



UNAIDS/PCB(20)/07.7  
10 May 2007

**20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board**  
**Geneva, Switzerland**  
**25-27 June 2007**

*Provisional agenda item 3.3:*

**UNAIDS role in strengthening global coordination on AIDS and  
development of the Programme Coordinating Board**

**Additional documents for this item:** *none*

**Action required at this meeting - the Programme Coordinating Board is requested to:**

Consider proposals contained in paragraphs I to XII

**Cost implications for decisions:**

- ii. Additional PCB meeting per biennium – US\$ 250,000
- v. Field trips – US\$ 50,000
- vi. Six briefing session with simultaneous interpretation in English and French – US\$ 15,000

At its 19<sup>th</sup> meeting (in Lusaka, Zambia, 6-8 December 2006) the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) decided to: *“establish a process under the leadership of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board, in close consultation with Board members and observers and with the support of the UNAIDS Secretariat, to elaborate further on the UNAIDS role in strengthening Global Coordination of AIDS and how to develop the UNAIDS’ Programme Coordinating Board into a more relevant and effective policy-making Board; the process will include matters such as number of Board meetings, venues, character of meetings, Board representation, NGO participation, speaking protocol, decision-making and the further development of the constituency system; a report with recommendations will be presented to the 20<sup>th</sup> Programme Coordinating Board in June 2007 (agenda item 5, decision 8).*

1. The above PCB decision addresses two different perspectives of the subject; the decision “established a process to elaborate further on .....

- UNAIDS’ role in strengthening Global Coordination on AIDS, and
- how to develop the UNAIDS’ Programme Coordinating Board into a more relevant and effective policy-making Board.

2. To facilitate consultations on the implementation of the above-mentioned decision, a draft paper on reform (dated 4 April 2007) was presented by the Chair and the Vice-Chair. Consultations were held on 19-20 April with Member States, Co-sponsor organizations and civil society. Based on this first round of consultations, the Chair and Vice-chair issued the second draft proposal (dated 26 April 2007), which identified both issues and proposals where an emerging consensus could be noted, and matters that required further deliberations and more thorough discussions. The Chair and Vice-Chair also invited further comments on proposed recommendations. This final draft proposal is based on such written comments and will be presented to the PCB meeting in June 2007 for adoption.

3. It should be noted that partners during the consultation expressed a general support for the analyses and some shortcomings in the Chair/Vice-Chair’s paper from 4 April. However, many partners stressed that PCB, as the governing body of UNAIDS, in many ways and compared to other Boards, is a rather effective mechanism and that it has been an important policy-making and coordinating body for the international response to HIV and AIDS. Furthermore, it was underscored that UNAIDS has been at the forefront of UN reform efforts; that UNAIDS from the very beginning of its establishment set an example on how to facilitate coordination and coherence in policy setting and implementation of activities and programmes. It was emphasized that more far reaching matters will have to be part of and in conformity with the broader UN reform agenda.

4. There was general support for the need for increased interaction between UNAIDS and other key actors, both at Secretariat and intergovernmental levels. At the same time, it was emphasized that several coordinating efforts have been made at the Secretariat level and that there is nothing that hinders further development in this regard. The need not to establish new bureaucratic layers and create cumbersome models and mechanisms was emphasized by several partners. There was very little support for the ideas included in the first draft of the Chair/Vice-Chair’s paper on the possibility to include the Chairs/Vice-Chairs of Governing boards of UNAIDS cosponsoring organizations and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM) to participate in PCB meetings as well as the idea of an informal retreat involving the same group of people.

5. In the following, a number of issues are addressed and proposals for change are introduced. The paper tries to address the need for comprehensive solutions for enhancing both the efficiency of PCB's and UNAIDS' role in global coordination on AIDS, preparatory work and consultation process, engagement of all relevant actors, quality of decisions, and the need to stay accountable to what has been agreed upon. All efforts must be made to make sure that PCB develops into a more meaningful and result-based decision making body that monitors progress and holds members accountable.

## **I. Nature of meetings**

### **Proposal for change:**

- PCB meetings should consist of a decision making segment and a thematic segment.
- Interactive discussions should be encouraged rather than prepared statements and texts.

