

GLOBAL FUND OBSERVER (GFO), an independent newsletter about the Global Fund provided by Aidspace to over 9,000 subscribers in 170 countries.

Issue 172: 16 December 2011. (For formatted web, Word and PDF versions of this and other issues, see [www.aidspace.org/gfo](http://www.aidspace.org/gfo).)

+++++

## CONTENTS

+++++

### [1. ANNOUNCEMENT: Aidspace, Publisher of GFO, Seeks New Executive Director](#)

This article consists of a reprint of an announcement from Heidrick and Struggles, a global executive search firm.

### [2. COMMENTARY: Moving On](#)

“I founded Aidspace, publisher of GFO, nearly ten years ago,” says Bernard Rivers. “It’s time for me to hand over leadership to someone else. I strongly believe that no founder should run his or her own organisation for more than a decade. If you are interested in this role, or know others who might be, please consider applying. You will be providing a real service to Aidspace, and to future GFO readers, if you engage in some creative thinking about who should apply.”

### [3. NEWS: OIG Releases Audit Report on 12 Grants in Sri Lanka](#)

On 31 October 2011, the Office of the Inspector General released the final report of an audit on 12 grants in Sri Lanka, involving three principal recipients. The OIG identified what it called “losses” of \$2.6 million. Two of the PRs disputed some of the OIG’s findings.

### [4. NEWS: OIG Issues Progress Report and 2012 Work Plan](#)

The Office of the Inspector General has conducted an investigation into actions of a fund portfolio manager in the Global Fund Secretariat, and has concluded that some allegations against the FPM have merit. This is just one of many topics covered by the OIG’s progress report for the period April–October 2011.

### [5. NEWS: Should the Global Fund Try to Recover All “Losses”?, Sub-Committee Asks](#)

In a report to the Board, the Finance and Audit Committee’s Sub-Committee on OIG Matters asks whether it is worth trying to recover “losses” from “ineligible” and “undocumented” expenditures from grants in the early rounds of funding, considering that these losses occurred some time ago, and the fact that, at the time, the Global Fund and the implementers were in “emergency mode.”

### [6. NEWS: Board Adopts Evaluation Strategy](#)

The Global Fund’s new five-year Evaluation Strategy is built around three types of evaluations: programme evaluations to assess performance, efficiency and quality; thematic evaluations to assess the success of key initiatives; and impact evaluations at country and global levels.

### [7. NEWS: New Partnership Combines Entertainment with Prevention Messages and HIV Testing](#)

Sony Corporation and the Global Fund are collaborating on behaviour change projects, where Sony provides state of the art equipment and movies, and the Global Fund ensures that they are provided to agencies best able to reach communities most in need.

+++++

## **1. ANNOUNCEMENT: Aidspan, Publisher of GFO, Seeks New Executive Director**

*We reprint here an announcement by Heidrick and Struggles, a global executive search firm.*

Aidspan is an independent watchdog of the *Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria*, and is publisher of *Global Fund Observer*, read by nearly 10,000 health and development professionals globally. Aidspan aims to work as a critical friend of the Global Fund, undertaking research and facilitating discussion, with a mission to reinforce and improve the effectiveness of the organisation. It has an annual budget of circa \$2 million.

The founder of Aidspan, Bernard Rivers, will hand over the Executive Director position in mid-2012, having led the organisation successfully for a decade. During this time, Aidspan has grown in influence and regard, developing substantive donor relationships, and relocating from New York to Nairobi. A successor is sought to provide leadership for the next phase, managing a team of 13 staff and further developing strong external relationships with stakeholders and funders. The entrepreneurial nature of Aidspan means that the Executive Director is an active do-er, engaging in research and analysis, as well as overall leader.

Ideal candidates will combine strength in developing vision and strategy with an outstanding aptitude for research/analysis. They will be compelling communicators, and experienced managers of people and budgets. A demonstrable commitment to the goals of the Global Fund is essential, along with a track record of positive external relationship management. The annual salary will be about \$140,000, plus excellent benefits.

