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INTRODUCTION

The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the Global Fund) was created in late 2001 to expand the response to the three diseases by raising new financial resources and disbursing these resources in countries in need. The Global Fund is designed to work through existing or new public-private partnerships at country level. In its first three rounds of funding, the Global Fund approved 227 proposals from 122 countries and three territories, involving expenditures of $2.1 billion\(^1\) over two years. At its meeting on 28-30 June 2004, the Global Fund Board is scheduled to consider another $964 million in funding for proposals received in the fourth round.

After only a few years of operation, it is a little early to talk about the Global Fund’s long-term impact. Nevertheless, there have been some obvious successes. For example:

- The Global Fund has created a new model for doing business. Compared to bilateral and other multilateral funding programs, the Global Fund (a) is able to get money out more quickly; (b) is more creative and flexible; and (c) is more open and transparent with respect to its decision-making processes and information on approved projects.
- The Global Fund has focussed greater attention worldwide on HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria.
- In some countries, the Global Fund has brought new energy, team spirit and motivation to the fight against the three diseases.
- The Global Fund has raised some new resources. (It appears that not all of the resources raised by the Fund are new. It is difficult to know for sure, but it seems that some government donors to the Global Fund have simply re-channelled existing development assistance money.)

As well, through the establishment of Country Coordinating Mechanisms (CCMs), the Global Fund has affirmed and legitimatized the critical importance of the involvement of a full range of stakeholders in proposal development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Where the CCMs are working well, they provide unparalleled opportunities - often not available elsewhere - for the full range of stakeholders to work together in partnership. These stakeholders include governments, bilateral and multilateral donors, the private sector and civil society (including NGOs, affected communities and faith-based organizations).

The CCMs are working well in some countries. Unfortunately, however, this is not the case in most countries. This report documents some of the major concerns that NGOs have raised concerning the CCM process (see Section I).

This report also addresses other aspects of the Global Fund. The Fund is currently experiencing a serious shortfall in fundraising for future rounds of funding. This issue is discussed in Section II. As well, NGOs have identified concerns with respect to the Fund’s governance and operations. These concerns are discussed in Section III.

In each of the three sections of this report, the description of the issues and concerns is followed by a list of the actions that ICASO believes need to be implemented to address these issues and concerns.

This report was compiled with input from the regional secretariats of ICASO and from representatives of HIV/AIDS NGOs actively working on Global Fund issues.

\(^1\) All funds in this report are in US$. 
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The following is a summary of the major concerns raised by NGOs related to the structure and operations of CCMs.

**Issue No. 1**

*There is inadequate representation of NGOs and vulnerable populations - including women, persons living with the diseases, injection drug users and sex workers - on many CCMs.*

The composition of CCMs has been evolving over time, but it is evolving too slowly. While NGO representation on CCMs has increased since the first round of funding, it is still often inadequate. As a result, NGOs are under-represented on many CCMs in both quantity and quality. Also, people living with the diseases are still only marginally represented: There is still no representation of people living with the diseases in about 25 percent of the CCMs; on CCMs where there is representation from this sector, often it consists of only one person from one of the three disease communities. The purpose of involving people living with the diseases is often not well understood by the CCMs. As well, representation on many CCMs from other vulnerable populations is rare. For example, few CCMs have followed existing Global Fund guidelines on ensuring a gender balance. Furthermore, in many countries there is little representation on CCMs from civil society organizations located outside the capital city. Finally, in many countries there is no proper and transparent process for nominations to CCMs.

**Issue No. 2**

*Civil society representatives have not been treated as full partners on many CCMs.*

Unfortunately, in many countries, despite having a seat at the table, civil society representatives have not played a significant role in deciding the content of proposals or in commenting on draft proposals. These are countries where the CCMs are dominated by government members who do not understand or appreciate the value of civil society involvement. In these countries, the government officials (and, in some cases bilateral and/or multilateral donors) control CCM member selection, meeting agendas and decision-making, however many civil society representatives sit on the CCM. In these countries, systems have not yet been established to allow for a participatory approach to decision-making. The problems described here tend to occur in countries where there is no culture of collaboration between governments and civil society, and where existing government structures do not allow for the full involvement of civil society under terms of equality and respect.

