

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

Additional documents for this item: Final report of the PCB Working Group (UNAIDS/PCB (EM)6.2); Options Paper (UNAIDS/PCB (EM)CRP1)

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

- Approve the final report of the PCB Working Group on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN System and beyond (UNAIDS/PCB/(EM)/6.2), including the final plan contained therein, and requests the PCB Chair to transmit it, including the decisions of the Board related to it, to ECOSOC.
- Request the Executive Director and the Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations to prepare the Terms of Reference for a Joint Programme Transition Task Team composed of Secretariat and Cosponsor representatives, nominated by their respective agencies, and present them for the Programme Coordinating Board's approval at its 59th session, to implement the final plan as agreed by the Programme Coordinating Board.
- Request the Executive Director and the Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations to include two NGO-nominated community representatives in the Joint Programme Transition Task Team.
- Request the Executive Director and the Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations Chair to provide an update on the implementation of the final plan at the 59th Programme Coordinating Board meeting.
- Call for the immediate initiation of the fast-track selection process for the next UNAIDS Joint Programme Executive Director.
- Request the PCB Bureau to initiate the fast-track selection process and present the process and Terms of Reference for the Search Committee for the Nomination of the UNAIDS Joint Programme Executive Director at the 59th meeting of the Programme Coordinating Board.
- Request the PCB Bureau to prepare the Terms of Reference for the UNAIDS Joint Programme Executive Director and present these Terms of Reference for intersessional approval by the Programme Coordinating Board before 1 February 2027.

Cost implications for the implementation of the decisions: Would result in a 2027 Workplan and Budget of US\$ 85 million mobilized centrally by the Secretariat.

Table of Contents

Executive summary.....	4
Opening and framing by the PCB Chair	5
Framing remarks by the UNAIDS Executive Director	6
Presentation of the Options Paper by the Co-Facilitators, with an overview of areas of convergence and pending issues	7
Questions and discussion on the Options Paper	10
Plenary synthesis and discussions – day one	12
Opening – day two	13
Plenary synthesis and discussions – day two.....	14
Closing remarks	15

Executive summary

1. On 28–29 September 2026, 375 Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) members and stakeholders participated in a multi-stakeholder consultation convened by the PCB Bureau, pursuant to decision point 7.6 from the 57th PCB meeting.¹ This decision 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.”
2. The consultation was designed to support the work of the *PCB Working Group on the further transition and integration of UNAIDS into the UN system and beyond*. The Board approved the establishment of the Working Group at its 57th meeting in December 2025. The Bureau subsequently established the Working Group following the Board’s approval of its terms of reference in February 2026.
3. The Working Group’s terms of reference² task it with:
 - outlining steps to transition and integrate the Joint Programme’s multisectoral capacity and the inter-related core functions of the Secretariat;
 - proposing a United Nations-mandated governance model that preserves the role of communities and civil society and ensures the United Nation’s continued coordination, accountability and leadership of the HIV response;
 - developing a funding model to sustain the proposed governance model; and
 - articulating a forward-looking and evidence-based timeline for transition and integration.
4. The terms of reference require a consultative approach to inform and guide the Working Group’s work. The first multi-stakeholder consultation, held on 12 May 2026, informed the preparation of its interim report. A summary of that consultation was made available as a conference room paper for the 58th PCB meeting.³
5. The Working Group presented its interim report at the Board’s 58th meeting. Following its consideration of the report, the Board requested the Working Group to share, through the PCB Bureau, the detailed options for the transition plan ahead of the second multistakeholder consultation.⁴ It also called for the final report to recommend a concrete, actionable and sustainable plan based on the key transition options and their cost estimates, for discussion and decision-making at the fully virtual, half-day PCB Special Session on 26 October 2026.

¹ Decisions from the 57th PCB meeting: https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2025/PCB57_Decisions

² Terms of reference of the PCB Working Group: https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2026/PCB58_Terms_Of_Reference_PCB_Working_Group

³ Summary of the first multi-stakeholder consultation: https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/2026-06/PCB58_CRP4%20Report_EN.pdf

⁴ Decisions from the 58th PCB meeting: https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2026/PCB58_Decisions

6. The second multi-stakeholder consultation held on 28–29 September provided PCB members and stakeholders—including communities living with, affected by, and at risk of HIV—a structured opportunity to react to the detailed transition options before the Working Group finalized its plan. Discussions focused on three areas: country and regional presence arrangements for a more integrated “One UN” approach; a responsible and financially sustainable transition; and opportunities to transform global decision-making within the Joint Programme. The inputs were intended to help strengthen convergence, clarify remaining differences and inform the Working Group’s final recommendations.
7. The consultation generated extensive feedback from stakeholders across all regions, including implementing countries, donors, multilateral partners, and communities and civil society, including people living with HIV and representatives of key and priority populations. Over 100 written submissions responding to the guiding questions were received before and after it.
8. The Working Group drew on these oral and written inputs to inform the preparation of its final report for consideration at the PCB Special Session.

