

SUMMARY OF THE MULTI-STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION ON THE FURTHER TRANSITION AND INTEGRATION OF UNAIDS INTO THE UN SYSTEM AND BEYOND

Additional documents for this item: Interim Report of the PCB Working Group (UNAIDS/PCB(58)/26.17)

Action required at this meeting—the Programme Coordinating Board is invited to:

- *Consider* the Interim report of the Working Group on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN System and beyond (UNAIDS/PCB/58/26.17);
- Taking these considerations into account and recalling decision points 7.3e and 7.6 of the 57th meeting of the Programme Coordinating Board in December 2025, *look forward* to the presentation of the final plan for the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond, at a fully virtual half-day Special Session of the PCB to be held on 26 October 2026;

Cost implications for the implementation of the decisions: none

Table of contents

Executive Summary:.....	4
Opening and framing by the PCB Chair	5
Framing remarks by the UNAIDS Executive Director.....	5
Presentation by Co-Facilitators.....	6
Input from stakeholders	8
Closing remarks.....	18

UNEDITED

Executive Summary:

1. On 12 May 2026, 251 PCB members and stakeholders participated in a multistakeholder consultation convened by the Bureau of the UNAIDS Programme Coordination Board (Board), pursuant to the Board's decision 7.6 from its 57th meeting, which requested the PCB Bureau to "organize appropriate and inclusive consultations of the Working Group, open to all PCB members and stakeholders, ahead of the scheduled Programme Coordinating Board meetings to inform and guide the Working Group, taking into account the discussions in the UN80 initiative." The consultation was designed to support the work of the Board's *Working Group on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond*, which was approved by the Board at its 57th meeting December 2025 and created by the Bureau pursuant to the approval of the Working Group's Terms of Reference by the PCB in February 2026.
2. The Working Group's Terms of Reference¹ task it with: (1) outlining steps to transition and integrate the Joint Programme's multisectoral capacity and the inter-related core functions of the Secretariat; (2) proposing a United Nations-mandated governance model that preserves the role of communities and civil society and ensures the United Nations continued coordination, accountability and leadership of the HIV response; (3) developing a funding model to sustain the proposed governance model; and (4) articulating a forward-looking and evidence-based timeline for transition and integration. Under the Board's decisions from its 57th meeting, the Working Group is to present an interim report on its work to the Board, through the Bureau, for consideration at the Board's 58th meeting, and a final report, through the Bureau, for consideration at a special session of the Board no later than the end of October 2026.
3. The Working Group's Terms of Reference mandate a consultative approach, including the convening of multistakeholder consultations by the Bureau, ahead of the scheduled Programme Coordinating Board meetings, to inform and guide of the Working Group. The objectives of the first multistakeholder consultation held on 12 May 2026 were to:
 - a) Gather stakeholder perspectives on how the multisectoral capacity and expertise of the Joint Programme and the Secretariat's core functions can be integrated into relevant entities of the United Nations development system and beyond;
 - b) Identify what type of United Nations-mandated governance arrangements are required to ensure continued political leadership and accountability, advocacy, coordination, and preserve the role of communities and civil society as mandated by the United Nations Economic and Social Council (1995/2).
 - c) Gather stakeholder perspectives on a realistic, evidence-based, and inclusive timeline for the transition and integration process. The timeline should ensure continuity in the implementation of the core functions and minimize disruptions at a time of significant change and instability in the United Nations system.

¹ Terms of Reference of the PCB Working Group:

https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2026/PCB58_Terms_Of_Reference_PCB_Working_Group

4. The Working Group received extensive feedback during the Bureau-convened consultation. Speakers came from all regions and included implementing countries, donors, multilateral partners (including entities of the United Nations and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria), communities and civil society, including people living with HIV and representatives of key and priority populations. In addition to more than 50 interventions during the consultation, 26 written submissions were received following the consultation.
5. The Working Group used the inputs during the multistakeholder consultation to inform and guide its work towards producing its interim report. A second multistakeholder consultation will occur prior to the Working Group's presentation of a final report at the Board's special session in October 2026.

Opening and framing by the PCB Chair

6. The Chair of the Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) (Netherlands) welcomed participants to the multistakeholder consultation. Following a moment of silence in memory of people who have died of AIDS-related causes, the Chair outlined the agenda, flow and ground rules for the consultation.
7. The Chair noted that the consultation was occurring to support the Working Group in fulfilling its mandate (under decision 7.3d from the [57th PCB meeting](#)) to provide an "interim report on the plan including a timeline for the further integration and transition of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond, in coherence with the UN80 Initiative" for consideration by the PCB at its 58th meeting. The Chair described the four deliverables of the Working Group, as set out in the Working Group's [Terms of Reference](#). Noting the emphasis in the Terms of Reference on a consultative approach to development of the Working Group's interim and final reports, the Chair noted the objectives of the multistakeholder consultation (see Executive Summary).
8. In the opening framing remarks, the Chair said that "transition" of UNAIDS does not mean the "sunsetting" of the global HIV response or changing the United Nation's mandate on HIV. Rather, transition aims to ensure that the global HIV response remains sustainable and fit for purpose in a changing environment, including fiscal pressures and innovations that are shaping the response. In this continually changing environment, the Chair noted the importance of rethinking how the HIV response can contribute to deliver impact and ensure accountability under new circumstances. The Chair encouraged a focus on how to preserve the unique value and attributes of the UN response to HIV and to ensure more sustainable approaches focused on country ownership.

