

Donor Advisory Group Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, 1st October 2025

Participants List

Name	Title & Organization
1. Sally MacKay	Assistant Director, Health Policy Branch, Development Policy Division, DFAT, Australia
2. Lena Hothes	Chief, SRHR, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark
3. Evelina Irstad	Program Specialist for SRHR and Gender Equality, Sida
4. Minja Nieminen	Deputy Director, Unit for Civil Society, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Finland
5. Susanne Ziegler-Wirtz	Team leader - Sector initiative population dynamics, sexual and reproductive health and rights (PD/SRHR), GIZ, Germany
6. Alina Noeth	SRHR Advisor, Populations Dynamics, SRHR, GIZ, Germany
7. Julika Breyer	Senior Policy Officer - Division for Social Protection, SRHR, BMZ, Germany
8. Anne Holmes	Policy Co-Lead, Global Health Team, Development Co-operation Directorate Department of Foreign Affairs, Ireland
9. Satomi Ichino	Assistant Director, Global Health Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan
10. Lars Faber	Senior Policy Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands
11. Juana Diesing	Senior Policy Officer, Multilateral, Partnerships & Humanitarian Team, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, MFAT, New Zealand
12. Nina Strom	Senior SRHR Advisor, Health Department, Norad, Norway
13. Selina Baumberger	Programme Officer, Health, SDC, Switzerland
14. Jane Hobson	Senior Social Development Adviser, SRHR, Global Health Directorate Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office, United Kingdom
15. Katie Chapman	Senior Social Development Adviser, SRHR, Global Health Directorate Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office, United Kingdom
16. Alvaro Bermejo	Director General, IPPF
17. Mina Barling	Director, External Relations Division, IPPF
18. Manuelle Hurwitz	Director, Development and Impact Division, IPPF
19. Riva Eskinazi	Director, Donor Relations, IPPF
20. Stefanie Wallach	Director, Performance, Learning and Impact, IPPF

Agenda

1. **Welcome** (5 min)
Lena Hothes, DAG Chair
Alvaro Bermejo, Director General, IPPF
2. **IPPF Fight Back Fund & Impact of US Funding Cuts** (30 mins)
 - a. *Director General's update on efforts made to establish the Fight Back Fund to accelerate the Federation's transformation, sustain progress and strengthen resilience in the current geopolitical landscape.*
 - b. *Overview of 2nd Federation-wide survey results on the US cuts and their implications, particularly around commodities (presented by Stefanie Wallach, Director, Performance, Learning and Impact and Manuelle Hurwitz, Director, MA Development and Impact)*
 - c. *Q&A*
3. **Discussion on expectations from UNFPA's new leadership and how donors and partners can effectively communicate priorities** (25min)
4. **Update leading up to the IPPF 2025 General Assembly** (20 min)
Presented by Mina Barling, Director of External Relations
5. **AOB** (5 min)
 - a. *Overview of the Midterm Review of the Strategy 2028*
 - b. *Update on the transition plans for the new Director-General*

Minutes

Welcome

Lena Hothes (LH), MoFA, Denmark opened the meeting as Chair and welcomed all participants.

She noted that the discussion would focus on both internal and external developments affecting IPPF: the appointment of IPPF's incoming Director-General and the upcoming General Assembly; UN80 Reform process and expectations surrounding the new leadership of UNFPA.

LH also referred to the recent report from the UN Secretary-General, which included a proposal to merge UN Women and UNFPA.

IPPF Fight Back Fund & Impact of US Funding Cuts

Alvaro Bermejo (AB), IPPF thanked participants for joining and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to pause and reflect together, given how quickly the global and organizational context is changing.

AB emphasized that it was important for IPPF and its partners to take every opportunity to come together and strategize collectively. He then introduced the first agenda item, which was an update on the progress of the **IPPF Fight Back Fund**.

