

## **PROGRAMME COORDINATING BOARD**

UNAIDS/PCB(31)/12.CRP.3

Issue date: 16 November 2012

### **THIRTY-FIRST MEETING**

DATE: 11-13 December 2012

VENUE: Executive Board Room, WHO, Geneva

---

**Agenda item 5**

## **Independent Review: NGO/Civil Society Participation in the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board**

**Document prepared by the Independent Consultant**

---

## Contents

<b>SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Overview of report.....	1
1.2. Purpose and management of 2012 Review .....	1
1.3. Areas of analysis for 2012 Review.....	1
1.4. Methodology of 2012 Review .....	2
<b>SECTION 2: BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1. The UNAIDS PCB.....	3
2.2. The NGO Delegation.....	4
<b>SECTION 3: FINDINGS: STATUS OF NGO DELEGATION PARTICIPATION IN THE PCB.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Theme 1: Official structures, processes and roles that relate to NGO/civil society participation in the PCB.....	5
Theme 2: Composition, selection criteria and process for the PCB NGO representatives. ....	14
Theme 3: Systems for communication, consultation and accountability among the PCB NGO representatives.....	17
Theme 4: Capacity and resources for NGO/civil society participation in the PCB .....	23
Theme 5: Involvement of people living with HIV and other marginalized groups within NGO/civil society participation in the PCB .....	26
<b>SECTION 4: FINDINGS: STATUS OF PCB RECOMMENDATIONS ON CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION.....</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1. Introduction to key PCB recommendations.....	29
4.2. Status of key PCB recommendations.....	29
<b>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: LIST OF QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE RESULTS OF E-SURVEY .....</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>ANNEX 4: LIST OF RESOURCES FOR DESK REVIEW .....</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>ANNEX 5: FUNCTIONS OF PCB AND PCB BUREAU.....</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>ANNEX 6: QUALIFICATIONS AND COMMITMENTS OF PCB NGO DELEGATES .....</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>ANNEX 7: MEMBERS OF NGO DELEGATION SINCE 2007 .....</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>ANNEX 8: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR COMMUNICATION AND CONSULTATION FACILITY .....</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>ANNEX 9: MISSION, VISION, PRINCIPLES AND CODE OF CONDUCT OF PCB NGO DELEGATION .....</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>ANNEX 10: ANALYSIS OF STATUS OF PCB RECOMMENDATIONS ON CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION .....</b>	<b>.....</b>

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The findings, conclusions and recommendations expressed in this report are those of the Independent Consultant that implemented the Independent Review of NGO/Civil Society Participation in the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board. They are not necessarily those of UNAIDS or the PCB Bureau (which acted as the Oversight Committee for the initiative).

The Independent Consultant sincerely thanks the many individuals, organisations and agencies that contributed their time, opinions and ideas to this Review.

## ACRONYMS

<b>AMSHer</b>	African Men for Sexual Health and Rights
<b>ARASA</b>	AIDS and Rights Alliance of Southern Africa
<b>CCO</b>	Committee of Cosponsoring Organisations
<b>Cosponsor</b>	Cosponsoring Organisation (of UNAIDS)
<b>ECOSOC</b>	(United Nations) Economic and Social Council
<b>FBO</b>	Faith-based organisation
<b>GIPA</b>	Greater involvement of people living with HIV
<b>Global Fund</b>	Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
<b>GNP+</b>	Global Network of People Living with HIV
<b>ICASO</b>	International Council of AIDS Service Organisations
<b>ICSS</b>	International Civil Society Support
<b>INPUD</b>	International Network of People who Use Drugs
<b>ITPC</b>	International Treatment Preparedness Coalition
<b>MDG</b>	Millennium Development Goal
<b>MNCH</b>	Maternal, newborn and child health
<b>MOU</b>	Memorandum of Understanding
<b>MSM</b>	Men who have sex with men
<b>MSMGF</b>	Global Forum on MSM and HIV
<b>NGO</b>	Nongovernmental organisation
<b>PCB</b>	Programme Coordinating Board
<b>PLHIV</b>	People living with HIV
<b>SADC</b>	Southern African Development Community
<b>SIE</b>	Second Independent Evaluation
<b>SRH</b>	Sexual and reproductive health
<b>TORs</b>	Terms of reference
<b>UBRAF</b>	Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework
<b>UNAIDS</b>	Joint and Cosponsored United Nations Programme on AIDS
<b>WAC</b>	World AIDS Campaign

## SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Overview of report

This **report** presents an Independent Review of NGO/Civil Society Participation in the Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) of the Joint and Cosponsored United Nations Programme on AIDS (UNAIDS). The Review was implemented in September - October 2012. This report has six sections:

- Section 1: Introduction** – providing an overview of the 2012 Review
- Section 2: Background** – introducing the UNAIDS PCB and NGO Delegation<sup>1</sup>
- Section 3: Findings: Status of NGO Delegation participation in the PCB** – assessing the contribution of the NGO Delegation according to five themes (see section 1.3)
- Section 4: Findings: Status of PCB decisions on civil society participation** – assessing progress on specific PCB recommendations relating to civil society participation
- Section 5: Conclusions** – summarising the key issues and trends emerging from the 2012 Review
- Section 6: Recommendations** – proposing further actions to enhance civil society participation

### 1.2. Purpose and management of 2012 Review

The 2012 Review was based on Terms of Reference (TORs) provided by UNAIDS<sup>2</sup>. Its overall **purpose** was to: assess the NGO Delegation's participation in and contribution to the UNAIDS PCB; and recommend forward-looking actions (including any financial implications) for increasing the engagement and impact of civil society voices in the Board. The Review addressed the five year period since the previous Independent Review of NGO/Civil Society in the UNAIDS PCB in 2006/7<sup>3</sup>. It was **implemented** by Sarah Middleton-Lee - the same Independent Consultant as for the 2006/7 Review, enabling a systematic assessment of progress. In response to the TORs, the Consultant developed an Inception Report<sup>4</sup> which was approved by the PCB Bureau (acting as the **Oversight Committee** for the initiative). The Review was **managed** by the Governance and Multilateral Affairs Department of the UNAIDS Secretariat, Geneva.

### 1.3. Areas of analysis for 2012 Review

As in 2006/7, the 2012 Review was based on an analysis of five themes:

- Theme 1:** Official structures, processes and roles that relate to NGO/civil society participation in the PCB
- Theme 2:** Composition, selection criteria and process for the NGO representatives
- Theme 3:** Systems for communication, consultation and accountability among the NGO representatives
- Theme 4:** Capacity and resources for NGO/civil society participation in the PCB
- Theme 5:** Involvement of people living with HIV (PLHIV) and other marginalized groups within NGO/civil society participation in the PCB

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: In this report, the term 'NGO Delegation' is used in recognition of the name utilised by the 10 NGO Members and Alternates to describe themselves as a group. However, it is recognised that ECOSOC Resolution 1994/24 and the PCB Modus Operandi do not provide for an official Delegation.

<sup>2</sup> *Terms of Reference: Consultant: 2012 Review of NGO/Civil Society Participation in the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board*, UNAIDS, June 2012.

<sup>3</sup> *Independent Review: NGO/Civil Society Participation in the Programme Coordinating Board of UNAIDS*, Sarah Middleton-Lee, March 2007.

<sup>4</sup> *Inception Report: 2012 Review of NGO/Civil Society Participation in the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board*, Sarah Middleton-Lee, September 2012.

In addition, as requested in the TORs, the 2012 Review specifically explored the:

- Status of the implementation of the recommendations of the: **20<sup>th</sup> PCB** (including the 2006/7 Review); and **26<sup>th</sup> PCB** (under agenda item 4: Increased involvement of civil society in the PCB).
- Value added, strengths and cost effectiveness of the **Communication and Consultation Facility** (Communications Facility) of the NGO Delegation and support provided by the **UNAIDS Secretariat** to the NGO Delegation.

The Review did not aim to comprehensively record the full activities and results of the NGO Delegation, but, instead, to identify and analyse key examples, issues and trends. It also did not aim to assess civil society participation in wider UNAIDS processes beyond the PCB.

#### **1.4. Methodology of 2012 Review**

The 2012 Review used five complementary methodologies:

- 1. Key stakeholder interviews.** A total of 33 interviews were carried out with representatives of: Member States (9); Cosponsoring Organisations (Cosponsors) (4); UNAIDS Secretariat (5); past/present NGO Delegates and the Communications Facility (7); and wider civil society (8). The interviews were conducted by telephone, lasted approx. 45 minutes and were based on a list of 10 questions. [See Annex 1 for a list of participants and Annex 2 for the questions].
- 2. Focus group discussion with current NGO Delegation.** A discussion was carried out with 6 members of the current NGO Delegation. It lasted 2 hours and was based on the same 10 questions as for the key stakeholder interviews. [See Annex 1 for a list of participants].
- 3. E-survey among wider civil society.** An e-survey for all civil society organisations involved in HIV (at community, national, regional or global levels) was developed in four languages. It was disseminated through contacts lists, including those of the NGO Delegation and UNAIDS Secretariat. A total of 318 responses were received (161 in English, 72 Russian, 45 Spanish and 40 French). The respondents came from across the world, with the largest number from Eastern Europe and Central Asia (23%), Western and Central Africa (16%) and Latin America (15%)<sup>5</sup>. They represented a range of organisations, with the largest number from national NGOs or networks (26%) and AIDS service organisations (18%)<sup>6</sup>. Of note, 18% of respondents had not previously been aware of the NGO Delegation, while 37% were aware of it, but had had no involvement<sup>7</sup>. [See Annex 3 for a summary of the quantitative results of the survey].
- 4. Desk review.** A review was carried out of over 70 documents relating to the: PCB (such as its Modus Operandi and meeting reports); NGO Delegation (such as its TORs, Delegates Manual and NGO Reports); and UNAIDS Programme (such as its Second Independent Evaluation (SIE), 2011-2015 Strategy and Strategic Investment Framework). [See Annex 4 for a list of resources].
- 5. Observation of the context:** The Consultant observed a telephone briefing between an NGO Delegate and civil society constituents in Europe. She was also given access to examples of internal communication within the NGO Delegation, such as e-mail exchanges.

The limitations of the 2012 Review included its tight timeframe. This meant that the e-survey was only open for a short period, while the fifth methodology (observation of the context) could not be fully implemented, for example with the Consultant unable to observe the NGO Delegation at a PCB Meeting.

---

<sup>5</sup> Question 1 of e-survey – see Annex 3.

<sup>6</sup> Question 2 of e-survey – see Annex 3.

<sup>7</sup> Question 3 of e-survey – see Annex 3.

## SECTION 2: BACKGROUND

### 2.1. The UNAIDS PCB

**UNAIDS** was established by resolution 1994/24 of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)<sup>8</sup>. It was launched in January 1996. The Programme now brings together 11 UN Cosponsors<sup>9</sup> which operate according to a division of labour. As outlined in its 2011-2015 Strategy, the vision of UNAIDS is of zero new infections, zero AIDS-related deaths and zero discrimination<sup>10</sup>.

**Figure 1: Civil society and global leadership**

*"Our times demand a new definition of leadership - global leadership. They demand a new constellation of international cooperation - governments, civil society and the private sector, working together for a collective global good."*

United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon,  
World Economic Forum, 2009

The PCB acts as the **governing body** of UNAIDS on all programmatic issues concerning policy, strategy, finance and monitoring and evaluation. It meets twice a year in principle and has eight main functions [see **Annex 5**] and an agreed Modus Operandi<sup>11</sup>. The latter was revised in 2011, following attention to issues of governance in the UNAIDS SIE.

The PCB is **composed** of: 22 UN Member States from all geographic regions; 11 Cosponsors; and 5 NGOs, with one Member and one Alternate from different regions (three from developing countries and two from developed countries or those with economies in transition). ECOSOC resolution 1994/24 granted voting rights to the Member States, but not the Cosponsors and NGOs. However, to date, the PCB has operated a consensus model of **decision-making**. Recommendations are proposed within agenda items discussed in plenary, refined in a drafting room and then agreed back in plenary. The ECOSOC resolution also stated that the NGO Delegation should have neither a negotiating role nor the right to take part in formal decision-making process. However, in practice, the Delegation has been able to participate actively.

Upon written application and approval by the UNAIDS Secretariat, **Observers**, including from civil society, can also attend PCB Meetings.

The work of the PCB is supported by the **PCB Bureau** – with representatives of the PCB Officers (Chair, Vice Chair and Rapporteur), the Chair of the Committee of Cosponsoring Organisations (CCO) and the NGO Delegation. The Bureau aims to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of the PCB and has five main functions including preparation of the PCB agenda<sup>12</sup> [see **Annex 5**]. The Cosponsors and UNAIDS Secretariat comprise the CCO which serves a standing committee to the PCB.

<sup>8</sup> Resolution 1994/24: Joint and Cosponsored United Nations Programme on Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS), United Nations Economic and Social Council, July 1994.

<sup>9</sup> United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF); Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) ; World Food Programme (WFP); United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA); United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC); UN Women; International Labour Organisation (ILO); United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO); World Health Organisation (WHO); and World Bank.

<sup>10</sup> UNAIDS 2011-2015 Strategy: *Getting to Zero*, UNAIDS, 2010.

<sup>11</sup> *Modus Operandi of the Programme Coordinating Board of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)*, UNAIDS, revised December 2011.

<sup>12</sup> *Modus Operandi of the Programme Coordinating Board of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)*, UNAIDS, revised December 2011.

## 2.2. The NGO Delegation

UNAIDS was the first ever UN Programme to have **civil society** formally represented on its governing body. This ground-breaking move has been credited as the precedent for the sector's involvement in other global governance mechanisms for HIV and health, such as those of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the Global Fund), UNITAID and GAVI. This page provides a brief 'snapshot' of the NGO Delegation, with further details in subsequent sections of the report.

The NGO Delegation is **comprised** of two NGOs representing each of: Africa; Asia and the Pacific; Europe; Latin America and the Caribbean; and North America. A broad range of civil society organisations are eligible (see **Figure 2**). As specified in ECOSOC resolution 1994/24, the members are **selected** by the NGOs themselves. The process uses criteria for the qualifications and commitment of the individual Delegates and their organisation [See **Annex 6**], combined with attention to the overall balance of the Delegation (such as representation of PLHIV and key affected communities). **Annex 7** lists the members of the NGO Delegation in the past five years. NGOs normally serve for a term of two years, but may extend to three. They work on a voluntary basis and are expected to allocate *at least* 10 hours per week to their role. The costs for attending PCB Meetings are paid by the UNAIDS Secretariat.

**Figure 2: Eligibility for the NGO Delegation**

*“Local, national, regional and international NGOs, networks of people living with HIV (PLHIV Networks), AIDS service organizations (ASOs), community-based organizations (CBOs), AIDS activist organizations, faith-based organizations (FBOs) and networks or coalitions of AIDS organizations.”*

Terms of Reference, NGO Delegation

According to its TORs, the **mission** of the NGO Delegation is: *“To bring to the PCB the perspectives and expertise of people living with, most affected by, and most at risk of, vulnerable to, marginalized by, and affected by HIV and AIDS, as well as civil society and nongovernmental entities actively involved in HIV work, in order to ensure that their human rights and equitable, gender-sensitive access to comprehensive HIV prevention, treatment, care and support are reinforced by the policies, programmes, strategies and actions of the PCB and UNAIDS.”*<sup>13</sup> The Delegation's **role** focuses on: participating objectively and independently in the workings and decision-making of the PCB; undertaking various forms of proactive and informed advocacy within the structures and processes of the PCB; and enhancing the transparency and accountability of relevant PCB decision-making and policy-setting, helping to meet requirements for upwards accountability (towards the PCB and other Delegations) and downwards accountability (towards the people, communities and constituencies affected by HIV)<sup>14</sup>.

The **Communications Facility** was established in 2008 in response to the 2006/7 Review and a decision of the 20<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting. It has been independently hosted for two-year contracts by the: World AIDS Campaign (WAC) in 2008-2010; and International Council of AIDS Service Organisations (ICASO) in 2010-2012. A Request for Proposals has been issued for 2013-2014. The Facility has written TORs [see **Annex 8**], with goals focused on: supporting the internal management of the NGO Delegation; providing technical and policy support to the NGO Delegation; and helping facilitate the NGO Delegation's communication and consultation with wider civil society - to ensure that it is appropriately nominated and equipped to represent civil society issues to the PCB<sup>15</sup>. The NGO Delegation is also supported by the **UNAIDS Secretariat**, including funding for the Communications Facility and informational support from the Governance and Multilateral Affairs Department and Civil Society and Private Sector Division.

<sup>13</sup> *Terms of Reference of the UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation*, PCB NGO Delegation, (update being finalised) September 2012.

<sup>14</sup> [http://unaidspcbngo.org/?page\\_id=1139](http://unaidspcbngo.org/?page_id=1139)

<sup>15</sup> [http://unaidspcbngo.org/?page\\_id=1199](http://unaidspcbngo.org/?page_id=1199)



## SECTION 3: FINDINGS: STATUS OF NGO DELEGATION PARTICIPATION IN THE PCB

### Theme 1: Official structures, processes and roles that relate to NGO/civil society participation in the PCB

**Theme 1 of the 2012 Review addressed: the role and nature of civil society participation; constitutional issues about civil society participation; civil society participation in the preparation of PCB meetings; civil society participation before and during PCB meetings; NGO Delegation contributions to PCB agenda items; NGO Delegation's use of NGO Reports; civil society Observers to the PCB; civil society participation in other PCB Delegations; NGO Delegation's relations with other PCB Members; and civil society responses to the changing environment.**

#### **Role and nature of civil society participation**

The 2012 Review found that the inclusion of civil society in the PCB remains universally welcomed – as an important characteristic and valued asset of UNAIDS governance. Representatives from all stakeholder groups speak passionately about the NGO Delegation's **role** as a reality check to the Board's proceedings – which, otherwise, risk being overly theoretical and political. As a representative of a Member State put it: *"The NGOs keep the Member States focused on what UNAIDS is all about."* In particular, the NGO Delegates bring the real life experiences, views and concerns of those on the ground and fulfil the greater involvement of people living with HIV (GIPA) principle. They can 'shift' the discourse – by providing real life evidence, perspectives and opinions. The Review's e-survey found strong support for such a role – with 84%, 74% and 71% of civil society respondents rating it as 'very important' that the NGO Delegation represents the voice of PLHIV, key affected communities and civil society in general<sup>16</sup>.

Three of the nine Member States interviewed for the Review expressed strong concerns as to the **extent** of civil society participation. They consider their negotiation and advocacy role to be inappropriate for a UN body and to go beyond ECOSOC resolution 1994/24. However, the other Member States interviewed – as well as other stakeholders, including Cosponsors – welcome the NGO Delegation's full and active participation, even when it raises challenges and sensitivities, for example on issues such as sex work and harm reduction. As a representative of one Member State said: *"It's the job of the NGOs to put things on the table that show the reality – even if we don't agree with those things or they make us feel uncomfortable."*

There are also mixed views about the **focus** of civil society participation. Again, three of the nine Member States interviewed for the Review felt strongly that the NGO Delegation has an inappropriate focus – prioritising culturally-sensitive issues (related to legal barriers, human rights and key affected communities) at the expense of others of higher relevance to HIV in their countries (such as access to treatment). They also feel that interventions should not be made in an activist manner – as this lacks respect for UN etiquette. However, once more, a larger proportion of Member States and others welcome that – as a sign of progress compared to 2006/7 - the NGO Delegation now demonstrates a clear and strong strategy (focused on human rights and key affected communities – such as people who use drugs, sex workers, men who have sex with men (MSM) and transgender people). As a respondent to the e-survey said: *"Representing 'civil society' is an almost impossible task, quixotic even. Focusing on key populations and PLHIV needs might bring the real priorities into clearer focus."*

---

<sup>16</sup> Question 4 of e-survey – see Annex 3.



