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Why HIV/AIDS M&E?

“Raise it, spend it, prove it”

Richard Feachem, frm. Executive Director
Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria
Why M&E of HIV/AIDS?

Increasing demand for effective M&E of the epidemic and the response due to:

- Rapid expansion of new resources available to respond to the epidemic (GFATM, PEPFAR, WB, public funding, etc.)
- Rapid scale-up of treatment and prevention programs (3x5, Universal Access)
- Global push for improved coordination among donors and among donors and national HIV/AIDS programs – focus on strengthening national capacities
The “Three Ones”
Key Principles

1. One agreed HIV and AIDS action framework
2. One national AIDS coordinating authority
3. One agreed monitoring and evaluation framework
Components of a National M&E System

- Biological and behavioral HIV/AIDS surveillance
- Essential research on HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment and care
- Program activity monitoring and program evaluation
- Financial monitoring, resource needs estimates
Financial M&E to monitor program implementation and effectiveness

Allows answering questions addressing:

• **Spending Patterns**
  – What are key funding sources (public, private, non-for-profit organizations, donors, etc.) – proportional spending
  – How does national level spending compare to spending at the sub-national level?

• **Cost-efficiency**
  – How are economic inputs into HIV/AIDS programs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) converted into results?
  – Do we see economies of scale as service coverage goes up?

• **Equity**
  – Are populations in need benefiting?
Financial Resource Tracking in Eastern Europe and Central Asia
Data includes:

• International donors, domestic spending (including public spending and out-of-pocket expenditures)

• International Foundations and GF included from 2003 onwards, PEPFAR included from 2004 onwards

Estimated total annual resources available for AIDS 1996 – 2005
Trends in domestic and international AIDS funding, 10 CIS countries
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Domestic public expenditures for HIV and AIDS in ten CIS States and Latvia, 2006
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Per capita domestic public expenditures for HIV and AIDS (CIS and Latvia, 2005-2006)
Financial Resource Tracking in Selected Countries
Country reporting on domestic expenditure (DoC review, March 2006)
Conducting NASA in the Russian Federation to assess HIV/AIDS Spending, 2004

- Government Funding: 37 million US$
- Donor Funding: 30 million US$
Allocations by Functions, 2004

- Prevention: 49%
- Care and Treatment: 23%
- Other country defined activities Not Elsewhere Classified: 17%
- Social Mitigation+Orphans and Vulnerable Children: 8%
- Program management costs: 3%
- Research: 0.06%
Allocation to Preventive Activities by Function, 2004

- Blood safety: 47%
- Mass media: 47%
- Prevention programs for people living with HIV: 2%
- Prevention of mother-to-child transmission: 21%
CONCLUSION

• **Low spending**: Only 0.2% of the total Russian health budget was allocated to HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention in 2004.

• **Imbalance in spending for prevention activities**: close to 50% spent on blood safety, one-fifth of the funds aimed at mother-to-child transmission and 30% was spent on mass media activities (almost zero spending on MARPs).

• **Insufficient funding for T&C**: 23% of public funding allocated to treatment and care (diagnostics, purchasing of test systems, ARV, OI treatment).

• **Major funding gap for social support and mitigation**: 0.06%. No funding allocated for orphans and vulnerable children.
HIV/AIDS NHA Sub-analysis
Ukraine, 2004
Sources of Health Financing for HIV/AIDS in Ukraine, 2004

- Household Funds: 56.5%
- Private Sources: 63.4%
- Public Sources: 13.6%
- Rest of the World: 23.1%
- Non-profit institutions serving households: 6.8%
- Regional & City Gov. revenues: 8.0%
- Central Government Revenues: 5.6%
International Comparison for Expenditures for HIV/AIDS by Functions