

**First Meeting of the Resource Needs Steering Committee
15 April 2005 (9:00-17:30)
Maison Internationale de l'Environnement 2, Geneva**

REPORT

Participants

Rob Moodie, Victorian Health Promotion Foundation, Australia (Co-Chair)
Paul De Lay, UNAIDS Secretariat (Co-Chair)
Jean-Paul Moatti, France
Laurent Aventin, France
Carole Presern, UK
Mark Dybul, USA (via phone in the afternoon)
Euclides Castilho, Brazil
Anupong Chitwarakorn, Thailand
Victor Mukonka, Zambia
Peter McDermott, UNICEF
Jim Y. Kim, WHO
Perna Banati, Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
Wanjiku Kamau, Civil society
Paul Zeitz, Civil society (Global AIDS Alliance)
Mohga Kamal-Smith, Civil society (OXFAM)
Thérèse Lethu, Global Business Coalition on HIV/AIDS
Phil Compennolle, Royal Tropical Institute, Netherlands
Fritz Lherisson, Global Task Team Secretariat
Achmat Dangor, UNAIDS Secretariat
Catherine Hankins, UNAIDS Secretariat
Robert Greener, UNAIDS Secretariat
José Antonio Izazola-Licea, UNAIDS Secretariat
Elisabeth Manipoud Figueroa, UNAIDS Secretariat

Discussion

Agenda item 1: Review of agenda and objectives of meeting

Rob Moodie opened the first meeting of the Resource Needs Steering Committee by presenting its **expected objectives** as follows:

1. to gain an appreciation for the concerns and issues surrounding the current estimations of resource needs and the diverse needs for the use of this information;
2. to provide broad guidance on coverage assumptions, the potential use of scenarios and overall political implications;
3. to agree on a proposed timeline with specific products;
4. to endorse the proposed establishment of a supporting Resource Needs Technical Working Group (including its membership);
5. to build the firm commitment of Steering Committee members to the exercise.

This was followed by a discussion introduced by Rob Moodie on the **role and status of the Steering Committee**. It was clarified that the creation of the Steering Committee had been recommended by the “Making The Money Work” meeting held in London on 9 March 2005 to provide time-limited guidance to the UNAIDS Secretariat for its ongoing work on estimating resource needs for AIDS. The Steering Committee would seek to work by consensus; in the event that it would not seem possible to achieve consensus, the issue in question would be noted and transmitted to the UNAIDS Secretariat for further resolution.

Comments/conclusions

- The importance of strongly engaging developing countries throughout this exercise was stressed by a number of participants. To that effect, it was recommended that more representatives of developing countries be included as members of the Steering Committee – as well as within the Resource Needs Technical Working Group.
- Furthermore, it was also suggested that a formal consultation involving developing countries be convened, possibly at the time of the World Health Assembly (WHA) in May, to collect input on the resource needs estimates process and outcome.
- The Steering Committee would give technical and political legitimacy to reasonable resource requirement estimates.

Concern was expressed up front about the very short **60-day time limit set for the exercise** by the 9 March meeting, which constrains a more rigorous technical approach. The UNAIDS Secretariat indicated that, while some level of reporting back on progress was required by 9 May, there was also a clear need for a more long-term process in the area of estimating resource needs for AIDS. It was also clarified that the **main purpose of this exercise** was political advocacy and resource mobilization – more so than strategic planning and programme implementation.

Comments/conclusions

- While there was broad agreement about the very tight timeframe, it was also recognized that estimates were needed as soon as possible in light of several important ongoing political processes and upcoming events.
- It was stressed that the overall advocacy objective should not only aim to generate international resources from donors but also domestic commitments from national governments, as specified in the Communiqué of the 9 March meeting.
- Increasing attention to country-level requirements will need to be addressed.

A short information presentation was also made under this item by Achmat Dangor on the **9 March meeting**, with reference to the other process which had come out of this consultation, i.e. the Global Task Team (GTT) on improving coordination among multilateral institutions and international donors.

Comments/conclusions

- Concern was expressed about the unclear linkage with the GTT process as well as about the timing of those two exercises. In particular, the feasibility of developing resource needs estimates – within this 60-day timeframe – prior to the definition of the “overall financial architecture” – through the GTT 80-day period

– was questioned. Achmat Dangor indicated that the issue of greater alignment of dates and outputs for those two processes would be discussed with the three co-host Governments of the 9 March meeting the following week.