A strong majority of stakeholders also welcome the **vibrancy** that the Delegates can bring. For example, Cosponsors welcome that, through encouragement and negotiation with the Delegation, NGOs can ‘push the boundaries’ of issues that the agencies cannot, themselves, raise in the PCB. They also warn, however, that there are limits. One Cosponsor said that: *“When you’re working in a Board that’s political, you have to accept the rules of the game. The NGOs could work smarter. They need to analyse what they can push for now or what they should push for later – and do the diplomatic ground work with Member States to make it happen.”* A further set of stakeholders express regret that the NGO Delegation has become *overly-diplomatic* and lost touch with what they regard as its activist roots. A representative of the UNAIDS Secretariat was concerned that: *“Sometimes the NGO Delegation sound more like the UN than the Member States – which risks diluting their unique voice.”* These different perspectives reflect what past and present NGO Delegates consider to be a false dichotomy about their role – as, in practice, depending on the needs and circumstances, *both* diplomacy and activism can be appropriate and strategic approaches.

The NGO Delegation is credited with keeping civil society central to the **ethos** of the PCB. For example, at the 19<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting (during the 2006/7 Review) it influenced the inclusion of *“based on the meaningful and measurable involvement of civil society, especially people living with HIV and populations most at risk of HIV infection”* as a guiding principle for the PCB (serving as a preamble to all decisions). At the 24<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting, *“based on the principle of non-discrimination”* was included as an additional principle after the issue was highlighted in an NGO Report<sup>17</sup>.

### Constitutional issues about civil society participation

In contrast to 2006/7, the 2012 Review found that the NGO Delegation’s lack of a right to **vote** or stand as **Chair or Vice Chair** are less ‘live’ subjects. Some stakeholders, especially within wider civil society, feel passionately about voting as an issue of principle and equity. However, many others feel that it was ‘battled out’ in the 2006/7 Review (which recommended voting rights), UNAIDS SIE (which did *not* recommend voting rights<sup>18</sup>) and subsequent Governance Task Force of the PCB. The latter reviewed the Modus Operandi, for example clarifying the **speaking order** – with NGO Delegates no longer having to make interventions after other Board members<sup>19</sup>. Currently, there is a sense that there are higher priorities than voting rights and that - within an unpredictable and, in some contexts, increasingly conservative political environment - addressing the issue (which would require a return to ECOSOC) might result in *worse* rather than *better* provisions for civil society. In the meantime, the lack of voting rights does not, in practice, present a barrier to civil society participation in the PCB – as the body works on consensus and has never voted on an issue.

More widely, the 2012 Review identified widespread concern about tense dynamics between some members of the PCB. This is seen to have contributed to a scenario whereby – to conclude some highly sensitive agenda items and prolonged debates – some Member States have started to **‘dis-associate’** themselves from decision points. Some stakeholders fear that, as a representative of a Member State put it, *“the time for universal consensus has gone”* – weakening the power of PCB decisions. However, others, including many in the current NGO Delegation, welcome that ‘dis-association’ enables the PCB to maintain relatively strong language, such as about key affected communities.

<sup>17</sup> Agenda item 1.6, decision point 6.2. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2009.

<sup>18</sup> *UNAIDS Second Independent Evaluation 2002-2008: Final Report*, 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009, October 2009.

<sup>19</sup> Decision point 10.5 b of agenda item 42. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2010.

## Civil society participation in the preparation of PCB meetings

Through membership of the **PCB Bureau**, the NGO Delegation has played an increasingly active role in shaping – rather than just responding to – the agenda of meetings. Some Member States in the position of Chair or Vice Chair have appreciated the Delegation/Communication Facility’s support, especially in: highlighting sensitive issues; developing thematic sessions (including suggesting speakers); and providing institutional memory of past decision points that require follow-up. It is welcomed that – in response to a decision point from an agenda item on meaningful participation at the 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB<sup>20</sup> – Bureau meetings are now regularly held in-person, strengthening communications and relationships. Meanwhile, NGO Delegates – alongside some other members of the PCB – express on-going frustration that some processes around the PCB agenda continue to be un-transparent. They note that some agenda items lack a clear roadmap (despite a further decision point of the 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB recommending this<sup>21</sup>) - which limits the timely input of civil society.

## Civil society participation during PCB meetings

In the period immediately before and during PCB Meetings, the NGO Delegation operates an intensive **schedule**<sup>22</sup>. This has typically included: orientation of new Delegates; an internal strategy day; a formal briefing for civil society Observers; preparatory and side meetings with the UNAIDS Secretariat, Cosponsors, PCB Bureau, Chair/Vice-Chair/Rapporteur, Member States and the UNAIDS Executive Director; daily de-briefs with civil society Observers; and a Delegation de-brief after the close of the meeting<sup>23</sup>. During PCB Meetings, the NGO Delegation participates in all relevant **processes** – from plenary agenda items to thematic sessions, the drafting room, informal ‘corridor discussions’ and side meetings. An example of the latter was a session on the Global Fund at the 29<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting – where Delegates raised concerns about the Transitional Funding Mechanism. The 2012 Review particularly noted that, in terms of written interventions, the quality of the NGO Delegation’s contributions is considered to have improved significantly – reflecting a stronger evidence base and political strategy.

## NGO Delegation contributions to PCB agenda items

In the past five years, the NGO Delegation has enabled civil society to play an increasingly vital role within **agenda items** related to the PCB’s strategic responsibilities for UNAIDS. Many stakeholders consider that it was influential in securing greater attention to human rights and key affected communities in the UNAIDS 2011-2015 Strategy (although the Delegates continued to express disappointment at the non-inclusion of issues of criminalisation). The NGO Delegation also – alongside wider civil society - played an important role in fostering the environment for some key affected populations to, for the first time, be specified in the 2011 Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS<sup>24</sup> (although, again, the Delegates continued to advocate about the non-inclusion of transgender people<sup>25</sup>).

<sup>20</sup> Decision point 7.3. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.

<sup>21</sup> Decision point 7.4. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.

<sup>22</sup> For example see: *NGO Delegation Agenda: 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, 3-8 June 2012*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012; and *NGO Delegate Agenda, 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, 2-9 December 2010*, PCB NGO Delegation 2010.

<sup>23</sup> *Orientation for New PCB NGO Delegates*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.

<sup>24</sup> *Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS: Intensifying our Efforts to Eliminate HIV/AIDS*, United Nations General Assembly, 2011.

<sup>25</sup> *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 13-15 December 2011.

Similarly, many stakeholders note the detailed and important engagement of the NGO Delegation in the design and follow-up to the UNAIDS SIE – which found civil society and PLHIV involvement to be one of the successful areas of UNAIDS, although primarily at the global level. The Delegation provided a comprehensive response to a broad range of issues raised by the Evaluation, including through a PCB conference room paper<sup>26</sup> and sign-on letter supported by over 100 civil society signatories<sup>27</sup>. These raised issues such as the UNAIDS Partnership Strategy, Division of Labour, technical support, leadership on universal access and connection between the PCB and the governing Boards of individual Cosponsors.

In comparison to 2006/7, the NGO Delegation has also increasingly engaged with key **financial and administrative processes** managed by the PCB. This includes agenda items on the Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework (UBRAF) – with the NGO Delegation raising issues both specifically related to civil society and more generally related to the efficiency and accountability of UNAIDS. As a representative of a Cosponsor said: *“Discussions about the UBRAF may not be the most exciting ..... but they are critical to UNAIDS governance and the NGO Delegation have shown that they have both the interest and knowledge to engage.”*

A strong finding of the 2012 Review was that the NGO Delegation has played a particularly important role in keeping **priority items** related to civil society on the PCB agenda (supported by the Communications Facility providing institutional memory). The Delegation was instrumental in the series of recommendations – at the 20<sup>th</sup> PCB (in follow-up to the 2006/7 Review)<sup>28</sup>, 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB (under an agenda item on meaningful participation)<sup>29</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> PCB (under an agenda item on follow-up to the SIE)<sup>30</sup> – that have called on the PCB to take concrete steps to enhance civil society participation. These recommendations are analysed in further detail in **Section 4** and **Annex 10**. Meanwhile, **Case study 1** provides an example of how the NGO Delegation has pursued issues relating to the **UNAIDS Partnership Strategy** and a measurable **indicator for civil society involvement**. Further examples of issues that the Delegation has repeatedly emphasised include **technical support**, with interventions at the 27<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> PCB Meetings, including practical suggestions of how to improve coordination through a virtual steering committee<sup>31</sup>. The issues also include **gender** – which was the subject of concerted advocacy by previous NGO Delegations, culminating in mobilisation for the Agenda for Accelerated Country Action for Women, Girls, Gender Equality and HIV<sup>32</sup>. Recent NGO Delegations have built on those foundations – continuing to advocate on gender at multiple PCB Meetings, for example, at the 27<sup>th</sup> PCB, introducing a decision point to link the sexual and reproductive health (SRH)/HIV needs of women, girls and key affected communities to the next UNAIDS UBRAF<sup>33</sup>.

---

<sup>26</sup> *Conference Room Paper: Second Independent Evaluation of UNAIDS: PCB NGO Response to SIE*, 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009, 30 November 2009.

<sup>27</sup> *Sign-On Response to the Second Independent Evaluation of UNAIDS*, PCB NGO Delegation (and over 100 civil society signatories).

<sup>28</sup> *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 25-27 June 2007.

<sup>29</sup> *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.

<sup>30</sup> *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009.

<sup>31</sup> Decision 9.4. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 5-7 June 2012.

<sup>32</sup> *Agenda for Accelerated Country Action for Women, Girls, Gender Equality and HIV*, UNAIDS, 2009.

<sup>33</sup> Decision point 7.6. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 6-8 December 2010.

### Case study 1: Advocacy for UNAIDS Partnership Strategy and measurable indicator for civil society involvement

Recommendation 2 of the UNAIDS SIE called for the development of a UNAIDS Partnership Strategy<sup>34</sup>. In turn, this became decision point 4.24 of the 25<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting in 2009<sup>35</sup> [see full wording in [Annex 10](#)]. Both requested a more coherent approach to partnership with civil society and PLHIV across the UNAIDS Programme, based on clear and measurable objectives.

Since 2009, the NGO Delegation has played a strong and persistent role in calling UNAIDS to account to fulfill these SIE and PCB recommendations. It has emphasized that partnership with civil society should be: consistent (at country/regional/global levels and across the UNAIDS Secretariat and all Cosponsors); linked to a technical support strategy; and, to ensure accountability, supported by Cosponsor budget allocations and measurable indicators in the UBRAF. The NGO Delegation has repeatedly articulated its standpoint and made related interventions at PCB Meetings<sup>36</sup>. For example, at the 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting, it reiterated the need for a Partnership Strategy and called for financial allocations to civil society engagement to be cited in the UBRAF<sup>37</sup>. At the 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting, it highlighted the lack of progress on development of the Partnership Strategy<sup>38</sup>.

In practice, the UNAIDS Partnership Strategy was integrated (in the form of high level partnership issues) into UNAIDS 2011-2015 Strategy - which was developed through a highly consultative, multi-stakeholder process. The Strategy was supplemented by UNAIDS Guidance for Partnerships with Civil Society, Including People Living with HIV and Key Populations.

At the 28<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting, the NGO Delegation welcomed that the UNAIDS Guidance would be completed by December 2011. Meanwhile, Delegation advocacy in the Budget Subcommittee and during meetings with Cosponsors and the UNAIDS Executive Director contributed to decision point 9.6 that: *“Requests UNAIDS to provide more explicit reporting on resourcing and engagement of civil society supported with indicators and clear reporting from the Secretariat and Cosponsors within the Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework.”*<sup>39</sup>

At the 29<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting, the NGO Delegation welcomed attention to indicators for civil society participation and the publication of the UNAIDS Guidance<sup>40</sup>. The latter provides a shared vision and targets for the staff of Cosponsors and the UNAIDS Secretariat working at national, regional and global levels. However, it does not cite specific objectives, measurable indicators or an implementation plan. As of October 2012, the NGO Delegation is continuing to actively collaborate with the UNAIDS Secretariat and PCB colleagues to finalise a minimum standard for civil society engagement.

<sup>34</sup> *UNAIDS Second Independent Evaluation 2002-2008: Final Report*, 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009, October 2009.

<sup>35</sup> *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009.

<sup>36</sup> For example: *Conference Room Paper: Second Independent Evaluation of UNAIDS: PCB NGO Response to SIE*, 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009, 30 November 2009; and *Sign-On Response to the Second Independent Evaluation of UNAIDS*, PCB NGO Delegation (and over 100 civil society signatories).

<sup>37</sup> *Communiqué: What Happened at the 26th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) in Geneva, Switzerland, June 22-24, 2010?*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2010.

<sup>38</sup> *Communiqué: What Happened at the 27th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) in Geneva, Switzerland, December 6-9, 2010?*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2010.

<sup>39</sup> *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 21-23 June 2011.

<sup>40</sup> *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 13-15 December 2011.

The NGO Delegation – and civil society more widely – has made a particularly important contribution to the organisation and delivery of **thematic sessions** of PCB meetings. A key example was the thematic at the 29<sup>th</sup> PCB on HIV and Enabling Legal Environments<sup>41</sup> which built on the work of the Global Commission on HIV and the Law and an NGO Report (with evidence from 27 focus group discussions in all regions<sup>42</sup>). The session was prepared collaboratively by representatives of Cosponsors, Member States, the UNAIDS Secretariat and the NGO Delegation. It included presentations by NGO Delegates and civil society Observers and the showing of a video prepared by the NGO Delegation. It led to intense debate, with some Member States objecting to the strength of the language used in the Delegation’s recommendations. In response, the Delegation took the pragmatic step to withdraw its decision points, re-introducing the issues within an agenda item at the subsequent PCB Meeting. Here, again, civil society representatives made powerful speeches - providing the ‘human face’ of the issue. After complex negotiations, including some nine hours of deliberation in the drafting room, a series of decision points were agreed<sup>43</sup>. While not specifying key affected communities, the decisions included that the PCB called upon Member States to: *“Review, as appropriate, laws, law enforcement and access to justice and policies that adversely affect the successful, effective and equitable delivery of HIV prevention, treatment, care and support programmes to people living with and affected by HIV and to consider their review in accordance with relevant national review frameworks and time frames.”*

A small number of Member States interviewed for the Review cite this series of events as one of the strongest examples of the NGO Delegation ‘overstepping the mark’. However, many others see it as the embodiment of the **added value** that civil society brings to the PCB – in terms of providing concrete evidence and forcing debates about critical subjects, even where they are politically/culturally sensitive. They also feel that it demonstrates the increasing maturity and flexibility of the NGO Delegation. As a representative of the UNAIDS Secretariat said: *“The Delegation works in an increasingly clever way – sometimes taking a strong stance, sometimes being more conciliatory. They’ve learned that there’s only so much you can achieve through outright confrontation.”* Other examples of thematic sections include those on: SRH/HIV at the 26<sup>th</sup> PCB (including presentations by an NGO Delegate for Africa and sex worker from Myanmar)<sup>44</sup>; and combination prevention at the 30<sup>th</sup> PCB (where Delegates co-led breakout sessions and brought in speakers to share the perspectives of sex workers and women living with HIV)<sup>45</sup>.

### NGO Delegation’s use of NGO Reports

As described in **Case study 2**, the NGO Delegation has made increasingly effective use of the **NGO Report** – an annual opportunity to make a formal presentation (supported by a paper) to the PCB plenary. Some Member States are concerned that the Reports focus too much on issues of human rights and key affected communities, neglecting wider community priorities. However, the vast majority of civil society respondents to the e-survey (over 90% in all cases) found the subjects of NGO Reports to be very or quite relevant to their work<sup>46</sup>. The highest score of ‘very relevant’ was given to the subject of ‘impact of reduced funding for HIV on civil society’ (addressed in the 2012 NGO Report).

---

<sup>41</sup> *Report of the Twenty Ninth Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 13-15 December 2011*, UNAIDS, February 2012.

<sup>42</sup> *Report by the NGO Representatives*, 29th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 13-15 December 2011.

<sup>43</sup> Decision points 6.1 – 6.2. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 5-7 June 2012.

<sup>44</sup> Presentations included by Lydia Mungherera and Ricky Swuanpyae.

<sup>45</sup> Presentations included by Meena Seshu and Alice Welbourn.

<sup>46</sup> Question 5 of e-survey – see Annex 3.



## Case study 2: Enhancing the quality and impact of NGO Reports

In the past five years, the NGO Delegation's NGO Reports (listed below) have become increasingly:

- **Strategic:** The NGO Reports have strengthened their focus on issues that: are timely (such as addressing the impact of the financial crisis in the 2012 Report); and reflect the stated priorities of civil society (such as stigma and discrimination in the 2010 Report).
- **Evidence-based:** Each NGO Report has been based on a process of consultation, using diverse methods, such as e-surveys in multiple languages, focus group discussions, one-to-one interviews and literature reviews.
- **Inclusive:** The consultation processes have led to increased civil society participation, such as with the 2010 NGO Report involving over 50 interviews and 1,500 e-survey participants in 10 languages.
- **Disseminated:** The NGO Reports have been translated and disseminated widely, including through: the NGO Delegation's website; social media (including blogs, twitter and YouTube); journals (such as with research from the 2010 NGO Report published in the African Journal for AIDS Research); and events (such as with the 2011 NGO Report shared at the XIX International AIDS Conference through participation in a panel discussion and the distribution of 1,500 copies).
- **Influential:** The NGO Reports are used more extensively both within the PCB and broader advocacy. For example, the NGO Delegates share them through other global initiatives, such as youth coalitions and the civil society Delegations to the Global Fund. They also use them at the: regional level (such as with the 2012 Report used in the Middle East and North Africa to advocate on the impact of the financial crisis in middle income countries); and country level (such as with the 2010 NGO Report shared with stakeholders developing Morocco's national HIV strategy - which now includes a pillar on discrimination).

Year	Subject of NGO Report
2007 <sup>47</sup>	<b>Priority issues for civil society</b> <sup>48</sup> - with evidence from NGO Delegates and constituents in all regions.
2008 <sup>49</sup>	<b>Civil society issues for meeting commitments to universal access</b> <sup>50</sup> – with evidence from literature reviews and NGO Delegates/constituents in all regions.
2009 <sup>51</sup>	<b>Barriers to universal access</b> - with evidence from 35 interviews and over 380 consultation respondents from NGO Delegation constituents.
2010 <sup>52</sup>	<b>Stigma and discrimination</b> - with evidence from a literature review, e-survey (in 10 languages, with over 1,500 responses), 50 one-to-one interviews and 8 focus group discussions.
2011 <sup>53</sup>	<b>HIV and the legal environment</b> - with evidence from 27 focus group discussions with civil society stakeholders (including PLHIV and key affected communities) in all regions.
2012 <sup>54</sup>	<b>Impact of reduced funding for HIV on civil society</b> - with evidence from 8 case studies of diverse NGO Delegation constituents (including PLHIV and key populations) in different regions.