To apply for this position or to receive further particulars, please visit [www.heidrick.com/aidspan](http://www.heidrick.com/aidspan). Email: [aidspan@heidrick.com](mailto:aidspan@heidrick.com). Telephone: +44 (0)20 7075 4079. The closing date for applications is 3 February 2012.

+++++

## **2. COMMENTARY: Moving On**

by Bernard Rivers

I founded Aidspan, publisher of GFO, nearly ten years ago. It's time for me to hand over leadership to someone else. I strongly believe that no founder should run his or her own organisation for more than a decade. I also believe that once people turn sixty-five (as I did recently, though I find it hard to believe), they should make way for younger people and should turn their attention to freelance work, pro bono work and having fun.

So Aidspan's Board is today launching a vigorous worldwide search for a new Executive Director. Full details can be found at the website of our executive search firm, Heidrick and Struggles. See [www.heidrick.com/aidspan](http://www.heidrick.com/aidspan).

I'll continue working as Executive Director (E.D.) until a new E.D. is chosen and can start work, which we hope will be by 1 July 2012. From then until the end of 2013, I'll be available to Aidspace on a consulting basis, including for the writing of GFO articles.

The Global Fund is different from most other funding agencies; it incorporates some bold and innovative ideas. And Aidspace is also different; there's no other organisation quite like it. We are a watchdog of the Fund, but a "loving watchdog" that would far rather wag its tail than bark or bite. In addition, taking advantage of our complete independence of the Global Fund and our receiving no money from it, we seek to "deconstruct" the Global Fund, explaining to thousands of people who are involved in applying for or implementing Global Fund grants what exactly we believe the Fund means or wants. Unfortunately, the need for someone to play this role appears to be as strong as ever – as I pointed out in a recent Commentary where I grumpily complained that the press release through which the Fund reported on what had happened at the recent Accra Board meeting did not contain the words "cancel" or "Round 11."

Because I founded Aidspace, I of course have had a major influence on what exactly Aidspace does. But during the search for Aidspace's second Executive Director, the Board will not look for a clone of me. The Board will look for someone who has qualities that overlap with mine, but are not identical to them. And the new E.D., with these different qualities, will have a major influence on the course that Aidspace takes. Which is as it should be.

If you are interested in this role, or know others who might be – including people who have little or no experience of the Global Fund world – please go to [www.heidrick.com/aidspace](http://www.heidrick.com/aidspace) to learn more about what Aidspace does, what it is looking for, and how to apply. You will be providing a real service to Aidspace, and to future GFO readers, if you engage in some creative thinking about who should apply. All applications will, of course, be treated in confidence.

Bernard Rivers ([bernard.rivers@aidspace.org](mailto:bernard.rivers@aidspace.org)) is Executive Director of Aidspace and Editor of GFO.

+ + + + +

### **3. NEWS: OIG Releases Audit Report on 12 Grants in Sri Lanka**

*"Losses" of \$2.6 million identified by the OIG*

#### **Two of the PRs dispute some of the OIG's findings**

*Editor's note: By their very nature, audits tend to focus on what is not working well, and to devote much less space to what is working satisfactorily. This summary of the OIG audit in Sri Lanka reflects that "bias."*

On 31 October 2011, the Global Fund's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) released the final report of an audit on 12 grants in Sri Lanka from Rounds 1–8, involving three principal recipients (PRs). The three PRs were:

- Ministry of Health Care and Nutrition (MOH&N) – six grants: HIV, Round 6; malaria, Rounds 1, 4, 8; and TB, Rounds 1, 6
- Lanka Jatika Sarvodaya Shramadana Sangamaya (Sarvodaya) – five grants: malaria, Rounds 1, 4, 8; and TB, Rounds 1, 6
- Tropical Environmental Disease and Health Associates Pvt. Ltd (TEDHA) – one grant: malaria, Round 8

The audit was conducted in 2010. The value of all 12 grants was \$63 million, of which \$22 million had been disbursed at the time of the audit.