Opening and framing by the PCB Chair

9. The PCB Chair, Netherlands, welcomed participants to the multi-stakeholder consultation. Following a moment of silence in memory of people who have died of AIDS-related causes, the Chair emphasized the importance of the consultation as the Working Group prepared its final plan for consideration at the Board’s Special Session on 26 October 2026.
10. The Chair recalled that the Working Group had presented its interim report at the 58th PCB meeting in June 2026. Following the Board’s guidance, the Working Group had focused on a single strategic direction—a proposed UN-based Hub—which had received broad support during the Board’s discussions. Within this direction, the Working Group had developed several options. The Bureau had provided consolidated feedback on the options to the Co-facilitators on 17 September⁵, and a revised options paper had subsequently been circulated as the background document for the consultation.
11. The Chair clarified that the consultation would focus on reviewing the options paper, with the Working Group to finalize its plan afterwards. She invited participants to ground their interventions in the guiding questions circulated before the consultation:
 - What opportunities and challenges do you see in the proposed country presence options for advancing a more integrated “One UN” approach on the ground - while sustaining effective support to the national HIV response and the strengthened role of communities?

⁵ Summary of the PCB Bureau meeting on 17 September 2026:
https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2026/Summary_PCB_Bureau_Meeting_170926

- What do stakeholders consider essential to ensuring UNAIDS's transition is both responsible and financially sustainable - particularly in balancing sufficient time for the transition against the reality of a declining budget?
 - Within the bounds of the existing ECOSOC mandate, where do stakeholders see the greatest potential to transform decision-making at the global (Hub) level — in a way that keeps all Joint Programme actors meaningfully involved and invested in decision-making, core-function implementation, and funding allocation?
12. The Chair stressed that the functions and capacities needed to sustain an effective HIV response, including a clear plan for evolving country-level capacities, should guide decisions on the future structure, scope, field presence and budget. The consultation aimed to clarify how different constituencies aligned on the proposed options, strengthen convergence, narrow remaining differences and identify potential compromises.

Framing remarks by the UNAIDS Executive Director

13. UNAIDS Executive Director Winnie Byanyima welcomed participants and thanked the PCB Chair and Bureau for their leadership, and the Co-Facilitators and Working Group members for their work in preparing for the consultation. She invited participants to keep the realities facing countries and communities at the centre of their discussions.
14. Funding cuts had forced programmes to shrink or close, weakened data systems and placed community organizations serving marginalized populations under pressure, she said. Countries faced difficult choices about protecting essential services, integrating programmes, mobilizing domestic resources and sustaining HIV treatment and prevention.
15. Ms. Byanyima outlined the Secretariat's ongoing support to countries, including redesigning programmes in response to changing financing conditions, developing sustainability roadmaps, strengthening national ownership and rebuilding data systems. The Secretariat was also working with governments and communities to make the best use of remaining international financing, while challenging discriminatory laws and defending human rights. She emphasized that both country-level support and global functions remained important.
16. Reflecting on recent high-level discussions in New York, she reported a consistent call for continued UN engagement and transformation of the Joint Programme while preserving its distinctive strengths: political leadership, multisectoral coordination, strong data and accountability, and community leadership. She urged participants to begin by considering what countries and communities needed from the UN to end AIDS, and to use those needs to guide institutional arrangements.
17. Ms. Byanyima welcomed the options paper's rejection of "sunsetting" UNAIDS and its recognition of the need for a central Hub, community co-creation and co-leadership, protection of human rights and a phased transition. She also welcomed the retention

of the ECOSOC mandate and the PCB as the foundations of the future model, emphasizing the importance of preserving Member State ownership, formal community engagement and shared decision-making. She noted that significant questions remained unresolved, and that the consultation provided an opportunity to address them.