<sup>47</sup> Report by the NGO Representatives, 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board Geneva, Switzerland, 25-27 June 2007.

<sup>48</sup> Issues were: universal access; prevention for youth; stagnation in AIDS treatment scale-up; gender inequality, PMTCT and male circumcision; co-infection of HIV and TB; co-infection of HIV and chronic Hepatitis C (HCV); safeguarding sex workers' rights; how homophobia hampers HIV efforts; and injecting drug users.

<sup>49</sup> Report by the NGO Representatives, 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Chiang Mai, Thailand, 23-25 April 2008.

<sup>50</sup> Issues were: co-infection management - HIV and Tuberculosis; co-infection management - HIV and Hepatitis C; meeting the treatment target; meeting the prevention target amongst injecting drug users; stigma and discrimination and human rights; criminalization of transmission and legal developments; sexual and reproductive health and rights of PLHIV; and UNAIDS Guidance Note on Sex Work.

<sup>51</sup> Report by the NGO Representatives, 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2009.

<sup>52</sup> Report by the NGO Representatives, 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2010.

<sup>53</sup> Report by the NGO Representatives, 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 13-15 December 2011.

<sup>54</sup> Report by the NGO Representatives, 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 5-7 June 2012.

## Civil society Observers to the PCB

**NGO Observers** continue to bring important added value to PCB Meetings – expanding the range of civil society perspectives. The NGO Delegation has made efforts to increase the involvement of Observers in its work, for example inviting them to participate in: a pre-PCB teleconference (held two weeks before each meeting); a pre-PCB meeting (held on-site with the Delegation); and daily debriefs. Some NGO Observers have welcomed being involved as key resource people in PCB sessions, for example providing testimonies and case studies. However, some others have felt that their knowledge and contribution has been under-utilised. As noted in the 2006/7 Review, there remain concerns that - in practice, due to constrained resources - the Observer system is only accessible to civil society organisations that are based in Geneva and/or are large enough to have a budget for global advocacy work. Meanwhile – as described in other sections of this report – the NGO Delegation has intensified its efforts (such as through social media) to reach out to constituents that are not able to attend PCB meetings in person.

## Civil society participation in other PCB Delegations

The 2012 Review found that, while widely welcomed, civil society participation in the PCB remains predominantly seen as the responsibility of the NGO Delegation. For example, as detailed in **Section 4** and **Annex 10**, while the involvement of civil society representatives in **Member States Delegations** was raised in the 2006/7 Review and endorsed by a decision of the 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB<sup>55</sup>, there are few indications of *increased* involvement as a result. Some Delegations – such as Poland, New Zealand, Thailand and Brazil - have included civil society representatives. However, this appears to be as a result of their on-going good practice, rather than in response to the PCB decision. Meanwhile, some stakeholders express concern about the idea of civil society involvement in national Delegations – fearing that such a position compromises the independence of the organisations in question. However, others maintain that such participation would provide an invaluable additional contribution to PCB proceedings. In addition, while many Member States liaise with national civil society on an on-going basis, it appears that few specifically consult the sector about PCB agenda items. An example of an exception is provided by Canada – which holds a call between the government and civil society before each Meeting.

## NGO Delegation's relations with other PCB Members

The 2012 Review identified mixed perspectives on the NGO Delegation's communications and relations with **others in the PCB**. Some Member States describe highly productive and collegial relationships with the NGOs, while others strongly criticise what they see as the Delegation's lack of constructive communication with them (with approaches only made around specific, sensitive agenda items). Some Cosponsors regret that their opportunities to meet with the NGO Delegation (both at and between PCB Meetings) are both too short and infrequent. Agencies such as UNICEF and UNDP have welcomed opportunities to collaborate closely with the NGO Delegation on thematic sessions, but call for more routine communication in order for the CCO and Delegation to better understand each other's priorities and work more collaboratively on a wider range of agenda items. For example, some interviewees suggested providing an opportunity for an NGO representative to participate in the Cosponsors' Global Coordinators Meeting. Meanwhile, the Review also highlighted on-going concerns about the extent to which the decisions made at PCB meetings, including those relating to civil society participation, are connected to the decisions and processes of the governance structures of each Cosponsor.

---

<sup>55</sup> Decision 7.2. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.



## Civil society responses to the changing environment

As a final issue under Theme 1, the 2012 Review specifically explored the role that civil society has and could play in PCB discussions and debates on the **changing landscape** for the response to HIV. It found that the NGO Delegation has made efforts to engage with and promote relevant issues, in particularly those that affect PLHIV and key affected communities. A range of stakeholders noted that, within a context of advances in research and technical responses to HIV, the Delegation has an especially critical role in ensuring on-going attention to entrenched social and cultural barriers (such as stigma and discrimination) and the nuanced implications of new interventions (such as treatment as prevention). They also have a vital voice in ensuring that the integration of HIV within wider responses to health and development does not mean the dilution of the specificities needed for an effective response to HIV.

Examples of steps taken by the NGO Delegation in this area include: focusing the 2012 NGO Report on the impact on civil society of reduced funding for HIV<sup>56</sup>; advocating for attention to innovative financing<sup>57</sup>; requesting, in response to a report by Cosponsors, an agenda item at the 31<sup>st</sup> PCB on the post-2015/Millennium Development Goal (MDG) agenda<sup>58</sup>; and hosting an event at the 2012 International AIDS Conference on the post-2015 agenda, including panellists from UNDP and UNFPA<sup>59</sup>. They have also engaged with agenda items addressing the UNAIDS Strategic Investment Framework – emphasising the need to translate the tool to the needs and realities of civil society and for there to be investment in the ‘critical enablers’<sup>60</sup>.

Some participants in the 2012 Review urged the NGO Delegation to more thoroughly adapt to the **changing financial environment** and to be more realistic about the need for further reductions to budgets (for the Delegation itself and civil society more widely). Meanwhile others – across all stakeholder groups – encouraged the NGO Delegation to work more strategically with others within civil society involved in **wider responses to health and development**. For example, it is considered a priority to work more closely with the civil society delegations to the Global Fund on the roll-out of the mechanism’s new funding model. It is also considered important to work with peers working in SRH and maternal, newborn and child health (MNCH) – which are likely to be priority areas in the post-MDG agenda.

More widely, and beyond its specific remit, the 2012 Review identified significant concerns among a range of stakeholders about the perceived lack of **leadership** demonstrated by the PCB – and UNAIDS as a whole – within the development of the post-2015 agenda and, in turn, the future positioning of HIV. The Review indicated that it is not evident to many stakeholders where UNAIDS fits within the process of agenda-setting and how the PCB and NGO Delegation might bring influence. There is a sense that UNAIDS should not only be playing a stronger leadership role in developing the content of the post-2015 agenda, but also reviving its ground-breaking roots - by advocating for the full and meaningful involvement of civil society within the governance of that agenda.

---

<sup>56</sup> *Report by the NGO Representatives*, 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 5-7 June 2012.

<sup>57</sup> Within response to Executive Director’s Report. *Communiqué: What Happened at the 26th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) in Geneva, Switzerland, June 22-24, 2010?*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2010.

<sup>58</sup> *Communiqué: 06/14/12 - What Happened at the 30th UNAIDS Board Meeting?*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.

<sup>59</sup> *AIDS Post 2015: The Future We Want, The Trends We Face*, Community Dialogue Space at XIX International AIDS Conference, PCB NGO Delegation, July 2012.

<sup>60</sup> *Communiqué: 06/14/12 - What Happened at the 30th UNAIDS Board Meeting?*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.

## Theme 2: Composition, selection criteria and process for the PCB NGO representatives.

**Theme 2 of the 2012 Review addressed the: selection criteria and process for the NGO Delegation; composition of the NGO Delegation; identity, roles and responsibilities of the NGO Delegation; and accountability of the NGO Delegates.**

### **Selection criteria and process for the NGO Delegation**

In comparison to 2006/7, the 2012 Review found a strong improvement in the quality and transparency of the **selection process** for the NGO Delegation. As cited in the PCB Modus Operandi, this is led by the Delegation and now coordinated by the Communications Facility. It is described in publicly available documentation and includes: widely distributing a call for nominations for vacancies; rating and short-listing candidates against qualification and commitment criteria [see **Annex 6**]; doing telephone interviews; and receiving formal approval by the PCB. Candidates are selected with consideration to both their individual strengths and the overall needs and balance of the Delegation. Many participants in the 2012 Review felt that the process has been continually improved, including by fulfilling recommendations from the 2006/7 Review. For example, now: the interviews are carried out by a regional panel that includes a representative of wider civil society; candidates must be formally endorsed by their constituency; and candidates' NGOs must provide a letter of support (confirming organisational commitment). The administration of the process has been improved through the use of recruitment software and wider dissemination (such as through the NGO Delegation's website and expanded contacts list).

However, despite these significant improvements, some stakeholders retain concerns. Some Member States dispute the **transparency** of the selection process – as they, themselves, are not directly provided with information about how the NGO Delegates are chosen. They also regret that they are not consulted or (prior to the formal announcement in PCB meetings) notified about new Delegates. Meanwhile, some people within wider civil society debate whether – despite the NGO Delegation's good intentions - selection is truly open to all within their sector, rather than just the 'usual suspects'. A respondent to the e-survey felt that: *“So far people who are elected into this body are well connected.”* Such comments highlight a common tension within the NGO Delegation (as well as other civil society Delegations to global institutions) – between the need to have high quality members (with appropriate seniority, knowledge and contacts) and the desire to move beyond the 'usual suspects'.

A further concern is that the **number of applicants** remains low (such as with just five people applying for the two vacancies for Europe Delegates in 2012). There appear to be a number of reasons for this, including the low profile of the PCB (with potential candidates not knowing about the Board or fully appreciating its relevance to their work). A respondent to the e-survey said: *“I'm very active in advocacy, care and treatment. I've never even heard of the PCB.”* The other reasons include the: time commitment required of Delegates (which can be especially challenging for small organisations); lack of proactive efforts by some existing Delegates to identify suitable candidates from their regions; and lack of opportunity for candidates with strong *potential* to build their capacity. The latter can be particularly pertinent among some geographic regions and specific constituencies (including key affected populations) – where there may be few candidates with both the required language skills and experience of working in high-level policy forums. A representative of a Cosponsor felt that: *“The PCB isn't the time for experimentation .... It's a political animal ... In an ideal world, you would offer mentoring and skills building, but, in reality, you need people of a certain seniority, reach and calibre who can not only survive, but perform well.”*

## Composition of the NGO Delegation

The 2012 Review found broad satisfaction that the NGO Delegation has provided a good **balance** of representatives and civil society voices. It has continued to give a high profile to PLHIV and, in recent years, key affected communities. Some stakeholders specifically welcomed that – whatever their own background - NGO Delegates are increasingly able to speak to a breadth of civil society issues. As a representative of a Cosponsor said: “They’ve changed from being single-topic Delegates to a Delegation of wider representation.” Efforts to address constituency gaps are also welcomed, for example with the Delegation recently including a person who uses drugs and a representative of young people.

However, three of the Member States interviewed for the Review expressed strong concerns – perceiving the **composition** of the NGO Delegation to be too biased towards key affected populations, at the expense of other civil society voices, especially from generalised epidemics. They - as well as some other stakeholders, including within wider civil society - question whether key aspects of civil society (notably faith based organisations (FBOs) and AIDS service organisations) are fully welcomed or incorporated within the Delegation. In response, the NGO Delegation emphasises that, in fact, its recent and current members have included representatives of a broad range of civil society organisations, such as ones focused on areas such as gender and treatment.

An on-going challenge to the NGO Delegation is **geographic representation**. The e-survey indicated that a large proportion of civil society respondents (47%) do not feel that the current division of Delegates<sup>61</sup> represents all regional needs<sup>62</sup>. Progress has been made in some areas, such as with the first ever NGO Delegate from the Middle East and North Africa – a previously under-served sub-region and a gap identified by the PCB’s Task Force on Governance<sup>63</sup>. However, there are concerns that the current division is both unrealistic (for example with Delegates expected to cover vast areas such as Asia Pacific) and illogical (for example, with the diverse regions of Latin America and the Caribbean combined as one). As with the 2006/7 Review, some stakeholders call for the NGO Delegation’s divisions to be changed, while others recommend that the Delegation should focus on developing mechanisms to improve its outreach to all regions.

Specific recent limitations to the NGO Delegation have included both of the Delegates for Europe coming from Western Europe and both of those for North America coming from the United States. The individual Delegates are credited for making considerable efforts to reach out to non-represented areas [see **Case study 3**]. However, some stakeholders are concerned that the situation has under-addressed critical areas such as Eastern Europe and Central Asia – home to some of the fastest-growing epidemics and with specific political challenges for civil society. The Review noted that, in response, representatives from that particular region have now been selected and will join the NGO Delegation in 2013. Meanwhile, one Member State expressed strong concern that the two limitations cited above contravene ECOSOC requirements<sup>64</sup>.

---

<sup>61</sup> Two Delegates from: Africa; Asia and the Pacific; Europe; Latin America and the Caribbean; and North Africa.

<sup>62</sup> Question 6 of e-survey – see Annex 3.

<sup>63</sup> Decision point 10.5 g of agenda item 42. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2010.

<sup>64</sup> For example, resolution 1994/24 calls for three NGOs from developing countries and two from developed countries or those with economies in transition. *Resolution 1994/24: Joint And Cosponsored United Nations Programme On Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS)*, United Nations Economic and Social Council, July 1994.

## Identity, roles and responsibilities of the NGO Delegation

In the immediate follow-up to the 2006/7 Review<sup>65</sup> and subsequent years, the Communications Facility has supported the NGO Delegation to take concrete steps to strengthen its **identity** and clarify and document **roles and responsibilities**. This has included the development of core resources, including a Delegates Manual<sup>66</sup> and TORs<sup>67</sup> (both updated in 2012) and materials for orientation<sup>68</sup>. These articulate the expected contribution of Delegates. They have brought a stronger sense of identity – with a shared goal (“to make UNAIDS policy more relevant and supportive of persons living with and affected by HIV and AIDS”), as well as mission, vision, principles and code of conduct [see **Annex 9**]. While much of this work has taken place ‘behind the scenes’, many stakeholders note a general impression that the quality and cohesiveness of the NGO Delegation’s contribution to the PCB and their representation of civil society has greatly improved. A representative of a Member State said that: “Now, the Delegation is not just ten individuals, but a united group that also has thousands and thousands of others behind them.”

## Accountability of the NGO Delegates

Compared to 2006/7, the 2012 Review also found greater efforts to address **accountability** within the NGO Delegation. As described under Theme 3, external accountability has been strengthened through increasing communications and consultation, especially with wider civil society. Meanwhile, internal accountability – in terms of Delegates’ performance – has been enhanced through measures such as a Statement of Commitment - which each NGO Delegate is required to sign as a personal commitment to good practice, including in relation to representation, confidentiality and conflict of interest.<sup>69</sup>

The Communications Facility has worked with International Civil Society Support (ICSS) to develop an Accountability Tool for civil society delegations. Also, the NGO Delegation continues to build on its internal performance assessment tool (developed in 2008). This is used every six months and combines self and peer assessment of performance with monitoring of attendance (at meetings and tele-conferences). The inputs are combined by the Communications Facility, with the results sent to the individual Delegates in confidence. Where necessary, problems are directed to a Communications Facility Working Group – which can take a range of steps, including discussing challenges with the candidate, proposing solutions and/or recommending the removal of the NGO from the Delegation. Overall, the NGO Delegation has become more able to articulate what accountability means<sup>70</sup> and, where necessary, to take action, including early termination of the Delegate’s term<sup>71</sup>. Applying the latter has proved challenging and sometimes controversial, but indicates the Delegation taking accountability seriously. Overall, the NGO Delegation acknowledges that accountability remains a ‘work in progress’ – with further effort needed to ensure a system of constructive feedback and enhanced performance. Meanwhile, most other stakeholders know little about how internal or external accountability is being addressed, but note that individual Delegates appear to bring different qualities and strengths. While recognizing the considerable ask made of a voluntary NGO Delegation, they urge that the members to continue to be constantly encouraged to meet the highest standards of transparency and performance.

---

<sup>65</sup> For examples from the follow-up period: *Increased involvement of Civil Society in the Programme Coordinating Board*, 25th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009, UNAIDS, October 2009.

<sup>66</sup> *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegates’ Manual*, PCB NGO Delegation, (update being finalised) September 2012).

<sup>67</sup> *Terms of Reference of the UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation*, PCB NGO Delegation, (update being finalised) September 2012.

<sup>68</sup> *Orientation for New PCB NGO Delegates*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.

<sup>69</sup> *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation Statement of Commitment*, PCB NGO Delegation, (undated).

<sup>70</sup> *Orientation for New PCB NGO Delegates*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.

<sup>71</sup> *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation: Recruitment Process*, PCB NGO Delegation, (undated).

### Theme 3: Systems for communication, consultation and accountability among the PCB NGO representatives

**Theme 3 of the 2012 Review addressed: external communication and consultation by the NGO Delegation; constituency building by the NGO Delegation; NGO Delegation outreach to other civil society representatives; internal communications in the NGO Delegation; and the role and work of the NGO Delegation Communications Facility.**

#### **External communication and consultation by the NGO Delegation**

The 2012 Review found that the NGO Delegation, supported by the Communications Facility, has made significant efforts to enhance civil society participation in the PCB by increasing and enhancing its external **communications**. This work has included developing a core set of communication tools. Examples include a **communiqué** – providing a summary of key discussions and decisions from each PCB Meeting of relevance to civil society<sup>72</sup>. The Delegation aims to have it written, translated (into English, French, Spanish, Russian, Portuguese, Chinese and Arabic) and posted on the website and external mailing list within a week of each meeting<sup>73</sup>. A further example of a tool is the NGO Delegation’s **website**. This now provides an interactive and multi-lingual platform (again in seven languages). It aims to: be a resource on UNAIDS processes and decisions; facilitate civil society’s knowledge of and involvement in UNAIDS processes; increase awareness and understanding of the PCB and the NGO Delegation; and make others aware of, and encourage participation in, civil society advocacy and processes with other global health institutions (such as the Global Fund and UNITAID)<sup>74</sup>. Data from 1 March 2009 to 31 July 2012<sup>75</sup> indicates that visits to the site are rising and totalled 54,336. The majority of visitors (75.8%) use the site in English, followed by French and Spanish (13.8%). The largest proportions are from North America and Western Europe, followed by Southern Asia and Eastern Africa.

