

GLOBAL FUND OBSERVER (GFO), an independent newsletter about the Global Fund provided by Aidspace to over 8,000 subscribers in 170 countries.

Issue 130: 24 September 2010. (For formatted web, Word and PDF versions of this and other issues, see www.aidspace.org/gfo.)

+++++

CONTENTS

+++++

[1. NEWS: Demand for Round 10 Expected to Be Strong](#)

According to the Global Fund, the total two-year cost for all Round 10 applications, before screening and before review by the TRP, amounts to \$4.36 billion. This is comparable to Round 9, which was the second largest round ever (after Round 8).

[2. NEWS: Some Donors Announce Their Pledges to the Global Fund for 2011-2013](#)

France, Japan, Canada, Norway and China have announced how much they plan to donate to the Global Fund for the three-year period 2011-2013.

[3. ANALYSIS: How the Round 10 Prioritisation Criteria Might Work](#)

This article describes the prioritisation criteria adopted for Round 10, and provides an example of how proposals might be ranked if the criteria need to be invoked.

[4. NEWS: Board Rejects Request for Phase 2 Funding from Sri Lanka](#)

For the first time in more than three years, the Global Fund has declined to approve a Phase 2 funding application. The Board rejected a request for Phase 2 of a Round 6 TB grant in Sri Lanka. Some Board members opposed the decision.

[5. NEWS: New "Country Team Approach" Adopted for Managing Grants](#)

As part of internal reforms, the Global Fund Secretariat will be using a "country team approach" to manage grants. The new approach is being adopted initially in 13 countries, but will encompass a further 29 countries by the second quarter of 2011.

[6. NEWS: Global Fund Provides Updates on Grant Consolidation and Other Areas](#)

In the first eight months of 2010, 13 countries went through a process in which 38 grants were consolidated into 19. The Global Fund estimates that this will result, on average, in a reduction of 50% in transaction costs for implementers.

+++++

1. NEWS: Demand for Round 10 Expected to Be Strong

+++++

It appears likely that the demand for funding in Round 10 will be about the same as it was in Round 9. The Global Fund has released preliminary figures indicating that the total two-year cost for all Round 10 applications amounts to \$4.36 billion. This is prior to the screening process, which determines which proposals are eligible for consideration, and prior to review by the Technical Review Panel (TRP), which will determine which of the "screened in" proposals are recommended to the Board for funding. (The screening process also includes clarifications of the financial request, which could also affect the final total.)

In Rounds 9 and 8, the total two-year costs at this stage were, respectively, \$4.88 billion and \$5.79 billion. Round 8 was the largest round ever.

HIV/AIDS proposals constitute 63% of the total Round 10 demand, with TB and malaria proposals accounting for, respectively, 19% and 18%. In Rounds 9 and 8, the percentage cost split among HIV / TB / malaria proposals, after screening, was, respectively, 49 / 24 / 27 and 50 / 17 / 33.

In Round 9, proposals recommended for funding by the TRP represented 46% of the total request for funding. Extrapolating this to Round 10 would suggest that the costs of all proposals recommended for funding will be about \$2.0 billion. This is without accounting for the fact that some Round 10 applications may be deemed ineligible; however, this is not likely to make a significant difference to the total.

In Round 9, the total two-year cost of proposals approved for funding was \$2.21 billion. However, due to limited resources, the Global Fund imposed a 10% reduction, on average, across all proposal budgets, bringing the cost down to \$1.99 billion.

The final cost of Round 10 will not be known until the screening process is completed and the TRP makes its recommendations to the Board. However, if past experience is a guide, there will not likely be sufficient funds available for the Board to immediately approve all Round 10 proposals recommended for funding by the TRP. In both Rounds 8 and 9, the Board deferred formal approval of some of the TRP-recommended proposals until more funds became available.

Further, it is not clear yet how much money will be raised in the donor replenishment process currently underway for the years 2011-2013. Money for Round 10 will come primarily from these donations. (See next article.)

