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Introduction

On May 12-13, 2008 AAI’s 1st Rating Workshop was held at Tammsvik Conference & Herrgård, Stockholm, Sweden. The meeting gathered thirty-eight internationally acknowledged experts representing academia, donors, civil society, governments, the private sector and the UN. For a list of the delegates, please see the Appendix.

The Workshop aimed to:

1. Receive feedback and support for the Country Rating Scorecard.
2. Solidify commitment to develop and promote independent ratings holding leaders accountable for their promises to respond to the AIDS epidemic.
3. Develop actions plans for the further development of at least five types of ratings.

The Workshop was divided into two parts. The first part was dedicated to the review and discussion of the first version of the Country Rating Scorecard Model that had been developed during spring 2008 by Dr. Jaran Erikson and a small team of advisors. Participants discussed different technical and content aspects of the proposed model and made suggestions for improvement of the model.

During the second part of the Workshop, participants divided into five sector specific rating tracks:

- Governments: the Country Rating Relative Response
- UN
- Private Sector
- Donors
- Civil Society

For each track discussion AAI had commissioned a paper presenting a unique rating proposal. The rating proposals on governments and the private sector were at the time of the workshop more developed than the other track proposals rendering very different levels of point of departure for the discussions.

After discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the rating proposals, each track presented suggestions for different rating approaches that AAI may undertake and recommendations for an action plan.

This summary provides a presentation of the Country Rating Scorecard discussions, followed by the key outcomes of the five track discussions. An additional outcome of the Workshop, The Tammsvik Commitment is presented thereafter. The delegate list is found at the end as an appendix.
Summary of Discussions and Key Outcomes

This section is a summary of the key outcomes of the discussions on the Country Rating Scorecard, the Country Rating Relative Response and the proposals to rate the UN, the Private Sector, Donors and the Civil Society.

The Country Rating Scorecard

The Country Rating Scorecard model was presented to the plenary by Dr. Jaran Eriksen. Participants then discussed different aspects of the proposed model in small groups. Two groups discussed the selection of elements and weighting. A third group focused on the service delivery element, whereas a fourth group discussed the validity of the data used for this scorecard. The remaining two groups talked about indicators for in-country actors (enabling environments) and focus of the response.

Some policy considerations regarding timing and legitimacy were discussed but the lion part of the discussions dealt with content and technical issues.

Content issues

Groups reported mixed views regarding the ten Scorecard elements. No elements were suggested to be removed and none to be added. However, some missing areas within the set of indicators were identified. Furthermore, one asked for the inclusion of more qualitative data.

Technical issues

Participants requested more information on why a certain indicator had been included in the scorecard. Further, some suggested the use of disaggregated data and references to other frameworks like the MDGs/Abuja targets. Groups reported mixed views on weighting. A general suggestion was to not use mathematical weighting. However, it was also noted that weighting is implicit in the fact that we have selected certain indicators. Participants recommended revision of the grouping of countries.

Immediate actions

The consultation led to the following list of actions, to be undertaken by AAI for the launch of the scorecard:
- Development of useful communication products with qualitative narratives
- To commission a gender review of the Scorecard
- Revision of country list by regions
- Each scorecard element will be reviewed before the final decision on which indicators to include is taken.

Rating Governments: The Country Rating Relative Response

The Country Rating Relative Response was presented by Dr. Chris Desmond and Prof. Evan Lieberman. The group work was presented and facilitated by Dr. Laura Ferguson.

The group started by identifying strengths and weaknesses of the current methodology.

Strengths

- Provides a controlled framework for comparison
- Uses existing data that were considered important
- Measures across PMTCT, treatment and impact mitigation
- The graphs presented at the workshop constitute easy-to-understand and powerful messages
- Two variables have been identified for making meaningful comparisons between countries (GDP and prevalence).
Weaknesses

- Less comprehensive than the scorecard
- Relies on existing data which might limit what is included
- Cannot include qualitative data
- Poses an advocacy challenge if a country scores ‘relatively’ well but absolutely not so well
- It’s broad enough to cover all country settings so lacks country specificity
- High income countries report differently so they can’t be included
- Currently no disaggregation

Key issues for improvement

Finally, the group made some suggestions for how to improve the current methodology. It was proposed that one should use the UNGASS to provide the framework but present indicators individually as examples of work in PMTCT, treatment etc. not as being representative of that area. Further, more indicators could be added – whether aggregated or not is up for debate. It was suggested that an analysis of disaggregated data could be carried out and time dynamics could be strengthened over time.