The role of the **Resource Needs Technical Working Group**, whose constitution should be endorsed by the Steering Committee at this first meeting, was also considered under this agenda item, in addition to deliberations foreseen under item 8. The Technical Working Group (TWG) would be the technical arm serving the Steering Committee. It would be composed of a small number of experts in areas such as economics, modelling, costing, programme implementation, and impact assessment. It would function under broad policy parameters set by the Steering Committee, and would be tasked with the further refinement of previous work on resource needs calculations.

Comments/conclusions

- As a starting point, the TWG should undertake a technical review of the work in progress (both methods and outcomes of existing data) which had been carried out as background for the 9 March meeting. A report on the results of this review would be provided to the second meeting of the Steering Committee in May.
- The importance of constantly staying abreast of continuing changes affecting costs in a number of specific areas, as well as utilizing updated information emerging from countries, was stressed.
- The Steering Committee would be responsible for providing clear guidance to the TWG in order to make the end product comprehensible and acceptable for a broad range of non experts.
- The methodology which would be agreed upon, as well as the underlying assumptions, should be articulated very clearly.

The **provisional agenda** was adopted without changes.

Agenda item 2: Background and historical perspective on estimating AIDS resource needs

Paul De Lay made a short presentation based on the two background papers (*Historical background: Estimating financial resource needs for HIV/AIDS* and *Estimating the resource needs of scaling-up HIV/AIDS interventions in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review*) which had been prepared for this agenda item. He indicated that each of the four exercises which had been undertaken by the UNAIDS Secretariat to estimate AIDS resource needs since 2001 had been linked to a major international event – UNGASS, the International AIDS Conferences in Barcelona and Bangkok, and most recently the 9 March meeting.

Comments/conclusions

- It was clarified that the needs for vaccine and microbicide research, which were costed through a separate process, had not been included in the previous exercises but only referenced. It was recommended that the TWG follow the same trend for this new round of programmatic estimates given the time limitations. In addition, a request should be made to the relevant organizations in order to ultimately align these two processes.
- The importance of linking this exercise with the MDG process was also stressed.

Agenda item 3: Presentation on methodology, using an example of a single intervention

Phil Compennolle presented this agenda item based on the background paper (*Costing methodology*). The presentation illustrated how choices about data and assumptions are made at the different steps of resource estimation. One of the determinants of the resource requirement estimation are the targets set for service delivery.

Comments/conclusions

- During the short discussion, the issue of target setting was first raised (see more comments under agenda item 4). It was recommended that the TWG be tasked to identify a small number of coverage targets building on internationally agreed targets such as those for UNGASS, MDG, PEPFAR, and 3x5.

Agenda item 4: Discussion on assumptions, focusing on timeframe, coverage and scenarios

Paul De Lay presented this agenda item.

Comments/conclusions

- The issue of how to estimate the contribution of the private sector was raised.
- The need to be able to cost, at some point, cross-cutting factors and broader programme components such as technical assistance, investments in capacity, infrastructure and human resources was recognized. It was mentioned that the MDG process had included an item for technical cooperation. It was recommended to link/refer the issue of costing technical assistance to the work of the GTT Working Group on Harmonization of Technical Support.

Timeframe

- It was decided that the timeframe for the resource needs exercise would be limited to the next three years – 2006 to 2008.
- Representatives of civil society emphasized the importance of sticking to the same figure for two to three years, as the branding process required with stakeholders was taking on average 18 months.
- As already mentioned under agenda item 1, it was stressed that some estimates were urgently needed – hopefully before the G8 meeting in July.

Targets

- The TWG will endeavour to identify three to four targets for this time period – on prevention, ART, orphans and vulnerable children (OVC), and possibly care and support. These should be derived from and be aligned with existing major targets.
- Concern was expressed as to the feasibility or necessity of setting new targets in the very tight period determined by the 9 March meeting.

- There was a strong plea to use existing targets and processes of target setting already in place in different programmatic areas as the input for the AIDS resource estimation – such as the expanded Inter-Agency Task Team, facilitated by UNICEF, for OVC. Sub-groups within these existing structures could possibly be specifically tasked with providing input on the targets to be used.
- It was clarified that the ongoing process for developing a strategy for intensifying prevention, which is facilitated by the UNAIDS Secretariat, includes the development of specific goals – however, these will not be developed within the 60-day timeframe of this exercise.
- These targets should be clear and simple, with buy-in from both donors and developing countries.
- Different views were expressed on two issues: How to actually set the targets – based on scale-up data or aspirational? Coverage targets or absolute numbers?
- Targets should reflect the reality of countries and local issues such as capacity and the human resource crisis.
- Regarding the specific area of treatment, and the 3x5 target, concern was expressed about setting a new target for 2008 before the end of 2005. However, the process of exploring this issue is ongoing.

