KEY FINDINGS
Structured dialogue to prepare a new pan-European hiv/aids partnership

Response
- 34 organisations from 21 countries (written survey)
- 3 keyplayers (interviews)

Priority areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishing a strong pan-European initiative on the impact of hiv/aids in Europe</th>
<th>Priority?</th>
<th>Priority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiv/aids to get a higher priority on the European and national governments agenda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration, mobility and hiv/aids</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing inequalities with regard to HIV/AIDS among EU countries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N: varies between 28 and 33 answers)

The "yes" category was split in three 'levels': advocacy, policy development and programmatic practice. Top priorities got high scores on all three:
- hiv/aids to get a higher priority on the European and national agenda (advocacy 28, policy development 22, programmatic practice 18)
- human rights issues (advocacy 21, policy development 17, programmatic practice 14)
- migration and mobility (advocacy 16, policy development 19, programmatic practice 20)
- addressing inequalities among EU countries (advocacy 18, policy development 17, programmatic practice 16).

Co-ordination of North/South collaboration

In general terms North/South collaboration has a lower priority than the European issues. This is closely related to the fact that fewer organisations have experience in this area (less than half of them).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-ordination of North/South collaboration</th>
<th>Priority?</th>
<th>Priority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access tot treatment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange joint efforts to get funding (from European and global funds)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with (international) development agencies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N: varies between 28 and 30 answers)

Top priority areas, indicated by those who stated: 'yes' this is a priority, are:
- access to treatment (advocacy 18, policy development 18, programmatic practice 11)
- arrange joint efforts to get funding (advocacy 13, policy development 13, programmatic practice 12)
- working with (international) development agencies (advocacy 11, policy development 12, programmatic practice 12).
Support for Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for CCEE and former Soviet Union</th>
<th>Priority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiv/aids to get a higher priority on national governments agenda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building for AIDS NGOs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support for enlargement states</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N: varies between 28 and 31 answers)

Top priorities of those responding 'yes', in this area are:
- hiv/aids to get a higher priority on national governments agenda (advocacy 24, policy development 17, programmatic practice 17)
- capacity building for NGOs (advocacy 17, policy development 21, programmatic practice 23)
- financial support for enlargement states (advocacy 16, policy development 13, programmatic practice 18)
- human rights (advocacy 16, policy development 14, programmatic practice 12).

Conclusions and recommendations

Both the results of the written consultation as well as the telephone interviews strongly support the conviction of the group of initiators that there is an urgent need for a new pan European partnership on hiv/aids.

Most organisations support the outline as proposed in the documents that circulated and are keen to participate and contribute. More specific the following conclusions and recommendations can be drawn from the written consultation.

Commitment to the initiative

The number of questionnaires returned as well as the input in each of it was impressive and shows that many different organisations all over Europe support the creation of a new European partnership. The three organisations that were interviewed all agreed on the importance of creating such a new partnership.

Reasons to join a new partnership

The main reasons to join a new partnership are the exchange of experiences and information as well as strengthening and intensifying advocacy and lobbying.

Overall priorities

The results very clearly give a direction in which the new partnership should operate in the three main areas as defined. A leading role in advocacy is desired especially when it concerns agendas setting with national governments and European institutions, creating broader access to treatment and human rights. In addition to these general priorities, organisations from CCEE strongly expressed the need for capacity building that got a very high priority.

Support

Although all respondents strongly support the creation a new pan European partnership, this does not automatically mean that they are able to contribute financially. Especially organisations in CCEE, but not onlya those, lack possibilities to financially support the new initiative.

A membership fee would probably be feasible for most organisations, although depending strongly on the amount and the level of services that organisations can expect. A formula needs to be developed to define membership and fees.
**Structure**
The interviewees were all very clear and explicit in stating that inclusiveness and accessibility of the new initiative is the key to its success. No bureaucracy, but a pragmatic, constructive approach is needed. As well as creating inclusiveness by using several languages (incl. Russian).

**Services**
A new partnership should offer concrete tools and services to its 'members'. The focus should be on: representation at international and EU meetings, organisation of meetings and exchange visits, developing an electronic newsbulletin and producing advocacy materials and training programmes (all related to the priority areas as defined earlier on).
Although new media might be relatively cheap, it should be taken into account that access is still not always easy in CCEE and the former Soviet Union.