
# RETHINKING JUSTICE:
# 7th Symposium on HIV, Law and Human Rights

## Report

September 14, 2017

Published by the
**Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network**
1240 Bay Street, suite 600
Toronto, Ontario
Canada  M5R 2A7

Telephone: +1 416 595-1666
Fax: +1 416 595-0094

www.aidslaw.ca

The tagline of the 7th Symposium organized by the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network was “Rethinking Justice: Working together to end the unjust criminalization of HIV.” The Symposium took place at the Chelsea Hotel in Toronto on Thursday, June 15, 2017.

## Contents

## Background

Since 2009, the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network has organized a number of symposia on HIV, Law and Human Rights. The issue of criminalization of HIV non-disclosure has been and remains an ongoing issue of concern to people living with HIV, community organizations, service providers and human rights advocates; therefore, it has been the subject of a number of workshops and discussions at several of the symposia over the years. For the 7th such Symposium, the Legal Network determined that the entire event would be devoted to a discussion of this issue.

This report is a general summary of the presentations, panels and dialogue at the Symposium. It aims to provide a snapshot of the event and act as a record of the information shared. It is not intended to present an exact record of the presentations.

## Opening statements

The day started with a welcome from Trevor Stratton, coordinator of the International Indigenous Working Group on HIV & AIDS (IIWGHA) hosted by the Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network. Mr. Stratton is an HIV activist and a member of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation near Toronto, with mixed English and Ojibwe heritage. With this welcome, participants acknowledged they were gathering on territories traditionally inhabited by various Indigenous peoples, including most recently the Mississaugas of New Credit.

Richard Elliott, executive director of the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, thanked Trevor for opening the event, noting that HIV criminalization is an issue disproportionately affecting Indigenous people in Canada, and specifically Indigenous women, who are overrepresented among women who have been charged with HIV non-disclosure. He provided an overview of the Symposium agenda and also outlined the current context for the discussion of overly broad criminalization of HIV non-disclosure.

Previous community mobilization and advocacy efforts have generated a growing momentum in Canada on the issue of HIV criminalization, making it particularly timely, in June 2017, to facilitate a more in-depth community discussion. In October 2016, advocates from across the country launched a new Canadian Coalition to Reform HIV Criminalization (CCRHC). On World AIDS Day (December 1, 2016), the federal Justice Minister publicly recognized the problem of the "over-criminalization of HIV." She also stated her government's commitment to examine the criminal justice system's response to HIV, setting in motion a process of review and discussion currently underway among federal, provincial and territorial justice departments. The Legal Network and other advocates, including via the CCHRC, have been actively engaging the federal government during that process. Given how the law on HIV criminalization has evolved through the courts over the last two decades, the Coalition has also recently convened a day-long "think tank" to assess the pros and cons of pursuing possible amendments to the *Criminal Code* as a means of limiting unjust HIV criminalization. Meanwhile, ongoing advocacy calling for action by provincial governments — e.g., calling for the development of sound prosecutorial guidelines — has continued as well, as has intervention by human rights defenders in a number of ongoing criminal court cases. The week before the Symposium, the House of Commons

Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights decided to conduct a study of HIV criminalization; the timing of that study is yet to be determined, but it may begin in late 2017. There is a growing global movement against unjust HIV criminalization, including via the HIV JUSTICE WORLDWIDE campaign of which the Legal Network is a founding member.

In light of developments in Canada, including the current review underway by the federal government, it is important that people living with HIV and those working in the HIV response formulate common, clear advocacy objectives and positions. To this end, the CCRHC is developing a Community Consensus Statement on ending unjust HIV criminalization. This Symposium is the first event in what will be a series of consultation workshops and other opportunities in the following months for people across the country to inform and help articulate that community consensus.

## A. THE STATE OF HIV CRIMINALIZATION

### Personal stories of HIV criminalization

***Alexander McClelland,*** *PhD candidate (Concordia University) and CCRHC member*

To help put a face to the issue of HIV criminalization, the audience listened to an audio experience based on research by Alexander McClelland, a Concordia University student and member of CCRHC, in partnership with the Legal Network. The audio presentation comprised a series of first-person accounts from people who have been criminally charged in relation to HIV non-disclosure and the impact this criminalization has had on their lives.