Scenarios

- Different views on the use of scenarios were expressed by participants – either one scenario/figure which would be seen as practical and achievable, or multiple scenarios as was the case in the last exercise facilitated by the UNAIDS Secretariat. In the hypothesis of several scenarios, it would be important to list very clearly the different assumptions that determine the outcome of the scenarios.
- An agreement was reached among participants that this new round would keep one scenario describing projected available resources and another one describing resources needed for achieving agreed targets within a timeframe that is realistic given the need for simultaneous investment in delivery capacity. This would allow an estimation of the resource gap.
- These scenarios could be presented as ranges – including variation of costs depending on a number of parameters – rather than single numbers.
- It was also suggested to use sensitivity analyses around key parameters to illustrate their importance to the resource needs (e.g., costs of second line ART).

Agenda item 5: Discussion on technical considerations

Robert Greener presented this agenda item and the following key technical considerations made in AIDS resource estimations were discussed.

Comments/conclusions

Orphan care

- The number of AIDS-related OVC needs to be identified from epidemiological and demographic projections.

- Choices have to be made about which children to include in the AIDS resource estimations. Some participants expressed the view that, given the impact of AIDS on the overall social security system in heavily affected countries, all OVC should be included, regardless of the cause.
- Current work in progress by UNICEF on orphan support is dealing with technical and policy issues such as the cost per OVC of a comprehensive package of support and the relationship between OVC and poverty.
- No other impact mitigation is currently included in the resource estimations (e.g., households fallen into poverty due to the impact of AIDS).

Prevention

- The determination of populations in need is important. It is based on national population census data, epidemiological data and projections, and surveys and case studies.
- Moreover, information needs to be gathered on current coverage rates (e.g., from surveys and project implementation information) and on the rate of growth in coverage (based on past growth rates or experiences of scaling-up in other services).

Treatment

- The number of people in need of ART needs to be determined per country, along with the rate of increase in coverage and current coverage.
- Moreover, decisions need to be made on the preferred way of providing ART (e.g., duration of nutritional support) and the impact of survival benefit, failure and toxicity rates for ART first and second line.
- These inputs to the model are based on prevalence and incidence measures and evidence from case studies and existing programmes.
- In the current work by the UNAIDS Secretariat, the cost of changing regimens is included, but not the cost of treating the side-effects of ART.
- Cost-savings from ART could also be included. The current model does include reduced requirements for opportunistic infections (OI) treatment due to the effect of ART, but not wider hospital cost-savings.

Unit cost information

- For both prevention and treatment, unit cost information needs to be gathered, based on empirical data and evidence-based projections. For treatment, unit costs cover ART medicines, laboratory monitoring, treatment of OI and palliative care as well as programme costs that include the training of health personnel, including education of new physicians and nurses. For orphan care, costs could include those for education, health care, nutritional support, and home and community support.
- Often, appropriate unit costs are missing and must be imputed from relevant data, such as evidence reported in the literature from small- or medium-scale programmes.

Other issues

- Though coverage rates are adapted to **country contexts**, the current work in progress does not include contingency for fragile states or potential humanitarian disasters.
- The current work for resource estimations focuses on **publicly provided services** for AIDS, though the public sector is not necessarily the sole provider.

Agenda item 6: Discussion on methodological approaches

Three presentations were made under this agenda item:

1. Current modelling of unit costs by Robert Greener;
2. National spending assessments by José Antonio Izazola-Licea;
3. Stochastic models by Perna Banati, as an example to illustrate the potential usefulness of different methodologies for resource estimation.

Comments/conclusions

- The UNAIDS Secretariat obtained data on unit costs from 155 country experts from 78 countries via 9 regional workshops. This process required time and expense but provided valuable information based on country-level experience.
- The Steering Committee agreed on the usefulness of the exercise both for gathering information and for building country capacity for resource estimations. It further recommended that a second round of workshops be conducted in 2006-2007 to collect updated unit cost information and other data which could inform new modelling approaches.
- The National Spending Assessments (NSAs) conducted in more than 35 countries could provide costing of programmes rather than unit costs to address the issue of the difference of cost between pilot interventions and costing through real operations conditions. The major problem is that only a minority of countries have NSAs available and the incompatibility of classifications.
- NSAs in combination with resource needs estimates can quantify the gap between availability of resources and needs.
- It was noted that stochastic modelling addresses uncertainty in projections – i.e., some countries will reach targets faster than others, and countries will prioritize different interventions initially.
- It was also acknowledged that different methodologies and models exist for resource estimations; however, the most appropriate mix will depend on the purpose of the exercise and the availability of information.
- The Steering Committee recognized that it would not be possible to make projections of resource requirements on the basis of a completely new model within the set timeframe. However, it was recommended that the TWG does advise the Steering Committee of the potential benefit of alternative methodologies for resource estimations in the future and as a validation of current estimations.

