



UNAIDS PCB BUREAU MEETING

DATE: Wednesday, 27 May 2026

TIME: 12:30–14:00 (CEST) and 16:30–17:30 (CEST)

VENUE: Hybrid (in person at UNAIDS building and virtually on Zoom)

PARTICIPANTS

Netherlands: Representing the PCB Chair: Ambassador Ms Erica Schouten, Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations; Ms Zina Olshanska, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Geneva; Ms Carolien van Embden Andres, Senior Policy Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Mr Fabian Schipper, Senior Policy Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Philippines: Representing the PCB Vice-Chair: Mr Joselito Feliciano, Executive Director of Philippine National AIDS Council; Mr Jeffrey Valdez, First Secretary, Philippine Mission in Geneva.

Kenya: Representing the PCB Rapporteur: Dr Douglas Bosire, Chief Executive Officer, National Syndemic Diseases Control Council, Ministry of Health;

Representing the PCB NGO Delegation: Ms Amanita Calderon-Cifuentes, HIV Research and Advocacy Officer, Trans Europe & Central Asia (TGEU).

UNDP: Representing the Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations: Ms Mandeep Dhaliwal, Director of the HIV and Health Group, UNDP; Ms Karin Santi, Regional Team Leader HIV, Health and Development, UNDP.

UNAIDS Secretariat: Mr Mahesh Mahalingam, Chief of Staff; Mr Morten Ussing, Director of Governance; Ms Samia Lounnas, Senior Governance Advisor; Ms Adriana Hewson, Governance Officer; Mr. Luca Kaupp, Governance Officer; Ms Saliha Ozdemir, Governance Assistant; Ms Ajwah Malik, Governance Intern; Ms Maya Salama; Governance Consultant.

Co-Facilitators (representing the PCB Working Group): Fionnuala Murphy, Joe Phaahla, Bob Rae.

MEETING AGENDA

1. **Review of the interim report of the PCB Working Group on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond:** *The Bureau will consolidate comments from Bureau members on the Interim report in preparation for the discussion with*

the Co-Facilitators of the PCB Working Group during Part II of the PCB Bureau meeting.

- 2. Discussion with the Co-Facilitators on the Interim report of the PCB Working Group on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond:** *The Bureau will present its consolidated comments and discuss with the Co-Facilitators the Interim report of the PCB Working Group.*
- 3. Discussion of next steps in preparation of the 58th Programme Coordinating Board meeting (30 June–2 July):** *The Bureau will engage with the Co-Facilitators of the PCB Working Group on the next steps to finalize the Interim report in preparation of Agenda Item 8 of the 58th Programme Coordinating Board meeting.*
- 4. Any other business**

Summary of the Meeting

The Chair welcomed Bureau members to the meeting and recalled that the draft agenda and background documents had been circulated in advance. The Chair recalled that the purpose of the first part of the Bureau meeting was to discuss the Bureau feedback on the PCB Working Group's interim report and consolidate key points for discussion with the Co-Facilitators during the second part of the meeting to help them finalize their interim report to the PCB.

The Chair welcomed that the latest UN80 Initiative Progress Report, published on 26 May, reflected greater alignment with the PCB Working Group's approach. In particular, the report refers to the approach of "transition[ing] UNAIDS and mainstream[ing] its capacity and expertise into relevant development system entities to protect the HIV response," rather than "sunsetting" UNAIDS, and confirms that work is moving steadily forward through a dedicated PCB Working Group. The report also notes that a decision on the transition of UNAIDS and the consolidation of training and research capacities is expected to be submitted to the competent UN and intergovernmental organs as anticipated.

- 1. Review of the Interim report of the PCB Working Group on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond**

The Chair recalled the following decision from the 57th PCB meeting in December 2025:

- **Decision 7.3(d):** *Requests* the PCB Bureau to mandate the Working Group to provide an interim report, on the plan including a timeline on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond, in coherence with the UN80 Initiative, through the Bureau, for the Programme Coordinating Board's consideration and decision-making at the 58th meeting of the Programme Coordinating Board in June 2026;

The Chair recalled that, in accordance with the decision of the 57th PCB and the PCB Working Group's Terms of Reference, the interim report had been shared with Bureau members in advance of the meeting for review and feedback. The Chair thanked Bureau members for their written

submissions (Annex 2), which had been consolidated by the Secretariat to support the Bureau's discussion.

Bureau members provided feedback on the interim report, drawing on both their written submissions and additional reflections shared during the meeting. Bureau members first discussed their overall assessment of the interim report before discussing the four deliverables outlined in the Terms of Reference.

Bureau members welcomed the interim report as a useful basis for discussion at the 58th PCB meeting and acknowledged the significant progress made by the PCB Working Group within a limited timeframe. They emphasized the importance of preserving the core functions of the Joint Programme: leadership and advocacy, convening and coordination, accountability and community engagement. Some Bureau members highlighted that consideration of these core functions should encompass the Joint Programme as a whole, including both the Secretariat and Cosponsors.