+++++

2. NEWS: Some Donors Announce Their Pledges to the Global Fund for 2011-2013

+++++

France has announced that it will contribute \$1.4 billion to the Global Fund during the three-year period 2011-2013, an increase of about 9% over its contribution during the period 2007-2009. France is one of five countries that have indicated this week how much they plan to contribute. Most countries will make their announcements at the Global Fund's replenishment meeting in New York on 4-5 October 2010. The other four countries that have announced are Japan (\$800 million, up 42%), Canada (\$520 million, up 36%), Norway (\$225 million, up 32%) and China (\$14 million, up 133%). *(All monetary amounts in this article are in US dollars. Comparisons with earlier pledges are approximate because of exchange rate fluctuations.)*

In early 2010, the Global Fund provided donors with three possible resource needs scenarios for the period 2011-2013:

- **Resource Needs Scenario 1**, which would cost **\$13 billion**, would allow for the continuation of funding for existing programmes. New programmes could only be funded at a significantly lower level than in recent years.
- **Resource Needs Scenario 2**, which would cost **\$17 billion**, would allow for the continuation of funding for existing programmes, and funding for new programmes at a level that comes close to that of recent years.
- **Resource Needs Scenario 3**, which would cost **\$20 billion**, would allow for the continuation of funding for existing programmes, and for well-performing programmes to be scaled up significantly, allowing in turn for more rapid progress towards achieving the health-related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Many people are hoping that the Global Fund will raise between \$17 and \$20 billion, but are apprehensive because of the current economic climate. (There are a number of initiatives underway to persuade donors to give generously to the Global Fund, including an online petition and a Global

Week of Action organised by the Communities Delegation of the Global Fund Board with the support of a number of non-profit organisations – see www.globalfundreplenishment.org.)

Earlier this year, the Global Fund also released a Technical Note in which it outlined four possible formulae, or "contribution scenarios," for obtaining the money that the Fund needs for 2011-2013. The scenarios are as follows:

- **Scenario 1 (the "Pro-Rata" scenario):** Each country contributes a share of the need that is equal to its share of all contributions given to the Fund during 2007-2009.
- **Scenario 2** is based on each country's share of contributions made to the International Development Association (i.e., traditional foreign aid), and is not pursued further here.
- **Scenario 3 (the "Adjusted GNI" scenario):** Each country contributes a share of the need that is equal to its share of global Gross National Income (GNI), adjusted by GNI per capita.
- **Scenario 4 (the "0.7" scenario):** This is a hybrid between Scenarios 1 and 3, in which the contributions of those countries whose "Scenario 1 contribution" is less than 0.7 (i.e., 70%) of their "Scenario 3 contribution" are increased to the 0.7 level. The contributions of the other countries are then reduced to "offset" these additional contributions.

(The four scenarios are discussed in more depth in "Which Countries Should Give How Much to the Global Fund?" in [GFO 117](#).)

To supplement the scenarios developed by the Fund, GFO developed a "bad scenario" to illustrate the possible thinking of some donors – Scenario 0 (the "No Increase" scenario), whereby each country contributes the same dollar amount per year that it has averaged in recent years, even though the need has increased significantly.

In the table below, we show what each country's contribution would be if it followed Scenario 0, and if it followed Scenarios 1, 3 or 4 for both the \$17 billion and \$20 billion targets. All these numbers are as published by the Global Fund. In the last column of the table, we record the pledges announced so far.

Table: Amounts that donors might contribute to the Global Fund to meet the \$17 billion and \$20 billion targets for 2011-2013, as per various scenarios, plus the amounts already announced as pledges

Donor	Average Annual Contribution 2007-09, \$m.	Total contribution over the <u>three</u> years 2011-2013, \$m.							Pledges announced by 23 Sept 2010, and % change vs 2007-2009 *
		Scenario 0: No Increase	To meet \$17b. target			To meet \$20b. target			
			Scenario 1	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 1	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	
Australia	29.0	87	160	291	204	189	342	240	
Austria	0	0	0	138	97	0	162	114	
Belgium	18.6	56	103	176	123	121	207	145	
Brazil	0.1	0	0	70	49	0	82	57	
Canada	127.1	381	703	485	657	827	571	773	520 (+36%)
China	2.0	6	11	96	67	13	113	79	14 (+133%)
Denmark	29.1	87	161	161	150	189	189	177	
Eur. Commission	143.7	431	795	795	795	935	935	935	
Finland	4.1	12	22	103	72	26	121	85	
France	429.1	1,287	2,374	955	2,217	2,793	1,123	2,609	1,400 (+9%)
Germany	233.4	700	1,291	1,237	1,206	1,519	1,456	1,419	
Greece	0.9	3	5	77	54	6	91	64	
India	2.0	6	11	11	10	13	13	12	
Ireland	26.1	78	144	92	135	170	108	159	