Rating the UN

The UN Track was introduced by Dr. Josef Decosas who presented his paper “Rating the UN System’s Response to HIV/AIDS”. Mr. Tom Scalway presented the group work and facilitated the discussions.

The group acknowledged that not only the UN, but also other inter-governmental bodies and multilateral banks should be rated. Further, it was stated that a rating of the UN or equivalent would not only be useful for the executive branch of national governments. Instead Civil Society would be the primary beneficiary of such a tool. It was also noted that UN is a relatively small HIV/AIDS spender, that the UN agencies are very different and that they may hence not be comparable.

Two approaches

Based on these notions, the group proposed two possible rating approaches, both requiring a phased time-frame, starting small.

Approach 1: AAI scrutinizes and publicizes performance in relation to existing UN frameworks, particularly the Unified Budget and Workplan (UBW).

Approach 2: AAI examines the leadership commitments and resulting outputs of individual agencies.

Recommendations

The group recommended that AAI should hold technical consultations to identify gaps in the already existing UN accountability mechanisms (57 indicators monitoring international and national level). Also, the idea was raised that a UN rating may gauge UNAIDS’s engagement with civil society. The group further noted that a rating of the UN should separate between the national, regional and international levels.

Rating the Private Sector

Ms. Alyson Slater presented the paper “Relevance of AIDS for the Business Sector” written by Mr. Gavin George. Group discussions were facilitated by Ms. Carol O’Brien.

The group identified the following long term results of a private sector rating:
- Hold companies to account for their promises
- Help drive change by attracting companies to compete well on the tool
-Drive change by equipping investors, employees, civil society, and authorities with more information about company response

**Two approaches**

Discussions led to the conclusion that AAI may choose one out of two rating approaches.

**AAI "inside"** the system. AAI acts as the accountability mechanism for already existing commitments - eg. Global Business Coalition’s self assessment tool, International Council of Mining and Metal’s HIV charter etc. The strength of this approach is that it brings accountability to existing “greenwash” (or redwash?) initiatives. As such, it is based on info in the public domain and build on collaboration and partnership with other organizations and it can roll out relatively quickly across geographies and sectors. The main concern with this approach is that AAI by this means would only be engaging with those companies who are already taking a leadership position on HIV/AIDS, leaving out those who should but are not responding.

**AAI as mini Standard & Poors.** AAI collects information from all companies - those active and those not active. This approach would require a unique methodology (determining sample, criteria by sector, geography, risk profile and indicators). Data would be collected from companies from the public domain (quality checked) or confidentially. The greatest advantage of this approach is that it would engage all companies - leaders and laggards, that it would use high quality data and enhance AAI’s brand. The challenges are to conduct the required research and to access the confidential information.

**Immediate actions**

The group developed the following list of actions to be undertaken by AAI and partners within 2008/2009:
-Identify tool design parameters
-Create a business case for the rating tool
-Develop a communications strategy and network building platform (ILO endorsement, employees)
-Conduct deep research on public data and test several approaches
-Make sample survey of companies
-Make sample survey of users – SABCOHA, civil society, investors, etc
-Complete model including pilot by March 2009

**Rating Donors**

The Donor Track was introduced by Dr. Roger Drew who presented his paper “Rating Donors in the Response to HIV/AIDS”. Group work were presented and facilitated by Ambassador Sigrun Møgedal.

The group started by identifying the main reasons to rate donors’ responses to HIV/AIDS. One concluded that there is a need of an effort that combines financing and policy influences and that advances the predictability in funding to HIV/AIDS. The issue of conditionality: the fact that implementing governments become more accountable to donors than to their people, was noted as another reason to rate donors.

**Aims**

The group identified the following long term aims of a donor rating:
-Overcome the gap between rhetoric and action
-Achieve better visibility and awareness of the implications of donor funding policies and funding decisions, including a public exposure of which areas and countries are and are not funded
-Achieve better coherence in terms if donor “behaviour”
**Recommendations**

The group recommended number of issues to take into consideration in the development of a donor rating tool. Firstly, it was acknowledged that the donor landscape consists of a highly diverse mix of actors and influences. Hence, one needs to determine whether to compare government and private donors in the same rating or whether to separate the two, and whether to measure external resources at global or national level.