Bureau members also highlighted the need for greater clarity regarding the organizational options under consideration, including governance arrangements, the respective roles of the Secretariat and Cosponsors, and the proposed hub model. Some Bureau members emphasized the importance of preserving meaningful participation of communities and civil society, including people living with HIV and key populations, within any future arrangements.

Several Bureau members stressed the importance of situating the report within the broader context of declining HIV financing, ongoing UN reform efforts, including the UN80 Initiative, and the evolving global health architecture. Some Bureau members highlighted the need for differentiated approaches for varying country contexts, capacities and epidemic profiles. Several Bureau members further noted that additional elaboration of the options under consideration would be necessary before discussion of specific transition timelines could take place.

In concluding the discussion, the Chair highlighted the key points emerging from the Bureau's feedback: (i) the need for caution in discussing transition timelines before options were clearer; (ii) the importance of situating the report within the broader financing, political and UN reform context; (iii) the need for differentiation between country- and global-level dimensions of the HIV response, reflecting differing country contexts, capacities and epidemic profiles; (iv) the need for greater detail on the organizational options under consideration, including the proposed hub model; (v) clearer articulation of the respective roles of the Secretariat and Cosponsors; and (vi) improved clarity and structure in the presentation of the first two deliverables, as they are closely linked. Overall, the Chair concluded, the report would benefit from a more analytical structure to present the different options, including considerations like benefits and disadvantages, risks and stakeholder positions, in a more comprehensive manner. The Chair indicated that these points, together with the detailed written feedback submitted by Bureau members, would be shared with the Co-Facilitators for consideration in finalizing the interim report.

Bureau members acknowledged that not all comments could be incorporated before the June PCB meeting and noted that the PCB discussion would provide an important opportunity to guide the PCB Working Group in preparing its final report.

2. Discussion with the Co-Facilitators on the Interim report of the PCB Working Group on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond

The Chair welcomed the Co-Facilitators and expressed the Bureau's appreciation and respect for the work they had undertaken so far. The Chair noted that the latest UN80 Initiative Progress Report published on 26 May reflected greater alignment with the PCB Working Group's approach. In particular, the report refers to the approach of "transition[ing] UNAIDS and mainstream[ing] its capacity and expertise into relevant development system entities to protect the HIV response," rather than "sunsetting" UNAIDS, and confirms that work is moving steadily forward through a dedicated PCB Working Group. The report also notes that a decision on the transition of UNAIDS and the consolidation of training and research capacities is expected to be submitted to the competent UN and intergovernmental organs as anticipated.

The Chair explained that the Bureau had distilled some key points from its earlier discussion and would share them with the Co-Facilitators as guidance for them to finalize their report, in line with the Terms of Reference of the PCB Working Group.

The Chair presented six key points as follows:

- Give greater prominence to the structural decline in UNAIDS financing in the contextual section of the report, alongside the geopolitical context and UN80, as this is the key factor guiding this transition. The report requires a focus on realistic financing and planning.
- Refrain from specifying a transition timeline (2027–2030) at this stage, as it is not yet supported by sufficiently developed options or a concrete transition proposal.
- Greater focus on the differentiation between the country and global levels of the HIV response.
- Provide greater detail on the proposed hub model, including whether it refers solely to the Secretariat or to a broader arrangement involving both the Secretariat and Cosponsors.
- Clarify the relationship between Deliverables 1 and 2 — they should either be more clearly distinguished or considered together.
- Ensure a more balanced focus on the roles and responsibilities of the Secretariat and Cosponsors in relation to the core functions, including current functions performed by the Cosponsors.

In addition to the six key points, Bureau members raised a number of further considerations during the discussion, including:

- Greater recognition of the role of community-led systems in service delivery, monitoring, accountability, research and evidence generation, and further consideration of how these could contribute to future arrangements.
- Greater clarity regarding governance arrangements, accountability mechanisms and the meaningful participation of civil society, including people living with and affected by HIV, in future decision-making structures.

- Continued use of agreed PCB terminology, including references to key and priority populations.
- Recognition that elements of transition and transformation have already begun at country, regional and global levels, and that lessons learned from these experiences should inform future arrangements.
- Emphasis on preserving a strong central coordinating mechanism to maintain political leadership, advocacy, accountability, data and strategic coherence in the HIV response.
- Recognition that many core functions are delivered across the Joint Programme as a whole and are already shared between the Secretariat and Cosponsors, and that further consideration should be given to the current and potential future contributions of Cosponsors.
- Emphasis on safeguarding the gains made in the HIV response and ensuring that the transition process supports continued progress towards the 2030 HIV targets.

The Co-Facilitators welcomed the Bureau's feedback and indicated that they would review the issues raised and, to the extent possible, reflect them in the final version of the interim report. They noted, however, that the report remained an interim and consultative document and that some issues would require further discussion and refinement as the PCB Working Group continued its work. They emphasized that the PCB Working Group was not yet presenting final proposals or recommendations but rather seeking guidance from the PCB on the options that should be explored further.