This recording of personal testimonies was followed by a video address from Mr. McClelland presenting some of the preliminary results of his ongoing doctoral research into the experiences of criminalization of people living with HIV in Canada, the first such research project of its kind in the country. He noted some common experiences emerging from the interviews, including the harmful and lasting effects of police press releases and media coverage, including disclosure of names and sometimes faces of those accused; guilty pleas compelled by fear of missing family members; suicide contemplation or attempt; violence, abuse and administrative segregation in prison, as well as informal, unofficial forms of punishment; ongoing surveillance and policing; and the impact of sex offender designation and the lasting record (including online) of charges when seeking employment and accommodation.

### *Chad Clarke, CCRHC member and community activist*

Following Mr. McClelland's video presentation, Chad Clarke took the podium to tell his story of being one of the more than 180 people in Canada who have been charged, convicted and imprisoned for a crime related to HIV non-disclosure. His experience of prosecution and incarceration illustrated powerfully many of the points emerging repeatedly in McLelland's research.

### Policy-makers' response to HIV criminalization

***Marco Mendicino**, Member of Parliament, and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada*

Parliamentary Secretary Mendicino was met with applause when he opened his presentation by saying that "HIV is not a crime"; it is a public health issue. Mr. Mendicino said that aggravated sexual assault, in particular, is an inappropriate charge in non-violent cases of HIV non-disclosure. He mentioned, as well, the advances in antiretroviral therapy that allow people to have undetectable viral loads that greatly reduce the risks of transmission.

While acknowledging that Canada has a long way to go on criminalization, Parliamentary Secretary Mendicino reiterated the government's commitment to working with affected communities, medical professionals and others to examine the criminal justice response to non-disclosure. He promised this work is being undertaken in collaboration with the provinces and territories and includes examining medical evidence, the role of public health, policy considerations and criminal laws. Some of the current steps being taken by the Department of Justice are as follows:

- Convening country-wide roundtables reviewing the criminal justice system (on a range of criminal justice issues)
- Conducting an international review of the law and science related to HIV criminalization (and he noted the upcoming House of Commons committee study)
- Investigating the potential use of prosecutorial guidelines and HIV-specific training, and applying a restorative justice lens to HIV non-disclosure that would incorporate public health responses to the issue

Moving forward, Mr. Mendicino encouraged the audience to bring resources to the attention of the justice officials with whom they are in contact, and promised that his staff attending the Symposium would be providing Minister of Justice Jody Wilson-Raybould with an overview of the day.

## Panel 1: Criminalization in Canada and Internationally

### HIV criminalization: A global overview

***Edwin J. Bernard**, Global Coordinator, HIV Justice Network*

This panel provided an overview of the current legal state of HIV criminalization in Canada in relation to other countries around the world. Edwin J. Bernard began by remarking that roughly 70 countries have HIV-specific laws, many of which are either overly broad, including not being informed by scientific evidence regarding HIV transmission. However, HIV-related prosecutions are also taking place under laws of general application, as is the case in Canada. However, among these countries, Canada is unusual in using the law of sexual assault for such prosecutions —particularly the most serious offence of "aggravated sexual assault." Along with the United

States and Russia, Canada is among the jurisdictions with the greatest number of prosecutions for HIV-related offences.

Most cases involve a HIV-positive person having sex without disclosing their HIV status. Many involve exposure only (i.e., no transmission of HIV) and no or negligible risk of transmission (including prosecutions for spitting, or for anal or vaginal sex where a condom was used or the partner with HIV had a low or undetectable viral load). In some cases, the partner who was diagnosed first with HIV (e.g., women who get diagnosed through antenatal screening) were faced with charges on the false assumption that they must have infected their partner. Among the thousands of known prosecutions, cases where it was proven *beyond reasonable doubt* that an individual planned or wanted to infect another person with HIV are exceedingly rare. Mr. Bernard noted a number of examples of unjust prosecutions from countries around the world — including the case of a woman living with HIV in Canada who had an undetectable viral load who was prosecuted for aggravated sexual assault for allowing a man to perform oral sex on her. In summary, too many people living with HIV are being convicted of crimes contrary to international guidelines on HIV and human rights as well as contrary to scientific evidence and best public health advice.

