



30 April 2009

**Second meeting of the subcommittee *ad interim* of
UNAIDS Programme Coordinating Board
Geneva, Switzerland
16 April 2009**

**Report of the second meeting on the preparation
of the 2010-2011 Unified Budget and Workplan**

Agenda item 1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda (Annex 1)

The agenda was adopted and the minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

Agenda item 2. Review of the draft 2010-2011 Unified Budget and Workplan (Annexes 2a and 2b)

A presentation was made on the UBW 2010-2011 outlining the priorities and context of the UBW. The presentation showed the UBW draft budget allocations, categories and amounts totaling US\$777 million. The UBW also estimates country level budgets per agency amounting to a total of US\$1.8 billion, which while formally outside the UBW, bring the combined estimated AIDS-related resources the Cosponsors and the Secretariat to US\$2.5 billion.

Clarity was sought on UNAIDS budget strategy, redeployment of resources to respond to an epidemic which is constantly evolving, the interagency budget and its relationship to Cosponsor funds at regional and country level, and technical support.

In response, it was explained that strengthening the capacities of countries to respond to the epidemic and 'making the money' work to support programmes at country level are key principles underpinning UNAIDS work, and it was noted that the Cosponsors and the Secretariat are currently in the process of revising the overall strategy for delivery of technical support at country level. In the discussion that followed on UNAIDS staff at country level, it was pointed out that a number of initiatives are ongoing which are expected to provide more information about the desired number and qualifications of UNAIDS staff at country level. These include:

- The second independent evaluation, which will present its initial findings in first week of June 2009;
- An ongoing assessment of the functions and structures of regional and country offices;
- A rapid survey, which is being carried out with the World Bank, WHO and the Secretariat, on the effects of the economic crisis on the response to AIDS.

On technical support it was acknowledged that this means different things to different audiences. Several participants noted that technical support must be tailored to the situation in each country and in each region, and to their respective needs and capacities. It was suggested that a regional hub or approach may work well in many cases, for example in Africa. Countries within a region could learn from each others experiences. The role of the UN agencies is best employed to strengthen country capacities in the long run. Different country capacities will require different approaches and skill sets. Concern was expressed that funds for technical support were not filtering down to country level and tailored to country-specific needs.

On resources and staffing at county levels it was noted that

- The situation and capacities of countries differ greatly and needs to be factored in
- It is important to consider the added value and define the role of UNAIDS staff
- UNAIDS Secretariat staff have an important role in coordinating and advising on rather than implementing the work of Cosponsors
- Skill sets of Secretariat staff need to be considered in relation to skill sets of country level staff of Cosponsors and matched to country/regional requirements
- UNAIDS staff should not be spread too thin on the ground

A table summarizing budget allocations by principal outcome and key output was requested to be included in the UBW document. Clarification was sought and provided that Programme Acceleration Funds (PAF) are included in the interagency component of the UBW. Furthermore salaries and operating costs of UNAIDS country staff should be specified. Clarification was also sought on how much funding was provided for civil society and how much can be accessed by civil society directly. It was noted that US\$12 million was directly allocated to strengthening civil society but that working with and through civil society was mainstreamed throughout the UBW. It was pointed out that the UBW should not only be viewed as a source of funds for civil society by the UN. It should also facilitate involvement and funding of civil society through government processes and resources.

The 8 priority areas were discussed. It was noted that more comprehensive approaches to prevention, sexual transmission and gender cut across a number of priority areas and need to receive sufficient attention even if they are not explicitly or fully captured in the list of 8 priority areas. It was noted that most of the 8 priority areas deal with prevention and a number of them address gender. It was also pointed out that the 8 priority areas focus on where the UN can add value and demonstrate results, but that they do not represent everything UNAIDS will be doing in 2010-2011.

Overall, several participants acknowledged a very big improvement in the latest version of the UBW although the documents were circulated too late to allow in-depth consideration. Given the considerable changes to the UBW following the appointment of the new Executive Director, presentation of and communicating the differences should be prioritised in order to allow for strategic discussions at the up-coming PCB. One participant noted that the annexes were really good but that they would need to be better presented to the PCB to show exactly what UNAIDS was doing.