Donor	Average Annual Contribution 2007-09, \$m	Total contribution over the three years 2011-2013, \$m.							Pledges announced by 23 Sept 2010, and % change vs 2007-
		Scenario 0: No Increase	To meet \$17b. target			To meet \$20b. target			
			Scenario 1	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 1	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	
Italy **	184.5	554	1,021	622	954	1,201	731	1,122	
Japan	188.1	564	1,040	1,559	1,092	1,224	1,835	1,284	800 *** (+42%)
Korea (Rep. of)	3.3	10	18	188	132	22	222	155	
Kuwait	0.8	2	4	26	18	5	31	22	
Luxembourg	3.4	10	19	29	21	22	35	24	
Mexico	0	0	0	74	52	0	87	61	
Netherlands	93.5	281	517	346	483	608	407	568	
New Zealand	0	0	0	29	20	0	34	24	
Norway	56.7	170	314	302	293	369	356	345	225 (+32%)
Portugal	2.8	8	16	38	26	18	44	31	
Russia	68.3	205	378	110	353	445	129	415	
Saudi Arabia	6.0	18	33	49	34	39	57	40	
South Africa	1.1	3	6	14	10	7	16	11	
Spain	151.3	454	837	389	782	984	458	920	
Gen. Cat. (Spain)	2.3	7	13	13	13	15	15	15	
Sweden	84.9	255	470	200	439	552	235	516	
Switzerland	6.2	19	35	272	191	41	320	224	
Thailand	1.0	3	6	5	5	7	6	6	
Turkey	0	0	0	54	38	0	63	44	
United Kingdom	150.5	452	833	1,058	778	980	1245	915	
United States	829.7	2,489	4,589	5,757	4,287	5,399	6,773	5,044	
Other countries	0.9	3	5	111	78	6	131	92	
Pvt Foundations	100.7	302	557	557	557	655	655	655	
Private Sector	56.2	169	340	340	340	400	400	400	
Innov. Financing	20.3	61	170	170	170	200	200	200	
Total	3,057.2	9,172	17,000	17,000	17,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	2,959

* The percentage increases shown here compare the dollar value of 2011-2013 pledges with the dollar value of 2007-2009 contributions as published by the Global Fund in its March 2010 Technical Note. For pledges made in currencies other than US dollars, exchange rate fluctuations mean that the percentage increase shown here could be significantly different from the percentage increase in the national currency.

** The "Average Annual Contribution 2007-09" shown for Italy is based in part on Italy's pledge of €130 million (\$165 million) for 2009. In fact, Italy has not yet paid any of its 2009 pledge.

*** The period over which the Japan pledge applies is "the coming years."

Note: For each of Scenarios 1, 3 and 4, the contributions by the European Commission, private foundations, the private sector and innovative finance sources are flat-lined because indicators of capacity to contribute (such as Adjusted GNI) are not relevant to these donors. It is assumed that contributions from the European Commission and private foundations will equal their current shares of total contributions to the Global Fund, and that the contributions from the private sector and innovative finance sources will increase (as a share of total contributions to the Global Fund).

"Technical Note 1: Illustrative Contribution Tables," is available at www.theglobalfund.org/en/replenishment/hague/documents.

+++++

3. ANALYSIS: How the Round 10 Prioritisation Criteria Might Work

+++++

Earlier this year, the Global Fund amended its prioritisation criteria for Round 10, giving less weight to technical merit than under the old criteria. This has led to some misconceptions about how the prioritisation criteria would be used for Round 10. The purpose of this article, therefore, is to explain the facts and provide an example of how proposals might be ranked if the criteria need to be invoked.

Prioritisation criteria are used to rank proposals recommended for funding by the Technical Review Panel (TRP) when there is not enough money to immediately pay for all of those proposals. The way it works is that the top-ranked proposals are funded first, and the other recommended proposals are funded as more funds become available (in descending order of ranking).

The criteria have been invoked in several previous rounds, resulting in delays in the funding of some approved proposals. The delays were up to several months in some instances, but all approved proposals were eventually funded.