However, some jurisdictions are beginning to apply science more rigorously to such cases. In 2005, for instance, the Netherlands Supreme Court became the first to limit the ambit of the law based on actual HIV risk posed. In 2009, a Swiss court quashed an HIV exposure conviction following the "Swiss statement," a ground-breaking 2008 paper by the Swiss Federal Commission for HIV/AIDS that highlighted the negligible risk of sexual HIV transmission when a person on antiretroviral medication has an undetectable viral load. And in 2011, Denmark suspended an HIV-specific law to reflect the reduced harms associated with living with HIV and the improvements to life expectancy. Mr. Bernard also noted the importance of a number of scientific consensus statements aimed at informing the criminal justice system and limiting overly broad HIV criminalization. Since the original Swiss statement, these include the 2014 Canadian scientific consensus statement, which has also served as a template for a similar 2016 Australian statement and is informing a forthcoming "Global Consensus Statement on the Science of HIV in the Context of Criminal Law."

Other jurisdictions that have modernized HIV-specific criminal laws through legislative reform include Switzerland, Australia, Kenya and several states in the U.S., including California, Colorado, Illinois and Iowa. Law reform is often helped by the support of public health organizations that endorse the modernization of laws.

Finally, Mr. Bernard drew the attention of Symposium participants to the emerging HIV JUSTICE WORLDWIDE movement, comprising civil society organizations with the mission of ending the unjust punishment of people living with HIV. The Symposium marked the launch of the public website of HIV JUSTICE WORLDWIDE, and Mr. Bernard extended an invitation to other organizations to join the movement.

### Current state of HIV criminalization: Canada

***Amy Wah**, Staff Lawyer, HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario (HALCO)*

Amy Wah presented the current legal framework on HIV criminalization in Canada and the demographic patterns of prosecution since 1989 using data from a report recently published by the Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network and authored by Colin Hastings, Cécile Kazatchkine and Eric Mykhalovskiy. Between the first documented prosecution in 1989, as of the end of December 2016, there had been 184 individuals charged with HIV non-disclosure in 200 cases, with 90% of those charged being men. Among women, Indigenous women are disproportionately affected; among men, Black men are disproportionately represented, as they are in media coverage of such prosecutions. More than 18% of defendants came to Canada as immigrants and refugees. More than half of the cases occurred in Ontario alone. Most prosecutions occurred from 2004 to 2014 with roughly 10–15 cases occurring per year during that period.

Ms. Wah noted that since the 1998 Supreme Court of Canada decision in *R. v. Cuerrier*, in which the Court said there was a duty to disclose (known) HIV-positive status before engaging in sexual activity posing a "significant risk of serious bodily harm," the number of prosecutions for aggravated sexual assault has significantly increased despite scientific developments that should have tipped the scales toward non-prosecution. The 2012 Supreme Court ruling in *R. v. Mabior* has further muddied the waters and made the situation worse: it declared that, in the context specifically of HIV, a "significant risk of serious bodily harm" exists when there is a "realistic possibility" of transmission. Based on the evidence before it, the Court recognized that, in the case of vaginal sex, this risk is negated when there is **both** condom use for penetrative sex **and** the partner with HIV has a "low" or undetectable viral load. (Presumably this would also apply in the case of anal sex.) The Court did not address the question of oral sex. It did leave open the possibility that the law might adapt "to future advances in treatment and to circumstances where risk factors other than those considered in this case are at play." There continue to be conflicting interpretations of the ruling, and prosecutions continue for alleged HIV non-disclosure, especially in Ontario, where the risk of transmission does not warrant them.

## Panel 2: The Science and its Interaction with the Law

### The role of scientific expert evidence in avoiding wrongful convictions

***Megan Longley**, Executive Director, Nova Scotia Legal Aid, former criminal defence lawyer and counsel in R. v. JTC (Nova Scotia Supreme Court, 2013)*

Megan Longley was a youth court criminal defence lawyer when she took on the case of "JTC," a 16-year-old living with HIV who was charged with aggravated sexual assault for HIV non-disclosure despite having an undetectable viral load. This was one of the first prosecutions following the Supreme Court's ruling in *R. v. Mabior* in October 2012. While the Supreme Court's decision had been understood in some quarters to require both condoms and a low or undetectable viral load in order to avoid criminal conviction for not disclosing, Ms. Longley did not interpret the ruling in this narrow a fashion. Through the testimony of a scientific expert, Ms.