### **Comment:**

6. Consultations showed a general support for these proposals. The need for clarity on agenda settings in between the two segments was emphasized, and also that decisions should only be taken by the Board members in the decision making segment. The agenda for the thematic sessions should be flexible to enable it to respond to the most urgent matters at hand. Participation in the segment could also vary depending on topics to be discussed. The thematic segment will provide an opportunity for thematic and policy making discussions that in the present system are supposed to be the main topic for Board meetings held outside Geneva. The segment will provide an opportunity for relevant actors to discuss HIV and AIDS in a strategic way, thereby moving the agenda forward, but also facilitating UNAIDS' role in strengthening Global Coordination of AIDS. The segment should be opened to a broad range of participants. (See further details under the item on "participation of key partners" below). The structure of the segment should ensure that unnecessary overlap is avoided. On the relationship between the segments, it can be expected that items that will be discussed in the thematic segment will later on be subject to deliberations and decisions by Board members in the decision making segment.

## **II. Number of PCB meetings**

### **Proposal for change:**

- PCB meetings should be held twice a year, an increase of one meeting for the two-year period compared to the current practice of three meetings (two meetings in even years and one meeting in odd years). Since meetings should be held only when there is a substantive need to do so, the PCB could decide at its second meeting in an even year to cancel the second meeting during the following, odd, year.

### **Comment:**

7. The rationale for having two meetings per year is that it would better enable UNAIDS PCB to act in an effective way in its decision making segment but also, through the thematic segment, better fulfil its role in Global Coordination on AIDS. Two meetings per year would provide ample time for PCB to fulfil its overall co-ordinating role and also facilitate the increased interaction that is being sought between UNAIDS and other partners.

8. In view of the very high costs for holding meetings every second year outside Geneva, the additional costs for a second meeting in Geneva in odd years should not be too high, if any.

9. Consultations showed that there was no complete agreement on the Chair/Vice-Chair's proposal to have two PCB meetings per year. The above-mentioned proposal therefore takes into account comments made during the consultative process and provides the PCB with the flexibility to decide not to hold a second meeting in an odd year if there is no need for it.

10. When discussing number of meetings it was stressed during the consultations that meetings must be short, focused and well prepared.

11. If there would be only one meeting in odd years, there is a need to explore more fully the potential of informal consultations in between PCB meetings while at the same time avoiding a creation of a new mechanism.

### **III. Participation of key partners**

#### **Proposal for change:**

- Key partners should be invited to participate in the thematic segment in a well structured and recognized way. A meaningful and relevant discussion on critical thematic policy matters has to include all relevant partners, such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM), People living with HIV/AIDS, private sector, foundations, research and academia, etc.

#### **Comment:**

12. Consultations showed that there is a clear wish to include a broader range of relevant partners in the policy discussions that take place within UNAIDS. Since a major change in the current governance structure of UNAIDS is not foreseen at this stage, many partners felt that a thematic segment with a broader range of participants would be an alternative way to facilitate such a discussion. An opportunity to discuss thematic matters twice a year with a broader group of stakeholders will both move the policy agenda forward and also enhance the UNAIDS role in Global Coordination on AIDS. The participation of major actors on AIDS, such as the GFATM, will be in addition to all necessary, and already ongoing, contacts and coordination activities that take place between UNAIDS and other actors at managerial levels. Consultations stressed that key partners will only participate in the PCB work if there is a value added for such participation. Therefore it is critical that arrangements for the new proposed thematic segment are made in such a way that key partners find it relevant to participate.

### **IV. Venue for PCB meetings**

#### **Proposal for change:**

- In principle, all meetings should be held in Geneva in order to limit costs for the Secretariat and facilitate better participation by all Board members. This does not exclude PCB to decide to hold some meetings outside of Geneva.

#### **Comment:**

13. Consultations showed strong overall support for meetings to be held in Geneva while some members see value of having some meetings outside of Geneva.

## V. Field trips

### Proposal for change:

- Fields trips could be organized as separate events from PCB meetings. Furthermore, such trips should consist of small groups and be arranged together with, or preferably by, co-sponsors.