Framing remarks by the UNAIDS Executive Director

9. UNAIDS Executive Director, Winnie Byanyima, noted that the PCB Bureau is the only such UN board where most affected communities have a seat and are part of setting the agenda for the Board. At a time of shrinking civic space, including the closure of many community-led organizations working in the HIV response, she said it was important to ensure that any transition avoid further diminishing the role of communities and civil society. The Executive Director cited the need to ensure that communities in the HIV

response continue to benefit from the UN mandate from the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). She said maintenance of the role of communities and civil society in governance is “not negotiable.”

10. The Executive Director cited numerous headwinds confronting the global HIV response, including the rise in anti-rights laws and policies and a breakdown in the traditional aid model. Twenty-eight countries in Africa are now spending more on debt servicing than health. In the midst of these challenges, UNAIDS is receiving reports of rising new HIV infections, increased loss to follow-up for HIV services and other signs of reversal of many of the HIV-related advances made to date.
11. The Executive Director emphasized the inter-related nature of the four core functions² of the UNAIDS Secretariat. These functions, she said, must be delivered in a coherent and accountable way. She noted that the Working Group is now exploring how these functions can be delivered by the UN system during a system-wide transformation that preserves what matters most. The Executive Director cautioned about the potential of unintended harm as a result of transition, underscoring the need to identify a safe landing that ensures continuity of services, countries’ access to coordination and political support, and meaningful support for community-led responses.
12. The past 10 months, the Executive Director noted, has been a period of radical change in the Joint Programme, including the approval and implementation of a revised operating model. Human resources within the Secretariat have been cut by 55%.
13. At the same time that UNAIDS itself has transformed, the UN80 initiative is exploring how the UN system as a whole can adapt to a rapidly changing global environment. Major changes are occurring across the UN system and not only within UNAIDS. One potential “direction of travel” for the future UN response to HIV is to move towards the integration of a senior HIV leader in Resident Coordinator’s offices. Among its many areas of work, the UN80 initiative is working to define how best to host entities in the Resident Coordinator’s office.
14. The Executive Director looked forward to the deliberations at the multistakeholder consultation and expressed confidence that these inputs would help the Working Group frame its interim report to the PCB. The Executive Director has agreed with UNDP, Chair of the Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations (CCO), that the upcoming meeting of heads of agency would focus on the interim report to enable the Joint Programme to relay its effective thinking to the PCB at its 58th meeting.

Presentation by Co-Facilitators

15. Working Group Co-Facilitator Fionnuala Murphy, a member of the PCB NGO delegation, reminded participants of the four deliverables outlined in the Working Group’s Terms of Reference. Ms Murphy described the working modalities of the Working Group, noting that Working Group members as of the time of the consultation had convened for eight

² The four core functions, as endorsed by the PCB, are (1) leadership and advocacy; (2) convening and coordination; (3) accountability through data, targets, strategy; and (4) community engagement.

meetings, during which they gathered information from the UNAIDS Secretariat, Cosponsors, community and civil society representatives, and donors. The Working Group also commissioned work on numerous issues, including protocols for civil society engagement in hosted partnerships and global health initiatives and the ongoing work of the UN80 initiative.

16. Ms Murphy noted that the Working Group had begun coalescing around a few key findings, all of which are preliminary and subject to change. She said the Working Group looked forward to hearing the thoughts of stakeholders on the scope of work outlined in the Terms of Reference, with particular attention to the first two deliverables.
17. Deliverable 1 focuses on preserving the UN's expertise and capacity on HIV and the core functions of the UNAIDS Secretariat. Ms Murphy said the Working Group agreed that transformation of the Joint Programme must happen, but that sunsetting the Joint Programme by the end of this year is not an option. An emerging convergence within the Working Group, she said, is to look towards transitioning the UNAIDS Secretariat to a smaller UN-based hub, with the core functions maintained. It is particularly important that multisectoral HIV data analysis, political leadership and accountability, advocacy, coordination, and support to communities be preserved in any transition. It was noted that both implementing countries as well as communities and civil society expressed a desire during the Working Group's meetings for the UN to remain active as a leader on HIV at both national and global levels.
18. The Working Group formulated three questions to guide stakeholders' input on Deliverable 1 during the consultation:
 - a) How should the critical functions best be organized at country, regional and global levels, either within or beyond the UN system?
 - b) How a hosted leadership hub or similar central structure would preserve political leadership and accountability, advocacy, multisectoral HIV data analysis, coordination and support to communities, and what options exist for where such a structure might be hosted?
 - c) What are the options for country presence integration – support to national responses and integration in Resident Coordinator system or alternatives?
19. Co-Facilitator Joe Phaahla, Deputy Minister of Health of South Africa, addressed the Working Group's second deliverable, which is to propose a governance model appropriate for the transition recommended in Deliverable 1, in a manner that allows preservation of the role of communities and civil society and ensures the continued coordination, accountability and leadership of the HIV response by the UN system. The Working Group agrees that HIV continues to require political solutions in an increasingly difficult global political environment. The Working Group further agrees that the governance function of whatever emerges from the transformation of the UN's response must preserve community participation and maintain coordination, leadership and accountability of the response.
20. To guide stakeholders' interventions with respect to Deliverable 2, the Working Group proposed two guiding questions:

- a) What other governance models could preserve the UN mandate, multisectoral coordination, community and civil society inclusion and human rights accountability at the level currently provided by the PCB?
 - b) How can each governance function (oversight, accountability, consensus building, political mobilization, monitoring, normative stewardship) be preserved or adapted within a post-integration setting?
21. Co-Facilitator Bob Rae, former Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Canada to the UN and former President of ECOSOC, described the Working Group's third and fourth deliverables – how to fund any future governance model and to articulate a timeline for transformation, with milestones for the transition and integration process. It was noted that the Working Group's progress is less advanced on these two deliverables than on Deliverables 1 and 2.
22. To guide discussions on Deliverables 3 and 4 and on issues that cut across all four deliverables, the Working Group proposed the following guiding questions:
- a) What are the relative strengths, weaknesses and risks of some of the different options discussed today? Which safeguards or risk mitigation measures must be in place to ensure minimum disruption to the HIV response and the UN's role before any transition steps begin?
 - b) Which mechanisms can ensure adequate, dedicated resources and technical and policy support for key populations and vulnerable groups and their meaningful engagement in the AIDS response?

Input from stakeholders

28. The PCB Chair noted that interventions during the consultation would be limited to two minutes each. The Chair opened the floor for interventions, beginning with Deliverable 1.

Deliverable 1

29. Several Member States and Observer NGOs cited the importance of preserving the UN's capacity and leadership on HIV. Speakers cited the need to preserve the core functions of the Secretariat under the revised operating model. One PCB NGO delegation member said the focus should be preserving the key features of the HIV response rather than merely identifying locations for different functions. Several observer NGOs warned against reorganizing UNAIDS for the primary purpose of achieving efficiencies, without taking into account preservation of the core functions of UNAIDS as a joint programme, including its multisectoral approach and leadership on efforts to remove punitive laws. Another observer NGO said restructuring must not weaken the HIV response and that particular efforts are needed to protect community leadership and funding, preserve human rights, strengthen accountability, ensure continuity of HIV services, institutionalize community-led monitoring and ensure national ownership while safeguarding global solidarity and support. Several speakers said the critical functions of the Joint Programme must remain coordinated, with any restructuring avoiding the potential fragmentation of leadership and accountability mechanisms. Cautioning that people's

lives depend on decisions made about the future of the UN's HIV response, one NGO stakeholder urged that transition approaches avoid having HIV become invisible or disconnected from broader social and human rights, including gender. Preserving the UNAIDS advocacy role was cited by several NGO stakeholders, with an emphasis placed on the continued need for political solutions that take account of the reality that HIV not only a health issue but also a development and justice issue. Several speakers highlighted the role UNAIDS plays in supporting Global Fund processes, including engagement of communities and support for community-led interventions.

30. Speakers discussed possibility of transitioning the Secretariat to a smaller, UN-based hub. Some Member States and observer NGOs expressed openness to this proposal. One Member State said it was reasonable to explore a possible transition to a smaller UN-based hub provided that such an arrangement safeguards the core capacity and political role and mandate of UNAIDS. Another Member State indicated it was open to the option of having Secretariat functions hosted within a larger multilateral entity, but it cautioned against allowing political guardianship of the HIV response to be lost in the process of integrating towards Universal Health Coverage. A Member State recommended having a dedicated, modestly sized coordination hub with a clear mandate on HIV to preserve political leadership, multisectoral coordination, accountability, strategic advocacy and the meaningful participation of affected communities. One NGO speaker said any HIV hub should provide political leadership and advocacy; preserve global accountability; retain multisectoral HIV data analysis; maintain coordination across Cosponsors, governments, donors and communities; and provide structured support to communities. Hosting of any such hub, it was submitted, "must not become absorption, and integration must not become invisibility." A multilateral partner expressed openness to integration of HIV in the Resident Coordinator's office but noted that the office would need to be held accountable to take on this additional coordinating function, be sufficiently resourced and tethered to a central global UNAIDS hub for strategic direction. An observer NGO said integration into the Resident Coordinator system should not weaken dedicated HIV expertise or reduce direct engagement with communities. In the view of one NGO observer, any new leadership hub could work only if it is carefully designed with strong governance, independent authority and meaningful community participation, cautioning against taking steps that could result in greater fragmentation and reduced accountability in the response. One NGO stakeholder said an option that might avoid single-agency "capture" of a hosted entity might involve a revolving, inter-agency consortium model, although the organization noted that this approach could include considerable coordination costs and reduce organizational agility.
31. Numerous speakers stressed the importance of retaining a centralized global hub for coordination, leadership and accountability. One NGO emphasized the importance of a dedicated HIV coordination and accountability function at global level as well as maintenance of a strong coordinating and technical support mechanism at the regional level. Separately, another observer NGO noted the inter-related nature of the four core functions of UNAIDS and recommended a centralized hub or entity for stewardship of the Global AIDS Strategy and Political Declaration targets; strategic information and accountability functions, including community-led monitoring and legal/policy monitoring; global advocacy on human rights, stigma, discrimination, criminalization and gender

