

> GLOBAL REVIEW PANEL >>
ON THE FUTURE OF THE UNAIDS JOINT PROGRAMME MODEL



GLOBAL REVIEW PANEL

1ST MEETING REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The Global Review Panel on the future of the UNAIDS Joint Programme model is tasked with making recommendations for a sustainable and fit for purpose Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), with a particular focus on three fundamental pillars of the Joint Programme: joint working, financing and accountability, and governance. The Panel, requested by the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, is co-convened by Helen Clark, Chair of the UN Development Group, and UNAIDS Executive Director Michel Sidibé. The Panel Co-Chairs are Awa Coll-Seck, Health Minister of Senegal, and Lennarth Hjelmåker, Sweden's Ambassador for Global Health.¹

At its first meeting, held 20 January 2017 in Geneva, Switzerland, the Panel achieved a shared understanding on the scope of the review and the key issues to be addressed. The Panel also began the process of developing answers to guiding questions (see below) set out in a background paper entitled 'Review, refine and reinforce'.² The background paper—developed by the Panel Co-Chairs—laid out the challenges that led to establishment of the Panel, the context surrounding those challenges, and also many of the issues that the Panel should consider as it develops its recommendations. Panel members remarked that the scope and areas of focus for the Panel, as set out in the background paper, provided a good basis for discussion.

Panel members were urged by Ambassador Hjelmåker and the Co-Conveners to take the opportunity of their first meeting to brainstorm freely and think boldly, as a first step towards developing recommendations that will generate real change within the areas of the Joint Programme that need strengthening. At the same time, the Panel was urged to be judicious—to refrain from fixing things that aren't broken, and to ensure that its final recommendations are feasible to implement. Minister Coll-Seck, who was unable to attend the first meeting, sent a written statement "from an African perspective" stressing that the Panel must leverage changes in the global context into opportunities for UNAIDS to develop ways to work smarter, to be more effective and efficient, and to generate greater value for money (see full statement in Annex A). To facilitate a frank dialog, it was agreed that the meeting report would not attribute specific statements to individual panel members.

During the opening session, it was repeatedly noted that UNAIDS plays a critical role within the global response to the AIDS

epidemic, setting the vision and global agenda and providing leadership to achieve this agenda at country level, engaging in evidence-informed advocacy, delivering normative guidance and technical expertise, providing independent monitoring of the epidemic and response, and promoting human rights and meaningful engagement of civil society. The Joint Programme, the collective action of 11 UN organizations and the Secretariat, was also recognized by the Panel as a unique model that has promoted UN coordination and coherence around a priority issue—a joint approach that resonates with the outcomes of the 2016 Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of the United Nations Development System. Panel members stressed that UNAIDS provides a model for coordinated UN action within the context of supporting countries to implement Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development.

However, both UNAIDS and the wider UN system have challenges that must be addressed. A significant change in global context—including the emergence of new actors within the global health and development system—has occurred since the establishment of UNAIDS, bringing further complexity to the overall environment. The United Nations system is under pressure to increase the pace of UN reform, and new Secretary-General António Guterres has pledged to lead a comprehensive reform effort focused on leadership, coordination, building a culture of accountability and strong performance management. While leadership and coordination are natural strengths of UNAIDS, Panel members called for UNAIDS to use this opportunity to ensure the required capacities within the Secretariat and Cosponsors are in place and to strengthen accountability systems in order to ensure consistent delivery of results and clear reporting of the added value of UNAIDS' work. The Panel's leadership challenged Panellists to develop recommendations for a more robust decision-making process for UNAIDS' work that will guide strengthened delivery and accountability, including through more dynamic budgeting and financial allocation processes.

Panel members also reiterated several basic principles of the AIDS response that must be maintained, including country ownership and the "Three Ones" of national-level coordination: the participation of people living with HIV and marginalized populations, human rights-based and gender-sensitive approaches, and the use of evidence to focus AIDS responses on the most effective programmes and the locations and populations in greatest need.

¹The terms of reference of the Global Review Panel are available at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4knHNADgtxZeE0N0gxOGRrY2M/viewview>.

²The background paper can be accessed at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4knHNADgtxZOVlcS1PYmF6VHM/view>.

JOINT WORKING

Illustrative questions on joint working proposed to the Panel:

- 1.1. What incentives, tools and processes can be put in place to enhance joint UN work on AIDS?
 - 1.2. How can the division of labour among Cosponsors and the Secretariat be refined?
 - 1.3. How to ensure the Cosponsors and Secretariat have optimal human resources at country, regional and global level?
 - 1.4. How can UN entities outside the Joint Programme and other partners be more systematically engaged?
-

On the issue of joint working, Panel members discussed the quality and consistency of efforts by Cosponsors and the Secretariat to coordinate their work and jointly deliver results. A formal division of labour—negotiated in 2005 and revised in 2010 and 2012—defines the roles and responsibilities of Cosponsors and the Secretariat, including the identification of convening agencies for 15 areas of work. It was noted during the session that not all results must be delivered jointly, especially in areas where one or a few Cosponsors have the required mandate and capacities. In addition, awareness of the division of labour among UNAIDS’ partners at country level may be low, which limits efforts to hold Cosponsors and the Secretariat accountable for playing their respective roles.