### Comment:

14. Field trips provide an opportunity for Board members to see the realities on the ground, which was one of the reasons for a thematic meeting to be held outside Geneva. However, consultations gave a very clear message that field trips do not need to be held on a regular basis and must also be manageable and cost-effective. Field trips should preferably be organized by, or at least, together with co-sponsors, not the UNAIDS Secretariat. Such field trips would further underline the joint character of the UNAIDS program.

## VI. Meeting documents and consultation process

### Proposal for change:

- A preliminary list of participants should be distributed prior to the meetings and updated during the meetings.
- Further development of informal networks should be explored to facilitate a better interaction in between PCB meetings.
- More frequent briefing sessions and open consultation processes should be organized by the Secretariat.

### Comment:

15. Consultations showed doubts about establishing new structures, such as informal working committees, because it might create bureaucracy, duplications and increased costs. At the same time, there was a strong support for informal contacts and consultations prior to and in between PCB meetings, particularly on key issues such as budget, work programme and draft decisions and recommendations.

16. There is today an existing network, e.g. Friends of UNAIDS, that could be used more frequently. However, this network only includes major donors, thereby excluding a great number of Board members and observers. Therefore, there is a need for a change, either, perhaps preferably, through an opening up of the existing Friends of UNAIDS group, or through an establishment of another similar network.

## VII. Strengthening of constituency system

### Proposal for change:

- The constituency system should be strengthened to improve the quality of participation and representation at Board meetings (through code of conduct, training, mentoring, etc). Recognizing that such improvement should primarily rest with Member States, the Bureau could play an active role in this context. This might imply a need to expand the Bureau to cover all regional groups.
- UNAIDS Secretariat should also facilitate support to constituencies and strengthen its outreach activities.

**Comment:**

17. Consultations showed a strong feeling that participation of Board members must improve, in the plenary and in the drafting group. Support need to be given to certain constituency groups to ensure meaningful participation. A strong constituency system would allow the views of non-PCB members to be reflected and articulated at the Board meetings. It would thus assure that key decisions taken by the Board would have the support and reflect the consensus view of all Member States.

18. Consultations also showed a willingness to support constituencies to develop into more effective mechanisms. Nevertheless, it was also mentioned that the lack of strategic direction, clear outputs and impact could also lead to less willingness to participate in the PCB work.

19. Furthermore, consultations showed an interest in further discussions on how rotation and constitution of constituencies are made. Today, a number of decisions are made in New York that impacts mainly Geneva. While recognizing that decisions must be procedurally correct, a call was made for greater flexibility but also a clear understanding on what scope there is to make changes within current parameters and what ultimately needs to be changed.

**VIII. Drafting group**

**Proposal for change:**

- The Chair should play an active role in ensuring balanced representation in the drafting group.
- A drafting group should not be held in parallel with other on-going discussions.

**Comment:**

20. Consultations showed support for the need to seek a more balanced participation in the drafting group that would also ensure the presence of all relevant partners. At the same time, there was very little support for a model with “fixed-seat allocations”. It was also stressed by several partners that the substantive part of the decision making should take place in the plenary, while the role of the drafting group is to reflect on what the Plenary agreed upon.

**IX. Coherence and accountability; implementation of PCB decisions**

**Proposal for change:**

- A further development of the Unified Budget and Workplan (UBW) to enable it to be a strategic tool for division of responsibilities and other governance matters within UNAIDS, the Secretariat and the ten co-sponsors. The UBW should include incentives for action and collaboration.
- Funds allocated to co-sponsors should be linked to specific outputs and a release of funds should be performance-based. The UBW should clearly identify expected results and responsible actors.
- PCB decisions should include clear language on who is responsible for its implementation, and also a time frame and identified reporting mechanisms.