equality; coordination of multisectoral UN action; and formalized engagement of civil society and communities. Another NGO speaker submitted that moves towards further transition and integration should ensure the availability of qualified counterparts and experts at global level on key issues and for each key and priority population.

32. Where a new global hub might be housed was a focus of several comments. One Member State and one observer NGO suggested the Office of the UN Secretary-General as an appropriate venue for such a hub. One observer NGO warned that transition of UNAIDS regional hubs to UNDP or other UN regional offices risks subordinating HIV-specific expertise to broader development priorities. One observer NGO said any new hub should prioritize HIV prevention.
33. However, several stakeholders expressed reservations about changes to the revised operating model of UNAIDS. One observer NGO urged retention of the “singularity” of UNAIDS, submitting that UNAIDS should be ended only when AIDS is ended as a public health threat. Another observer NGO said it had not seen “a single evidence-based technical document” showing why UNAIDS should be closed or sunset. Warning against treating the closure of UNAIDS as a “done deal,” this NGO representative said UNAIDS must be allowed to continue at least through 2030. Another NGO speaker said “we cannot sunset UNAIDS when it is also sunrise for HIV in Africa,” citing UNAIDS as a key source of advocacy for human rights in Africa and as a pivotal supporter of community-led responses. Numerous speakers emphasized the importance of retaining a mandate from ECOSOC for any future arrangement for the UN’s response to HIV. An NGO speaker said that engagement with key populations does not “integrate naturally” into the Resident Coordinator model.
34. Several NGO speakers said the time was not appropriate for major changes to the model for the UN’s response to HIV. An observer NGO noted that a new UN Secretary-General will assume office at the beginning of 2027 and that a major transition for UNAIDS should not be pursued in a rushed manner and in the current political climate. Another observer NGO recommended that exploration of further transition and integration not be dominated by the larger politics of the UN80 agenda and take seriously the threat of a resurgence of HIV.
35. UNAIDS’ role in supporting community engagement in decision-making and community-led responses was highlighted by numerous speakers, who urged that further transition and integration avoid diminishing the role of communities and civil society. One Member State underscored the importance of retaining the UNAIDS governance model, especially with respect to the role of communities and civil society. Another Member State suggested that the UN support countries in implementing social contracting for non-state actors. Several speakers lauded UNAIDS’ country-level presence for its willingness to address issues affecting key populations, including the recent rise in anti-gay stigma and discrimination in Senegal. It was noted that UNAIDS is one of the few international fora where communities are actively engaged as formal parts of the decision-making process. For many communities and civil society organizations, UNAIDS remains the primary trusted point of entry to the UN system. One observer NGO cited UNAIDS’ “unique role” as a bridge between governments and key populations and urged that any integration into the Resident Coordinator offices formally adopt and

actively implement this approach moving forward. Noting that the prioritization of HIV has diminished, one NGO observer called on the UN to support community systems and community-led responses. Another NGO speaker urged that civil society be supported to carry on much of the work of UNAIDS if the Joint Programme is sunsetted. An NGO partner urged that country-level coordination remain close to communities and integrated across key sectors, that regional structures strengthen technical support and coordination, and that at global level political leadership, strategic data analysis, advocacy and community engagement remain visible, independent and adequately resourced. Several speakers noted the importance of ensuring the full, active and meaningful engagement of people living with HIV.