It was also mentioned that the financial difficulties faced by UNAIDS put additional pressure on the Cosponsors and Secretariat to prioritize and consider scaling back work in some areas. Prioritization will likely be a challenge for a Joint Programme that has historically stressed the importance of broad partnerships and inclusive dialogue. Deprioritization of some areas of work could weaken these partnerships. Similarly, concerns were expressed that prioritization could result in Cosponsors or the Secretariat dropping work on particularly challenging issues, such as the rights of key populations and intellectual property.

Gaps in UN support are already a concern, especially at country level, where Joint UN Teams on AIDS are convened within UN Country Teams. In some countries Cosponsors may not have a presence or a staff member dedicating a significant amount of his/her time to AIDS, even if the Cosponsors’ lead area is a key feature of the epidemic and response. This challenge is more common in countries where HIV is not a priority within the UN Development

Assistance Framework. Similarly, some Panel members noted that UNAIDS Secretariat offices are the “go to” place for civil society when they need UN support, and the closure of UNAIDS Secretariat offices would risk to erode this critical function of the Joint Programme.

Panel members shared their knowledge and experience of incentives, tools and processes that promote joint UN work. It was suggested that at least one previous assessment had noted that Joint Teams that meet regularly tend to better coordinate their work. “Delivering as One” pilots were highlighted as innovative efforts to improve the UN system’s impact at country level through more coherent programmes, reduced transaction costs and lower overhead costs.³ An early evaluation of Delivering-as-One countries found that two innovations were improving broader country-level coordination:

- One Houses, which bring individual agencies under one roof; a particularly notable example is Viet Nam, where the staff from various agencies sit in thematic clusters, rather than among their agency colleagues.
- One Funds, which are a pool of un-earmarked funds at country level, programmed jointly by thematic working groups.

It was asked how UN Resident Coordinators, the country representatives of Cosponsors and the Secretariat and staff working primarily on the Joint Programme could be more firmly held accountable for working jointly to implement the UNAIDS Strategy, perhaps through their respective performance appraisal systems. It was proposed that past assessments of the functioning of Joint Teams and other country-level UN coordination structures and processes should be taken into account as the Panel formulates its recommendations.

³Standard operating procedures for Delivering-as-One pilots call for the establishment within the UN Country Team of One Programme, One Fund, One Leader, Operating and One and Communicating as One. Some pilot countries have added “One House”.

Panel members suggested that a well-functioning Joint Programme was closely linked to having the right people and the right skills in place among the Cosponsors and Secretariat. When the right capacities are in place at country level, UNAIDS is a powerful catalyst for change. An example given was the Joint Programme's capacity to advocate with government on sensitive issues, such as human rights. Panel members asked if Cosponsors and the Secretariat systematically work jointly to assess and ensure their staff resources were optimally deployed to meet the needs of countries, and if not, whether a specific mechanism could be put in place (including possibly at country level).

The proposed question on more systematic engagement of additional UN entities outside the Joint Programme and other partners did not trigger much discussion. At country level it was noted that other UN entities, such as the International Organization for Migration, were free to join Joint Teams, and that wider national coordination was already being facilitated by UNAIDS, but was ultimately the responsibility of the national AIDS coordinating authority. It was agreed that these partners required more systematic engagement at the global level, and that discussion took place within the governance session of the Panel meeting.

Ideas put forward for potential solutions and areas in need of further investigation:

- Review the division of labour and consider: (a) how to strengthen accountability for convening and delivering in Cosponsor-led areas and the Secretariat's cross-cutting functions; and (b) whether the Panel should recommend that the Joint Programme establish a process to drop some areas of work.
 - Use a proportion of the Joint Programme's core budget to provide Joint Teams with One Fund-style resources that are jointly programmed and dynamically allocated for country-level activities.
 - Require Joint Teams to develop country-level fund-raising plans.
 - Develop options for mechanisms to jointly review and allocate Secretariat and Cosponsor financial and human resources at country level (possibly in collaboration with countries) and consider whether these mechanisms should be applied globally or in Fast-Track countries⁴.
 - Co-locate country-level Cosponsor and Secretariat staff in one office.
 - Establish other mechanisms and incentives which facilitate enhanced joint working.
 - Review past assessments on joint UN work to identify incentives, tools and processes that have enhanced coordination, collaboration and the effectiveness of UN support.
 - Review the performance assessment systems for UN Resident Coordinators and Cosponsor and Secretariat country representatives, and determine whether it is feasible to include joint work on AIDS within their performance appraisals.
-

⁴Thirty-five countries that together account for more than 90% of people acquiring HIV infection and 90% of people dying from AIDS-related causes worldwide. See list on page 44 of the UNAIDS 2016–2021 Strategy.