18. She called for a senior UN HIV leader in every priority country, connected to the Hub and equipped with the authority and accountability to convene partners across the UN system around results. She emphasized that the core functions of leadership, coordination, data and accountability, and community leadership and engagement should remain connected and mutually reinforcing. Communities should be embedded as co-creators, co-leaders and co-implementers, supported by predictable resources. Any reduction in country presence should proceed country by country, based on evidence and readiness, guided by the principle of “do no harm”.
19. On financing, she urged traditional donors to maintain core funding, warning that withdrawal would put collective achievements at risk. She also highlighted growing contributions from programme countries to support UNAIDS’ country presence and work.
20. In closing, Ms. Byanyima emphasized that success would mean a country-owned, increasingly community-led and sustainably financed HIV response, grounded in global solidarity, inclusion, accountability and human rights, with countries and communities able to sustain the response themselves and end AIDS.

Presentation of the Options Paper by the Co-Facilitators, with an overview of areas of convergence and pending issues

21. The Co-Facilitators of the Working Group, Bob Rae, Fionnuala Murphy and Joe Phaahla, presented the Working Group’s progress across its four deliverables, outlining areas of convergence, outstanding questions and options requiring stakeholder guidance. They said the Working Group had held 28 virtual meetings and a three-day in-person meeting in Geneva in August. Its work had been informed by the first multi-stakeholder consultation, guidance from the 58th PCB meeting, feedback from PCB constituencies through the Bureau, and discussions with the Secretariat and Cosponsors. Technical support for costing and transition planning had recently become available, they noted, but limited resources and expertise had prevented the Working Group from providing the requested level of detail in some areas.
22. Mr Phaahla emphasized that the Working Group unanimously rejected the “sunsetting” of the Joint Programme, while recognizing that continuation of the status quo was not viable. The proposed transformation drew on the original ECOSOC vision of co-ownership, collaborative planning and implementation, and shared responsibility. It sought to address fragmentation, duplication and uneven responsibilities by distinguishing more clearly between the Hub’s leadership, coordination and accountability functions and the Cosponsors’ technical

implementation and delivery roles. This would require a change in organizational culture towards joint action, alongside greater national ownership and community co-creation and co-leadership.

23. Ms Murphy outlined convergence on a model in which Cosponsors would lead implementation of individual results areas of the Global AIDS Strategy, drawing on their respective mandates and expertise. Pooled funding would support Cosponsored or facilitated work at country level. The Hub's country presence would be phased out over time, with joint UN teams coordinating support to national responses and the longer-term objective of integrating country-level functions into national institutions. Approaches and timelines would differ by country, guided by transparent criteria and rigorous assessments confirming that the capacity to carry forward those functions was in place.
24. The proposed model would embed community co-creation and co-leadership across the Joint Programme at global, regional and country levels. Measures included remunerated community positions linked directly to the Hub, community representation in regional and country joint UN teams, and incentives for community partnerships in activities supported through pooled funding. The Hub would provide global leadership and advocacy, steward the Global AIDS Strategy, mobilize political and financial commitments, coordinate a unified budget and workplan, gather and analyse multisectoral data, and support institutionalized community participation. Human rights and gender equality expertise would be preserved across its core functions. The Hub would also support the PCB's role as a global agenda-setting and policy-making forum for HIV.
25. Important questions remained concerning country and regional arrangements. While both the Secretariat and Cosponsors recognized the need for Joint Programme presence in more than 50 countries, the number requiring a Hub presence in the immediate term had not been determined. Country arrangements would need to reflect epidemiology, civic space, human rights, gender equality and country preferences, aligned with the Global AIDS Strategy. Relevant countries should have a clearly identified HIV coordinator working on behalf of the whole Joint Programme under shared terms of reference. Possible locations included a standalone UNAIDS office, a Cosponsor office, a Resident Coordinator's office or a national institution.
26. The Working Group also envisaged a clear Joint Programme presence in all regions, including the Middle East and North Africa. Options included regional Hub presence or small regional desks within the Hub drawing on existing Cosponsor capacities. The Hub was expected to fulfil regional roles initially, with their integration into the broader UN system over time, although the arrangements had not been finalized. The Hub's size also remained unresolved: one proposal envisaged a global unit of 35–40 staff, while others called for greater staffing to ensure sufficient capacity and political standing. Hosting proposals included another Cosponsor or UNOPS. The Working Group had identified no compelling reason to change the existing administrative services agreement with WHO, but encouraged continued efforts to reduce overhead costs.

