

GLOBAL FUND OBSERVER (GFO) NEWSLETTER, a service of Aidspace.

Issue 40 – Monday 7 March 2005. (For formatted web, Word and PDF versions of this and other issues, see www.aidspace.org/gfo)

++++++
CONTENTS
++++++

[NEWS: "Phase 2 Renewal" Process Leads to Cancellation of a Global Fund Grant](#)

The Global Fund has informed Senegal that it will not renew a malaria grant that is approaching the end of its second year, because of "systemic issues that resulted in poor performance." This is the first Global Fund grant to be terminated by the Fund after two years rather than being renewed for Years 3 through 5.

[NEWS: Round 5 to Commence Soon](#)

The Fund will issue its Round 5 "Call for Proposals" on March 17. On that date the new Proposal Form and the accompanying Guidelines for Proposals will be published. Completed applications must be delivered to the Fund by June 10, and the board will make its decisions at the end of September.

[ADVICE: CCMs need to Move Fast to Implement New Requirements](#)

CCMs wishing to apply for Round 5, or to be approved for Phase 2 renewal, will have to provide documentation proving that CCM members representing the non-government sectors have been selected by their own sector(s) based on a documented, transparent process, developed within each sector. This will require some CCMs to take some fast action.

[NEWS: Fund Prepares for First Replenishment Conference in Stockholm](#)

Next week, in Stockholm, the Fund will hold the first of two meetings of its first "Voluntary Replenishment Mechanism." The main objectives will be for donors to assess the performance of the Fund, to assess the Fund's ability to handle a larger volume of funding, and to agree on a funding target for 2006 and 2007. In September, pledges for 2006-7 will then be agreed.

[NEWS: Fund Releases New Forecasts of Financial Needs](#)

The Fund, whose average revenue during each of the past three years was just over \$1 billion, forecasts that its total needs for 2005, 2006 and 2007 will be \$2.2 b., \$3.6 b. and \$3.7 b., respectively.

[ANALYSIS: Successes and Failures Among Grants Reviewed for Phase 2](#)

Twenty-seven percent of the grants that have just been considered for Phase 2 renewal were rated as having performance that was "Inadequate, but potential demonstrated," or "Unacceptable."

[NEWS: Report from Fund Lists Some New Developments](#)

The Fund is about to publish an Executive Dashboard monitoring its own performance. The Fund has studied the effectiveness of LFAs. In some countries, "the CCM model is an idea somewhat ahead of its time and has not worked as well as hoped." The Fund has developed a simple CCM checklist which will serve as a basis for regular sample audits.

+++++

NEWS: "Phase 2 Renewal" Process Leads to Cancellation of a Global Fund Grant

+++++

The Global Fund has informed Senegal that it will not renew a malaria grant that is approaching the end of its second year, because of "systemic issues that resulted in poor performance." This is the first Global Fund grant to be terminated by the Fund after two years rather than being renewed for Years 3 through 5.

From the day that it was established, the Global Fund has made it clear – both to donors and recipients – that it is "results-based." This is a two-sided arrangement. On the one hand, it means that the Fund does not tell countries what funded grants must consist of; instead it lets countries specify what they will do if the grants are approved, on condition that they also specify what results these actions are expected to deliver. But on the other hand, it means that if countries do not then deliver the promised actions, or if they do not achieve something reasonably close to the anticipated results, their grants will be in danger of being terminated by the Fund after two years.

All grants are approved in principle for five years. But at the start, funding is only committed for two years. Funding for Phase 2 (that is, Years 3 through 5) is only approved after an in-depth review conducted by the Fund's Secretariat in the middle of the second year. Approval needs to be agreed to by both the Secretariat and the Board.