The NGO Delegation is widely praised for making increasing and creative use of visual and **social media**. For example, it: uses Twitter; does blogging; has photo galleries on its website; and has self-made videos on YouTube. It hosted a session at the XIX International AIDS Conference on using social media to strengthen the global response to HIV<sup>76</sup>. This work complements the group’s formal PCB interventions, such as through using a video to ‘bring to life’ the issues addressed in the NGO Report on HIV and the Legal Environment at the 29<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting. Stakeholders, particularly in wider civil society, welcome that these initiatives help to make the work of the Delegation more accessible. They also particularly applaud the NGO Delegation’s concrete efforts to work in multiple **languages**. Furthermore, since the 2006/7 Review, the Communications Facility has supported the NGO Delegation to develop an **external mailing list** which, as of August 2012, had 1,551 contacts<sup>77</sup>. This is used to disseminate key information, such as the communiqués and recruitment announcements. There is evidence of proactive work to expand the list, for example by adding the details of constituencies involved in consultations or participating as PCB Observers. There has also been work to multiply dissemination through links to other organisations’ lists, such as International Treatment Preparedness Coalition (ITPC) and SEA-AIDS.

<sup>72</sup> For example: *Communiqué: 06/14/12 - What Happened at the 30th UNAIDS Board Meeting?*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.

<sup>73</sup> *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation: CF Program Assistant Handover Manual*, PCB NGO Delegation Communications and Consultation Facility, (draft) September 2012.

<sup>74</sup> *UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board NGO Delegation External Communications Plan and Guidelines*, (updated) August 2012.

<sup>75</sup> *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation – Google Analytics Analysis 1 Mar 2009 – 31 July 2012*, PCB NGO Delegation.

<sup>76</sup> *Strengthening the Global HIV Response through Social Media: Moving Beyond the Tweets*, Global Village Session at XIX International AIDS Conference, PCB NGO Delegation, July 2012.

<sup>77</sup> *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation – Google Analytics Analysis 1 Mar 2009 – 31 July 2012*, PCB NGO Delegation.



The NGO Delegation's work in this area is consolidated in a comprehensive **Communications Plan** (updated in August 2012) – indicating a commitment to better implementation and measurement of results<sup>78</sup>. The Plan provides guidelines for all relevant work - from how to communicate with specific stakeholder groups (such as Member States and Cosponsors) to how to write a blog. The Delegation has also benefitted from stronger event-specific communication plans, such as for the XIX International AIDS Conference – where the Delegates and the Communications Facility used multiple sessions and methods to inform and mobilise constituents about issues related to the PCB.

Alongside practical issues for constituents (such as language and access to computers), the NGO Delegation's work in this area is constantly tested by how to translate the complexities of the PCB into information that is accessible to constituents on the ground. As a member of the current NGO Delegation said: *"It's an on-going challenge – we want the widest possible participation, but, in reality, it's difficult to keep people up to speed on the fast and furious conversations that go on."*

The e-survey provided an indication of the possible **impact** of some of the NGO Delegation's communications efforts. Among those answering the relevant question, some 40-50% of civil society respondents had benefitted from *some* steps taken by the NGO Delegation to reach out to the wider sector<sup>79</sup>. However, lower levels were seen for two critical areas: 'known how to contact an NGO Delegate from your region' (32%); and 'known how to raise issues of concern from your country or region with the Delegation' (29%).

The e-survey also indicated different perspectives on the **effectiveness** of steps taken by the NGO Delegation to increase engagement in the last five years<sup>80</sup>. The highest levels of appreciation were seen for 'produced and disseminated communiqués summarising the key discussions and decisions of each PCB Meeting' – which was rated as being carried out either 'very effectively' or 'quite effectively' by 55% of respondents to the question. Similar levels were seen for: 'provided an NGO Delegation website, including information about the Delegation and upcoming PCB Meetings' (50%); 'produced and disseminated NGO Delegation updates highlighting key issues and initiatives of the Delegation' (48%); and 'been accessible to you (by phone or e-mail) during the year for questions and discussions about the PCB and the NGO Delegation' (41%). The lowest level was seen for 'held civil society briefing calls (regional and global) to involve you in the work of the NGO Delegation and get your input' (35%).

Overall, the 2012 Review concluded that there has been considerable and concrete progress, although there is still work to be done. The latter is hinted at by two examples of concerns about the current NGO Delegation expressed by respondents to the e-survey: *"representation means nothing without consultation, involvement and feedback"*; and *"the PCB Delegation is a very important body and its influence to the UNAIDS is immense. However, its work is largely unknown because it operates mostly top down - with little involvement on the ground."* Meanwhile, as noted previously, 18% of all respondents to the e-survey had not previously been aware of the NGO Delegation, while 37% had been aware of it, but had no involvement<sup>81</sup>.

---

<sup>78</sup> UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board NGO Delegation External Communications Plan and Guidelines, (updated) August 2012.

<sup>79</sup> Question 7 of e-survey – see Annex 3. The steps were: 'been informed about the basics of what the NGO Delegation is and what it does'; 'been informed about the key issues and discussions coming up at UNAIDS PCB meetings'; 'been informed about how to contribute to the key issues and discussions coming up at UNAIDS PCB meetings'; 'received an NGO Delegation communiqué'; and 'received a call for applications to become a member of the NGO Delegation'.

<sup>80</sup> Question 8 of e-survey – see Annex 3.

<sup>81</sup> Question 3 of e-survey – see Annex 3.

## Constituency building by the NGO Delegation

There are mixed opinions about the extent and impact of efforts to actively consult and **build a constituency** among wider civil society. This issue is recognised as vital for the credibility of the overall NGO Delegation, but also to be a key responsibility of individual Delegates. In practice, however, it can be an area of frustration. For example, on the one hand, as a respondent to the e-survey put it: *“The ease with which organisations can engage with the PCB is dependent on the extent to which the regional NGO Delegation representative reaches out to organisations - the NGO Delegation should thus ensure that Delegates selected are committed to engaging with civil society in the region.”* Yet, on the other hand, NGO Delegates cite efforts to reach out to their constituents being met with little or no response, while the late availability of some PCB documents make consultation unfeasible.

As shown in **Case study 3**, there have, in fact, been some impressive efforts by Delegates to engage and mobilise organisations within their geographic region and/or constituency, particularly those that are under-served. Other examples include that the Asia Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean Delegates hold briefing and/or de-briefing calls with constituents for each PCB Meeting. It is also clear that some Delegates make good use of their existing involvement in regional and global networks. For example, past or present Delegates have come from organisations such as ITPC and the Global Forum on MSM and HIV (MSMGF) – bringing extensive contacts and connections to their PCB role. A Delegate from AIDS and Rights Alliance of Southern Africa (ARASA) was able to use their NGO’s existing regional mailing list, membership of the Regional African AIDS NGO Forum and partnerships with key groups (including for PLHIV, women and youth) in the Southern African Development Community (SADC).

In addition, the Delegation as a whole, supported by the Communications Facility, has taken steps to actively **consult constituents** and seek inputs and feedback. This has included opportunities for a range of civil society organisations to participate in research (for example, to inform NGO Reports – see **Case study 2**) or present their experiences and evidence to PCB Meetings. Once more, there is tangible improvement since 2006/7, although still work to be done. There may be a need to further institutionalise expectations that each NGO Delegate should bring an *existing* set of key contacts and be committed to *increasing* that list over time. While, in their orientation, the Delegates are asked to map their constituents and identify key contacts, in practice, their level of active outreach still varies. There is also a particular need to strengthen relations and channels of involvement for **constituencies** (notably specific key affected communities, such as sex workers and transgender people) that are not presently represented on the NGO Delegation. This might involve a formal or informal version of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with respective regional or global networks for those constituencies. As an interviewee from such a network put it: *“If diversity is not represented, you need a mechanism to explicitly involve that constituency in consultations.”* Some form of MOU might also be useful to institutionalise relations with other key networks that do not have formal representation on the Delegation, such as the Global Network of People Living with HIV (GNP+).

Responses to the e-survey<sup>82</sup> gave other ideas from wider civil society about how to enhance communication and consultation. They focused on two areas. Firstly, there is a need to improve the dissemination of *existing* information tools. Many people call for materials (such as bulletins after PCB Meetings) that the Delegation actually already produces, but which do not appear to be reaching key audiences. Secondly, there is a need for a more systematic mechanism to connect the regional NGO Delegates to key national civil society stakeholders. For example, this might involve identifying a focal point in each country or having UNAIDS partnership staff advise how best to liaise with a national sector.

---

<sup>82</sup> Questions 9 and 10 of e-survey – see Annex 3.



### Case study 3: Constituency building by the NGO Delegation

Two sub-regions provide recent examples of efforts by the NGO Delegation to build a wider constituency among civil society, particularly key affected communities. Eastern Europe and Central Asia lacked direct representation on the NGO Delegation. Meanwhile, the Middle East and North Africa – while benefitting from having a Delegate for the first time – had been historically under-served, including due to the challenges of language and civil society culture (with a tradition of in-person rather than written or electronic communication).

In Eastern Europe and Central Asia, the two Europe NGO Delegates - one of whom worked for the International Network of People Who Use Drugs (INPUD) - were supported by the Communications Facility to use multiple approaches to try to increase the scale and breadth of their contacts. These included: building partnerships with key HIV networks (such as the European AIDS Treatment Group) and harm reduction and drug user networks; setting up communications systems (such as a regular teleconference with constituents); and adding groups (such as the International Drug Policy Consortium) to the Delegation mailing list – for them, in turn, to forward information to their networks. Crucially, the Delegates provided opportunities to raise the profile of national and constituent priorities within global forums, including by brokering discussions with UNAIDS policy-makers and showcasing data and case studies. For example: 26% of respondents to the 2010 NGO Report survey (on stigma and discrimination) came from the drug user community, including many from Eastern Europe and Central Asia; and the 2012 NGO Report (on the impact of reduced HIV funding) featured a case study on the challenges of the Global Fund’s Transitional Funding Mechanism for harm reduction programmes in Russia. The NGO Delegates also facilitated opportunities for people who use drugs to themselves engage in global advocacy, particularly around the 2011 High Level Meeting. In addition, they maximised opportunities to engage directly with constituents. For example, they recently participated in a UNAIDS site visit to Ukraine – during which they met with groups of PLHIV and people who use drugs.

In the Middle East and North Africa, an NGO Delegate for Africa, supported by the Communications Facility, has reached out to constituents, including by: using and publicising NGO Delegation materials (such as the communiqué and website) in French as well as English; adding francophone contacts to the Communication Facility’s mailing list; and using the NGO Delegation’s evidence to initiate discussions on sensitive subjects, such as stigma. Again, they have provided opportunities to connect regional issues to global discussions. Examples include that: the 2011 NGO Report included data from a focus group in Yemen; and the 2012 NGO Report included a case study on the impact of changes to Global Fund resourcing on work with key populations in the concentrated epidemic and middle-income context of Algeria. In addition, the NGO Delegate has actively collaborated with the UNAIDS Regional Support Team in Cairo – participating in meetings and encouraging the Team’s engagement in the PCB. As an example of improved relations, the United Arab Emirates invited the NGO Delegate and Communications Facility Manager to speak about the PCB and civil society in front of all regional Ministers and UNAIDS at the first ever HIV conference held in Saudi Arabia.

### NGO Delegation outreach to other civil society representatives

Many respondents to the 2012 Review – notably representatives of Cosponsors and wider civil society – urged the NGO Delegation to further reach out to **civil society leaders** in other global health and development bodies. The Delegation has benefitted from a process facilitated by ICSS to bring together key civil society Delegations - with meetings and a Working Group providing opportunities to share advocacy priorities and ways of working. It has also taken its own initiative, for example reaching out to others to address key issues (such as Global Fund financing) and organising events (such as Raising Your Voice – a session at the XIX International AIDS Conference involving delegates to the Boards of UNTAID, the Global Fund, International Health Partnership and Medicines Patent Pool<sup>83</sup>).

<sup>83</sup> *Raising Your Voice: Civil Society on International Health Boards*, Community Dialogue Space at XIX International AIDS Conference, PCB NGO Delegation, July 2012.

However, the Review identified a need for such collaboration to be more on-going and systematic. This is particularly the case in relation to the three civil society delegations to the Global Fund - in the light of key areas of cross-over, such as the new funding model, Strategic Investment Framework, gender and human rights. Overall, stakeholders urge stronger collaboration in the future – with the PCB Delegates maintaining a focus on HIV, while moving beyond the field to also reach out to those working in other aspects of the post-2015 agenda.

### Internal communication in the NGO Delegation

As noted under Themes 1 and 2, the NGO Delegation has made important progress on developing internal processes and ways of working. This has included attention to **internal communications**. For example, there are now all-Delegation monthly teleconference calls (increased to fortnightly in the build-up to PCB meetings) - based on a prepared agenda, facilitated by members of the Delegation and documented by the Communications Facility. The NGO Delegation uses these to establish priorities and monitor follow-up on agreed actions. There is also now a more established system of a Google group and internal Working Groups – with Delegates assigned to specific areas of work (for example, relating to the PCB Bureau, the UBRAF, thematic sessions, recruitment and orientation) and with responsibility for communicating relevant information to their colleagues.

### The role and work of the NGO Delegation Communications Facility

As requested in the TORs, the 2012 Review specifically explored the work, contribution and value for money of the NGO Delegation's **Communications Facility**. As detailed in **Section 4** and **Annex 10**, the Facility resulted from decision 9.1 of the 20<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting. Its goal is to: *“Enhance the effectiveness and accountability of the Delegation and ensure transparency of information and the validity of representative voices.”*<sup>84</sup> It operates according to TORs<sup>85</sup> [see **Annex 8**], with tasks that include ensuring: fluid communications to and from NGO Delegates with civil society, Cosponsors, UNAIDS Secretariat and Member States; efficient management of the administrative and logistical needs of the NGO Delegation; a means of communication and appraisal amongst Delegates; and transparent information exchange between all stakeholders.<sup>86</sup> The implementation of activities, performance management and overall responsibility for the achievement of deliverables lies with the Delegation.

In recent times, the Communications Facility has had two full-time **staff** (a Programme Manager and Programme Assistant). Some stakeholders question whether the staff allocation represents the most efficient use of resources, while others are concerned that staff have sometimes appeared to lead the NGO Delegation rather than vice versa. Instances are cited of people perceiving it to be difficult to speak directly to Delegates rather than the Facility. However, overall, both of the Facility's staff are praised for their high level of commitment, skill and knowledge. A notable number of representatives of Member States and Cosponsors know little or, in some cases, nothing about the Communications Facility – perhaps reflecting that much of its work is 'behind the scenes'. However, the stakeholders that *are* familiar with the Facility consider that it plays an invaluable role and brings demonstrable added value.

---

<sup>84</sup> *Orientation for New PCB NGO Delegates*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.

<sup>85</sup> *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegates' Manual*, PCB NGO Delegation, (update being finalised) September 2012.

<sup>86</sup> *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegates' Manual*, PCB NGO Delegation, (update being finalised) September 2012.

The 2012 Review found that the Communications Facility has, in particular, taken an immense logistical burden off the NGO Delegates – by providing efficient support and **administration** of the ‘nuts and bolts’ of a civil society delegation. Examples include arranging teleconferences, administrating the selection process, coordinating translation, planning orientation and developing communications tools. As a member of the current NGO Delegation says: *“The CF binds us as a Delegation.”* The Facility has also provided invaluable **strategic support** to the NGO Delegation – notably in terms of institutional memory (for example of the history of PCB decision points related to civil society) and ‘political intelligence’ (about positions and ways of working of other PCB members). While this is strongly welcomed by the NGO Delegation itself, it has caused a degree of tension with some other stakeholders – such as some representatives of the UNAIDS Secretariat – that envisaged a more predominantly administrative role.

As documented in a paper to the PCB in December 2008<sup>87</sup>, even in its first six months, the Communications Facility made significant progress, including by implementing recommendations from the 2006/7 Review. Since then, it has continued to expand and strengthen **systems**, becoming central to enhancing the NGO Delegation’s communications, functioning and effective representation of constituents. It has, as a representative of wider civil society put it: *“Brought about a seismic shift in the quality and quantity of the Delegation’s work.”* As a respondent to the e-survey said: *“The Communications and Consultation Facility has been a great benefit and resource for the NGO Delegation. There is more communication with broader civil society and also improved quality of engagement.”* A representative of a Cosponsor concluded that: *“The CF has been a turning point. The Delegation has gone from coming as individual advocates to working as a cohesive unit.”*

Some stakeholders question the extent to which the Communications Facility can be truly independent when it receives the majority of its funding from UNAIDS. However, this issue has not been a concern for the NGO Delegation. Furthermore - despite success in funding the participation of some individual NGOs, such as at thematic sessions – the Facility has lacked success in wider **fundraising**. Indeed, many express concern about the sustainability of the Facility and urge the NGO Delegation to explore further creative means to mobilise resources.

During the 2012 Review, UNAIDS issued a Request for Proposals to host the Communications Facility for 2013-2014. This followed a Request issued earlier in the year which failed to recruit an organisation due to concerns among the NGO Delegation about the transparency and equity of the process. The budget for 2013-2014 will be reduced from that of the previous two year periods (from \$500,000 to \$300,000) due to UNAIDS current budget constraints and the negative real growth of the UBRAF since 2008. Members of the NGO Delegation – and some other stakeholders, including some Member States and wider civil society – express concern that such a reduction will considerably reduce the quality and quantity of the NGO Delegation’s work. However, other stakeholders argue that such a reduction is inevitable within the overall financial context for HIV and, more specifically, recent major cut-backs at the UNAIDS Secretariat. They urge the Communications Facility and NGO Delegation to further explore and make maximum use of cost efficient means of communication and consultation. Finally, some stakeholders – notably past and current members of the NGO Delegation and representatives of wider civil society – call for the tenure for hosting the Communications Facility to be extended beyond two years – to provide administrative stability and strengthen institutional memory.

---

<sup>87</sup> *Increased Involvement of Civil Society in The Programme Coordinating Board*, (prepared by PCB NGO Delegation), 23rd Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.

#### Theme 4: Capacity and resources for NGO/civil society participation in the PCB

**Theme 4 of the 2012 Review addressed: financial resources for civil society participation in the PCB; orientation, capacity building and institutional memory of the NGO Delegation; support for the NGO Delegation from the UNAIDS Secretariat (Geneva); and support for the NGO Delegation from the UNAIDS Secretariat (regional and country).**

#### **Financial resources for civil society participation in the PCB**

As of 2012, NGO Delegates' flights, accommodation and per diems for PCB Meetings are paid by UNAIDS. As noted under Theme 3, the Communications Facility has also predominantly been funded by UNAIDS, with \$500,000 for each of the two-year periods to date. A reduction to \$300,000 is being implemented for the next two years. The Communications Facility has made considerable efforts to mobilise further **resources**, but with only modest success (providing funding for specific meetings or the participation of some NGO Observers at PCB Meetings, but not core funding for on-going work)<sup>88</sup>.

The 2012 Review found significant concern about the adequacy and **sustainability** of resources for the NGO Delegation and, in particular, the Communications Facility. Past/present NGO Delegates and representatives of wider civil society emphasise the enormous ask made of the Delegation, arguing that its work will be unfeasible with reduced funding. The likely cuts to the Communications Facility's budget are considered to be disproportionate and to risk limiting the services that it can provide (potentially losing many of the gains from the past five years). Some Delegates fear that a reduced budget sends a wider message – of undervaluing the work of the Facility and the Delegation. The cuts are also particularly challenging within the context of Delegates' own organisations experiencing reduced funding (particularly for advocacy on HIV) – which puts them in a weak position to provide any further support to the Delegation.

