors. It is seeking to develop regional technical resources, but these plans are embryonic. They will prioritise local inputs to the full extent possible, recognising that much HIV/AIDS technical support is much more relevant if locally sourced. UNAIDS does very little procurement. 1

Is the number of Project Implementation Units decreasing or non-existent?

Information not available

In what ways has UNAIDS been aligning its strategy/programme/projects with national strategies?

✓ The recognition of the government as the leader of the national response and alignment behind one national AIDS coordination mechanisms, one plan and one M&E framework are the central premise of the Three Ones principle promoted by UNAIDS. Significant effort has been made to ensure that national strategic plans are inline with the MDGs and UNGASS commitments. Tools for country reporting against these have been developed by UNAIDS. 6

## Harmonisation

To what extent does UNAIDS participate in local donor coordination activities such as sector working groups/thematic groups?

⇔ UNAIDS is perceived to be actively engaged in harmonisation efforts. Donors acknowledge cases where UNAIDS have taken active steps to avoid overlap with other development agencies and majority view that UNAIDS's interagency coordination had made significant progress over the last 3 years. MOPAN partners, however, reported very little evidence of UNAIDS working with the World Bank or of the World Bank working with UNAIDS. There appeared to be overlap. MOPAN partners felt that this was a serious issue, as work between the two organisations would add considerable value. 8 Efforts have been made by GTT to address this – collaboration with WB has improved over the past 2 years. 9 As part of the Three Ones principle UNAIDS has intensified efforts at country level to promote and facilitate donor coordination. UNAIDS shares information well and proactively with other development actors. 8 UNAIDS is also key to the coordination of its co sponsors in country. This has been backed up by the reorientation of UNAIDS budget and programme of work around priority country activities. Anecdotal evidence reports that co sponsors do not always support UNAIDS in country efforts to facilitate local donor coordination, seeing UNAIDS as a secretariat for its own programme of work rather than an external facilitator. 1 6

**\*Disclaimer:** This Effectiveness Summary is a tool designed to simply present the latest available information on UNAIDS's effectiveness. It is one of many prepared by DFID covering a range of multilaterals. The summaries will inform policy but are only one of a range of criteria and sources of evidence considered in recommending future DFID funding allocations. The balanced scorecard format organises what we believe to be the objective sources of information available on four aspects of each organisation's internal effectiveness. It does not measure actual development results on the ground or the merits of the organisation's development objectives. The text within each summary box provides a short analysis of what we believe this information tells us. Any unreferenced text is DFID analysis not in the public domain. It should be noted that the amount of information available and the quality and reliability of information varies considerably across organisations, so there is a limit to which the summaries will be used for comparative purposes.

To what extent does UNAIDS share information with other donors?

✓ UNAIDS raison d'être is inter-agency partnership with their work plans being based on the coordination of global and regional efforts between the Secretariat and Co-sponsors. Partnership is one of UNAIDS five key functions and strategies exist through corporate agreements with agencies such as IFAD, FAO, GFATM and bilateral donors. There is no doubt that the partnerships UNAIDS has established have led to major policy changes in how the AIDS epidemic is addressed.<sup>1</sup>

What evidence is there of harmonising procurement and consulting services procedures, disbursement policies and evaluation practices?

Information not available

**\*Disclaimer:** This Effectiveness Summary is a tool designed to simply present the latest available information on UNAIDS's effectiveness. It is one of many prepared by DFID covering a range of multilaterals. The summaries will inform policy but are only one of a range of criteria and sources of evidence considered in recommending future DFID funding allocations. The balanced scorecard format organises what we believe to be the objective sources of information available on four aspects of each organisation's internal effectiveness. It does not measure actual development results on the ground or the merits of the organisation's development objectives. The text within each summary box provides a short analysis of what we believe this information tells us. Any unreferenced text is DFID analysis not in the public domain. It should be noted that the amount of information available and the quality and reliability of information varies considerably across organisations, so there is a limit to which the summaries will be used for comparative purposes.

# What do we know about UNAIDS COUNTRY/GLOBAL RESULTS?

**Summary** There is no doubt that UNAIDS is achieving its mandate at the global level by advocating and leading on the response to the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The high level of political commitment to tackling the disease has resulted in the dramatic increase of people in poorer countries being able to access treatment. The challenge will be to sustain this in the long term. At country level UNAIDS effectiveness is less consistent. UNAIDS five-year evaluation has reoriented the programme's focus and budget to supporting country level activities. Periodic reviews of Theme Groups and country level operations are requested by, and provided to the PCB. UNAIDS is developing mechanisms to monitor their impact at country level but often reporting is only of outputs. UNAIDS manage the Global Task Team (GTT) to develop global commitments to support implementation of the "Three Ones" principles at country level. This has been a big step for UNAIDS, although the effect of this has yet to be seen.