**Issue No. 3**

*The roles and responsibilities of the members of CCMs and of the CCMs themselves are not clearly defined.*

On many CCMs, the roles of the individual members of the CCM have not been spelled out. Furthermore, the role of the CCM itself is not clear with respect to (a) the relationship to Principal Recipients (PRs), Sub-Recipients and Local Fund Agents; (b) the implementation of approved projects; and (c) the monitoring and evaluation of approved projects.
Many civil society representatives on CCMs do not have the skills they need to participate fully. Civil society representatives do not automatically come to the table with the knowledge and skills required to participate fully in policy-making; decision-making; priority-setting; and program design, implementation and monitoring. They often lack the skills to negotiate with other CCM members concerning their role on the CCM and their participation in CCM meetings. The financial and human resources required to expand the capacity of civil society representatives and improve their skills are often lacking.

The flow of information to and from CCMs, and within CCMs, is often inadequate. Three types of problems have been identified with respect to information sharing. First, problems of communication between CCM Secretariats and CCM members are widespread. Second, the flow of information from the Global Fund to CCMs is often quite limited. Third, communications from civil society representatives on the CCMs to members of their own constituencies have sometimes been deficient. The last problem is sometimes due to the limited communications infrastructures within many civil society organizations. In addition, the fact that many CCMs function in a grant-writing language that is not the first language of the country, or of some of the CCM members, limits civil society participation in these countries. Ineffective communication impedes participation.

Civil society representatives on some CCMs are not truly representative. In some countries, there is no adequate process in place to ensure that the civil society representatives on CCMs are truly able to represent the interests of their constituencies. In some cases, the problems stem from a flawed selection process that does not allow civil society organizations to choose their own representatives. In other cases, the problems are due to competition among NGOs. Another factor in some countries is the absence of representative national or umbrella NGO bodies.

The requirements of CCM participation contribute to a crisis in human and financial resource capacity among NGOs. The Global Fund is just one of many new and complex initiatives to which HIV/AIDS NGOs are expected to contribute time and energy. Unfortunately, the resources of these NGOs have not increased at the same rate as the increasing demands being placed on them.
ICASO POSITION

To address the concerns outlined above, related to the structure and operations of CCMs, ICASO calls for the following actions to be implemented:

1. The Global Fund, in collaboration with civil society, should develop more detailed guidelines for CCMs. These guidelines should spell out minimum standards that CCMs have to meet. Specifically, the guidelines should: (a) define what constitutes adequate representation of NGOs and vulnerable populations; (b) set minimum requirements for the selections process; (c) define the roles and responsibilities of members of the CCMs; and (d) define the relationship of the CCM with respect to the PRs, Sub-Recipients and Local Fund Agents.

2. Individual CCMs should develop terms of reference and operating procedures for the CCM. These terms of reference and operating procedures should define: (a) the composition of the CCM; (b) the selections process; (c) the roles and responsibilities of CCM members; and (d) the relationship of the CCM with respect to the PRs, Sub-Recipients and Local Fund Agents.

3. The Global Fund should educate all members of CCMs (particularly government representatives) with respect to the importance of the participation on CCMs of NGOs, people living with the diseases, and other vulnerable populations.

4. Civil society delegations on the Global Fund Board, in consultation with their constituencies, should on an ongoing basis collectively formulate recommendations for ways in which civil society representation and participation on CCMs can be improved.

5. Individual CCMs should review the composition of their CCMs and take action to ensure that there is strengthened representation and meaningful participation from NGOs and vulnerable populations.

6. Civil society organizations should be funded to develop indicators to assess the effectiveness of civil society participation on CCMs, and to monitor the effectiveness of such participation. Either the Global Fund should directly fund civil society organizations to do this work, or it should facilitate a process that enables civil society organizations to obtain the necessary funding.
The Global Fund, in consultation with stakeholders, should monitor the governance and operations of CCMs on an ongoing basis, and should document and disseminate examples of good practice.

Technical assistance and resources should be provided to CCMs to enable them to (a) increase the capacity of civil society representatives (and other representatives, as required); (b) improve representation from outside the capital cities; (c) improve communications within CCMs, and from CCMs to the broader constituencies of CCM members; (d) allow CCMs to operate in more than one language, where required; (e) improve CCM governance; and (f) improve the operating efficiency of the CCMs. Either the Global Fund should invest in CCMs directly; or plans should be drawn up on a country-by-country basis to ensure that CCMs have coordinated and sustainable access to technical support and other resources.

Additional resources and technical assistance should be provided to HIV/AIDS NGOs to enable them to better respond to the increasing demands being placed on them by the need to participate in CCMs and other aspects of the Global Fund operations, and in other new initiatives. This support should be geared to increasing the management and coordination capacity of the NGOs to work in these environments. While this support does not necessarily have to come from Global Fund’s own resources, the Fund should nevertheless play a facilitating role.