Some other stakeholders strongly urge the NGO Delegation to make a more realistic response to the **financial constraints** affecting all aspects of the response to HIV – and to seek other sources of funding and/or employ cost-efficiencies in its work. Of note, some representatives of the UNAIDS Secretariat and Member States encourage the Communications Facility to make a stronger business case for its work – in terms of more clearly and succinctly articulating the return that it provides for the investment.

#### **Orientation, capacity building and institutional memory of the NGO Delegation**

A current area of particular concern to the NGO Delegation is whether the annual **orientation** of members will continue to be fully resourced by UNAIDS. This has traditionally been carried out in-person and in collaboration with the Secretariat. It has provided (especially for in-coming Delegates) critical information about what the PCB and NGO Delegation are, how they function and expected roles and responsibilities.<sup>89</sup> It also provides a degree of skills-building, for example in how to word interventions. One NGO Delegate described the orientation as a *"life-saver"* – as it enabled them to get grounded in their new role in, turn, perform it more effectively. Another Delegate – who did *not* benefit from in-person orientation – felt disadvantaged in starting their role. Overall, while Delegates welcome on-line orientation as an additional, useful resource, they feel strongly that it is *not* a replacement for an in-person process.

---

<sup>88</sup> Communication with PCB NGO Delegation CF, 20.9.12.

<sup>89</sup> *Orientation for New PCB NGO Delegates*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.

As seen in 2006/7, involvement in the NGO Delegation continues to demand significant commitment by its members – often way beyond the 10 hours per week outlined in the TORs (especially in the lead-up to PCB Meetings). In practice, despite orientation and existing skills, some Delegates find the time pressures and learning curve immense – raising questions about the degree to which the role and expectations of the NGO Delegation are realistic. In response, some stakeholders suggest that the NGO Delegates’ **tenure** (of 2-3 years) should be extended – to allow a longer period to build up full effectiveness as a Delegate and avoid overly-frequent turnover. Some others suggest the need for **capacity building** schemes, while recognising the challenge of mobilising resources for such work.

More widely, the issue of **institutional memory** is an on-going challenge for the NGO Delegation – and a concern that is heightened by the recent departure of the Communications Facility’s Programme Manager and the upcoming transfer of host organisation. The Communications Facility has made important efforts to address this, including by developing a set of comprehensive handover materials<sup>90</sup>. These provide detailed guidance on how all aspects of the Facility works, such as managing the website and coordinating the recruitment process. Meanwhile, all key information for individual Delegates and the Delegation as a whole – such as what happens, where and why during PCB Meetings - is contained in a comprehensive Delegates Manual (an update of which is currently being finalised)<sup>91</sup>.

Despite such steps, there remains concern that the NGO Delegation risks losing the ‘human factor’ – of people with first-hand experience of participating in PCB Meetings and tracking the evolution of agenda items and decisions. As a respondent to the e-survey said, the NGO Delegation: *“Needs experienced ‘wisdom keepers’ who would be able to offer advice informally.”* An attempt to establish a Resource Group (in response to a recommendation of the 2006/7 Review and aiming to provide advice to the Delegation) was unsuccessful. Similarly, the Delegation has often noted the need for forms of **mentoring** (such as ‘buddying’ between in-coming and former Delegates), but there has been limited action (largely due to limited resources). There are, however, some examples of succession planning, for example with the out-going Delegates for Europe currently providing a systematic handover to those in-coming.

### **Support for the NGO Delegation from the UNAIDS Secretariat (Geneva)**

The 2012 Review found that the NGO Delegation has had a generally positive, but sometimes tense, relationship with the UNAIDS Secretariat. It has graduated from an arrangement of considerable dependency to one of (non-financial) autonomy, although there remain needs for collaboration on both sides. There is strong appreciation for when the Secretariat has actively supported the Delegation, for example providing strategic advice and sign-posting to key documents, processes or contacts. However, some NGO Delegates are concerned that the Delegation has received an inconsistent level of support from the Secretariat – with the speed of response, level of interest and willingness to engage varying dramatically, often depending on the individual or team involved. It is not always clear from which department the Delegation should seek/receive information and about what – risking ‘mixed messages’. Delegates are also concerned that the lead responsibility for liaison with the NGO Delegation has recently moved from the Civil Society and Private Sector Division to the Governance and Multilateral Affairs Department. They fear that this reflects on-going de-prioritisation of civil society, and specifically the Civil Society Division, within UNAIDS. A further concern is that, with dramatic reductions/changes of staff in Geneva, UNAIDS has less able institutional memory of PCB processes related to civil society.

---

<sup>90</sup> UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation: *CF Program Assistant Handover Manual*, PCB NGO Delegation Communications and Consultation Facility, (draft) September 2012.

<sup>91</sup> *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegates’ Manual*, PCB NGO Delegation, (update being finalised) September 2012.



As seen in 2006/7, there also remains a degree of confusion about how the NGO Delegation is or is not related to civil society involvement in **wider UNAIDS processes** (such as the High Level Meeting and the Strategic Investment Framework). For example, while members of the Delegation do not presume that they would represent the sector in all UNAIDS processes, there is frustration if other civil society representatives are selected without any communication or, in some cases, even notification. A current example of where greater clarity would be helpful relates to the UNAIDS Guidance for Partnerships with Civil Society, Including People Living with HIV and Key Populations – in terms of which civil society constituents should be working with UNAIDS to take the guidelines forward to implementation.

### **Support for the NGO Delegation from the UNAIDS Secretariat (regional and country)**

As described in **Section 4** and **Annex 10** (with reference to decisions at the 20<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB Meetings), the 2012 Review identified little evidence of increased support for the NGO Delegation from UNAIDS at the **country or regional level**. Some UNAIDS staff and NGO Delegates collaborate closely. However, this appears to be built on existing personal relations rather than an institutional appreciation of and commitment to the role of the Delegation. Of particular note, while Partnership Advisors – or equivalent UNAIDS staff roles – have played a vital role in supporting civil society within countries, that role does not seem to have extended to liaison with NGO Delegates for the region. Meanwhile, there is concern among some UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsor stakeholders that some NGO Delegates do not actively enough promote their positions and role to UNAIDS colleagues or national civil society sectors.

There remains a need for, in particular, UNAIDS **Regional Support Teams** to systematise their relationship with the NGO Delegation – recognising the Delegates as a regional resource and working with them to mobilise regional civil society and connect regional priorities to the global agenda of the PCB. Decisions taken by the Board – for example requesting Regional Support Teams and Cosponsors to include NGO Delegates in regional meetings<sup>92</sup> - have had little follow-up, with Delegates citing examples of not being invited to critical regional meetings. Where participation has taken place – for example in UNAIDS Regional Management Meetings - it has been valued by UNAIDS and civil society and contributed to enhancing the understanding of civil society issues within the Regional Support Teams.<sup>93</sup> Of particular note, the recent re-assignment of some Geneva staff to country or regional Community Mobilisation Advisor positions is seen as a timely opportunity to address some of these issues.

---

<sup>92</sup> Decisions 7.6. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.

<sup>93</sup> *Increased involvement of Civil Society in the Programme Coordinating Board*, 25th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009UNAIDS, October 2009.

## Theme 5: Involvement of people living with HIV and other marginalized groups within NGO/civil society participation in the PCB

**Theme 5 of the 2012 Review addressed: involvement of PLHIV and key affected communities in the NGO Delegation; communication and consultation with/from PLHIV and key affected communities; and prioritisation of PLHIV and key affected community issues.**

### **Involvement of PLHIV and key affected communities in the NGO Delegation**

As also seen in the 2006/7 Review, there is a strong commitment to involving **PLHIV and key affected communities** as members of the NGO Delegation – and, in turn, bringing those voices to the PCB. The Delegation’s TORs note that – in support of the GIPA principle – preference should be given to qualified applicants who are openly living with HIV and that, as a rule, there should be a minimum of three PLHIV Delegates<sup>94</sup>. The TORs also specify the need to ensure an overall balance of constituencies, including Delegates that can represent and advocate for key affected communities. In practice, as seen in **Annex 7**, in the past year, the NGO Delegation has included members representing constituencies of PLHIV, MSM and people who use drugs, as well as wider population groups, such as young people and women.

The Review noted an overall improvement in the NGO Delegation’s **recruitment** – with some proactive efforts to identify and mobilise people who are not only PLHIV and/or key affected communities, but also have the requisite high level of skills and breadth of knowledge (that goes beyond their own personal experience). However, the Review found that the recruitment process is still not always clear to all representatives of such constituencies – suggesting (as seen in Theme 3) a need for some specific communication and relationship-building with the leaders of such NGOs and networks.

As noted under Theme 1, some Member States express strong concern about what they perceive as over-**representation** of key affected communities in the NGO Delegation – considering it to be disproportionate and unhelpful. As also noted, however, more widely it is widely recognised that Delegates who are PLHIV and/or from key affected communities provide an especially powerful voice within PCB proceedings. For example, a notable number of respondents to the 2012 Review recalled an intervention at the 30<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting by the incoming NGO Delegate for Africa (from African Men for Sexual Health and Rights (AMSHer)) who, amidst a challenging exchange with some Member States about the human rights of key affected communities, talked about the real life implications of the issues. As a representative of a Cosponsor remarked: *“It helped focus minds on what we were really talking about and why it really mattered.”* [Note: The intervention can be seen on YouTube<sup>95</sup>].

The 2012 Review identified that – as in 2006/7 - the inclusion of NGO Delegates from PLHIV and/or key affected communities can also continue to be complex and sensitive. For example, one such representative was asked to leave the Delegation in 2012 due to concerns about performance. However, there was a lack of clarity among some in the person’s constituency as to how and why the decision was taken. Meanwhile, some respondents to the Review, including from wider civil society, expressed concern that some members of the NGO Delegation use the PCB to progress ‘identity politics’ rather than to remain focused on issues directly related to HIV. Others, however, consider that such moves are both inevitable and acceptable – given the marginalisation and vulnerabilities that remain central to HIV epidemics, as well as other health and socio-political challenges.

<sup>94</sup> *Terms of Reference of the UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation*, PCB NGO Delegation, (update being finalised) September 2012.

<sup>95</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DeYoGpoPGxE>



## Communication and consultation with/from PLHIV and key affected communities

As described in more detail under Theme 3, the 2012 Review found that, since 2006/7, the NGO Delegation has made considerable efforts to widen its reach to civil society, including PLHIV and key affected communities. Its methods have included: recruiting Delegates who come from existing constituency networks; encouraging NGO Observers from constituencies; providing opportunities for constituencies to engage in Delegation research; and including interested organisations in on-going communication initiatives (such as the dissemination of communiqués). As also described under Theme 3, there remains a further need to actively consult with the leadership of some key constituencies – especially when those communities are not directly represented on the Delegation.

## Prioritisation of PLHIV and key affected community issues

Issues relating to the rights and needs of PLHIV and key affected communities – notably MSM, people who use drugs and sex workers – have been of the highest **strategic priority** for the NGO Delegation. This has been demonstrated by both *what* the NGO Delegation has brought to the PCB table (for example, in the content of its NGO Reports or contributions to thematic sessions) and *how* it has responded to agenda items (on subjects as varied as universal access, the UBRAF and the Strategic Investment Framework). As a representative of a Member State noted: *“It’s clear where the NGOs’ priority lies .... The human rights of those most affected has been their consistent theme, bringing a strong sense of focus to their work.”* While some Member States strongly oppose such prioritisation, many other stakeholders feel that it is more important now than ever – with reduced financial resources combined with complex political environments that risk sensitive or controversial issues being diluted or neglected.

The NGO Delegation has increasingly translated their focus on human rights, PLHIV and key affected communities into efforts to influence the key **strategic decisions** taken by the PCB. For example, it has advocated on relevant issues within the development of the UNAIDS Strategy and the follow-up to both the UNAIDS SIE and the 2011 Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS. It has endeavoured to match political attention to key affected communities with the allocation of appropriate resources. For example, at the 27<sup>th</sup> PCB, the Delegation introduced a decision point (7.6) to link the SRH/HIV needs of key populations to the next UBRAF<sup>96</sup>. It has also mobilised and played a key role in PCB agenda items on issues of priority importance to PLHIV and key populations. For example, at the 26<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting, it was instrumental to agenda item 2 (‘Ensuring non-discrimination in responses to HIV’) which resulted in a series of recommendations. These included: *“Requests UNAIDS, together with Member States and other partners, to intensify its assistance to networks of people living with HIV and key populations at risk to measure HIV-related stigma and discrimination and to mobilize comprehensive responses to reduce it.”*<sup>97</sup>

In addition, the NGO Delegation has used PCB agenda items to advocate for the specific needs and rights of *individual* key affected communities. The Delegation – often facing considerable political opposition from some Member States – has pushed for the strongest rights-based language that would be supported by the majority of PCB members, reflect international standards and be useful for further civil society advocacy within countries and regions.

---

<sup>96</sup> *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 6-8 December 2010.

<sup>97</sup> Decision 7.6. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2010.

Examples of individual communities include people who use drugs, such as with the NGO Delegation contributing to extensive decision points (8.1 – 8.11) under agenda item 3 ('HIV prevention among injecting drugs users') at the 24<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting<sup>98</sup>. The decisions included encouraging: *"Governments to reaffirm commitment to, and intensify harm reduction efforts in relation to HIV Encourages governments to reaffirm commitment to, and intensify harm reduction efforts in relation to HIV"*. They also included calling upon: *"Member States to further harmonize national laws governing HIV and drug use, in accordance with relevant national circumstances both from a public health and a human rights perspective."*

A further example is MSM and transgender people, such as with the NGO Delegation contributing to the debates under agenda item 5 ('Reducing HIV transmission among men who have sex with men and transgender people') of the 26<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting<sup>99</sup>. Decision point 12 (from which the Islamic Republic of Iran dis-associated itself) read: *"Takes note of the report on the progress made by UNAIDS since 2009 on the implementation of the 'UNAIDS Action Framework: Universal Access for Men who have Sex with Men and Transgender People' and calls upon UNAIDS and all partners to intensify efforts to meet the health needs of men who have sex with men and transgender people in the context of HIV and to ensure non-discrimination, in particular to urgently address the key economic, legal, social and technical barriers, which impede effective HIV responses, and to enhance their direct participation in national, regional and global HIV policy and programming."*

---

<sup>98</sup> *Report of the Twenty Fourth Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2009*, UNAIDS, May 2010.

<sup>99</sup> *Report of the Twenty Sixth Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2010*, UNAIDS, November 2010; and *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions, 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2010*.

## SECTION 4: FINDINGS: STATUS OF PCB RECOMMENDATIONS ON CIVIL SOCIETY

### PARTICIPATION

#### 4.1. Introduction to key PCB recommendations

The 2006/7 Review provided a comprehensive assessment of civil society participation in the PCB since the start of UNAIDS. It made four main recommendations, supported by detailed 'options for action'. The recommendations were incorporated into a paper presented by the NGO Delegation at the 20<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting, June 2007<sup>100</sup>. As a result, the PCB adopted four recommendations (decision points 9.1-9.4)<sup>101</sup>. In response to decision point 9.4, the NGO Delegation prepared a further submission on civil society participation for the 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB Meeting, December 2008<sup>102</sup>. This resulted in a series of additional recommendations (decision points 7.2-7.9)<sup>103</sup>.

As requested in its TORs, the 2012 Review assessed progress on these recommendations and decision points. It also specifically addressed the associated decision point (4.24) at the 25<sup>th</sup> PCB meeting, December 2009, within an agenda item on follow-up to the UNAIDS SIE<sup>104</sup>.

#### 4.2. Status of key PCB recommendations

**Annex 10** summarises the analysis of the Independent Consultant<sup>105</sup> of the status of recommendations on civil society participation made at the 20<sup>th</sup>, 23<sup>rd</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> PCB Meetings. It does not necessarily represent the views of the NGO Delegation, UNAIDS or the Oversight Committee for the 2012 Review.

The analysis shows that the PCB has demonstrated a commitment to keeping civil society participation on its agenda - as indicated by decisions 9.3 and 9.4 of the 20<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting and decision 7.8 of the 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB Meeting. It also, however, shows that the status of *implementing* specific recommendations is highly varied. Some have been fully actioned and brought vital progress. For example, decision point 9.1 of the 20<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting led to the establishment and funding of the Communications Facility. By the time of the 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB Meeting, the Facility was already making an important contribution to strengthening the quality and impact of the NGO Delegation's work<sup>106</sup>. A paper presented to the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting also highlighted progress on other issues raised in the 2006/7 Review. For example: opportunities had been increased for the NGO Delegation to meet with key players (such as the Chair/Vice Chair and CCO) prior to PCB Meetings; and an equitable speaking order had been established for PCB Meetings (with the NGO Delegation no longer having to wait until after other members).

---

<sup>100</sup> *Provisional Agenda Item 3.2: Results of the Review of NGO/Civil Society Participation in the Programme Coordinating Board*, 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland.

<sup>101</sup> Decisions 9 – 9.4. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 25-27 June 2007.

<sup>102</sup> *Increased Involvement of Civil Society in The Programme Coordinating Board*, (prepared by PCB NGO Delegation), 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.

<sup>103</sup> Decisions 7.1 - 7.9. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.

<sup>104</sup> *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009.

<sup>105</sup> Note: Analysis based on desk review of *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions* of all subsequent PCB Meetings and other related UNAIDS documents. Also informed by key informant interviews.

<sup>106</sup> *Conference Room Paper: Increased Involvement of Civil Society in the PCB: Role of the Civil Society Communications and Consultation Facility in Supporting the PCB NGOs*, 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.

For other PCB recommendations, there is little indication of full or partial implementation. For example, as noted under Theme 1, decision point 7.2 of the 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB Meeting encouraged Member States to consider involving representatives of civil society in their national delegations to the PCB. In practice, while some countries have included such representatives, there is little evidence that the recommendation led to an *increase* in such practices. Similarly, there appears to have been only partial follow-up to the decisions of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> Meetings which called on the UNAIDS Secretariat to provide costings and support for the detailed recommendations of the NGO Delegation's papers. While the costings were provided to the 25<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting<sup>107</sup>, the actions were not implemented.

Of particular note - and of major concern to some stakeholders consulted for the 2012 Review - while some PCB recommendations have been followed-up, the *nature* of that follow-up has been very different to that implied by the original language of the decision points. The clearest example is decision 4.24 of the 25<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting which, in follow up to the UNAIDS SIE, requested the development of an overarching UNAIDS Partnership Strategy with clear and measurable objectives and distinct strategies for working with both civil society and PLHIV. In practice, as part of the multi-stakeholder process to develop the new UNAIDS strategy, it was decided to embed the Partnership Strategy in the overall UNAIDS 2011-2015 Strategy. It was also decided to complement the strategy with guidance for different groups. UNAIDS Guidance for Partnerships with Civil Society, Including People Living with HIV and Key Populations was published in December 2011. However, while providing a shared vision for the staff of Cosponsors and UNAIDS Secretariat working at country, regional and global levels, the Guidance lacks specific objectives, measurable indicators and an implementation plan.

---

<sup>107</sup> *Increased Involvement of Civil Society in the Programme Coordinating Board*, 25th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009, UNAIDS, October 2009.

## SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS

The 2012 Review of NGO/Civil Society Participation in the UNAIDS PCB produced a wealth of findings. As a summary, the Independent Consultant draws the following conclusions:

- Civil society participation continues to be universally welcomed as an important principle and valued asset of the UNAIDS PCB.** While some Members States question the *degree* and *nature* of participation that is appropriate, all stakeholders in the 2012 Review acknowledged that civil society brings value-added to UNAIDS governance – in particular providing a vital reality check through the voices of those living with and most affected by HIV. There is regret that – as hoped by some when UNAIDS was established – civil society participation has not become a more common practice within the governance of other UN mechanisms.
- Civil society participation has maintained high profile on the PCB agenda. The resulting decision points – notably at the 20<sup>th</sup>, 23<sup>rd</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> Meetings - remain valid. However, while some have been effectively implemented and led to concrete results, others have received only partial or no follow-up.** Some of the resulting decision points – such as to establish the NGO Delegation’s Communications Facility<sup>108</sup> - have been fulfilled and demonstrated positive impact on the degree and quality of civil society participation. However, others – such as the inclusion of civil society representatives in Member State Delegations<sup>109</sup> and coordination between UNAIDS Regional Support Teams and regional NGO Delegates<sup>110</sup> - have not been fully actioned. Meanwhile, some PCB recommendations – such as to develop a distinct and measurable UNAIDS Partnership Strategy for work with both civil society and PLHIV<sup>111</sup> – have received follow-up in a different manner to that indicated by the wording of the original PCB decision.
- Since 2006/7, the NGO Delegation has developed a stronger identity – with a strategy focused on championing the rights and needs of PLHIV and key affected communities.** The majority of stakeholders welcome this focus, even where it challenges their own politics and positions. However, some Member States feel that it is insensitive to national cultures and specificities and risks neglecting other important aspects of a comprehensive response to HIV.
- The NGO Delegation plays a vital watchdog role - monitoring and, as necessary, pushing issues and agenda items of relevance to civil society that risk slipping off the agenda.** The NGO Delegation has shown persistence in ensuring that key PCB decision points – such as relating to technical support and the UNAIDS Partnership Strategy – are brought back to the table and receive appropriate attention. It has made good use of the opportunities available to it, for example show-casing civil society priorities (such as stigma and discrimination and HIV and the legal environment) in PCB thematic sessions.

---

<sup>108</sup> Decision 9.1. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 25-27 June 2007.

<sup>109</sup> Decision 7.2. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.

<sup>110</sup> Decisions 7.6 and 7.7. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.

<sup>111</sup> Decision 4.24. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009.

5. **The NGO Delegation has made an increasingly important contribution to the overall strategic and administrative frameworks of UNAIDS.** It has played an active role in trying to ensure that the frameworks for UNAIDS – such as the 2011-2015 Strategy and UBRAF – are evidence-based, respond to the needs of civil society and enable the Programme to be held to account.
6. **The NGO Delegation has significantly improved the scale, quality and, ultimately, influence of its work – through enhanced systems, an expanded evidence-base and stronger cohesion. This reflects both the commitment of its members and the work of the Communications Facility – which has proven a sound investment.** The Communications Facility has made a major contribution to a ‘seismic shift’ seen in the NGO Delegation’s efficiency and effectiveness. It has, in particular, supported the group to: develop systems (such as for Delegate selection and accountability); improve communication tools (such as its website and communiqué); enhance consultation processes (such as through using e-surveys and focus group discussions to gather evidence); and generally work more professionally. The Communications Facility has proved a good investment of UNAIDS resources. It is likely that a reduction in its funding will reduce the scale of support that it can provide and, in turn, limit the quantity and quality of the NGO Delegation’s work.
7. **Aspects of the NGO Delegation’s work still need further development, notably their outreach and accountability to wider regional civil society and some key constituencies.** Despite some members’ impressive efforts to build their constituencies, the Delegation as a whole needs to invest further time and systems in ensuring that it has a wide and comprehensive reach to civil society stakeholders in the countries and regions that they represent. They also need to ensure that they have institutional relations with the leadership of priority constituency groups (such as key affected communities), especially if such groups are not currently directly represented on the Delegation.
8. **The NGO Delegation has a more difficult - but also more crucial - role than ever within the changing and challenging environment for HIV. It must take proactive and strategic action to meet that challenge and play a catalytic and leadership role within the PCB.** Within a resource-constrained and, in some regions, increasingly conservative context, the voice of civil society will be vital. This includes in terms of ensuring that investment-based approaches to HIV acknowledge the rights and needs of those most affected and that, while maximising technical developments, appropriate attention is paid to the ‘critical enablers’ (such as the legal environment) that ‘make or break’ effective responses. The NGO Delegation’s roles will include holding Member States to account for the 2011 Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS and mobilising UNAIDS and its PCB to play a full leadership role that secures effective positioning of HIV within the post-MDG agenda.
9. **Going forward, the NGO Delegation needs to strengthen its strategic partnerships with other leaders in civil society, both within and external to the HIV field.** The Delegation needs to work more closely and systematically with other civil society leaders involved in HIV (especially the Delegations to the Board of the Global Fund). It also – in the light of HIV being integrated into wider responses to health – needs to enhance its outreach to civil society advocates and representatives to other global health and development institutions.



## **SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings and conclusions of the 2012 Review, the following recommendations are made to further increase and improve civil society participation in the UNAIDS PCB. It should be noted that, in acknowledgement of the constrained financial environment, the recommendations *intentionally* do not require additional financial resources, although some may require changes to allocations of, or the more efficient use of, existing budgets.

It is recommended that:

### **All PCB members are to:**

- 1. Work together to finalise and incorporate an indicator for civil society involvement in the UNAIDS UBRAF – to serve as a measurable standard for civil society engagement and a tool by which to hold UNAIDS and its Cosponsors to account.**
- 2. Champion the needs and participation of civil society (including PLHIV and key affected communities) in processes relating to wider global frameworks for health and development, especially the post-MDG agenda.** This should aim to ensure that HIV remains on the global agenda and that responses remain evidence-based, rights-based and provide value for money. It should also ensure that civil society has a ‘place at the table’ of relevant decision-making forums.

### **Member States are to:**

- 3. Recall decision point 7.2 of the 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB Meeting and consider the involvement of representatives of civil society within national Delegations to PCB Meetings.<sup>112</sup>**
- 4. (In addition or where resources are constrained) Enhance the evidence-base and accountability of national delegations to PCB Meetings by ensuring a system to facilitate input from and feedback to national civil society (including PLHIV and key affected communities) on PCB agenda items and decisions.** Each Member State should identify a simple and cost-efficient means to communicate with representatives of national civil society before and after each PCB meeting. This might involve holding a teleconference call or adding an agenda item to an existing meeting of an NGO Forum. As appropriate, it could be supported by the country’s UNAIDS office and/or the regional NGO Delegate.
- 5. Work with the NGO Delegation to identify appropriate mechanisms to systematise and strengthen constructive and consistent communication between the Delegation and Member States, in particular *between* PCB Meetings.**

---

<sup>112</sup> Decision 7.2: “Mindful of the sovereignty and capacity of Member States: a). Encourages Member States to consider the possibility of involving, in a capacity they deem appropriate, one or more representatives of civil society, including people living with HIV and affected communities, within their national delegations to Programme Coordinating Board meetings; and b). Recommends that the UNAIDS Secretariat, country offices and Regional Support Teams explore and identify ways to support Member States to involve civil society in their delegations.”



**The UNAIDS Secretariat and Cosponsors are to:**

- 6. Recall decision points 7.6 and 7.7 of the 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB Meeting<sup>113</sup> and further institutionalise collaboration between UNAIDS/Cosponsors at country and regional levels and the regional NGO Delegates.** This should include strengthening relations between the Delegates and the relevant UNAIDS Regional Support Team (especially Community Mobilisation Advisors or equivalent positions). For example, they might work together to improve communication to and from national and regional civil society constituents on PCB agenda items. Where regional NGO caucuses (recommended in decision 7.7) are not feasible, other options also need to be explored, for example teleconferences and/or the addition of sessions on the PCB to existing UNAIDS and Cosponsor meetings.
- 7. Work with the NGO Delegation to clarify the communication needs and processes between the Delegation and different teams within the UNAIDS Secretariat.** Transparent communication and clear roles and responsibilities are critical for on-going relations as well as progressing key initiatives, such as the further development of the Strategic Investment Framework and the implementation of the Guidance for Partnerships with Civil Society, Including People Living with HIV and Key Populations<sup>114</sup>.
- 8. Work with the NGO Delegation to identify appropriate mechanisms to systematise and strengthen constructive and consistent communication between the Delegation and Cosponsors, in particular between PCB Meetings.** Examples of approaches might include monthly calls between the Chair of the CCO and a focal point for the NGO Delegation and/or participation by a representative of the NGO Delegation in a section of the Global Coordinators Meeting.
- 9. Work with the NGO Delegation to revisit and strengthen the orientation process for new civil society members of the PCB – exploring cost-efficient approaches, while ensuring resources for adequate in-person training to enable Delegates to play an appropriate and strong role.**

**The NGO Delegation and Communications Facility are to:**

- 10. Respond to the changing global environment and likely post-MDG agenda by working more systematically and strategically with civil society leaders and Delegations to both: other key HIV mechanisms, especially the Global Fund; and wider health and development initiatives.** This should aim to ensure consolidated messages and consistent advocacy to ensure that the needs and issues of civil society are addressed within both responses to HIV (for example, resourced by the Global Fund's new funding model) and the post-2015 global agenda.

---

<sup>113</sup> Decision 7.6: "Requests the UNAIDS Regional Support Teams and Cosponsors to include NGO delegates, or their designated representative, in regional meetings, where appropriate." Decision 7.7: "Calls upon the Regional Support Teams to facilitate NGO regional caucuses, including people living with HIV and other key affected populations. These will be co-hosted periodically by the Regional Support Team, regional PCB NGO delegates and the PCB NGO's Communications Facility, and could be attached to a pre-existing meeting."

<sup>114</sup> UNAIDS Guidance Document: UNAIDS Guidance For Partnerships With Civil Society, Including People Living With HIV And Key Populations, UNAIDS, 2011.

- 11. Further develop the NGO Delegation’s outreach and accountability to wider civil society in countries and regions – with particular attention to any geographic areas (such as sub-regions) or constituencies (such as specific key affected communities) not directly represented on the Delegation.** The NGO Delegation should collaborate with UNAIDS, Member States and Cosponsors to identify practical ways to ensure that its regional Delegates are better able to communicate and consult with a wide range of relevant constituents. Ideas to explore could include: establishing formal relations (such as through a Memorandum of Understanding) between the NGO Delegation and global or regional networks of PLHIV and key affected populations (with current priorities including sex workers and transgender people); and having an NGO Delegation focal point in each country (such as a representative of the national NGO forum or PLHIV networks).
- 12. Further increase the NGO Delegation’s profile and transparency (particularly to Member States) by expanding dissemination of its core communications materials and producing brief, public summaries of key processes.** Ideas to explore could include: updating all relevant stakeholders (including other PCB members) about the existing information and resources available on the Delegation’s website; and developing and disseminating (including to Member States) one-page summaries, for example of the methods and results of each recruitment process, including the profile of the appointed Delegates.
- 13. Further explore cost-efficient approaches to building capacity and ensuring institutional memory within the NGO Delegation.** Ideas to explore could include: establishing a virtual mentoring scheme between former and in-coming Delegates; collaborating with ICSS and other civil society Delegations to global institutions to mobilise resources for joint Delegate training; continuing to refine on-line orientation materials (to complement in-person orientation for new Delegates); and developing a checklist to support the handover between out-going and in-coming Delegates in a region.

**ANNEX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION**

<b>Member States:</b>	
1. Anna Marzec-Bogusławska	Government of Poland
2. David Hohman	Government of the United States of America
3. Monique Middlehoff	Government of the Netherlands
4. Kourosh Ahmadi	Government of Iran
5. Mokhtar Warida	Government of Egypt
6. Mariame Sy	Government of Senegal
7. Prangtip Kanchanahattakij	Government of Thailand
8. Rosibel Menendez	Government of El Salvador
9. José Antonio Izazola	Government of Mexico
<b>Cosponsors:</b>	
10. Thilly DeBoldt	United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)
11. Elizabeth Benomar	United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
12. Ludo Bok	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
13. Christian Kroll	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
<b>UNAIDS Secretariat:</b>	
14. Jan Beagle	UNAIDS, Geneva
15. Kate Thomson	UNAIDS, Geneva
16. Mariangela Simao	UNAIDS, Geneva
17. Helen Frary	UNAIDS, Zambia
18. Richard Burzinsky	UNAIDS, Geneva
<b>NGO Delegation:</b>	
19. Ed Ngoksin	(Current) PCB NGO Delegate: Asia and the Pacific; International Treatment Preparedness Coalition (ITPC)
20. Mabel Bianco	(Current) PCB NGO Delegate: Latin America and the Caribbean; Fundación para Estudio e Investigación de la Mujer (FEIM)
21. Evan Collins	(Former) PCB NGO Delegate: North America; Ontario HIV Treatment Network
22. Felicita Hikaum	(Former) PCB NGO Delegate: Africa; AIDS and Rights Alliance for Southern Africa (ARASA)
23. Pavel Aksenov	(Former) PCB NGO Delegate: Europe; Russian Harm Reduction Network (ESVERO)
24. Ian McKnight	(Former) NGO Delegate: Latin America and the Caribbean; Caribbean Vulnerable Communities Coalition (CVC)
25. Sara Simon	Communications and Consultation Facility, PCB NGO Delegation
<b>Wider civil society:</b>	
26. Nicci Stein	Interagency Coalition on AIDS and Development (ICAD)
27. Dasha Ocheret	Eurasian Harm Reduction Network (EHRN)
28. Ruth Foley	Ecumenical Advocacy Alliance (EAA)
29. Julian Hows	Global Network of People Living with HIV (GNP+)
30. Raoul Fransen	International Civil Society Support (ICSS)
31. Ruth Morgan Thomas	Global Network of Sex Work Projects (NSWP)
32. Innocent Laison	African Council of AIDS Service Organisations (AFRICASO)
33. Rachel Ong	Communications Focal Point, Communities Delegation to the Board of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria

**Participants in focus group discussion with current PCB NGO Delegation:**

Name	Organisation
1. Alessandra Nilo	PCB NGO Delegate: Latin America and the Caribbean; Gestos – HIV+, Communication and Gender, Brazil
2. Nadia Rafif	PCB NGO Delegate: Africa; Association de Lutte Contre le Sida (ALCS), Morocco
3. Matthew Southwell	PCB NGO Delegate: Europe; International Network of People Who Use Drugs (INPUD), United Kingdom
4. Mabel Bianco	PCB NGO Delegate: Latin America and the Caribbean; Fundación para Estudio e Investigación de la Mujer (FEIM), Argentina
5. Jane Bruning	PCB NGO Delegate: Asia and the Pacific; Positive Women Incorporated / Asia Pacific Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS (APN+), New Zealand
6. Ebony Johnson	PCB NGO Delegate: North America; International Community of Women Living with HIV/AIDS (ICW), United States

## ANNEX 2: LIST OF QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

### **1. In what capacity – and over what period of time - have you experienced NGO/civil society participation in the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB)?**

For example, have you:

- Been part of an NGO Delegation?
- Worked alongside an NGO Delegation as a member of the PCB?
- Been involved in supporting or communicating with an NGO Delegation as part of broader civil society?

### **2. In the last 5 years (2007-12), what overall difference has the NGO Delegation made to the agenda, discussions and decisions of the PCB?**

For example, can you provide any examples of where the NGO delegation has:

- Represented the views of civil society as a whole and brought a key issue for the sector onto the agenda of the PCB?
- Made a critical intervention within an agenda discussion or thematic session of the PCB?
- Brought a different voice or piece of evidence to discussions of the PCB?
- Strongly influenced an important decision/recommendation made by the PCB?
- Mobilised the PCB to increase the meaningful involvement of civil society in the PCB?

### **3. In particular, what role has the NGO Delegation played in supporting the PCB to respond to the changing – and challenging – environment for HIV?**

For example, can you provide any examples of where the NGO Delegation:

- Provided analysis of how the changing environment is impacting on civil society?
- Supported the PCB to identify ways to address the changing environment and ‘keep AIDS on the agenda’?
- Engaged in processes promoted by the PCB – such as the Strategic Investment Framework – to respond to the changing environment?
- The delegation’s interaction with the boards of other global health entities, such as the Global Fund and UNITAID, etc.?

### **4. In the last 5 years, what difference has the Communications and Consultation Facility made to the work of the NGO delegation?**

For example, can you provide any examples of where the Communications and Consultation Facility:

- Improved the systems (for selection, consultation, etc.) used by NGO Delegation?
- Helped the NGO Delegation to work more professionally and have greater impact?
- Increased the meaningful involvement of civil society in the PCB?
- Increased the extent to which the NGO Delegation represents the views of civil society as a whole?
- Provided good value for money?

### **5. What are the key existing strengths and weaknesses of the official structure and processes of the PCB in relation to NGO/civil society participation? How could things be improved in the future? How well does the PCB NGO delegation utilise the official structure and processes of the PCB to achieve its objectives?**

For example, what are your opinions and ideas about:

- The official role of the NGO Delegation within the PCB?
- The non-voting status of the NGO Delegation within the PCB?
- The relationship between the NGO Delegation and the other members of the PCB (including the cosponsors)?
- The relationship between the NGO Delegation and the UNAIDS Secretariat?



**6. What are the key existing strengths and weaknesses of the composition, selection criteria and selection process for the NGO Delegation on the UNAIDS PCB? How could things be improved in the future?**

For example, what are your opinions and ideas about:

- The number of representatives in the NGO Delegation?
- The type of NGOs that can be part of the NGO Delegation (according to the ECOSOC resolution)?
- The composition of the NGO Delegation (i.e. the balance in terms of geography, gender, HIV status, experience, age, constituency representation (especially marginalized groups), etc.)?
- The selection criteria for the members of the NGO Delegation?
- The selection process for the members of the NGO Delegation?
- How the NGO Delegates communicate among themselves and work 'as a whole'?

**7. What are the key existing strengths and weaknesses of the systems for communication, consultation and accountability between the NGO delegation on the UNAIDS PCB and broader civil society? How could things be improved in the future?**

For example, what are your opinions and ideas about:

- The systems for general communication from the NGO Delegation to broader civil society?
- The systems for general communication from broader civil society to the NGO Delegation?
- The systems for consultation and constituency representation between the NGO delegation and broader civil society on key strategic issues?
- The systems for accountability between the NGO Delegation and broader civil society?

**8. What are the key existing strengths and weaknesses in relation to the capacity and resources for NGO/civil society participation in the UNAIDS PCB? How could things be improved in the future?**

For example, what are your opinions and ideas about:

- The orientation available to new member of the NGO Delegation?
- The on-going support available to the NGO Delegation, including from the UNAIDS secretariat?
- The capacity building available to the NGO Delegation?
- The resources (money, expertise, logistics, etc.) needed and available to the NGO Delegation?
- The sustainability of knowledge and 'institutional memory' for the NGO Delegation?
- The cost-effectiveness and efficiency of the NGO Delegation's support and services and whether the resources are allocated in a way that provides the greatest impact?

