

Perspective from the Ground



IOM Workshop on Evaluating the Impact of PEPFAR
April 30 – May 1, 2007

Sara Pacqué-Margolis
Director, Monitoring and Evaluation
The Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation

Perspective from the Ground



“What unique perspectives and capabilities do **implementers** bring to the conduct and interpretation of the results of **impact evaluation**? ”

What is impact evaluation?



- Research that focuses on **long-term results** of the program, including changes in health status, systems capacity, and other social, economic, and political outcomes
- Must be based on a **conceptual model** informing research design to assess the extent to which and how the program contributed to achievement of its stated goals/results, while controlling for other factors that contribute as well
- Impact evaluations are **rare** due to high human and financial resource **costs** and due to extensive **timeframe**, **coordination**, and **commitment** required to successfully complete them

What has been the impact of PEPFAR?



Population Level Impact on Health Status

“Since PEPFAR’s inception, we have supported PMTCT services for women during more than 6 million pregnancies. Through Fiscal Year 2006, there are 4,863 PEPFAR-supported PMTCT service outlets in the focus countries, and PEPFAR has supported ARV prophylaxis for HIV-positive women during 533,700 pregnancies. This has saved an **estimated** 101,500 infants from HIV infection.” Dybul, April 24, 2007

Development of Conceptual Framework Measurement of Intermediate Outcomes



- Defining the conceptual model
 - *PMTCT cascade*
- Measuring the model's inputs and outcomes
 - *Program monitoring data*
- Model assumptions and conversion factors
 - *Operations research, cohort studies, etc*

What has been the impact of PEPFAR?



Program Level Impact on Health Sector Systems and Capacity

“PEPFAR’s capacity-building initiatives have positive spillover effects: Whenever a country upgrades its health systems and strengthens the health workforce it improves overall healthcare delivery. In a recent study conducted at 30 primary health centers in Rwanda, 21 of 22 measured basic (i.e., non-HIV/AIDS) health service indicators showed improvement after 6 months of offering a full package of basic HIV care. Of the 21 indicators, 17 showed a statistically significant improvement.” Dybul, April 24, 2007

***Partnering in the provision of data
for multi-country or comparative studies
(sites, patients, providers, costs)***



- Is the correlation observed in Rwanda replicable in other settings with different levels of baseline human and financial resources, different target populations, and different epidemics?
- To what extent are overall improvements in the health system attributable to PEPFAR's capacity building inputs as opposed to other external changes in the environment and the populations served?
- Improvements in outcomes at site level (data collected) may be associated with poorer outcomes at levels not observed.
- Are improvements sustained over time?

What has been the impact of PEPFAR?



Population level and Program Level Impact on Broader Political, Social, Economic Outcomes

“By destroying the social fabric caused [by] and leaving a generation of orphans HIV/AIDS is creating a long term breeding ground for radicalism...We have begun work with international partners to develop models that quantify the impact of treatment and prevention in preventing orphaning of children. These are preliminary estimates at this point as we refine the methodology, but there is no doubt that the impact is very great. We estimate that PEPFAR support for treatment has averted the orphaning of 229,000 children to date...”

Dybul, April 24, 2007

Interpretation, Dissemination and Use of Data / Information (Advocacy and Planning)



- Multi-sectoral response
- Use of evaluation and program monitoring data for advocacy and national planning, including budgeting
- Developing local capacity to undertake continuous program improvement, operations research, and advocacy

Challenges



- M&E, operations research, clinical research, and advocacy are not prioritized in Country Operation Plan (COP) planning, in part due to funding earmarks/directives
- Partners (including country-level stakeholders) do not have a place at the table in defining research agenda and conceptual frameworks
- Funding mechanisms do not promote harmonization, economies of scale, capacity building

Recommendations



- Ensure “evaluation” function (broadly defined) is prioritized in COP planning
- Systematically include partners (including country level) in OGAC technical working groups on evaluation
- Ensure funding mechanisms that promote harmonization and flexibility, while developing capacity for evaluation research, information dissemination and advocacy.