GOVERNANCE

Illustrative questions on joint working proposed to the Panel:

- 2.1. How can the UNAIDS Board provide ongoing guidance to the wider global AIDS response, in support of UN General Assembly commitments?
 - 2.2. How can the CCO enhance integration of the work of the Joint Programme into Cosponsor efforts to deliver on the SDGs?
 - 2.3. How can the CCO better serve as a link between the UNAIDS Board and the Boards of Cosponsors and improve policy coherence within the UN development system?
 - 2.4. How can important additional stakeholders be brought into Board discussions in a more structured and systematic way?
-

Given the leadership entrusted to the Joint Programme for the global AIDS response, as manifest in its global strategies and its role in supporting countries to report on progress towards commitments made in the UN General Assembly, the issue of governance relates not only to the Joint Programme, but also the response more broadly.

At country level, many Panel members noted that the issue of governance is intimately tied to country ownership, the need for all partners to respect national priorities and the possible benefits of greater engagement of country partners in the planning and reviews of Joint Team efforts. At global level, the background paper for the Global Review Panel's work suggested there is insufficient systematic discussion and oversight of the wider global AIDS response in between UN High-level Meetings on AIDS. The paper suggested the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board could help fill that gap. Panel members debated this suggestion. Potential areas where the UNAIDS Board could play such a role included policy alignment and tracking of overall resource needs, investments and gaps for the AIDS response.

Panel members also discussed the overall functioning of the UNAIDS Board and whether its current composition adequately represented all key constituencies of the global AIDS response. Many Panel members agreed that the inclusion of civil society within the Board was an innovation that must be retained. However, a proposal to widen Board representation to include representatives of the private sector, private foundations and research institutions was met with a variety of opinions. Some viewed the Global Review Panel as an opportunity to include these

stakeholders, arguing that they are critical to quickening the pace of response, as envisioned in the UNAIDS Fast-Track strategy. Others expressed concerns that changing the composition of the Board would require approval by the UN Economic and Social Council. There were different views on the potential outcome of such a move, with several noting that implications of a change must be carefully considered. It was also mentioned that the value of participating in the UNAIDS Board would need to be articulated and demonstrated to private foundations and other stakeholders.

Panel members debated alternatives for more structured and systematic policy-level engagement with all key stakeholders. One idea was to establish a partnership platform that would engage in rigorous and detailed discussions on policy and programme issues and report regularly to the Board. Some were opposed to establishing formal sub-structures within the Board, expressing concern that adding further complexity to UNAIDS' governance system could paralyze the main body. But at the same time, it was important for some forum to proactively formulate innovative recommendations to key policy issues, and for the Board to more consistently respond to such recommendations, such as those put forward by the Global Commission on HIV and the Law. It was also suggested that ad-hoc task teams could be established by the UNAIDS Board to generate policy advice on specific issues, and that membership in these task teams could include representatives of the most relevant stakeholders. No matter what the form of engagement, an important issue to be addressed is how the representatives of these stakeholders could be identified.

Another governance challenge facing UNAIDS is ensuring a coherent policy direction within the Joint Programme and the Boards of the Cosponsors. Various Panel members stated that this is in part due to the different compositions of the boards of these UN entities, inconsistent positions by individual Member States across various boards, and a lack of awareness of UNAIDS Board decisions within the boards of Cosponsors. Similarly, there were calls for strengthened mutual accountability among Cosponsors and the Secretariat, both globally and at country level. It has been suggested that the Committee of Cosponsoring Organizations (CCO) could be asked to serve as a more systematic link between the boards. It was also noted that a more systematic link could help expand resource

mobilization for the Joint Programme beyond UBRAF core funds, as it appears that an assumption in many Cosponsor boards is that it is primarily the UNAIDS Secretariat's responsibility to raise HIV funds for the Cosponsors. The background paper also suggested that the CCO should spend more of its time tackling the challenge of taking AIDS further out of isolation and integrating the response within the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in a way that does not dilute attention to the unique nature of the AIDS epidemic and the need for effective strategies to reach key populations. A positive example provided was coordinated policy engagement that resulted in increased attention to and additional resources for the response to HIV among men who have sex with men.