## Country/Global Results

What information is available on the UNAIDS's performance at country level?

⇔ Annual reports are provided on UNAIDS PAF objectives. This data is aggregated and used for future refinement of allocations. As the reports have been somewhat introspective, the reporting guidance has been overhauled and improvements should be seen in the future.<sup>1</sup>

What evidence is there of the independence, credibility and utility of UNAIDS's own evaluations?

✓ UNAIDS is perceived as a transparent organisation that is open to critical review and learning.<sup>7</sup>

What results is UNAIDS having at the country-level?

⇔ UNAIDS has developed several tools to support country reporting against the UNGASS commitments and scaling up for Universal Access priorities. As many of these are output indicators it is difficult to ascertain what impact or outcomes are being achieved by UNAIDS at country level.<sup>1</sup> 44 countries formed joint UN teams on AIDS, 50% agreed to accountability mechanisms to monitor progress. However there has been some reticence of Head of Agencies of cosponsors to engage with joint teams and programmes.<sup>2</sup> UNAIDS could make better use of its comparative advantages in policy dialogue. It provides very good technical advice focused on central government. MOPAN country teams unanimously find that UNAIDS has a comparative advantage in the area of advocacy.<sup>8</sup>

What results impact is UNAIDS having at the global level?

✓ UNAIDS is recognised as the lead authority on HIV/AIDS in the world and have successfully obtained political commitment from the majority of member states to address the HIV/AIDS epidemic either through action or funding. This commitment is being maintained and has translated into the dramatic rise of people able to access treatment around the world. The UNGASS on HIV 2006 galvanised support for this from the UN - The main focus of the meeting was to review progress achieved in realizing the commitments set out in the Declaration of Commitment and to: 1)review progress in implementing the 2001 Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS, focusing on both constraints and opportunities to full implementation; 2)consider recommendations on how the targets set in the Declaration may be reached, including through the "towards universal access processes" and 3)renew Political commitment.<sup>6</sup>

## Portfolio Quality

What is the % of projects/programmes which met their targets?

Information not available

How does this vary across sectors, regions and countries?

Information not available

**\*Disclaimer:** This Effectiveness Summary is a tool designed to simply present the latest available information on UNAIDS's effectiveness. It is one of many prepared by DFID covering a range of multilaterals. The summaries will inform policy but are only one of a range of criteria and sources of evidence considered in recommending future DFID funding allocations. The balanced scorecard format organises what we believe to be the objective sources of information available on four aspects of each organisation's internal effectiveness. It does not measure actual development results on the ground or the merits of the organisation's development objectives. The text within each summary box provides a short analysis of what we believe this information tells us. Any unreferenced text is DFID analysis not in the public domain. It should be noted that the amount of information available and the quality and reliability of information varies considerably across organisations, so there is a limit to which the summaries will be used for comparative purposes.

# REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

1. DFID's 2004 Multilateral Effectiveness Framework (MEFF) report
2. 19<sup>th</sup> PCB documents, UNAIDS (Dec 2006)
3. Executive Directors Future Directions Paper, UNAIDS
4. UN website: Chapter of the United Nations – Chapter 3, Article 8
5. 2004/05 UNAIDS Financial Report
6. UNAIDS website ([www.unaids.org](http://www.unaids.org))
7. UNAIDS IS review for 05/06
8. MOPAN Survey 2005
9. GIST Minutes of Meeting
10. HLSP – An Independent Assessment of Progress on the Implementation of the Global Task Team Recommendations in Support of National of National AIDS Responses

**Background** This fact sheet is designed to summarise information available on the effectiveness of UNAIDS. It collates the latest published information in four key areas from a variety of sources including the Multilateral Effectiveness Framework (MEFF)<sup>1</sup> as well as a range of UNAIDS's own Annual Reporting<sup>2-8</sup> and assesses areas of strength (✓) and weakness (✗) and where progress is mixed (↔).

**\*Disclaimer:** This Effectiveness Summary is a tool designed to simply present the latest available information on UNAIDS's effectiveness. It is one of many prepared by DFID covering a range of multilaterals. The summaries will inform policy but are only one of a range of criteria and sources of evidence considered in recommending future DFID funding allocations. The balanced scorecard format organises what we believe to be the objective sources of information available on four aspects of each organisation's internal effectiveness. It does not measure actual development results on the ground or the merits of the organisation's development objectives. The text within each summary box provides a short analysis of what we believe this information tells us. Any unreferenced text is DFID analysis not in the public domain. It should be noted that the amount of information available and the quality and reliability of information varies considerably across organisations, so there is a limit to which the summaries will be used for comparative purposes.