The Co-Facilitators also welcomed the updated language in the Secretary-General's report, noting that the shift from "sunsetting" to "transitioning" UNAIDS was constructive and reflected a growing alignment in understanding of the process.

On the substantive issues raised by the Bureau, the Co-Facilitators noted that no final recommendation had been reached regarding the future organizational model and stressed that the report did not rule out any option at this stage, including the option of a downsized Secretariat. They emphasized the importance of maintaining a central focal point for the global HIV response and cautioned against approaches that would simply disperse functions across the system. They highlighted the need to preserve institutional memory, coordination, advocacy, data collection and political leadership, while recognizing that the Joint Programme extends beyond the Secretariat and includes the contributions of Cosponsors, civil society and community-led organizations. They also stressed concerns raised by stakeholders about the risks of a hurried transition and the importance of ensuring that gains made in the HIV response are not lost.

The Co-Facilitators encouraged stakeholders to continue sharing lessons learned, proposals and written inputs to inform the PCB Working Group's ongoing deliberations. They also noted the practical need for the PCB to secure resources to support the participation of the Co-Facilitators in person at the 58th PCB meeting in Geneva.

The Chair expressed the hope that the Bureau's feedback raised during the discussion could be considered, as appropriate, in the final version of the interim report. The Chair noted that the Bureau would also share its more detailed comments on the four deliverables.

The Bureau thanked the Co-Facilitators for their work and reiterated its appreciation for the progress achieved to date. The Bureau underlined the importance of ensuring that the PCB discussion provides clear guidance to support the development of the PCB Working Group's final report.

3. Discussion of next steps in preparation of the 58th Programme Coordinating Board meeting (30 June–2 July): *The Bureau will engage with the Co-Facilitators of the PCB Working Group on the next steps to finalize the Interim report in preparation of Agenda Item 8 of the 58th Programme Coordinating Board meeting.*

The Bureau discussed preparations for Agenda item 8 of the 58th PCB meeting on the interim report of the PCB Working Group, including possible modalities for the discussion. The Chair noted that four hours had been allocated for the agenda item and that the process would benefit best from interactive discussion, rather than approaching the agenda item by statements. To facilitate such substantive dialogue, the Chair proposed exploring a more interactive format that would provide guidance to the PCB Working Group for the next phase of its work.

The Co-Facilitators reiterated the importance of dialogue on this agenda item.

The Secretariat noted that further consideration would be required regarding the practical modalities for the discussion, including equal participation for in-person and online participants, interpretation requirements, breakout room arrangements and chairing responsibilities and the agreed modalities for the 58th PCB meeting.

The Secretariat also outlined the process for the development of draft decision points for Agenda Item 8 and noted the practical arrangements under discussion for the Co-Facilitators' participation in the June PCB meeting, as well as the tentative date for the Special Session of the PCB in October.

The Chair noted that further discussions would be held with the Bureau and the Secretariat on what is possible for the discussion of this agenda item at the 58th PCB meeting.

4. Any other business (AOB)

There was no other business discussed.

The Chair thanked the Bureau members for their time and closed the meeting.

Annex 1: Bureau meeting PowerPoint presentation

PCB BUREAU MEETING

27 May 2026



MEETING DRAFT AGENDA

12:30 – 14:00 (CEST)

- 1. Review of the Interim report of the PCB Working Group on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond :** *The Bureau will consolidate comments from Bureau members on the Interim report in preparation for the discussion with the Co-Facilitators of the PCB Working Group during Part II of the PCB Bureau meeting.*

16:30 – 17:30 (CEST)

- 2. Discussion with the Co-Facilitators on the Interim report of the PCB Working Group on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond:** *The Bureau will present its consolidated comments and discuss with the Co-Facilitators the Interim report of the PCB Working Group.*
- 3. Discussion of next steps in preparation of the 58th Programme Coordinating Board meeting (30 June–2 July):** *The Bureau will engage with the Co-Facilitators of the PCB Working Group on the next steps to finalize the Interim report in preparation of Agenda Item 8 of the 58th Programme Coordinating Board meeting.*
- 4. Any other business**



2. Discussion with the Co-Facilitators on the Interim report of the PCB Working Group on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond



PCB Bureau overall feedback on draft interim report

1. More clear contextual information about the structural decline in financing of UNAIDS, which is a key factor in this transition. Importance to focus on realistic financing;
2. Refraining from the reference to timeline 2027-2030: this is not explained currently and is not grounded in concrete proposals for the transition;
3. Importance of bringing the focus on the differentiation between the country and global level of HIV response;
4. More detailed explanation of what the hub model implies: does it refer solely to the Secretariat or to both the Secretariat and the Cosponsors;
5. More clarity in terms of structure of the report: deliverable 1-2 could be considered together if that makes more sense (core functions and governance model);
6. More balanced focus on the roles and the responsibilities of the Secretariat and Cosponsors when it comes to the core functions (deliverable 2).