Update on Fight Back Fund

AB reminded participants that the Fight Back Fund had been introduced during the IPPF annual donors' meeting held in June 2025. At that time, the IPPF Board had recognized the seriousness of the financial challenges facing the Federation, owing to U.S. funding cuts, and approved an allocation of USD 15 million from IPPF's reserves. The funds were distributed as follows:

- **PROTECT - Emergency Funding:** USD 6 million was allocated to safeguard services in Member Associations (MAs) that were directly affected by U.S. funding cuts.
- **RESPOND – HER Fund and Safe Passage:** USD 2 million was set aside for humanitarian response, particularly to address increased migration and other crises.
- **TRANSFORM** - USD 4 million was earmarked specifically for “fight back” initiatives designed to strengthen and transform IPPF's ability to respond to these challenges.

- USD 4 million was invested in efforts to strengthen **IPPF's individual giving programme**.

Following this decision, IPPF asked donors to match this commitment, with the aim of raising an additional USD 15 million through donor contributions.

AB reported that the IPPF had successfully surpassed this target, receiving more than USD 15 million in matched commitments from a range of donors from government to foundations alike. He expressed deep gratitude for donors' ongoing commitment and solidarity, particularly during a time when securing additional funding is increasingly difficult for all organisations. He acknowledged and thanked several key contributors, including the Governments of Ireland, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland and the UK, the Packard Foundation, MAC-P and Vitol Foundation.

AB emphasized that this success was not the result of a single large contribution, but rather the collective effort of multiple committed partners. He stated that IPPF feels privileged to work with donors who demonstrate such strong support and activism in defence of SRHR.

AB noted that to guide the strategic use of the Fight Back fund, IPPF has established an **Executive Director's Advisory Committee** made up of ten experienced MA Executive Directors. This committee is working closely with the Secretariat to design programs that are operationally sound and relevant to needs on the ground. At the time of the DAG, a meeting was taking place in London with donors and members of the Advisory Committee to enable direct dialogue and collaboration. This meeting was intended to better inform how the USD 15 million Fight Back Fund will be implemented and monitored.

Overview of 2nd Federation-wide survey results on the US funding cuts

Stefanie Wallach (SW), IPPF, explained that IPPF had conducted its **second survey** at the **end of July** to collect updated information from MAs on the continued impact of funding losses, both on their organisations and their clients. The survey also gathered broader data on the state of SRHR within their respective countries. She noted that the survey revealed a continuing and deepening impact. While data validation and analysis were still being finalised, a comprehensive report was expected to be shared by **mid-October**.

SW presented preliminary highlights with the caveat that final figures could still be adjusted following validation:

- Of the 81 MAs that responded, **80% reported verified funding losses**. Unlike the first survey, which had asked about both actual and potential losses, this round focused only on confirmed losses (funding contracts that had been cancelled or reduced):
 - The majority of MAs reported losing funding primarily from USAID and UNFPA, closely followed by the Global Fund.
 - The magnitude of losses varied widely depending on the size of the MA, ranging from tens of thousands to over one million U.S. dollars. Most MAs, however, reported losing **20% or more** of their annual budgets, with some facing losses of **up to 50%**. MAs in **Africa** were disproportionately affected.
- At the organizational level, many MAs reported severe threats to their **financial sustainability**, as well as reduced **capacity for collaboration** with other organizations on advocacy, activism, and movement-building.
 - These challenges were likely linked to both **reputational impacts**, as MAs were forced to scale back or shut down services, and to **growing opposition** to work on SRH, abortion care, diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), and support for marginalized populations.
 - In some countries, the situation was further aggravated by the closure or downsizing of other allied organisations.
- **33 MAs** had reported they were now unable to provide the **full range of HIV services and products** that they had offered at the start of the year. This reduction was attributed to both **limited access to commodities** and **staffing shortages**, whether within the MA itself, the Ministry of Health, or among other service providers to whom clients were referred.