This article provides a summary of the OIGs comments on the performance of the PRs, and on the oversight provided by the CCM, the LFA and the Global Fund Secretariat.

For all three PRs combined, the OIG observed weak financial controls and multiple instances of failing to comply with the grant agreement and failing to adequately conform to policies, operating standards and sound commercial practices. The OIG concluded that the internal control environment of the grants requires significant improvement.

For all grants combined, the OIG identified what it called “losses” of \$2.6 million which, it said, should be refunded to the Global Fund. These losses consisted of ineligible and unsupported expenditures. The OIG defines “ineligible” expenditures as costs not in line with the budget and workplan approved by the Global Fund. The OIG defines “unsupported” expenditures as those lacking adequate supporting documents to provide evidence that the activity took place and that the expenditure was in line with programme activities. None of the losses identified by the OIG were in the category of “fraud” or “misappropriations.”

The OIG noted weaknesses in financial management systems that applied in some cases to two PRs and in some cases to all three PRs. These included ineffective monitoring of expenditures; using inferior accounting software; co-mingling of grant funds with funds from other donors without an accounting system that could segregate the bank balances by donor; and recording of expenses under incorrect budget lines. The OIG also noted weaknesses in procurement and supply chain management, such as a lack of adequate documentation to support procurements; and failure to enter data into the Global Fund’s Price Quality Reporting (PQR) mechanism.

### **Ministry of Health Care and Nutrition (MOH&N)**

The seven grants administered by the MOH&N had a total value of \$44 million, of which \$11 million had been disbursed at the time of the audit.

The OIG identified “losses” of \$1.4 million in the grants managed by the MOH&N, made up of \$1.2 million in ineligible expenditures and \$0.2 million in unsupported expenditures. One example of ineligible expenditures concerned the purchase of vehicles. The OIG said that MOH&N spent \$368,472 in excess of what had been budgeted. A second example of ineligible expenditures was \$616,241 in inter-grant transfers for which the OIG said there was no evidence of prior approval by the Global Fund. A third example involved \$189,779 for the payment of taxes on the purchase of goods and services despite the fact that the programme had tax exemption status.

One example of expenditures that the OIG said were unsupported was travel expenses without proof of travel.

In addition, the OIG said that there were several instances where value for money did not appear to have been realised – for example, the purchase of 50 microscopes in 2006 which were only distributed at the time of the audit in 2010.

Finally, with respect to sub-recipient (SR) management, the OIG said that there was no system in place to ensure regular reporting from SRs; and that the MOH&N failed to develop formal guidelines spelling out the operational, financial and budgeting requirements that SRs should comply with when administering Global Fund grants.

### **Lanka Jatika Sarvodaya Shramadana Sangamaya (Sarvodaya)**

The five grants administered by the Sarvodaya had a total value of \$14 million, of which \$8 million had been disbursed at the time of the audit.

The OIG identified “losses” of \$1.2 million in the grants managed by Sarvodaya, made up of \$0.4 million in ineligible expenditures and \$0.8 million in unsupported expenditures.

Most of the ineligible expenditures concerned \$305,124 in inter-grant transfers, for the Round 1 malaria grant, for which the OIG said there was no evidence of prior approval by the Global Fund. The OIG provided the following details: (1) One bank account was used for both the Round 1 malaria grant and the Round 1 TB grant (also managed by Sarvodaya), and \$167,671 that should have been used for malaria was used instead for TB; (2) \$91,935 was transferred to the MOH&N; and (3) \$45,518 was transferred to the Anti-Malaria Campaign (AMC), a programme not covered by the Global Fund. The OIG said that the transfers raised the risk that funds would not be available when needed to implement programme activities.

In the audit report, the OIG did not provide a breakdown of the expenditures that it said were not supported.

With respect to SR management, the OIG observed that Sarvodaya did not have documented eligibility criteria for the selection of SRs; and there was no system in place to ensure regular reporting from SRs.

### **Tropical Environmental Disease and Health Associates Pvt. Ltd (TEDHA)**

The one grant administered by TEDHA had a total value of \$5.2 million, of which \$2.8 million had been disbursed at the time of the audit.