In recent weeks, the first 26 grants have been reviewed for Phase 2 renewal. Of these:

- 22 grants were recommended by the Secretariat for renewal, and each was approved by the board. These grants (all of which were Round 1 grants except for two Round 2 HIV grants in Madagascar) were Benin – Malaria; Burundi – HIV; China – TB; China – Malaria; Ghana – HIV; Ghana – TB; Haiti – HIV (2 grants, combined into one for Phase 2); Honduras – TB; Honduras – Malaria; India – TB; LAO PDR – Malaria; Madagascar – Malaria; Madagascar – HIV (2 grants); Moldova – TB/HIV; Mongolia – TB; Morocco – HIV; Panama – TB; Rwanda – TB/HIV; Tajikistan – HIV; Zanzibar – Malaria. The total renewal cost of these grants is \$119 million.
- Two grants (LAO PDR – HIV, and Senegal – HIV.) were recommended by the Global Fund Secretariat not to be renewed, but based in part on advice from the TRP, the Board disagreed. The Secretariat will re-review these two grants, and will seek in April to present a recommendation that the board supports. Thus, these two grants might end up being approved for Phase 2, or they might not.
- One grant (Senegal – Malaria) was recommended by the Global Fund Secretariat not to be renewed, and the TRP and the board agreed with this. As a result, the grant will be terminated soon, at the end of its second year.
- One grant (Honduras – HIV) is still being reviewed. The Secretariat originally recommended that this grant not be renewed, but the Honduras government lodged a protest after commissioning and receiving a lengthy report from an independent external four-person team of health economists and HIV/AIDS experts. The Secretariat then concluded that some of the information it had received from the LFA was incomplete and/or inaccurate, and the Secretariat is now seeking additional data.

For further details regarding the 26 grants, see "ANALYSIS: Successes and Failures Among Grants Reviewed for Phase 2," below.

The terminated Senegal malaria grant was over a year behind schedule, with only 36% of its two-year budget disbursed since its official start date almost two years ago. After 18 months, the Principal Recipient (the Ministry of Health) had still not entered into contractual relationships with its Sub-Recipients and had not reported any disbursements to Sub-Recipients. The Secretariat found "serious weaknesses in the PR's financial and programmatic management capacities." In addition, the CCM was functioning poorly, with problems of governance and internal coordination, partly

because the person who was serving as Minister of Health (who chairs the CCM) had been changed four times in sixteen months.

From now on, the Fund will consider further grants for Phase 2 renewal almost every month. The Fund has budgeted on the assumption that 15% of grants will not be approved for Phase 2, and has devised procedures to be followed during the wind-down when terminated grants have people on life-saving treatment.

++++
NEWS: Round 5 to Commence Soon
++++

The Fund will issue its Round 5 "Call for Proposals" on March 17, as previously reported. On that date the new Proposal Form and the accompanying Guidelines for Proposals will be published at the Fund's web site. Completed applications must be delivered to the Fund by June 10, and the board will make its decisions at the end of September. Further details, including a draft version of the Guidelines, are available at www.theglobalfund.org/en/apply/call.

Immediately after the Call for Proposals, Aidspan, publisher of *Global Fund Observer*, will publish "The Aidspan Guide to Round 5 Applications to the Global Fund." This will include a chapter on lessons learned from the TRP's comments on Round 3 and Round 4 applications, and a chapter providing step-by-step advice for filling out the application form. The Guide will be announced in GFO, and will be available at www.aidspan.org/guides.

++++
ADVICE: CCMs need to Move Fast to Implement New Requirements
by Bernard Rivers
++++

At its November meeting, the Global Fund Board resolved that for all proposals submitted for Round 5, and for all Phase 2 renewals as of June 2005, CCMs must follow some key new requirements. Because these are requirements rather than just recommendations, the Round 5 application form can be expected to ask for proof that these requirements have been implemented.

The requirements are:

- (a) "All CCMs are required to show evidence of membership of people living with and/or affected by the diseases;"
- (b) "CCM members representing the non-government sectors must be selected by their own sector(s) based on a documented, transparent process, developed within each sector;"
[Note: It was made clear that "the non-government sectors" means each sector that is not part of the national government.]
- (c) "CCMs are required to put in place and maintain a transparent, documented process to:
 - Solicit and review submissions for possible integration into the proposal;
 - Nominate the Principal Recipient(s) and oversee program implementation;
 - Ensure the input of a broad range of stakeholders, including CCM members and non-members, in the proposal development and grant oversight process"

Many CCMs will find it difficult to show documentary proof that requirements (b) and (c) have already been put in place.

Here is a possible path forward. (Certainly there are other options. Each CCM will need to form its own judgment as to the best approach.)

1. The CCM could set up a Special Working Group (SWG) to examine which of the above requirements have not yet been implemented, and to recommend back to the CCM how to proceed in each case.