The Global Fund and other funders should provide more opportunities for the exchange of information among CCMs, including opportunities for inter-regional exchanges.

In those countries where competition among NGOs has raised concerns about the representativeness of the civil society representatives on the CCMs, individuals within these civil society organizations need to show leadership and take action to come up with a process to correct the problem.
The Global Fund is facing a serious funding crisis. The Fund has stated that it needs to receive at least $1.4 billion in 2004 and $3.4 billion in 2005. The reason for the sharp increase in needs in 2005 is that the Fund has to start allocating funding not only for new projects but also for the final three years of the five-year projects approved in the early rounds of funding.

There is a growing concern among NGOs that the Global Fund is being overly conservative in its forecasts and that actual needs may be much higher.

As of 21 May 2004, total pledges were $1.5 billion for 2004 and $0.8 billion for 2005. Pledges for 2005 are only 26 percent of what the Global Fund says it needs, resulting in a current shortfall of $2.5 billion.

Many civil society organizations have proposed that the bulk of Global Fund revenues should come from the governments of the world’s relatively affluent countries; and that the equitable contribution for each of these countries should be determined based on the country’s gross national product (GNP). This approach is known as the Equitable Contribution Framework. (It should be noted that the Global Fund Board and many donor countries have not yet endorsed the Equitable Contribution Framework.)

President Jacques Chirac of France and others have proposed that the contributions to the Global Fund should be split into three equal parts, as follows: (a) the United States, which has 32.2 percent of world GNP, should pay one-third of the costs; (b) the European Union countries, which have 26.7 percent of world GNP, should pay one-third; and (c) other countries, which account for 41.1 percent of world GNP, should pay one-third.

Based on this formula, and using the Global Fund’s own stated needs for 2004 and 2005, Aidspan² has calculated what the Equitable Contributions should be for each of the 41 countries defined by the World Bank as "high-income." Of these countries, 21 have not yet pledged anything for 2004 or 2005. These include Austria, Finland, Greece, Portugal, Switzerland and New Zealand. Among countries that have made pledges for these years, six have pledged less than their fair share for 2004 - Australia, Canada, Iceland, Japan, South Korea and Singapore.

According to the Aidspan calculations, so far only two countries - France and the Netherlands - have pledged their fair share for 2005. All other high income countries have so far fallen short. To cite but a few examples:

- the United States has pledged $200 million for 2005, 18 percent of its Equitable Contribution of $1.1 billion;

---

² Aidspan is a US-based NGO whose mission is to increase the effectiveness of the Global Fund. See the last section of this report for contact information.
Japan has not pledged anything for 2005 (its Equitable Contribution would be $709 million);

Germany has pledged $85 million for 2005, 35 percent of its Equitable Contribution of $242 million;

Canada has pledged $52 million for 2005, 45 percent of its Equitable Contribution of $115 million;

the United Kingdom has pledged $58 million for 2005, 30 percent of its Equitable Contribution of $195 million; and

Australia has pledged $4 million for 2005, six percent of its Equitable Contribution of $63 million.

The shortfalls are even greater than what is shown above if one accepts that the Global Fund’s own projected needs are too low.

It is important to point out that the Equitable Contributions Framework represents minimum donations. If some countries donate amounts equal to the minimum, and some countries fall short, the Global Fund will never reach its fundraising goals.
ICASO POSITION

To address the funding crisis faced by the Global Fund, ICASO calls for the following actions to be implemented:

1. ICASO calls on all donor countries and the Global Fund Board to endorse the Equitable Contribution Framework.

2. ICASO calls on all donor countries that have not yet made contributions at least up to their Equitable Contributions for 2004 and 2005 to do so urgently.

3. Civil society organizations should increase and better coordinate their advocacy efforts to promote the Global Fund with the governments of donor countries.
SECTION III
GLOBAL FUND GOVERNANCE
AND OPERATIONS

The following is a summary of the major concerns raised by NGOs concerning the governance and operations of the Global Fund.

Issue No. 1

People living with the diseases lack voice on the Global Fund Board. There are 18 voting positions and five ex-officio (non-voting) positions on the Global Fund board. Although there are two voting positions for NGO representatives, there is only one ex-officio position for a representative of the communities of people living with HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis or malaria.

Issue No. 2

The composition of most government delegations to the Global Fund Board does not adequately reflect public-private partnerships at country level. While two delegations - Italy and Latin America - have included civil society representation on their delegation, most delegations have no civil society members.