36. Several speakers cited the rise of anti-rights and anti-gender movements throughout the world as an important contextual backdrop that should inform consideration of options for further transition and integration. An observer NGO cited the rise of anti-gender and anti-rights movement in recommending continuation of UNAIDS' "crucial work, especially with top leaders." Several NGO stakeholders urged that any transition include a clearly articulated protection and accountability framework for key populations.
37. Strategies for further transition and integration of country-level coordination and leadership were discussed. Speakers stressed the importance of a differentiated approach with respect to further integration and transition at country level and also said further transition and integration should prioritize preservation of leadership on removing punitive laws. Several speakers, including both Member States and observer NGOs, suggested openness to the integration of senior HIV advisers in Resident Coordinator's offices. Several speakers cautioned that safeguards would be needed in such case to prevent HIV from becoming merely one issue among many and lose urgency within the UN. It was observed that the revised operating model already anticipates differentiated approaches for different country settings. In addition to embedding HIV expertise into the Resident Coordinator system, models for country-level coordination suggested by NGO speakers, included joint UN country team HIV coordination platforms, regional technical support teams tasked with serving multiple countries, and hybrid models. Any new model for country-level coordination, it submitted, should ensure continuity of support for national HIV strategic planning, community systems strengthening, key population programming, human rights and stigma reduction interventions, HIV data collection and accountability, resource mobilization and donor coordination.
38. Leadership on harm reduction and drug decriminalization was cited by some speakers as a non-negotiable requirement for further transition and integration. UNAIDS, it was submitted by one observer NGO, plays a "uniquely important role" in providing leadership on harm reduction, in advocating for decriminalization of drug use, and in recognizing civil society as indispensable partners in the response, with the speaker stating that no other single entity in the UN has the capacity to continue the harm reduction work currently undertaken by UNAIDS. UNAIDS, it was submitted by another observer NGO, is one of the few actors within the UN system to make the case that punitive legal environments impede effective national responses, issuing the first-ever guidance note on the decriminalization of drugs. This leadership, the NGO said, has been possible only because of the multisectoral approach of UNAIDS.

39. In closing the discussion on Deliverable 1, Ms Murphy, Co-Facilitator, noted concerns expressed by stakeholders regarding the risks of fragmentation and the importance of maintaining coordination, linkages and synergies between the four core functions of UNAIDS. She noted that some stakeholders had indicated that now is not the right time to be having discussions on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS. The importance of UNAIDS in promoting community leadership was noted by stakeholders, as was the willingness of UNAIDS to engage publicly on human rights issues, including protecting key population communities in hostile environments. Ms Murphy noted that stakeholders cited UNAIDS' role in supporting development of UNAIDS grants and the importance of the strategic multisectoral data function, including the importance of community-led monitoring. The substantial number of comments regarding UNAIDS' role in promoting harm reduction was noted, and Ms Murphy suggested the Working Group might benefit from a specific briefing on this issue.
40. Mr Rae, Co-Facilitator, echoed many of the summary points provided by Ms Murphy, including fears that AIDS will rebound due to a decrease in funding and an increasingly hostile environment in many countries. As these challenges intensify and proliferate, there are genuine challenges in ensuring that the global system can respond to this crisis in new, innovative and optimally effective ways. A key challenge in moving forward, Mr Rae said, is sustaining donor support, which in turn will depend on creating a more effective response that can attract needed investments. As the AIDS challenge is not going away, sunseting the strategy to deal with AIDS is not an option.

Deliverable 2

41. The Chair invited stakeholders to provide comments on Deliverable 2, reminding participants of the guiding questions for the deliverable. Should there be further consideration of transitioning the Secretariat to a UN-based hub, a multilateral partner recommended exploration of options for using the ECOSOC mandate in a hosted platform, stating that absorption of UNAIDS into another UN agency, without taking on the unique UNAIDS governance structure, risks losing some of the unique value of the unique UNAIDS governance model.
42. Several speakers emphasized the importance of preserving the role of communities and civil society in governance. For example, an observer NGO urged that any future governance structure preserve political coordination and accountability functions, place communities at the centre, and prioritize the promotion and protection of human rights. Governments and civil society, it was submitted, rely on UNAIDS to open doors that are otherwise closed to them. A PCB NGO delegate, also addressing governance questions, noted that the PCB model is unique within the UN system, with communities and civil society serving not as observers but as ECOSOC-mandate members who contribute to decision-making. Another NGO also emphasized the importance of community inclusion, citing UNAIDS as "one of the few places within the UN" where communities are treated with equality. One NGO stakeholder said it was "not tenable" to diminish the role civil society currently holds in PCB governance and it submitted that transfer of core functions from the Secretariat should occur only once further progress has been made in attaining epidemic control. An observer NGO, also noting the importance of prioritizing community and civil society engagement, highlighted UNAIDS' strong alignment with partners

(including the Global Fund) and encouraged greater focus on UN advocacy and support for HIV responses in eastern Europe and central Asia, where new HIV acquisitions are on the rise. Another NGO urged steps to ensure that community and civil society participation is meaningful rather than symbolic, while a separate NGO stakeholder urged maintenance of community participation in decision-making as part of an inclusive, rights-based and multisectoral response. Another NGO cited the PCB as a “vital democratic stronghold” and cautioned against diluting the input and expertise of key and priority populations, and yet another NGO submitted that governance models of Cosponsoring agencies do not meet the same standards as UNAIDS governance and encouraged the Working Group to recommend full and equal voting rights to non-state actors. An NGO stakeholder cited the importance of joint accountability in maintaining the credibility of the Joint Programme and encouraged steps to preserve coordination, the integrity of community engagement in governance, multisectoral accountability and data independence. Another NGO stakeholder opposed “replacing the PCB model with purely intergovernmental or agency-led governance,” which in its view would represent a “major regression in participation, accountability and legitimacy,” and it said any structure “must retain dedicated convening authority across health, human rights, development and community sectors.”