27. Mr Rae placed the proposals within wider changes in HIV financing and the global health architecture, including the roles of the Global Fund and PEPFAR, advances in treatment and growing national capacity. On governance, the Working Group recommended retaining the PCB as the Joint Programme's governing body, recognizing its distinctive inclusion of civil society. Although changes to NGO voting rights had been considered, the Working Group favoured strengthening community decision-making through other mechanisms, particularly participation in allocating pooled funding, within the existing ECOSOC framework.
28. Accountability would be based on a single results framework and workplan covering global, regional and country arrangements and Cosponsor commitments. The Executive Director would remain accountable to the PCB for stewardship of the common workplan, the integrity of global functions and the performance of the Joint Programme as a whole. Cosponsors would be accountable for their agreed commitments and resources received through Joint Programme mechanisms. The Working Group also recommended continued efforts to simplify governance arrangements and reduce their costs.
29. On financing, the Working Group recommended a unified budget encompassing all funding sources, including those traditionally classified as core and non-core. Within this budget, pooled funding would support country-level work, with the PCB establishing clear rules and allocation criteria and the Hub, Cosponsors and communities collaborating on funding decisions. The overall funding envelope remained under discussion. Further costing would distinguish transition-specific costs from recurring costs under the future model. Options for administering pooled funding included a simplified Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework (UBRAF) or a mechanism through the UN Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office. Further analysis would set out the advantages and disadvantages of these options.
30. Mr Rae outlined four proposed phases for transition. Phase zero would involve essential PCB decisions on the Hub's size, hosting and terminology, a separate transition budget, regional direction and recruitment of transition leadership, alongside guidance for capacity assessments. Phase one would establish a revised Division of Labour, determine pooled-funding arrangements and criteria for differentiated country and regional presence, and initiate capacity assessments in consultation with governments and communities. In phase two, the Hub would become fully operational, pooled funding would be activated and transfers of functions would proceed where assessments confirmed readiness. In phase three, the new model would be substantially operational, with a new steady-state budget and agreed governance and accountability arrangements, while country and regional arrangements continued to evolve. Lessons from the transition would be documented and reviewed.
31. The Working Group envisaged a transition period of 12–18 months, with the final report to provide greater specificity. There was unanimous agreement on the urgent need to recruit leadership for the transition, but differing views on whether to appoint an interim leader or immediately recruit a permanent Executive Director. A Special Envoy had also been proposed to secure support from senior UN leadership,

although some PCB constituencies had questioned its necessity. Mr Rae emphasized that decisions on budgets and timelines must support a properly managed transition that protected people relying on the HIV response.

32. In closing, the Co-Facilitators emphasized the continuing need for a Joint Programme able to respond to declining international resources, greater national ownership and a deteriorating human rights environment. The Working Group was converging on a more cohesive and efficient model centred on national ownership and community co-creation and co-leadership. They welcomed stakeholder guidance to help resolve the outstanding questions and finalize the plan.

Questions and discussion on the Options Paper

33. Following the presentation, the Chair invited participants to ask questions and provide initial feedback on the options paper, with the three guiding questions to be considered in greater depth during the breakout sessions. The Chair noted that interventions during the consultation would be limited to two minutes each.
34. PCB members and observers welcomed the opportunity to transform the Joint Programme and strengthen coordination across the UN system. Speakers emphasized national ownership, clearer responsibilities and greater efficiency, while preserving HIV expertise, leadership and accountability. Functions should guide decisions on structures, it was stressed, and leadership, data and evidence, accountability and community engagement should not be fragmented or diluted.
35. Views differed on the role and capacity of the proposed Hub. Some PCB Member States emphasized that a leaner Hub should retain the political standing, authority and capacity to lead across sectors, safeguard community participation and preserve UNAIDS' expertise and convening role. An observer Member State supported a downsized, operationally independent Secretariat within the ECOSOC framework. A Cosponsor sought greater clarity on the Hub's scope and stronger recognition of Cosponsor mandates, capacities and leadership roles, including their wider country presence.
36. Country ownership should guide the design of future arrangements, speakers said. They called for meaningful country participation in decision-making, collective accountability and reduced duplication in coordination and reporting. Country and regional arrangements should reflect epidemiological realities, national systems, capacities and priorities. Speakers also emphasized the continuing need for a trusted global platform providing comparable HIV data.
37. On country presence and the pace of transition, some PCB Member States supported further integration of HIV functions into existing UN structures and requested clearer timelines and comparative assessment of options to reduce, consolidate or, where appropriate, discontinue standalone UNAIDS country presence. One constituency sought a distinction between arrangements that could be transitioned within 12 months and those requiring more time. Other PCB Member States favoured a longer, progressive transition to preserve essential capacity,

including a proposal for transition through 2030, guided by country needs and readiness.