Issue No. 3

There have been problems getting money to NGOs who are implementing portions of approved projects. In some countries, PRs have been notoriously slow in moving Global Fund resources, particularly with respect to onward granting to NGOs. Often the PRs are governments, but many governments do not have adequate systems in place to award and track grants to NGOs. For example, in Zimbabwe, the NGOs are ready to begin implementing their portion of the approved Global Fund grant, and the Fund has provided the government with some of the grant monies, but the government has not yet provided the NGOs with the necessary funds.

Issue No. 4

There is a lack of clear criteria concerning the selection and role of PRs. The criteria for selecting PRs are not clear. As a result, there has been a lack of transparency in PR selection. The relationship of PRs to the CCMs is also unclear, and is potentially problematic in that the PRs are more accountable to the Global Fund Secretariat than to CCMs. Despite Global Fund guidance that requires that the PRs provide reports to the CCMs, few PRs are doing so.
Issue No. 5

*There is a lack of coordination between the Global Fund and bilateral funding agencies.* Although there is communication between the Global Fund and a range of bilateral funding agencies, this has not yet resulted in effective coordination of grant-making. Such coordination is crucial if approved projects are to operate efficiently and effectively.

Issue No. 6

*The Global Fund has not created meaningful partnerships with civil society.* Although the Global Fund has entered into formal partnership agreements with agencies such as the World Health Organization and UNAIDS, it has not yet done so with civil society organizations. Through formal partnerships with stable and well-resourced in-country NGOs, the Global Fund could fill some of the gaps that currently exist in the provision of technical support to these NGOs. UN agencies are generally not well positioned to provide this kind of support.
ICASO POSITION

To address the concerns outlined above, related to the governance and operations of the Global Fund, ICASO calls for the following actions to be implemented:

1. The Global Fund should act immediately to ensure voting representation on the Global Fund Board for communities living with HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria.

2. All government delegations to the Global Fund Board should include representation from NGOs and vulnerable populations. Resources need to be allocated to make this happen; the Global Fund can play a role in identifying appropriate sources of funding.

3. Barriers to the flow of funds to NGOs that are implementing portions of approved Global Fund projects must be removed. To accomplish this, some or all of the following steps should be considered: (a) existing PRs should develop and implement as quickly as possible policies and procedures to allow for the timely flow of funds to NGOs; (b) training on the disbursement of funds should be provided for PRs, particularly where governments are acting as PRs; (c) the Global Fund should facilitate the sharing of good practices with respect to the flow of funds from governments to NGOs (e.g., the experiences of the government of Brazil); and (d) NGOs that are experienced in the disbursement of funds should be used as PRs. As well, in future rounds of funding, the criteria for the selection of PRs should include having the capacity to disburse funds to civil society organizations.

4. The Global Fund should develop detailed guidelines concerning the selection, roles and responsibilities of PRs. In particular, these guidelines should address the relationship of the PRs to the CCMs.

5. The Global Fund and bilateral funding agencies should coordinate their granting programs.

6. The Global Fund should enter into formal partnership agreements with civil society organizations, particularly international NGOs working on HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria.
CONCLUSION

As with any new organization, the Global Fund has endured its share of growing pains. As it evolves, it improves. ICASO believes that the Global Fund will continue to improve especially if civil society maintains strong advocacy efforts with the Board, the Secretariat and in-country.

The concerns described in this report need to be addressed soon if the Global Fund hopes to meet its goals and realize its potential. The building blocks for effective partnerships are in place at all levels of the Fund’s operations and governance. But they need to be nurtured and bolstered before they can be fully effective.

The CCM process is a unique opportunity to develop partnerships in-country. The experience of the first few rounds of funding has demonstrated that CCMs work best in countries where civil society and governments are already working well together. Where these partnerships are not happening, where the CCMs are not operating effectively, the Global Fund has an obligation to step in to ensure that sufficient human, financial and technical resources are made available.

The Global Fund is no longer a new experiment. It’s up, it’s running. And it now needs to be based on a financing mechanism that is solid, predictable, reliable, and equitable. Donor governments need to view the Global Fund in the same way that they view their other national priorities, like contributions to international peacekeeping, or investments in domestic school systems. The Global Fund must be based on a truly joint and long-term global commitment to financing the war on AIDS, TB & malaria.

That commitment is what unites us. Much progress has been made to include a range of perspectives in the Global Fund’s governance and its operations. But despite our best combined efforts, important voices remain marginalized and some partnerships are sadly superficial ones.