Deliverable 1: Transition and integration of multisectoral capacity and expertise of the Joint Programme and the UNAIDS Secretariat's core functions

- Suggest a more structured presentation of findings, in particular clarifying the distinction between Deliverable 1 and 2 (merged in some places).
- Important to understand that the core functions are across the Joint Programme, not just the Secretariat, and that transition and transformation has already begun.
- Emphasize the strengths of the Secretariat and Cosponsors in preserving and strengthening the implementation of the core functions under the different options.
- A central political driving entity will still be needed to coordinate support to implementing countries and communities in order to end AIDS and ensure multisectoral coordination and accountability.
- Need for clarity on how community-led systems and governance structures fit into the future operational model.
- Strengthen references to people living with HIV, key and priority populations and GIPA principles.
- A detailed framework would need to be developed for final report, which clearly articulates which functions should be preserved, decentralized and transferred.
- Looks forward to a clearer theory of change and linkage to broader global health architecture reform as part of the final report.



Deliverable 2-4: Governance Model, Funding Model and Timeline for Transition

- **Deliverable 2 – Governance model:**
 - Further clarify how civil society participation in governance mechanisms will be preserved under future arrangements.
 - Define robust accountability mechanisms within any proposed future governance structures.
- **Deliverable 3 - Funding model:**
 - Develop a financially realistic long-term budget approach, taking into account the structural decline in global HIV funding
 - Further reflection on sustainable financing mechanisms for community-led systems and monitoring structures.
 - Explore sustainable financing and social contracting
 - Realistic budget
- **Deliverable 4 – Timeline:**
 - See point 2 in overall feedback



**3. Discussion of next steps in preparation of the 58th Programme
Coordinating Board meeting (30 June–2 July 2026)**



4. Any other business (AOB)

Annex 2: Written feedback on interim report

Philippines (Vice-Chair)

Template for Bureau feedback on draft interim report of the PCB Working Group

Purpose: Bureau comments to guide revisions to the interim report before it is presented to the PCB as per the Terms of Reference of the Working Group. The comments will be consolidated into a set of slides for discussion at the PCB Bureau meeting on Wednesday, 27 May 2026.

Name of Bureau member: Philippines

Date reviewed: 27 May 2026

Overall feedback

a. Overall assessment of the draft interim report:

The Philippines appreciates the substantial work undertaken by the PCB Working Group and welcomes the thoughtful, balanced, and consultative nature of the interim report. The report appropriately recognizes the gravity of the current transition moment and reflects broad stakeholder concerns regarding continuity of the global HIV response.

The report acknowledges that the global HIV response remains unfinished, that abrupt disruption would carry serious risks, and that preserving critical functions of the HIV response must remain central.

The Philippines agrees that the objective should not be framed as merely “sunsetting” UNAIDS, but rather as responsibly transforming the global HIV architecture in a way that preserves critical functions while adapting to a changing multilateral environment. We acknowledge that the global health architecture is evolving, including under broader UN reform processes, and believe this transition should be viewed not solely as a disruption, but as an opportunity to innovate and strengthen the sustainability, efficiency, and integration of the HIV response.

No transition is easy. However, change should be harnessed to preserve what works, reform what no longer serves current realities, and build stronger systems for the future.

At the same time, transformation must not come at the expense of gains painstakingly achieved over decades, particularly in community engagement, human rights advocacy, accountability, and multisectoral coordination.

b. Summary of the main strengths:

- Strong recognition that ending AIDS remains an unfinished global priority.
- Clear acknowledgment that abrupt or poorly managed transition would jeopardize hard-won gains.
- Appropriate emphasis on preserving the four interdependent core functions of UNAIDS.
- Strong reflection of stakeholder concerns regarding community engagement, human rights, and accountability.
- Recognition that country contexts differ and that differentiated implementation models may be necessary.

- Constructive openness to reform and alternative institutional arrangements rather than defaulting to status quo preservation.
- c. Summary of any gaps:
- Absence of a clear theory of change to guide transition, as explicitly requested in Annex 1 of the TOR;
 - Limited articulation of objective criteria for evaluating transition options;
 - Insufficient development of concrete governance, operational, and financing scenarios;
 - Limited discussion of operational continuity, workforce transition, fiduciary obligations, and implementation sequencing;
 - Financing analysis remains preliminary and lacks concrete costing or risk mitigation;
 - The report remains heavily HIV-specific and could better articulate how the transition aligns with broader health systems strengthening, universal health coverage, and integrated service delivery;
 - Limited articulation of how transition aligns with broader global health architecture reforms, including health systems strengthening and integration agendas.
- d. What does the PCB Bureau consider the most critical the Working Group needs to review before the report is finalized and presented to the PCB in June 2026?
- The Philippines considers the most critical issue to be the articulation of a realistic transition model that preserves the essential strengths of the HIV response while aligning with contemporary global health realities.
 - Specifically, the final report (in October) should ensure that transition timelines are feasible and minimize disruption to country responses.