38. The PCB NGO Delegation welcomed the stronger language on community engagement but called for operational guarantees of formal representation, decision-making rights and resources wherever functions were transferred. Observer NGOs similarly emphasized community co-leadership and predictable funding, including for young women and youth-led organizations. Speakers stressed the importance of preserving communities' ability to influence decisions and access UN support, particularly where criminalization or limited political will constrained their participation.
39. The PCB NGO Delegation and observer NGOs requested clarity on how capacity and readiness would be assessed before functions were transferred. Observer NGOs stressed that alternative arrangements should be operational before existing support was withdrawn, with governments and communities involved in assessing readiness. They also called for clear accountability and corrective action where commitments were not fulfilled, including through community-led monitoring.
40. Speakers emphasized the importance of continued regional support to countries and community networks. They highlighted UNAIDS' role in facilitating engagement with governments, supporting human rights advocacy and enabling cooperation and learning across countries. Future regional arrangements should preserve these functions and communities' access to resources and the UN system.
41. PCB Member States requested clearer cost assumptions and further information on the relationship between operational models and budget scenarios, including the implications of hosting, staffing and governance arrangements. Some welcomed the lower funding scenario as a basis for planning within foreseeable resource constraints and emphasized efficiency, value for money and impact. Others stressed that budgets should reflect the functions required of the Joint Programme and the resources needed for a responsible transition.
42. Responding to the discussion, Ms Murphy acknowledged the importance of getting country-support arrangements right and the serious consequences for communities if those arrangements failed. She welcomed questions on readiness and accountability, including what would happen if the proposed model did not deliver. She emphasized the potential of Cosponsors' proposed leadership of Global AIDS Strategy results areas and invited practical written suggestions to clarify their roles in relation to the Hub.
43. Mr Rae affirmed that the Working Group's approach placed functions before structures and recognized the importance of country-specific criteria, resources and governance. He acknowledged the need for greater precision on the respective roles of the Hub and Cosponsors. Transformation would require changes across the Joint Programme, while strengthening national leadership and the role of communities and civil society.

44. Mr Phaahla emphasized that transferring functions must be accompanied by monitoring, regular evaluation and reporting to the PCB. The Hub would have a role in coordinating assessments of Joint Programme performance and ensuring that weaknesses prompted corrective action, so that no function was left without clear responsibility.
45. The Chair thanked participants and invited them to continue the discussion in the breakout groups. The Chair outlined the format of the breakout discussions, with one round on the first day and two on the second, each addressing a guiding question. Each group would be chaired by a PCB elected Bureau Officer and include a Working Group Co-Facilitator to provide clarification and respond to questions, with consultants recording the main points. Following each round, participants would reconvene in plenary to hear the key messages from the groups.
46. Participants then moved to their assigned breakout groups to discuss the first question: What opportunities and challenges do you see in the proposed country-presence options, as well as regional, for advancing a more integrated “One UN” approach—while sustaining effective support to the national HIV response and the strengthened role of communities?

Plenary synthesis and discussions – Day one

47. Following the breakout discussions, participants returned to the main session. The Chair invited the three Co-Facilitators to present brief syntheses from their respective groups, highlighting areas of convergence and issues where differing perspectives remained.
48. Reporting on Group 1, Working Group Co-Facilitator Bob Rae noted strong convergence on pursuing a more integrated “One UN” approach to improve efficiency and effectiveness. The general direction of the options paper had been positively received, although participants continued to seek greater detail. Different perspectives reflected both pressures to reduce costs and the vulnerabilities faced by communities living under criminalization. He emphasized the need to clarify the sequencing of country-level transition and the relationship with regional arrangements. The Working Group would draw on the consultation and technical support to strengthen its final report, while recognizing that decisions on the way forward would ultimately rest with the relevant governing bodies and Member States.
49. Reporting on Group 2, Working Group Co-Facilitator Mr Phaahla described broad support for integration, alongside differing views on country and regional presence and the pace of transition. He noted that the United States had strongly supported continued Hub presence, particularly for leadership and protection of data processes, while other donors had emphasized the pace of integration. Implementing countries and community organizations stressed differentiated arrangements and careful management of transfers to Cosponsors, with clear accountability where commitments did not translate into delivery. Cosponsors expressed willingness to assume responsibilities, while communities drew attention to gaps experienced following country and regional withdrawals and uncertainty about where to seek

support.