- One-third of MAs indicated a **decline in stock levels** since the beginning of the year, with the most severe shortages affecting **contraceptive services** and **STI testing and treatment**. Again, the most acute challenges were seen among MAs operating in **Africa**.
- Even MAs that had **not lost direct funding** were experiencing indirect impacts on their ability to operate fully. These included difficulties in providing the same breadth of services as before, reduced outreach and education activities, and constraints on engaging in advocacy and policy work.

In response to initial survey results in February, IPPF established a **Harm Mitigation Task Force** to support the most affected MAs. In the **first round**, 30 MAs received assistance to sustain essential services and procure critical commodities. She emphasized that this first round had been largely **reactive**, given how quickly the situation was evolving.

SW announced that a **second round of allocations** would follow once the new survey results were verified. Around **USD 2 million** had already been confirmed for this next round, and the total was expected to rise to at least **USD 3 million** as additional donor contributions were finalised.

She acknowledged that while this level of funding was still small relative to the overall need, IPPF would place greater emphasis on **sustainability**, focusing not only on short-term relief but also on building long-term resilience. These efforts would continue to be guided by input from the Executive Director's Advisory Committee.

Commodities and Supply Chain Update:

Manuelle Hurwitz (MH), IPPF, emphasised that the impacts IPPF is facing are not only financial but also related to access to essential supplies, including both family planning commodities and HIV-related products. She noted that IPPF maintains a dashboard to monitor supply availability and identify countries where shortages are most severe. Recently, IPPF observed that countries previously unaffected by stockouts, such as Mozambique and Bangladesh, were now reporting shortages. Other countries, including Uganda and Tanzania, have also reported stockouts.

MH highlighted Tanzania as a particular concern: one-third of the country's annual contraceptive supply, previously allocated from the large stock held in Belgium, was delayed, likely exacerbating shortages. Persistent condom shortages were also being reported in Madagascar and Zambia. To address these challenges, IPPF is working closely with UNFPA, particularly through its partnership programs.

However, it was noted that UNFPA Supplies, a key global mechanism for contraceptive distribution, is currently **revising its operating model to reduce its footprint and promote greater domestic financing** from national governments. Concern was expressed that in the current financial climate, governments may face difficult choices around resource allocation for contraceptives, HIV supplies, and other essential health products. Under the revised UNFPA model, civil society organizations (CSOs), including IPPF's MAs, are often excluded from key planning discussions, such as national compacts and annual forecasting. As a result, CSOs' requests for supply allocations are frequently unmet or deprioritized.

To mitigate this, IPPF is exploring alternative mechanisms, including closer collaboration with social marketing organisations such as DKT, and participation in emerging pooled procurement systems. At the country level, IPPF is also actively involved in tracking supply availability through the Global Visibility and Analytics Network (VAN), an initiative of the Reproductive Health Supplies Coalition. The VAN platform enables real-time tracking of supply levels across partners and facilitates redistribution to prevent stockouts. It was noted that the VAN initiative itself is now at risk due to reduced U.S. funding, threatening critical data visibility and supply chain management systems globally.

MH concluded by noting that these issues would be discussed further at the UNFPA Supplies Partnership Steering Committee meeting in October. IPPF will continue to advocate for stronger CSO visibility and engagement in all supply-related discussions, particularly as governments face increasing anti-rights pressures that threaten investments in SRHR. She stressed the importance of ensuring that civil society remains visible and active service providers where governments cannot, or choose not, to act.

Q&A Session

Q: Sally Mackay (SM), DFAT, Australia thanked both presenters for their comprehensive and insightful updates. She asked for clarification on what was meant by IPPF's "use of pooled procurement mechanisms" for commodity supplies. SM noted that while she was aware of various initiatives that could potentially evolve in this direction, she was uncertain about whether these discussions were linked to UNFPA Supplies or to other emerging mechanisms.