**Comment:**

21. Consultations showed a strong support for the need to find ways and means to strengthen accountability and follow up; to ensure that PCB decisions and recommendations lead to action at all levels - global, regional and national. The need to improve accountability and follow up was seen as relevant for both the UNAIDS Secretariat and the Secretariats of the ten co-

sponsors but also for the “owners” of the system, the Member States. It is critical for Member States to follow-up and monitor PCB decisions by the boards of co-sponsors in a coherent manner. Within the UNAIDS family, the UBW is the critical instrument for follow up and to secure accountability. Nevertheless, there might also be a need for some kind of additional follow up system. The draft UBW for 2008-2009 that will be presented to the June Board meeting and that has been developed by the UNAIDS Secretariat together with the co-sponsors includes a follow up system. The coming two years will provide an opportunity for Board members to see if this system is far reaching enough, if it provides enough “teeth” for an effective follow up. The further development of UBW should also seek to enable it to adjust to PCB decisions that are made during the course of the biannual budget.

22. During consultations there was also an interest in the extent to which the Secretariat can adequately monitor PCB decisions, for example the implementation of GTT recommendations.

#### **X. Coordination at country level**

##### **Proposal for change:**

- Systematic coordination among relevant partners at country level needs to be strengthened; within UNAIDS (Secretariat and co-sponsors), with other UN agencies and with other development partners, multilateral and bilateral, and also with authorities in HIV/AIDS affected countries.

##### **Comment:**

23. The Global Task Team on improving coordination on AIDS among multilateral partners and international donors (GTT) stressed the necessity for effective alignment and harmonization at country level. Donors and international partners must stay accountable to commitments made to inclusive national ownership and leadership. UNAIDS has a critical role to play in implementation and follow-up to both the three-ones principle and the GTT’s recommendations. During consultations, it was asked to what extent countries feel able to hold donors (not only the UN) accountable to GTT principles.

#### **XI. Election process, including election of officers**

##### **Proposal for change:**

- To synchronize with the ECOSOC process, the Chair/Vice-Chair should be elected for one calendar year, starting the term on 1 January of each year.
- A long-term planning of the election of the officers of the Board is suggested.
- Further ways to improve coordination on electoral matters between ECOSOC and PCB should be explored.

##### **Comment:**

24. In order to bring the terms of Chair/Vice-Chair into harmony with the terms for which members of the PCB are elected and thus eliminate the risk that an incumbent Chair/Vice-Chair is no longer a Board member, a solution could be to elect the Chair/ Vice-Chair for one calendar year, starting the term on 1 January of each year. Such a new procedure could enter into effect from 2009. The PCB would then in June 2008 elect a Chair/ Vice-Chair until 31 December 2008 with the tacit understanding that the same Chair/ Vice-Chair would be re-elected for the full calendar year of 2009 at the second PCB meeting in 2008.



25. To facilitate the work for Member States, regional groups and the Secretariat, there should be long-term planning regarding the officers of the Boards, i.e. Chair, Vice-Chair and rapporteur. This is not, at this stage, to propose any changes to the current selection process but rather a better application of the existing system.

26. However, as already mentioned above in the section on the constituency system, questions were raised during consultations on the division of labour between New York and Geneva and in this regard also if it would be possible to change the system, thereby giving Geneva a more direct role to propose and decide on, for example, candidates for the Board, decisions later on to be endorsed by ECOSOC in New York, etc.

## **XII. Number and status of PCB members and observers**

27. During the consultation process, the NGOs delegations made recommendations, with reference to the review of the NGO role in the PCB, for a full and equitable role in the PCB. The delegation also proposed one additional seat for people living with HIV/AIDS.

28. Several Member States indicate their preference of not changing the number of Board members, but rather to improve efficacy of working methods, including a constituency system.

29. Views were also expressed that there should be a reduction in the number of co-sponsors on the UNAIDS' Board, thereby underlining that there is sufficient trust and mutual accountability among co-sponsors and the Secretariat. A "troika" arrangement was mentioned as one possible way of doing this, i.e. the current CCO Chair, the previous Chair and the forthcoming one, being the only co-sponsors on the Board.

30. "As already noted under item III" (Participation of key partners), a major change of the current governance structure of UNAIDS is not foreseen at this stage since this could imply renegotiation of the ECOSOC mandate in establishing UNAIDS (ECOSOC resolution 1994/24). Since this paper does not introduce any changes in governance structure, other solutions have been sought to facilitate broader participation at the PCB, in particular the introduction of the thematic segment open to a wider groups of stakeholders. Both the questions of size of PCB and status of PCB members and observers would need further deliberations and more thorough discussions.