2. The CCM could adopt the SWG's recommendations (amended as necessary), recording this in the minutes.
3. If the above two steps HAVE been completed by June 2005, the CCM could include in its Round 5 application(s), and/or in its requests for Phase 2 approval, a copy of the relevant minutes, and a copy of the accompanying documentation required in items (b) and (c) above. (Note that the documentation required in (b) is not just documentation of CCM procedures, but documentation of procedures developed within the various sectors.)
4. But if the above two steps have NOT been completed by June 2005, the CCM could submit minutes that very clearly state that it is the CCM's intention to do these things, that the process is under way, and that the process will be completed prior to board approval of Round 5 proposals in late September.

More detailed suggestions will be provided in "The Aidspan Guide to Round 5 Applications to the Global Fund," scheduled for release on March 17.

[Bernard Rivers (rivers@aidspan.org) is Executive Director of Aidspan and Editor of its GFO. He recently advised a large CCM on implementation of the new CCM requirements.]

++++
NEWS: Fund Prepares for First Replenishment Meeting in Stockholm
 ++++

Next week, in Stockholm, the Fund will hold the first of two meetings of its first "Voluntary Replenishment Mechanism." The second meeting will take place in London in September. Further rounds of the Replenishment Mechanism are expected to be held every two or three years.

The overall objective of the two Replenishment Meetings is to persuade – and help – donors to plan their financial contributions to the Fund on a more systematic and predictable basis.

At present, donor announcements of how much they will give are made on an ad hoc basis, which makes it difficult for the Fund to plan its work, and makes it difficult for grant applicants to know how much money will be available in future years.

At next week's meeting, donors will learn about and discuss the Fund's work thus far and its plans for the future. Then they will communicate with each other, with domestic decision-makers, and with the Fund, prior to meeting again in September to announce their funding decisions.

When the first pledges were made to the Fund in 2002 and 2003, they represented indications of faith in what it was hoped the Fund would become. But starting with this year's Replenishment Meetings, donors will not be satisfied with dreams and plans, they will want to see the evidence of results and impact.

This month's meeting will be hosted by the government of Sweden; September's meeting will be hosted by the UK government.

Sven Sandström, Vice Chair of the Replenishment Mechanism (standing in for Kofi Annan, the Chair) has told likely participants that the main objectives of next week's meeting will be to assess the performance of the Fund, to assess the Fund's ability to handle a larger volume of funding, and to agree on a funding target for 2006 and 2007. However, the extensive outstanding needs for 2005 will certainly feature.

Last November, the board agreed to commission an independent study of "the options and choices available to the Global Fund in its fiscal management structure and processes." This will examine factors such as the Fund's current Comprehensive Funding Policy, which states that before the Fund signs any grant agreement, it must place in the bank the entire amount that implementing that agreement will cost. (This means that the Fund finds itself sitting on a multi-billion dollar "cash mountain" which, although it is all spoken for, gives the impression that the Fund has spare cash

when in fact it does not.) The study is currently being carried out by PricewaterhouseCoopers, and will be completed in April. This will enable participants in the Replenishment Mechanism to study it thoroughly before the September meeting.

++++
NEWS: Fund Releases New Forecasts of Financial Needs
 ++++

In a new report "The Resource Needs of the Global Fund 2005-2007", prepared for the Stockholm meeting and available at www.theglobalfund.org/en/about/replenishment, the Fund has calculated its future needs using two independent methods.

The first method, known informally as the "bottom-up" method, is the primary demand-forecasting mechanism that the Fund uses. It calculates the need based on when future Rounds of grants are expected to be approved, and how much it is expected to cost to pay for successful proposals in those rounds.

As of 23 February 2005, this leads to the following. It is worth noting that although the amount of money promised thus far for 2005 (\$1.3 billion) is close to the largest amount raised in any past year, it is only enough to pay for grant renewals this year. Any new grants to be approved in Round 5 will have to be paid out of 2005 pledges not yet received.