43. A Member State stressed the importance of the PCB model, especially in the midst of a growing pushback on human rights and gender. The same Member State said UNAIDS should not give up that role and emphasized the importance of an ECOSOC mandate for the inclusion of communities and civil society in governance. Another Member State also emphasized the importance of expanding civic space for the meaningful engagement and leadership of communities and civil society. One Member State noted the importance of preserving multisectoral coordination in any model for further transition of integration and encouraged any future country-level coordination to ensure the availability of technical support for national AIDS coordinating bodies as places where communities can find a home. Another Member State emphasized the need for any new governance model to ensure the meaningful participation of civil society and affected communities in decision-making and also recommended a stronger role for UNDP in further work under the Global Partnership for action to eliminate all forms of HIV-related stigma and discrimination.
44. Various possible future governance models were discussed. Focusing on country-level governance, one Member State called for establishment of a national multistakeholder oversight body in the inclusive spirit of the Global Fund’s Country Coordinating Mechanisms, UN-mandated stewardship under the direction of the Resident Coordinator’s office, and support for the integration of social contracting to support communities and civil society. The same Member State encouraged future governance to move beyond HIV-only towards HIV-inclusive governance, institutionalizing the roles of key populations and people living with HIV in the fabric of national public health and financing systems. A number of observer NGOs suggested the establishment of a UN-mandated Global HIV Coordination and Accountability Council, including a constituency model that ensures voting rights for community and civil society representatives. Under this model, it was submitted, operational coordination would be decentralized across UN entities according to their comparative advantage, with overall strategic oversight, accountability and multisectoral leadership centralized through the Council and a small

technical secretariat. Another NGO also suggested exploration of a hybrid governance platform linked to the UN Resident Coordinator system and a multisectoral global HIV and health equity platform, while another NGO submitted that one possible governance model would be a multi-stakeholder platform within the UN system that guarantees equal and meaningful participation of civil society and community representatives alongside Member States and UN agencies. Another NGO highlighted the need for any governance mechanism for a UN-mandated board of successor mechanism maintain a results framework that tracks progress across all key elements of the global HIV response. To the extent a smaller Secretariat or leaner HIV-housed hub is implemented, one multilateral partner said scaled-back governance appropriate to the new scope of the centralized coordinating body may be appropriate, with governance functions fulfilled through a matrix of global, regional and country actions. One way forward for global-level coordination and leadership, one NGO speaker suggested, might be a strengthened interagency model jointly led by UNAIDS, the Office of UN High Commissioner on Human Rights, UN Women, WHO and other relevant UN agencies. Another NGO stakeholder, citing the unique model of the PCB structure within the UN system, suggested exploration of a dedicated high-level oversight board for any future leadership hub or successor structure, suggesting exploration of such key questions as the number of seats dedicated to civil society, voting rules, and whether the body has genuine oversight authority or is merely advisory. Hybrid models might also be considered. Models suggested by other NGOs included reforming and retaining a PCB-like governance body, establishing an ECOSOC-mandated independent multisectoral oversight council or joint governing body within the UN system, creating a hybrid governance platform with formal voting and participation rights for civil society and communities, and convening an annual global HIV accountability forum that brings together broader stakeholders, including communities, national AIDS authorities, regional bodies, donors, the Global Fund, PEPFAR, technical partners, and civil society networks.

45. Several Member States expressed concerns regarding possible future changes in governance of the UN's HIV response. One Member State recommended that the current governance model be allowed to continue to function, using a step-by-step approach to identify ways to evolve the model as reforms are implemented. For any Secretariat functions that are transferred to Cosponsors, the Member State suggested a multisectoral steering committee, including the most affected communities and people living with HIV, to ensure the accountability of Cosponsors in carrying forward their new duties.
46. Several NGO informants asked the Working Group to take account of the practical effects of moving to a new governance model. One NGO positioned current discussions on the future of the global HIV response as a "political fight" and expressed skepticism that governments would on their own assume responsibility for functions currently performed by UNAIDS. Another recommended that discussions on the further transition and integration recognize the impact of decisions on the lives of people affected by HIV and take into account the hostility experienced by key populations from their governments in many parts of the world. One observer NGO recommended the carrying forward of the ECOSOC mandate and the PCB model of governance, citing the UN mandate as the only institutional protection for many key population partners. Another NGO stakeholder encouraged the Working Group to use a reality test to explore future

governance arrangements, observing that countries in eastern Europe and central Asia are not presently prepared to implement a well-integrated HIV response within comprehensive national health and community-led systems. Any new model must preserve strong multisectoral coordination, meaningful community participation, and accountability grounded in human rights.

