**JUPSA TERMINAL EVALUATION LESSONS LEARNT AND CONCLUSIONS**

**Summary**

In 2007, the UN in Uganda responded to the UN reform to improve its effectiveness, relevance and coordination to position UN as a strategic partner to the national AIDS response. Hence the Joint United Nations Programme of Support on AIDS (JUPSA) was established in 2007-2012 and a Joint UN Team on AIDS set up to oversee and monitor its implementation. JUPSA was aligned to UNDAF 2010-2014; The National Development Plan (2011-2014); The National HIV Strategic Plan (2011/12-2014/15) and to priority areas in the UNAIDS vision on getting to *Zero New Infections, Zero AIDS-related Deaths and Zero Discrimination.* JUPSA provides upstream support; it is a coordination mechanism for UN agencies to support HIV and AIDS interventions, and hence JUPSA is not a direct implementer.

The overall objective of the evaluation was to undertake an in-depth analysis of the JUPSA Programme in order to generate comprehensive and specific evaluation feedback on the implementation of the Programme. The evaluation findings informed priorities for the January – December 2015 Bridging Work Plan.

 **Lessons Learned**

1. The JUPSA model facilitated scaling up the resource envelope through pooling of funds and employing a coordinated approach to the HIV and AIDS response; thus minimises duplication of interventions and increases efficiency as well as effectiveness.
2. The re-engagement of parliament, political, religious and cultural leadership yields stronger political will and better results.
3. The establishment of the JSC that involves the government, private sector, the UN, development partners and PLHIV fosters national ownership of the JUPSA and collaboration for its delivery.
4. Limited involvement of the government at district level in the initial planning processes of JUPSA interventions leads to limited ownership of the programs, hence may limit its sustainability.
5. Delays experienced by the UN system; followed by delays from government and other implementing partners system creates ‘multiple delays’ which is not desirable.

**Best Practices**

1. Planning reporting and implementing as one has enhanced synergies
2. Private sector engagement expanded the resource base in the national HIVand AIDS response
3. Working with cultural institutions through their subjects to address GBV and HIV and AIDS issues
4. Male involvement in HCT to minimize GBV
5. Pooling of funds together in one basket
6. Use of faith based model to disseminate HIV and AIDS messages
7. Regular JUPSA engagement with UAC and other stakeholders has enhanced ownership, coordination and participation in the national HIV and AIDS response.

**Conclusions**

1. **Relevance**: Overall, JUPSA is deemed as a very relevant program given its alignment to the national and international HIV and AIDS strategic plans; as well as the focus the divers of the epidemic as well as the needs of those infected and affected by HIV and AIDS.
2. **Effectiveness**: The program has largely achieved is objectives and hence realized the intended outcomes, in areas of HIV Prevention, Care and treatment, as well as governance and human rights. However, there is still a high unmet need for HIV and AIDS services.
3. **Efficiency**: The JUPSA model has brought considerable returns with relatively moderate input due to pooling together of resources, which minimizes duplication of efforts and resource wastage. The joint and coordinated activities harness synergies of different agencies; and ensure that each agency focuses on its niche. However, weak accountability and transparency in government and other institutions limits further achievements of efficiency.
4. **Impact**: JUPSA has had commendable impact on the HIV and AIDS response in all the thematic areas evidenced by the reduction in deaths related to HIV and AIDS and reduction in new infections.
5. **Sustainability:** JUPSA has a strong element of continuity through great investment in capacity enhancement as well as working with and through existing service delivery, political, religious and cultural structures, which will ensure sustainability of services.