Agenda item 3. Review of the proposed 2010-2011 performance monitoring framework (Annexes 3a and 3b)

A presentation was made on the development of the 2010-2011 Performance Monitoring Framework (PMF). A number of comments were made to strengthen the PMF further and align it with the annexes of the UBW. Furthermore, strong support was voiced for having one PMF to serve the reporting needs of everyone – all donors, other PCB members and other constituencies.

The issue of how accountability was addressed in the PMF was raised and the process of compiling the PMF was outlined, including the use of the Cosponsor Evaluation Working Group, the membership of which includes M&E experts from the Cosponsors and the Secretariat. It was noted that accountability rested on 3 pillars:

1. Monitoring the collective efforts of UNAIDS
2. Individual monitoring and accountability of the Cosponsors and the Secretariat
3. Mid-term and other reviews, case studies, in-depth assessments and evaluations

To illustrate an attempt to move towards performance-based funding as requested at the 20th PCB Meeting, June 2007, it was noted that a 40% implementation rate of the biennium budget would be used as one measure of performance for release of additional funds for the remainder of the biennium.

A request for more qualitative indicators was put forward and the use of qualitative indicators was also discussed but their practicality relative to their cost and difficulty of production and the fact that they could be highly subjective was noted, and it was agreed that more qualitative information would be provided.

The issue was raised as to which indicators could apply to the 8 priority areas, and it was noted that indicators by definition have limitations and cannot necessarily satisfy all monitoring or reporting needs. The Secretariat outlined an alternative approach to cluster and synthesize across multiple indicators and areas of intervention so that they give a more complete picture. Clustering of indicators and using composite indices as well as qualitative information from specific studies and evaluations will be used as a basis for UNAIDS next global report on the AIDS epidemic in 2010.

The need to use language consistently and to distinguish between priority areas from principal outcomes was pointed out along with the need to capture the link between the 8 priority areas and the framework and to estimate the resources applied against the 8 priority areas.

It was requested that outcomes and results also be monitored by region and country. A specific request was made to introduce an indicator on how many countries included the issue of migrants and mobile populations in their national plans. The meeting was informed that the next thematic PCB would deal with mobile populations and mobility.

The meeting was informed that the performance monitoring framework including principal outcomes, key outputs and respective indicators would be finalized by the end of April to be made available with the other documents for the PCB. The preparation of the next layer of the PMF – including baselines, targets, data sources and frequencies, would continue and be distributed as a conference paper at the PCB.

Agenda item 4. Review of other documents and follow up to previous PCB decisions (Annexes 4a and 4b)

A verbal presentation was given on the interim financial reports for the PCB. Changes in accounting policies and terminology relating to the implementation of the international public sector accounting standards (IPSAS) were explained. Several delegates congratulated the Secretariat on the production of excellent clear and detailed financial reports. Specific questions on the composition of expenses were requested and clarified. A number of questions centered around country level expenditures and expenditures of Cosponsors at country level were requested.

Concerns was expressed that the report did not include financial information on other main actors such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria or UNITAID, but following discussion it was agreed that these were outside the scope of the report financial reports prepared for the PCB. Nevertheless it was considered that it would be a useful addition if a report on the overall funding for AIDS could be presented to the PCB.

Agenda item 5. Conclusions and recommendations of the subcommittee

A verbal report was presented on behalf of the Chair.

Agenda item 6. Process for preparation of the report of the subcommittee to the PCB (Annex 5)

An outline of the report of the subcommittee to the PCB was discussed and agreed to. It was also agreed that a draft report of the subcommittee to the PCB will be circulated by email to the members of the subcommittee for comments by the end of April 2009.

Agenda item 7. Closure of the meeting

It was agreed that the PMF matrix with principal outcomes, key outputs and indicators should be updated to be identical to the UBW matrix and sent to members of the subcommittee early in the week starting April 20 to enable members of the subcommittee to review the indicators and provide any comments by April 26, 2009.

The detailed PMF with baselines, targets, data sources and frequencies, would be circulated for comment to the members of the Subcommittee in the next month.

The representatives of civil society wished to record their appreciation of their membership on the subcommittee which breaks new ground for the UN, another first for UNAIDS.