Agenda item 7: Political issues and implications of selected approaches

Paul de Lay presented this agenda item, based on the list of issues which had been included in the background paper (*Political Issues and the Implications of Selected Approaches*). A number of those issues had already been discussed to a certain extent under previous agenda items.

Comments/conclusions

- In relation to specific charts presenting donor resources, it was recommended to indicate very clearly the methodology which had been used. There was also strong agreement that the methodology to determine resources available should be comparable for all donors. It was also important to try to obtain the most current data on available resources as opposed to estimated resources.
- It is in this area that close cooperation with the GTT is required. The TWG will be expected to in first instance concentrate on the resource requirements and then resource availability.
- The issue of branding of the resource estimates was again brought up, and it was recommended that the Steering Committee provide clear guidance on this.
- The related issue of the language to be used throughout the final document was also considered as critical. Terminology such as achievable, realistic, aspirational, inspirational, constraints (which may also be regarded as “opportunities”), ideal should be very carefully considered.
- The packaging of the document was also recognized as needing very careful attention by the Steering Committee. Different presentations, though all geared towards simplicity, would be needed for different audiences and constituencies, i.e., M&E experts, the media, politicians, etc.

Agenda item 8: Products and timelines – including endorsement of proposed membership for Resource Needs Technical Working Group

Rob Moodie presented a proposed timeline, which has now been finalized as follows:

1. 15 April 2005 = 1st meeting of Resource Needs Steering Committee (Geneva)
2. By 22 April = Submission of names by Steering Committee members for TWG
3. 3, 4, 11 or 12 May = First meeting of TWG (Geneva)
4. Week 9 May = Short interim report on progress – summarizing process in place and some of the consensus on assumptions – provided to participants of the 9 March meeting and other partners
5. 17 May = 2nd meeting of Steering Committee (Geneva)
6. 27 June = More comprehensive report presented to a special meeting held immediately before the UNAIDS PCB meeting to report on follow-up to 9 March meeting with respect to both the GTT and resource needs (Geneva).

Comments/conclusions

- It was decided that the TWG should be constituted with approximately 15 members (5 from the pre-9 March meeting Working Group and Advisory Committee and 10 additional persons with diverse experience/expertise, including

- economics, modelling, costing, programme implementation, impact assessment, etc. Names would be submitted to the UNAIDS Secretariat by 22 April.
- It was stressed that TWG members should be regarded as very credible to a wider group of stakeholders as well as fairly independent.
 - As already mentioned under agenda item 1, developing countries should be well represented in the TWG.
 - Proper attention should be given to an acceptable geographic and gender balance.
 - It was also clarified that Steering Committee members could not serve on the TWG.
 - Initial terms of reference (TORs) for the TWG would include:
 - ❖ review the current modelling approach (unit costs) and assess the need for refinement or for alternative various modelling approaches which could strengthen the estimates;
 - ❖ review current international targets and develop the background for aligning targets for resource needs estimates (this will require close collaboration with other initiatives to establish targets, e.g., UNICEF, WHO, UNAIDS prevention strategy, MAP, MDG, PEPFAR);
 - ❖ review the previous methodology with presentation of methods and assumptions;
 - ❖ identify other issues that would be relevant for Steering Committee review.
 - The TWG would prepare a report for the second meeting of the Steering Committee in May.
 - In the context of discussing the TORs for the TWG, the issue of the relationship with the GTT Working Group on Harmonization of Programming and Financing was raised. A suggestion was made that the Resource Needs Steering Committee becomes an additional – fourth – working group under the GTT, retaining the TWG as part of the support function. Achmat Dangor indicated that he would transmit this recommendation to both the GTT Secretariat as well as to the three co-host Governments of the 9 March meeting.
 - A request was made to take advantage of planned meetings – such as the Global Fund Board meeting the following week and the WHA in May – to organize information briefings on the current process for estimating resource needs for AIDS.
 - As part of the common communications strategy which had been developed for the GTT and this process, an update would be provided by e-mail every other Friday to all attendees of the 9 March meeting as well as other partners including all members of this Committee. The first bulletin had been sent out on 8 April.