A: MH clarified that at present, there is no formal or confirmed global pooled procurement initiative, however, informal discussions are taking place among stakeholders, including private foundations and global health partners, on how to mitigate the loss of the large-scale procurement activities previously led by USAID. Those mechanisms, she explained, had complemented UNFPA's efforts by providing additional global procurement capacity for SRH commodities. With the U.S. now significantly scaling back, the sector is exploring alternatives to avoid a total collapse of supply continuity. She noted that the Global Financing Facility is becoming more active in related conversations, particularly around domestic resource mobilisation, and there are early talks about convening a global forum of major procurers to explore coordinated approaches. While these ideas remain conceptual, IPPF will continue to monitor developments and keep donors updated.

Q: LH echoed **SM's** appreciation for the detailed overviews and said they were very useful in understanding the evolving challenges. She asked for clarification regarding the findings that HIV and AIDS services were among the most affected areas. Specifically, she wanted to understand whether this was due to MAs prioritising other areas internally, or if it was primarily the result of external funding reductions, such as the decrease in U.S. PEPFAR support.

A: AB explained that while family planning is indeed heavily dependent on international aid, HIV programs are even more reliant on external funding. He gave the example of Mozambique, where 97% of the national HIV response is funded externally, primarily through U.S. government programs (PEPFAR, CDC) and the Global Fund. Given this extreme dependence, it is unsurprising that HIV services are among the first and most severely affected when donor funding declines. The reductions are not due to MAs deprioritizing HIV work, but rather because the bilateral and multilateral funding streams that sustain those programs are drying up. IPPF may not be the primary HIV service provider in most countries, but these funding cuts still have a significant impact, especially when MAs that once offered integrated sexual health and HIV services can no longer maintain those components. He noted that IPPF is hearing consistent reports from multiple countries of HIV service disruptions, signalling a major emerging concern across the Federation.

Q: Jane Hobson (JH), FCDO requested additional context regarding the increasing difficulties in working with Ministries of Health in several countries. She asked whether these challenges stemmed mainly from anti-rights influence or funding constraints, and whether IPPF could share some examples illustrating these dynamics. She also asked whether IPPF could highlight positive examples where cooperation with governments or ministries was working well, noting that it would be valuable to identify and learn from successful cases despite the difficult global environment.

A: MH confirmed that in some countries, particularly Uganda, the issue is increasingly linked to anti-rights movements and political pressure. These dynamics have made it harder for MAs to access or distribute supplies through official channels, something that had not been a problem in the past. However, she also highlighted positive examples, citing Benin as a case where collaboration between the UNFPA country office, the government, and the IPPF MA has been exceptionally strong. In Benin, the MA is recognised as a key partner to government, not only in service delivery but also in policy dialogue.

A: SW added that, as IPPF continues to analyse survey data, the Secretariat will follow up directly with specific MAs to gather more qualitative information about the issues raised in their survey responses. This will include

understanding why relationships with Ministries of Health have deteriorated in certain contexts, as well as the precise reasons for HIV service disruptions. She emphasised that IPPF aims to use this deeper insight to inform both advocacy efforts and the next round of the Harm Mitigation Fund allocations.

Q: Evelina Irstad (EI), Sida thanked IPPF for the thorough updates and emphasised the importance of continuing data sharing across partners. She asked how IPPF coordinates its situational analyses with other organisations conducting similar exercises, and how donors can best engage or access shared information. Finally, she asked which forums or platforms IPPF considers most effective for data exchange and strategic collaboration.

A: SW responded that this issue had been discussed at an FP2030-hosted meeting held the previous day. The meeting brought together a wide range of organisations, including PSI, MSI, Avenue Health, Reproductive Health Supplies Coalition, and various humanitarian agencies, to discuss the proliferation of separate data collection efforts and how they might be better coordinated. Participants recognised that many actors are currently running parallel surveys and that stakeholders at the country level are experiencing fatigue from being asked similar questions by multiple organisations. To address this, the group agreed to work toward a collaborative framework that includes developing shared and standardized survey questions; Data-sharing agreements to avoid duplication and promote transparency; developing a unified approach to categorising and tagging responses, and Joint dissemination of findings to ensure coherent messaging across the sector.