Table 1: Global Fund Revenue and Needs, by Year

	2001-2	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Future needs:						
New grant proposals (Phase 1)				\$1.0 b.	\$1.1 b.	\$2.6 b.
Renewal of grants (Phase 2)				\$1.3 b.	\$2.4 b.	\$1.0 b.
Adjustments				-\$0.1 b.	\$0.1 b.	\$0.1 b.
Thus, total contributions needed				\$2.2 b.	\$3.6 b.	\$3.7 b.
Contributions/Pledges	\$1.0 b.	\$0.9 b.	\$1.4 b.	\$1.3 b.	\$0.7 b.	\$0.4 b.
Thus, additional pledges needed				\$0.9 b.	\$2.9 b.	\$3.3 b.

The table is based on the assumptions that (a) Round 5 grants will be approved in 2005, Round 6 in 2006 and Rounds 7 & 8 in 2007, and (b) the total value of grants approved for Phase I of each round (the initial two years) will be \$1.0 billion for Round 5, \$1.1 billion for Round 6 and \$1.3 billion for each of Rounds 7 & 8.

The second demand-forecasting method used by the Fund, known informally as the "top-down" method, calculates global need, and then computes what share of this should be provided by the Fund. This serves primarily as a reality check on the first method.

Using this method, the Fund records that according to WHO, UNAIDS, and the Roll Back Malaria and Stop TB Partnerships, the estimated global needs in 2007 for tackling the three diseases are \$19.4 billion, of which \$4.5 billion will be covered out of domestic expenditures, leaving \$14.9 billion to be provided by international funding sources.

Table 2: Estimated Costs for 2007 for the Three Diseases

	Malaria	TB	HIV	Total
Resource needs	\$2.9 b.	\$2.0 b.	\$14.5 b.	\$19.4 b.
Total domestic expenditure	\$0.3 b.	\$1.2 b.	\$3.0 b.	\$4.5 b.
Total international share	\$2.6 b.	\$0.8 b.	\$11.5 b.	\$14.9 b.

For 2006, the number in the bottom right corner is \$13.4 b.

The Fund then calculates that currently, the portion that it is providing of the "total international share" is 45% for malaria, 66% for tuberculosis and 20% for HIV/AIDS. Applying these shares to the bottom

line in the above table leads to Global Fund resource needs of \$3.6 billion in 2006 and \$4.0 billion in 2007.

Thus, the two methods end up with very similar predictions regarding Global Fund needs.

++++++
ANALYSIS: Successes and Failures Among Grants Reviewed for Phase 2
++++++

During the past month, the Global Fund Secretariat has presented 26 grants to the board for consideration for Phase 2 renewal. For each of these grants, the Fund has provided the board with the results of an extensive and candid review of the grant's performance thus far.

The Secretariat's review of each grant is contained in two overlapping documents. First is the "*Grant Performance Report*," which is made public at www.theglobalfund.org/en/funds_raised/performance. This contains considerable data about the grant (including comparisons between targets set and levels achieved for various indicators), together with certain Secretariat evaluations of the data.

Second is the "*Grant Scorecard*," which is given to the board but is not made public. [Note: When board members show GFO copies of board materials such as these, GFO does not report on them until after the board has made its decisions.] The Grant Scorecard repeats some of the data in the Grant Performance Report, but provides considerably more discussions and evaluations of how the grant has performed.

Within the Grant Scorecard, the Secretariat aggregates its various assessments into an "Overall Grant Rating." This can have the following values:

- A: Grant performance has met or exceeded expectations
- B1: Grant performance has not met expectations, but has been adequate
- B2: Grant performance has been inadequate, but potential has been demonstrated
- C: Grant performance has been unacceptable

Separately, the Secretariat assesses "Contextual Considerations," which relate to factors beyond the control of those involved in grant implementation but that can have an impact on the chances of success.

Finally, after taking into account the "Overall Grant Rating" and the "Contextual Considerations," the Secretariat makes one of the following recommendations:

- "Go": The grant should be approved for Phase 2 (Years 3-5)
- "Conditional Go": The grant should be approved for Phase 2, on condition that specified actions are taken by the PR and/or CCM within a specified time period.
- "Revised Go": The grant should be approved for Phase 2, subject to specified major changes being made from the original proposal.
- "No Go": The grant should not be approved for Phase 2.

The Board reviews these Go / No Go / etc. recommendations by email. (For "Revised Go" and "No Go" recommendations, the TRP is also asked for an opinion.) If, for any grant, the Board disagrees with the Secretariat's recommendation, the Secretariat reviews the evidence and then submits a new recommendation (which might be the same as before) to the board. If they still don't agree, the grant is discussed at a board meeting.