Ideas put forward for potential solutions and areas in need of further investigation:

- Elaborate further a mechanism linked to the UNAIDS Board for systematic, strategic discussion and oversight of the wider global AIDS response with a broader range of partners in between United Nations General Assembly High-level Meetings on AIDS, especially in the areas of policy alignment and tracking of overall resource needs, investments and gaps for the AIDS response.
 - Develop specific options on expanding participation in UNAIDS policy dialogue in more detail, analysing the potential contribution of each stakeholder group, weighing the pros and cons of each option, and build consensus around a specific recommendation.
 - Develop specific options on how the CCO can increase its focus on policy coherence among the UNAIDS and Cosponsor boards and ensure more systematic reporting on the Joint Programme in Cosponsor boards.
 - Develop specific options on how Member States could provide more consistent engagement on the AIDS response across the UNAIDS and Cosponsor boards.
 - Explore any further specific proposals from Panellists on how the Joint Programme can leverage its unique model take the AIDS response further out of alignment, reflecting the integrated and indivisible nature of the Sustainable Development Goals.
-

FINANCING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Illustrative questions on financing and accountability proposed to the Panel:

- 3.1. How can resource mobilization for the Joint Programme better align to the ambitious results demanded in the UBRAF?
 - 3.2. How can resource allocation to and among Cosponsors be differentiated to better respond to performance and the overall resource envelope?
 - 3.3. Should specific joint initiatives aligned with the Strategy be developed to mobilize more resources for the Cosponsors?
 - 3.4. What opportunities can be developed to finance the Joint Programme's unique supporting supporting role to the Global Fund?
 - 3.5. How can results-based planning, management and reporting be used to further reinforce strong performance of the Joint Programme?
 - 3.6. Should the Cosponsors/Secretariat provide detailed reporting on all AIDS-related work to the UNAIDS Board? Should the Board take a more active role in the oversight of financing for the entire AIDS response?
-

As described in the background paper, UNAIDS is facing a significant budget shortfall. Shortly after the UNAIDS Board adopted the Fast-Track Strategy and a two-year budget, several major donors significantly reduced their contributions to the UN system. The gap between the Board-approved budget and financial commitments reached 31% before some Member States stepped in with additional contributions. However, 2017 funding is still expected to fall significantly short of the budget. Panel members discussed the reasons behind the disconnect between what the Joint Programme is asked to do and the financing provided to do it, noting that some issues may be related to the broader environment and beyond the control of UNAIDS, while others must be squarely addressed with constructive recommendations.

While the UNAIDS Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework (UBRAF) is generally positively viewed as an innovative approach within the UN system in fostering coordination, coherence and accountability, the panel repeatedly spoke of the need for the Cosponsors and Secretariat to better align around one plan that identifies the concrete results expected of the Joint Programme and a reporting system that 'tells the story' of the value it demonstrably adds to the AIDS ecosystem.

A specific concern expressed was that UNAIDS needs to ensure that its resource mobilization, planning, budgeting and reporting mechanisms clarify to donors what each Cosponsor and Secretariat are responsible for, the work that each does within

these areas of responsibility, the results that have been achieved for communities, the resources that were used to achieve specific results and the added value of those results. This concern reflects UNAIDS' past struggles to tell a compelling story about the added value of each partner within the Joint Programme, as well as a consistent call for greater accountability within the UN system within individual boards and higher-level fora such as the UN General Assembly's Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review. UNAIDS' ability to respond to this call may be the single greatest challenge facing the Joint Programme, and therefore one of the biggest tasks of the Global Review Panel is to provide strong and specific recommendations on this issue. In the words of one Panel member, "UNAIDS needs to send an aggressive message: 'We are going to deliver.'"

Panel members called for UNAIDS' results framework to be further strengthened around outcomes and outputs that are linked to the core objectives of the Joint Programme, as specific as possible and as attributable as possible to the Joint Programme, while keeping it simple and focusing specifically on country-level results. For example, putting the global AIDS response on a "Fast-Track" and achieving targets such as 90–90–90 is a collective responsibility of all stakeholders, and specifically of Member States who made formal commitments in the 2016 Political Declaration to End AIDS. Cosponsors and the Secretariat are responsible for supporting low- and middle-income countries to Fast-Track in specific areas, as identified in the division of labour. It was noted

that many of the results of the Joint Programme are not as easily quantifiable as the amount of medicines procured or the number of people accessing antiretroviral therapy, but that outputs and outcomes should still be objectively measurable, instil a culture of accountability and show the contribution of individual entities within the Joint Programme. Similarly, Secretariat and Cosponsor staff at all levels should have performance metrics that directly align to the core objectives of UNAIDS.

On one hand, it was mentioned that the ability of Cosponsors and the Secretariat to deliver results needs to be linked to the allocation of financial resources within the Joint Programme. Some Panel members expressed concern that static year-on-year allocations could be taken for granted. A more dynamic and differentiated allocation model, based on the UNAIDS Strategy, with performance incentives would likely motivate stronger achievement of results. While recognizing that healthy competition can be good, it was emphasized that performance incentives should not lead to a situation that discourages information-sharing and joint work among Cosponsors and the Secretariat.