The OIG identified “losses” of \$85,583, made up entirely of ineligible expenditures. Examples of ineligible expenditures were payments for the project director’s residence; and payments to consultants (including TEDHA’s directors) that exceeded actual time worked.

### **Oversight**

**CCM.** The OIG noted that PRs and SRs sat on the CCM, and that the CCM’s conflict of interest policy was inadequate to mitigate the resultant risks. In addition, the CCM was inadequately funded, so programme funds had to be used to cover CCM-related costs.

**LFA.** PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) was the LFA from the start of the grants. The OIG said that although PwC had made some effort to improve its performance over time, including increasing the number of staff involved, only twice in the seven years the grants were operational did PwC procurement experts get involved – despite the fact that procurement comprises 70% of the Sri Lankan grants.

**Secretariat.** The OIG noted that there had been no systematic process in place to monitor recommendations from LFA reviews.

### **Recommendations and Follow-Up**

The audit report advanced 40 recommendations to address the weaknesses noted in the audits. Many of these recommendations had been made earlier, at the de-briefings held in-country at the conclusion of the field visits, and when the draft audit report was prepared.

In its report, the OIG commended the commitment of in-country stakeholders to address the audit’s recommendations, and stated that the recommendations were already being

implemented at a rapid rate. Some details are provided in a letter from the Global Fund Secretariat which is included in the audit report.

The audit report contains an annex where the OIG recommendations are listed, and comments are provided by the entity to whom the recommendations were addressed – i.e., Secretariat, PRs, LFA, CCM.

#### *MOH&N*

Concerning the “loss” of \$616,241 that the OIG said was transferred between grants by the MOH&N without the prior approval of the Global Fund, the MOH&N told GFO when we were preparing this article that this occurred during a transfer from a general bank account to a grant-specific bank account, and that this matter was fully resolved in September 2010.

#### *Sarvodaya*

In the annex to the audit report, Sarvodaya provides an explanation for the inter-grant transfers identified by the OIG as losses. With respect to the \$167,671 that the OIG said was spent on the TB programme instead of the malaria programme, Sarvodaya said that this “payment” was made on the advice of the LFA, and that the expenditure is reflected in the TB grant. Therefore, Sarvodaya said, this amount can be treated as actual programme expenditure under the TB grant.

Concerning the \$87,291 that the OIG said was transferred to the MOH&N, Sarvodaya said that this amount was paid to MOH&N as a loan for the Global Fund-supported programme at the National Programme for TB Control & Chest Diseases (NPTCCD); and that this was done at the request of the Director of NPTCCD, and with approval of the fund portfolio manager at the Global Fund Secretariat. Sarvodaya said that the \$87,291 was subsequently returned to the bank account used for the Round 1 grants, and that this matter has therefore been settled.

(Note: There is some confusion in the audit report concerning whether the amount of the transfer to MOH&N was \$93,135, as reported earlier in this article, or \$87,291 as mentioned by Sarvodaya in its comments.)

With respect to the \$45,588 that the OIG said was transferred to AMC, Sarvodaya said that this amount constituted savings from a grant managed by another PR, was transferred to AMC to overcome a cash flow shortfall and, on instructions from the fund portfolio manager, was used for activities in the Round 1 malaria grant managed by the MOH&N.

When we provided Sarvodaya with a draft of this article, Sarvodaya responded that the “losses” referred to in our article “were fully explained (with all required supporting documents)” in the OIG report “and accepted by the OIG.” Sarvodaya said that it would be “factually incorrect” to refer to these as “losses” and that to do so would be “not only erroneous but un-ethical” and “unfairly damaging to the reputation of the organisations concerned.”

When contacted by GFO, the OIG said that while Sarvodaya’s comments about the losses identified by the OIG were included in the final audit report, the OIG did not receive any supporting documents to back up Sarvodaya’s comments. The OIG added that the OIG’s calculation of ineligible expenses would only be reduced if Sarvodaya’s claims concerning the losses “can be accepted with verification on supporting documents.”