SW noted that this collaborative process is essential, particularly given the intentional dismantling of data and evidence in some political contexts. IPPF is committed to ensuring that the data it produces is robust, trusted, and sustainable. She added that there will be continued discussions at the upcoming International Conference on Family Planning (ICFP), with a follow-up meeting planned for early next year to formalise next steps among participating organisations.

LH emphasised that the information shared during this meeting is extremely useful for donors, particularly when making the case internally for continued support to IPPF and its MAs. She noted that concrete data and real-world examples are essential in policy and budget discussions at the national level. **LH** concluded by requesting that IPPF **share the presentation slides and key data highlights** following the meeting.

Discussion on expectations from UNFPA's new leadership and how donors and partners can effectively communicate priorities

AB reflected on IPPF's perspective of the UNFPA leadership change and UN80 Reforms process as a global civil society partner. He explained that IPPF and many partners had been observing developments around UNFPA's new Executive Director with increasing concern, both in terms of the direction of leadership and broader trends in how UN agencies are addressing SRHR.

AB noted that even before the new Executive Director's formal appointment, public gestures and statements had suggested a potential shift away from UNFPA's historically rights-based positioning. In particular, he highlighted concerns that early messaging appeared to align with more conservative interpretations of global health and rights frameworks, and that the new leadership's first official remarks included references that could be read as sympathetic to the **Geneva Consensus Declaration**, a statement widely viewed as in conflict with international SRHR commitments.

AB acknowledged the possibility of misinterpretation, however, said that this development was nevertheless disappointing and part of a wider pattern being seen where several multilateral actors are stepping back from explicit SRHR commitments and from engagement with marginalised or criminalised populations, often to maintain political neutrality or retain key donor funding. He added that silence risked entrenching the marginalisation of key populations that rely on UN agencies for protection and access to essential services.

AB then turned to the **UN80 Reform process**, explaining that IPPF's main concern was about **protecting mandates**. In the context of the **Secretary-General's latest report**, he urged donors to prioritise ensuring that **SRHR remains central** to the mandates of restructured entities.

AB explained that IPPF's concern is that in efforts to streamline agencies, **SRHR could become diluted or lost entirely**. If a new structure requires compromise with more conservative member states, there must be an alternative mechanism to safeguard the rights and services now at risk. He recalled similar challenges during recent Global Fund deliberations, where programmatic compromises were made to preserve U.S. participation, resulting in reduced support for LGBTQI communities, sex workers, and people who use drugs. **AB** cautioned that a comparable dynamic could unfold in the UN80 reform context if rights-based mandates were traded off to maintain political consensus.

AB suggested that donor governments committed to SRHR should prepare alternative funding and policy channels to sustain programs for excluded populations if major multilateral institutions can no longer do so. This could include channelling support through existing mechanisms that are not subject to restrictive funding conditions.

AB concluded by inviting reflection on how **donors can collectively safeguard SRHR priorities** through both political dialogue and resource allocation. He noted that the muted response to rights dilution within the Global Fund replenishment cycle illustrated how **political sensitivity can constrain open discussion**, even among allies. He expressed concern that a similar dynamic could arise in relation to **UNFPA and the broader UN reform** and urged partners to remain **vocal and coordinated** in defending rights-based approaches, noting that if we accept these quiet erosions as inevitable, the people the UN was originally created to serve will once again be the first to lose.

AB closed by encouraging donors to reflect on whether these discussions were being actively held within their respective governments, and whether there was **space to push back** against the marginalisation of SRHR in the evolving global policy landscape.

Mina Barling (MB), IPPF then expressed strong concern about the lack of clear public emphasis on UNFPA's core mandate, specifically, the absence of explicit references to SRHR in recent communications and materials. She observed that while the UN80 reform process is being discussed primarily in financial and structural terms (e.g. the proposed USD 200 million restructuring effort), there has been little to no discussion of mandate preservation. She stressed that this omission is troubling given that mandate clarity, not structure, determines the agency's purpose and accountability.