On the other hand, it was stressed that funding for Cosponsors and the Secretariat needs to be more predictable or it will be impossible for the Joint Programme to plan effectively. It was noted that UNAIDS relies almost entirely on voluntary contributions⁵, which makes the Joint Programme more vulnerable to short-term financing shocks, compared to UN entities that receive assessed contributions. It was also noted that a particular strength of the UBRAF is that the vast majority of funding provided by donors is un-earmarked. Maintaining this flexibility will be critical moving forward.

Some Panel members called for the allocation of UBRAF core funding to prioritize funding to the Secretariat to ensure that it continues to perform the functions that have long been recognized as particular strengths of the Joint Programme. It was noted that the UBRAF is the sole source of funding for the Secretariat. However, others stressed that the Joint Programme approach itself should be maintained, and therefore the Secretariat could not be protected at all costs at the expense of the Cosponsors if the resource environment becomes increasingly strained, undermining the ability of some Cosponsors to fulfil their HIV-related mandates. It was also suggested that while the UNAIDS Secretariat plays a unique role fulfilling specific functions, that role should not expand to include more operational functions, such as project and programme implementation.

Panel members debated ways to strike a balance between predictability and accountability. It was suggested that core funding be provided in a catalytic way that incentivizes Cosponsors to raise resources through their agency budgets or through new and innovative resource allocation models. One idea was to retain some core funding for each Cosponsor, while making additional allocations contingent on a collaborative approach and/or an ability to demonstrate individual results.

It was also suggested that the Secretariat should change the tone of its reporting on the AIDS response to make it clear to traditional donors and the general public that the AIDS epidemic is far from over, and to develop a new fund-raising strategy that seeks to tap into non-traditional sources of funding. Middle-income countries and the private sector were specifically noted as potential sources of additional funding. An example given was Argentina, which provides funding to UNDP for the technical support that UNDP provides to Argentina. Another proposed approach would be to develop specific initiatives and then identify fund-raising streams for those initiatives.

There was significant amount of discussion regarding how the Joint Programme's unique supporting role to the Global Fund could receive consistent financial support. There was general agreement that UNAIDS needs to be well resourced to play this role, which goes beyond technical support in the traditional sense. It was suggested that the Global Fund's donors should as a matter of practice ensure that Global Fund commitments are accompanied by a proportionate contribution to UNAIDS, but it was unclear how this could become a more widespread and consistent practice. The Global Fund could potentially provide resources to UNAIDS for technical support to grant processes—an arrangement that had been considered in the past, but one that UNAIDS ultimately declined out of concern that the Joint Programme would become a “sub-contractor” of a funding agency, rather than an inter-governmental entity that provides independent policy guidance and programmatic support. Several Panel members noted that the funds from the Global Fund's latest round of replenishment have already been allocated to countries, making it difficult to re-allocate a portion of those resources to UNAIDS. Ultimately, it was agreed that the Panel has been specifically instructed by the UNAIDS Board to explore options in this area, and that the above issues must be considered during the Panel's elaboration of both options and recommendations.

⁵All core UBRAF resources, all non-core resources for the Secretariat and most of the non-core resources of the Cosponsors are voluntary contributions. Among the Cosponsors are some specialized agencies that receive assessed contributions from Member States. A small proportion of those assessed contributions may be allocated to activities and results in the UBRAF.

Ideas put forward for potential solutions and areas in need of further investigation:

- Establish a differentiated and more dynamic model for the allocation of core UBRAF resources that is needs- and results-based, but does not put the Cosponsors and Secretariat in direct competition with each other for resources.
 - Refine and simplify the results framework and reporting system to make it more transparent and accountable, ensuring it captures the results and added value of individual Cosponsors and the Secretariat, especially at country level.
 - Develop a proposal for a specific mechanism that balances accountability measures with the Joint Programme's need for predictable and un-earmarked funding.
 - Identify specific strategies for the Cosponsors and the Secretariat to tap into new sources of funding, such as joint resource mobilization at country level and encouraging contributions from governments in a position to financially support UNAIDS' work in their own country.
 - Develop options for more consistent financial support to the Joint Programme's unique supporting role to the Global Fund without challenging the intergovernmental nature of UNAIDS.
-

CONCLUSIONS

The first meeting of the Global Review Panel successfully developed a shared understanding of key issues facing UNAIDS that must be addressed in the Panel's final recommendations. However, in each of the three fundamental pillars, more work needs to be done to ensure the Panel's recommendations are specific, actionable, feasible and will generate real change.

