



Think Tank update on the monitoring of the Dublin Declaration

Teymur Noori


European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control

Luxembourg, 16-17th December 2009

Outline of presentation



1. Advisory group composition
2. Progress to date – timeline
3. M&E workshop in June
4. General feedback from countries on the questionnaire
5. Reflections from ECDC on the process so far
6. Submission rates – EU/EFTA & Neighbouring countries
7. UNGASS review process → implications for the EU



Advisory group composition



Bulgaria	EU COM
Estonia	EMCDDA
Germany	WHO EURO
Italy	UNAIDS
Norway	CSF
Portugal	CSF
Spain	AAI
Sweden	
UK	
Ukraine	



Purpose of the M&E workshop (16-18 June)



- Provide background information on the Dublin Declaration
- Present the indicator framework and seek participants' views about indicator priorities, relevance and gaps
- Consider the availability of country data including data already submitted for other purposes, e.g. UNGASS, EMCDDA
- Identify regional difficulties in monitoring global commitments and suggest ways to improve submission rates
- Update participants about wider developments in international M&E



General comments on process so far



General feedback from countries



- Questionnaire yielded more information than expected
- Good overview of the entire HIV programme
- However, it also pointed out the lack of information, especially on certain risk groups
- Good to include indicators on migrants & prisoners
- Impact of pandemic flu posed challenges in submitting
- There was good input from civil society, although they had hoped to have a larger role in assessing the country response
- Customised country questionnaires highly appreciated

General reflections from ECDC



- High response rate – including responses from UNGASS non-responders – especially considering pandemic flu
- Standardised indicators vs. flexible data reporting
- Respondents not participating in the M&E workshop found it more difficult to respond – importance of M&E capacity building
- Some non-responses due to communication problems (non-EU countries)
- Building on UNGASS reporting a good decision
- Advisory group has been crucial in guiding the process
- Overall the process that we chose was a good one



Submission rates



Submission rates EU/EFTA



Austria	Hungary	Slovakia
Belgium	Ireland	Slovenia
Bulgaria	Italy	Spain
Cyprus	Latvia	Sweden
Czech Republic	Lithuania	United Kingdom
Denmark	Luxembourg	
Estonia	Malta	Iceland
Finland	Netherlands	Liechtenstein
France	Poland	Norway
Germany	Portugal	Switzerland
Greece	Romania	29 ÷ 31 = 94%

Submission rates of remaining countries in the European and Central Asian region



Albania	Kosovo (UNSCR 1244)	Turkey
Andorra	Kyrgyzstan	Turkmenistan
Armenia	Monaco	Ukraine
Azerbaijan	Montenegro*	Uzbekistan
Belarus	Moldova	
Bosnia & Herzegov.	Russian Federation	
Croatia	San Marino	
Georgia	Serbia	
Israel	Tajikistan	20/24 = 83%
Kazakhstan	TFYROM	

20/24 = 83%

Submission rates of the 55 countries



Overall submission rate: 49/55 = 89%

Albania	Finland	Liechtenstein	Serbia
Andorra	France	Lithuania	Slovakia
Armenia	Georgia	Luxembourg	Slovenia
Austria	Germany	Malta	Spain
Azerbaijan	Greece	Moldova	Sweden
Belarus	Hungary	Monaco	Switzerland
Belgium	Iceland	Montenegro*	Tajikistan
Bosnia & Herzeg.	Ireland	Netherlands	TFYROM
Bulgaria	Israel	Norway	Turkey
Croatia	Italy	Poland	Turkmenistan
Cyprus	Kazakhstan	Portugal	Ukraine
Czech Republic	Kosovo (UNSCR 1244)	Romania	United Kingdom
Denmark	Kyrgyzstan	Russian Federation	Uzbekistan
Estonia	Latvia	San Marino	

UNGASS review process



UNGASS review process 2010



The objectives of the review are to:

1. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of international HIV reporting
2. Obtain broad agreement on the key elements of the system to maintain over the next 2 to 4 rounds of reporting
3. Review indicator performance and identify “gap” areas
4. Obtain agreement on revisions to the set of core indicators



Opportunities for the EU



- ECDC proposed to be a member of the steering committee
 - advise on issues specific to the European context
 - ECDC would want input from EU MS into the process
 - ✓ Dublin advisory group
 - ✓ Dissemination meeting

- Dublin/BS findings to feed into the UNGASS review
 - ECDC to provide alternative solutions to problematic indicators (especially the knowledge related indicators)
 - hope to delete indicators not relevant (NASA/OVC indicator)
 - may suggest indicators in gap areas (i.e. migrant indicators)
 - ECDC to propose using the behavioural indicators for our region

- Great opportunity to push for regionalisation of UNGASS

Thank you



This paper was produced for a meeting organized by Health & Consumers DG and represents the views of its author on the subject. These views have not been adopted or in any way approved by the Commission and should not be relied upon as a statement of the Commission's or Health & Consumers DG's views. The European Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this paper, nor does it accept responsibility for any use made thereof.