50. Reporting on Group 3, Working Group Co-Facilitator Ms Murphy noted support for a more integrated UN approach, with opportunities for stronger coordination, reduced duplication, better alignment with health and development priorities, and more efficient use of resources. Some participants favoured continued dedicated UNAIDS country presence, particularly where human rights, gender equality, community engagement and HIV leadership remained vulnerable. Others supported hybrid arrangements involving Resident Coordinators, Cosponsors and regional structures, provided these could demonstrate sufficient capacity, accountability and commitment to meaningful community engagement.
51. Ms Murphy highlighted concerns about dilution of HIV-specific expertise and leadership and the need for each function to have a clearly identified institutional home and responsible lead. Across constituencies, participants called for differentiated, evidence-based country arrangements reflecting epidemiology, national capacity, transition readiness, community engagement, human rights and gender equality. Some proposed that transition should not proceed where meaningful community participation could not be guaranteed. Participants also sought greater clarity on who would make transition decisions, who would be involved and the steps required. She noted that these proposals could help the Working Group formulate more specific safeguards and recommendations.
52. Closing the first day, the Chair thanked the Co-Facilitators, Bureau Officers and participants for their constructive engagement. She noted that the discussions had identified common ground as well as differences requiring further work and encouraged the Working Group to reflect these inputs in its final report. She reminded PCB members of their responsibility to agree on the way forward and invited participants to reflect on the discussions ahead of the remaining two questions on Day 2. The Chair closed the session.

Opening – Day two

53. The Chair welcomed participants to the second day of the consultation. Before turning to the agenda, she introduced a video message from Fiji's Minister for Health and Medical Services, Dr Atonio Lalabalavu.]
54. Speaking as an observer Member State, Fiji supported a more integrated, efficient and responsive UN system, while emphasizing that reform should be judged by its impact on people. The Minister described the sharp increase in HIV infections in Fiji and the constraints facing Pacific Island countries, including geographical distances, small workforces, limited specialist capacity and scarce resources. He highlighted the complementary contributions of WHO and other Cosponsors and the Secretariat's role in bringing governments, communities and partners together, strengthening evidence and mobilizing international support. Fiji called for a dedicated and sufficiently resourced UNAIDS Secretariat serving Fiji and the wider Pacific, with transition carefully sequenced to avoid gaps before national and regional capacities

were ready.

55. Reflecting on Day 1, the Chair noted opportunities for greater UN coherence, reduced duplication and better use of expertise. Participants had stressed that integration should strengthen national HIV responses and preserve effective functions. Country arrangements should reflect epidemiology, capacity and circumstances, including civic space and barriers faced by key populations, with regional support responsive to country needs. The Chair recalled calls for verified capacity and resources before functions moved, clearer accountability for country coordination, readiness assessments and monitoring, and formal, funded community engagement under every country model.
56. The Chair outlined the two remaining areas for discussion: ensuring a responsible and financially sustainable transition, including balancing sufficient time with a declining budget; and transforming global decision-making while ensuring meaningful involvement of Joint Programme actors. The two remaining breakout rounds would take place consecutively and participants would return to the main session after both rounds to hear the Co-Facilitators' summaries. Participants then moved to their assigned breakout groups.

Plenary synthesis and discussions – Day two

57. On returning to the main session, the Chair thanked participants for their substantive contributions and invited the Co-Facilitators to report areas of convergence, remaining differences and practical proposals.
58. Ms Murphy, Co-Facilitator, reported strong support for retaining the PCB governance model and its underlying ECOSOC mandate, alongside a desire to transform decision-making within the Joint Programme. Participants expressed interest in pooled funding arrangements that would give the Hub, Cosponsors and communities shared decision-making authority, with the PCB providing strategic direction. They requested clearer roles, transparent resource-allocation criteria and accountability matched to responsibilities. Actors responsible for delivery should also have a role in setting priorities, allocating resources and responding to results.
59. Community co-creation and co-leadership received strong support. Participants called for communities to be equal partners from the outset, with defined and remunerated roles and meaningful authority over resource allocation, monitoring and accountability. Community-generated evidence should be able to prompt corrective action where delivery fell short. Ms Murphy highlighted the importance of explicitly including youth-led organizations, which could otherwise be overlooked within broader approaches to community leadership.
60. Participants also called for a review of the Division of Labour to align responsibilities with the Global AIDS Strategy, relevant mandates and expertise, and community perspectives. Ms Murphy noted the need to address issues cutting across results areas, including the needs of people who use drugs in prevention, treatment, integration and human rights work. Global decisions should remain connected to