On some questions posed to the Panel, well-informed answers will require additional work by individuals with specific experience and expertise. For some issues, the Co-Chairs of the Panel will reach out to individual Panel members and request them to develop options, as well as elaboration of the pros and cons of each option from the perspectives of each constituency represented on the Panel. Panel members are also encouraged to volunteer to conduct additional analyses within areas of particular interest.

An important next step will be a virtual consultation: an online public forum that will be open to the general public for the first two weeks

of February. The virtual consultation will likely generate additional questions and proposed solutions that the Panel should consider. The Co-Chairs will work with the Panel secretariat to synthesize the results of the virtual consultation into a short report that will be shared with Panel members by the end of February.

In March, all of the above inputs will be considered by the Co-Chairs as they prepare a draft report, featuring draft recommendations of the Panel. This draft report will be shared with Panel members for comment, and those comments will be incorporated into a second draft that will be shared ahead of the second Panel meeting. At that meeting, the Panel is tasked with achieving consensus on its final analysis and recommendations. The Co-Chairs will then finalize the Panel report and present it to the Co-Conveners.

ANNEX A

African perspective: why do we need a better unaids/aids ecosystem to deliver results? by dr awa coll-seck, minister of health, republic of senegal

- From the African perspective, the issue about HIV and AIDS is at the core of its development continuum. Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) has also 70% of the burden of HIV Globally (25.5mil of 36.7mil). SSA has 11.8 mil on treatment with antiretroviral therapy by end of 2015.
 - To end AIDS by 2030 as a public health challenge, a lot needs to be done and ambitious targets have been agreed as part of the Sustainable Development Goals. Our job is unfinished. Getting the job done is a shared responsibility and global responsibility (fast tracking and financing the response from both international and domestic resources).
 - To respond to the question of “why we need a better UNAIDS”? I will start by saying we actually need a different UNAIDS/AIDS ecosystem that has internalized the significant gains in AIDS response and related fields, such as: the critical role of a dedicated political and agenda-setting organization to advance health indicators; the intricate relationships between health and other sectors such as human rights, commerce and trade, democracy; complex health interventions being no more inaccessible in challenged settings; and new models of health systems that captures societal and technological changes since the Alma Ata.
 - This also means we should think changes in UNAIDS together with changes in the broader AIDS ecosystem, and what this means for the other global health organizations. The new AIDS ecosystem would then provide the new UNAIDS a better structure to advance on the unfinished business and conclude the global AIDS response with the 90-90-90, and the ending of AIDS by 2030.
 - The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) is the UNs strategy of being effective and responsive by strengthening coordination for maximal impact through joint action with clear division of labor, unified governance and being accountable for results.
 - It is great having a robust UNAIDS Strategy (2016-2021) but not investing fully into this plan means that we cannot deliver tangible impact for people especially women and children.
 - The reality is that we have ambitious targets at a time of serious funding crisis which puts the UNAIDS Strategy (2016-2021) at risk of failure and missing out of the SDGs.
 - As a resilience institution, the UN needs to turn this changing dynamics into opportunities for working smarter and effective, be efficient, and generate greater value for all efforts and investments.
 - We need to reform, refine how we do business by being more creative and innovative for impact. Simply put we need to be fit-for-purpose. We need to diversify our funding sources and mobilize more resources for our core and non-core resources for the implementation of the UNAIDS Strategy and to achieve results.
 - The expectation from SSA is that amidst these crises, we will support the UN Joint Program on HIV/AIDS to become fit-for-purpose by refining for the better its governance, operations and accountability structure and function to become more responsive to our global need of ending AIDS by 2030.
-

ANNEX B – MEETING AGENDA AND PARTICIPANTS LIST

Global Review Panel on the future of the UNAIDS Joint Programme model

FIRST MEETING

20 JANUARY 2017, 09:30 – 17:00.

KOFI A. ANNAN CONFERENCE ROOM, UNAIDS

AGENDA

09:30 – 10:45	OPENING Introductory remarks by Co-Conveners and Co-Chairs General Discussion
10:45 – 11:15	BREAK
11:15 – 12:15	SESSION 1: JOINT WORKING Scene setting by Discuss scope and questions
12:15 – 13:30	LUNCH BREAK
13:30 – 14:30	SESSION 2: GOVERNANCE Scene setting Discuss scope and questions
14:30 – 15:30	SESSION 3: FINANCING AND ACCOUNTABILITY Scene setting by Discuss scope and questions
15:30 – 16:00	GROUP PICTURE, FOLLOWED BY BREAK
16:00 – 17:00	PROCESS GOING FORWARD

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

PANEL CO-CONVENERS

HELEN CLARK UNDG Chair and UNDP Administrator

MICHEL SIDIBE Executive Director, UNAIDS

PANEL CO-CHAIR

H.E. LENNARTH HJELMÅKER **Special Ambassador for Global Health, Sweden**

PANEL MEMBERS

JEFFRY ACABA Education and Advocacy Lead, Asia Pacific Network of Young Key Populations (Youth LEAD)