To take an informed decision on the development of a rating or another tool measuring donors’ response to HIV/AIDS it was suggested that AAI should conduct a baseline study to map the most recent HIV funding trends. The group proposed that AAI should do a first scan of the field through sending out questionnaires to different donors.

**Rating the Civil Society**

The Civil Society Track was introduced by Ms. Susan Fox who presented the papers “Rating Civil Society’s Response to HIV/AIDS” written by herself and Mr. Sam McPherson; and “Democracy, Accountability and the HIV/AIDS Epidemic” by Mr. Claudio Fernandes. Discussions were facilitated by Dr. Warren Parker.

The group chose to focus their discussions on how to integrate civil society into the Country Scorecard. The rationale behind this was that “Civil Society involvement in a country’s HIV/AIDS responses is a good thing”. Nevertheless it was noted that some civil society groups, by sake of competition for donor funding or political/religious beliefs etc, are implementing programs that are counterproductive to the response to HIV/AIDS. Therefore one concluded that there was also a need to create a separate rating system that measures and compares different civil society entities.

The group formulated the following goals:

Short term goal: Integration of civil society in the Country Scorecard

Long term goal: A rating system for civil society and the creation of an International communications network

**Integration of the civil society in the Scorecard**

The current Scorecard model was criticised by the group for not highlighting gender inequality. Concerns were also raised around the fact that AAI does not have resources to collect its own data, which means that AAI is reliable on second-hand data that may not be credible. To overcome this weakness, the group suggested that AAI partners with national and international organizations such as ICASO, GNP+ to validate data used, gather contextual data to help interpret scores and evaluate the usefulness of the tool. Further it was also discussed that the Scorecard should be part of an accountability discussion between different stakeholders. A number of possible civil society indicators were suggested for Scorecard element 6: In-country Actors.
The Tammsvik Commitment

During the second day of the workshop a small group of participants were invited to discuss their impressions of AAI and the country rating initiative and to make a statement regarding how AAI should move forward. During the final plenary session Elaine McKay presented the following statement on behalf of this group:

*We believe there is a need for greater accountability and leadership in the response to HIV/AIDS. To these ends we support AIDS Accountability International’s efforts to measure and compare the degree to which public, private and civil society actors are fulfilling the commitments they have made to respond to the epidemic.*

*More specifically we recommend that AAI moves forward to finalize the country rating, doing so with a sense of urgency and transparency. We ask that AAI takes our recommendations for improving the Country Rating under serious consideration and remembers to be accountable to those most affected by the disease.*

General Conclusions and Steps Ahead

Based on the outcomes of the workshop AAI has developed an action plan for June-December 2008. Below is a brief outline of the key activities to be undertaken.

It is clear to us that the 1st Rating Workshop was critical for the development of AAI’s ratings and for strengthening and building partnerships. Therefore, we will continue to host this type of meetings. The next rating workshop will be held in South Africa on March/April 2009. Invitations to this meeting will be distributed during fall 2008.

The feedback received at the workshop shows that there is support for the development and launch of a first version of the Country Scorecard. An updated version of the Scorecard model will be presented at the “AIDS 2008” in Mexico City on August 3rd to 8th, at the Satellite Meeting AIDS Accountability International’s HIV/AIDS Country Scorecard: A tool for increasing accountability and leadership in the response to the AIDS epidemic scheduled on August, 3rd 2008, at 1.30 pm – 3.30 pm.

Further, AAI will also continue the development of sector specific ratings. The Private Sector initiative will be discussed in a specific meeting at the Mexico Conference. In September this year we will make decisions about the advancement of the other ratings.

**Summary of next steps**

Within 2008 AAI will:

- Establish a Rating Workshop Advisory Group of nine representatives from the 1st Rating Workshop to make recommendations regarding the Scorecard model, our other rating initiatives and the structure and content of the next Rating Workshop
- Present the Country Rating Scorecard model at the “AIDS 2008” in Mexico City on August 3rd to 8th
- Make specific plans for moving forward in each rating area
- Expand AAI’s board of directors to achieve a higher level of diversity
- Invite a large number of HIV/AIDS experts to join our Global Rating Advisory Group