The new prioritisation criteria consist of a composite index, where scores are allocated for (a) technical merit, (b) disease burden and (c) poverty level. Proposals can earn up to four points in each category, meaning that the maximum score is 12. See Table 1 for details.

Table 1: Description of the composite index

Criterion	Indicator		Score
Technical merit (up to 4 pts)	TRP recommendation category	Category 1 or 2	4
		Category 2B	3
Disease burden (up to 4 pts)	<i>See "New Prioritisation Criteria Give Less Weight to Technical Merit" in GFO 122 for information on how the disease burden scores are computed.</i>		4
			3
			2
			1
Poverty level (up to 4 pts)	World Bank classification	Low income	4
		Lower-middle income	2
		Upper-middle income	0
Maximum score possible			12

It is important to note that recommended proposals are ranked according to the prioritisation criteria by the Global Fund Secretariat only after (a) the TRP has completed its work, and (b) it is apparent that there is not enough money to immediately fund all recommended proposals. In its deliberations, the TRP looks only at the technical merit of the proposals. The TRP has been specifically instructed not to consider whether the Global Fund will have sufficient funds to pay for a proposal; therefore, the TRP does not ever consider the prioritisation criteria.

This means that a country with a high disease burden and a high poverty level is **not** more likely than others to have its proposal approved. What the rules say is that **if** the TRP recommends for approval a proposal from Country X, and **if** Country X has a high disease burden and a high poverty level, and **if** there is not enough money immediately available to fund all proposals recommended by the TRP – then, the proposal from Country X may receive its funding earlier than proposals from countries with a lower disease burden or poverty level.

Thus, all Round 10 proposals that were submitted to the Global Fund will be reviewed by the TRP providing that they met the Fund's eligibility criteria. (Eligibility criteria are different from the prioritisation criteria, even though they both cover some of the same elements.)

So, how might the prioritisation criteria come into play in Round 10? Well, the ideal scenario would be that the criteria are not invoked at all because there is sufficient money to pay for all recommended proposals. But if the criteria do have to be invoked, the following hypothetical example, using a small

number of proposals (12) to keep it simple, explains how it could work. The proposals in Table 2 are listed in descending order of ranking as per the prioritisation criteria. For this example, we assume that there is only enough money to immediately fund eight of the 12 proposals. The proposals are labelled A through J, in descending order of ranking.

Table 2: Hypothetical example of how the prioritisation criteria might be applied

Proposal	Indicators and scores			Total score
	Technical merit	Disease burden	Poverty level	
A	4	3	4	11
B	3	4	4	11
C	3	4	2	9
D	3	2	4	9
E	3	3	2	8
F	3	1	4	8
G	4	1	2	7
H	3	4	0	7
I	4	2	0	6
J	3	1	2	6
K	3	2	0	5
L	3	1	0	4

Under this scenario, the top eight proposals, the ones that are shaded in the table, would be funded immediately. The other four proposals would be funded as more money became available, starting with I and J, and then K, and then L (assuming that sufficient new money comes in). As this scenario shows, it is possible that some proposals scoring 4 in technical merit will be funded later than some proposals scoring only 3 in technical merit.

What all this means is that if there is not enough money to immediately fund all proposals recommended by the TRP, the Global Fund Board will immediately approve some of the TRP-recommended proposals, and will approve “in principle” other TRP-recommended proposals, pending funding availability. But what happens if not enough new money comes in to fund those recommended proposals that are approved in principle and not funded immediately? When it launched Round 10, the Global Fund Board said that the amount of money allocated to Round 10 could not exceed the amount of money that donors give to the Fund for use by the end of 2011 (after setting aside money to pay for Phase 2 of grants approved in previous rounds). So, if, by the end of 2011, the Global Fund has not received enough money for use in 2011, then some recommended proposals might not be funded. However, the Board could adopt alternative measures, such as imposing a budget cut on all approved proposals.

+++++

4. NEWS: Board Rejects Request for Phase 2 Funding from Sri Lanka

+++++

In August 2010, the Global Fund Board rejected a request for funding for Phase 2 of a Round 6 tuberculosis (TB) grant in Sri Lanka. This is the first time in more than three years that the Global Fund has declined to approve a Phase 2 request. Some Board members opposed the decision.