When there is no disagreement between Secretariat and Board, their agreed opinion (Go / No Go / etc.) becomes a final decision.

For the 26 grants that have been considered thus far, the outcomes were as follows:

Table 3: Decisions Regarding Phase 2 Renewals

Grant	Secretariat Rating	Secretariat Recommendation	Board Opinion	Result
Benin, Malaria - Rd 1	B1	"Conditional Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Burundi, HIV - Rd 1	B1	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
China, Malaria - Rd 1	A	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
China, TB - Rd 1	A	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Ghana, HIV - Rd 1	B1	"Conditional Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Ghana, TB - Rd 1	B1	"Conditional Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Haiti, HIV - Rd 1 (PR=an NGO)	A	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Haiti, HIV - Rd 1 (PR=UNDP)	B1	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Honduras, HIV - Rd 1	B2	Was "No Go", but now being re-evaluated	Awaiting Secretariat re-evaluation	To be determined
Honduras, Malaria - Rd 1	B2	"Conditional Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Honduras, TB - Rd 1	B2	"Conditional Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
India, TB - Rd 1	A	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
LAO PDR, HIV - Rd 1	B2	"No Go"	Disagreed	Decision awaits Secretariat re-evaluation
LAO PDR, Malaria - Rd 1	B2	"Conditional Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Madagascar, HIV - Rd 2 (PR=CRS)	A	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Madagascar, HIV - Rd 2 (PR=PSI)	B1	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Madagascar, Malaria - Rd 1	B1	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Moldova, TB/HIV - Rd 1	A	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Mongolia, TB - Rd 1	A	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Morocco, HIV - Rd 1	A	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Panama, TB - Rd 1	A	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Rwanda, TB/HIV - Rd 1	A	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Senegal, HIV - Rd 1	C	"No Go"	Disagreed	Decision awaits Secretariat re-evaluation
Senegal, Malaria - Rd 1	C	"No Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 NOT approved
Tajikistan, HIV - Rd 1	A	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved
Zanzibar, Malaria - Rd 1	B1	"Go"	Agreed	Phase 2 approved

Summarizing the above, the Secretariat has rated the 26 grants as follows:

Table 4: Totals of Overall Grant Ratings for Phase 2 Renewals

Grant Performance	Number of grants	Percent
A: Met or exceeded expectations	11	42%
B1: Adequate	8	31%
B2: Inadequate, but potential demonstrated	5	19%
C: Unacceptable	2	8%
Total:	26	100%

In a new report, "The Global Fund at Three Years" (available at www.theglobalfund.org/en/about/replenishment), the Fund conducts a further analysis of the above "Phase-2-ready" grants. (The Fund's analysis refers to 27 grants that have been assessed, rather than 26. One grant seems to have disappeared from the list after the Fund did this analysis and before recommendations were put to the Board.) The Fund's findings include the following:

- Taken together, the 27 grants have reached just over 60% of their targets for people on antiretroviral treatment, nearly 80% of targets for malaria treatment, and more than 100% of targets for mosquito net distribution. All TB grants reached their targets for TB treatment under DOTS. The grants rated B2 or C account for most of the shortfall in targets that were not reached.
- B2 and C-rated grants reached only 27% of their agreed targets for "people reached," 57% of their agreed targets for "people trained," and only 24% of targets for "people on ARVs."
- Non-governmental PRs have performed well in absorbing funds, with an average disbursement rate of 91% of expected disbursement, as compared to an average of 79% for governmental PRs. And non-governmental PRs had the strongest performance record, with two A, two B1, and no B2 or C-rated grants.
- Grants that performed poorly did so as a result of three forms of delay:
 - Some delays resulted from a lack of capacity to execute the often sizeable programs, which frequently involve significant scale-up of new services with little in-country experience. The biggest problems related to procurement procedures.
 - Some delays resulted from the Global Fund's own procedures, or from lack of clarity regarding these procedures.
 - Finally, some delays resulted from a variety of internal issues within the countries receiving the grants, ranging from repeated changes of political leadership or senior management to internal conflicts of various kinds.

