Comments received from Members of the Executive Committee

Comments from Canada:

- Canada was an active participant on the GTT. While Canada endorses the logic behind resolution WHA 59.12 to streamline and coordinate the HIV/AIDS activities according to the comparative strengths of the respective UN agencies, it is clear that PAHO’s comparative strengths in the Region of the Americas had not been taken into full consideration at the time of the approval of the Resolution.

- The GTT acknowledges that there will be a need to tailor approaches: “Any global division of labour within the UN system must be applied flexibly at the country level to take into account the presence and relative strengths of individual Cosponsors on the ground. For example, if a Cosponsor is not present in a certain country or proves unable to fulfill its agreed-upon role, the UN system must find other means to support that sector of the AIDS response.” WHO is listed as a partner in many of these areas, so that does not preclude PAHO from being engaged in procurement.

- With regard to paragraph 8 (page 3), Canada recognizes the importance of having and maintaining an efficiently operated Regional Revolving Fund for Strategic Health Supplies, and notes with concern that the Fund could be undermined if the lead role be taken over by UNICEF as required by the WHA Resolution. Canada believes that this procurement mechanism for ARV and other HIV commodities is proving to be more efficient, more responsive to the
countries’ needs, and more timely in the delivery of supplies than the procurement system out of Copenhagen managed by UNICEF.

Comment from the United States of America:

- The United States is opposed to adapting the GTT recommendations, and sees no need for a decision on this topic.