ERTHARIN COUSIN Executive Director, World Food Programme

KIERAN DALY Deputy Director, Global Policy and Advocacy: HIV, TB, Malaria and the Global Fund, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

SUSAN ECKEY Ambassador of Norway to Uganda

**H.E. SAMMIE PESKY
EDDICO**

**Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the European
Offices of the UN, WTO and other International Organizations in
Geneva and Vienna, Ghana**

PROFESSOR SMAÏL MESBAH
Director-General of Prevention and Health Promotion, Ministry of Health, People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

ALESSANDRA NILO Executive Director, Gestos

KATE THOMSON Head, Community, Rights and Gender, Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

DANIEL GRAYMORE Head, Global Funds Department, Department for International Development, and Senior DFID Representative, United Kingdom

DR. NDUKU KILONZO
VIA TELECOM FOR THE WHOLE DAY

PHUMZILE MLAMBO-NGCUKA
VIA PHONE FROM 2:30 TO 5:00 PM

OTHER ATTENDEES

KJETIL GAMMELSRUD AASLAND	Counsellor, Norway Mission
JAN BEAGLE	Deputy Executive Director, Management and External Relations, UNAIDS
CYNTHIA BLICK	Intern, UNAIDS
LUDO BOK	Team Leader, Development Effectiveness, HIV, Health & Development Group, UNDP
LAETITIA BOSIO	Policy and Strategy Officer, Strategic Policy Directions, UNAIDS
MARTIN BLOEM	Senior Nutrition Advisor/UNAIDS Global Coordinator, United Nations World Food Programme
KENT BUSE	Chief, Strategic Policy Directions, UNAIDS
MANDEEP DHALIWAL	Director, HIV, Health & Development Group, Bureau for Policy & Programme Support, UNDP
CHRIS FONTAINE	Senior Adviser, Policy Analysis and Reporting, UNAIDS
ANNEMARIE HOU	Director, Communications and Global Advocacy, UNAIDS
PHIL JOHNSTON	Economic Adviser, Global Funds Department, Department for International Development, United Kingdom
BETH MAGNE WATTS	Senior Advisor, UNAIDS
JULIA MARTIN	Senior Health Advisor and Representative to the Global Fund, United States Government
JOEL REHNSTROM	Director, Planning, Finance and Accountability, UNAIDS
MARIANGELA SIMAO	Director, Rights, Gender Prevention and Community Mobilization, UNAIDS

ANNEX C – UNAIDS DIVISION OF LABOUR MATRIX

Role of the UNAIDS Secretariat: overall coordination, coherence and accountability of the Division of Labour.

The UNAIDS Secretariat will have overall responsibility for ensuring functioning and accountability across all areas of the Division of Labour on the following.

- Leadership and advocacy: to influence the setting of a rights-based and gender-sensitive HIV political agenda for the three Strategic Directions outlined in the UNAIDS Strategy for 2001–2015, in order to reposition the Joint Programme within a changing (aid and development) environment, based on the analysis of strategic information, including data on the current drivers of the HIV epidemic. The three Strategic Directions are:
 - revolutionizing HIV prevention;
 - catalysing the next phase of treatment, care and support; and
 - advancing human rights and gender equality for the HIV response.
- Coordination, coherence and partnerships: across all the areas outlined in the Division of Labour matrix, to ensure delivery on the three Strategic Directions.
- Mutual accountability: to support the mutual accountability of the Secretariat and Cosponsors to enhance programme efficiency and effectiveness and to optimally deliver on the shared Joint Programme mission, vision and Strategy, with measurable results.

More specifically, the Secretariat will:

- lead in advocacy and facilitate the generation of strategic information for an evidence-informed, rights-based and gender-sensitive global HIV political agenda, in accordance with a collectively agreed agenda;
- assure overarching coherence, coordination and support for effective and flexible partnerships across all areas outlined in the Division of Labour, including with people living with HIV, in close collaboration with Cosponsors;
- capitalize on interagency mechanisms to ensure appropriate coordination and cohesion across the three Strategic Directions to:
 - identify concrete deliverables and targets, taking into consideration the bold results defined in each of the priority areas;
 - assess how all priority areas of the outcome framework will contribute to the three Strategic Directions;
 - facilitate coordination and collaboration across all areas of the Division of Labour in order to maximize the potential synergy between the priority areas;
 - enhance the role that human rights and gender equality must play to improve the outcomes on prevention and on treatment, care and support;
 - promote synergy between the efforts that focus on prevention, treatment, care and support as part of the AIDS response and the efforts that are being mainstreamed into broader areas of development; and
 - ensure mutual accountability mechanisms, including optimum use of the Unified Budget and Workplan (and the Unified Budget and Accountability Framework for 2012–2015), for the entire Joint Programme to the Executive Director and the Programme Coordinating Board;