Longley demonstrated that, given his undetectable viral load, there was no "realistic possibility" of her client transmitting HIV through the sexual activity that took place. This also meant that the complainant's life had not been put in danger. As a result, applying the *Mabior* ruling correctly, the fact that he did not disclose his status did not amount to "fraud" vitiating the consent of the complainant. Therefore, there was no basis for convicting him of sexual assault, aggravated or otherwise. The trial judge agreed and acquitted her client; the Crown did not appeal the decision.

Ms. Longley's advice for other lawyers is that the defence should approach the case as if the Crown and the presiding judge know nothing about HIV. The defence may have to start at ground zero, explaining to the court what HIV is, how it is transmitted, what an undetectable or low viral load means, the transmission rates depending on type of sexual activity, and so on. The science becomes crucial because the defence can show that, depending on the circumstances, their client posed little-to-no risk of transmitting the virus. This could allow a court, even if bound to follow the *Mabior* ruling, to apply it in a way that leads to an acquittal and limits criminalization at least somewhat.

## Phylogenetic forensic science and implications for HIV criminalization

***Art Poon**, Assistant Professor, Western University*

While advances in forensic science are important forms of evidence in HIV criminalization cases, they carry a risk of being misinterpreted, leading to dangerous legal implications. There is a troubled history between HIV genetic analysis and HIV criminalization. Professor Poon explained the various forms of forensic science and their associated risks.

Genetic Clusters: The use of genetic clustering methods helps scientists understand the evolution of HIV as it replicates over time. Using a genetic sample from the population, a cluster is a group of gene sequences that are more similar to each other than they are to the rest of the sample. This similarity can indicate that a group of HIV infections is related by recent transmission. Unfortunately, these similarities can be misinterpreted as transmission events, and, if not correctly explained and understood, could be incorrectly presented in the courtroom as supposedly conclusive evidence of HIV transmission between two people (e.g., the accused person and a complainant).

Phylogenies: A phylogeny is a family tree that represents how different infections are related, allowing a scientist to trace the evolutionary history of a virus back in time. Because of the visual representation of a phylogeny as a tree, it can be prone to misinterpretation, with a "branching point" seen incorrectly as a collection of HIV transmission events.

The scientific community is concerned that, in HIV non-disclosure prosecutions, non-scientific professionals and courts could misuse information from clustering and phylogenies to make incorrect deductions that one person infected another. Professor Poon advocates caution in applying these methods, as this area of research is rapidly evolving and is prone to misuse, including in the context of HIV criminalization.

## B. ENDING THE UNJUST CRIMINALIZATION OF HIV NON-DISCLOSURE

### Advocacy update: Campaign for prosecutorial guidelines

***Glenn Betteridge**, Staff Lawyer, HIV & AIDS Legal Clinic Ontario (HALCO)*

In the second half of the Symposium, the focus shifted to advocacy efforts aimed at ending unjust HIV criminalization. Glenn Betteridge explained the role that sound prosecutorial guidelines could play in limiting prosecutions, and provided an update on the campaign for prosecutorial guidelines in Ontario.

Prosecutorial guidelines would not change the law as it exists in statute (e.g., the sexual assault provisions of the *Criminal Code*), nor as it has been interpreted and stated by the courts (e.g., deciding when HIV non-disclosure might amount to a "fraud" that leads to a sexual assault conviction). However, they are one important part of the effort to limit HIV criminalization, because they can affect which cases prosecutors take forward. Therefore, they can also affect how the police investigate and whether to lay charges in specific circumstances. Similar guidance already exists in Canada in relation to other issues (e.g., domestic violence); in B.C., there are some charge screening guidelines regarding HIV non-disclosure, but they are very general and do not address some key questions.

Since 2010, the Ontario Working Group on Criminal Law and HIV Exposure (CLHE) has been calling on the Attorney General to create prosecutorial guidelines to stop unjust prosecutions for HIV non-disclosure in Ontario. In January 2017, CLHE intensified its campaign, adding a call for an immediate moratorium on all prosecutions (except in cases of alleged intentional and actual transmission), with mobilization by AIDS organizations and other concerned individuals around the province. To date, however, the Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General has not been willing to adopt prosecutorial guidelines in a form that advocates believe addresses the concerns about the overly broad use of criminal charges. In Quebec, there have been discussions, but the prosecution service has similarly rejected calls for guidelines.