47. Following the remarks, Mr Phaahla, Co-Facilitator, thanked stakeholders for their interventions on Deliverable 2 and observed that a common theme was the non-negotiable requirement of institutionalized engagement of civil society in governance. He noted that stakeholders emphasized the importance of civil society's active involvement in decision-making and that any new hub should protect these governance-related achievements of the global HIV response.
48. Ms Murphy, Co-Facilitator, noted that civil society involvement in the PCB was the "global gold standard" for inclusive governance, emphasizing that civil society involvement was not merely good practice but key to protecting and promoting human rights. Comments from stakeholders, Ms Murphy said, indicated that the Working Group needs to further investigate the question of the ECOSOC mandate. Other comments of note concerned improving the governance alignment between UNAIDS and the Global Fund and raising the priority level for regions where new HIV acquisitions are increasing.
49. Mr Rae, Co-Facilitator, also observed the agreement among stakeholders on the importance of preserving the role of civil society and communities in decision-making. Civil society has been key to the progress made to date in the global HIV response, and taking the fight against AIDS to the next stage will require the full participation of civil society.
50. Hilar Talentos said the PCB "serves as a vital democratic stronghold" that empowers grassroots organizers to challenge stigma and punitive legal frameworks directly." According to Hilar Talentos' written submission, "Rather than dissolving this unique structure, the UN80 process should replicate its successes to strengthen other agencies." RedLac Trans emphasized the importance of having a governance model that ensures a permanent channel of communication with communities and civil society.

Deliverables 3 and 4

51. The Chair invited stakeholders to provide input with respect to Deliverables 3 and 4 and the cross-cutting questions posed by the Working Group. A PCB Member State began the final session by requesting that the Working Group analyze different country settings to promote a better understanding of who does what among UN partners. An observer NGO submitted that UNAIDS is a leader of UN reform efforts, citing global health as one of the international community's few clear success stories in the 21st century. One Member State warned against relegating HIV to the "back of the global agenda," while another focused its written comments regarding this deliverable on the importance of ensuring robust domestic financing for key population programming. Another Member State said a "modestly sized but clearly identifiable central hub" appeared to be the best option for further transition and integration. Numerous NGO stakeholders and at least one Member State emphasized the importance of preserving the key elements of the

HIV response that have made it unique and successful, including prioritization of human rights, gender equality, community participation, and the fight against stigma and discrimination.

52. Ensuring that further transition and integration addresses the needs of key and priority populations was the focus of numerous comments. Numerous stakeholders called for any new financing model to include “ring-fenced” funding to support community-led responses, with specific attention to responses led by key and priority populations and people living with HIV. A PCB NGO Delegate Amrita Sarkar submitted that any future structure for the global HIV response should address people who are being left behind. Another NGO representative expressed concerns that transition could dilute accountability, political urgency and dedicated attention to the needs of communities affected by HIV, stressing the importance of ensuring that the engagement of communities and civil society be meaningful rather than symbolic and that technical leadership on HIV and closely related issues such as gender equality not be allowed to be hidden within other structures or systems. A multilateral partner highlighted the challenges of ensuring meaningful financing for the work of key and priority populations and suggested that country-level social contracting and a global-level funding set-aside for engagement of key and priority populations and civil society within any emerging global platform should be explored. The multilateral partner cautioned against having the unique UNAIDS governance inadvertently overtaken by a host UN agency in a manner that diminishes the key role of communities and civil society. One NGO speaker encouraged adherence to human rights principles in steps towards further transition and integration, with care taken to ensure that key and priority populations are not further marginalized.
53. Numerous speakers addressed the timeline for further transition and integration, with strong recommendations that steps be taken gradually and deliberately. One PCB Member State recommended that timelines recommended by the Working Group emerge as a consequence of a well-defined transition strategy and cautioned against relying on arbitrary deadlines. One NGO called for a “coherent and ethical timeline” that allows UNAIDS to transition after AIDS has been ended. Another NGO called for a “phased transition with clear milestones and accountability mechanisms,” while another NGO speaker stressed the importance of transparency during a phased transition. One NGO advised that the transition should “proceed gradually”, be guided by evidence, and subject to regular independent review, citing the dangers of “a potentially destabilizing restructuring during an already fragile moment for the global HIV response.” Another warned against “abrupt structural changes,” encouraging a phased transition approach. Yet another NGO said the process of transition should be “gradual, transparent, adequately resourced, and guided by meaningful consultation with civil society and communities at all levels.” Another NGO objected to a timeline focused on the UN80 calendar, noting that the “HIV response has taken decades to build the community trust, the data infrastructure, and the political relationships that make it function. These cannot be reconstructed quickly.” Instead, the speaker encouraged the Working Group to commission an independent comparative analysis of analogous transitions to obtain insights into how these processes have affected community and civil society participation in the UN context.