MB noted that UNFPA's official website has undergone visible changes that appear to narrow the agency's public focus. The homepage now emphasizes "mothers and newborns," with a fundraising banner centered on maternal health, and while references to family planning remain, the language on SRHR and reproductive rights has largely disappeared. She described this as indicative of a strategic shift away from rights-based framing toward a more politically neutral, or potentially conservative, presentation.

MB explained that these concerns had been shared privately among civil society partners and discussed at a recent PMNCH (Partnership for Maternal, Newborn & Child Health) meeting. There had been tentative agreement that CSOs and several donor agencies would coordinate a collective statement or approach to express their concerns. However, no coordinated action has yet materialized.

Finally, **MB** acknowledged that the wider UN80 reform process, including potential shifts involving DESA (Department of Economic and Social Affairs), is expected to focus more on population and demographic issues. Nonetheless, she questioned how both UNFPA and UN Women would emerge from these institutional and political changes, given the erosion of visible commitment to SRHR and the muted response from the international community.

The DAG then gave the following reflections:

- **Donor Positioning:** Several donor governments have not yet formalized positions on the proposed UN80 agency mergers but share concerns about protecting SRHR mandates. Some donors reported engaging bilaterally with the new UNFPA Executive Director, with mixed impressions but cautious optimism about

recent signals. There was agreement that collective coordination among donors remains vital, given the “moving” and rapidly evolving nature of the reform process.

- **Shifting Narrative and Loss of Normative Language:** Concern was expressed that discussions around UN80 reform are increasingly leading to the erosion of language related to SRHR, gender equality, diversity, and inclusion. It was noted that even when “human rights” remains in official discourse, other essential dimensions are being dropped or diluted. There is a perceived trend towards simplification of UN negotiation language that risks excluding rights-related terms. The group highlighted the need for **evidence and advocacy** showing that the loss of terminology leads to a loss of substance and policy focus.
- **Agency Mergers:** Participants discussed the UN80 reform proposal, which considers merging UNFPA, UN Women, and UN DESA. It was noted that these entities have different political alignments and mandates, raising concerns about the implications for normative leadership and SRHR priorities. It was re-iterated that few Member States are directly raising SRHR-related concerns with the UN Secretary-General’s office, despite ongoing reforms. Questions were raised as to why only gender and SRHR-related agencies are being considered for restructuring, while other sectors (e.g., Rome-based agencies, humanitarian system) remain untouched. Concerns were voiced that “mainstreaming” could once again lead to the dilution of gender equality and SRHR mandates.
- **Procurement and Supplies Concerns:** The potential centralisation of procurement functions and its effects on suppliers and SRH commodity access were flagged as major risks. For example, ongoing debates about UNICEF potentially leading centralized procurement raised scepticism about their willingness to include SRHR-related commodities (e.g., misoprostol, mifepristone). Some participants suggested maintaining separate procurement streams for SRHR-related products to safeguard continuity and autonomy.

Next steps:

- **Information-Sharing and Partner Coordination:** Participants agreed that ongoing information sharing among like-minded donors and civil society is critical. Suggestions were made to use future DAG meetings or other fora to track developments and align messaging. Joint communication efforts, such as collective letters or coordinated statements, were encouraged where appropriate.
- **Regional and Thematic Advocacy Opportunities:** The need for vigilance across multiple negotiation spaces (e.g., Human Rights Council, WHO, Global Fund, EU MFF) was underscored. Participants discussed the value of “tactical framing” using less politically sensitive language (e.g., maternal health) while internally maintaining a full SRHR approach. Participants reaffirmed their commitment to supporting the full SRHR agenda, including procurement of commodities and the ICPD Programme of Action. Reference was made to recent correspondence on the WHO Europe strategy, where multiple missions sent a joint letter urging stronger inclusion of SRHR.
- **National Engagement:** Several national governments have reported internal coordination challenges, as UN80 reform processes are broad and touch multiple ministries. Some countries are working through cross-ministerial task forces or UN coordination mechanisms to manage their engagement. The UNFPA Supplies Partnership was identified as an important entry point with lower- and middle-income countries, who view it positively for its economic and programmatic benefits. There is an opportunity to leverage this partnership to strengthen collective advocacy and member state alignment on SRHR.