Deliverable 1: Transition and integration of multisectoral capacity and expertise of the Joint Programme and the UNAIDS Secretariat's core functions

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 1:

- a. Does report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?
- Partially. The TOR explicitly calls for a detailed framework identifying which functions should be preserved, transformed, transferred, decentralized, or integrated. The report identifies possible strategic directions, but does not yet provide the detailed and actionable framework envisioned by the TOR.
- b. Does the report adequately reflect stakeholder concerns raised at the multi-stakeholder consultation, including the written submissions?
- Yes, largely. Stakeholder concerns regarding fragmentation, weakened accountability, erosion of community participation, and human rights risks are clearly reflected.
- c. Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?
- Yes, clearer theory of change and better linkage to broader global health architecture reform. Though mentioned in lines 46-47, the Philippines would also wish to see stronger analysis of the differentiated capacities, epidemiological contexts, and levels of HIV

response maturity across countries. A one-size-fits-all transition model is unlikely to be effective. Countries vary significantly in domestic financing capacity, institutional readiness, health systems strength, legal and policy environments, and the extent to which community-led and multisectoral HIV responses are already institutionalized. The transformation of UNAIDS country presence should therefore be gradual, context-sensitive, and tailored to country realities, with differentiated pathways that ensure continuity of support where needs remain greatest, while enabling progressive transition toward greater country ownership and integration where capacities are stronger.

Deliverable 2: Governance model

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 2:

- a. Does report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?

Partially. The TOR calls for actionable institutional arrangements and a clear theory of change, which remain incomplete. The principles are clear, but governance options remain underdeveloped.

- b. Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?

Yes: clearer governance options and clearer articulation of decision-making roles for communities.

Deliverable 3: Funding model

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 3:

- a. Does report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?

The TOR explicitly requires a financially realistic transition plan, including full costing, fiduciary analysis, transition liabilities, and risk mitigation. The interim report does not yet meet this expectation. The Philippines believes financing discussions should move beyond preservation of legacy funding structures and toward sustainable, innovative financing approaches.

- b. Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?

Yes: sustainability assumptions.

Deliverable 4: Timeline for transition

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 4:

- a. Does report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?

Broadly yes, but insufficiently detailed. The TOR calls for a realistic, milestone-based roadmap. The Philippines agrees that a rushed transition would be destabilizing. Timelines should be driven by readiness, continuity safeguards, and implementation feasibility, not arbitrary deadlines.

Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?

Kenya (Rapporteur)

1. The draft WG group report is a progressive and welcome draft especially in how it defines the non negotiables. This is important for implementing countries (Data, political advocacy leadership, strengthening multilateral and multisectoral coordination of the HIV response among others)
2. PCB should guide the WG onto further priorities - appreciate focus that a centralised political, multisectoral driving force for the response needs to continue through 2030 and support political ambition of Global AIDS Strategy.
3. Cosponsors are still important within their respective mandates and sectors but will need a complimenting political driving entity outside their specific sector and this entity needs similar to that which ECOSOC and the PCB has given to UNAIDS so far - otherwise the UN will not be the partner implementing countries and communities need to end AIDS.
4. Need for the WG to articulate more on the necessity to protect civic space and rights progress against an unprecedented push back.
5. There is need for us to use the draft as a basis of discussion at the PCB and not discuss it as a final report; some of the proposals we are making can be considered for inclusion in the final report after PCB discussions in late June.

The Netherlands (representing the country's position)

Template for Bureau feedback on draft interim report of the PCB Working Group

Purpose: Bureau comments to guide revisions to the interim report before it is presented to the PCB as per the Terms of Reference of the Working Group. The comments will be consolidated into a set of slides for discussion at the PCB Bureau meeting on Wednesday, 27 May 2026.

Name of Bureau member:

Date reviewed:

Overall feedback

- a. Overall assessment of the draft interim report:

The report clearly outlines the options and the two models explored by the Working Group, highlighting the key areas where consensus has already been reached. It also thoughtfully distinguishes between the to be proposed model for transition and integration, and the sequencing of the transition process which will be developed in the next phase. Furthermore, the report provides valuable insights on country-level coordination and the need for tailored approaches, as well as on the need to align with current efforts within the UN80-initiative. However, it is important to note that 'tailored approaches' might risk being perceived as varying interpretations of the implementation of the HIV response. In contrast, UN80 centers on strengthening the RC system to ensure operational coherence across diverse contexts. UN has a say in it. Therefore, it is essential to discuss it with the co-sponsors and the PCB. These points will serve as an excellent foundation for our discussions at the June PCB, helping to shape a shared vision for implementing countries.

Overall, the report provides a strong foundation, but it could be streamlined by reducing redundant information and steps through references/footnotes to relevant documents such as the ToR. To create a more balanced and accurate picture, we recommend expanding the focus to highlight the important roles and contributions of the cosponsors alongside the secretariat. Additionally, explicitly emphasizing the decline in international funding for HIV support since 2017—the primary catalyst for the current review of the UN's global HIV response model—will significantly strengthen the report's context and realistic planning of the budget for any future model HIV model.