The PR for the grant is Lanka Jatika Sarvodaya Shramadana Sangamaya (“Sarvodaya”), a local development NGO. The programme supported by the grant was designed to strengthen Sri Lanka’s TB control efforts by widening the scope of directly observational therapy (DOTS) to reach marginalised and vulnerable populations. Activities included promoting a single national TB control programme implemented through all health care providers; implementing interventions to address HIV-related TB and multi-drug-resistant TB; and increasing access to better quality DOTS services.

One of the objectives of the programme was to empower communities to become an inherent part of the TB control efforts.

The programme was being implemented through two grants. Sarvodaya was the PR for one grant; the Ministry of Health (MOH) was the PR for the other grant. The Sarvodaya grant started in January 2008, which coincided with the start of a renewed offensive by government forces against the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka's civil war. The fighting did not end until May 2009.

The budget for Phase 1 of the Sarvodaya grant was \$957,593. At the time of the request for Phase 2 funding, \$624,995 of the Phase 1 funds had been disbursed. The request for Phase 2 funding was submitted by the CCM on 15 September 2009. On 16 March 2010, the CCM was notified by the Global Fund Secretariat of its intention to classify the request as "No Go."

Reasons for the "No Go" recommendation

The Secretariat said that performance was inadequate, with 10 of 12 indicators showing poor results. The Secretariat added that Sarvodaya had failed to establish the effective linkages needed to support the activities of the Ministry of Health, as envisioned by the dual-track financing element of the original proposal. The Secretariat also said that Sarvodaya had demonstrated poor coordination with its sub-recipients (SRs); that Sarvodaya had not established mechanisms to measure the indicators in the performance framework; and that Sarvodaya had not provided evidence that the grant was widening the scope of DOTS among marginalised populations.

In accordance with Global Fund procedures, the CCM was given four weeks to respond to the concerns raised by the Secretariat.

Response from the CCM

In its response, the CCM said that the civil war had negatively impacted the ability of Sarvodaya to carry out community-based activities, but that the pace of implementation had picked up considerably since the end of the conflict. The CCM added that the conflict, as well as certain other factors, had adversely affected the establishment of linkages to support MOH activities, but that the Ministry and Sarvodaya, together with the SRs, had now drawn up a comprehensive strategy to establish these linkages.

The CCM stated that deficiencies in government and private sector reporting systems had resulted in the grant score card indicating poor scores for some indicators, even though Sarvodaya had accomplished a considerable proportion of the work entrusted to it. Finally, the CCM said that Sarvodaya had now put in place mechanisms to accurately measure results, and that Sarvodaya had recruited people to strengthen its SR management capacity.

Additional comments from the Global Fund Secretariat

The Global Fund Secretariat said that the response from the CCM failed to fully address the concerns it had raised. The Secretariat said that no significant updated results were presented to address the weakness in performance noted at the time of the initial Phase 2 review; that the CCM did not provide evidence that adequate systems have been established to allow Sarvodaya to accurately report on key indicators; and that, although it had recently undertaken positive steps, particularly since the cessation of conflict in parts of the country, the CCM had carried out very few decisive actions since receiving the "No Go" intention letter from the Secretariat.

Consequently, the Secretariat re-affirmed its "No Go" recommendation. The Board followed this advice, and rejected the funding request. The vote was held electronically (i.e., by email). There were some dissenting votes, but not enough to block the recommendation from going through.

+++++

5. NEWS: New “Country Team Approach” Adopted for Managing Grants

+++++

The Global Fund is making some changes to the way the Secretariat manages grants. A new “country team approach” is being adopted, initially in 13 countries, but it will encompass a further 29 countries by the second quarter of 2011.

The country team approach (CTA) involves creating teams that will bring together operations-focused staff (fund portfolio managers and programme officers) and monitoring and compliance staff (legal, procurement, finance and M&E) to take shared responsibility for grants throughout the entire grant cycle. The Global Fund says that the current approach – whereby grant management functions and monitoring, compliance and legal functions tend to occur separately and sequentially – contributes to delays in signing grants and processing disbursements.