### Critical feminist approaches to HIV criminalization and the law of sexual assault

***Notisha Massaquoi**, Executive Director, Women's Health in Women's Hands Community Health Centre*

The issue of criminalization is central to Notisha Massaquoi's work at Women's Health in Women's Hands Community Health Centre (WHIWH). During her talk, Ms. Massaquoi highlighted the intersectionality of HIV issues, which often goes unnoticed. One of the most high-profile prosecutions in the early period of HIV criminalization was against a man who had immigrated to Canada from Uganda and whose prosecution in London, Ontario, was accompanied by sensationalized and often racist media coverage trading in long-standing stereotypes about Black men's sexuality and commentary about hyper-virulent "African AIDS." Two of the first women who were convicted of transmitting HIV to a man during sex were an Indigenous woman and a racialized immigrant. Ms. Massaquoi noted that African and Caribbean women are overrepresented in HIV and AIDS statistics, but in her experience, they are likely to

receive the least support in health care and with HIV disclosure. At WHIWH, they have observed cases in which the fear of prosecution for non-disclosure leads some women to seek prenatal care at very late stages in their pregnancies or to stay in abusive relationships; it also deters testing for HIV. Effective HIV prevention should include full access to testing, care, treatment and support in helping women disclose and stay safe in relationships. The overly broad use of the criminal law does nothing to prevent transmission.

## *Criminal Code* amendments as a strategy to limit unjust HIV criminalization: Pros and cons

***Richard Elliott,*** *Executive Director, Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network*

There are pros and cons to amending the *Criminal Code* in an effort to limit unjust HIV criminalization, including the possibility that such amendments might end up including an HIV-specific criminal offence (which is not currently the case). Arguments in favour of a specific offence include the potential for more clearly, and more narrowly, defining which specific acts might be criminally prohibited than is currently the case under the way the law — particularly the law of sexual assault — has evolved through the courts' interpretations to date. A specific offence could also define any penalty for the prohibited conduct more appropriately than what happens now following convictions for aggravated sexual assault (including mandatory designation as a sex offender). Carefully drafted amendments could minimize the likelihood of judges and courts over-extending the law. This is an important consideration not just in relation to sexual assault law: We need to remember that there are other provisions in the *Criminal Code* other than those dealing with sexual assault (e.g., the offences of "criminal nuisance," "criminal negligence causing bodily harm," and "administering a noxious thing") that have been used already in some cases, and might well be used by prosecutors in future, especially if the sexual assault sections of the *Criminal Code* were changed to limit their scope and applicability to cases of HIV non-disclosure. A strategy of pursuing legislative amendments needs to keep these multiple sections of the Code in mind.

On the other hand, most international guidance, such as that from UNAIDS and the Global Commission on HIV and the Law, suggests avoiding criminal provisions that single out HIV; the stigma and discrimination inherent in such provisions is obviously deeply disturbing. That said, in the Canadian context, this concern might unfortunately be less significant than it would otherwise be, because the criminal law — particularly the interpretation and application of non-HIV-specific offences such as sexual assault — has already gone so far, and has also largely singled out people living with HIV. The stigma and discrimination is already operative in the application of the law, even if there isn't a specific provision in the *Criminal Code* singling out HIV.

Beyond pursuing amendments to the *Criminal Code*, which *might* end up in the form of an HIV-specific offence, there is a need to continue other advocacy strategies, including providing support to people accused of HIV non-disclosure and their defence lawyers, intervening in key cases (including at the Supreme Court of Canada and appellate courts), educating judges and prosecutors about HIV and the harms of HIV over-criminalization, and campaigning for prosecutorial guidelines. These efforts are strengthened by mobilizing a broader range of actors

concerned about HIV over-criminalization, including scientists whose expertise is needed to inform the criminal justice system, as well as bringing a feminist perspective to bear in our advocacy, including regarding the appropriateness of pursuing such charges via sexual assault law.