- collect and synthesize key data on the epidemic, in accordance with newly emerging trends, patterns and categories, including from a human rights and gender perspective, to monitor and evaluate progress towards achieving universal access and the Millennium Development Goals;
- lead the development, coordination and implementation of a mutual accountability framework (in accordance with the above) for the entire Joint Programme (encouraging the use of the Cosponsor Evaluation Working Group and the UNAIDS Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group);
- create space for and support Cosponsors in acting as One United Nations, maximizing their joint comparative advantages at the country level in relation to development partners, in support of national efforts to achieve universal access and Millennium Development Goals;
- facilitate in brokering and strengthening synergy, complementarity and accountability between technical support mechanisms and providers for appropriate national AIDS responses; and
- lead in mobilizing resources for the core budget and collaborate, where appropriate, with Cosponsors, in mobilizing supplemental and any other funds

DIVISION OF LABOUR AREA	CONVENERS	AGENCY PARTNERS		
REDUCE THE SEXUAL TRANSMISSION OF HIV ^a	WORLD BANK UNFPA	WORLD BANK UNFPA WHO	UNDP UNICEF WFP	UNHCR ILO UNESCO
PREVENT MOTHERS FROM DYING AND BABIES FROM BECOMING INFECTED WITH HIV ^a	WHO UNICEF	WHO UNICEF	UNFPA WFP	
ENSURE THAT PEOPLE LIVING WITH HIV RECEIVE TREATMENT ^a	WHO	WHO UNICEF WFP	UNHCR WHO ILO	UNDP
PREVENT PEOPLE LIVING WITH HIV FROM DYING FROM TUBERCULOSIS ^a	WHO	WHO WFP UNODC	UNICEF ILO	
PROTECT DRUG USERS FROM BECOMING INFECTED WITH HIV AND ENSURE ACCESS TO COMPREHENSIVE HIV SERVICES FOR PEOPLE IN PRISONS AND OTHER CLOSED SETTINGS ^a	UNODC	UNODC UNICEF WORLD BANK UNESCO	WHO UNDP UNFPA	

EMPOWER MEN WHO HAVE SEX WITH MEN, SEX WORKERS AND TRANSGENDER PEOPLE TO PROTECT THEMSELVES FROM HIV INFECTION AND TO FULLY ACCESS ANTIRETROVIRAL THERAPY ^a	UNDP UNFPA	UNDP UNFPA UNESCO	WORLD BANK WHO	
REMOVE PUNITIVE LAWS, POLICIES, PRACTICES, STIGMA AND DISCRIMINATION THAT BLOCK EFFECTIVE RESPONSES TO AIDS ^a	UNDP	UNDP UNESCO UNHCR	UNFPA WHO ILO	UNODC UNICEF UN WOMEN
MEET THE HIV NEEDS OF WOMEN AND GIRLS AND STOP SEXUAL AND GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE ^a	UNDP UNFPA UN WOMEN	UNDP UNFPA WFP	UNICEF WHO UNODC	UNESCO UNHCR ILO
EMPOWER YOUNG PEOPLE TO PROTECT THEMSELVES FROM HIV ^a	UNICEF UNFPA	UNICEF UNFPA ILO	WFP UNESCO WHO	UNHCR
ENHANCE SOCIAL PROTECTION FOR PEOPLE AFFECTED BY HIV ^a	UNICEF WORLD BANK	UNICEF WORLD BANK ILO	WFP WHO UNHCR	UNDP
ADDRESS HIV IN HUMANITARIAN EMERGENCIES ^b	UNHCR WFP	UNHCR WFP UNICEF	WHO UNODC UNDP	UNFPA
INTEGRATE FOOD AND NUTRITION WITHIN THE HIV RESPONSE	WFP	WFP UNICEF	WHO UNHCR	
SCALE UP HIV WORKPLACE POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES AND MOBILIZE THE PRIVATE SECTOR	ILO	UNESCO ILO WHO		
ENSURE HIGH-QUALITY EDUCATION FOR A MORE EFFECTIVE HIV RESPONSE	UNESCO	UNESCO WHO	UNFPA UNICEF	ILO
SUPPORT STRATEGIC, PRIORITIZED AND COSTED MULTISECTORAL NATIONAL AIDS PLANS	WORLD BANK	WORLD BANK UNESCO WFP ILO	UNDP WHO UNFPA UNICEF	UNHCR UNODC UN WOMEN

UNAIDS
Joint United Nations
Programme on HIV/AIDS

20 Avenue Appia
1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland
+41 22 791 3666

unaids.org