Finally, we believe the report would benefit from a clearer structure and clear overview of the options, including for examples pro's and cons, considerations/risks and a clear recommendation. Currently, the use of headings is somewhat confusing. We suggest to restructure, so that each deliverable is its own chapter under the same type of heading, with similar subheadings.

b. Summary of the main strengths:

- The report includes a presentation of different options;
- The focus on the country-level coordination is brought into focus: it is very important for the discussions at the June PCB;
- Bringing into focus the Resident Coordinator offices, which is also an important element of UN80 reform.

c. Summary of any gaps:

- Lack of a clear reference to the core reason behind the UNAIDS transition: the structural decline of international HIV-funding. This trajectory is difficult to reverse, underscoring the need for a funding model that is not only clinically effective but also financially sustainable over the long term. It is definitely good that 'numerous countries have stepped forward to increase domestic investments in HIV', but it won't be sufficient to replace the previous level of international investment.
- To ensure the future transition strategy is as practical as possible, it would be better to refrain from making reference to a 2027–2030 timeframe until there is more clarity on the recommended way forward, including a corresponding timeline. Without established transition phases, keeping the timeline flexible will allow us to build a more grounded and realistic process.
- Currently, the text places a disproportionate emphasis on the Secretariat's activities. For example, while the report highlights the Secretariat's advocacy efforts at the country level, it lacks visibility on how Cosponsors step into these roles in areas where the Secretariat does not have a physical presence. Providing a more holistic perspective will be vital for framing discussions on the future operating model avoiding the risk of being one-sided. Besides, it is important to bring into the focus how the leadership of co-sponsors could be strengthened in relation to some of the core functions. If at this stage there is no sufficient time to do it, then the report should at least make a reference to how the reflection on the current division of labour between the secretariat and co-sponsors should take into account the importance of strengthening the growing leadership of the co-sponsors in the future as the result of this transition.
- The report lists, and to an extent elaborates on, different options that are being considered (3rd para on the 5th page). These options are however not mutually exclusive, recommendations could include elements from different options taken together (for example: a 'hub' that works on 3 out of 4 core functions, with one core functions transferred

- to a cosponsor, and country-level operations transitioned into RC offices). It would be good to get a better sense of how these options relate to each other.
- While the Working Group (WG) outlines valuable ideas for the future global HIV response, it would be highly beneficial to further explore the implications for ECOSOC. Specifically, it is worth clarifying whether and under what circumstances formal decisions by ECOSOC might be required.
- d. What does the PCB Bureau consider the most critical the Working Group needs to review before the report is finalized and presented to the PCB in June 2026?
- The report should make a clear reference to the structural funding decline to the global HIV response since 2017, and the unlikeliness of domestic investments to replace, especially in the short and mediate term, the level of international funding of previous years. In addition, it is important to mention that it is unlikely to sustain the core budget of USD 60 ml for UNAIDS in the long run considering the lack of multi-annual engagements among donors and ongoing reductions of ODA. Focus on sustaining is important, focus on 'reviving' is unrealistic.
 - The report would benefit from a more balanced representation of the respective roles and responsibilities of both the secretariat and the cosponsors. Additionally, clarifying how each entity implements / could implement core functions, alongside their distinct strengths, will provide greater value.
 - As we look at the transition, there also is a need to highlight the importance of CCO leadership, especially for the future of the HIV response after the transition is finalized. This is an area the report should bring to the forefront, as the capacity of cosponsors will be vital for reviewing the core functions and responsibilities transferred between the secretariat and the cosponsors.
 - Regarding the 'hub' model, the preliminary report states: the core functions of the Secretariat would be mapped and transferred. Were this option to be presented to the PCB as the recommended way forward, this would require elaboration and concrete recommendations. There should be a set of key questions identified for the discussion at the June PCB in order to navigate the discussions during the session.

Deliverable 1: Transition and integration of multisectoral capacity and expertise of the Joint Programme and the UNAIDS Secretariat's core functions

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 1:

- a. Does report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?
- The report is not sufficiently in line with this deliverable as outlined in the ToR. The report shares the options which have been explored, but there is a need for a more structured presentation of findings. Some considerations seem to also relate to deliverable 2, or even fall under that deliverable. The report would therefore benefit from a clearer distinction between how the options mentioned relate to deliverable 1, and deliverable 2. Furthermore, the report, would benefit from elaboration on which core functions could potentially be transferred, and what potential divisions of roles between the secretariat and the cosponsors have been discussed and how.

- b. Does the report adequately reflect stakeholder concerns raised at the multi-stakeholder consultation, including the written submissions?
 - Considering that the discussion of the core functions is crucial, at the current stage the report does not sufficiently allude to how those core functions (which have been already mapped) are implemented by both: the secretariat and the cosponsors..
- c. Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?
 - it would help to emphasize the strengths of different entities (secretariat and cosponsors) in the elaboration on preserving or strengthening the implementation of the core functions under the different options.