As this report has demonstrated, there is a lot of work to be done. And it needs to be done quickly. With more and more implementation activities starting up, the possibilities for things to go awry are increasing. However, with strengthened partnerships, systems that run smoothly, representative governance, and realistic donor commitments, the Global Fund has the potential to alter the course of the epidemic. Civil society remains committed to helping the Global Fund to realize that potential, and we will do so by monitoring its progress and participating in its evolution.
KEY RESOURCES AND CONTACTS

Organizations and Individuals

**The Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria**

**Geneva Secretariat**
53, Avenue Louis-Casaï
1216 Geneva-Cointrin, Switzerland
Tel: (41-22) 791 17 00
E-mail: info@theglobalfund.org
Website: http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/

Vacant
Civil Society Relations Manager
Tel: (41-22) 791 1767

**Doris D’ Cruz-Grote**
Coordinator, CCM Development
Tel: (41-22) 791 1790
E-mail: doris.d cruzgrote@theglobalfund.org

**NGO and Community Global Fund Board Members, Alternates and Communication Focal Points**

**Developing Country NGO Representatives**

**REPRESENTATIVE**
Rita Arauz Molina
President, Nimehuatzin Foundation
Nicaragua
Tel: (50-52) 278 0028
E-mail: nimehuatzin@cабlenet.com.ni

**ALTERNATE**
Razia Essack-Kauaria
Secretary General, Namibia Red Cross Society
Tel: (264-61) 23 5226
E-mail: secgen@redcross.org.na

**COMMUNICATION FOCAL POINT**
Lucy Ng’ang’a
Executive Director
Tanzania
Eastern African National Networks of AIDS Service Organizations
Tel: (255-27) 250 7521
E-mail: eannasop@eannaso.org
Developed Country NGO Representatives

REPRESENTATIVE
Hélène Rossert-Blavier
Director General, AIDES, France
Tél: (33-1) 4183 4606
E-mail: hrossert@aides.org

ALTERNATE
Jairo Pedraza
Director, International Programs
Cicatelli Associates Inc., USA
Tél: (1-212) 594-7741 ext. 242
E-mail: jpgfna@aol.com

COMMUNICATION FOCAL POINT
Richard Burzynski
Executive Director
ICASO, Canada
Tél: (1-416) 921-0018 ext.15
E-mail: richardb@icaso.org

Communities Living with the Diseases Representatives

REPRESENTATIVE
Anandi Yuvaraj
Program Officer, India HIV/AIDS Alliance
Tél: (91-11) 51633 081
E-mail: ayuvaraj@allianceindia.org

ALTERNATE
Rodrigo Pascal
Executive Coordinator, Vivo Positivo
REDLA+, Chile
Tél: (56-2) 635 9396
E-mail: rpascal@vivopositivo.org

COMMUNICATION FOCAL POINT
Stuart Flavell
Executive Director
Global Network of People Living with HIV/AIDS (GNP+)
The Netherlands
Tél: (31-20) 423 4114
E-mail: infognp@gnpplus.net

Other Organizations

Aidspan
Website: www.aidspan.org

Fund-the-Fund Campaign
Website: www.fundthefund.org
## Documents

**The following documents can be obtained from the Global Fund:**

The Framework Document of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria  

Analysis of CCM Memberships at Rounds 1, 2 & 3  
Available at http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/about/structures/ccm_analysis/

Guidelines on the Purpose, Structure and Composition of Country Coordinating Mechanisms  
Available at http://www.theglobalfund.org/pdf/5_pp_guidelines_ccm_4_en.pdf

**The following document can be obtained from GNP+:**

A Multi-Country Study of the Involvement of People Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) in the Country Coordinating Mechanisms (CCM)  
Available at http://www.gnpplus.net/ccm-reports.html

**The following documents can be obtained from ICASO:**

Fund the Fund Advocacy Guide: An Urgent Call to Civil Society Organizations  
Available at http://www.icaso.org/icaso/gfatm/fundthefund.htm

Global Fund Update -- Information on the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria  

**The following documents can be obtained from Aidspan:**  
Available at http://www.aidspan.org/guides/index.htm

The Aidspan Guide to Obtaining Global Fund-Related Technical Assistance  
(First edition, released 11 January 2004)

The Aidspan Guide to Applying to the Global Fund  

The Aidspan Guide to Building and Running an Effective CCM  
(Due second quarter 2004)

The Aidspan Guide to Surviving Global Fund Assessments and Negotiating a Global Fund Grant Agreement  
(Provisional title)  
(Due second half 2004)

The Aidspan Guide to Procurement and Supply Management for Recipients of Global Fund Grants  
(Due second half 2004)

An Updated Analysis of the Equitable Contributions Framework regarding the Global Fund, 21 May 2004  
Available at http://www.aidspan.org/gfo/docs/gfo61.pdf
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