54. Reviewing the risks and benefits of various transition options, speakers emphasized the importance of having safeguards in place before transition occurs. One PCB Member State Cambodia suggested implementation of a three-year “shadow budget” whereby domestic funds gradually replace donor funds, with the UN system shifting from “doing” to “stewardship” following effective integration of HIV in national systems and budgets. Possible safeguards mentioned by NGO stakeholders include a clear UN mandate; protected community and civil society representation with agenda-making power; continued support to national AIDS responses; clarity regarding the Division of Labour among UN agencies; a clear and robust accountability framework; protection of human rights and gender equality mandates across the UN system; continued commitment to a multisectoral response; a formal impact assessment in each country to guide and inform further transition and integration; protections to ensure continuity of HIV service access; and measures to protect and “ring-fence” the UN system’s technical capacity on HIV. Numerous stakeholders highlighted the importance of community-led monitoring and urged that further transition and integration protect and strengthen this approach.
55. Stakeholders expressed concerns regarding the potential over-medicalization of HIV in the context of further transition and integration. One observer NGO cautioned against allowing the HIV response to become “detached from its social justice, human rights and community foundations.” Another NGO said the most significant long-term risks to the global HIV response were posed by the transfer of HIV coordination to WHO or another single UN agency, due to the risk of medicalization of the HIV response.
56. One NGO noted that while various integration options have the potential to improve efficiency, coordination and alignment with the broader development agenda (including the push to achieve Universal Health Coverage), it was also important to avoid allowing the HIV response to “reduce political visibility, dedicated expertise, and community-centred approaches within larger systems.” Another NGO the strongest transition option appears to be a “managed integration model,” with country coordination embedded in the Resident Coordinator system, technical expertise distributed across pertinent UN agencies, and a UN mandate retained.
57. Several comments also addressed questions regarding the future financing model for the UN’s response to HIV. One NGO, citing the steady decline in voluntary contributions to UNAIDS in recent years, encouraged exploration of assessed financing from Member States or a dedicated window within the Global Fund or other pooled financing mechanisms to ensure sufficient funding for any new governance model.
58. Speaking on behalf of Cosponsors, UNDP reaffirmed Cosponsors’ commitment to the UN’s mandate on HIV, citing the Global AIDS Strategy as Cosponsors’ “North Star.” Further transition and integration, she said, must be phased, function-driven and preserve the Joint Programme’s core functions, each of which must be delivered with clear coordination, strategic focus, meaningful community engagement, and grounded in human rights and gender equality.
59. Following the remarks of stakeholders during the consultation, Ms Murphy, Co-Facilitator, encouraged participants to submit written interventions following the consultation. Ms Murphy said she was struck by a number of interventions, including

UNDP's emphasis on the future of the coordination function, the importance of the support UNAIDS has provided for Global Fund processes and community-led services, and the anxieties and injuries experienced by communities in countries where human rights are being rolled back.

Closing remarks

60. During the closing session, the UNAIDS Executive Directors said she heard during the consultation a clear call for continued leadership of communities, including meaningful involvement of communities and civil society in future governance of the UN's support to the HIV response. She also noted the emphasis during the consultation on the Joint Programme's country presence, which provides benefits to both governments and civil society. The Executive Director noted the call of countries for a continued coordinating role for UNAIDS, with a senior UNAIDS leader and all UN team members working in coordination. She also recalled interventions during the consultation expressing concerns regarding the potential for HIV to move off the global political agenda, underscoring the need for continued leadership at both global and country levels. Ensuring that the interests of key populations and people living with HIV are not compromised emerged as an important theme of the consultation, she said.
61. The Executive Director recommended that thoughtful, deliberate steps be taken to transition the core functions of UNAIDS. The transition, she said, must be responsible, careful and adequately funded. She said UNAIDS remained committed to delivering on the ground and will not abandon the struggle to protect the health and wellbeing of people living with and affected by HIV. Confidence was expressed in the ability of the Working Group to propose solutions to take UNAIDS and the global HIV response forward.
62. The PCB Chair said that the multistakeholder consultation had been substantial and productive, and she encouraged stakeholders to provide follow-up written comments on the guiding questions proposed by the Working Group. Noting that the Working Group planned three consecutive days of meetings to reflect on the feedback from the multistakeholder consultation, the Chair encouraged stakeholders to submit their additional input in a timely manner.
63. The Chair noted that a summary of the multistakeholder consultation would be available as a conference room paper at the 58th meeting of the PCB. The Working Group was expected to share an interim report with the PCB Bureau by the end of the May, and the interim report would be posted on the UNAIDS website by the beginning of June.

[End of document]