Deliverable 2: Governance model

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 2:

- a. Does report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?
 - Yes, the report aligns with this deliverable as it is formulated in the ToR. But most of the information related to the governance model is formulated under the deliverable
- b. Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?
 - It would be useful if either both deliverables 1 and 2 are addressed together (if it makes sense to do it in this way); or to formulate the vision of these two deliverables in line with the ToR separating the focus on core-functions and the ideas about the governance model. In both cases, there should be more insight provided on the role of both, secretariat and cosponsors, in implementing those core functions (see the comment under deliverable 1).

Deliverable 3: Funding model

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 3:

- a. Does report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?
 - There is currently no sufficient information on this deliverable besides how costing should be done.
- b. Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?
 - It is advisable to make an explicit reference to the importance of developing financially realistic budget (not for 'reviving') for the long-run considering the structural financial declining in HIV global funding.

Deliverable 4: Timeline for transition

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 4:

- a. Does report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?
 - There is currently no sufficient information on this deliverable.
- b. Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?
 - We recommend refraining from proposing the 2027–2030 transition period without clear recommendations and supporting evidence, especially concerning long-term financial viability. It is also crucial to acknowledge that the impetus for revisiting this 2030 transition

timeline (previously recommended by the High Level Panel) stems from the secretariat's necessary and urgent downsizing, which probably is not final. The shift in the financing landscape warrants an expedited transition process that aligns with realistic and stable financial projections.

NGO Delegation

COMMENTS ON *draft interim report of the PCB Working Group.*

Name of Bureau member: NGO Delegation

Date reviewed: 26 May 2026

Overall feedback

a. Overall assessment of the draft interim report

The NGO Delegation welcomes the substantial work undertaken by the Working Group and appreciates the effort to identify areas of convergence under a very challenging timeline and political context. We particularly welcome the reaffirmation that the sunsetting of the Joint Programme by the end of 2026 is not considered an option, as well as the recognition that the UN must continue to play a meaningful political, normative, accountability and coordination role in the HIV response through 2030 and beyond.

We also welcome the emphasis placed on preserving functions related to data, accountability, advocacy, coordination and support to communities. The report reflects important convergence around the need to protect core HIV functions and avoid disruption to the response during the transition process.

The report could also acknowledge broader civil society mobilisation around the future of UNAIDS, including the global sign-on opposing the sunsetting of the Joint Programme, endorsed by more than [1,027 organisations](#). This reflects the level of concern and engagement across communities and civil society on the future of the response.

At the same time, the NGO Delegation believes that the next stage of the Working Group's work should more explicitly explore the potential role of community-led systems not only as stakeholders or beneficiaries of the future model, but as operational and accountability actors within it. This perspective emerged strongly during the multistakeholder consultation and should be reflected more visibly in future iterations of the report.

b. Summary of the main strengths

- Clear reaffirmation that the HIV response requires continued political leadership, accountability and multisectoral coordination within the UN system.
- Recognition that transition should be phased, realistic and guided by milestones in order to minimise disruption to the HIV response.

- Strong acknowledgement of the importance of meaningful and timely community engagement, leadership and preserving support to communities.
- Recognition of the importance of maintaining strategic information, accountability and advocacy functions.
- Inclusion of sustainability and financing considerations, including the protection of resources related to community engagement, data and country support.

c. Summary of the gaps

- The report could more clearly articulate the operational role that community-led systems could play within future governance and implementation arrangements.
- References to communities and civil society remain somewhat general and could be strengthened through more explicit reflection on community-led monitoring, accountability, research and integrated service delivery functions.
- The report could further explore how community-led integrated models may support or operationalise functions currently coordinated by the Joint Programme, while remaining technically and politically supported by UN entities according to their mandates and expertise.
- Greater clarity may be needed regarding how civil society participation and governance mechanisms currently protected under the UNAIDS model would be preserved under potential future arrangements.
- The report could give more visibility to people living with HIV and their leadership role within governance, accountability and decision making processes, including through the application of GIPA principles. The report does not mention GIPA.
- The report should consistently apply previously agreed UNAIDS and PCB terminology, including the use of “key and priority populations” rather than “vulnerable populations.”
- would also be helpful on the distinction between a downsized Secretariat and a possible hub model, including how governance, accountability, core functions and participation of communities and civil society would be organised.
- more clarity on the proposed hub model, including whether similar arrangements already exist within the UN system or other multilateral settings, lessons learned from comparable models, and whether this would represent a new institutional approach. Additional explanation on the rationale, added value and practical differences between a hub model and a downsized Secretariat would also strengthen understanding of this option.

d. What does the PCB Bureau consider the most critical the Working Group needs to review before the report is finalized and presented to the PCB in June 2026?