++++
NEWS: Report from Fund Lists Some New Developments
++++

One of the reports prepared for the Replenishment Meeting in Stockholm next week, discussed above, is "The Global Fund at Three Years" (available at www.theglobalfund.org/en/about/replenishment). This contains some interesting items of information, including the following:

Monitoring the Fund

In assessing its own performance, the Fund will monitor activities and impacts at four levels. Using the Fund's terms and GFO's explanations, these are:

- (a) Operational performance – What the Secretariat is doing
- (b) Grant performance – What grant recipients and sub-recipients are doing
- (c) System effects – What impact the above two have on health systems (and related systems) in-country
- (d) Impact – What impact all the above have on levels of disease

Executive Dashboard

As part of measuring and reporting on (a) above, the Fund will, starting this month, post at its web site, with monthly updates, an Executive Dashboard. This will measure five things:

- Resource mobilization (Primarily: Resources contributed as compared to pledges and internal targets for resource mobilization)

- Proposal management (Primarily: Grants signed as a share of the total number of approved grants)
- Grant negotiation (Primarily: The median proposal handling time, from call for proposals to grant signing)
- Disbursement and grant management (Primarily: Actual disbursements compared to disbursement targets)
- Business services (Primarily: Operating and Secretariat costs as a percentage of total expenditure)

LFA study and reform

Late last year, the Fund commissioned a thorough external review of (a) the whole concept of using outsourced oversight; (b) the effectiveness and value-for-money of existing LFA contracts and working arrangements; and (c) the effectiveness, benefits and weaknesses of individual LFAs. From this review came a number of recommendations, which the Fund says it is now implementing through updated work procedures and revised terms for future contracts. Details have not been provided of the actual findings or recommendations.

CCMs

"In a number of countries, the CCM model is an idea somewhat ahead of its time and has not worked as well as hoped. Some of the problems facing CCMs are due to practical limitations: travel costs, language barriers, lack of organization among constituencies and scarce resources for administration have all hindered the smooth functioning of some CCMs. In others, the government has not been willing to fully include nongovernmental groups in decision-making processes and oversight functions, and this has reduced genuine multi-sectoral participation. ... However, while CCMs in many countries are in need of reform, not even their critics are in favor of scrapping what is a cornerstone of the Global Fund structure and process."

CCM Checklist

The Fund has developed a simple CCM checklist (available in Appendix 2 of "The Global Fund at Three Years") which "will serve as a tool for yearly self-assessments of CCM composition and functioning, and as a basis for regular sample audits." The Fund has initiated a study that will develop a set of baseline data for all CCMs by June 2005.

A success story

"In the Western Cape, South Africa, pilot programs run by NGOs were already in place treating hundreds of people for HIV/AIDS. Global Fund financing enabled these pilots to be rapidly scaled up, with local governments building on the successful NGO model to treat over 5,000 people – meeting their five-year treatment target in only one year. Global Fund financing was only one piece of the success amongst the concerted efforts of multiple players, but once all the elements were in place, treatment scale-up was very rapid. The Principal Recipient was amazed at the speed of the results and is now focused on scaling up prevention efforts as well as maintaining ongoing treatments."

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

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

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 7,500 subscribers in 170 countries once to twice a month.

Aidspan and the Global Fund have no formal connection, and Aidspan accepts no grants or fees from the Global Fund. 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 has an Editorial Advisory Board comprising ICASO, GNP+ and the Eastern African National Networks of AIDS Service Organisations (the three organizations designated as Communications Focal Points within the Global Fund's NGO board delegations), and the International HIV/AIDS Alliance. GFO is currently provided in English only. It is hoped later to provide it in additional languages.

GFO is a free service of Aidspan (www.aidspan.org), based in New York, USA. Aidspan is a nonprofit organization that promotes increased support for, and effectiveness of, the Global Fund.

GFO Editor: Bernard Rivers (rivers@aidspan.org, +1-212-662-6800)

GFO Contributing Editor: Esther Kaplan (estherkaplan@earthlink.net)

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."

To stop receiving GFO, send an email to 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
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

For a collection of papers on the Global Fund, see www.aidspan.org/globalfund and www.theglobalfund.org/en/about/publications

For information on all approved and rejected proposals submitted to the Global Fund, see www.aidspan.org/globalfund/grants

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

Copyright (c) 2005 Aidspan. All rights reserved.