## Forging a community consensus: Identifying elements of a consensus statement

***Ryan Peck**, Co-Chair, Ontario Working Group on Criminal Law and HIV Exposure (CLHE)*

***Tim McCaskell**, founding member, AIDS ACTION NOW!*

***Valérie Pierre-Pierre**, Director, African and Caribbean Council on HIV/AIDS in Ontario (ACCHO)*

The Canadian Coalition to Reform HIV Criminalization (CCHRC) was launched in October 2016, and comprises lawyers, academics, community-based organizations and people living with HIV. The Coalition is advocating for an end to overly broad HIV criminalization. To that end, one step is to develop a community consensus statement that identifies some common positions and advocacy objectives regarding ending unjust HIV criminalization, including possibly through legislative reform, and that addresses harassment, stigma and violence.

To this end, a facilitated discussion took place in small groups to help inform the Coalition's work in developing a community consensus statement. Groups tackled three key "big picture" questions:

> ***Question 1: Do you think it's ever appropriate to prosecute non-disclosure of HIV-positive status as a crime? Why or why not? What kind of situations might legitimately be prosecuted? What kind of situations should clearly be excluded from prosecution?***
>
> ***Question 2: Do you think it's ever appropriate to prosecute non-disclosure of HIV-positive status as "sexual assault"? Why or why not?***
>
> ***Question 3: What do you think about changing the* Criminal Code *to exclude prosecutions for sexual assault and instead having a specific offence about HIV non-disclosure?***

While the audience presented a variety of opinions on the questions, there were numerous points attracting unanimous or very widespread agreement. There was very clear consensus that sexual assault charges (and the application of the sex offender registry if convicted) are not an appropriate vehicle for addressing HIV non-disclosure. There was widespread support for the idea that criminal prosecutions be limited to cases where there has been actual transmission of HIV, accompanied by intent to transmit — although unease and mistrust remains about how "intent" will be assessed by the criminal justice system, given the context of HIV stigma and experience to date with the courts. There was less clarity about whether merely "reckless" behaviour should attract criminal liability (and how this might be defined in the context of HIV

non-disclosure), but there was consensus that, as a broader proposition, criminalization is not the answer to what is primarily a public health issue.

There was general agreement that better access to treatment and support, as well as better and more comprehensive sexual health education and information, rather than criminal punishment, is what is needed. Instead of criminalizing people living with HIV, where is the accountability for institutions and decision-makers failing to provide adequate HIV care and support? Furthermore, the law does not protect people living with HIV from the harms that may result from disclosing, and there is often little support for disclosure; this adds to the injustice of criminalizing people for not disclosing, particularly given how broadly the law has been applied.

In infrequent cases where intervention may be necessary, public health legislation is generally sufficient. Criminalization drives people underground, contributes to stigma, and does not help people with disclosure. There was widespread agreement that there is no justification for prosecution in cases where someone has a low or undetectable viral load, or a condom is used for vaginal or anal sex. Similarly, criminal charges are not warranted for oral sex, in cases of biting or spitting, and in cases of breastfeeding (particularly given pressure women often face to breastfeed).

There was general recognition that advocacy efforts to limit HIV criminalization are an exercise in "harm reduction," given the harms of the current overly broad use of the criminal law in Canada. There were mixed views on whether an HIV-specific offence in the *Criminal Code* would be acceptable, but there was agreement that if this were pursued, it had to be part of broader decriminalization efforts. There were also mixed views about the potential benefits of prosecutorial guidelines; they will not fully resolve the issue, particularly for racialized communities who disproportionately experience the burden of the criminal justice system. Any assessment of the potential pros and cons of different strategies, including *Criminal Code* amendments, needs to be intersectional in nature, understanding the ways in which criminalization affects different communities, particularly in the context of disparities in access to various HIV prevention option and access to care, treatment and support (including to achieve viral suppression). Some participants expressed interest in exploring options for restorative justice, as an alternative to criminal convictions and penalties, to deal with cases of alleged HIV non-disclosure, but there was uncertainty about how this might work.

## Conclusion and next steps

***Richard Elliott**, Executive Director, Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network*

The Legal Network closed the Symposium by thanking participants for their engagement. The Symposium was one of several opportunities to discuss these complex questions. The Coalition will benefit from the discussion in crafting the Community Consensus Statement and more generally pursuing its advocacy against unjust HIV criminalization. The Coalition will also be determining how to engage in additional, broader community consultation, both in-person and online, with people living with HIV, service providers and others across the country in the months ahead. Symposium participants will receive some follow-up messages with information about those efforts as the Coalition's work proceeds.