*Editor’s note: In this article on the Sri Lanka audit, as in all articles we have written about the audits and investigations conducted by the OIG, we do not express an opinion about the accuracy of the OIG’s findings or the validity of its determinations. We simply report what the*





Sub-Committee noted that there are still on-going discussions between the Secretariat and the OIG on the issue of categorisation of losses, and said that these discussions should be documented for the new Audit and Ethics Committee.

Further, the Sub-Committee said that the Audit and Ethics Committee “may wish to consider” exploring the idea of asking principal recipients (PRs) to pay for any additional expenditure incurred by the OIG as a result of a lack of cooperation with the OIG. (In its report on the investigation into foreign currency exchanges in four grants in Nigeria, for which the PR was the Yakubu Gowon Centre [YGC], the OIG said that the Global Fund should seek reimbursement from YGC to compensate for the costs of the investigation because of what the OIG called YGC's "misrepresentations and failure to cooperate.") The Sub-Committee noted that one option being discussed by another funding agency is to request payment of the entire audit or investigation cost in cases where substantial evidence of mis-use of funds is identified.

The Sub-Committee said that with increasing requirements being imposed on implementers, as a result of measures taken by the Global Fund to reduce risk, there is a very real risk that some implementers may no longer wish to work with the Fund.

Elsewhere in its report, the Sub-Committee noted that drug theft continues to be a key risk for the Global Fund, and there is evidence of a sophisticated and organised effort to distribute goods on the black market. The Sub-Committee also noted that the OIG currently has 10 investigations related to bed nets, involving diversion, thefts, counterfeiting, missing nets and collusion in procurement.

With respect to the recent OIG reports, the Sub-Committee said that the style and tone of the reports have improved; that there is more consistency in the reports; and that the Secretariat responses are more clear. The Sub-Committee applauded the fact that recent reports from the OIG contained more comments from the PRs involved.

Other items of interest from the Sub-Committee report were as follows:

- The OIG will apply the “Round 6 and after” recommendation to new work, but not to work currently underway. (The High-Level Panel recommended that the OIG concentrate its efforts on the more recent rounds of funding.)
- A Secretariat staffer, Elmar Vinh Thomas, formerly Team Leader of the East and Pacific region, has been appointed as the Director of Audit at the OIG.

*The report of the Sub-Committee should be available shortly at [www.theglobalfund.org/en/board/meetings/twentyfifth](http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/board/meetings/twentyfifth). Look for "GF/B25/15."*

Postscript:

*Bernard Rivers, GFO Editor, writes:*

*In a [Commentary](#) in GFO 166 on “The Most Important and Difficult Global Fund Board Meeting Ever,” I said:*

*“Thus far, the OIG has identified \$17 million in fraud across all grants that it has audited and investigated. But it has identified almost three times as much – \$48 million – in other forms of “loss” that must be refunded...”*

*That computation was based on Attachment 2 to the report of the Board sub-committee that is the subject of this article. However, that attachment mentions “losses” from Mauritania twice, once based on an earlier investigation and once based on an updated investigation, which led me to engage in some double-counting. If that double-counting is eliminated, the above quote should have read:*

*“Thus far, the OIG has identified \$10 million in fraud across all grants that it has audited and investigated. But it has identified almost five times as much – \$48 million – in other forms of “loss” that must be refunded...”*

*This actually reinforces rather than weakens the point I was making. The total amount of fraud that the OIG has thus far publicly identified across all the countries that it has audited and investigated is \$10,349,065, which is under 0.1% of the money that the Global Fund has disbursed thus far (though of course, the OIG has not yet audited all recipients of those disbursements, and has not yet published reports on all of its audits and investigations).*

+++++

## **6. NEWS: Board Adopts Evaluation Strategy**

As reported in our Board decisions [article](#) in GFO 167, the Global Fund Board has approved a five-year Evaluation Strategy. This article provides additional information.