The Global Fund believes that the CTA will produce the following benefits:

- earlier "upstream" identification and joint resolution of potential implementation challenges and compliance issues;
- simplified and better coordinated communication between the Secretariat and implementers;
- increased standardisation of practices across grants and countries; and
- increased Secretariat capacity to support partnership functions at the country level, such as strengthening the CCM's oversight role and helping to mobilise technical assistance.

The Global Fund also believes that the country team approach will help to enhance the Secretariat's responsiveness to the findings of audits and investigations by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG).

The CTA will be applied to what the Global Fund calls “high impact” countries – i.e., countries with large volumes of funding, a multiplicity of grants, complex operations or other challenges. The CTA is being implemented now in 13 countries. After three months, implementation in these countries will be evaluated, before the approach is expanded to an additional 29 high impact countries.

In the last few months, about 5% of Secretariat staff have been redeployed to support implementation of the CTA.

Because the Secretariat has been asked to propose a zero-growth operating budget for 2011, certain IT projects have been postponed, and cuts have been made in all clusters of the Secretariat and in most activity areas. “Even a major corporate priority such as Resource Mobilization will be subject to a cut of roughly 10 per cent,” said Michel Kazatchkine, the Global Fund’s Executive Director.

Other internal reforms

The Secretariat is also instituting other changes to make it more efficient and more responsive to applicants and implementers. These changes include the following:

- The Secretariat is implementing quality control mechanisms for key decision-making processes, including disbursements and periodic reviews. As a result, implementers can expect more consistent decision outcomes, particularly for disbursements.
- The Secretariat is codifying existing best practice into documented Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) to provide portfolio managers with technical guidance to manage Global Fund operations. The SOPs will complement the Operational Guide, which was recently released. In addition, the Secretariat will publish Operational Policy Notes (OPNs) on its website by the end of September 2010. The OPNs will provide more details on certain policies and procedures than what is contained in the Operational Guide.
- The Secretariat is working on improving how the Global Fund pro-actively manages risks and responds to OIG requests and findings. The responsibility for this work will reside with the

new Country Teams. In addition, a full-time risk management officer in the Country Programs cluster will actively follow up on OIG recommendations.

Most of the information in this article was derived from "An Agenda for a More Efficient and Effective Global Fund," produced by the Global Fund, which should be available shortly at www.theglobalfund.org.

+++++

6. NEWS: Global Fund Provides Updates on Grant Consolidation and Other Areas

+++++

In the first eight months of 2010, 13 countries went through a grant consolidation process, a feature of the Global Fund's new grant architecture. In the process, 38 grants were consolidated into 19, and single-stream-of-funding agreements were signed for these 19 grants. The Global Fund estimates that this will result, on average, in a reduction of 50% in transaction costs for implementers.

Further consolidations are expected once Round 10 is completed. Submitting consolidated proposals was optional in Round 10, but will become mandatory in Round 11, expected in 2011. Given the five-year cycle of the Global Fund, this means the entire portfolio will be managed under the new grant architecture by 2016. The Global Fund forecasts that 50% of all grants will have transitioned to the new architecture by the middle of 2013.

Under the new architecture, all Global Fund grants in a given country's disease portfolio will undergo periodic programme reviews at the same time (compared to the current practice of individual grant performance reviews). The Global Fund said that the first such reviews are due to be conducted in the fourth quarter of 2011.

This information is contained in "*An Agenda for a More Efficient and Effective Global Fund*," recently released by the Fund. The report provided updates on a number of other areas, including the HSS joint platform, national strategy applications, CCM funding, and data quality. These are discussed below.

Health systems strengthening joint platform

Working with the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation (GAVI) and the World Bank, the Global Fund is implementing the HSS joint platform through two tracks. Track 1 involves reviewing the organisations' existing projects and programmes to ensure coherence and eliminate duplication. Track 2 involves new HSS funding through either a joint proposal form for grant applications to GAVI and the Global Fund (Option 1), or a joint assessment of national disease strategies (JANS) by development partners (Option 2).

For Track 1, from June to December 2010, the platform partners are undertaking field visits to three countries (Benin, Cambodia and DRC) in which specific areas of existing grants and loans, such as the M&E and fiduciary frameworks, will be harmonised and aligned with country processes.

For Track 2, the platform partners are developing a joint proposal form, due to be finalized in March-April 2011 for use in Round 11, and an agreed JANS methodology, which will be piloted in 4-5 countries in 2011.