country and regional realities. Proposals included opportunities for regional input before the PCB Special Session, with arrangements accommodating different time zones, and coordination of UNAIDS transition planning with Global Fund transitions.

61. On the transition process, Ms Murphy reported a strong emphasis on readiness, clear milestones and protection of core functions. Participants called for an explicit commitment that no function would move until a named, resourced and accountable entity was ready to assume it. They requested that functions be defined and costed before budgets were proposed, together with a separately costed transition roadmap distinct from recurring funding requirements.
62. Views differed on timing. Some participants favoured a longer transition based on demonstrated readiness, while others sought a defined end date or supported a 12-month transition. Milestones linked to pre-agreed budget decision points were proposed as a way to reconcile these positions. In the context of declining resources, participants suggested an agreed and funded minimum set of core functions, prioritization of high-burden and rights-constrained settings, reduced duplication, and ring-fenced support for community and youth leadership. There was also interest in broadening financing beyond traditional development assistance to include programme-country contributions, innovative financing and other sources.
63. Mr Rae, Co-Facilitator, similarly described differences between several donor countries favouring a shorter transition and substantially smaller budget, and civil society representatives and countries facing high or growing HIV incidence seeking a longer transition. The latter questioned whether Cosponsors had demonstrated sufficient capacity and commitment to community participation, human rights and decriminalization. He emphasized that the PCB would ultimately need to decide the pace of transition and the resources Member States were willing to provide, informed by further dialogue among donors, programme countries and civil society.
64. Mr Rae highlighted calls for a new Executive Director with expertise in managing transition and building partnerships across the Joint Programme, governments and civil society. He acknowledged concerns about potential losses during transition and the need to build mutual confidence through coherent proposals and practical assurances. In particular, women, young people and other vulnerable communities needed reassurance that their priorities would remain central. The consultation would help the Working Group make its final recommendations clearer, stronger and more detailed.

Closing remarks

65. The Chair noted that the consultation had addressed three central dimensions of the proposed transition: country presence and integration, a responsible and financially sustainable transition, and decision-making within the Joint Programme. While not every issue in the options paper had been covered, the discussions had clarified constituency perspectives on key questions. She urged PCB members and observers to take ownership of the process, identify common ground and demonstrate the political readiness to accommodate remaining differences ahead of

the PCB Special Session on 26 October.

66. UNAIDS Executive Director Winnie Byanyima thanked participants for their frank discussions and emphasized that the response should be guided by the needs of people. Success would mean integration into national institutions, informed by careful listening to programme-country governments and communities. She described Resident Coordinator offices as the preferred interim location for HIV coordinators before integration with national authorities and reiterated that transition should be phased and based on clear, verifiable evidence to uphold the principle of “do no harm”.
67. She acknowledged donor calls to rebuild trust and operate within a smaller funding envelope, while stressing the need for a viable Joint Programme able to meet increasing country demands. She called for a budget reflecting essential needs and collective efforts to retain traditional donors, re-engage former donors and attract new contributors. She thanked longstanding donors and recognized programme countries’ growing domestic investment in HIV responses and contributions to the Joint Programme’s country-level work.
68. In closing, Ms. Byanyima thanked the Working Group and participants for their commitment and emphasized their shared goal of ending AIDS as a public health threat. She urged all constituencies to work together towards that objective and confirmed the Secretariat’s readiness to support the Working Group and stakeholders through to the Board’s decisions.
69. The Chair thanked the Co-Facilitators, Working Group members, consultants, Secretariat, Bureau and participants for their contributions. She confirmed that written submissions could be received until close of business that day and would be reviewed alongside the oral interventions. The feedback would inform the Working Group’s final plan and the upcoming meeting of Cosponsor heads of agency with the Co-Facilitators. She announced that the plan was expected to be posted on the PCB website on 9 October at the latest, for consideration at the PCB Special Session on 26 October 2026, and declared the consultation closed.

[End of document]