Update leading up to the IPPF 2025 General Assembly

MB noted that IPPF’s third General Assembly will be held in Bali in November 2025. Following on from the previous Assembly in Colombia, where the overarching strategy was approved, MAs had requested the development of a Charter of Values to unify the Federation and provide guidance for its future. The Charter is intended to clearly communicate the Federation’s principles, including commitment to the mandate, dignity, equality, and justice, and to boldly re-affirm these values.

MB highlighted that, prior to the General Assembly, MAs were asked for an indicative vote on the Charter, which resulted in 97.5% support, exceeding expectations. She outlined the adoption process, noting that the Charter will first be endorsed at the General Assembly and then taken back to each MA board for formal approval, allowing the values to be carried forward within their respective organisations. **MB** emphasised that the Charter provides a clear and ambitious direction for the Federation, helping to guide future strategy rather than focusing solely on defensive or survival measures.

MB then introduced the topic of the global rebrand, developed in consultation with MAs. She explained that the rebrand has been developed to visually express the principles outlined in the Charter, focusing on clarity, resilience, and the Federation's unwavering commitment to its mandate. The new brand will be **soft launched at ICFP** and formally unveiled at the **General Assembly in Bali in November. IPPF's name will remain unchanged.**

Q&A Session:

Q: EI asked for elaboration on the process for adopting the Charter of Values at MA level. She inquired whether the Secretariat would support MAs internalise the Charter, identify gaps, or address specific issues after board approval.

A: MB responded that the Charter will be endorsed at the General Assembly in November. She explained that a guiding group, reflecting the diversity of MAs across geography and focus (service delivery vs. activism), had led the process. The first year of the Charter's development involved deep internal consultations, followed by external consultations with actors in climate justice, racial justice, and related areas, ensuring the Charter reflected contemporary challenges. The process then returned to MAs through consultations and the indicative vote. Once endorsed at the General Assembly, a toolkit will be provided to each MA to support implementation at the board level. This toolkit is designed to strengthen the accreditation process and guide how MAs present themselves and their values externally. She added that this work is anticipated to be a major focus for the following year.

JH expressed strong support for the Charter, praising its boldness and clarity in the current context, and conveyed enthusiasm for the next steps.

AOB:

- *Overview of the Midterm Review of the Strategy 2028:*
 - In addition to the approval of the Charter of Values, the midterm review of the strategy will be finalised at the General Assembly in November.
 - The MTR will have several sessions on the agenda of the GA, which will be MA-led and fully participatory.
 - It will not rewrite the strategy. It will emphasise new context variables and make recommendations for priority actions required to deliver the existing strategic commitments. The addendum will be presented in the morning of Day 3 of GA session, where it will be put to a vote for approval. If approved, it will be added to the strategy.
- *Update on the transition plans for the new Director-General:*
 - The incoming Director General, Maria Antonieta Alcalde Castro, will use the General Assembly to meet MAs ahead of her official start on March 1, 2026.
 - It will also be the final General Assembly for **AB** as current Director General and Kate Gimore, outgoing board chair. It was suggested that the new chair may be selected internally by the board, following recruitment of new trustees.
 - Additionally, recruitment is underway for a Regional Director for Africa, as the current RD Marie-Evelyne Petrus Barry is now retiring. It is anticipated that a final candidate will be appointed in time for the Assembly.

Closing remarks:

LH thanked participants and noted that today's dialogue had been very useful. She emphasized that these discussions would continue in other forums and networks, particularly on topics such as UN80 reform, the possible merger of UNFPA and UN Women, and updates on the Fight Back Fund. She requested that IPPF keeps donors informed about challenges faced by MAs, both financially and politically, so that support could be provided where possible, including through embassy assistance.