**9. In particular, what are the key strengths and weaknesses in relation to the greater involvement of people living with or affected by HIV or AIDS (GIPA) and other marginalized groups in NGO/civil society participation in the UNAIDS PCB? How could things be improved in the future?**

For example, what are your opinions and ideas about:

- The systems for people living with HIV and other marginalized groups to have a direct voice within the UNAIDS PCB?
- The systems for people living with HIV and other marginalized groups to communicate their views with and through the NGO Delegation on the UNAIDS PCB?

**10. In summary, what are the 2-3 priority actions that should be taken to improve NGO/civil society participation in the UNAIDS PCB in the future? Who should take these actions?**

### ANNEX 3: SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE RESULTS OF E-SURVEY

Total number of respondents (to some or all survey questions): **318**

Total number of respondents according to language:

- English: **161**
- Russian: **72**
- Spanish: **45**
- French: **40**

[Note: All percentages are of the number of respondents to the question, not the total number of respondents to the survey]

#### About your organisation

**1. What region is your organisation based in?** (please tick one option)

- a. Asia: **10.49%**
- b. Pacific: **0.33%**
- c. Latin America: **15.08%**
- d. Caribbean: **3.61%**
- e. East and Southern Africa: **11.15%**
- f. West and Central Africa: **16.39%**
- g. Middle East and North Africa: **3.28%**
- h. Eastern Europe and Central Asia: **22.95%**
- i. West and Central Europe: **9.18%**
- j. North America: **7.54%**
- k. Other: **1.64%**

**(Total respondents to question = 305)**

**2. How would you describe your organisation?** (please tick as many as are relevant)

- a. Community-based group: **12.87%**
- b. AIDS service organisation: **18.15%**
- c. Faith-based organisation: **3.96%**
- d. National NGO or network: **26.07%**
- e. Regional NGO or network: **10.89%**
- f. International NGO or network: **10.23%**
- g. Group or network of people living with HIV: **12.54%**
- h. Group or network of a key affected community (such as sex workers, people who use drugs, men who have sex with men and others): **5.28%**
- i. Other: **8.91%**

**(Total respondents to question = 303)**

**3. In the last five years, how has your organisation been involved with the NGO Delegation to the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board?** (please tick as many as are relevant)

My organisation has:

- a. Not known about the existence of the NGO Delegation: **17.92%**
- b. Known about the NGO Delegation, but had no involvement with it: **36.81%**
- c. Been a member of the NGO Delegation: **4.23%**
- d. Received information about the UNAIDS PCB from the NGO Delegation: **17.59%**
- e. Used communication materials (such as reports and the website) provided by the NGO Delegation: **5.86%**
- f. Provided input into research and information-gathering by the NGO Delegation (for example by participating in a survey or study): **6.84%**
- g. Provided input into the NGO Delegation's preparation for PCB meetings (for example through conference calls): **0.98%**
- h. Participated as an NGO Observer at a PCB meeting: **5.21%**
- i. Worked with members of the NGO Delegation at meetings or conferences: **4.56%**

**(Total respondents to question = 307)**

**The work of the NGO Delegation**

**4. In your opinion, how important is it that the NGO Delegation represents the voices of civil society in the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board?**

How important is it that the NGO Delegation represents the issues and needs of:

	Very important	Quite important	Not important	Do not know
a. Civil society (in general)?	<b>71.4%</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>
b. People living with HIV?	<b>83.5%</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>
c. Key affected communities (such as sex workers, people who use drugs, men who have sex with men and others)?	<b>74.2%</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>3.2%</b>

**(Total respondents to question = 267)**

**5. In the last five years, how relevant to civil society have been the issues raised by the NGO Delegation in the meetings of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board?**

The following are examples of issues raised in NGO Reports during 2007-2012. The NGO Report is a yearly document developed by the NGO Delegation and presented to the UNAIDS PCB to highlight priority issues for civil society. Examples can be seen at: [http://unaidspcbngo.org/?page\\_id=18002](http://unaidspcbngo.org/?page_id=18002)

Please indicate how relevant these issues are to your organisation and the response to HIV in your country or region:

	Very relevant	Quite relevant	Not relevant	Do not know
a. The impact of reduced funding for HIV on civil society	<b>76.6%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>
b. Legal and human rights issues related to HIV, including criminalisation	<b>71.7%</b>	<b>21.7%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>
c. Stigma and discrimination related to HIV	<b>72.2%</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>
d. Barriers to achieving universal access to HIV prevention, care, support and treatment	<b>71%</b>	<b>23.9%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>
e. Rights and needs of key populations, such as people who use drugs, sex workers and men who have sex with men	<b>64.0%</b>	<b>29.5%</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>3.2%</b>
f. Access to HIV-related treatment	<b>74.2%</b>	<b>21.4%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>
g. Co-infection of HIV and other health concerns, such as TB and Hepatitis	<b>65.2%</b>	<b>27.7%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>
h. HIV and sexual and reproductive health and rights	<b>65.5%</b>	<b>29.4%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>

**(Total respondents to question = 264)**

**6. The NGO Delegation is currently composed of 5 Members and 5 Alternate Members from the following regions: Africa; Asia and the Pacific; Europe; Latin America and the Caribbean; and North America. Do you think this division represents all regional needs?**

- a. Yes: **35.5%**
- b. No: **47.3%**
- c. Do not know: **17.2%**
- d. Comment: **(92 comments provided)**

**(Total respondents to question = 262)**

### Communication and consultation by the NGO Delegation

**7. What is working well about communications and consultation between the NGO Delegation to the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board and civil society?**

For example, through the work and communications of the NGO Delegation, has your organisation:

	Yes	No	Do not know/ not applicable
a. Been informed about the basics of what the NGO Delegation is and what it does?	<b>52.9%</b>	<b>34.8%</b>	<b>12.3%</b>
b. Been informed about the key issues and discussions coming up at UNAIDS PCB meetings?	<b>50.4%</b>	<b>39.5%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>
c. Been informed about how to contribute to the key issues and discussions coming up at UNAIDS PCB meetings?	<b>42.7%</b>	<b>44.8%</b>	<b>12.4%</b>
d. Received an NGO Delegation communiqué (issued after each UNAIDS PCB meetings to summarise key discussions and decisions)?	<b>47.9%</b>	<b>40.8%</b>	<b>11.3%</b>

e. Known how it could raise issues of concern from your country or region with the NGO Delegation?	<b>29.0%</b>	<b>57.1%</b>	<b>13.9%</b>
f. Known how to contact an NGO Delegate from your region?	<b>32.3%</b>	<b>56.1%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>
g. Received a call for applications to become a member of the NGO Delegation?	<b>43.5%</b>	<b>45.6%</b>	<b>11.0%</b>

**(Total respondents to question = 250)**

**8. In the last five years, what has worked well about steps taken by the NGO Delegation to increase the engagement and impact of civil society voices in the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board?**

For example, how effectively has the NGO Delegation:

	Very effectively	Quite effectively	Not effectively	Do not know
a. Provided an NGO Delegation website, including information about the Delegation and upcoming PCB Meetings?	<b>25.6%</b>	<b>24.2%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>34.8%</b>
b. Produced and disseminated communiqués summarising the key discussions and decisions of each PCB Meeting?	<b>25.2%</b>	<b>29.6%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>	<b>27.8%</b>
c. Produced and disseminated NGO Delegation updates highlighting key issues and initiatives of the Delegation?	<b>24.0%</b>	<b>27.5%</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>28.8%</b>
d. Held civil society briefing calls (regional and global) to involve you in the work of the NGO Delegation and get your input?	<b>19.8%</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>28.2%</b>	<b>37.0%</b>
e. Been accessible to you (by phone or e-mail) during the year for questions and discussions about the PCB and the NGO Delegation?	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>18.1%</b>	<b>26.4%</b>	<b>32.6%</b>

**(Total respondents to question = 246)**

**The future of the NGO Delegation**

**9. In the future, how could the NGO Delegation make it easier or better for organisations in your country or region to increase their engagement in the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board?**

- a. Do not know: **37.7%**
- b. Comment: **(82 comments provided)**

**10. Are there any further comments that you would like to make?**

- a. Comment: **(112 comments provided)**

## ANNEX 4: LIST OF RESOURCES FOR DESK REVIEW

### UNAIDS general resources:

1. UNAIDS website – pages on UNAIDS governance. [www.unaids.org](http://www.unaids.org)
2. *UNAIDS 2011-2015 Strategy: Getting to Zero*, UNAIDS, 2010.
3. *UNAIDS Guidance Document: UNAIDS Guidance For Partnerships With Civil Society, Including People Living With HIV And Key Populations*, UNAIDS, 2011.
4. *Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS: Intensifying our Efforts to Eliminate HIV/AIDS*, United Nations General Assembly, 2011.
5. *Together We Will End AIDS*, UNAIDS, July 2012.
6. *Investing in Results: Results for People*, UNAIDS, June 2012.
7. *A New Investment Framework for the Global Response to HIV*, UNAIDS, 2011.
8. *UNAIDS Second Independent Evaluation 2002-2008: Final Report*, 25th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009, October 2009.

### UNAIDS PCB resources:

9. *Resolution 1994/24: Joint And Cosponsored United Nations Programme On Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS)*, United Nations Economic and Social Council, July 1994.
10. *The Governance Handbook*, UNAIDS, January 2010.
11. *PCB Membership 1996-2014*, UNAIDS, May 2011.
12. *Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS: Composition of the Programme Coordinating Board (PCB)*, UNAIDS, January 2012.
13. *Provisional Agenda Item 3.2: Results of the Review of NGO/Civil Society Participation in the Programme Coordinating Board*, (prepared by PCB NGO Delegation), 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland.
14. *Increased Involvement of Civil Society in The Programme Coordinating Board*, (prepared by PCB NGO Delegation), 23rd Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.
15. *Increased involvement of Civil Society in the Programme Coordinating Board*, 25th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009, UNAIDS, October 2009.
16. *Conference Room Paper: Increased Involvement of Civil Society in the PCB: Role of the Civil Society Communications and Consultation Facility in Supporting the PCB NGOs*, 23rd Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.
17. *Conference Room Paper: Second Independent Evaluation of UNAIDS: PCB NGO Response to SIE*, 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009, 30 November 2009.
18. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 5-7 June 2012.
19. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 13-15 December 2011.
20. *Report of the Twenty Ninth Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 13-15 December 2011*, UNAIDS, February 2012.



21. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 21-23 June 2011.
22. *Report of the Twenty Eighth Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 21-23 June 2011*, UNAIDS, November 2011.
23. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 6-8 December 2010.
24. *Report of the Twenty Seventh Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 6-8 December 2010*, UNAIDS, January 2011.
25. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2010.
26. *Report of the Twenty Sixth Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2010*, UNAIDS, November 2010.
27. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009.
28. *Report of the Twenty Fifth Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009*, UNAIDS, March 2010.
29. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2009.
30. *Report of the Twenty Fourth Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2009*, UNAIDS, May 2010.
31. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008.
32. *Report of the Twenty Third Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 15-17 December 2008*, UNAIDS, April 2009.
33. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 23-25 April 2008.
34. *Report of the Twenty Second Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 23-25 April 2008*, UNAIDS, October 2008.
35. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 21<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 17-18 December 2007.
36. *Report of the Twenty First Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 17-18 December 2007*, UNAIDS, January 2008.
37. *Decisions, Recommendations and Conclusions*, 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 25-27 June 2007.
38. *Report of the Twentieth Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 25–27 June 2007*, UNAIDS, July 2007.
39. *Second Independent Evaluation of UNAIDS: PCB NGO Response to SIE: Document Prepared by the PCB NGOs*, 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009, 30 November 2009.

#### **PCB NGO Delegation resources:**

40. PCB NGO Delegation website – all pages. [www.unaidspcbngo.org](http://www.unaidspcbngo.org)
41. *Independent Review: NGO/Civil Society Participation in the Programme Coordinating Board of UNAIDS*, Sarah Middleton-Lee, March 2007.
42. *NGO Delegation Calendar 2012*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.
43. *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation: CF Program Assistant Handover Manual*, PCB NGO Delegation Communications and Consultation Facility, (update being finalised) September 2012.

44. *Orientation for New PCB NGO Delegates*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.
45. *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegates' Manual*, PCB NGO Delegation, (update being finalised) September 2012.
46. *UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board NGO Delegation External Communications Plan and Guidelines*, (updated) August 2012.
47. *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation: Vision, Mission, Principles, and Code of Conduct*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2007/8.
48. *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegates Manual*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2007/8.
49. *Terms of Reference of the UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation*, PCB NGO Delegation, (update being finalised) September 2012.
50. *Terms of Reference of the UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2007/8.
51. *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation Statement of Commitment*, PCB NGO Delegation, (undated).
52. *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation – Google Analytics Analysis 1 Mar 2009 – 31 July 2012*, PCB NGO Delegation.
53. *NGO Delegation Recruitment 2008-2012*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.
54. *UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation: Recruitment Process*, PCB NGO Delegation, (undated).
55. *The Key Activities of the Communications and Consultation Facility of the PCB NGO Delegation, April – December 2008*, PCB NGO Delegation.
56. *UNAIDS Partnership Strategy with Civil Society NGO Delegation Key Points and Perspectives*, PCB NGO Delegation, October 2012.
57. *NGO Delegation Agenda: 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, 3-8 June 2012*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.
58. *NGO Delegate Agenda, 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, 2-9 December 2010*, PCB NGO Delegation 2010.
59. *Message to the 25<sup>th</sup> PCB from the NGO Delegation and Wider Civil Society*, PCB NGO Delegation (and over 100 civil society signatories).
60. *Communiqué: What Happened at the 26th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) in Geneva, Switzerland, June 22-24, 2010?*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2010.
61. *Communiqué: What Happened at the 27th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) in Geneva, Switzerland, December 6-9, 2010?*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2010.
62. *Communiqué: What Happened at the 28th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) in Geneva, Switzerland, June 21-23, 2011?*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2011.
63. *Communiqué: What Happened at the 29th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board (PCB) in Geneva, Switzerland, December 13-15, 2011?*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2011.
64. *Communiqué: 06/14/12 - What Happened at the 30th UNAIDS Board Meeting?*, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.
65. *Report by the NGO Representatives, 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board Geneva, Switzerland, 25-27 June 2007*.
66. *Report by the NGO Representatives, 22nd Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Chiang Mai, Thailand, 23-25 April 2008*.
67. *Report by the NGO Representatives, 24th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2009*.
68. *Report by the NGO Representatives, 26th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 22-24 June 2010*.
69. *Report by the NGO Representatives, 29th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 13-15 December 2011*.
70. *Report by the NGO Representatives, 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board, Geneva, Switzerland, 5-7 June 2012*.

**Other resources:**

71. *Discussion Paper: How the HIV Community Can Shape the Future HIV and Development Agenda Post-2015*, International HIV/AIDS Alliance, Stop AIDS Now and Stop AIDS Alliance, October 2012.
72. *No Time to Lose: A Life In Pursuit of Deadly Viruses*, Peter Piot, 2012.
73. *Reimagining Participation in International Institutions*, Kenneth W. Abbott and David Gartner, Arizona State University, September 2011. Social Science Research Network.  
[http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1933562](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1933562)

## ANNEX 5: FUNCTIONS OF PCB AND PCB BUREAU

According to the *Modus Operandi of the Programme Coordinating Board of The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)*, UNAIDS, revised December 2011:

### **The functions of the PCB are:**

1. To establish broad policies and priorities for the Joint Programme, taking into account the provisions of General Assembly resolution 47/199.
2. To review and decide upon the planning and execution of the Joint Programme. For this purpose, it shall be kept informed of all aspects of the development of the Joint Programme and consider reports and recommendations submitted to it by the CCO and the Executive Director.
3. To review and approve the plan of action and budget for each financial period, prepared by the Executive Director and reviewed by the CCO.
4. To review proposals of the Executive Director and approve arrangements for the financing of the Joint Programme.
5. To review longer term plans of action and their financial implications.
6. To review audited financial reports submitted by the Joint Programme.
7. To make recommendations to the Cosponsoring Organizations regarding their activities in support of the Joint Programme, including those of mainstreaming.
8. To review periodic reports that will evaluate the progress of the Joint Programme towards the achievement of its goals.

### **The functions of the PCB Bureau are:**

1. Facilitating the smooth and efficient functioning of PCB sessions.
2. Facilitating transparent decision-making at the PCB.
3. Preparing the PCB agenda, and recommending the allocation of time to, and the order of, discussion items.
4. Providing guidance on PCB documentation, as needed.
5. Carrying out additional functions as directed by the PCB.

## ANNEX 6: QUALIFICATIONS AND COMMITMENTS OF PCB NGO DELEGATES

The following extract is taken from the *Terms of Reference of the UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation*, PCB NGO Delegation, (update being finalised) September 2012:

### Qualifications of the applying NGO:

Though applications to serve on the Delegation are submitted by individuals representing NGOs, it is the NGO itself that holds the seat on the PCB. In order to qualify to hold the seat on the PCB, the applying NGO must:

1. Be actively and principally involved with HIV work in the country and/or region for which the applicant is applying;
2. Maintain a comprehensive understanding of the health, political and social consequences and needs of the AIDS pandemic, particularly as it relates to the region;
3. Be strongly connected to and actively liaise with national and regional CS networks; and
4. Have extensive experience in national, regional and/or international policy-making and advocacy.

### Qualifications of the applying Delegate:

In order to qualify to represent its NGO on the PCB, an applicant for the position of Delegate must:

1. Have permanent residency in and be living and working in a country within the region for which they are applying to represent;
2. Have the ability to communicate effectively in written and spoken English;
3. Have effective skills for writing reports and presentations;
4. Be computer literate;
5. Have easy and regular access to the Internet and email;
6. Have a minimum three years' experience in HIV in their region;
7. Have an ability to collaborate well with a diverse group of people from different cultures from around the world;
8. Have the facility to work strategically in a group;
9. Have diplomacy skills;
10. Have some comfort with public speaking; and
11. Have some experience in national, regional and international fora.

### Commitments of the applying NGO:

It is required that the NGO must state in its letter of recommendation for the applying Delegate that the NGO:

1. Authorizes the applying Delegate to represent the NGO as its Delegate on the PCB;
2. Commits to the UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation Mission, Principles and Code of Conduct;
3. Will support their Delegate for the term of his/her office so that he/she will be able to fulfil the Commitments of the applying Delegate (see J. of this document) by confirming that the applicant:
4. Will have adequate office space;
5. Will be freed up from his/her regular duties to be able to dedicate a minimum of 10 hours per work week;

6. Will be additionally freed up from his/her regular duties in order to travel to attend the formal PCB meetings (including pre-meetings and debriefing meetings) and the NGO orientation meetings;
7. Will have adequate access to office equipment and supplies;
8. Will have organizational and administrative support;
9. Will ensure the quality and comprehensiveness of the applying Delegate's participation on the PCB; and
10. Will ensure that, if the Delegate is unable to complete his/her term of office, an equally qualified replacement, if available, will be offered by the NGO to finish the term of office. The final decision is adopted by the full delegation.