The NGO Delegation believes the following areas would benefit from further reflection prior to finalisation:

- How the future model will preserve meaningful civil society participation and accountability structures currently embedded within the UNAIDS governance model.
- How community-led systems and community-led integrated service models could be further reflected as part of the future operational architecture of the HIV response.
- How the transition process will protect political leadership on human rights, key and priority populations, and community-led responses within a changing UN landscape.
- How sustainable financing mechanisms for community-led organisations, monitoring and research functions will be protected.
- Ensuring consistency with previously agreed PCB language and commitments.
- How future arrangements will maintain dedicated political leadership, advocacy and accountability related to women and girls living with HIV, including through gender-responsive approaches.
- Further clarification regarding potential governance, accountability and participation arrangements under a possible hub model. Has this model been done before? Can we have examples of successful models? If not, the report should said that this is the first time.

Deliverable 1: Transition and integration of multisectoral capacity and expertise of the Joint Programme and the UNAIDS Secretariat's core functions

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 1

The NGO Delegation welcomes the recognition throughout the report of the importance of communities and civil society in sustaining the HIV response, particularly in relation to accountability, advocacy, research, coordination and service delivery.

Building on the feedback received during the multistakeholder consultation and broader stakeholder engagement, the NGO Delegation would encourage the Working Group to consider giving greater visibility in the next phase of work to the role that community-led systems could play not only in service delivery, but also in monitoring, accountability and evidence generation.

This could include further examination of how community-led integrated models may support functions currently coordinated by the Joint Programme, including community-led monitoring linked to the 10–10–10 and 30–80–60 targets, monitoring of programme

implementation and financing flows, identification of legal and policy barriers, peer navigation, and community-led research that informs policy and programmatic recommendations.

The NGO Delegation also encourages further reflection on how the future model could strengthen sustainable partnerships between UN entities and community-led systems, including through technical support, social contracting mechanisms, direct and flexible financing for community-led organisations, and strengthened accountability frameworks. Alongside references to communities and civil society, greater visibility could be given to the role of people living with HIV in governance, accountability, community leadership and decision making processes in line with GIPA principles.

We believe this could be an important area for deeper exploration during the next stage of the Working Group’s mandate, particularly given the extensive experience and infrastructure that community-led organisations already contribute to the HIV response in many contexts.

More clarity would be helpful regarding the practical distinction between a downsized Secretariat and a potential hub model, including governance and reporting lines, accountability arrangements, hosting responsibilities and coordination mechanisms across UN agencies. As the proposed hub would still require a focal point for coordination, leadership and oversight of the HIV response, additional clarification would help explain how this model differs operationally from a streamlined Secretariat arrangement.

a. Does the report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?

Partially. The report reflects important convergence around preserving core functions, but additional clarity would strengthen understanding of how community-led systems and governance structures fit into the future operational model.

b. Does the report adequately reflect stakeholder concerns raised at the multistakeholder consultation, including the written submissions?

It does.

c. Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?

Yes:

- Strengthen references to people living with HIV and GIPA principles.
- Further clarify how civil society participation and governance mechanisms will be preserved under future arrangements.
- Strengthen references to community-led monitoring, accountability and integrated service models.
- Ensure consistent use of agreed terminology such as “key and priority populations.”

Deliverable 2: Governance model

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 2

The NGO Delegation welcomes the recognition that governance and accountability functions must be preserved throughout the transition process.

We would encourage further reflection on how the unique governance features of UNAIDS — particularly the formal participation of civil society under ECOSOC Resolution 1995/2 — would be protected and operationalised under any future arrangement or structure. This remains one of the defining strengths of the Joint Programme and should not be diluted during transition discussions.

a. Does the report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?

Yes.

b. Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?

Yes:

- Greater clarity on how civil society governance participation would be preserved in practice.
- Clarification regarding accountability mechanisms within potential future structures.

Deliverable 3: Funding model

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 3

The NGO Delegation welcomes the inclusion of sustainability considerations, protection of country support functions and recognition of the need to safeguard resources dedicated to community engagement and accountability.

We encourage further examination of sustainable financing approaches for community-led systems, including institutionalised social contracting, direct and flexible funding models for community-led organisations, and financing mechanisms that protect community-led monitoring, research and accountability functions.

a. Does the report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?

Partially.

b. Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?

Yes:

- Further reflection on sustainable financing mechanisms for community-led systems and monitoring structures.
- Clarification on how resources dedicated to community engagement and accountability will be protected during transition.

Deliverable 4: Timeline for transition

Comments on the overall framing of Deliverable 4

The NGO Delegation welcomes the recognition that transition should be phased, realistic and implemented in a manner that minimises disruption to the HIV response.

Given the political, operational and governance complexity of the process, we encourage continued caution regarding timelines to ensure that meaningful consultation, accountability and preservation of core HIV functions are not compromised by speed of implementation.

a. Does the report align with the specific outcome as outlined in the ToRs?

Yes, broadly.

b. Should anything be clarified or strengthened before PCB circulation?

Yes:

- Clarify how stakeholder engagement, particularly with communities and civil society, will continue throughout the next phase of the process.
- Clarify how continuity of services, accountability and community participation will be safeguarded during transition phases.
- Will there be an opportunity for a broader CSO to have a Q&A with the working group and the secretariat regarding this transition?

[End of document]