The objectives of the Evaluation Strategy are (1) to assess the effectiveness and impact of Global Fund initiatives and investments; (2) to assess the implementation progress and success of the Global Fund Strategy 2012–2016; (3) to assess the implementation progress and success of the recommendations of the High-Level Panel; and (4) to estimate the contribution of Global Fund investments to Millennium Development Goals 4, 5 and 6.

The Strategy is built around three types of evaluations: (1) programme evaluations to assess performance, efficiency and quality; (2) thematic evaluations to assess the success of key initiatives; and (3) impact evaluations at country and global levels.

With respect to programme evaluations, the Global Fund will support, and participate in, multi-partner national programme reviews conducted by national disease programmes. In addition, the Global Fund will conduct 10-12 programme evaluations each year which the Fund says incorporate “more robust methodology” than the national programme reviews.

Thematic evaluations will examine specific thematic areas, such as gender equality and harm reduction, across the entire grant portfolio.

Concerning impact evaluations, the Global Fund will develop mechanisms to better attribute the impact of its investments. In addition, the Fund will collaborate with partners to undertake joint evaluations of impact at both country and portfolio levels.

The Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG) will coordinate an evaluation of the Global Fund at the end of its 12<sup>th</sup> year. That evaluation will be on a smaller scale than the five-year evaluation completed in 2008. There will be a systematic review and synthesis of evaluations conducted to date and over the next few years; and TERG will commission additional studies to fill critical knowledge gaps.

*Although approved by the Board at its meeting in Accra, the Evaluation Strategy is not contained in any of the Board documents from this meeting.*

+++++

## **7. NEWS: New Partnership Combines Entertainment with Prevention Messages and HIV Testing**

Sony Corporation and the Global Fund have entered into a partnership for the implementation of behaviour change projects, in which Sony provides state of the art equipment and movies, and the Global Fund ensures that they are provided to agencies best able to reach communities most in need.

In November, the partnership completed a pilot project in Tanzania with the African Medical and Research Foundation (AMREF). Sony donated equipment to AMREF that included a 150-inch screen (about 3.8 metres) together with a projector and sound system that are customised for easy transport and tough outdoor conditions. AMREF then organised public viewings in low-income areas such as Temeke in Dar es Salaam, as well as smaller cities like Tanga, Moshi and Arusha, where the HIV prevalence rate is high.

The project aims to attract young people who are at high risk of HIV infection by using the donated equipment to screen a mix of public health information and entertainment programmes, including movies provided by Sony Pictures Entertainment. Around the same time, voluntary HIV testing and counselling are offered at the public viewing venues. During the events, 2,482 people were tested for HIV.

Sony staff trained AMREF personnel on how to use the equipment for future prevention and education initiatives. Sony said that similar projects would be conducted in other countries and regions.

The Global Fund said that there are one million people living with HIV in Tanzania, out of which 450,000 need antiretroviral treatment (ART). At present, 250,000 of them have access to ART.

*Information for this article was taken from a Global Fund [press release](#).*

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

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

**We welcome suggestions for topics we could cover in GFO. If you have a suggestion, please send it to the Editor of GFO (see contact information below).**

*Author:* Articles 3-7 were written by David Garmaise ([david.garmaise@aidspan.org](mailto: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](http://www.theglobalfund.org)). *GFO* is emailed to over 9,000 subscribers in 170 countries at least twelve times per year.

*GFO* is a free service of Aidspan ([www.aidspan.org](http://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](mailto: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](http://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 – 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition" at [www.aidspan.org/guides](http://www.aidspan.org/guides).**

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

To receive *GFO* (if you haven't already subscribed), send an email to [receive-gfo-newsletter@aidspan.org](mailto:receive-gfo-newsletter@aidspan.org). Subject line and text can be left blank. (You will receive one to two issues per month.)

For *GFO* background information and previous issues, see [www.aidspan.org/gfo](http://www.aidspan.org/gfo).

For information on all approved proposals submitted to the Global Fund, see [www.aidspan.org/grants](http://www.aidspan.org/grants).

People interested in writing articles for *GFO* are invited to email the editor, above.

Copyright (c) 2011 Aidspan. All rights reserved.