The Global Fund said that the platform partners hope to have the M&E and fiduciary frameworks for Global Fund HSS grants harmonised with World Bank, GAVI and country processes in at least 15 countries by the end of 2012. By the fourth quarter of 2013, they aim to establish access to funding through JANS-based funding requests as the preferred approach for countries with strong health sector strategies.

National strategy applications

The second wave of NSAs will be launched in October 2010 through a call for expressions of interest by countries. Joint assessments of NSAs are due to take place in March-April 2011, with the Board to

consider proposals by the fourth quarter of 2011. The Global Fund said that it is aiming to have the NSA established as the preferred approach for requesting funding from the Global Fund for countries that have adopted strong national disease strategies by the fourth quarter of 2013.

CCM funding and strengthening

The introduction of the new grant architecture and new financing models has accentuated the need to ensure effective performance of CCMs, particularly with respect to the CCMs' oversight function. The Global Fund is currently reviewing its CCM guidelines. In addition, the Fund is developing best practice standards on good CCM governance and transparency.

Under the new expanded CCM funding policy, which allows for applications with no ceiling, funding for all CCMs combined is expected to increase from \$1.3 million in 2008 to \$7.2 million in 2010. The Global Fund said that CCM funding is likely to level off at \$13-15 million annually by 2012-2013, a ten-fold increase from 2008 levels.

The Global Fund has begun to design and promote a demand-driven approach to technical support for CCM strengthening. Regional workshops are being conducted to strengthen CCM knowledge and understanding of their most important functions – with a particular emphasis on grant oversight and the CCM's strategic role in the development of programmes. The workshops will provide a venue for sharing best practices across regions and for familiarising CCM members with evolving Global Fund policies. These workshops will continue through 2013.

Country visits by Secretariat staff or technical partners will also be conducted in response to CCM requests for assistance in addressing oversight challenges, partnership issues and management of conflicts of interest.

The Global Fund said that in 2011-2013 it will provide learning tools and systems which draw from CCM knowledge and experience, and that by 2011 it will implement a global system for assessing CCM performance and sharing results in a timely and public manner.

Data quality

The Global Fund is implementing reforms in four areas to improve data quality. These reforms aim to (a) strengthen data governance (e.g., by developing an operational policy note by the end of 2010); (b) streamline data architecture (e.g., by mapping and automating grant business processes by mid-2011); (c) reinforce data verification (e.g., by providing on-site data verification for at least 85% of grants); and (d) strengthen health information systems with partners at the country level (e.g., by rolling out reinforced data quality assurance at the country level during 2010).

The information in this article was derived from "An Agenda for a More Efficient and Effective Global Fund," produced by the Global Fund, which should be available shortly at www.theglobalfund.org.

++++++
END OF NEWSLETTER
++++++

This is an issue of the *GLOBAL FUND OBSERVER (GFO)* Newsletter.

Author: All articles for this issue were written by David Garmaise (david.garmaise@aidspan.org), Aidspan's Senior Analyst.

GFO is an independent source of news, analysis and commentary about the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria (www.theglobalfund.org). GFO is emailed to over 8,000 subscribers in 170 countries at least twelve times per year.

GFO is a free service of Aidspan (www.aidspan.org), a Kenya-based NGO that serves as an independent watchdog of the Global Fund, and that provides services that can benefit all countries

wishing to obtain and make effective use of Global Fund financing. Aidspan finances its work primarily through grants from foundations.

Aidspan does not accept Global Fund money, perform paid consulting work, or charge for any of its products. The Board and staff of the Fund have no influence on and bear no responsibility for the content of GFO or of any other Aidspan publication.

GFO is currently provided in English only. It is hoped to provide it later in additional languages.

GFO Editor and Aidspan Executive Director: Bernard Rivers (bernard.rivers@aidspan.org, +254-20-418-0149)

Reproduction of articles in the Newsletter is permitted if the following is stated: "Reproduced from the *Global Fund Observer* Newsletter (www.aidspan.org/gfo), a service of Aidspan."

Are you a newcomer to Global Fund issues? See Aidspan's "A Beginner's Guide to the Global Fund" at www.aidspan.org/guides.

To stop receiving *GFO*, send an email to stop-gfo-newsletter@aidspan.org. Subject line and text can be left blank.