#### **Commitments of the applying Delegate:**

In order to participate as an NGO Delegate to the PCB, it is required that the applying Delegate must commit to:

1. The UNAIDS PCB NGO Delegation Mission, Principles and Code of Conduct;
2. Spending a minimum of 10 hours per week performing the duties of Delegate;
3. Broadly and in collaboration with the CF, consulting with, seeking input from, learning about the relevant issues of, and reporting to their national and regional CS;
4. Attending and actively participating in key meetings including but not limited to:
5. Biannual PCB meetings (5 to 6 days each) typically in either Geneva, Switzerland or a heavily-impacted country, in early to mid-June and early to mid-December. These meetings include an NGO Delegation strategy pre-meeting (1 day), NGO Delegation pre-meetings with Board members and other relevant stakeholders (1 day), the PCB meeting (3 days) and NGO Delegation debriefing meeting (1 day);
6. Attending, actively participating in and either participating with or representing (and reporting back to) the Delegation at other meetings and consultations (usually 1 to 3 per year) as necessary and when possible. Some examples are: high-level meetings of the UN General Assembly Special Session (UNGASS) in New York; regional consultations; PCB consultations on developing policies; the PCB Bureau; etc.;
7. Actively participating in Delegation conference calls (average 1 per month), usually held at 15:00 Geneva time and lasting for 1-2 hours;
8. Maintaining timely communications with the Delegation and other PCB bodies via email;
9. Reading, absorbing and being prepared to engage in the issues of all relevant PCB documents in a timely manner;
10. Actively participating and strategizing with the Delegation in the reviewing and planning processes of the PCB and UNAIDS;
11. Actively participating in and chairing a fair share of ad hoc Working Groups (WG) or Steering Committees (SC) as needed. Some examples are: NGO Report WG; PCB Thematic Session WG; upcoming agenda item WGs; Recruitment WG; etc.; Skype or conference calls are generally required for these and can be held once or twice a month usually lasting for an hour.
12. Working in collaboration with the Secretariat; and
13. Participating fully in the work of the CF.



**ANNEX 7: MEMBERS OF NGO DELEGATION SINCE 2007**

Region	Current and past Delegates (since 2007)
Africa	<p><b>Current Delegates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nadia Rafif, Association de Lutte Contre le Sida (ALCS), Morocco</li> <li>• Joel Nana, African Men for Sexual Health and Rights (AMShER), South Africa</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Delegates since 2007:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nomonde Mhlahli Meji, African Sex Worker Alliance (ASWA), South Africa (2012)</li> <li>• Felicita Hikuam, AIDS and Rights Alliance for Southern Africa (ARASA), Namibia (2010-2011)</li> <li>• Lydia Mungherera, The AIDS Support Organization (TASO), Uganda (2009-2010)</li> <li>• Amelia Ranotsi (2009) and Mercy Machiya (2008), The Southern African Network of AIDS Service Organizations (SANASO), Lesotho/ Namibia (2008-2009)</li> <li>• James Clovis Kayo, Cameroon Network of Associations of PLWHA (RECAP), Cameroon (2007-2008)</li> <li>• Mary Vuningoma Balikungeri, Rwanda Women’s Network, Rwanda (2006-2007)</li> </ul>
Asia and the Pacific	<p><b>Current Delegates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jane Bruning, Positive Women Incorporated / Asia Pacific Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS (APN+), New Zealand</li> <li>• Attapon Ed Ngoksin, International Treatment Preparedness Coalition (ITPC), Thailand</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Delegates since 2007:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abdullah Denovan, Asia Pacific Network of People Living with HIV, Indonesia (2011)</li> <li>• Rathi Ramanathan, Asia Pacific Network of Sex Workers, Thailand (2010-2011)</li> <li>• Vincent Crisostomo, Asia Pacific Coalition of Regional Networks on HIV/AIDS, Thailand (2008-2010)</li> <li>• Gulnara Kurmanova, AntiAIDS Association, Kyrgyz Republic (2008-2009)</li> <li>• Bhavani Shanker Kusum, Gram Bharati Samiti (GBS), India (2006-2007)</li> <li>• Rachel Ong, Asia Pacific Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS, China (2005-2007)</li> </ul>
Europe	<p><b>Current Delegates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matthew Southwell, International Network of People who Use Drugs (INPUD), UK</li> <li>• Laura Kirkegaard, AIDS-Fondet / International AIDS Vaccine Initiative (IAVI), Denmark</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Delegates since 2007:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rhon Reynolds, International AIDS Vaccine Initiative, Netherlands (2010-2012)</li> <li>• Sonja Weinreich, Evangelischer Entwicklungsdienst (EED) /Church Development Service, Germany (2008-2009)</li> <li>• Vitaly Zhumagaliev (2007-2009) and Pavel Aksenov (2009), Russian Harm Reduction Network (RHRN), Russian Federation (2007-2009)</li> <li>• Paulo Vieira, European Youth Network on Sexual and Reproductive Rights – YouAct, Portugal (2006-2007)</li> </ul>

<b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b>	<p><b>Current Delegates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mabel Bianco, Fundación para Estudio e Investigación de la Mujer (FEIM), Argentina</li> <li>• Alessandra Nilo, Gestos – HIV+, Communication and Gender, Brazil</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Delegates since 2007:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amira Herdoiza, Corporación Kimirina, Ecuador (2010-2011)</li> <li>• Ian McKnight (2010) and Robert Carr (2009), Caribbean Vulnerable Communities Coalition, Jamaica (2009-2010)</li> <li>• Gracia Violeta Ross Quiroga, Nacional REDBOL, Bolivia (2007-2009)</li> <li>• Sandra Batista, Rede Latinoamericana de Reducao de Danos (RELARD), Brazil (2006-2008)</li> </ul>
<b>North America</b>	<p><b>Current Delegates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• George Ayala, The Global Forum on MSM &amp; HIV (MSMGF), United States</li> <li>• Ebony Johnson, International Community of Women Living with HIV/AIDS (ICW), United States</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Delegates since 2007:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evan Collins, Ontario HIV Treatment Network, Canada (2008-2010)</li> <li>• Maria Antonieta Alcalde Castro (2009/2010) and Alexandra Garita (2009), International Planned Parenthood Federation – Western Hemisphere, USA (2009-2010)</li> <li>• Michael O’Connor, Interagency Coalition on AIDS and Development (ICAD), Canada (2006-2008)</li> <li>• Zonibel Woods, International Women’s Health Coalition, USA (2007-2008)</li> </ul>

## ANNEX 8: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR COMMUNICATION AND CONSULTATION FACILITY

The following TORs were cited in the *Communication and Consultation Facility Request for Proposals (RFP) 2012*:

The CF, under the guidance of the PCB NGO, will serve as an independent administrative secretariat for the PCB NGO delegation and will work in close collaboration with the UNAIDS Secretariat. The organization, which will be recruited in this process, and that will host the CF, provides all relevant administrative, financial and technical resources to make the CF function properly. These include, but are not limited to:

1. Facilitating and coordinating the regular work of the delegates (10), which includes:
  - a. Organizing and supporting administrative aspects related to conference calls and meetings, including drafting meeting agendas and writing and disseminating meeting minutes. (Approximately monthly calls)
  - b. Managing the logistics of the recruitment process for new PCB NGO delegates, including hosting an application process, managing the call for nominations and arranging interviews;
  - c. Providing technical and administrative support for the development of the NGO delegation's reports (1 annual PCB report).
  - d. Compiling and synthesizing background documents to inform the delegation's policy analyses;
  - e. Archiving reports and other documents, ensuring work is well-documented and easily accessible for future use;
2. Providing technical and administrative support to the delegation in conducting high-level policy analysis on key global HIV policy issues;
3. Managing travel and logistics for subject area community experts and Secretariat focal point (Around 6 travels/year);
4. Managing (competitive selection, issuing and supervision) contracts for technical experts including: researchers, process facilitators, trainers editors and translators (Approximately 4 contracts every year);
5. Provide all services and equipment (including server) necessary to host and update the PCB NGO website; review, edit, proof-read and format content provided by PBC NGOs for posting on website ([www.unaidspcbngo.org](http://www.unaidspcbngo.org));
6. Building links with broader international AIDS initiatives, such as the GFATM, UNITAID, GAVI, IHP+ (through the identification of common activities and facilitating joint discussions with the delegation);
7. Assisting in resource mobilization to support PCB Observers and to undertake networking activities such as collaborating with NGOs involved in initiatives with other organizations, such as the Global Fund Board and UNITAID
8. Planning and conducting, under the supervision of the PCB NGO delegation, annual orientation meetings for the incoming delegates; and
9. Implementing any other task included in a mutually agreed workplan together with the PCB NGO delegation.

## **ANNEX 9: MISSION, VISION, PRINCIPLES AND CODE OF CONDUCT OF PCB NGO DELEGATION**

The following text is taken from materials used for the 2012 orientation of in-coming members of the PCB NGO Delegation<sup>115</sup>:

### **NGO Delegation mission**

To bring to the PCB the perspectives and expertise of people living with, most affected by, and most at risk of, vulnerable to, marginalized by, and affected by HIV and AIDS, as well as civil society and nongovernmental entities actively involved in HIV/AIDS in order to ensure that their human rights, and equitable, gender-sensitive access to comprehensive HIV prevention, treatment, care, and support are reinforced by the policies, programmes, strategies and actions of the PCB and UNAIDS.

### **NGO Delegation vision**

We envision a world where all stakeholders—civil society, governments and international bodies—meet the challenges of the global AIDS pandemic together by combining their collective wisdom to generate creative, equitable, holistic and effective policies and solutions that lead to a world free of HIV.

### **NGO Delegation principles**

1. Involvement of PLHIV
2. Human rights
3. Non-discrimination
4. Inclusion of those most at-risk of HIV infection and, especially, marginalized populations affected by HIV
5. Gender equality
6. Evidence informed
7. Public health

### **Code of conduct**

1. Respect diversity and are culturally sensitive
2. Foster a culture of inclusion
3. Co-lead and work together as a team
4. Value each other's knowledge and skills
5. Maintain integrity, professionalism and a high standard of ethics
6. Create a safe space for open dialogue
7. Communicate clearly and considerately
8. Respect confidentiality
9. Actively participate and contribute to the best of our abilities
10. Engage passionately
11. Are accountable to ourselves, each other, the PCB, and broader civil society
12. We hold ourselves and each other accountable and take ownership of our failures.

---

<sup>115</sup> *Orientation for New PCB NGO Delegates, PCB NGO Delegation, 2012.*

**ANNEX 10: ANALYSIS OF STATUS OF PCB RECOMMENDATIONS ON CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION**

20 <sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting, 25-27 June 2007: Agenda item 3.2: Results of the Review of NGO/civil society participation in the PCB		
Decision points		Status
9.	<i>Takes note</i> of the Results of the Review of NGO/Civil Society participation in the Programme Coordinating Board and <i>adopts</i> the following recommendations contained therein:	
9.1.	<i>Endorses</i> the establishment of an independent communication and consultation facility (CF) to strengthen the NGO participation and support effectiveness of NGO country-level voices in the Programme Coordinating Board policy dialogue, and <i>requests</i> that the CF be supported by the UNAIDS Secretariat;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Independent Communications Facility established in 2008, with TORs focused on supporting the NGO Delegation to increase and improve civil society participation in the PCB.</li> <li>Communications Facility funded by UNAIDS, with \$500,000 for each of 2008-2010 and 2010-2012.</li> <li>In October 2012, request for proposals issued for new Communications Facility host for 2013-12, with reduced level of funding (\$300,000) from UNAIDS<sup>116</sup>.</li> </ul>
9.2.	<i>Requests the</i> UNAIDS Secretariat to provide appropriate financial support towards the further development of the recommendations in the Review of NGO/Civil Society participation in the Programme Coordinating Board;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper produced on the costs/feasibility of regional civil society caucuses<sup>117</sup>, but not comprehensively followed-up.</li> </ul>
9.3.	<i>Agrees</i> to review the participation of the NGO Programme Coordinating Board Delegation in the Programme Coordinating Board within no more than five years; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of civil society participation in the PCB commissioned and funded by UNAIDS in 2012.</li> </ul>
9.4.	<i>Decides</i> to discuss, at the 22nd Programme Coordinating Board meeting, the forward looking mechanisms for achieving increased involvement of civil society in the Programme Coordinating Board.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not addressed at 22<sup>nd</sup> PCB Meeting. However, agenda item 4 ('Increased involvement of civil society in the PCB') included in 23<sup>rd</sup> PCB Meeting.</li> </ul>

23 <sup>rd</sup> PCB Meeting, 15-17 December 2008: Agenda item 4: Increased involvement of civil society in the PCB		
Decision points		Follow-up
7.1	<i>Welcomes</i> the report of the PCB NGOs on the " <i>Increased involvement of civil society in the PCB</i> ";	
7.2.	Mindful of the sovereignty and capacity of Member States: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Encourages</i> Member States to consider the possibility of involving, in a capacity they deem appropriate, one or more representatives of civil society, including people living with HIV and affected communities, within their national delegations to Programme Coordinating Board meetings; and</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some Member States have included civil society representatives in their national delegations. However, there is no evidence that the decision point led to an <i>increase</i> in such practices.</li> <li>Paper produced for 25<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting on the costs/feasibility of UNAIDS</li> </ul>

<sup>116</sup> The amount for 2013-2014 has been reduced due to UNAIDS current budget constraints and the negative real growth of the UBRAF since 2008.

<sup>117</sup> *Increased involvement of Civil Society in the Programme Coordinating Board*, 25th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009UNAIDS, October 2009.

	b. <i>Recommends</i> that the UNAIDS Secretariat, country offices and Regional Support Teams explore and identify ways to support Member States to involve civil society in their delegations;	<p>Secretariat supporting civil society participation in national delegations<sup>118</sup>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNAIDS continues to welcome the inclusion of civil society representatives in national delegations. However, there is no specific evidence that the decision point led to proactive measures to support such participation.</li> </ul>
7.3.	<i>Requests</i> the Programme Coordinating Board Bureau to host at least two of its meetings ‘in person’ in the lead-up to each Programme Coordinating Board meeting – and to provide resources to those members, including the representative of the NGO Delegation, that are unable to cover their costs;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two annual meetings of the PCB Bureau prior to PCB Meetings are now held in-person.</li> </ul>
7.4.	<i>Requests</i> the Programme Coordinating Board Bureau to provide a simple ‘road map’ for how each key document for decision will be conceptualized, developed and finalized and when/how different stakeholders, including civil society, can contribute;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A roadmap is not available for each PCB document. However, the PCB Bureau’s multi-sectoral representatives are informed of the status of documents and the UNAIDS Secretariat responds to specific requests for information.</li> </ul>
7.5.	<i>Encourages</i> all relevant stakeholders to submit their key documents for decision at least 8 weeks prior to Programme Coordinating Board meetings - to facilitate timely translation and enable comprehensive consultation among all sectors, including civil society;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Efforts have been made by the UNAIDS Secretariat to encourage the timely submission of documents.</li> </ul>
7.6.	<i>Requests</i> the UNAIDS Regional Support Teams and Cosponsors to include NGO delegates, or their designated representative, in regional meetings, where appropriate;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some Regional Support Teams (such as in Asia Pacific) have collaborated with NGO Delegates, but it has not been systematic.</li> <li>Since December 2011, the UNAIDS Secretariat in Geneva has officially introduced regional NGO Delegates to the relevant Regional Support Team.</li> <li>Paper produced for 25<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting on the costs/feasibility of civil society involvement in regional UNAIDS meetings<sup>119</sup>. Not comprehensively followed-up.</li> </ul>
7.7.	<i>Calls upon</i> the Regional Support Teams to facilitate NGO regional caucuses, including people living with HIV and other key affected populations. These will be co-hosted periodically by the Regional Support Team, regional PCB NGO delegates and the PCB NGO’s Communications Facility, and could be attached to a pre-existing meeting;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper produced for the 25<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting on the costs/feasibility of regional civil society caucuses<sup>120</sup>. Not comprehensively followed-up.</li> </ul>
7.8.	<i>Agrees</i> to schedule an agenda item to review progress towards increasing and improving civil society participation and, in particular, to review the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific agenda item not included in a PCB Meeting in 2010. However, civil</li> </ul>

<sup>118</sup> *Increased involvement of Civil Society in the Programme Coordinating Board*, 25th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009UNAIDS, October 2009.

<sup>119</sup> *Increased involvement of Civil Society in the Programme Coordinating Board*, 25th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009UNAIDS, October 2009.

<sup>120</sup> *Increased involvement of Civil Society in the Programme Coordinating Board*, 25th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009UNAIDS, October 2009.



	implementation of relevant recommendations from the Second Independent Evaluation, in a Programme Coordinating Board meeting in 2010.	society participation was identified as a key theme of the UNAIDS SIE – leading to decision points in agenda items on follow-up to the Evaluation, including at the 25 <sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting [see below].
7.9.	<i>Requests</i> the UNAIDS Secretariat to prepare a paper for the 25th Programme Coordinating Board meeting that responds to the management and cost implications of the proposed recommendations presented in the PCB NGO’s paper to the 23rd Board meeting on “ <i>Increased involvement of civil society in the PCB</i> ”, and taking into account the recommendations of the Second Independent Evaluation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paper produced for 25<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting on the costs/feasibility of UNAIDS Secretariat supporting the proposed recommendations<sup>121</sup>. Not comprehensively followed-up.</li> </ul>

<b>25<sup>th</sup> PCB Meeting 8-10 December 2009: Agenda item 2: Second Independent Evaluation of UNAIDS</b>		
<b>Decision points</b>		<b>Follow-up</b>
4.24	<p><i>Requests</i> the UNAIDS Secretariat to work with Cosponsors to develop an overarching partnership strategy with clear and measurable objectives with distinct strategies for working with both civil society and people living with HIV, and for working with global health initiatives such as the Global Fund, PEPFAR and other bilateral and development partners. Subsidiary recommendations are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a shared vision of the potential and expected benefits from civil society and People Living with HIV involvement, a clear set of objectives and a more systematic approach to documenting outcomes;</li> <li>• Develop a common approach across the secretariat and cosponsors to engagement with and capacity-building support for civil society and organizations of People Living with HIV;</li> <li>• Increase support at global and country levels for empowerment and participation of key populations; and</li> <li>• Strengthen efforts to engage with the private sector, including addressing the respective roles of the secretariat and ILO.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision taken to embed the Partnership Strategy in the UNAIDS 2011-2015 Strategy (rather than have a standalone resource) and to develop guidance for partnerships with civil society.</li> <li>• <i>UNAIDS Guidance for Partnerships with Civil Society, Including People Living with HIV and Key Populations</i> published in December 2011. Provides a shared vision and targets staff of Cosponsors and UNAIDS Secretariat working at country, regional and global levels. However, lacks specific objectives, measurable indicators and an implementation plan.</li> <li>• As of October 2012, an indicator on civil society involvement is being developed, but is not included in the UNAIDS UBRAF.</li> <li>• Issues related to technical support (including for civil society) have been raised in PCB Meetings, but no specific strategy has been developed.</li> </ul>

<sup>121</sup> *Increased involvement of Civil Society in the Programme Coordinating Board*, 25th Meeting of the UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board Geneva, Switzerland, 8-10 December 2009UNAIDS, October 2009.